

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

Pindar's Nemean Odes: A Poetic Commentary

Carolyn Jones,

Department of Classics, Jewish Studies and History, McGill University, Montreal

August 2000

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-70052-6

Canada

Abstract

This professes to be a poetic commentary to the Nemean odes of Pindar. It argues for a re-evaluation of this poet's epinikia as poetry and has taken as its principal focus the stuff that is critically ignored or devalued. Much that Pindar writes is difficult in that it is at once dense and dynamic, obedient to the strictures of a genre and yet never ruled by them. He invites commentary and scholars have for the most part centred their considerable efforts on decoding genius. There is as much literature on the poet and his relatively inaccessible work as there is an absence of poetic appreciation of it. The desire for a system of language, a master decoder of metaphor, imagery and thought processes, and the desire to find unity of thought, for *Grundgedanken*, for correspondences, structural parallels and polarities is the engine that drives the philologist reading these odes. But Pindar defies system.

Ce commentaire sur les odes Neméennes de Pindare se propose comme une évaluation poétique et se base sur le principe que cette genre de poésie mérite d'être appréciée en sa plénitude de richesses poétiques et non seulement à cause des défis d'analyses. Parmi les difficultés considérables du style Pindarique est la densité et dynamisme de son expression et le fait que même avec les strictures imposantes du genre, Pindare ne fait rien de l'ordinaire. Il invite donc les commentaires et des analyses qui se concentrent sur une méthode de déchiffrement et cherchent de rendre accessible les données d'une culture et d'une esthétique qui sont loins de notre portée. Il existe autant de littérature sur le poète et son oeuvre difficile qu'il en manque d'appréciation pour son génie poétique. Le désir de trouver un système linguistique, une clef pour déchiffrer ses métaphores, ses images et ses pensées, de découvrir l'idée universelle, le *Grundgedanken*, les relations entre la structure apparente et l'inexprimable est la force et l'inspiration qui guide et engage le philologue. Mais, comme tout génie, Pindare y résiste.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my friends whose unfailing support has been remarkable. I am especially grateful to Richard Townsend and Ruth Portner without whose timely generosity I would not have had a first-year Greek text or a Greek-English lexicon. The alphas of this latter, a 19th-century tome, have since fallen into quiet desuetude but the remaining pages bear the marks of wear well beyond the ordinary. Secondly, to my friend and colleague, Sandra Vereniecks, who was a constant companion and advisor throughout my undergraduate years and masters degree and who has always been eager for details of news at the Rialto. Then, to my friend Alan Belkin, who convinced me that typing was a thing of the past and introduced me to the world of Macintosh. Without his encouragement and help I might still be pounding a pre-war Underwood. And to my friend and colleague Dorota Dutsch with whom I spent many hours translating Aristophanes and even more hours preparing for mind-numbing comprehensives, who understands grammar as no one else does, and who has provided me with invaluable insight and encouragement in this unending task.

Finally, I should like to thank my mother who is still uncertain as to what a dissertation is, but stands behind me anyway.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	
Acknowledgements	
Introduction	i-vi
Nemean 7	1
Nemean 4	39
Nemean 3	63
Nemean 5	89
Nemean 8	105
Nemean 10	124
Nemean 1	145
Nemean 9	167
Nemean 11	185
Nemean 2	200
Bibliography	208

INTRODUCTION

First of all the absence of N.6 from this collection is not an oversight but due to the fact of its being the subject of my master's thesis. Secondly, the term "poetic commentary" should perhaps be explained since it reflects the general and particular focus that I have given this study of the Nemeans.

My main concern has been to generate an original and it is hoped, a well-argued evaluation of these odes primarily as poetry. The density of Pindar's imagery and language has challenged many scholars and the natural inclination of anyone confronted with such rich and varied material is to search for a system, a unifying theory. The quest for unity has led many down a dark path.

As we relate Pindar and his cultural valencies to our own, noting primarily the differences, we can note one important distinction. Pindar writes from within a predominantly oral culture. His poems were designed to be heard in live performance rather than read and studied in the silence of one's own thoughts. This does not preclude their literary nature, i.e. their writerly quality, but it does, to my mind, call for a significant change in the kind of analysis or study that is warranted. In their analyses of the mythic material, for example, commentaries often assume the existence of an authentic or authorized version of the myth and consider Pindar's version a variation within that context. Yet it is evident that the myths developed from an oral tradition and, more importantly, within an oral society—that is one that was not perfused with literacy. What we know of an oral culture not only does not permit the institution of an authoritative version, but demonstrates over and again how plastic and variable myth could be as it is used in the context of a poet's particular vision.

It is primarily in Marshall McLuhan's The Mechanical Bride, The Gutenberg Galaxy, and Understanding Media that I first encountered [a lifetime ago] a discussion and description of the differences between oral and literate cultures. In McLuhan's argument the divide between oral and literate culture is most keenly observed with the technological innovation of the printing press and, at the same time, with the innovation of perspective in painting. The most arresting observations that he makes have to do with the way in which perceptions change or shift with these technological changes. He notes that with the introduction of printed writing a number of conventions changed: the standardization of orthography; the innovation

of "silent" reading, i.e. the interiorization of word sounds as though spoken within the readers mind; the privacy of thought and the idea of private and individual cogitation leading ultimately to the experience of thinking as a private experience. From this there extends the separation or individualization of experience: the notion of a mind separate from the body. The highly literate individual experiences self by a division of inner and outer space and contextuality. He sees ideas and constructs them within a spatial context or visual space that uses the vanishing point of perspective as a means of organizing and measuring relatedness. We perceive our relation to others as a function of distance, starting or radiating from a point zero from within us. Literacy develops analytic thinking and uses verbal expression as its highest order of expression.

This is held in contrast to the experience of an oral culture in which acoustic space is the mode of experience. In this context the individual experiences immersion in sound and does not distinguish in such a clear-cut manner between inner and outer experience. They are one and the same. The body and the mind are one. There is no issue of privacy but a highly complex sense of community and tribal identity. Orality develops synthesis and uses non-verbal forms as the highest order of expression. Its experience is multi-focal.

The literate world then is the world of the eye; the oral, that of the ear. The literate mind is verbal, logical, linear, detailed, sequential, controlled and quantitative. The oral experience is tactile, musical, acoustic, holistic, metaphorical, simultaneous, emotional, and qualitative.

The contrasting values and experiences of oral and literate cultures are clearly, if we accept McLuhan's seminal exposition, dramatically different. While McLuhan's study is not mentioned by philologists, presumably because of its preoccupation with studies of media and communications, and perhaps because communication studies are not recognized as valid or relevant in the context of classics. This is in my opinion an error: in his grasp of the human experience of technology, McLuhan's work is of great value. Moreover, philological discussions, while they also argue for the re-evaluation of the import of an oral culture in our understanding of ancient Greek literature, tend to focus their attention on questions concerning the depth and diffusion of literacy.¹ One need only refer to the ongoing

¹ Notably, *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*, I. Worthington, ed., Leiden, 1996; *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Thomas, R., Cambridge, 1989; *Signs of Orality*, E. Anne Mackay ed., Leiden, 1999.

controversy concerning oral tradition and Homer: it is still a matter of debate to what extent the epic poems were from a written or oral tradition.

That this approach to ancient literature in general, and to Pindar's poetry in particular, is justified can be seen initially if we examine some of the ancient literary criticism. If for example we review what Dionysius of Halicarnassus said of Pindar, referring to the dithyrambic fr. 75 we are confronted immediately with what must be styled as an oral evaluation of the poem's impact: "These lines are vigorous, weighty and dignified and are marked by much severity of style. Though rugged, they are not unpleasantly so, and though harsh to the ear, are only so in due measure. They are slow in their rhythm, and present broad effects of harmony; and they exhibit, not the showy and decorative prettiness of our own day, but the severer beauty of a distant past." The poem is described primarily in terms of its aural reception. Horace in his Odes Bk.4.2., describes Pindar as "a mountain stream that rushes down and overflows the banks of the river." Both these "ear witness" accounts bear testimony to the aural impact of Pindar's verse and to the overall sense of dynamic density.

In order to illustrate and reconstruct some sense of the oral experience it may prove helpful to examine something not entirely foreign to literature but not usually associated with poetic analysis. The corpus of curse tablets and magical papyri offers something useful in this context.² First of all, not so much for its incantatory content, as for its treatment of writing. In the context of magic, that is, the attempt to produce an effect upon the natural world by what is written on lead, wax, or papyrus, we have a study of an oral culture using written language for its symbolic powers. What is written is treated as a set of moving and moveable symbols which have the power to effect change. The written words or symbols have powers beyond their phonetic values, and beyond their semantic boundaries. For example, the act of writing a word backwards was in order to effect a reversal of what it stated or signified. The scrambling of letters within a word or phrase would be in order to effect the same chaos in the one cursed, just as the *voces magicæ* which are usually in alphabetical and numerical sequence—alpha once, epsilon twice, eta three times, etc.—by their literate order were supposed to contain the code and hence to communicate to an orderly occult world of *numina*. The written word and the individual letters have magical powers and these powers are evoked by their physical

2 Betz, Hans Dieter ed., *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*, Chicago, 1986. Faraone, C. A. and Dirk Obbink eds., *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, New York, 1991. Gager, John G. ed., *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, New York, 1992.

placement on the tabella or on the page. Indeed, this tactile quality in the use of the letter and word values is a direct reflection of oral culture.

In Pindar the tactile and physical ordering of words has not been studied or examined as such although his odes are full of examples of this phenomenon. There are many examples of his poetry that challenge our linear thinking and seem to be deliberately difficult. What I propose is that these and other elements need to be re-examined with a view to their plastic and physical ordering. For example, in N.2.14ff. we flash back in time to Troy and are on the battlefield: ἐν Τρωίᾳ μὲν Ἑκτωρ Αἴαντος ἀκουσεν, "in Troy Hektor heard Aias." There has been much debate over the exact meaning of these words. I say that what is happening here is just what Pindar seems to state: Hektor heard Aias, heard his voice—perhaps bellowing a challenge of war. It is in fact central to the poem—and this line occurs at the poem's exact centre—to bring to life that instant of recognition between pursuer and pursued. In fact the "prey" of the ode, is immediately flushed out: ἄ Τιμόδημε σὲ δ' ἄλλα. Timodemos' name is juxtaposed, as immediately and closely as is physically possible in language, to that of Aias. Timodemos is tactilely and audibly right up against Aias. Pindar invokes, calls out for Timodemos and we hear him just as Hektor heard Aias.

Another example is in N.7.72, where the poet speaks of his swift tongue which, like a bronze-tipped javelin "sent forth the neck and strength unwetted from wrestling before the limb falls beneath a burning sun." ὅς ἐξέπεμψεν παλαισμάτων, αὐχένα καὶ σθένος ἀδίδαντον, αἰθῶνι πρὶν ἀλίῳ γυῖον ἔμπεσεῖν. The adjective ἀδίδαντον belies the aorist action of the verb: how could wrestlers be, like an already shot javelin, without sweat? πρὶν aptly interrupts the "action," before the verb it governs, ἔμπεσεῖν, and before the limb that is not to fall.

I suggest that the entire passage is like a picture frozen on a screen, or, more appropriately, a painting on a vase. And like a painted picture it contains only suggested movement. It is action that never arrives, the javelin poised in flight to no destination. The wrestlers are "unwetted" because they never fight, the limb remains with the sun blazing upon it forever before falling in the dust.

Both these examples illustrate the way in which Pindar expresses a tactile or plastic sense of time and poetry. In so doing he uses what I would like to call the grammar and syntax of the realm of pictures and architecture rather than those of the written world. And like the grammar or technical considerations of phenomena in the visual arts, we must rely on our sense of tension and dynamics of line within the context of space. Pindar's poetry is best served I think by using the perceptual

sensibilities that are applied to the visual arts, an awareness of such elements as negative and positive space, focus, balance, harmony, tension and movement.

Another valuable approach to this re-evaluation is to be found in recent studies of ancient Greek art and architecture.³ Their discussion of vase-painting and the narrative implications of pictorial structures is, interestingly enough, related in terms of literary material: the pictures are to be "read." Nevertheless, what we can "read" on vase paintings is of enormous importance to our understanding of the narrative structures that inform ancient literature. Perhaps the most obvious point has to do with the narration of time pictorially. We find immediately that the convention of left side equalling the past and right side the future—one that is in fact a direct descendent of our highly developed literacy since it follows the direction in which we in the West read—does not hold. The figures, to left, to right, upper band, lower, are all part of the storytime. Sometimes a mythical figure is repeated within the same frame it is possible to infer that he is at one point at the past and at another in the future or present of the myth. Time is understood as being on the same plane within a story. If we were to imagine or describe this in another way, to picture it, then the mythic tale in its entirety would be centred and radiating from this centre would be the various times and events. This is somewhat similar to ring-composition, which surrounds a central component of the story by rings of parallel elements, but, more specifically, it reproduces what oral cultures experience as time, i.e. a non-linear medium in which all events and times are available. One is immersed in the story and it can be entered at any point. We are distressed by this: we experience simultaneity as disorganized narration. Similarly, when Pindar jumps from a past to present event or element of a myth, it disturbs us and we find his narration flawed.

In a general way, the most important objection that I can offer to the Pindaric approach that is represented by Bundy and sponsored since by many scholars, is that it analyses the epinikion as a programmatic poem. While this basic description of praise poetry cannot be disputed as to its set elements i.e., naming of the victor, specifying the event in which he won, naming and recording victories of his family and ancestors, mythical material etc., what it does overlook is the more critical fact that Pindar, as a poet, surpasses the limitations of the genre. More especially I find it a somewhat unpoetic evaluation to consider the base elements as essential, while explaining gnomic statements and other seemingly unconnected material as light or

3 Cf. *Art and text in ancient Greek culture*, S. Goldhill, R. Osborne eds., Cambridge, 1994; *Reading Greek Art*, Himmelmann, N., Princeton, 1998; *Sexual and Asexual Pursuit*, Hoffmann, H., London, 1977; *Pictorial Narrative in Ancient Greek Art*, Stansbury-O'Donnell, M. D., Cambridge, 1999

dark foil. Such an approach reduces these "foils" to items of lesser poetic importance and of a more or less digressive or distracting quality which serve to detract from or enhance the more essential message. I think that it would be preferable to consider the reverse: that the "business" of the epinikion is far less essential to the impact and purpose of Pindar's poetry than his arresting metaphors and "dark" statements. A foil should then be considered as the important element which uses the structure and format of an epinikion as their "foil".

Having said this I must now make clear that my own commentary to these Nemean odes is one of cautious originality: a selective use of past approaches and some personal and less conventional ones. The most salient feature of my approach is the determination to find each poem's "meaning" fulfilled by its own text. This means that I will not first and primarily look for enlightenment outside of the individual ode's boundaries. The text at hand is the supreme end in itself and sense must be found within each ode as it stands.

This does not pretend to be an exhaustive commentary. Issues of date and metre, except when I have felt impelled to challenge dismissive statements about metrical convenience, have been left aside since the work already done on them cannot be improved by any effort on my part.

I have not neglected philological questions of importance or readings not in the Snell-Maehler text that I have thought worthy of reconsideration. But I have chosen my battles with care.

NEMEAN 7

1. Ἑλεΐθυια: Hesiod *Theog.* 922 gives an account of the genealogy: ἥ [sc.Hera] δ' Ἥβην καὶ Ἄρην Εἰλεΐθυιαν ἔτικτε. Although these three progeny held relatively minor roles within the extended Olympian family and their cults were native to Greece, Thrace and Crete respectively, yet all three are Hera's children in Homer: Hebe: *Od.* 11.604; Ares: *Il.* 5.892; Eileithuia: *Il.* 11.270-1, where, it should be noted, the goddess is pluralized: μογοστόκοι Εἰλεΐθυιαι, Ἥρης θυγατέρες. Elsewhere in the the *Iliad* [16.187; 19.103] she remains singular. Hera herself was worshipped as Ἥρα Εἰλεΐθυια¹ at Argos and Athens. In Boiotia, Eileithuia is also found as a cult title in association with Artemis.²

Although no exact source for the origin of her cult is known, she was the birth-goddess in Mycenaean times, her name being Ereutija, i.e. eleuthia, "the coming,"³ and from this it appears that her worship was very ancient. In the *hAp.* v.97 she is mentioned as the only goddess who has not been told of Apollo's birth on Delos: Μοῦνη δ' οὐκ ἐπέπυστο μογοστόκος Εἰλεΐθυια. The adjective μογοστόκος "helping women in hard travail" is interesting in that it is the same attribute in the *Iliad*. In her more primitive form she appears to have had the character of an Aphrodite-Moira, both of whom appear in this ode.⁴ Of greater interest and relevance to this poem is the traditional association of her image with a torch. Pausanias describes one statue of her holding a torch aloft in one hand with the other hand held outstretched [*Paus.* 7.23.5 (Aegium)]. This iconography is certainly relevant to οὐ φάος οὐ μέλαιναν. . εὐφρόναν of v.3. William Race⁵ describes this as a cultic hymn opening that is untypically direct.

The ancient scholars had several notions regarding the relevance of an invocation to Eileithuia to the victor Sogenes.⁶ Fraenkel⁷ discusses the last (fifth) commentary which is most often accepted by modern scholars. It is attributed to Aristodemos and explains that the goddess' invocation was due to the fact that Sogenes was born to Thearion late in his life. His birth was therefore a gift from the goddess and because of its special nature Pindar addresses her. "This view gained acceptance because of Simonides' epigram."⁸ Fraenkel rightly rejects this biographical explanation although other scholars, notably Wilamowitz, Fennell, Farnell and Segal⁹ have given it credence, yet his explanation is marred, as Young describes it, by his conclusion that the Simonidean epigram is lost.¹⁰ Young adduces that the epigram of Simonides that is lost may well be fr.168 (Bergk)¹¹ in

which Simonides takes the name Σῶσις and uses it as an onomastic pun i.e. that his name means he is a Σῶτηρ, or Saviour. Young rightly points out that this epigram has nothing to do with the historical Sogenes but serves perhaps as a linguistic/literary parallel to the scholiast's interpretation.

However, as Young observes, whether any of these technical considerations is correct or even possible, the more important question remains not so much why Eileithuia is addressed in this ode to Sogenes but what specific poetic value such an invocation might have. First her invocation is unique to this poem. The universality of birth and death is indeed relevant to nearly every poetic work that exists, and Pindar makes rich use of this theme within the context of nearly every ode. Here however, we can sense a beginning that is not ordinary. As Kirkwood¹² states, Eileithuia is "appropriate to the context of success through natural endowment."

1. πάρεδρε Μοιρᾶν βαθυφρόνων: Hesiod's genealogy of the Moirai *Theog.* 217-219 does not in any way implicate Eileithuia:

καὶ Μοίρας καὶ Κῆρας ἐγένετο νήλεσποινοῦς,
| Κλωθὴ τε Λάχσειν τε καὶ Ἀτροπον αἶ τε βροτοῖσι
γενομένοισι διδοῦσιν ἔχειν ἀγαθὸν τε κακὸν τε, |

Night is their mother here; at 904 it is Themis and Zeus. The adjective νήλεσποινοῦς is judged to belong more properly to the Kêres¹³ and the θεαὶ δεινόιο χόλοιο or, Erinyes, (220-2) in the following lines.¹⁴

The occurrence and significance of repeated triadic associations within N.7 suggests that the three Moirai have, in addition to their collective role, special significance as individuals: Lachesis for example is implicit in the verb ἐλάχομεν, v.4, Klotho at v.77, by the phrase εἶρην στεφάνους ἐλαφρόν and Atropos at v.103, with ἀτρεποῖσι Νεοπτόλῃμον ἐλκύσαι ἔπεισι.

Whatever may be said with confidence regarding an historico-cultic association of Eileithuia with the Moirai, and there is scant evidence that there was one, Pindar nevertheless uses such a pairing elsewhere in O.6.42, τὰ μὲν ὁ Χρυσόκομος πρᾶν μῆτιν τ' Ἐλεῖθυιαν παρέστασέν τε Μοῖραν and Paean 12.17, πολλὸν ῥόθον ἔσαν ἀπὸ στομάτων Ἐλεῖθυιά τε καὶ Λάχεσις¹⁵ As Most¹⁶ observes in his discussion of this poem, both the term πάρεδρος and the adjective βαθυφρόνης are notably unusual. Where do Eileithuia and the Moirai sit together? Most's idea that this suggests a setting of judicial process, "a metaphorical judicial scene" is an attractive one. The word πάρεδρος can have the legal connotation of "assessor" and is used by Pindar of Rhadamanthys in O.2.76 and of Themis in O.8.22, both of whom are associated with judgement and law. And the

Moirai, insofar as they allot portions of life, are dispensers of justice. The imperative ἄκουσον is as appropriate to the law-court as to an invocation, and in this ode, moreover, Pindar does "make a case" for Neoptolemos. We should also note that Aiakos was rewarded for his life by Zeus to be a judge of the dead in the underworld.

The adjective βαθύφρονες is of particular interest: the Moirai are described here for the first time as deep-thinking.¹⁷ The adjective directs us vertically, projecting a downward-looking focus which contrasts with the horizontal reflex of v.17, σοφοί δέ, who look to the oncoming wind.

2. παῖ μεγαλοσθενέος, ἄκουσον, Ἥρας, γενέτειρα τέκνων:

The invocation is interrupted by the imperative ἄκουσον, "hear!", which effectively separates Hera from her epithet μεγαλοσθενέος and deflects our attention from her. Eileithuia is not simply formally invoked, but told to listen. This disruptive injunction has the mimetic quality of an urgent and spontaneous appeal.

2-3. ἄνευ σέθεν | οὐ φάος, οὐ μέλαιναν δρακέντες εὐφρόναν:

"without you we do not look upon the light nor the black night." Cf. N.6.6, καίπερ ἑφαμερίαν οὐκ εἰδότες οὐδὲ μετὰ νύκτας. The Greek idiom for being alive or dead was "[still or no longer] to look upon the light of the sun." Like N.6.1-7, this ode begins with the beginning of all things and Pindar states this in terms of light and darkness. Here, in clear terms of polarity, the positive power of Eileithuia is stated using negatives: without, no light, no black night. The word εὐφρόναν, a euphemism, echoes βαθύφρονες. Segal observes that "It is through her that all mortals see *both* the light of day and the darkness of night."¹⁸

4. ἐλάχομεν: "we are allotted." The verb enforces the role of Eileithuia as the πάρεδρε of the Moirae, the Fates. These goddesses, or more exactly, these primal divinities, link Eileithuia with the beginning of time, a time that precedes Kronos and Zeus. It is curious that only female divinities are invoked at the start of N.7 whereas later on in the ode, it is Herakles. The effect of this is that of deepening the time to that of the beginning of life itself. The Moirai are βαθύφρονων since destiny is too profound for mortal man to penetrate with his thoughts: we do not foresee the diversity of our goals nor our limitations in achieving them. ἐλάχομεν is echoed by λαχόντες at v.54.

4. τεὰν ἀδελφεὰν. . ἀγλαόγυιον Ἥβαν: There is a connection between the shining limbs of Hebe and those of the wrestler in v.73, αἴθωνι πρὶν ἀλίω γυῖον ἐμπεσεῖν, whose limbs are in the blazing sun before he falls. Since, as I conjecture, this later description is that of a pictorial representation, it is all the more

intriguing that Fennell states that this "[suggests] that Pindar had a work of art before his mind 'transports us from the realm of poetry to the realm of prose'." We should also note the grandeur that accrues from vv.3-4 with the repeated "-an" phoneme: μέλαιναν, εὐφρόναν, τεὰν, ἀδελφεὰν, ἦβαν.

5. ἀναπνέομεν δ' οὐχ ἅπαντες ἐπὶ ἴσα: ἀναπνέομεν, cf. N.6.1, N.10.87. We are not all created equal. ἐπὶ ἴσα: The preposition ἐπὶ has a similar force and direction as that of ἐπὶ ἡμέροι or ἐφήμεροι, "creatures on a day" i.e. we are all inequally fettered on to the same destiny. We are equal in that our fate is to die. Our life's course however, is not ἐπὶ ἴσα "for / to the same ends." This primal force is again stated in negative terms.

6. εἴργει δὲ πότμῳ ζυγέινθ' ἕτερον ἕτερα: εἴργει, "hinders, restrains, checks," the initial verb blocks any action that follows. ἕτερα "some things" hinder, another, ἕτερον is yoked [ζυγέινθ'] to destiny, πότμῳ. "One thing, now another hinders one man, now another, yoked to destiny." The very construction of the sentence illustrates the confusion of differing fates. Both εἴργω and ζεύγνυμι, describe limiting or, what might be called, kinetically negative action and this action is applied to the same end.

6. σὺν δὲ τὴν: answers ἄνευ σέθεν, v.2. As such, it serves to reinforce the power of Eileithuia, expressed now as a positive force, as the consort of the Fates and daughter of Hera. It also underlines the natural qualities with which an athlete who is to win at the games must have at the start of his life, what he is born with.

7. καὶ παῖς ὁ Θεαρίωνος ἀρετᾷ κριθεῖς: The καὶ focuses our attention on Sogenes. ἀρετᾷ κριθεῖς mirrors the syntax and sense of πότμῳ ζυγέινθ'. Sogenes is selected by virtue of his excellence in the same way that we are bound to our fate. κριθεῖς, "judged, chosen," reminds us that his prominence is related to his athletic victory. He is εὐδοξος, glorious and being sung, αἰείδεται.

9-10. πόλιν γὰρ φιλόμολπον οἰκεῖ δορικτύπων | Αἰακιδᾶν: "for he is a citizen in the music-loving city of the spear-clattering Aiakidai." The particle γὰρ is explanatory and links Sogenes to his community. φιλόμολπον and δορικτύπων offer an interesting contrast of musical sound and aggressive noise, liquids and nasals versus 4 stops. Carey understands that φιλόμολπον explains αἰείδεται and that δορικτύπων, ἀρετᾷ κριθεῖς, i.e. the musical and agonistic.

10. μάλα δ' ἐθέλοντι σύμπειρον ἀγωνίᾳ θυμὸν ἀμφέπειν: "and they are especially willing to embrace a spirit familiar with contests." I translate the verb ἀμφέπειν in its primary sense of "gathering around, embrace," rather than "foster," or "cherish," since this best expresses the movement of a community of

citizens who share in the athlete's victory and surround him with glory; Sogenes is in fact physically surrounded in the poem, first by his father's name and then the Aiakidai. He is embraced by the heroic family of Aigina as he is by his genetic family. *σὺμπειρον ἀγωνία* further renders the sense of sharing in the experience of athletic achievement.

11. εἰ δὲ τύχη τις ἔρδων μελίφρον ' αἰτίαν ῥοαῖσι Μοισᾶν ἐνέβαλε: The verb ἐνέβαλε, "has cast upon, offers to" [Slater] in this phrase has a function similar to ἀναβάλλω of v.77, where it indicates that the song is to be cast up, started. Here it is the victory which gives a "cause" or reason that is μελίφρονος, "sweet to the mind," or "welcome" [Carey], and is cast into the streams of poetry. ἐνέβαλε is understood to be a gnomic aorist in hypothetical construction with εἰ δὲ τύχη τις ἔρδων, τύχη subj. of τυγχάνω. The part. ἔρδων, according to Hummel, is "un attribut du sujet ou noyau prédicatif d'une participiale objet".¹⁹ Fennell suggests that the metaphor may allude to some ritual gesture of throwing herbs, etc. onto waters to procure their abundance. Water is in any case always closely associated with poetry in Pindar.²⁰

12-13. ταῖ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαὶ | σκότον πολλὸν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι: The thick darkness of unsung greatness is closely related to the light and dark we do not see unless we are born: poetry acts to bring living beings into the light as Eileithuia does to all mortals. The parallel between poet and birth-goddess is borne out by the parallel word-pairs. Μοιρᾶν βαθυφρόνων and μελίφρον'. . . Μοισᾶν. The poet, because he is directed by the Muses is, like Eileithuia to the Fates, an assistant to divine agency. The imagery of these two lines is repeated in vv.61-2: σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων φάγον | ὕδατος ὡτε ῥοᾶς.

14. ἔργοις δὲ καλοῖς ἔσοπτρον ἴσαμεν ἐνὶ σὺν τρόπῳ: The phrase ἐνὶ σὺν τρόπῳ mimics the earlier σὺν δὲ τινι, implying that the condition in which victory can be seen is similar to the one in which it is gained: the victor depends upon the grace of Eileithuia for his win as his fame depends upon song. A mirror is reflective and shines uni-directionally, ἐνὶ σὺν τρόπῳ—i.e. it reflects light from a single source. We know of the divine as we know light only from its reflection in poetry or music that stores it. The verb ἴσαμεν contains both senses of knowing and seeing.

15-16. εἰ Μναμοσύνας ἕκατι λιπαράμπυκος | εὐρηται: As to the subject of εὐρηται: εὐρηταί τις has been generally deemed an interpolation [Boeckh, Dissen, Schroeder] and was restored to its present form by Hermann ap

Heyne. Hermann chose ἔργα as the understood subject, as did Dissen; Fennell judged that τις was understood, as in an impersonal construction.

Μνημοσύνας. . λιπαράμνηκος: Mnemosyne, memory, mother of the Muses, is here garlanded with an unusual adjective, coined by Pindar and chosen "on account of the metaphor. The headband of Memory is conceived as a bright surface that reflects".²¹ This lucent attribute of Mnemosyne is similar to that of shining-limbed Youth, ἀγλαόγυιον ἦβαν, and by it Pindar means the light of divine spirit without which we do not know of greatness any more than we know of life. Moreover, Memory, acting as a reflector of light by which we know of noble deeds, has a function closely related to that of Eleithuia who determines our seeing the light, vv.2-3. The poet then acts as a *paredros* to Mnemosyne as Eleithuia does to the Fates.

17. σοφοῖ: The common dispute is whether this refers to poets, patrons, sailors of experience or wise men. The scholia were certain that σοφοῖ meant patrons willing to spend money for fame. Fennell's opinion that σοφοῖ were wise poets was sanctioned by Wilamowitz and later by Schadewaldt. Fraenkel opted for wise patrons. On the sailor side: Dissen, Kirkwood. On the wise men: Bury; Dissen ap Boeckh, *prudentes*; Christ, *prudentes mercatores*. Most commentators since Schadewaldt grant the meaning of σοφοῖ as poets rather than patrons, or in this context of sailing, skilled helmsmen [as suggested by Slater and scholiasts]. This choice however does not solve the problem of βλάβεν [Ep. for ἐβλάβησαν 3 pl. aor. pass.]: how are poets who have foreseen the future [wind or storm] not damaged or harmed by gain? Farnell speculates that this is an "aphorism which is oracular and at first sight obscure." Carey is equally wise in his attribution: "This gnome includes poets, patrons, and everyone else"²². The third wind that is to come might then reasonably refer to the future beyond life μέλλοντα τριταῖον ἄνεμον since the lines immediately following direct our attention to the indifferent future of all mortals: ἀφνεὸς πενιχρὸς τε θανάτου πέρας / ἅμα νέονται, "rich and poor dwell at the same time in the end of death."

Although I side with Carey's view, I think that there is an indication contained within the poem which might further clarify the matter. At vv. 58-60 Thearion is addressed, Θεαρίων, τὴν δ' εὐκότα καιρὸν ὄλβου / δίδωσι, τόλμαν τε καλῶν ἀρομένῳ / σύνεσιν οὐκ ἀποβλάπτει φρενῶν, "Thearion, to you she grants a timely and fitting portion of success, to one who has won daring from noble deeds, and she does not harm your mind's intelligence." The poem at this later juncture has completed two parts of the Aiakid triad, i.e. the stories of Aias

and Neoptolemos, and in fact enters upon the third epode of the poem's triadic structure. The verb ἀποβλάπτει there is a reflex of βλάβειν here. The notion of timeliness, καιρὸς, and power of mind or intelligence, σύνεσιν, that prevents harm provides further congruence with this passage. The σοφοὶ then, who have learned, ἔμαθον, must be understood to be the wise, those who see and have understand the light from the mirror of Mnemosyne and those who have the ability to understand what Moira, or fate, holds out for them. This must include poets who await the right time to give praise, the third part of the triad, [the third wind], Sogenes.²³

19. ἀφνεὸς πενιχρὸς τε θανάτου πέρας: We should note the tactile sense that Pindar exploits, placing the two contrasting individuals contiguously in the line as they are to lie buried in death.

20. ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔπομαι λόγον Ὀδυσσεός ἢ πάθαν διὰ τὸν ἀδυεπῇ γενέσθ' Ὅμηρον: The exemplum of Odysseus and Aias is now a focal point for the previous line; like the rich and poor man they both lie side by side in death; like them they share a destiny unequal to their inherent qualities. Odysseus has more and Aias less fame than he deserves.

This idea, expressed at the end of the first triad and effectively in transit to the next, forms an important bridge. The mythological chain of Odysseus, Aias and Neoptolemos forms a triad of mythic narration and these three figures in turn form a three-fold connection to Troy, Aigina and Delphi. The suggestion that Odysseus was rich in stolen or false glory and that Aias was impoverished moreover, develops the previous examination of mortal destiny in strophes 1 and 2. The usual reading of this line is that Homer is a poet who by the sweetness or charm of his verse exalted a hero of questionable quality.

While it is not entirely new that aspersions be cast upon Homer—Xenophanes fr.1.1-3 [D.K] disparages Homer and Hesiod, saying that they attribute everything to the gods that is blameworthy and immoral in men: stealing, adultery and deceiving of one another,²⁴ and Herakleitos is also said to have stated that Homer was worthy to have been thrown out of the games and cast away,²⁵—what is novel is Pindar's supposed negative assessment of Homer and his personal statement, ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον' ἔλπομαι that the λόγος of Odysseus was greater than his πάθη. In other words, Odysseus' reputation in a spoken and written tradition exaggerated the heroic experience.

There are several problems with this interpretation. To begin with, there exist no other instances of Pindar's disparaging the work of Homer in the three other cases in which Homer's name occurs: P.4.277, I.4.37, and Paean 7b11. A

further consideration is to distinguish between the treatment of Homer and of Aias in N.7, N.8, and I.4. As Nisetich²⁵ has observed that the Homer of N.7 is the poet of the Odyssey; of I.4 of the Iliad. In N.8, although the story of Aias is taken from the Odyssey and the cyclic poems, Pindar does not mention Homer. As Richardson²⁶ observes, the characterization of Odysseus' part in the quarrel between him and Aias in N.8.23-34 demonstrates clearly Pindar's antipathy to that hero and explicitly makes Odysseus the villain by reason of his guile and clever rhetoric.

In I.4.37-39, where he is named, Homer is, as Mann²⁷ notes, "on the side of the angels." Aias' story is rectified, "straightened"—ὀρθώσας:

ἀλλ' Ὀμηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, ὅς αὐτοῦ
πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν
θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν.

Would antipathy towards Homer in N.7 as Nisetich, Richardson²⁸ and others suggest there is, serve to pacify the resentment of the Aiginetans for the downplay of their hero's contribution to the destruction of Troy? Or is it not rather his antipathy to Odysseus which serves to strengthen Pindar's argument for the praise of both Aiginetan heroes, Aias and Neoptolemos, who is here alone said to have sacked Troy? Is Pindar's idea of Homeric qualities a reflection of the power of poetry as rhetoric to persuade to truth or falsehood, that in the hands of a great poet the truth can be distorted by the energy and promise of words, that the quality or virtue of beauty in words and expressive power develop their own ambiguity with regard to truth or historical accuracy? Or is it not that quality of σοφία which Odysseus uses in his words or λόγος that misleads: his clever speech which κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις, "robs with misleading tales." It is Odysseus' version of events which deceives, which is ambiguous and betrays truth.

Farnell ad loc. posits that Pindar was not, as Bury offers in his Introduction p.117, "out of sympathy with Homeric poetry: . . . What he says here of Homer's poetry is like what he says of charis in O.1.30-33: both have the magic art of making the false seem true." I think however that these assessments of Pindar in his evaluation of Homer, although they are the more common ones, neglect one possible reading which would render the passage less problematic.

My argument pivots entirely on the reading of διὰ as meaning "through" [as in, "through the air"], "throughout," rather than "because of." As Hummel notes, it is not easy to make a line of distinction between the sense of διὰ with the gen. or acc. Pindar's use of the preposition "autorise une certaine osmose entre les deux types de constructions."²⁹ E.g. N.6.48, πέτεται δ' ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ

θαλάσσης, and I.3/4,59, ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν, and P.9.123, ἄγειν ἱππευτῶν Νομάδων δι' ὄμιλον. In all of these examples διὰ has the sense "through, throughout". There is no nuance of agency, direct or indirect. With this change we can understand the lines to mean that "throughout sweet-worded Homer" Odysseus' story was, in Pindar's estimation, greater than his suffering. If furthermore we note that Odysseus' *logos*, in the *Odyssey*, and in relation to Aias in particular, is given in *oratio recta*, that it is indeed in his own words, we might be able to assess Homer and Pindar in a less problematic way.

At Od.11.543-551, Odysseus, in the Underworld encounters the shade of Aias, who refuses to speak to him:

οἷη δ' Αἴαντος ψυχὴ Τελαμωνιάδαο
νόσφιν ἀφεστήκει, κεχολωμένη εἵνεκα νίκης,
τὴν μιν ἐγὼ νίκησα δικαζόμενος παρὰ νηυσὶ
τεύχεσιν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλλῆος· ἔθηκε δὲ πότνια μήτηρ.

Since this represents Odysseus' version, in his words, we should examine it closely. At v.545, δικαζόμενος suggests that Odysseus himself awarded or allowed the decision that he should win the arms of Achilles³¹. He then states that Achilles' mother, Thetis, proposed it, ἔθηκε, implying that Thetis either set up the contest or decided upon Odysseus. In any case it is clear that Odysseus does not take full responsibility. Line 547 is identical to a line of the *Ilias Mikra*, [quoted below p.11v24], with the Trojans [here παῖδες instead of παρθένου] and Athena judging; it was deleted as an interpolation by Aristarchos. It remains uncertain however whether this is a pre-Homeric version³².

Lines 550-551 of the *Odyssey* repeat the words of *Iliad* 17.279-280 in their assessment of Aias' achievement and importance.

Αἴανθ', ὅς περὶ μὲν εἶδος περὶ δ' ἔργα τέτυκτο
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα.

In the next verse Odysseus says: τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἐπέεσσι προσηύδων μελιχίοισιν: "I then addressed him speaking with honeyed words."

While it is the opinion of Nisetich (above) that Pindar's reference to this story is taken from the *Odyssey*, Pindar's evaluation of Aias as a hero seems to be that of the *Iliad* 2.768 and 17.279-80.

ἀνδρῶν αὖ μέγ' ἄριστος ἦν Τελαμώνιος Αἴας [2.768]

Αἴας, ὅς περὶ μὲν εἶδος περὶ δ' ἔργα τέτυκτο
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα. [17.279-80]

22. ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσσι οἱ ποτανᾷ τε μαχανᾷ σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι:
Whether these next lines characterize Homer or Odysseus rests upon deciding to

whom οἱ refers. Bury finds for Homer. The possible readings as Köhnken³² has listed are as follows: 1) therefore by his (Homer's) lies and winged poetic skill a certain magnificence was bestowed, quippe mendaciis eius et alatae arti magnificum inest quiddam.³³ 2) from the lies of Odysseus and Odysseus' winged art lies a certain noble worth [etwas Ehrwürdiges].³⁴ 3) "then he [sc. Odysseus] created for himself a certain noble worth in the winged and artful skill of [Homer's] poetry."³⁵

In any event, since Pindar does not assess Homer negatively elsewhere, this fact renders the reading of Homer for οἱ difficult. The ambiguity of the pronoun may suggest that there is confusion as to who is responsible. If it is, however, applied to Odysseus, then it is in keeping with the epinician program to praise Aias as hero of Aigina, and is evidence of what Most³⁶ describes as the beginning of anti-Odysseus sentiment. This leads one to conclude that this phrase with its burden of lies and flying-word devices must refer to Odysseus.

23. **σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι**: "a certain sacred quality is added on," signifying that Odysseus has acquired through his words a surface of venerability. The verb, which Slater translates as "lies upon" suggests that the **σεμνὸν τι** is just an exterior and not an inner quality; one that has, like a garment, been put on for outward show and which disguises the lack underneath. Dissen cites Aristophanes *Nub.* 1025: ὥς ἡδύ σου τοῖσι λόγοις σῶφρον ἔπεστιν ἄνθος.

23. **σοφία δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις**: It would appear that **σοφία** is almost universally accepted to mean "poetic skill," yet in this context **σοφία** must refer to Odysseus rather than to Homer and therefore must have the sense of cleverness or skill in rhetoric or persuasion. This then gives the sense that cleverness steals, robs one of a sense of justice or of what is right by its use of **παράγοισα μύθοις**, words that lead astray. What is in fact stolen is Achilles' armour from Aias who was its rightful recipient. In the same way that Odysseus has a quality of awe put "on" [ἐπὶ] him, he uses words that lead "from" [παρὰ] the way.

23-4. **τυφλὸν δ' ἔχει | ἦτορ ὄμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος**: The progression of thought is this: we do not see light without the aid of Eileithuia who sits with the Fates; greatness of deeds that is unsung by poets lies within dense obscurity, **σκότον πολλόν**; Memory of greatness as it is contained in the honeyed words of poets reflects a uni-directional light of the divine; the great mass of mankind, **ὄμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος** has a blind heart.

But what is the particular blindness of heart of most men? What truth is it that, had they seen it, would have changed things? What, more importantly

perhaps, is the particular light which they do not see? They see the light of being, of having life. The eyes of poets when they are blind to light enable them to see and hence know things that are usually granted only to immortal gods. But what is it that the heart sees?

The madness of Aias is mentioned in the *Destruction of Troy* (Allen v) where it is Podaleirios, one of Poseidon's sons (the other Machaon, surgeon):

ὅς ῥα καὶ Αἴαντος πρῶτος μάθε χωόμενοι
ὄμματα τ' ἀστράπτοντα βαρυνόμενον τε νοῆμα.
who then first noticed that Aias was angered
and noticed his rolling eyes and burdened mind.

whereas the *Ilia Mikra* contains the story of Aias and Odysseus quarreling over the difference in their respective achievements, the Hellenes, on the advice of Nestor go among the Trojans and the Trojan girls are overheard saying that Aias was the better man: τοὺς δὲ πεμφθέντες ἀκοῦσαι παρθένων διαφερομένων πρὸς ἀλλήλας ὧν τὴν μὲν λέγειν ὡς ὁ Αἴας πολὺν κρείττων ἐστὶ τοῦ Ὀδυσσεύς. Does this mean that, had a poet sung the praises of Aias, they would have realized his true worth and not allowed the arms of Achilles to be awarded to Odysseus or that Odysseus, by his clever speech, robbed them of truth?

24–27. εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἔ τὰν ἀλᾶθειαν ἰδέμεν, οὐ κεν ὅπλων χολωθεῖς | ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ φρενῶν | λευρὸν ξίφος:
The statement is conditional, ἔ referring to ὄμιλος: if the gathering of men had seen the truth, then Aias would not have become enraged and killed himself. The condition directs us to the responsibility of those that witnessed the decision. Yet clearly, Aias plants the sword into himself. Perhaps this statement is meant to direct us to Aias' own blindness as well. The initial part of the conditional sentence places the subject of the protasis in an acc./ inf. construction; Aias as the subject of the apodosis is in the nominative; he is the direct and they the oblique subject. The split thereby implies that the responsibility for the condition is shared, but that the result of the condition is entirely his. The sword is described as λευρὸν—a word usually used to mean "even, level" when describing land and by Pindar unusually, here to mean "smooth." This use leads us to an uncomfortable and tactile sense of the act. The blade is not sharp or swift, but one that sinks into his body without resistance. And this lack of resistance, like a stretch of ground from which all trees and stones has been removed, points to Aias himself: he has killed himself too easily; the deed is done without resistance. The transition from anger to self-destruction was smooth. His *logos*, no match for that of Odysseus', the *ergon* of suicide is his only response to the deception of παράγοισα μύθοις.

Perhaps the deeper meaning of this passage of verses [17-27] might be illuminated by the lines in Iliad 23.708-737, where Odysseus and Aias wrestle each other in the games that Achilles has ordered in Patroclus' honour for a prize of a tripod. Appropriately enough to the triadic structuring and thematic play of N.7, it constitutes the third contest. Odysseus is described at 709, *ἂν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς πολύμητις ἀνίστατο, κέρδεα εἰδώς*, and later at 713, their struggle is compared to that of a two locked-together rafters: *δώματος ὑψηλοῖο, βίας ἀνέμων ἀλεείνων*

Comparing these lines to *σοφοὶ δὲ μέλλοντα τριταῖον ἄνεμον / ἔμαθον, οὐδ' ὑπὸ κέρδει βλάβεν* we may understand that the *κέρδος* which can cause harm in N.7 and which the *σοφοὶ* know about, foreseeing the third wind that comes, might readily be transferred from the struggle between Odysseus and Aias which in the Iliad is said to be like those fitted rafters of a high-built house that withstand the force of winds, *βίας ἀνέμων ἀλεείνων*. Here, the contest is for a prize which Achilles awards to be shared equally between the two rivals, whereas in Pindar the contest is won by Odysseus unfairly. Or so at least I understand it. Odysseus is described here as *πολύμητις* and later [725] as "not forgetting a trick," *δόλου δ' οὐ λήθεται Ὀδυσσεύς*. In Pindar this becomes falsehoods and winged devices, *ψεύδεσσι οἱ ποτανᾶ τε μηχανᾶ* Pindar says of the wrestler in v.72, that he, the poet, did not "shoot forth. . . a swift tongue which sends out the neck and strength unwetted of wrestling," *παλαισμάτων αὐχένα καὶ σθένος ἀδίαντον* which contrasts with the sweat that streams down the back of the wrestlers in Il. 715, *κατὰ δὲ νότιος ῥέειν ἰδρώς*. It is also significant that Achilles stops the fight between the two men as they rise for the *third* time in their effort to throw each other for the prize.

Aias' bravery is doubly praised by the phrase *ὁ καρτερὸς Αἴας* which is immediately followed by: *ὦν κράτιστον Ἀχιλέος ἄτερ*. The verb *ἔπαξε*, "planted, fixed" is demonstrated by the vase-painting in which Aias is seen leaning over a sword planted in the ground as he is about to fall with his weight upon it.³⁸

27-30. ξανθῷ Μενέλαῳ δάμαρτα κομίσαι θοαῖς | ἐν ναυσὶ πόρευσαν εὐθυπνόου Ζεφύροιο πομπαὶ | πρὸς Ἴλιου πόλιν. This description of Zephyr is unique to Pindar: the wind is *εὐθυπνόος*—"straight of breath"—an unusual adjective that directs in breathless syntax the movement of Aias from the ignominy of his suicide to the place and purpose of his glory. The direction however is to the past, to the beginning of the Trojan war. As well the movement is structured from the past forward: it begins with Menelaus, his wife,

the intention of conveying her back, the swift ships they are to sail in, the wind which drives them to Ilion. This wind bears in some measure a resemblance to the "third wind" since it too is followed by a reminder of the indifferent end of all men.

30. ἀλλὰ κοινὸν γὰρ ἔρχεται | κῦμ' Ἀΐδα, πέσε δ' ἄδόκητον
 ἐν καὶ δοκέοντα: The wave of death which follows Aias' journey and is common to all men contains a change of tense, i.e. a continuous present, ἔρχεται, and an empiric aorist, πέσε, which can refer to many points in time.³⁸ Death keeps coming yet falls but once every time. It should be noted that the dead are again cast in two molds: the one who is ἄδόκητον and the one δοκέοντα. There is some speculation as to the specific connotation of these two words; Slater gives "unexpected? unexpected?" and "expecting"; Dissen, "inglorious and glorious";³⁹ Fennell, "ingloriously even on a glorious hero"; Farnell translates: "on him who looks not for it and on him who does."⁴⁰

The scholiasts offer two meanings: παντὲς γὰρ ἀποθνησκομεν καὶ οἱ ἄξιοι καὶ οἱ μὴ, "we all die, both the worthy and the unworthy." And further, ἢ ἄδόκητον κέκληκε τὸν ἄδοξον δοκέοντα δὲ τὸν ἔνδοξον, "or he has called ἄδόκητον the one who is without a reputation and δοκέοντα the one who is respected." The second scholiast differs: ἄδόκητον τὸν νεώτερόν φησιν· οὐ γὰρ προσδοκᾷ ταχέως τὸ ἀποθανεῖν· δοκέοντα δὲ τὸν πρεσβυτίτην· προσδοκᾷ γὰρ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ἐμπίπτει, φησίν, ὁ θάνατος ὁμοίως καὶ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ νεωτέροις."⁴¹ Gerber enumerates five interpretations [excluding this last] and chooses, "on him who does not expect it and on him who does."⁴² His choice is based upon what precedes and on the excursus that follows: Neoptolemos did not expect to die at Delphi. This makes clear sense if we accept that the story of Neoptolemos within this ode is concerned with whether he expected to die or not. In Young's discussion of this passage he argues that the sense must be "esteemed and unesteemed" based on the close linguistic parallel of fr. adesp.482[Nauck], καθελὼν μὲν δοκέοντ' ἄδόκητον δ' ἐξαείρων.⁴³ He attributes the other sense of "expecting" to the assumption of a transitive sense for δοκέοντα and notes that from the evidence he cites:

It seems certain that δοκέοντα in the tragic fragment is used absolutely, having the force of the English passive, "esteemed," a common use and meaning of δοκέων. The other member, therefore, ἄδόκητον, must surely be an antonym and passive, meaning "unesteemed."

Since the following verse centres on τιμᾶ, "honour, reward" I think that esteemed is the most relevant sense.

31. τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται ὧν θεὸς ἄβρὸν αὖξει λόγον τεθνακόντων βοασθόν: Farnell greets this passage as the "key-passage of the personal part of the ode" and goes on to denote it as one of the most difficult and perplexing. If we ignore for the moment the maelstrom what remains essentially is that "honour happens to those of the dead whose gentle story a god will increase." Honour or reward as τιμὰ means is clearly something to be shared by both Aias, whose tale and example precede this statement and Neoptolemos, whose account is about to be given. As such it serves a dual transitional purpose and thence provides a context for understanding the terms ἀδόκητον and δοκέοντα. The word in its primary intransitive sense refers to what is seen, what can be considered to be from its appearance.

The difference between what is seen to be and what it actually is, the difference between the truly heroic and the appearance of heroism is one that underlies the entire ode. Life in the first triad is something we do not *see* without being born; great unsung deeds are not seen unless they are celebrated in poetry. The mirror of memory is what we see when it is no longer there. Memory holds and enables us to behold what is invisible. The σκότον πολὺν of what is not remembered in verse is the darkness not of death but of events or personal glory that are no longer visible in our memory. Poetry thus has the power to make visible and present to our senses through memory those past events we can no longer see in our life. This elucidates the metaphor of the mirror which is uni-directional: memory is self-reflective. We reproduce scenes through words. In her discussion about the primary importance of the sense of sight in early Greek philosophy, Hannah Arendt makes this point:

Pindar, in the lost Zeus poem, must have made clear the subjective as well as the objective side of these early thinking experiences: Both the world and men stand in need of praise lest their beauty go unrecognized. Since men appear in the world of appearances, they need thoughts which are then uttered in words. . . . To state this in conceptual language: The meaning of what actually happens and appears while it is happening is revealed when it has disappeared: remembrance, by which you make present to your mind what actually is absent and past, reveals the meaning in the form of a story.⁴⁵

What Pindar says about those who are ἀδόκητον and δοκέοντα, esteemed and unesteemed, must also be understood in relation to what is seen to be the case by those who confer respect or honour on them. The verb δοκέω means intransitively, "to seem, to appear," and if read in this context, signifies that death falls on those who, like Aias, were not seen to be worthy of esteem and those who, like Odysseus, were. The blindness then of the hearts of the other Greeks was their

inability to see and remember how great Aias was. His honour had in effect become invisible to them.

Here, Pindar states that there are those whose account or story that is ἄβρὸν a god will increase when they are dead. The λόγος is qualified as "splendid" [Sl.] or "luxurious" [Kurke] who (like Fennell⁴⁶) takes it as predicative, "so that it is luxurious" and judges this reading of the adjective to be an innovation motivated by the changed social context and denoting something that is lavish.⁴⁷ The ἄβρὸν λόγον is meant to contrast with the πλέονα λόγον of Odysseus account. The increase that a god will give, αὔξει, will not be an exaggeration. That these two loci are meant to be compared is implicit in the verb they share, γίνεται / γενέσθαι < γίγνομαι.

The punctuation and reading of this passage however has been a problem and subject of much complex contention.⁴⁸ It first centres on βοαθῶν as 1) qualifying τεθνακότων and hence punctuated τεθνακότων βοαθῶν, or 2) τεθνακότων βοαθοῶν, a nom. masc. part. with μόλον as first pers., "I came" or 3) βοαθῶν which then modifies ἄβρὸν λόγον. As a secondary problem there exists the equally valid reading of μόλον 1st or 3rd pl. and μόλεν, 3rd sing. Finally the choice of τοῖ as relative, "they," or emphatic particle, "indeed". Clearly, if the subject of the verb "to come" is taken to be plural then τοῖ must read as the relative pronoun; 1st sing. or 3rd sing., then τὸι must be understood as a particle. The real difficulty then, centres on the meaning and viability of the forms of βοαθοέω.

In the first instance, we read: "those who are dead warriors, those who came etc." In this reading of "champions, warriors," βοαθῶν is used as a noun, which use, as Farnell points out, is unheard of. If we read the second variable "I [or they] came helping" we have a more difficult interpretation. Helping whom? The third choice offers "the luxurious helping account" which, as Farnell points out, is "an awkward and suspicious complex." Certainly the phrase ἄβρὸν λόγον is above suspicion, since Pindar uses such combinations as ἄβρὸν κῦδος, O.5.7; I.1.50; ἄβρὸν σῶμα, O.6.55; ἄβρὸν πλοῦτον, P.3.110; and ἄβρὸν στέφανον, I.8.66. But the combined ἄβρὸν λόγον βοαθῶν is odd and uncharacteristic.

There is a fourth possibility, that of, τεθνακότων βοαθῶν τοῖ παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου μόλον χθονός, in which case βοαθῶν modifies μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν and which might read, "They came indeed to the great navel "Helper" of the broad-lapped earth." βοαθῶς is a cult-epithet of Apollo⁴⁹. The

difficulty with this—as with the others—is that there is no precedent for the combination of βοαθόον ὀμφαλόν.

If we look for the word βοηθός as it occurs in Homer II.13.477 and 17.481, ὥς μένεν Ἰδομενεὺς δουρικλυτός, οὐδ' ὑπεχώρει,
Αἰνείαν ἐπιόντα βοηθόον [13.477]

ᾧ ὣς ἔφατ', Ἀλκιμέδων δὲ βοηθόον ἄρμ' ἐπορούσας [17.481]

we see that in the first case, since it qualifies Aineas attacking Idomeneus, it must bear its original sense of "shout" and "running" hence, Aineas attacking and bellowing war. In the second case it modifies "chariot" an object which does not shout or cry, and therefore the sense is restricted to "rushing or charging", Alkimedon sprang up onto the charging chariot. From this we might surmise that the original combination of βοη [shout, cry] and θός [run, rush] was used to characterize the sound of attack in motion⁴⁹; the later Hellenistic sense certainly seems to have been that of someone rushing to the aid of someone else, or being called upon as "helper."⁵⁰ As examples of the latter there are the citations of various epigrams of the *Anth.Graec.*, *Adesp. Papyr.* and Callimachus.⁵¹

The difficulty as it is narrowed down is fixed on βοαθοῶν. Does it refer to θεός or Neoptolemos? If we choose Neoptolemos, then he is the one who came as one offering assistance. This is Farnell's reading, τεθνακότων followed by a stop, then βοαθοῶν with Neoptolemos as subject, verb μόλεν, and the choice of Carey [Snell and Bowra]. The other choice is τεθνακότων βοαθοῶν followed by a stop with θεός as the subject and with τῷ for mss. τοι. This latter is the choice of Most. He translates: "But true honour comes into being for those whose account a god nourishes to splendor after they have died, thereby coming to their assistance. For that reason, Neoptolemos went to the great navel of the broad-bosomed earth—and he lies in the Pythian precinct—after he sacked Priam's city, where the Danaans labored too." 270].⁵² This seems to me [at present] to be the best rendering of a passage that will never yield a perfect resolution of its difficulties.⁵³

ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις κεῖται: The δὲ directs us to a change in subject, Neoptolemos, who is the third hero in the triad of Trojan warriors. As he lies in the earth at Delphi, Pindar gives us his story in more detail than that of Odysseus or Aias. This fact, as Race⁵⁴ has elaborated in his discussion of climactic elements of Pindar's poetic style, directs us to the importance of Neoptolemos as an exemplum. Here we have an increasing order of length and specification: Odysseus has the shortest number of words/lines [20-23] and is very non-specific with regard to his actions; Aias follows with 6 lines and descriptive detail about his character and past

history; finally, Neoptolemos [34-48] is awarded the most lengthy and detailed verses.

The τιμὰ, reward / honour which a god can increase will fall to his lot since he exemplifies those who, among the dead, are distinguished i.e. are made to be known and remembered by us through their *logos*. The honour conferred upon him by the nameless, unarticled θεὸς is the same that is conferred upon him by Pindar. Pindar is not apologizing for a previous condemnation of Neoptolemos—as most readers have understood this ode—he is rather, as though giving birth to his story, honouring him. The goddess of birth who began the ode offers an insight as to her function within the poem. Neoptolemos is being brought into the light of those remembered.

This at any rate is how I would like to account for the presence of Neoptolemos' myth within this ode. First, there is no part of what remains of the Paean 6 which establishes a prior version by Pindar which he is here retracting, in which he had, as Aristodemos suggested, insulted the reputation of the Aiakidai by insulting Neoptolemos. Then, there is no negative portrayal of Neoptolemos elsewhere in Pindar's work, i.e. N 4.51. To be sure, the fact of his being one of the sackers of Troy would certainly have made him disliked by Apollo; and one of the myths of his going to Delphi involves his demanding compensation of Apollo for the death of his father, Achilles. This is Euripides' version of his visit to Delphi in *Andr.* and, to a lesser extent in the *Ilias Mikra*, but there is no proof whatsoever that these versions and variants served as a mythological base for Pindar. Moreover, as Fontenrose demonstrates, the myth of Neoptolemos is in most details that of Achilles.⁵⁶ The fact remains there is no hard evidence that Pindar is apologizing for himself or for another's negative type-casting of Neoptolemos.

35. Πριάμου πόλιν Νεοπτόλεμος ἐπεὶ πρᾶθεν, τᾷ καὶ Δαναοὶ πόνησαν: ἐπεὶ must have the temporal sense here of 'after' complementing the past of πρᾶθεν [sacked] and places events in their chronological order: we revert from the present to the past.⁵⁷ The mention of other Danaans matches those dead whom the god increases and brings Neoptolemos forward from his work at Troy to the parallel of the labour of Sogenes. It is equally relevant to Neoptolemos' story that he be classified here as the sacker of Priam's city, since it was his part in Priam's murder that gave his heroic cast a darkened aspect.

36. ὁ δ' ἀποπλέων: Again the δὲ serves to contrast Neoptolemos' fate to those who lay dead at Troy. The tale moves swiftly as we follow the voyage of Neoptolemos missing the island of Skyros, then, after wandering, arriving at

Ephyros and finally being made king of the Molossians. Appropriately his journey has a triad of stopping points: Skyros, Ephyrus and Molossia.

38–40. ὀλίγον | χρόνον ἀτὰρ γένος αἰεὶ φέρειν τοῦτό οἱ γέρας: The short time that he was ruler contrasts with αἰεὶ, the eternal time that the *genos* held that honour of his.

40–1. ὤχετο δὲ πρὸς θεόν, | κτέαν' ἄγων Τρωίαθεν ἀκροθινίων: But he left for Delphi bringing with him the most precious things, spoils from Troy. The expression πρὸς θεόν, while it continues to keep Apollo's name out of the account, brings us back to the phrase θεὸς ἄβρὸν αὖξει λόγον, and the choicest possessions, κτέανα ἀκροθινίων he brings with him are luxury items to increase the treasury and will, like the luxurious or materially rich account by which the god increases heroic memory, serve to increase or pay the god. This represents the traditional gift-exchange of the Homeric world. Neoptolemos brings Trojan goods to Apollo: Apollo will pay him with the τιμὰ of a splendid story.

42. ἵνα κρεῶν νιν ὑπὲρ μάχης ἔλασεν ἀντιτυχόντ' ἀνὴρ μαχαίρα: "There a man with a knife killed him in a fight over sacrificial meats." The line is filled with nameless elements: the event a wasteland of anonymity. This lack of definition is a mark of obscurity, the darkness that covers those whose deeds are not remembered. It also denotes the obscurity of an event unwitnessed: if there are none to see the actual happening, nothing is clear, no one can be named or accused. The word-order is choppy,—Bury remarks that the anastrophe of ὑπὲρ separated by νιν from the word it governs, κρεῶν, is "unusual, perhaps unparalleled—mimicking the roughness of the encounter and suggesting its unplanned disruptive nature." The participle ἀντιτυχόντα marks the randomness of their meeting and exculpates Neoptolemos⁵⁶. Neoptolemos' death lacks the smoothness of Aias'. He is the victim of violence over the ritual meat of a sacrifice and the man "with a knife" could very well be one whose knife would have been used for sacrificing the animal.

43. βάρυνθεν δὲ περισσὰ Δελφοὶ ξεναγέται: Pindar immediately expresses sympathy for the Delphinians: they are described as "welcomers of guests" and they are oppressed, βάρυνθεν (for the 3 pl.aor.I pass. ἐβαρύνθησαν) δὲ περισσὰ, beyond measure. Their reaction is in direct contrast to the laconic and nondescript way in which Neoptolemos dies. It also supports in large measure the traditional stance with regard to the cultural gift-exchange and guests: Neoptolemos. was a guest, a visitor to Delphi and due proper treatment at their hands. Pindar is exonerating them from any blame in the incident.

44. ἀλλὰ τὸ μόρσιμον ἀπέδωκεν: "Yet he paid his debt to destiny." Again this idea of debt and payment reinforces the framework of guest-friendship rules yet reconstructs it to mean that his death was the gift which Apollo gave him.

44-7. ἐχρῆν δέ τιν' ἔνδον ἄλσει παλαιτάτῳ. . θεμίσκοπον οἰκεῖν ἔόντα πολυθύτοις: The impersonal ἐχρῆν, "it was fated, necessary," and the phrases τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμμεναι, "for all time to come," and "θεοῦ παρὰ," are in much the same style and language of a formal decree, thus formalizing Neoptolemos' institution as θεμίσκοπον or overseer of the laws pertaining to sacrifices. The term is coined by Pindar for ἐπισκόπον θέμιτος [Carey, 154]. In such a context we must understand the τιμὰ as payment / compensation for his acquittal of a debt, ἀπέδωκεν, which interpretation is further strengthened by the earlier αὔξει, "increases", and supplies the materialistic nuance to ἄβρον λόγον.

In light of the several versions for Neoptolemos' reasons for going to Delphi—although they are not made explicit here—we can assume that Pindar is recreating the story as one of a cancellation of debt. In Euripides *Andr.* vv.1065-1165, Neoptolemos is said to have gone to Delphi to do penance for his former sins to Apollo and to seek compensation for his father's death: ἤτησα γὰρ πατρός ποτ' αὐτὸν αἵματος δοῦναι δίκην [1107-8], and is falsely accused by Orestes of intending to rob the sanctuary of its riches. In the ensuing mêlée, some terrifying sound—the god's voice—is heard issuing from the inner temple: τις ἀδύτων ἐκ μέσων ἐφθέγγετο δεινὸν τε καὶ φρικῶδες [1147-8]. In *Orest.* it is Apollo himself who declares to Menelaus and Orestes that Neoptolemos will die by Delphian hands [1654-56] when asking redress for his father. In Pindar's Paean 6 [117-121] Apollo kills Neoptolemos "quarrelling with the attendant temple-servants over myriad honours, ἀμφιπόλοις δὲ / μυριάων περὶ τιμῶν / δῆρι ἀζόμενον κτάνεν." In all these versions Neoptolemos is guilty of some misdemeanour. The programme of Pindar's mythological retelling is generally to rectify or in some way modify to the good: here he has rendered all parties, Apollo, Neoptolemos and the Delphians, blameless.

44. τιν' ἔνδον ἄλσει παλαιτάτῳ Αἰακιδᾶν κρεόντων: The grove is most ancient and coupled with the mention of the Aiakidai as an ancient and venerable ruling family. They are in fact the inheritors of the τιμὰ through the cult of Neoptolemos and are placed within the ode as is their ancestor situated within the Delphic precinct i.e. to live "beside the well-walled home of the god", θεοῦ παρ' εὐτειχέα δόμον. The business of Neoptolemos to oversee the many sacrifices of those who make their processions to honour the heroes, ἡρώϊαις δὲ πομπαῖς

θεμίσκοπον οἰκεῖν ἔόντα πολυούτοις, is the point from which Pindar will make his ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων, his "glorious path of words" to honour the heroes of the island of Aigina. It also bears a specific relationship to the later verses [91-94] where Sogenes is given a home and in the same sense "housed" within the poem.

48. εὐώνυμον ἔς δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει: "For just renown three words suffice." Nearly every commentary has puzzled over what these three words might be or what the expression might mean⁵⁷. The most conservative reading is that "three" equals "few." Even if we accept the punctuation of some scholars of a stop after δίκαν, the phrase in isolation remains mysterious.

There is in my opinion another option to the interpretation that what is meant here is that as few as three words are enough to establish the worthiness of the duties and honour bestowed upon either Neoptolemos—the sense understood without the period—or those heroes who are honoured. We have noted the pervasive theme of triadic clusters. Of the scholia, Aristodemos suggested that Pindar meant a triad by ἔπος and that τρία ἔπεα referred to the three triads that remained. In Homer ἔπεα can signify "speeches."⁵⁸ If we extend this to mean narratives then a reasonably different sense of this enigmatic statement can be made. There are in fact three stories, each one belonging to the Aiakidai: Aias, Neoptolemos and Sogenes. They each receive the honour or right to a "good name," εὐώνυμον ἔς δίκαν. Moreover, in relation to the idea of διαρκέσει, a sufficiency of words, three times Pindar refers to the possibility of a surfeit or excess of praise: here, at vv.52-3, ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀνάπαυσις ἐν παντὶ γλυκεῖα ἔργῳ· κόρον δ' ἔχει etc., and at vv.104-5: ταῦτ' αὖτε τρεῖς τετράκι τ' ἀμπολέϊν ἀπορία τελέθει. Aiakos and his sons, the Aiakidai, are named three times in the text [vv.10, 45, 84]; Sogenes [8, 70, 91].

At vv.77-9 Pindar says: "Indeed the Muse welds together gold upon white ivory and the lily flower lifted up from the dew of the sea." If this interpretation is correct then by the three strands of gold, ivory and coral the Muse has wound together, Pindar is referring to the ἔπεα of the three Aiakidai. I would not venture to say to whom gold and ivory apply, but surely the "lily flower lifted up from the dew of the sea" might represent Aigina itself, an island that rose once from the ocean bed and in mythology was one of the daughters of Poseidon's son Asopus, a nymph whom Zeus (after she bore Aiakos to him) transformed into the island. The noun λείριον moreover is thought to be equivalent to the adjective λείρος, which Hesychius glosses as "slender; pale," qualities that might readily be seen to correspond to those of a nymph-island. And if we accept the three materials to form

a triad that corresponds to the Aiakidai then, following their geographical allocations [Troy, Delphi and Nemea], Aigina belongs to Sogenes.

49. οὐ ψεύδεις ὁ μάρτυς ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατῇ. The need for a witness to celebrate and recreate a moment of glory, bringing it to the minds and memory of those who cannot otherwise see it, is the task of the poet and his poetry. Bury notes that ψεύδεις is a rare form and "contemptuous" in tone which idea Farnell rejects. Certainly the phrase, ψεύδεσσι οἱ ποταναὶ τε μηχανᾶ, which earlier refers to the false *epos* of Odysseus and the subsequently bloated reputation he acquired thereby, would direct us to understand this statement in the light of that. No doubt this might refer to Apollo who would bear witness to Neoptolemos' institution as *themiskopon*, but Pindar might also be referring to himself in his role as purveyor of true versions of glory. The statement occurs immediately before his praise of Aigina and forms a natural progression from Neoptolemos to Thearion and Sogenes.

Here we might also observe another progression: memory allows us to see/know [ἴσμεν] noble deeds by its one-way mirror; the memory of Aias' great exploits is clouded and not seen/known [ἰδόμεν] by most men because of the falsehoods and treachery of Odysseus; but in the case of Neoptolemos it is someone who *stands/presides over* [ἐπιστατῇ] the truth. This is the mark of Apollo, cf. P.9.42, P.3.29f. It must then be Apollo who is the witness.⁶¹

50. Αἶγινα, τεῶν Διὸς τ' ἐκγόνων θρασὺ μοι τόδ' εἰπεῖν: Pindar begins his praise of the island. The poem directly changes focus and pace taking on a tone of excitement as Pindar addresses his audience. θρασὺ μοι τόδ' εἰπεῖν is generally translated as: "I make bold to say this."⁶² Since, as Woodbury observes, the phrase requires an acc./inf. construction τόδ' must be read in apposition to ὁδὸν of the next line. The proximity of Zeus and the descendants of Aigina τεῶν Διὸς τ' ἐκγόνων is emphasized by their conjunction in the line.

51. φαενναῖς ἀρεταῖς ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων | οἴκοθεν: The φαενναῖς ἀρεταῖς "shining qualities of excellence" or "shining virtues" which pave the master-road of words from home, οἴκοθεν, are those deeds which are honoured outside of Aigina. Although the path of song is a familiar metaphor for the poet's work of praise, the important distinction here is that the poet is fashioning a ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων in contrast to the ἄβρὸν λόγον which a god offers to certain heroes and the λόγον πλέονα of Odysseus. By implication, Pindar is not exaggerating: he sings the truth. He cuts a path of λόγων between the deeds [ἔργμασιν] of v.49 and that of v.52 [ἔργω]. Even the words that form the boundary of the line indicate

his purpose: Aigina begins and ends the path from its source, οἴκοθεν; the glories of the Aiakidai are self-contained.

52-3. ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀνάπαυσις ἐν παντὶ γλυκεῖα ἔργῳ· κόρον δ' ἔχει καὶ μέλι καὶ τὰ τέρπν' ἄνθε' Ἀφροδίσια: The pause, ἀνάπαυσις comes as an interruption in what has just begun, and functions as a precursor to the final and third expression of the inner theme of the diversity of goals and mortal limitations in achieving them. The poem is here at its exact mid-point and Pindar offers the elements of seduction—τὰ τέρπν' ἄνθε' Ἀφροδίσια—"the delightful flowers of sexual encounters" at the same moment that he withdraws them. The "sweetness" of these lines is tantalizing and parallels very closely the first antistrophe. At vv.10-12:

Αἰακιδᾶν· μάλα δ' ἐθέλοντι σύμπειρον ἀγωνία θυμὸν ἀμφέπειν.
εἰ δὲ τύχῃ τις ἔρδων μελίφρον' αἰτίαν
ροαῖσι Μοισᾶν ἐνέβαλε.

the hero is being welcomed and his glory celebrated; the home of the Aiakidai ties in with the beginning of the line and breaks in the same foot; we have honey-sweet thoughts and streams of the Muses; ἔρδων and ἔργῳ. There ensues the caution about the darkness which enfolds deeds that are not sung. Here however Pindar reverts to those ideas expressed in the first strophe.

54-5. φυᾷ δ' ἕκαστος διαφέρομεν βιοτὰν λαχόντες, | ὁ μὲν τα, τὰ δ' ἄλλοι: "Each one of us, our life allotted differs in his nature, this person has this quality/nature, others that one." This is extremely close in sentiment to vv.5-6. Fennell explains that because nature, φυᾷ, is variable, the verb διαφέρομεν is pres.ind., whereas fate, being invariable, the aorist λαχόντες is used. This in fact is precisely what occurs in vv.5-6: πνέομεν as our nature is, is in the pres. ind. and ζυγένθ', aor. 2 pass. part. of ζεύγνυμι is conjoined to fate, πότμος.

55-6. τυχεῖν δ' ἔν' ἀδύνατον | εὐδαιμονίαν ἅπασαν ἀνελόμενον: "It is not possible for a single man to have won complete happiness." ἀνελόμενον, "by winning" sets up the discourse which is to come on Sogenes and his particular case.

56-8. οὐκ ἔχω | εἰπεῖν τίνι τοῦτο Μοῖρα τέλος ἔμπεδον | ὥρεξε: Again the indicative and aorist of the two verbs act to separate the present ability of the poet to speak of the nature or character of an individual (Sogenes) and the end which is fated i.e. which Μοῖρα has extended, ὥρεξε, to him.

58. Θεαρίων, τὴν δ' ἐοικότα καιρὸν ὄλβου | δίδωσι, τόλμαν τε καλῶν ἀρομένῳ | σύνεσιν οὐκ ἀποβλάπτει φρενῶν: "Thearion, to you she grants a timely and fitting portion of success, to one who has won daring from

noble deeds, and she does not harm your mind's intelligence." The *καιρὸς*, portion, or timeliness of Thearion's success is to some extent related to the timeliness of his name within the ode itself. First we note that *ἀρομένω* from *ἄρνημαι*, "to win, gain" is closely linked to the previous *ἀνελόμενον* > *ἀναίρω*, "to win for oneself" and thus binds the praise of Thearion to the preceding cautionary sentiment that no one can win for himself utter success. There is an allusion to vv.17-18, whereby Thearion, like the *σοφοί*, those who are wise, possesses a quality of mind that enables him to foresee and to avert harm, *ἀποβλάπτει*, from the good fortune he has won: the wise are not harmed, *βλάβειν*, by desire for gain, *κέρδος*. That his intelligence, *σύνεσιν*, is considered in a context with daring for noble achievements, *τόλμαν καλῶν*, expresses a deeper connection between these verses: for in the underlying idea that success for man depends upon the god's time and mortal's character, Thearion is connected directly—and Sogenes indirectly—to the exempla of their heroic ancestors: Aias who, though possessed of great character quarrelled and killed himself over armor, and Neoptolemos, who died bickering over food. Concern over gain, *κέρδος*, or what they possessed, *κτέανα*, caused them considerable harm. The *σοφοί* have learned, *ἔμαθον*, but Thearion has the intellectual capacity, *σύνεσιν*, or, literally, to put things together. He (or Fate) does not do harm to his *φρενῶν*, that same place where Aias' sword entered and did much harm.

61. *ξεῖνός εἰμι*: This unusually dramatic statement wherein the poet makes a theatrical entrance, breaks into the poem and shifts our attention. It recalls the Delphinians, described as *ξενάγεται*, welcomers of guests, and most importantly provides Pindar with a programme of instating Sogenes within his own precinct or sacred territory in Aigina. Just as Apollo did for Neoptolemos, so will Pindar for the hero he celebrates. He will avoid all the flaws that he has mentioned in the previous verses; those of exaggeration, of violence, of darkening a reputation by not revealing the truth, of wanting too much. As a visitor or stranger he prepares the allusions to the gift-exchange rituals and the elements by which he fulfills his role⁶¹.

61. *σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων φόγον*: This bears a direct relation to v.13: *σκότον πολὺν ὕμνον ἔχοντι δεόμεναι*. Here the dark element qualifies blame or reproach. Fennell notes that *σκοτεινὸν* is causative, "causing darkness."

62. *ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων*: The flowing water is similar to the *ῥοαῖσι Μοισᾶν* of v.12, and marks the poet's words which in their reflection of the light reveal what is true and in their flowing are generous. *φίλον*

ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων, "bringing (glory) to the man I love" represents the gift which the poet as guest-friend brings. φίλον, "loved", has the additional nuance of "one's own" with the sense of kinship and here serves to bring the poet in closer relation to his laudandum.

63. κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω: The verb αἰνέσω, "I will praise, (bearing) true fame." κλέος ἐτήτυμον, true fame or glory, contrasts with the σοφία παράγοισα μύθοις of v.23, the cleverness that leads astray with its stories.

64. ποτίφορος δ' ἀγαθοῖσι μισθὸς οὗτος: This should be compared to v.16, εὔρηται ἄποινα μόχθων κλυταῖς ἐπέων ἀοιδαῖς where the poet notes that payment or reward, ἄποινα, can be found for labours in glorious songs of poetry. It must be remembered that at v.15 it is stated that because of Memory with the bright headband we know of mortal greatness. Here the payment, μισθὸς, is suitable, ποτίφορος, for those who are good.

We should note the distinction made in this ode between the suitability that defines gift-exchange between poets and patrons and the uneven distribution of fortune between gods and mortals. It is as though Pindar through the sale of praise purchases a way to redefine the relationship between fortune and fate or, at least, put to rights the outcome. He has given two exempla that, apart from their ancestral ties to Aigina, are only defined by a fate that was unequal to their character. The waters of the Muse purify.

64. ἐὼν δ' ἐγγὺς Ἀχαιοὺς οὐ μέμψεται μ' ἀνὴρ Ἴονίας ὑπὲρ ἄλλος οἰκέων: These are controversial lines. Who is the Achaean who will not reproach the poet? And why would he reproach Pindar? I propose that Pindar does not in this statement allude to any person in particular, nor does he wish us to infer that in any way that he is reproachable. He is speaking in effect rhetorically: there is nothing blameworthy in his account⁶². ἐὼν δ' ἐγγὺς, "being near" can signify the spatial proximity of someone and yet also mean proximity of kind or blood.⁶³ It is in this respect much like ἄγχι, cf. N.6.9; Paean 7.10.

In any case, the spatial reading is especially difficult since the Achaean is described as presently living beyond the Ionian Sea, Ἴονίας ὑπὲρ ἄλλος οἰκέων. Fennell deems it unlikely that "hypothetical proximity would be placed in such a prominent position," in the poem and concludes that a Molossian was present at the performance of the ode. So too Bury, who states that many foreigners were in the streets of Aigina. Woodbury provides a useful list and discussion of other scholars who have debated the identity of this mystery Achaean and offers his own

preference for the scholiast's reading that it means Neoptolemos himself.⁶⁶ Then why, one might ask, does Pindar not name him?

There must in fact be some reason—poetic one suspects—for repressing the identity of one, a hero, who is close to the action of the poem. Whether it be Neoptolemos himself, or a nameless Molossian representative, there is still no explanation for his being characterized as near and far and not reproaching the poet. Perhaps the point is his obscurity.

I think that, while the mystery Achaean is not likely to be positively identified by any argument or analysis, there is one possibility that has been neglected which may better account for Pindar's non-specificity. In the two other odes where he uses the word, he gives a geographical location, although generalized—Kleitor, Tegea and the lofty cities of the Achaeans (Arcadia), N.10.47: Therapne (Sparta) and Phylake (Phthiotis/Thessaly), I.1.31.58—his geographical placement of Achaeans is like that of the Iliad. In Paean 6.85, he uses the term much as Homer does, to designate Greeks at Troy. The term Danaan is similarly used at v.36. If we examine the literal meaning of the phrase Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ ἄλδος οἰκέων, i.e. beyond, i.e. inland of, or overlooking the Ionian sea, then we have to admit to a difficulty. It is a remarkable detail that in the Iliad no sea or body of salt water is named. The Ionian Sea and Sea of Ionia of the classical period respectively designate the waters that lie between Sicily and Greece and off the coast of Asia Minor.⁶⁷ Herodotus tells us that the Ionians were Achaeans who settled in Asia Minor.

65. προξενία πέποιθ' : "I trust in the hospitality shown to *proxenoi*." The poet has just referred to the fact that he is a visitor, a guest, ξείνός εἰμι, and that he will keep away the blame that causes darkness, σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων φόγον, the same obscurity that befalls the one whose noble deeds are not celebrated in song and that falls on the dead who are ἀδόκητον ἐν καὶ δοκέοντα. He mentions the μισθὸς or payment which for *proxenoi* was a legally instituted expense account. The poet comes as an official representative of foreign interests.

65–6. ἔν τε δαμόταις | ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν: Among his demos he "looks clearly / brightly with the eyes." δέρκομαι λαμπρόν is connected to the light Mnemosyne of the shining headband. The phrase literally means "I look / flash a radiance from the eyes", cf. N.10.39ff. Memory, as Pindar stated earlier, is the one-way mirror by which we can experience and store information. Poets remind us of these past glories and enables us to see the events through their eyes. The light that is seen is that of inner consciousness, inner reflection, the reflected light

of Memory. Pindar's mission as an ambassador-poet is to make that light visible to his fellow men.

66-7. οὐχ ὑπερβαλὼν, | βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσαις: οὐχ ὑπερβαλὼν, lit. "not casting beyond the mark, overshooting," a frequent metaphor for the exact due of praise that the poet offers; the accuracy of his words. ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσαις, "having dragged my foot away" from all violence. The first condition replies to the story of Odysseus, the second to Aias and Neoptolemos: exaggeration in the one and violence in the other.

69. μαθὼν δέ τις ἀνερεῖ, εἰ πὰρ μέλος ἔρχομαι ψάγιον ὄαρὸν ἐννέπων: Again we have the anonymous τις like the "Achaean," the witness, the man with a knife, the one who (v.11) prospers, and the one (v.54) to whom Fate will extend sure good fortune. The one "who has learned," like the wise who know the third wave to come, is one who has σύνεσις, is able to synthesize information—here, the poetic data that is spiralled in three complex strands. We should also note the awkwardness of the line, εἰ πὰρ μέλος ἔρχομαι ψάγιον ὄαρὸν ἐννέπων, the words ψάγιον ὄαρὸν are in themselves discordant in sound and sense, literally: "crooked, distorted utterance." Some editors prefer ψόγιον ὄαρὸν, in which case the meaning is "reproachful discourse." Although ὄαρὸς is usually plural, here it may be taken to be crooked or distorted. "Distorted" is preferable to "reproachful," if only because it avoids the confused issue of Pindar's otherwise inexplicably apologetic posture. More particularly the words ψάγιον ὄαρὸν ἐννέπων with their repeated "o" and nasal "n" sounds are unmusical and ponderous, a condition which fulfills aptly the expression πὰρ μέλος, "untuneful" melody which is to the side or off the mark.

70. Εὐξενίδα πάτραθε Σώγηνες: Sogenes is named for the second time in the vocative. Appropriately, the name of his clan, the Euxenidai, means "those who receive strangers well."

71-4. ἀπομνύω | μὴ τέρμα προβάς ἄκονθ' ὥτε χαλκοπάρχον ὄρσαι | θοὰν γλῶσσαν ὅς ἐξέπεμψεν παλαισμάτων | αὐχένα καὶ σθένος ἀδιδάντον, αἰθῶνι πρὶν ἀλίῳ γυῖον ἐμπεσεῖν: "I swear that I did not overstep the mark." Pindar's oath contains a problem as to the exact sense of μὴ τέρμα προβάς which may have relevance to the technical side of athletic contests. This is compounded by the extraordinary metaphor of a tongue swift as a bronze-cheeked lance shooting forth. It is arresting language because of its sheer physicality: Pindar matches γλῶσσαν with χαλκοπάρχον; there is the body, αὐχένα, σθένος, and γυῖον of the wrestlers; the tactile contrasts of ἀδιδάντον,

unwetted and the sun that burns, all of which entangle poet and athlete together. Tongue and javelin share qualities in a way that exemplifies entanglement in a striking manner: the tongue is swift, *θοᾶν γλῶσσαν*, and the javelin is bronze-cheeked, *χαλκοπάραιον*. The neck and strength of the wrestler-tongue-javelin being "unwetted" implies something that is untasted, undrunk. The wrestler's limb, like the shaft of the lance, shines in the bright sun before it hits the ground.

Perhaps, as Segal has observed,⁶⁶ the whole passage does not refer to overstepping the bound of an athletic contest but rather serves to emphasize the direct focus upon Sogenes' victory which will be the target of the poem from now on. The poet's tongue with the speed of a hurled javelin will hit the victor with praise. The *τέρμα*, whether or not it represents an actual line that must not be stepped over in the games, can certainly be read to mean the boundary of propriety that poets who are not exaggerating must respect. In this respect we have to ask what boundary Pindar means, that is, what limit has he not stepped beyond in casting praise.

I think that Pindar is referring to his use of the exempla of Aias and Neoptolemos. In adjacent lines he states that he has not overthrown, and has kept all violence from his foot, *οὐχ ὑπερβαλὼν, βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσαις*, words that are conspicuously allied to these. Upon closer examination the words *βίαια πάντα* can have the sense of something forced as well as violent, and thus admit the added nuance that Pindar has avoided forced praise. *ῥσαι*, aor. inf. > *ῥνυμι / ῥνύω*, which Slater translates as "send on one's way" is a verb rich in its ambiguity of action. It is used for the beginning of an act i.e. whatever starts or sets in motion the act, not the full action itself: "stir, stir up, set in motion, rouse," all denote a proto-kinetic state. It serves to freeze the javelin pre-flight while *ἐξέπεμψεν* then directs it: "sent out, forth."

It might be useful to examine the tangled syntax of these lines as well. *ὥτε*, like, occurs between the javelin and its epithet—one worthy of a shaft's length—and its comparison, *θοᾶν γλῶσσαν*, which should precede; *ῥσαι* is separated from negative *μὴ*, and the other clause which continues the comparison, *ὅς ἐξέπεμψεν*, "which sent forth" the neck and strength unwetted of wrestlers; the adjective belies the aorist action of the verb: how could wrestlers be, like an already shot javelin, without sweat? *πρὶν* aptly interrupts the "action," before the verb it governs, *ἐμπεσεῖν*, and before the limb that is not to fall.

The entire passage is an enactment of something that is not to happen. It is like a picture frozen on the screen, or, more appropriately, a painting on a vase.

And like a painted picture it has arrested movement. It is action that never arrives: the javelin is poised in flight to no destination, the wrestlers are "unwetted" because they never fight, the limb that before falling in the dust remains with the sun blazing upon it. The disruptive syntax imitates the messiness of combined stasis and kinesis, as the aorist aspect of all the verbs denotes events outside the bounds of time. The picture is a reality that is concrete yet is not real. The jumble of words acts perfectly to realize the juncture of past and present, being and not becoming.

προβὰς then must be resolved to mean "having stepped forward" up to the line, and the line is that one which forms the boundary between what is real, actual and visible to the eye and what only appears to be real, actual etc. and is not.

74. εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλέον πεδέρχεται: If there was real effort i.e. if the wrestlers were actually real, then there is more pleasure to be derived. It provides a pivotal point where Pindar is about to begin with his praise of a *real* competitor.

75. ἔα με: Translations take this to be either an injunction for release from some obligation, permission, or as an apology: "Let me alone," i.e. "Fear not" [Fennell], "Let me be" [Bury], "Quare sine me facere, quod meditor" [Dissen ap. Boeckh], "Forgive me" [Race; Sandys], "Permit, i.e. forgive me" [Slater], "Don't worry about my finishing properly" [Floyd]. None of these are satisfactory.

ἔαω c.acc. pers., is generally defined as "let go, let alone, let be" as in: ἔα χόλον [Il.9.260]; ἔα, φρήν, κυπάρισσον, ἔα δὲ νομὸν Περιδαίον [Paeon 4.50-1]; ἔα πόλεμον μάχαν τε πᾶσαν [O.9.40]. There is no reason to alter this sense of the verb: the difficulty arises from the need to know from what Pindar wishes release. This problem is eradicated if we relate the imperative to its context. "Let me go," "Release me," is a natural progression from the previous image of the javelin / tongue and readily coheres to its simile. The javelin as metaphor for praise of Sogenes was poised for flight and now the poet, shifting from his static pause, moves to launch it.

75. νικῶντί γε χάριν, εἴ τι πέραν ἀερθεῖς ἀνέκραγον, οὐ τραχύς εἰμι καταθέμεν: νικῶντί γε χάριν, it is as thanks / grace to the victor. χάρις has the additional sense of "payment" and would here be the preferred rendering of the word. For the release of Pindar's tongue will enable him to "hit" the victor with praise and thus fulfill his obligation to his patron. εἴ τι πέραν ἀερθεῖς ἀνέκραγον "if soaring too far I cried out:" πέραν ἀερθεῖς, "soaring too far" [elated: Slater] clearly continues the metaphor of the javelin and the flight of song. ἀνέκραγον, I lifted up my voice, has connotations of loudness. οὐ τραχύς

εἰμι καταθέμεν, "I am not averse to paying a debt of honour." καταθέμεν "to put down" as payment.⁶⁷ Pindar is by this account mentioning the dues of his patron for the praise poetry and his own debts at this juncture because he has reached the third and final phase of his poem. As such it is part of the established gift-exchange program. The conditional conceit might now be read as Pindar's "apology" for singing of others who are not his patrons at present or for the complex and roundabout way in which he has approached this encomium of his victor.

Yet there are a few inconsistencies in this reading. For example, κράζω is generally used to describe the vocalise of crows, cf. N.3.82 or loud speech, Od.14.467, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸ πρῶτον ἀνέκραγον, οὐκ ἐπικεύσω. It is therefore curious why Pindar uses ἀνακράζω here, a form of the verb which still carries overtones of ugliness to characterize his song. οὐ τραχύς εἰμι quite literally means "I am not rough / harsh." τραχύς is used to qualify roads, rocky terrain, rugged; the human voice and character: e.g. N.4 fin. τραχύς δὲ παλιγκότοις ἔφεδρος, to describe the character of a poet wrestling words when encountering an adversary. With the context so clearly concerned with sound εἰ παρ μέλος ἔρχομαι; ὄρσαι θοὰν γλῶσσαν and the release of the poet's voice, one is obliged to address the strictly vocal sense of ἀνακράζω and τραχύς.

77. εἶρειν στεφάνους ἐλαφρόν: "to weave wreaths is easy." The wreaths are the poet's work and ideas of praise that have been bound and twisted together in this ode. For a more detailed discussion, see below.

77. ἀναβάλεο: "strike up the song." This imperative, it has been suggested, is addressed to Pindar's chorus leader. It marks the beginning of the real praise of Sogenes.

77-8. Μοῖσά τοι | κολλᾷ χρυσὸν ἔν τε λευκὸν ἐλέφανθ' ἄμᾳ | καὶ λείριον ἄνθεμον ποντίας ὑφέλοῖς ' ἑέρσας: These natural elements are the stuff of the Muse's wreaths and in being three represent the Aiakidai as discussed supra p.20. κολλᾷ, "weld" [cf. *Fr.* collar, "glue"] is distinct from εἶρειν "to weave." One explanation may be that the wreaths, the στεφάνοι, which are in fact the crowns that victors at the games wear, are Pindar's words of praise for Sogenes. Weaving and sewing of words is a standard Greek metaphor for the art of writing poetry: e.g. rhapsode. Of the material that the Muse welds together, ivory and gold (two materials that made up the lyre which Hermes gave Apollo as compensation for stealing his cattle) are quite different in their nature from the "lily flower lifted up from the dews of the sea," or coral, which we have suggested alludes to Aigina, the island-mother of the Aiakidai. While this phrase is

usually understood as an elaborate and poetic description of coral, whatever the material may be, it is certainly expressed in specifically delicate terms. Compared to gold and ivory, "the dew of the sea" is matter that is ephemeral and fragile. Yet this very aspect fits the previous assignation of coral for Sogenes, gold and ivory for Aias and Neoptolemos. The renown of both those heroes has been immortalized and has become something solid like gold and ivory. Sogenes, on the other hand, is yet to be made immortal: Pindar is in the course of doing just that: his renown is still at the delicate stage of beginning. His immortality starts here.

80. Διὸς δὲ μεμναμένος ἀμφὶ Νεμέα: Pindar begins at Zeus. He begins with Memory. We are now located at Nemea, where Sogenes has won his victory.

81. πολύφατον θρόον ὕμνων δόνει ἥσυχᾶ: The sounds of the song are to be gentle, ἥσυχᾶ, and present a multi-leveled, intricately harmonized tumult, πολύφατον θρόον. The melodic lines are swirled, δόνει, like strands twisted to form a garland or wreath braiding all of Pindar's poetic material of praise into one strand of contrapuntal complexity. The verb δόνει is particularly rich and is used by Pindar to describe such complex movement as that of the waves churning at the keel of a ship as it cuts the water [N.6.57-9]. This description of musical sound is in distinct contrast with the earlier ἀνέκραγον, τραχύς and the poet's promise not to bring a song πὰρ μέλος. And we should attend to the particular musicality of,

Διὸς δὲ μεμναμένος ἀμφὶ Νεμέα
πολύφατον θρόον ὕμνων δόνει

which in the first line is created by the fine alternation of liquids "m" and "n" and in the second by the rounded assonance of the nasalized and open vowels "o" and "u". It perfectly matches the quality of the ἀμέρα ὀπί, a gentle, soft voice [vv. 83-4].

**82-4. Βασιλῆα δὲ θεῶν πρέπει | δάπεδον ἄν τόδε γαρυμέν
ἀμέρα | ὀπί:** πρέπει, "it is fitting" to sing the king of the gods on this spot with gentle voice. δάπεδον recalls the ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις [v.34], the spot in Delphi in which Neoptolemos lies buried. Pindar relocates the central focus to Aigina. Bury and Fennell tell us that this δάπεδον is the floor of the Aiakeion, or clan house, where the celebration of Sogenes' victory would have been held.

84. λέγοντι γὰρ Αἰακὸν νιν ὑπὸ ματροδόκοις γοναῖς φυτεῦσαι: "For they say that he sired Aiakos here by a mother welcoming his seed." ματροδόκοις > δέχομαι: receive; welcome, is a combination that does not so much serve to describe the Greek notion of the physiology of conception as much as to continue the theme of *xenos*, politically and socially correct guest relations. Zeus, usually the initiator of uninvited sexual conquest, is re-cast as a guest performing

the rites of guest-gift exchange, with the nymph Aigina playing the receptive and willing hostess. This is a typically Pindaric reformation of mythical material. The less noble and more unsavoury details are either omitted, given a new and positive twist or corrected.

85. ἐμᾶ μὲν πολίαρχον εὐωνύμῳ πάτρᾳ: Farnell's objection to ξῆμα, which is the mss. reading, is that there is no connection between Pindar, Thebes and Aiakos. He proposes Hermann's emendation, ξᾶ [3p. poss. adj. dat.s., "his"] rejecting Bury's ἐτᾶ, which curiosity Bury derives from ἐτός, adv., which he equates with ἔτυμος / ἐτήτυμος and then renders "true name". Fennell on the other hand accepts the reading and explains that Thebans and Aiginetans alike were connected/related; since Aigina was the daughter of Asopos, they both belonged to the Asopidai. This to me seems the preferable reading. Ruck understands ἐμᾶ εὐωνύμῳ πάτρᾳ as identifying "the speaker of this section as a native of Aigina."⁶⁸ This can mean that this last movement of the ode presents a shift to the poet's choral voice or that the poet himself, verifying his claim in v. 65 to Aiginetan citizenship, has assumed their voice for his own." Fennell's explanation, although it may need to be expanded here, does away with this difficult shift of voice. Asopos is the name of four rivers but for our purposes will designate that river in Boiotia which rises in Mt.Cithaeron, separating the territories of Plataea and Thebes, continues flowing throughout southern Boiotia and empties into the Euripus near Oropus.

It is in keeping with the program of kinship and guest-friend that Pindar speaks these lines. When he states that "Aiakos is born to be the ruler πολίαρχον of many cities in my illustrious land" he must be including himself within the same blood-context of Sogenes. The expression εὐωνύμῳ πάτρᾳ, is certainly meant to recall εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν of v.48 and the title of θεμισκοπος is to Neoptolemos what πολίαρχον is to Aiakos. He, Pindar, is the link within the chain of Aiakid being and becoming. It is through him that things are put together. It is therefore necessary that he be related, that he have a deep and personal connection to the material and subject within his poem.

86. Ἡράκλεες, σέο δὲ προπρεῶν ἔμεν ξεῖνον ἀδελφεόν τ': Herakles [voc.], like Eileithuia is invoked to assist at a birth; he begins the final triad and with it the birth of Sogenes' name and location within the Aiakid "Hall of Fame". The connection is strengthened as σέο δὲ reflects ἄνευ σέθεν, v.2 and as ἔμεν ξεῖνον ἀδελφεόν τ' does τεὰν ἀδελφεὰν, v.4. Aiakos is both the guest-friend and brother of Herakles; Eileithuia is sister to Hera and consort to the Fates. The intimate link that exists between kinship by bloodline and its ritualized form

reproduced in the aristocratic institution of guest-friendship is reflected by the very contiguity of the words within the line, *ξείνον ἀδελφεόν*.

86-7. εἰ δὲ γεύεται | ἀνδρος ἀνὴρ τι, φαῖμεν κε γείτον ἔμμεναι: The verb *γεύεται*, "taste," informs this passage that is heavily vested in neighbourliness with a sensuality that surely derives in some measure from what is to be shared: the textual proximity of *ἀνδρος ἀνὴρ τι* has parallels in vv.6 and 19, *ἕτερον ἕτερα; ἀφνεὸς πενιχρός*, but for different reasons: here the closeness is a positive one of sharing good fortune and the act of tasting, which, even when it is modified to "enjoy" is illustrative of a physical proximity and benefit. Tasting is an activity that normally only the individual experiences: here the sense serves to highlight the sensual community of experience. By extension this means that the experience which is shared benefits in a very physical way: the community is nourished, feeds upon the victory or heroic renown of its individuals. A man that "tastes" or enjoys another is his neighbour. Herakles has been similarly incorporated into the community, *προπρεῶνα*, "inclining to, leaning toward" possessing cognate physical connotations and the nouns, *ξείνον ἀδελφεόν* in like contextual nearness.

88. νόῳ φιλάσαντ' ἄτενεί γείτονι χάρμα πάντων ἐπάξιον: "kindly disposed to his neighbour in earnest, to his neighbour a joy worthy of everything." There is slight confusion in *γείτον* of the previous line and *φιλάσαντ'* here, since they are not absolutely defined by case-ending—acc.s.—and might both technically be dative, in which case the *χάρμα ἐπάξιον* as object belongs to both neighbours and the distribution of the qualities of mind and earnestness is more fluid. The interesting result of this indeterminate state is that we cannot distinguish one from the other. The line demonstrates concretely the measure of positive contiguity to be found in community whereas the earlier verses [vv.6 and 19] exemplified the shared limits of destiny and death.

89. εἰ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ θεὸς ἀνέχοι: Rusten⁶⁹ in his discussion of the relationship between hero cults and neighbouring dwellings assumes that Herakles is the god at line 89 and notes that a Herakleion in Aigina is mentioned by Xenophon, *Hell.* 5.1.10. However, *θεὸς ἀνέχοι* is too close to the earlier context where the *θεὸς αὐξεί*, the god who increases is also not named and is Apollo. This interpretation is further encouraged by the matching situation of Sogenes and Neoptolemos with respect to their being "housed" near sacred enclosures. In any case (Apollo/Zeus, or Herakles) the god is in opposition to the neighbour "man." "If even a god were to uphold this, αὐτὸ, i.e. the principle of kinship in glory."

90-92 .ἐν τίν κ' ἑθέλοι Γίγαντας ὅς ἐδάμασας, εὐτυχῶς |
 ναίειν πατρὶ Σωγένης ἀταλὸν ἀμφέπων | θυμὸν προγόνων
 ἐυκτήμονα ζαθέαν ἀγυιάν: The vocabulary matches the antistrophe vv.10-
 11: ἑθέλοντι σύμπειρον ἀγωνία θυμὸν ἀμφέπειν. Sogenes is named for the
 third and last time. The "tender spirit" ἀταλὸς θυμὸς and the "spirit of fellow-
 experience," σύμπειρος θυμὸς, both of which are to be embraced, ἀμφέπειν,
 form a parallel between the celebration of the first antistrophe in which the
 community welcomes the returning victor and Sogenes' being granted a special
 place beside Herakles' sanctuary. The street being richly propertied, holy and
 belonging to his ancestors, forms its parallels with the site of Neoptolemos' shrine
 described in the second antistrophe which is also on ancient ground, ἔνδον ἄλσει
 παλαιτάτῳ, beside the god, θεοῦ παρ' εὐτειχέα, and which is to be a home for
 the Aiakidai to come as here Sogenes will be with his ancestors, προγόνων. The
 adjective ἐυκτήμονα echoes the wealth of Neoptolemos, κτέαν'. . . ἀκροθινίων
 which he brings from Troy.

As with the opening invocation of Eileithuia's aid, σὺν δὲ τίν, Herakles' help is here invoked with similar words, ἐν τίν. The phrase is then completed by the expression "he might wish" κ' ἑθέλοι. . . εὐτυχῶς ναίειν πατρὶ "happily to dwell with his father." The wish is interrupted by the designation of Herakles as he "who conquered the Giants," Γίγαντας ὅς ἐδάμασας, which heroic deed is in contrast to the pacific repose offered to Sogenes who will stay at home with his father. It constructs a further parallel with the fate of Neoptolemos who rests at Delphi after his "Heraklean" labours of sacking Troy, wandering, and then founding a royal Molossian dynasty.

93-4. ἐπεὶ τετραόροισιν ὥθ' ἁρμάτων ζυγοῖς | ἐν τεμένεσσι
 δόμον ἔχει τεοῖς, ἀμφοτέρας ἰὼν χειρός: The various interpretations of this passage are 1) that Sogenes' house is between two shrines of Herakles "enfolded. . . like the pole of a four-horsed chariot between the double yoke." [Farnell]; 2) that Sogenes' house faces the shrines which in turn face him "like the yoke-arms of a four-horsed chariot on either hand as he goeth forth" [Bury]; 3) that his house is "close as four-horse chariots may be seen (having one) on either hand as he goes" [Fennell]. The Greek expresses the same idea of ἀμφέπειν: Sogenes' house is "embraced" within the precincts of Herakles: the word δόμον is itself contained in the precincts in the phrase ἐν τεμένεσσι δόμον ἔχει τεοῖς. The image of a chariot with four horses, whatever its exact physical relation to actual shrines makes again the very physical point with ἀμφοτέρας ἰὼν χειρός, that

Sogenes is embraced, hence welcomed and protected by Herakles in a personal way.

94-6. ὦ μάκαρ, | τὴν δ' ἐπέοικεν Ἥρας πόσιν τε πειθέμεν κόραν
τε Γλαυκώπιδά: "It is befitting for you, O blessed one, to persuade the spouse
of Hera and the grey-eyed maid." Herakles is being asked to win over Zeus and
Athena: significantly, Zeus is designated by his wife's name as Athena is by her
epithet.

96-7. δύνασαι δὲ βροτοῖσιν ἀλκὰν | ἀμαχανιᾶν δυσβάτων θαμὰ
διδόμεν: "for often you are able to give help to mortals without resources and in
hard-going difficulty." The quality of ἀλκὰν which has the sense of assistance,
relief, rescue, protection, defense, is allied with v.12, μεγάλοι γὰρ ἀλκαὶ which
poetry must rescue from oblivion and with the "help" that Apollo offers. The prayer
for protection to Herakles echoes the prayer to Eileithuia at the beginning of the
ode. Sogenes has won victory thanks to the qualities bestowed upon him at birth
and now, as victor he will, with Herakles' aid, be of benefit to those who come
after him. His role within this sanctuary will parallel that of Neoptolemos' role at
Delphi.

98-100. εἰ γὰρ σφισιν ἐμπεδοσθενέα βίοτον ἀρμόσαις | ἦβα
λιπαρῷ τε γῆραϊ διαπλέκοις | εὐδαίμον' ἔόντα: It is significant to the
general poetic structuring of this ode that Herakles be now invited to weave
διαπλέκοις a life for Sogenes. Pindar further strengthens the connection between
the life which Herakles is to fabricate and the life which at the beginning Eileithuia
bestows by a number of verbal parallels. ἐμπεδοσθενέα is an echo of Hera's
attribute, μεγαλοσθενέα; the participle, ἀρμόσαις, while here it continues the figure
of a chariot running, by its reference to the life to which Sogenes is to be
harnessed, also recalls the yoke of v.6, and this again is tied to the sentiment and
words of v.54, φυᾷ δ' ἕκαστος διαφέρομεν βιοτὰν λαχόντες. The word ἦβα
recalls Ἥβα of v.4, whereas λιπαρῷ τε γῆραϊ, "shining old age" recalls both
Hebe's epithet, ἀγλαόγυιον, and the quality of Mnemosyne's headband,
λιπαρόμυκος, v.15. It is also used by Homer (as Bury notes) Od.11.136. γῆρα
ὑπο λίπαρῳ. The life of Sogenes is effectively woven into the texture of the poem.
The word ἀρμόσαις underscores the fact that the poem itself runs a path between
the precincts of Apollo and Herakles, between the shrine to Neoptolemos and the
house of Sogenes—a past Aiginetan hero and a present victor.

100-101. παίδων δὲ παῖδες ἔχοιεν αἰεὶ γέρας | τό περ νῦν καὶ
ἄρειον ὄπιθεν: "So that the sons of sons might have always the reward that is

now and one even nobler later." Yet another link is made for Sogenes with Neoptolemos, who held the kingship of the Molossians at vv.39-40, ἀτὰρ γένος αἰεὶ φέρειν τοῦτό οἱ γέρας. The γέρας that is to be shared by all Aiginetans on their own soil is also like that which they share at Neoptolemos' shrine at Delphi. Pindar here fulfills the promise of praise.

102-3. τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὐ ποτε φάσει κέαρ ἀτρόποισι Νεοπτόλεμον ἐλκύσαι ἔπει. These provide the most difficult lines to dismember and understand. Most scholars translate this to mean: "my heart will not ever say that it dragged Neoptolemos (down, through the dirt etc.) with inappropriate / inflexible words." There are several problems. First of all, the sentence as it stands, does not make sense within the ode. How has Neoptolemos been mistreated? how "dragged?" If it is construed as an apology, it still does not make sense with the imagined context of Paean 6.

The first problem to focus on is that of the particular meaning of ἀτρόποισι ἔπει. The scholia first explained ἀτρόπος as signifying "not appropriate," οὐκ ἀτροπως οὐδ' ἀπεουκότης. Dissen ap Boeckh ratifies this sense of the word with reference to ἐλκύσαι: proprie de canibus mortuos dilacerantibus, ut constat ex Homero aliisque. . . indecorum enim violare mortuos, and translates these lines: animus meus nunquam concedet se improbis Neoptolemum lacerasse verbis. Farnell, following the scholia, translates, "unfitting, improper." Bury and Fennell both take the sense to be, respectively, "inflexible", (irrevocable): "that which cannot be turned" with which reading modern scholars concur (Tugendhat⁷², Segal, Kirkwood, Ruck). Yet, as Slater observes of the sense "impassive, intractable": "It requires an effort of the imagination to think of the term applied to words rather than people, but Pindar must indeed have meant something very like the scholiast's ἀπεουκότης."⁷³ And he sides with Farnell's translation as correct if ambiguous. Slater's cogent and concise discussion takes up the second problem, that of ἐλκύσαι. It was understood by the scholiasts as a metaphor for dogs ripping at a corpse. However, there is another possibility. In *De mul.affect.* the noun ἐλκυστήρ, the midwives' forceps and verb ἔλκειν are both found in the context of birthing and Galen in his *Ling.Hipp.explic.*, 19.97.9, ἐλκυστήρι: ἐμβρυουλκῶ, clearly defines the forceps with ἔλκειν⁷⁴ The relevance to Eileithuia is apparent. There is an additional possibility for ἄτροπος which describes an artificial road track or shunt, "out of the way," built to avoid traffic confrontations⁷⁵. If I am right, then Pindar is combining two images, the one of birthing and the other associated with roads. The poet is saying that in effect he has given birth to a new story of

Neoptolemos and has done it on the ὁδὸν κυρίαν λόγων, the master/main road of song, i.e. he has done it truthfully and in straightforward fashion.

105-6. ταῦτα δὲ τρὶς τετράκι τ' ἀμπολεῖν | ἀπορία τελέθει, τέκνοισιν ἄτε μαφυλάκας, "Διὸς Κόρινθος." The expression means "the same thing over again," cf. Plat. *Euthd.* 292.e, τὸ λεγόμενον ὁ Διὸς Κόρινθος γίγνεται, and Ar.*Ran.*444, *Ekkl.*828. The reference to children is again relevant to the beginning verses.

1. West's commentary to Theogony, 411-412, ad loc.
2. Schachter, A. *Cults in Boiotia* (1986)
3. I owe this information to a note in Henderson's commentary to Aristoph. *Lys.*742. He cites A. Heubeck, *Kadmos* II 1972, 87ff., J. Chadwick and J. T. Killen, *The Knossos Tablets*⁴, p. 206.
4. Farnell: *Cults* ii.610-616.
5. Race, W., "How Greek poems begin," *YCS* 29 1992, 30-31.
6. Drachmann, A.B., ed: *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, 3 vols, Leipzig 1913-27, III.116-17.
7. Fränkel, H: "Schrullen in den Scholien zu Pindars Nemeen 7 und Olympien 3," *Hermes* 89, 1961, 391-94.
8. ἐπιστοῦτο δὲ τοῦτο ἐξ ἐπιγράμματος Σμωνίδου (fr. 166). (Drachmann.117)
9. Wilamowitz: *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922. 161; Segal, C. "Pindar's Seventh Nemean," *TAPhA* 98, 1967, 431-80.
10. Young, D: "Pindar *Nemean* 7: Some Preliminary Remarks (vv.1-20)," *TAPhA* 101,1970, 635-39.
11. Σῶσος καὶ Σωσώ, Σῶτερ, σοὶ τόνδ' ἀνέθηκαν,
Σῶσος μὲν σωθεῖς, Σωσώ δ' ὅτι Σῶσος ἐσώθη.
12. Kirkwood, G.M. "Nemean 7 and the Theme of Vicissitude in Pindar," in *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance: Studies in Honor of James Hutton*, Ithaca, 1975, 78. See also Lloyd-Jones, H., "Modern Interpretation of Pindar: *The Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes*," *JHS* 93, 1973, 109-37. 139-40.
13. West, M. L. ad loc.
14. Stobaeus considered 218-19 an interpolation of lines 905-6.
15. To this Carey, C., *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*, New York 1981, 138, adds Plat. *Symp.*206d and sees a natural association between Eileithuia and the Moirai in that we are given our destiny the moment we are born.
16. Most, G., *Measures of Praise*, Hypomnemata 83, Göttingen 1985, 138-9 & nn10,14-15.
17. Ibid. 139nn16-19, Most provides an extensive list of epithets applied to the Moirai.
18. Segal, op.cit. 457.
19. Hummel, P., *La syntaxe de Pindare*, Louvain & Paris, 1993, 281§354.
20. Cf. O.1.1; 48, O.14.1, O.6.85, P.1.67, P.5.31, P.9.88, N.7.62, I.6.74., fr. 198 b; etc.
21. Bury ad loc.
22. Op. cit. 142.
23. Lloyd-Jones, op.cit., 141 & nn118, 119 relates the third wind, citing Plato *Rep.*472a, as that wind "that will stir up the third and most formidable of three successive waves."
24. πάντα θεοῖς ἀνέθηκαν Ὅμηρος θ' Ἡσίοδος τε
ὅσσα παρ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὀνείδεα καὶ ψόφος ἔστιν,
κλέπτειν μοιχεύειν τε καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀπατεῦειν.
25. τόν τε Ὅμηρον ἔφασκεν ἄξιον ἐκ τῶν ἀγώνων ἐκβάλλεσθαι καὶ ῥαπίζεσθαι καὶ Ἀρχίλοχον ὁμοίως. Diog. Laert.9.1.1.
26. Nisetich, F.J. *Pindar and Homer*, Johns Hopkin's U. Press 1989.
27. Richardson, N. J., "Pindar and later literary criticism in antiquity," *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, vol.5, 1985, 387-88.

28. Mann, Rupert, "Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths," *GRBS* 35, 1994, 328.
29. . Op.cit. 387f.
30. Hummel, 161§177.
31. This is also the opinion of Càssola, F.: "δικαζόμενος": Odisseo si lascia giudicare, si sottopone al collegio arbitrale."
32. For a full discussion of this see Kullmann: *Die Quellen der Ilias* Hermes Einzelschriften 14, 1960, .
33. Köhnken, A. *Die Funktion des Mythos* Berlin, 1971, 48.
34. Boeckh, 1821, 81; Gundert, 1935, 50n.237; Tugendhat, *Hermes* 88, 1960, 403n.3; Bowra, *Pindar*, 1964, 28; Gianotti, *RivFil* 94, 1966, 392.
35. Des Places, *Le pronom*, 1947, 31 Fränkel, *Gnomon* 12.1930 (=W.u .F. 1960, 361.)
36. Mezger, *Komm.* 1880, 366; Rauchenstein, *Philologus* 31, 1858, 428; Schadewaldt, *Aufbau*, 1928, 46; Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, 1922, 162.
37. Most, op.cit. 149.
38. Notably the belly amphora by Exekias, Boulogne Museum 558. *ABV* 145, 18. The Brygos cup painting of Aias dead, shows him face up with his sword clearly planted in the ground and having penetrated up through his body as he lies face up, Bareiss collection, New York L.69.11.35.
39. Vid. Fennell ad loc., Hummel, 246§307, for whom it is a gnomic aorist.
40. Dissen: "caditque in ingloriosos et gloriosos."
41. Farnell ad loc.
42. He says, the younger man is ἀδόκητον because he does not expect death soon: but the older man is δοκέοντα, because he expects to die. Death falls, he says, on both the old and the young alike.
43. Gerber: "Pindar, Nemean, 7, 31." *AJPh* 84, 1963, 182.
44. Young, David C., "A Note on Pindar *Nemean* 7.30f." *CSCA* vol.4, 1971, 251.
45. The Life of the Mind, pp.132-3.
46. "Extension of the predicate. 'Rears to dainty (or 'luxuriant') growth.' " Also predicatively, Bury and Most; attributively, Lloyd-Jones and Race.
47. Leslie Kurke, "The politics of ἀβροσύνη" *CA* 11 no.1, 1992. pp.110-11.
48. Both Carey and Most offer the clearest and most exhaustive discussion of this passage's complexities since Farnell. Carey, op.cit., 148-151 and Most in his article "Pindar, Nem. 7.31-36," *Hermes* 114, 1986, 262-271.
49. Callim. *Hymns* 4.27
50. See Lexicon Homericum, p.52, line 20: βοηθόον: ἐν μάχῃ θοόν, ἀγαθὸν βοηθεῖν.
51. Hesychius, *Lex.* 776.1, however, offers the sense: *βοηθόον· κατὰ τὴν μάχην ταχύν.
52. Adesp. Papyr. et Epig., fr.971.1-2, Σπάρτα καὶ ἐδέδεκτο βοηθόον, ἀνίκα καυλῶ | ὠπλίσην, καίπερ γυῖα βαρυνόμενον. Anth. Gr. 9.197.1-4, Καὶ τόδε σῆς ζαθέης κεφαλῆς περιώσιον ἔργον, | Πρόκλε μάκαρ, πάντων βρέτας ἔμπροον ὅτι Μαρίνον | ἀθανάτων μερόπεςσι βοηθόον εὐσεβέεςσιν | ἀντὶ τῆς ἱερῆς κεφαλῆς ψυχροσσοῦν ἄλκαρ. Ibid. Ep.445.1-3, Ἦθελε μὲν βασιλεὺς σε βοηθόον εἰσέτι πέμπειν | ἄσπευται τειρομένοις δευομένων μερόπων, | Τητιανὲ χρύσειε. 10.Ep.8.3-4, ἀλλ' ἦν τις γριπεὺς με βοηθόον ἢ καλαμευτῆς | φωνήσῃ, πνοιῆς ἔμαι ὀξύτερος. Call. *Hymn.* 3.20-25, οὐρεσιν οἰκῶ, πόλεσιν δ' ἐπιμείβομαι ἀνδρῶν | μόνον ὅτ' ὀξείησιν ὑπ' ὠδίνεσσι γυναῖκες | τειρόμεναι καλέωσι βοηθόον, ἧσὶ με Μοῖραι | γεινομένην τὸ πρῶτον ἐπεκλήρωσαν ἀρήγειν, | ὅττι με καὶ τίκτουσα καὶ οὐκ ἤλγησε φέρουσα | μήτηρ, ἀλλ' ἀμογητὶ φίλων ἀπεθήκατο γυίων."
53. Hummel, 291§362 &n2 rejects Most's parentheses: Il n'est pas nécessaire, comme le pense Most, de mettre entre tirets la proposition ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις| κεῖται. He goes on to suggest that the participle might in this case be translated, "pour s'aider lui-même".
54. It should be noted that Hayden Pelliccia, "Pindar, *Nemean* 7.31-36 and the Syntax of Aetiology," *HCSP* 92, 1989, 71-101, is also at variance with Most's interpretation of ἐπεῖ.
55. Race, Wm., "Climactic Elements in Pindar's Verse." *HCSP* 92, 1989, 43-69.
56. Fontenrose, *The Cult and Myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi*, Univ. of Calif. Press, 1960, 207-210.
57. In a note given to me by Annette Tefstetter, who disagrees with the temporal reading of ἐπεῖ, points out that this is best read in a causal sense: "with multi-layered, systematic

- ambiguity, Pindar is making the point that Neoptolemos not only *went* to Delphi but *died* in Delphi *because* he sacked Priam's city." Cf. Lloyd-Jones, 145-6; Most, 163.
58. Cf. Carey, 153 ad loc. In the same note, Prof. Teffeteller has also pointed out to me in contrast to this chance death, that ἀντιτυχόντ' indicates a: " 'set-up' by Apollo: in a pattern familiar in Greek accounts of divine retribution, the perpetrator/victim-to-be is caused by the deity to repeat his crime and is then, in the full flush of guilt, slain for it.
59. Ruck, C.A. P., "Marginalia Pindarica," *Hermes* 100, 1972, 143-153, provides a good history of the scholarly discussion.
60. I justify this reading by the various examples in LSJ where ἔπεια is (esp. in Homer) regularly translated as "speeches."
61. Cf. Carey, C., "Pindarica," *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry*, edd. R.D. Dawe, J. Diggle, P.E. Easterling, Cambridge 1978, 35-38, who comes to the same conclusion for different reasons.
62. Rupert Mann, "Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths" *GRBS* 1994, 328; Leonard Woodbury, "Neoptolemos at Delphi" *Phoenix* 33, 1979, 113.
63. Cf. Kurke's discussion in "Traffic in Praise," 86-7.
64. Slater, W. J. "Futures in Pindar," *CQ* 1969.93, concisely argues that this is a positive statement and means in fact: 'he will praise.' As such the statement is a form of litotes. Slater later applies this argument to vv.102-3.
65. E.g. Aesch. fr.146: οἱ Ζηὸς ἐγγυς; Plat. *Phaed.* ἐγγυς τι τινός; also the comp., ἐγγύων and superl. ἐγγυτάτω, "more like, most like."
66. Woodbury, op. cit. 121n115.
67. Strabo 7.7.2.6.
68. Segal, Carl, "Two Agonistic Problems in Pindar *Nemean* 7.70-74 and *Pythian* 1.42-45." *GRBS* 9 (1968) 31-45.
69. See Kurke p.236n.25 which quotes Renehan's discussion of this.
70. Ruck, Marginalia Pindarica, *Hermes* 100, 1972. pp.152-3.
71. Rusten, J. S., "ΓΕΙΤΩΝ ΗΡΩΕ Pindar's Prayer to Herakles (N. 7.86-101) and Greek Popular Religion," *HSCP* 87 (1983) 289-297.
72. Tugendhat is credited by Segal, Ruck and Kirkwood (among others) with first challenging the earlier sense of "unfitting, inappropriate," but who do not credit Fennell and Bury, both of whom take the word in its primary sense of "inflexible, unturning."
73. Slater, W. J. "Futures in Pindar," *CQ* 1969, 92-94.
74. Hipp. *de mulier affect.*i-iii,70.6.
75. See Forbes, R.J. *Ancient Roads*, Amsterdam 1964, 99ff. Also Pritchett, W.K., *Studies in Greek Topography, III, Roads*, U of Calif. *Classical Studies* 28, Berkeley, 1982.

1. Ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα πόνων κεκριμένων | ἱατρός: "The best doctor for labours judged successful is happiness." εὐφροσύνα is here the sense of well-being and release that comes after accomplishment. However curious it might seem that labours should require medical treatment, the term ἱατρός implies some sort of physical relief from effort and is reasonable in the context of a victory ode to a wrestler. The participle κεκριμένων is used by Pindar to indicate the judging in the games that determines the victor and the distinction that results.¹

2-3. αἱ δὲ σοφαὶ | Μοισᾶν θυγάτρες αἰδοὶ θέλξαν νιν ἀπτόμεναι: The particle δὲ turns our attention to the relief offered by music, those songs which are σοφαὶ—a word whose multi-valenced import has certainly two applications in the context. Principally, since these songs are characterized as daughters of the Muses, σοφαὶ must carry the sense of poetic craft, artistic virtuosity, then by extension, wise or learned with respect to the healing arts. What is more significant is the very physicality of the various elements of this ode: the songs charm or enchant the recipient by touch, ἀπτόμεναι. This makes prosaic sense as songs are personified; poetic and medical sense as the touch of a healer. The verb θέλξαν was glossed by the scholiast as "soothe" and has generally been understood to have this sense.² Mezger³ however retains what Farnell calls the "far-fetched" sense of charm or spell-casting [zaubern]. While the sense of "soothe" is in keeping with the metaphor of doctors and well-being, nevertheless enchantment or magic is the more powerful reading and lies closer to the arresting image of songs being able to touch. At v.35 Pindar restates this idea of the tactile magic of song: ἔγγυι δ' ἔλκομαι ἦτορ νοσηνίᾳ θυγέμεν.

The scholiasts Didymus and Aristarchos understood the pronoun νιν respectively to refer to πόνων and to εὐφροσύνα; Fennell has it refer to "him" i.e. the victor, following Boeckh; Bury follows Mezger in having the reference to εὐφροσύνα. Machemer's argument, based on Hesiod's Theogony, 36-74, 94-193, the "Hymn to the Muses," which essentially describes their powers, although in considerably less compact form, thinks that νιν refers to them.⁴

4-5. οὐδὲ θερμὸν τόσον γε μαλθακὰ τέγγει γυῖα: "Not even warm water wets the soft limbs" continues the very physical appropriation of the capacity of music. The limbs are soft because relaxed. For Hubbard the polarity of *malthakos/trachus* μαλθακα informs the imagery of the ode since the soft healing of songs is contrasted to the rough physical πόνος of the athlete.⁵ τέγγει is here the less accepted reading but based on a citation in Plutarch's *de Tranquillo* 467 D where it is τέγξει. Farnell [and Bowra, following Heyne] argues that the fact of Plutarch's τέγξει, although not absolutely accurate, provides sufficient evidence for an independent reading of τέγγει, and that τεύχει, although it also occurs at v.84 is not evidence that it should be so here. Bury on the other hand, argues that the fact that τεύχει is in the mss. and the presence of the same verb within the ode does give greater credence to it. Fennell accepts Plutarch's τέγξει as the more original as it is the more uncommon word.⁶

The overall tactile program of the ode is better served by the sense of "wet; melt, soften," rather than τεύχει, "make." Pindar uses τέγγω similarly in context with θερμὰ at N.10.75, θερμὰ δὲ τέγγων δάκρυα στοναχαῖς. Moreover, the comparison here is between the relaxation of limbs from warmth of water and the softening or limb-loosening quality of music. [λυσίμελης is a term generally used by the lyric poets e.g. Sappho, Archilochos, Alcman in relation to Eros].

5. τόσσον εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάορος: The comparison, τόσσον, τόσσον, cf. Call. *Hymn to Apollo*. 94, makes music the more powerful influence. The touch of the music of praise is more potent than water on the limbs of those who have laboured. συνάορος, "accompanied" [Slater] is a complex of συν and αἰωρέω, "to lift and hang up; to wave, set waving." If we preserve this sense of συνάορος, "hanging together, wedded," it lends an interesting aspect to the combining of praise and the sound of the lyre; it is as though the music sends the words, εὐλογία, aloft and causes them to hang and move upon the air.

6. ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει: "A word lives longer than deeds." The verb βιοτεύει is noteworthy in that it denotes a process or manner of living. We might translate, "has a way of living" longer than deeds. Hubbard notes that "the pharmacological effect of the medicinal song may result in forgetfulness."⁷ Cf. N.1.69, N.5.48, O.2.18, N.10.24.

7-8. ὃ τι κε σὺν Χαρίτων τύχα | γλώσσα φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας: The subjunctive, rather than the optative, ἐξέλοι is the expected form following κε and Bergk read ἐξέλη. Dissen explains the optative as "modestior. . . in re quae non sine Gratorum ope fit." σὺν τύχα reflects the dependence that the poet has upon their participation in his celebration. Euphrosyne, as one of the Graces, has particular

relevance. The optative mood is therefore, as Bury notes, more expressive of this dependence.

The tongue draws out its poetry from the depths of the mind. As Fennell and Bury explain βαθείας is likely to refer to a rich storehouse and both cite O.2.54, P.1.66 where βαθύδοξος and βαθείαν μέριμναν occur respectively. The adjective qualifying the Fates in N.7.1, βαθύφρονων, seems, however, to be the more appropriate parallel. There its character denotes a quality of something too profound for mortal comprehension, a quality which is certainly proper to this instance. The Graces, like the daughters of the Muses, offer the poet a source of divine thoughts, divine songs and sensibilities. The word drawn from a divine source has the spirit of immortality—*χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει*.

9–10. τό μοι θέμεν Κρονίδα τε Δὶ καὶ Νεμέα | Τιμασάρχου τε πάλαι ὕμνου προκώμιον εἶη: "May this word be mine," τό μοι. . εἶη. Fennell understands τό as "wherefore." Yet it is more reasonable that τὸ refer to the ῥῆμα of v.6 and to the προκώμιον here. Clearly Pindar is beginning his programme of praise: Zeus and the victor, Timasarchos, have both been named; the Aiakidai as Timasarchos' ancestral clan are about to be. θέμεν draws an interesting comment from Bury for whom it suggests "a work of architecture or sculpture" and bases his impression on v.81 where sculpture is definitely alluded to: στάλαν θέμεν Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν. This ode could conceivably have been inscribed on a stone stele⁸. This would give even better meaning to the phrase ῥῆμα βιοτεύει, for it would certainly confer on the inscribed words a life lived longer than that of mortals.

11–12. δέξαιτο δ' Αἰακιδᾶν | ἡύπυργον ἔδος: Fennell asks if "me" or "it" i.e. the ode is meant to be the implied object of δέξαιτο. Perhaps, since the subject is the "well-fortified seat of the Aiakidai," the island of Aigina, the latter is to be preferred. Also, if we accept Bury's suggestion, then it follows reasonably that a ἔδος is entirely appropriate to a stone dedication.

12. δίκῃ ξεναρκέϊ κοινὸν φέγγος: The common light that protects strangers by its justice is a curious phrase. First, δίκῃ ξεναρκέϊ is a unique combination, "stranger-protecting justice," and can be understood as instrumental dative, i.e. by means of. The common or shared light is a feature of the brilliance of victory in which all Aiginetans can participate. What is notable is the asyndeton of the description of Aigina: ἡύπυργον ἔδος, δίκῃ ξεναρκέϊ κοινὸν φέγγος. The nouns and qualifiers are paired and piled one on top of another like bricks without mortar, a verbal mimesis of a tower or fortress wall.

Bulman has also noted the conflux of allusions to hospitality between Aigina, ξεναρκέι and Thebes, ξένιον ἄστν, v.23, φίλοισι γὰρ φίλος, v.22.⁹

13-14. εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἀλίῳ | σὸς πατὴρ ἐθάλπετο: Fennell reviews ζαμενεῖ as a word that Pindar uses to mean "quickenning" or "inspiring" and that here it is causative, i.e. the warmth of the sun causes, or would cause, Timokritos to have life. To be alive is expressed throughout Greek poetry by the phrase "to look upon the light of the sun." Hubbard identifies ζαμενεῖ as an element of *trachus* in that it denotes vitality with the "edge" of vigour and physical exertion unlike the softening of limbs in warm water, vv.4-5.¹⁰ The verb ἐθάλπετο then clearly relates to a deeper connection between Timasarchos and his father: Timasarchos, alive, experiences the softening of warmth while his father, dead no longer experiences the enervating warmth of the sun, i.e. life.

The distinction between the commonwealth light or splendor of the victor and the light that is no longer present for the the victor's father is also implicit. Moreover, the warmth which the living victor feels on his limbs and which does not compare with that of praise, is here distinguished from the warmth which his father no longer experiences and so prevents him from making music in celebration of his son's victory.

14-15. ποικίλον κιθαρίζων θαμά κε, τῷδε μέλει κλιθείς: The participle, κλιθείς, is judged by Bury to have an architectural sense and refer literally to leaning as on a pillar. Farnell lists the other options that commentaries have explored: "devoted to; favourably inclined to; bending over [the cithara]; leaning against the melody of the music," and notes that κλίνεισθαι is used elsewhere [Soph. *Ant.* 1188: ὑπτία δὲ κλινόμαι] to describe the incline or drooping of a body. I think the words τῷδε μέλει make the context obviously that of Pindar's music. We should also note the different aspects of the participles, κιθαρίζων pres. and κλιθείς aor. pass., the implications of which inform the logical construct that Timokritos can only in the present accompany a previously worked-out melody. As well, the term ποικίλος, which Race translates as "elaborate tune" is more suited to describe a harmonizing accompaniment to the melody.

16. υἱὸν κελάδησε καλλίνικον: υἱὸν is Bergk's emendation for ὕμνον which is the reading of all the mss. and accepted by Mommsen, Christ, Snell-Maehler and Slater. Fennell offers γόνον with the explanation that, although some noun referring to the victor is necessary because of the change from second person at v.16 [σὸς πατὴρ] to the third person pronoun νιν at v.21, no one with υἱὸν in the text would have expanded it to ὕμνον. This shift, described by Dissen as "transitu maxime Pindarico," is unacceptable to Fennell, Bury and Farnell [as well as Schroeder, Bowra and Turyn] because it is harsh and abrupt. The line is certainly difficult with ὕμνον for the reasons

cited above; moreover, without Bergk's emendation sense can only be made by understanding καλλίνικον to be a noun.¹¹ This seems to be an unnecessarily complex argument that, while affirming that κελάδησε can take a double accusative, nevertheless overlooks the obvious redundancy of words for music: μέλος; ὕμνου προκώμιον. It seems to me especially unlikely that Pindar would repeat ὕμνος within such a close range of verses and that he would obfuscate the recipient of the song of praise within the epinician programme to such a degree. The other argument I would propose for accepting υἱὸν is the phrase, θαμά κε, τῷδε μέλει κλιθεῖς, which can only mean that the celebration by Timokritos would have made use of Pindar's melodic idea for this strophic ode, which celebrates this particular victory of his son.

κελαδέω is associated with music and singing, often with the sense of a loud, joyous sound and these verses [14-17] are of a particularly musical nature: we should note the sequence of liquid "l" and guttural "k": ποικίλον κιθαρίζων θαμά κε, τῷδε μέλει κλιθεῖς, υἱὸν κελάδησε καλλίνικον Κλεωναίου.

17. Κλεωναίου τ' ἀπ' ἀγῶνος ὄρμον στεφάνων πέμφαντα: Cf. N.10.42. The Kleonaioi, or citizens of Kleonai, for a long time managed the Nemean games. The ὄρμον στεφάνων is a string of the crowns of victory. As Fennell notes, this might apply to one victory or several. [He also notes that it may belong to the crowns worn by the chorus, citing Eur. *Herc. Fur.* 677.] πέμφαντα refers to Timasarchos.

18-19. καὶ λιπαρᾶν | εὐωνύμων ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν: Athens is commonly described as "sleek" or "shining, glistening."¹²

19-Θήβαις τ' ἐν ἑπταπύλοις | οὐνεκ' Ἀμπιτρυῶνος ἀγλαὸν παρὰ τύμβον | Καδμείοι νιν οὐκ ἀέκοντες ἄνθει μίγνυν | Αἰγίνας ἔκατι: The τε coordinates οὐνεκα: "and because in Thebes of the seven-gates." Farnell observes that the games held beside the tomb of Amphytryon were probably the Iolaeia. The scholia quote Didymos as saying that the gymnasium was Iolaeian but the games Herakleian¹³. What is poetically—and politically—relevant is the connection that Pindar is making between Thebes, his birthplace, and Aigina. He does this not only by naming the two cities, but by having them form the narrative of the song which descends from Timokritos' hypothetical celebration in an entire strophe from the Nemean games to the site of Herakles' halls: Ἡρακλῆος ὀλβίαν πρὸς αὐλάν. The garlands that befall Timasarchos and the names of the chief families, carefully border the list: Κλεωναίου τ' ἀπ' ἀγῶνος ὄρμον στεφάνων / Καδμείοι νιν οὐκ ἀέκοντες ἄνθει μίγνυν. Furthermore, as strophe 2 begins with the name of Zeus this strophe ends with that of Herakles: it is a divine progression frequent in Pindar.

22. φίλοισι γὰρ φίλος ἐλθὼν: An adverbial phrase, "as a friend coming among friends." This statement reinforces the bond of friendship between Thebes and Aigina and, subsequently, between Pindar and Timasarchos. This close tie is also implicit in the previous phrase Καδμείοι νιν οὐκ ἀέκοντες ἄνθεσι μίγνυνον, "the Kadmeans [Thebans], not unwilling, mingled him with flowers [of victory]." The verb, μίγνυνον is sometimes used in conjunction with the leaves or flowers of the victor's crown: N.1.18: φύλλοις ἐλαΐαν χρυσεόις μιχθέντα; N.2.22: ὀκτὼ στεφάνοις ἔμιχθεν; I.3.3: εὐλογίαις ἀστῶν μεμίχθαι. This verb, which primarily has the sense of mixing—as in the physical mixing of milk and honey or the combined mixing and mingling of sexual congress,—must convey somewhat more than "crowning" [Slater] and, appropriate to the physicality of this particular ode and the general tactile quality of most of Pindar's uncommon metaphors, have the added physical dimension whereby two substances by their contiguity become indistinguishable from each other. The victor and his crown of celery or parsley leaves are to be imagined as becoming one and the same: the victor is inseparable from his victory.

Both Slater and Williams cite μίγνυνον as the emendation of Schroeder and that is the form used by Bowra and Snell-Maehler.¹⁴

23. ξένιον ἄστυ: The city is "bound to welcome strangers." This establishes the ritual guest-host relationship and the mutual hospitality of Thebes and Aigina.

23. κατέδρακεν: This is the mss. reading which Fennell emends to κατέδραμεν which he describes as a metaphor of navigation. Mezger who accepts this emendation translates: er lief durch die Stadt hinab.

24. Ἡρακλέος ὀλβίαν πρὸς αὐλάν: Farnell believes this to have been the temple of Herakles by the Elektra gates (Paus.9.11), and that because it stood on high ground, therefore κατέδρακεν must be correct. However, it makes somewhat more sense that κατέδρακεν have the αὐλάν of Herakles as its object: that once the victor arrived in the city he then looked upon the tomb of Herakles.

25-6. σὺν ᾧ ποτε Τρωίαν κραταιὸς Τελαμῶν | πόρθησε: This begins the first mythical portion of the ode. We should bear in mind that the narrative still constitutes what the poet imagines Timasarchos' father would have sung about, were he alive. The joining of Telamon and Herakles [σὺν ᾧ] in what are for the most part Heraklean adventures and travels serves to promote ever further the Thebes / Aigina connection.

The adjective κραταιὸς is not used in Homer to describe warriors, but fate, κραταιὴ Μοῖρα.¹⁵

26-7. καὶ Μέροπας | καὶ τὸν μέγαν πολεμιστὰν ἔκπαγλον Ἀλκυονῆ:
The inhabitants of Cos. The brief mention of Herakles in Cos [Il.14.255] is part of Sleep's account [242-262] to Hera of his fear of Zeus for when he had caused Zeus to sleep and Herakles thereby managed the destruction of Troy—after which Hera had him shipwrecked on the island—Zeus awoke and was angry with Sleep. The episode of Alcyoneus took place at Phlegra. In all cases it is primarily Herakles who is the hero. Fennell speculates that there may have been an Aiginetan version of these myths. In the I.6.3 lff. the same three episodes are told as being shared by Telamon and Herakles. As Bulman has observed, Herakles is here relegated to an auxiliary position relative to Telamon, whereas in I.6.31-33, Telamon is secondary.¹⁶

We should also note that the giant, Alcyoneus, is commensurably formed with three pertinent qualifiers: large, warlike, terrifying.¹⁷ It is of perhaps minor interest that πολεμιστῆς and ἔκπαγλος occur together only once in Homer at Il.21.589, ὧδ' ἔκπαγλος ἔων καὶ θαρσαλέος πολεμιστῆς, where Hector is addressing and describing Achilles¹⁸. Hector also describes him as ἔκπαγλος, at 22.256. Otherwise ἔκπαγλον qualifies verbal expression¹⁹. It is a distinguishing quality of Pindar's verse that while he uses what can be called Homeric material, he rarely uses Homeric epithets.

28. οὐ τετραορίας γε πρὶν δυνώδεκα πέτρῳ: That there are twelve four-horse chariots²⁰ may be an allusion to the twelve labours of Herakles.

29-30. ἥροας τ' ἐπεμβεβαῶτας ἵπποδάμους ἔλεν | δις τόσους: The sound of the perf. part., ἐπεμβεβαῶτας, resounds like that of the stones that fell, while, ironically, it characterizes the heroes as "mounted." ἥροας is, in the Snell-Maehler, Bowra texts, an emendation based on the 1923 appendix of Schroeder. This is counter to the mss. reading, ἥρωας, which Schroeder's edition of 1900 does not emend²¹.

The expression δις τόσους refers to the driver and his παραβάτης.

30-1. ἀπειρομάχας ἔων κε φανείη λόγον ὃ μὴ συνιείς: ἀπειρομάχας, [Dor. nom.], "inexperienced in war would he appear to be, whoever did not grasp my story." This is in contrast to the Theandridai who, at v.76, are said to have experience: πείραν ἔχοντες. The present participles, ἔων, συνιείς, make it clear that we have moved from past mythical time to the present.

31-2. ἐπεὶ ῥέζοντά τι καὶ παθεῖν ἔοικεν: "since it is likely that one who has done anything has suffered." This gnome is placed here at an important juncture. It bounds the previous mythic material with a due measure of closure. This is for two reasons, one of which is artistic and the other of which is bound up in the presentation. The mythic material of the ode is divided into two parts

33. τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἔρῳκει με τεθμὸς ὥραί τ' ἐπειγόμεναι:

This passage has received much attention as a "break-off" passage. Bundy posits that the poet did this for rhetorical effect, i.e. that Pindar reminds himself and the audience of the rules of epinician performance which would have required that the mythical material not be too lengthy a catalogue since it would distract from the victor's praise, only for the effect of stressing for his listeners how long the catalogue would be when it comes to the splendid past of Aiakid heroes.²²

This passage is further complicated by the fact that it is itself interrupted by the poet's references vv.35-41 to the new-moon festival, the sea holding "you" by the waist and the man with envy, before he urges a new song, v.44 begins again to narrate mythical tales of former Aiakid heroes.

Most scholars have disagreed with Bundy's interpretation. The sense of τεθμὸς is one of limits, not rules of epinician time-limits or length of material. Miller however, favours this reading, and defends it as a disruption of the narrative in which the poet argues for the leisure to praise the victor by extending his mythical narration. The love-charm and new-moon festival are other words for "getting down to business."²³ Bulman, agreeing on the whole with Miller, takes a somewhat different view of the love-charm and new-moon festival and sees in this imagery a struggle between ἔρως and ἔρις, desire and strife.²⁴ The poet is struggling with his own desires: "The attention Pindar draws is therefore to his own desire and to the internal conflict it causes him has another motivation: he wants to emphasize that his involvement with the Telamon myth has whetted his appetite for further praise of the victor."²⁵ Carey sees the new-moon festival to mean the celebration at hand and cites as a parallel P.8.29ff. He rejects however the notion that Pindar returns to the same mythic material, since "When he uses a formal break-off, Pindar nowhere rejects the external compulsion or ignores the dangers he cites."²⁶ He sees a distinct difference between the earlier myth which deals with kingship and the myth that is to follow which has to do with success and hardship in winning it.²⁷

All arguments on all sides are equally persuasive and equally fail to illuminate the poetic intention. Rhetoric and reason aside, it is clear that whatever the poet is doing by his extremely unusual imagery and language it is not commonly apparent. The passage eludes systematic analysis. And when the images and language of poetry exceed the bounds of normal or even intelligible expression it is best to take them at face value.

The only way in which it I can construe intelligible sense from these words is to understand it within the context of magic and incantation. The allusions to a law or stricture, τεθμὸς, and the pressing hours, ὥραί τ' ἐπειγόμεναι which prevent him

from expansive or liberal treatment of the whole story, have more to do with the spells of binding than with Pindar being rhetorically clever, constructing a break-off passage to quickening the pace of narrative or to effect a lively transition.

The argument for this is simple enough. The first strophe introduces the idea of magic or spell-casting, θέλξαν, and ends with the words γλῶσσα φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας. I think that these words constitute more than a reference to the ordinary experience of deep thinking. They project the image of a depth of mind that lies beyond normal consciousness. Both ideas of magic and of depth occur again in the lines that immediately follow the opening of this strophe: ὕγγι δ' ἔλκομαι ἦτορ νουμηνία θιγέμεν. Furthermore, there is the phrase δόξομεν. . ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν, "we shall appear to walk in the light" which has some bearing on the first strophe's ἔτι ζαμενῇ Τιμόκριτος ἀλίῳ / σὸς πατὴρ ἐθάλπεται, has a religious feel to it.

A final point: the poet says that Timokritos would have κιθαρίζων, i.e. played the kithara while the second part of the mythic element is played on the sweet lyre—γλυκεία φόρμινξ.

The verbs moreover that occur in this strophe all have an inherent sense of hindering or binding: ἐρύκει, ἐπειγόμεναι, ἔλκομαι, ἔχει, ἀντίτεινε. The image of the "sea" holding one about the middle is one of being bound by water. The word ἐπιβουλία gives the inanimate conscious will.

35. ὕγγι δ' ἔλκομαι ἦτορ νουμηνία θιγέμεν: The ὕγγι is a bird which ancient wizards and witches tied to a wheel which they then whirled about. It was used as a means of attracting and charming souls and thence as a love-charm. There is no doubt the bird had something to say about being tethered and swung round and that the sound it subsequently made was believed to have alluring, bewitching power.

Hekate, as we read in Burkert²⁸ is the goddess of the moon and moon-conjuring witches of Thessaly, e.g. Medea, and cross-roads which at night were traditionally thought to be haunted by ghosts: "Chthonic is also found as the epithet of Hecate the goddess of nocturnal society who is able to enter the underworld."²⁹

The line reads: "I am drawn in my heart by a charm to touch the new moon." Normally verbs of touching take a genitive of the object touched, but, as Farnell points out, θιγέμεν in Pindar takes either dative or genitive, and both Dissen's and Bury's attempt to separate θιγέμεν from νουμηνία he rejects as "hopeless, for θιγέμεν could not be used absolutely but demands its object." ἔλκομαι is appropriate to the power of a magical charm, especially that of the iunx: as it whirled around its cry and circular motion about the person wheeling it would, within the logic of magic, draw or attract the object to the sorcerer. The middle voice moreover encourages this sense of a power that

is not original with oneself, drawing the heart. This is a scene of enchantment. The new moon is only apparent—the smallest reflected light is to be seen as its thin crescent. The verse's statement about being drawn to touch the moon must be taken to mean just that. It is the desire of any conjuror.

The reference to the new moon is, in the view of most commentators one that applies to a festival on that day. But I think that in this particular context it is more reasonably related to magic and the paranormal. Significantly, Pindar does not in fact "touch on" the subject of the new moon festival. Apollo, to whom the beginning of the month was sacred, is not named or even alluded to. There is no celebration or festive note that immediately follows this statement about new moon: on the contrary, we have the rather threatening image of someone being held by the sea and a description of an envious man whose empty thought rolls within darkness.

36–7. ἔμπα, καῖπερ ἔχει βαθεῖα ποντιάς ἄλμα μέσσον: A deep salt sea holding one about the middle is a remarkable image. It is one that has elicited even more remarkable attempts of interpretation: it is meant to represent a hold in wrestling; it is a political allusion to Pindar's enemies who, presumably, surround him at the time of this ode's performance; it is, in Farnell's estimation, as a wrestling image, a blunder on Pindar's part; for Wilamowitz, it is the actual sea that intervenes between Pindar and Aigina. These complicated and thoughtful manoeuvres at understanding all ignore the context.

The deep sea is the the hostile darkness of the night sky which surrounds or possesses the new moon by its middle. ἀντίτειν , "strive against" is an injunction addressed to the moon, and ἐπιβουλία signifies a plan or scheme which is in some way hostile or treacherous. Investing the inanimate world with spirit and consciousness is the very essence of magic and incantation. The darkness of the night sky is here seen to be about to engulf the moon's precarious light like a vast sea. The words enjoin its sliver of light remain steady against the overwhelming dark—ἔμπα, καῖπερ—and become (eventually) full. Moreover, ἀντιτείνω in its fundamental sense means "to stretch out against" and this most aptly applies to the progression of the new moon's thin crescent light over the course of its cycle to becoming full. The verses which follow uphold this reading.

37–8. σφόδρα δόξομεν δαίων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν: δόξομεν, "we will appear, be seen." The future tense is distinct from the present of the previous lines of this strophe and marks the transition. ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν to arrive into the light or "win over, attain a goal" [Slater].

The verb also means literally to step down and is used by Pindar [N.3.25; P.3.73] in the context of stepping onto land from a ship that has come ashore. Here I suspect it serves a dual purpose: the moon will become full like a ship that comes to shore, and it will arrive or win its goal of fullness of light, σφόδρα δαίων ὑπέρτεροι, very much superior to the hostile forces.

Pindar in his rich use of this image is exploiting the occasion to engage yet another level of meaning. The moon's light is in this way a metaphor for his poetry. The light of his verse, like that of the moon, will grow with time against the darkness. The light of his praise of Timasarchos will grow with time against the darkness of the envious.

39–40. φθονερά δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων | γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότῳ κυλίνδει: "Another man, i.e. not a poet/sorcerer, when he looks [on, for light], enviously rolls an empty idea in darkness." φθονερά, n. pl. is construed as an adverbial expression with βλέπων and usually translated: looking enviously; with envy in his eye. However, adverbially, φθονερά is equally suited to accompany the verb κυλίνδει. Whichever reading is preferred, in Pindar darkness is the key-note of envy. The feeling of envy is that of the lesser man: the one who has not won victory: the one who is not favoured with anything divine. His obscurity to the human community is his darkness. The light that is always associated with the victor and which is necessarily derived from the immortal world, shines on him and on his family, his clan and his poet.

41. χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν: The empty idea has fallen to the earth as it falls on the first line of this new strophe. The mimetic effect of this particular enjambement is deliberate: this is the only run-on line that breaks mid-verse. To Farnell the image this suggests is an arrow weakly shot that misses the target. To others it is a metaphor from wrestling. The power of the verb κυλίνδει, "rolls or tosses about", is, in Pindar, usually associated with stones, e.g. P.1.24; P.2.23; P.4.209. (whereas in Homer it is more usually used in reference to the sea). The γνώμαν κενεὰν thus rolls once it has fallen to the earth—πετοῖσαν, Dor. aor. for πεσοῦσαν—in the predictable manner of any stone or round object. What is important is again, context. At v.38 Pindar has the phrase ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν; here σκότῳ κυλίνδει χαμαὶ. Both passages are informed by the previous imagery of the moon and both come to earth in their own way. In the first, the poet arrives to earth—or shore—like the moon coming to its full light. In the second a man rolls something empty on the earth in darkness. That which is empty and which still has the ability to roll around, then it must be much like a phantom or imaginary moon. Again, the idea that the moon is at sea or in some material that has depth βαθεῖα ποντιῶς

ἄλμα, contrasts with the adjective κενεᾶν; the moon is held in place ἔχει μέσσον, whereas the hollow object rolls, κυλίνδει.

41-2. ἐμοὶ δ' ὅποιαν ἀρετὰν ἔδωκε πότμος ἄναξ: Destiny is given a title of "lord" and suggests that the excellence (or talent or genius) granted to the poet is like a gift of the sorcerer or the seer.

43. εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι χρόνος ἔρπων πεπρωμέναν τελέσει: Like v.43 which begins the previous strophe this too bears a reflection on time. The participle πεπρωμέναν, fated, used proleptically with τελέσει—will accomplish its fated end—is echoed at v.61: τὸ μόριμον Διόθεν πεπρωμένον ἔκφερεν.

The statement that time will serve to bring to fruition the poet's work is related to v.6 χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει, and the confidence a destined and masterful poet feels about his task. It also functions as a contradiction to the previous statement at v.34 that time was pressing.

44. ἐξύφαινε, γλυκεῖα, καὶ τόδ' αὐτίκα, φόρμιγξ: This introduces a new and second start to the poem. In comparison to the first mythic portion the operative word here is αὐτίκα: the pace of the narration will be swift. Weaving as a metaphor for musical and poetic composition is common to Pindar, cf.P.4.275, fr.179, N.7.77. Farnell remarks that the resemblance of a phorminx to a loom makes such a metaphor natural.

45. Λυδία σὺν ἀρμονίᾳ μέλος πεφιλημένον: Lydian harmony is a reference to the modal scale used; the melody that is πεφιλημένον, beloved, seems to suggest that a change of tune has occurred. But this introduces the unanswerable question of how two different melodies would suit this particular strophic arrangement. Since the Lydian mode was used chiefly for lamentations or dirges it may be understood in this context as a song of mourning for those Aiakidai who are about to be sung. πεφιλημένον recalls v.22, φίλοισι γὰρ φίλος ἐλθών.

46-7. Οἰνώνια τε καὶ Κύπρῳ ἔνθα Τεῦκρος ἀπάρχει | ὁ Τελαμονιάδας: Oenone is the ancient name for Aigina. Cyprus was their colony. "Where Teucer rules far away." Farnell explains that Pindar is the earliest authority for the tradition that Teucer colonized Salamis in Cyprus. The Cypriot kings were called the sons of Teucer: Τευκρίδαι [Paus.ii.29.4]. Race explains that Teucer was exiled from Salamis upon returning from Troy because he had not saved his half-brother Aias. Köhnken notes that two verbal markers connect this with the preceding tale of Telamon. καὶ τόδε, v.44.and the patronymic.³⁰

47-8. ἀτὰρ | Αἴας Σαλαμῖν ' ἔχει πατρώαν. There was a cult of Aias on Salamis. Thus Fennell translates: "is tutelary deity of." ἀτὰρ indicates that what Aias has is in contradistinction to Teucer. Salamis was πατρώαν, or the paternal home to both.

49. ἐν δ' Εὐξείνῃ πελάγει φαεννὰν Ἀχιλεὺς νᾶσον. The island is thought to be Leuke, or White Island, which lies at the mouth of the Danube. What should draw our notice to these vv.46- 62 is not so much the quantity of mythic material, as the speed with which it is covered: there is a name in nearly every verse. The tale ranges widely over the various geographical areas. There is at once expansion and crowding.

This does nothing so much as remind one of a painting or stone relief in that the structuring of the various elements in the text seems to be without temporal or spatial perspective. All the figures are seen on the same plane. Distant places are all gathered in one mass without respect to their relative locations: Aigina, Salamis, Cyprus, the Black Sea, Epirus, Phthia, Dodona and the Ionian Sea, Mt. Pelion, Thessaly. Most of the verbs are in the present tense: ἀπάρχει, ἔχει, κρατεῖ, κατὰκείνται, ἀρχόμενοι, προστραπὼν. The narrative is given in quick strokes of the brush.

With the mention of Achilles' shining island, φαεννὰν Ἀχιλεὺς νᾶσον, where a temple and statue of him were believed to be,³¹ we have a further connection between this and the previous myth in the reference to the tomb of Amphitryon, v.20, ἀγλαὸν τύμβον. and the blessed hall of Herakles, ὀλβίαν αὐλάν.

51. Νεοπτόλεμος δ' Ἀπείρῳ διαπρυσιᾷ "but Neoptolemos [rules] in Epirus stretching far, from end to end where the headlands which are exceptionally good for cattle-grazing slope downwards, starting from Dodona towards the Ionian sea,"

52-3. βουβόται τόθι πρῶνες ἔσοχοι κατὰκείνται | Δωδώνῃθεν ἀρχόμενοι πρὸς Ἴόνιον πόρον. The lines of poetry extend downwards as though following with an imaginary finger the descending graphic line. And the following narration of the three incidents in Peleus' life are swiftly told in painterly terms.

54-6. Παλίου δὲ παρ ποδὶ λατρείαν. . Αἰμόνεσσιν. The difficulty of these lines centres on the participle προστραπὼν, Ion. for προστρεπὼν. In Farnell's discussion he outlines the principle problem as its sense: "to turn towards someone as a suppliant." Wilamowitz suggested that it meant "having turned it over to [sc. the Haimones], but as Farnell explains, although this sense is possible it makes προστραπὼν redundant—in view of the verb παρέδωκεν. He argues that another possibility is that it have the active sense of "to turn against" in which case Ἰαωλκόν is the object. Fennell, also reading it in an active sense, argues that προστραπὼν takes a double accusative: "having turned

Iolkos to subjection with hostile violence." Bury: "Having turned towards it, but with hostile (not suppliant or entreating) hand."

I suggest that Pindar's syntax—especially when it is "difficult"—usually serves a poetic purpose and makes descriptive sense. In this context I think that whether Pindar is using as a point of reference for his narrative an actual pictorial representation or not, the rules and grammar of that medium provide a useful model for understanding and interpreting the structural and textual complexities.

The prosaic sequence of events is first the supplication at Iolkos situated at the foot of Mt. Pelion, then the conflict, followed by its bondage to the Thessalians. The initial confusion lies in the apparent contradiction of supplication and hostility in the phrase πολεμιά χερὶ προστραπῶν. In its active sense προστρέπω takes the accusative or acc. and inf. Those examples which exist in Attic poetry,—Soph. *Ajax* 831; *OC* 50; Eur. *Supp.* 1195—do not have the instrumental dative. If the active sense here is taken to mean "to turn against" then, as Farnell observes, Pindar has inverted the usual order of cases which ought to be: προστραπῶν χερά' Ἰαωλκῶ. Perhaps the phrase πολεμιά χερὶ should be divided between the verbs, i.e. χερὶ προστραπῶν and πολεμιά παρέδωκεν. In that case, the juxtaposition of λατρείαν Ἰαωλκόν presents the same inverted order: the bondage precedes the city that is appealed to. In this way the phrase χερὶ προστραπῶν Πηλεΐδης stands in the middle describing present time surrounded by its past. This difficult syntactical logic of which event comes first is the logic of pictures: we have no difficulty "reading" a picture which, as is frequently the case in ancient art, places a figure at the centre and encircles him with other figures or symbols that represent past events. To interpret the scene we might follow the gesture of the figure's hand. Here in this text, the word for hand is explicitly placed between that of the words for war and supplication.

56. δάμαρτος Ἰππολύτας Ἄκαστου δολίαις τέχναισι χρησάμενος: The problem here rests with χρησάμενος and Ἄκαστου, the latter having the form Ἀκάστου in the mss. Farnell accepts Schroeder's emendation, Ἄκαστος, because: "to retain [Ἀκάστου] is to despair of any sense," for that would mean that Peleus, as the subject of χρησάμενος, availed himself of Hippolyta's schemes in order to capture Iolkos. This version of the story is completely unknown. However, Schroeder's emendation requires that the verse begin as a new sentence with δάμαρτος and means that Akastos made use of the treacherous wiles of his wife. This is also difficult: did Akastos, knowing Hippolyta's accusations to be false, nevertheless attempt to put Peleus to death? or, as Farnell suggests, might it mean that Hippolyta gave him treacherous advice as to how he might kill Peleus?

If we accept the mss. then the difficulty revolves around Peleus as the continuing subject and this leads to the problem of how to understand *χρησάμενος*. If the participle is to have the sense "to experience," then, as Bury and Farnell demonstrate citing the examples collected by Dissen, the dative must describe the state of the person experiencing and not the cause—here, the *δολίαις τέχναισι*. This led to the innovative adoption of *χωσάμενος* [Triclinius] and *τέχναις χαρασάμενος* [Bergk]. Bury concludes that the reading of the mss. is correct and that *χρησθαι*, with *τέχναισι* as its dative, means "to deal with" or "to make use of."

Assuming the mss. reading to be sound, as seems only reasonable in this instance, then the difficulty lies with how the participle, whose aspect certainly allows us to understand it to precede *παρέδωκεν*, is to be translated. The best way might be causally—*because* he had dealt with / experienced the trickful arts of Hippolyta. But this is unacceptable for the reasons given above. In other words the phrase *δολίαις τέχναισι χρησάμενος* must mean, with Peleus as its subject, that he used Hippolyta's arts, but, by the necessity of the story, means that he was used by them and ought therefore to have the passive form. Yet, if we consider the situation that Peleus was in, this phrase becomes clear and logical: Peleus was said by Hippolyta to have "experienced" her sexually when in fact he had not. What better way to express this unusual "non-experience" than by the particular "illogical" grammar of an active participle denoting a passive condition? It denotes what one experiences without experiencing.

59. *τῷ Δαιδάλου δὲ μαχαίρᾳ φύτευέ οἱ θάνατον | ἐκ λόχου, Πελίαο παῖς*: Schroeder's earlier emendation requires changes to this line, and accordingly he altered it to: *τῷ Δαιδάλῳ τε*. The main difficulty remains however with *Δαιδάλου*. Thus *τῷ Δαιδάλου δὲ μαχαίρᾳ φύτευέ οἱ θάνατον ἐκ λόχου, Πελίαο παῖς* ought to mean: "the son of Pelias [i.e. Akastos] with the sword of Daidalos was plotting his [Peleus'] death by ambush." The phrase *τῷ Δαιδάλου δὲ μαχαίρᾳ* must mean the "the sword belonging to Daidalos" but, as Farnell discerns, it is Peleus, who in all versions of the myth owns the sword, and it is forged by Hephaistos. Bergk's view, which is also taken by Bury, is that the name of Daidalos acts as a synonym for Hephaistos. Schroeder and Wilamowitz retain *Δαιδάλου δὲ μαχαίρᾳ*. The scholiasts suggestion that the phrase is a proverb or metaphor for "a guileful ruse," in Farnell's estimation, "shows what they were capable of at a pinch." Didymus however suggests that it should be *δαιδάλῳ*, the mss. "O" [=Ω] losing an iota and then being mistaken for *οὔ*. This is the reading followed by Mommsen, Farnell, Fennell and Turyn and seems the most

reasonable solution as all others involve a major revision of the story or a poorly substantiated doublet for Hephaistos.

But there are still problems. Farnell goes as far as to claim that Pindar has written "unskilfully." Certainly Pindar's version of this myth seems to be without precedent. In the canonized [Hesiodic] version, Akastos' wife is Astydameia and not Hippolyta; she falls in love with him while he is in Iolkos being purified for a previous misdemeanour on the Calydonian boar-hunt and she lies to his wife Antigone and to Akastos about Peleus' illicit interest and intentions; he foregoes killing him on the spot and instead, in that tradition of revenge peculiar to men, takes him hunting; while Peleus sleeps, he hides the sword that Hephaistos made for Peleus and which has magic powers in a dung heap; Peleus awakes surrounded by dangerous Centaurs, but by the intervention of Cheiron and the return of his sword, he is safe.

Yet how different is Pindar's version? There is no mention of the love-intrigue; no mention of the hunt; Astydameia is Hippolyta; Hephaistos is Daidalos. However, the phrase *δολίαις τέχναισι* is an obvious allusion to deceit as *φύτευέ οἱ θάνατον ἐκ λόχου* is to hiding the sword and planning a secret ambush, (since the verb *φύτευέ*, rendered as "plant, sow the seeds of" [Slater] is imperfect, this implies that the plan was never realized). The question of Daidalos as the maker of the weapon is puzzling yet no commentary takes up the other enigma of Hippolyta replacing Astydameia as the wife. One question to ask is why—for what purpose narrative, poetic, political—would a poet like Pindar change the myth?

There are some aspects of its relation that have not yet been noted. Peleus whose account comes last in this mythic series is in fact ancestral to all others named in it—Telamon, his brother, father of Teucer and Aias; Achilles, his son, Neoptolemos, his grandson and Thetis, their mother—have all been mentioned first. There also seems to be some play on the names Peleus, Pelion and Pelias: the names form a counterpoint of sound and balance placed as they are at the beginning, middle and end. From the foot of Mt. Pelion, *Παλίου δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ*, until *Πελίαο παῖς*, the names surround that of the tale's central figure as indeed Peleus is surrounded by danger.

60–61. *ἀλαλκε δὲ Χείρων, | καὶ τὸ μόρσιμον Διόθεν πεπρωμένον ἔκφερον*: There is some dispute as to the subject of *ἔκφερον*. The first statement is clear: Cheiron protected Peleus.³² Fennell reads *ἔκφερον* as intransitive³³ because of its imperfect tense and understands *τὸ μόρσιμον* to be the subject. He argues that since *πεπρωμένον* occurs at vv.41–43 this suggests that neither Cheiron nor Peleus is the agent. The break of the line, which in Schroeder's [Snell-Maehler] metrical scheme [glyc. ^ pherecratean] occurs at the caesura, in Fennell's [pher.], after,

ἐκ λόχου, Πελίαο παῖς· ἄλλακε δὲ Χείρων
 - - - - - || - - - - -

neatly imitates the break in Peleus' story.

62. πῦρ δὲ παγκρατὲς: "all-consuming fire." This represents the first of the forms into which the Nereid Thetis metamorphosed.

62-3. θρασυμαχάνων τε λεόντων | ὄνυχας ὀξύτατους: "and the sharp claws of lions of bold and clever tactics." θρασυμαχάνων is Hermann's emendation for mss. θρασυμαχᾶν. It is an epithet of Herakles in O.6.67 and the battery of tests which Peleus must pass has some similarity to his labours. It also reflects the character of Thetis who assumes multiple shapes.

63-4. ἀκμᾶν | καὶ δεινοτάτων σχάσαις ὀδόντων: "and having checked the ridge of the terrible teeth." The participle, σχάσαις, appears to have caused some debate and has been variously translated. It is, as Farnell remarks, "a surprising word." Of its known meanings none seems to suit the surface sense of this passage and most scholars translate it as "check," "stop," "thwart," "defeat," or some variant. But, as is the case with surprising and unusual words that have maverick lives, it is well worth examining closely. σχάζω has the primary sense of cutting or slitting something open, as in lancing a vein. It has a secondary meaning of dropping, letting something fall, slackening. Here it applies both to the fire and to the edge of the lion's teeth.

What must be remembered is that the fire and lion are shapes that Thetis assumes while trying to resist Peleus' grasp. In fact, the *verbum regnans* is ἔγαμεν of the next strophe. We might better understand σχάσαις in this context: after Thetis had transformed herself in all the forms which she took, he let go of his hold of her and married her. The poetically interesting aspect of this reading is its physicality: letting something go or letting it fall requires that in some sense it be held and this brings Peleus that much closer to the physical dangers detailed. The lines are heavy with "cutting" consonants: ξ, χ, κ. The physical vulnerability of Peleus is especially suggested by Pindar's description which centres almost exclusively on sharp objects: the μαχαίρα, claws and teeth of a lion. I also think that, whether or not any other version of the Peleus-Thetis myth contains a reference to a lion, here, since we have already noted some connection between the heroic deeds of Herakles and the Aiakidai, and because this is a poem in celebration of the Nemean games, Pindar is making a conscious allusion to the Heraklean battle with the Nemean lion.

65. ἔγαμεν ὑψιθρόνων μίαν Νηρείδων: The first line of this strophe resolves the trials of Peleus. Thetis is "high-throned," an adjective which directs our gaze

upwards. Although it is an unusual site for a water nymph, it is similar again to Herakles' marriage to the immortal goddess Hebe.

ἔγαμεν is imperfect, which again contributes to the idea that Pindar is describing a pictorial scene: Peleus is in an arrested state of marrying in that the action of the verb is continuous.

66-7 εἶδεν δ' εὐκυκλον ἔδραν | τᾶς οὐρανοῦ βασιλῆες πόντου τ' ἔφεζόμενοι: "he saw the perfectly circular seat, on which the rulers of heaven and sea are sitting." This vision is somewhat similar to that described in P.3.93-4, καὶ Κρόνου παῖδας βασιλῆας ἴδον χρυσέαις ἐν ἔδραις ἔδνα τε δέξαντο, where Peleus and Kadmos celebrate their weddings among the gods. What is of some interest here is the circular arrangement of the gods as they sit at the feast. It is a "heavenly" circle, εὐκυκλον and the divinities are rulers, not of heaven and earth, as one might expect, but of heaven and the sea. τᾶς is explained by ἔφεζόμενοι which takes the gen. as well as dat. and acc. ἔφεζόμενοι, pres. participle also serves to suggest that these verses describe a scene depicted graphically.

68. δῶρα καὶ κράτος ἐξέφαναν ἐγγενὲς αὐτῷ: Bury resolves the difficulty of the "strong zeugma" required by ἐξέφαναν by changing it to ἐξύφαναν, "wove." The zeugmatic nature of ἐξέφαναν is that it must serve both δῶρα and κράτος ἐγγενὲς, i.e. the gods revealed their gifts and the future power of the race[of Peleus]. However "harsh" the verb may seem, it cannot be rectified to "wove," which Bury allows under the influence of Mezger's "echo" theory.

ἐγγενὲς is the proposed emendation [Rittershusius > Schroeder, Christ, Bury, Farnell, S/M and Turyn] for mss. ἐς γενεάς and ἐς γενεᾶς both of which are unmetrical. ἐς γένος was proposed by Flavius Ursinus, followed by Mommsen, Fennell and Bowra.

69-72. Γαδεῖρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν: Gadeira, or Gades (Cadiz): the Pillars of Herakles. This represents the furthest (mythical) point west, geographically, and by extension, the end of Peleus' tale. The allusion to the Pillars continues the Herakles-Aiakid parallel noted earlier. πρὸς ζόφον, literally "towards the gloom" provides a contrast to the beatific vision. οὐ περατόν, "that cannot be gone through" in its implication that the sea as well as the darkness are impenetrable, may remind us of the earlier vv.36-38. In fact this, the ninth strophe ends much in the same way that the fifth strophe begins, with a first-person statement to the effect that the story is too long to be told: ἄπορα γὰρ λόγον Αἰακοῦ / παίδων τὸν ἅπαντά μοι διελθεῖν and τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμὸς ὥραί τ' ἐπειγόμεναι. In both cases it is a force beyond the poet's powers—ἄπορα; ἐρύκει με τεθμὸς—which prevents the telling. In

both strophe's there are imperatives [ἀπότρεπε; ἔμπα] followed by imagery of the sea: αὐτίς Εὐρώπην ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα νῆος; καίπερ ἔχει βαθεῖα ποντίας ἄλμα μέσσον. There is also the "revealing" of the might of the Aiakid race: δῶρα καὶ κράτος ἐξέφαναν ἐγγενὲς αὐτῷ; σφόδρα δόξομεν δαίων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φόβῳ καταβάνειν. The gloom or impenetrable darkness which lies beyond the bounds of Gadeira form a parallel to the darkness in which an envious man rolls his thought; in the first instance hard ground is to be sought, ποτὶ χέρσον, in the second, it is where the idea has fallen, χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν. The opening and closing structure of these two strophes stand, like the two Pillars of Herakles, encircling the myths of Peleus and the other descendants of Aiaikos, marking the boundaries of the narrative of their story.

73-4. Θεανδρίδαισι δ' ἀξιγυίων ἀέλθων | κάρυξ ἐτοῖμος ἔβαν: With this declaration the formal and conclusive praise begins. κάρυξ ἐτοῖμος ἔβαν, "I have come as a ready herald." Θεανδρίδαισι can be read as possessive with ἀέλθων or as ind. obj. of συνθέμενος v.75. The Pindaric adjective ἀξιγυίων, "limb-strengthening" refers as much to the wrestling match that has been won as it reminds us of the relaxed limbs of the first strophe, v.4-5.

75. Οὐλύμπία τε καὶ Ἴσθμοῖ Νεμέα τε συνθέμενος: συνθέμενος, "as I engaged" "having agreed," makes explicit the contractual nature of the epinikion. And, as with formal political or financial agreements and contracts between cities and states, it is announced by a herald. The mention of Olympia, Isthmia and Nemea, whether it is a reference to actual past glories of Timasarchos or of his predecessors or contemporaries, the naming of names lends a formality and stateliness to the heraldic address.

76-7. ἔνθα πείραν ἔχοντες οἴκαδε κλυτοκάρπων | οὐ νεοντ' ἄνευ στεφάνων: "from where, once they compete [πείραν ἔχοντες], they do not return home without crowns of glorious victory." The adj. κλυτοκάρπων is a Pindaric original and combines the image of harvesting and fame. The return to home or *nostos* is a familiar theme within the epinikion programme.

77-9 πάτραν ἔν' ἀκούομεν, / Τιμάσαρχε, τεὰν ἐπινικίοισιν ἀοιδαῖς | πρόπολον ἔμμεναι: πάτραν ἔν' is, as Farnell describes it, a "certain correction" [Hermann] for mss. πάτραν νιν. Timasarchos' name occurs in the vocative, which is a clear indication that he is being called upon for praise. There is also a double entendre with the verb ἀκούομεν: we can understand that Timasarchos is being addressed directly by the poet and that we actually hear his name as though called out by a crowd. πρόπολος, "servant" is rendered variously to mean "much concerned with," in the sense of providing many victors [Fennell]; cultivation of lyric poetry and music [Müller]; providing choruses [Dissen]; minister [for all the above reasons: Bury]. Race translates

"devoted." It is nevertheless a curious word. At O.13.54 it is understood to mean the crew of sailors on the Argo: Ἀργοῖ καὶ πρόπολοις.

79–80. εἰ δέ τοι μάτρῳ μ' ἔτι Καλλικλεῖ κελεύεις: The particle τοι acts to emphasize the sentence, leading up to the "impressive asyndeton" of vv.82 and 85. μάτρῳ identifies Kallikles as a maternal uncle. ἔτι, yet, in the sense of "still further;" the particle δέ a strong "but".

81. στάλαν θέμεν Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν: Most editors punctuate this line with a colon. It is confusing since in fact the sentence cannot end at this point. The stele being whiter than Parian marble would make it very resplendent.

82–3. ὁ χρυσὸς ἐψόμενος / αὐγὰς ἔδειξεν ἀπάσας: "gold which has been refined displays all rays." This apparently unconnected phrase-thought must be understood as a continuation of the conditional sentence which begins v.79 and only then is it clear that gold and song are being compared to marble as media of memorial statuary. The aspect of ἔδειξεν may indicate the nature of the display i.e. the gold catches all the sun's rays in one brilliant reflection. Fennell suggests that ἀπάσας has the sense of "all kinds", i.e. that the "rays keep changing color." ἐψόμενος, meaning refined or smelted gold, suggests that the gold is of that quality which would be used for gilding statues. Moreover, the verb of the true apodosis, τεύχει, quite clearly defines this description as that of something fabricated: a statue or relief sculpture.

83–4. ὕμνος δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν | ἐργμάτων βασιλεῦσιν ἰσοδαίμονα τεύχει φῶτα: δὲ is adversative and thereby implies that the comparison favours ὕμνος: marble and gold are fine, but a song. With these words and sentiment we are brought back full circle to the first strophe, v.6: ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει. Here, the mortal man will be equal in happiness and fortune, ἰσοδαίμονα, to kings. In some measure the comparison in both passages is between the enduring quality of words of poetry which celebrate great deeds and the deeds themselves; kings moreover were remembered by their sculpted likenesses.

85. κεῖνος ἀμφ' Ἀχέροντι ναιετάων ἐμὲν γλῶσσαν εὐρέτω κελαδῆτιν: Farnell characterizes this as an ambiguous passage: the difficulty rests with the inv. εὐρέτω. Since this passage is syntactically connected to the conditional protasis at v.79 and is its true apodosis, the difficulty revolves around the subject of εὐρέτω. Who is it that dwells by Acheron? Is this the dead maternal uncle of v.79, Kallikles? If so, why is Euphanes, Timasarchos' grandfather then named at v.89? Is Pindar signifying that he will not compose a hymn to Kallikles?

This question might be eased by noting the similarities between this strophe and the first. The words, ἐμὲν γλῶσσαν εὐρέτω κελαδῆτιν are comparable to γλῶσσα

φρενὸς ἐξέλοι βαθείας (v.8) first, in that they follow close on the heels of similar statements about poetry [ῥῆμα etc. and ὕμνος etc.], and second, in that they occur within the context of verbal forms and undefined subjects expressing possibility [ὅ τι κε . . ἐξέλοι; κείνος. . εὐρέτω] as opposed to certain realization. Subsequent to both are the mention of gods and games, in the earlier case, Zeus and Nemea [τό μοι θέμεν Κρονίδα τε Δὶ καὶ Νεμέα]; here, Poseidon and the Isthmian games [Ὀρσοτριάνα ἔν' ἐν ἀγῶνι βαρυκτύπου θάλησε Κορινθίοις σελίνοις]. In both cases an ancestor is given the duty of praise: Timokritos for Timasarchos; Euphanes for Kallikles.

Farnell reasons that Pindar is declining Timasarchos' request to write an ode for his uncle and that his reason is that, not having witnessed the victory, he would lack the necessary inspiration. But the correspondances between the two strophes, forming as it were a ring about the central mythic content, are too apparent structurally to be overlooked and need to be evaluated as structure.

σὸς ἄεισέν ποτε, παῖ: Boeckh's emendation for mss. ὁ σὸς ἀείσεται, παῖ which is universally rejected because it is unmetrical; based on Hermann's [1798] suggestion but deleting the article. Mommsen's correction (accepted by Turyn) moved ὁ σὸς to the end of the phrase [ἀείσεται ποτε παῖ ὁ σὸς] but, as Farnell notes, ὁ σὸς is not native to Pindar. Moreover, as Schroeder observes, the future tense makes no sense in this context. Fennell offers διδάσκετο which sense supports his idea that Euphanes was an amateur trainer, [ἐθέλων]. Apart from the difficulties which a corruption in the text provides and the problems of weighing the merits of various editorial suggestions, what is clear is that the ring-structure informs Timasarchos' praise: he is bounded by his dead relations, former victors and praise singers. His present victory evokes the past glories of his ancestors and, as Pindar points out, these were commemorated by the poets of their day. Pindar's praise is for the present generation of outstanding achievers: ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλικες ἄλλοι, "those belonging to their generation [were sung] by others."

92. τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ἀντιτύχη; Mingarelli's correction for mss: ἄν τις τύχη; Bury: ἄν τις ἴση; I prefer Hermann's ἄν τις ἰδῇ. The merits of Mingarelli's suggestion which is adopted by most modern texts is that it eliminates τις which is repeated in the next line and thus avoids a somewhat cumbersome moment in the poetry. Such an objection is I believe overridden by the eminent sense it makes of Pindar's previous statement that each generation sings the praises of its peers and, therefore, "whatever one sees for himself" each man wishes to express in the most exceptional way possible. τις ἕκαστος then serves to emphasize the indefiniteness of subject and to diminish the directness of Pindar's refusal to build a memorial stele to Kallikles or to praise him with a separate epinikion.

93-6. οἷον αἰνέων κε Μελησίαν ἔριδα στρέφει. . ἔφεδρος: "Like someone praising Melesias, how he would turn, striving to drag [him] to the ground, weaving his words, in a tale not to be grappled, now being gentle towards noble men, now an aggressive match for the resentful." As most commentators have observed Pindar has crammed these lines with the vocabulary of wrestling. What is more interesting to the ode's—and to Pindar's—poetic style is the nature of this particular ending.

The most salient feature is that at this critical point it is not the victor, Timasarchos, who is praised. Pindar not infrequently ends his poem of praise by mentioning, naming someone new and extraneous to the entire content. The same trainer, Melesias, is praised at the end of N.6. Why end on this note? What has Melesias to do with Timasarchos? Moreover, if we examine the context carefully, it is not Pindar himself who would praise Melesias, but Euphanes.

First we should note the verb, στρέφει, "he would turn" and its optative mood; a similar circumstance occurs in the second strophe where it is Timasarchos father who would have celebrated his son were he alive: θαμά κε. . κελαδήσε. This forms a symmetry, not only of strophic lines (the last four) but of generations and praise: as Timokritos might praise his son, so Euphanes might praise Timasarchos' uncle, Kallikles and Melesias. Then we should note the phrase, ῥήματα πλέκων, "weaving words," one that so often describes the composition of poetry and which here is a metaphor for wrestling, has as its counterpoint the phrase, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων, v.14. The word ἀπάλαιστος, which can mean "unwrestled" or "not to be wrestled" is somewhat ambiguous.

The words μαλακὰ, "soft" and τραχὺς, "rough" are a reflection of the physical nature of the effects of music stated in the first strophe and recall its allusion to the medical theme of the opening lines. The way in which Melesias' praiser would apply softness to noble qualities or persons and rough treatment to the intransigent, follows the ancient medical principle and practice of treating like with like and furthermore connects the end of the poem with the beginning. The implication may be that the quality of the *logos* which here treats its "subject" as a doctor wrestles with his patient's disease.

1. Fennell provides as examples of judging victors: O.3.21; N.10.23; O.7.80. For the sense of distinction: N.7.7; I.4.11. To this last should be added N.6.2. where gods and men are distinct in their powers, *διείργει δὲ πᾶσα κεκριμένα δύναις*.
2. Fennell, Farnell, Slater.
3. Mezger, F., *Pindars Siegeslieder*, Leipzig 1880.
4. Machemer, G.A., "Medicine, Music, and Magic: The Healing Grace of Pindar's *Fourth Nemean*," *HSCP* 95, 1993, 114-119.
5. Hubbard, T.K., *The Pindaric Mind*, 76-81.
6. For a careful summary of the various positions taken by past scholars see: Williams, F. "A Critical Edition of Nemean Odes 1-4 of Pindar," Diss. Cornell 1970. 168-174. His argument for *τεύχει* as a reflection of *τυχᾶ* is elaborate and well-argued but neglects what I feel to be the essential feature of the physicality of the poem's language which is well supported by *τέγγει* / *τέγξει*.
7. Op.cit. 76.
8. For a discussion of the possibilities of inscribed monuments to victors of the games and the various references to their existence to be found in Pindar's odes, see Deborah Steiner, "Pindar's '*Oggetti Parlanti*'", *HSCP* 95, 1993, 159-180.
9. Bulman, P., *Phthonos in Pindar*, Berkeley 1992, 60.
10. Hubbard, op.cit. 77f.
11. Vid. Williams, op. cit. 179-80.
12. Cf. Arist. *Acharn* 639-40, *Εἰ δέ τις ὑμᾶς ὑποθωπεύσας λιπαρὰς καλέσειεν Ἀθήνας, | ἥρετο πᾶν ἂν διὰ τὰς λιπαράς, ἀφύων τιμὴν περιάσας*; *Eq.* 1329, *ὦ ταῖ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ ἀριζήλωτοι Ἀθηναί, Nub.* 300, *ἔλθωμεν λιπαρὰν χθόνα Παλλάδος, εὐάνδρον γᾶν*; Eur. *Alc.* 452, *λιπαραῖσί τ' ἐν ὀλβίαις Ἀθάναις. Tro.* 803, *οὐράνιον στέφανον λιπαραῖσί <τε> κόσμον Ἀθηναίς; Iph Taur.* 1130-1, *αἰείδων ἄξει λιπαρὰν | εὐ σ' Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ γᾶν*; Herodotus 8.77.6, *ἐλπίδι μαινομένη λιπαρὰς πέροαντες Ἀθήνας*.
- 13 Δίδυμος δέ φησιν -οὐκ- ἄγεσθαι Ἰολάεια ἐν Θήβαις ἀγῶνα γυμνικόν, αὐτὸ δὲ μόνον τὸ στάδιον καὶ γυμνάσιον εἶναι Ἰολάειον, καθὼς ὁ περὶ ἀγώνων ἀναγραφάμενος οὐκ Ἰολαίᾳ φησιν ἄγεσθαι ἀλλ' Ἡράκλεια. τὸν ἀγῶνα οὖν τῶν Ἡρακλείων φησὶν ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἰολάου γυμνασίῳ διαλεῖσθαι παρὰ τὸ τοῦ Ἀμφιτρύωνος μνήμα, ἔνθα φασὶ καὶ τὸν Ἰολάον κεκενοταγήσθαι τὸ γὰρ καὶ ἀλήθειαν ἀνψοῦ μνήμα ἐν Σαρδοῖ εἶναι.
14. There is no such emendation in Schroeder's text of 1900.

15. Iliad 5.83, 629; 16.334, 853; 19.410; 20.477; 21.110; 24.132,209: κραταιῇ. At 11.119, κραταιοῦ describes a lion. The one exception is 13.345, where κραταιῷ is used of Idomeneus and Meriones.
16. Bulman, 61n15.
17. Cf. Carey, C., "Three Myths in Pindar: N . 4, O. 9, N . 3," *Eranos* 78, 1980, 146.
18. Of Achilles, ἐκπαγλότατος, Iliad 1.146; 18.170; of Iphition, son of Orynteus, 20.389.
19. ἔκπαγλον, of threats: Iliad: 13.413, 445; 14.453,478; 15.198: [ἐκπάγλοις | 21.452, Od.10.448; 17.216: of a storm: 14.522:
20. For an interesting discussion of the phenomenon of the four as opposed to three-horse chariot in Greek literature, vid. Fennell ad loc.
21. Schroeder's note ad loc. is: ἥρωας, quod non magis corrigendum esse duxi, quam τόσσους 30, ubi τόσσους edunt c Tricl.
22. Bundy, E.L., *Studia Pindarica* I, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1962, 3n11.
23. Miller, A.M., "N.4.33-43 and the Defense of Digressive Leisure," *CJ* 78, 1982/3, 202-220. 207f.
24. Bulman, 63.
25. Ibid.64.
26. Carey, op.cit. 148.
27. Contra cf. Miller 204n7; 205n13 and 207n18.
28. Burkert, W., *Greek Religion*, Cambridge, Mass., 1985, 171; 200.
29. Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 500f; Theocr. 2.12 and Schol. ad loc.=Callim. fr.466; Sophron (Kaibel) *cgf* I 161; Orph. Hymn 41.5; Richardson 84; 156; Aesch. *Supp.* 676; Eur. *Phoen.* 109; Eur. *Med.* 395-7; *Hel.* 569f.
30. Köhnken, A., *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*, de Gruyter 1971, 212
31. Paus. 3.19.11, ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Εὐξείνῳ νῆσος κατὰ τοῦ Ἰστροῦ τὰς ἐκβολὰς Ἀχιλλέως ἱερά· ὄνομα μὲν τῇ νήσῳ Λευκή, περίπλους δὲ αὐτῇ σταδίων εἴκοσι, δασεῖα δὲ ὕλη πάσα καὶ πλήρης ζώων ἀγρίων καὶ ἡμέρων, καὶ ναὸς Ἀχιλλέως καὶ ἄγαλμα ἐν αὐτῇ.
32. So Dissen, Bury and Carey [150].
33. Also Köhnken, 203ff., Nisetich, *Victory Songs*, 248.

NEMEAN 3

1. ὦ πότνια Μοῖσα, μήτηρ ἀμετέρα, λίσσομαι: The Muse who is the mother of the poet or, more accurately, his poetry, is perhaps Kleio [v.83]. She is being summoned to the island for the celebration of the full moon festival. She bears the title, πότνια, formal for female divinities³⁴, a verb, λίσσομαι, appropriate to the invocation of a suppliant, and the imperative, ἵκεο, all denote a relationship of respect and familiarity — as with a mother.

Gianotti, linking the invocation to his interpretation of vv.80-82, i.e. that Pindar's eagle and cawing crows are a reference to comparative poetic abilities, finds the expression μήτηρ ἀμετέρα, to contain something more than a simple introduction; that it constitutes an effective sign of the poet's superior abilities.³⁵

Privitera notes that the Muse who is invoked as "our mother" cannot be Kleio, the Muse who at v.16 is responsible for Aristokleides' victory and who, in any case, is not ever associated with athletic contests or the pancration. The purpose of the poet is the etymological play on the names of Kleio and Aristokleides and this serves "mettere sullo stesso piano il poeta e il vincitore, il tebano e l'egineta."³⁶ Privitera neatly provides a rhomboid schema of the associations in the proemium between Pindar and Aristokleides, the Muse and Aigina:³⁷

Musa

Pindaro

Aristoclide

Egina

2-3. τὰν πολυξέναν. . Δωρίδα νᾶσον Αἴγιναν: Aigina is styled by Pindar as "welcoming to strangers" in O.8.26; N.4.23; N.5.8; and Paean 6.131. Praise for the island's generosity to strangers effectively provides another link to connect Aigina to the poet³⁸, who at v.9 characterizes his gifts as ἀφθονίαν. The reference to Aigina as a Dorian island, although Epidauros did in fact colonize it, cf. Hdt.8.46, is thought by Fennell to serve as a means of introducing Asclepiades' connection with Aigina.³⁹ Elsewhere in Pindar it is Dorian, cf. O.8.30, P.8.19f, I.9.1-4, Paean 6.123-5.

3-5. ὕδατι γὰρ | μένοντ' ἐπ' Ἀσωπίῳ μελιγαρύων τέκτονες |
κώμων νεανίαί σέθεν ὅπα μαιόμενοι: γὰρ indicates that there follows an

explanation as to why the Muse should come to Aigina: there is a group of young builders of the sweet-sung κῶμοι waiting by the waters of Asopos. Water is always closely associated with poetic expression in Pindar, [O.1.1;48, O.14.1, O.6.85, P.1.67, P.5.31, P.9.88, N.7.62, I.6.74., fr. 198b, etc.] no doubt by virtue of those qualities which, as a poet, he would have his poetry possess: clarity, flow, movement, depth; its surface reflects light in all directions, its physical properties are soothing and restorative. In this ode the tactile dimension of water's—and hence, poetry's—power to arouse the five senses, is its most important. The young men seek for, strive after, μαιόμενοι, a voice from the Muse. The fact that they are τέκτονες, "builders, carpenters," a metaphor from sculpture and architecture, implies that the ode is a structure whose design has been planned but is yet to be actualized: a poetic idea or occasion, but no words. At v.12, χώρας ἄγαλμα, corresponds to the sculptural/architectural metaphor in that Pindar's poem will be a monument to Aigina.⁴⁰

A major point of discussion within these lines is the exact location of the Asopos, the name of a river which runs in Boiotia, in Sicyon and, as Didymos would have it, in Aigina. Wilamowitz⁴¹ first noted that ὕδατι does not necessarily mean a river, and Privitera⁴² since then, has demonstrated that there was a spring in Aigina that was called the Asopean Spring where celebrations took place.⁴³ But since the builders are poised beside the waters of Asopos, the mythical father of the nymphs Aigina, Nemea and Thebe, the geographical reality is of considerably less consequence than the metaphorical. As a metaphor, the waiting τέκτονες symbolize the general situation of the poet depending on a moment of victory and waiting for the Muse's inspiration to celebrate. The men are young denoting vigorous poetic ideas and expression; they are τέκτονες because poetic ideas are the stuff of which odes are built. The fact that the waiting takes place beside the Asopos signifies that the spring is the source of the poetry for Aigina.

Most scholars have taken this to be a literal body of young choral dancers awaiting the poet and his poem and as, a further consequence of this literal reading, the κῶμος, it has been argued, must represent an integral part of epinikion performance, whether we accept the solo or choral hypothesis.⁴⁴ To understand in such literal terms and to judge Pindar's verse by such empirical standards is, in my opinion, a critical error. As Morgan has demonstrated in her discussion of these issues, there is ample evidence to suggest that these references to the performance of the ode are best understood rhetorically: "it is rhetorically more desirable to suppose that references to multiple voices do not look to a performance external to

the epinician ode. Rather, they express a more complicated dynamic wherein the poet's voice is imposed upon a chorus of multiple voices that in turn draws the κῶμος into its orbit."⁴⁵ I would argue that here the "circumstance" of waiting—like that of v.80, ὁψέ περ [vide infra]—is rhetorical and designed to create dramatic tension and heighten anticipation.

As Carey⁴⁶ has noted, the fiction which "confuses the separate times of composition and performance" is familiar to Pindar. This fiction of a present-time invocation of the Muse by the poet is continued by the imperatives ὄπαζε and ἄρχε at vv.9, 10. There are other instances in which Pindar begins an ode in a similar way, as Instone has noted as in P.11 and N.9, to which might be added the openings of I.8, P.10.

6. διψῇ δὲ πρᾶγος ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου: Water as poetry is explicit here: both satisfy thirst. One sort of deed [i.e. athletic victory] thirsts for a poem; another deed thirsts for another reward. The symmetry of the line makes this allocation clear: the phrases διψῇ δὲ πρᾶγος and ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου are both comprised of five syllables, balanced by the particles δὲ and μὲν, and interface at their mid-point. The "liquids" of the words ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου by their nature cause the line to dissolve. The idea of thirsting for poetry, which describes what we would expect to be an essentially intellectual experience as one that is felt as physical satisfaction is restated in a different at vv.41-2, where the man with learning but no heart "tastes," γεύεται, myriad talents with a mind that is ἀτελεῖ, "ineffectual," "uncomprehending," "unable to grasp."

7-8. ἀθλονικία δὲ μάλιστα ᾠιδᾶν φιλεῖ | στεφάνων ἀρετῶν τε δεξιωτάταν ὀπαδόν: The verb, φιλεῖ, "loves" adheres to the emotional colour of μαίόμενοι: the effort or striving is motivated by attraction. The words δεξιωτάταν ὀπαδόν, "most fitting, correct attendant" are also appropriate to the emotional tenor of the situation: the song is to its musical celebration a companion or attendant to those qualities that win crowns. Moreover, Pindar specifies that the attendant song is the most right, most appropriate thing, cf.v.11. The song is as responsive to the victory as the young men will be when the voice of the Muse reaches them.

9. τᾶς ἀφθονίαν ὄπαζε μήτιος ἀμᾶς ἄπο: The imperative ὄπαζε continues the sound and sense of ὀπαδόν, lit. "give as a companion": "Do thou bid attend" (Fennell), "Send along with" (Bury). It also marks the antistrophe as counterpart to the strophe: a call to a divinity with whom the poet has a personal relationship, with the request for her voice of inspiration followed by a reference to the poet's skills, μήτιος ἀμᾶς. The song is witness to both.

10–11. ἄρχε δ' οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι, θύγατερ, / δόκιμον ὕμνον: "Begin, daughter," the poet invokes, "for the ruler of thick-clouded heaven a fitting hymn." There is however some controversy over this line and its interpretation. Some locate the problem at οὐρανοῦ as two of the mss. have οὐρανῶ and others οὐρανοῦ or οὐρανῶ, since OPANO can yield either. If the dative is accepted, then the phrase must read "for Ouranos ruler," a point which led Aristarchus to suggest οὐρανῶ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι, rendering the sense: "[daughter] of Ouranos thick-clouded ruler." Farnell rejects this, arguing that κρέοντι cannot be used absolutely for "king" and that it makes the Muse a daughter of Ouranos, something not occurring elsewhere in Pindar, whose mythology is more often than not that of Hesiod. Other commentators (Mommsen, Schroeder, Bowra and Turyn) have πολυνεφέλα and read it as the modifier of οὐρανοῦ, but, as Farnell observes, πολυνεφέλα (gen.) is sound in all mss⁴⁷.

δόκιμον ὕμνον: δόκιμον is generally translated here as "acceptable [Slater], proper, fitting" with the resultant sense that the song is to be the right one for Zeus. What is not so often noted is the common use of this word in the epigraphic material, particularly building contracts, where it has more or less the same meaning: "approved; tested."⁴⁸ Pindar's particular use of this adjective to qualify his hymn—it occurs only here—must, I think, be considered within that context. The hymn then acquires the nuance of being a structural component, like a beam or foundation stone, whose material quality has been tested and approved: true to the principles of sound narrative or poetic construction, the Muse should begin from the foundation stone of Zeus. In her relationship to the poet the Muse is addressed as mother: in relation to Zeus, daughter. By this point Pindar underscores further the idea of structural design. The component parts—Zeus, the Muse, the poet and the τέκτονες—are each linked to the other in a specific relationship like a construction team.

This leads to another point: the sky is as thick with clouds, πολυνεφέλα, as the poet's skill is abundant and generous with ideas, ἀφθονίαν.

11–12. ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν ὁάροις | λύρα τε κοινάσομαι, "I will it join it to their voices with my lyre." κοινάσομαι, Boeckh's correction of the mss. κοινώσομαι, is a verb which Slater translates as "confide, entrust" but has the more fundamental definition of something shared. What is shared here is the construction of the song which, in conjunction with the τέκτονες, continues the theme of cooperation between poet and muse. The federation of poetic effort is to construct

an ἄγαλμα, a word which, although it is often read as "glory; delight," also means "statue," one more suited to the theme of construction.⁴⁹ Cf.N.5.1.

Hubbard takes the force of κοινάσσομαι even further, arguing that it connotes "communicate to the public." He also suggests that its future tense be understood as an "encomiastic future": "a programmatic statement directly proclaiming the present act of celebration."⁵⁰ As such it creates a transitional move from the preparation of the song, the confederation of inspiration and effort, and places the poet as the primary communicator.

12-13. χαριέντα δ' ἔξει πόνον | χώρας ἄγαλμα: Fennell suggests ὕμνος to be the subject, χώρας ἄγαλμα to be in apposition to it, and the verb, ἔξει, "will involve." Farnell simplifies things further and has ἔξει equal "will have" i.e. "the hymn will have a pleasing task, the glorification of the land." It is striking that in his commentary, Bury observes that πόνος does not mean toil, but rather the work of the hands, "as though the song in honour of Aigina were a statue," and notes that ἄγαλμα is used at N.10.67 of a headstone. The word πόνος most often refers to the toil of athletic effort, training and competition, but can, as it is here, be applied to that of the poet's labour as well.⁵¹

13-16. Μυρμιδόνες. . ὧν παλαίφατον ἀγορὰν οὐκ ἐλεγχέεσσιν Ἀριστοκλείδας τεὰν ἐμίανε κατ' αἶσαν: The Myrmidons were thought to be aboriginal to Aigina, to have emigrated to Thessaly with Peleus and became known as the Thessalian followers of Achilles in Troy, cf. Il.2.681-5. The story of Hesiod [fr.205 M-W] states that Zeus after begetting Aiakos with Aigina, changed as many ants as were on the island into men and women, so that he would not be alone: ὅσσοι ἔσαν μύρμηκες ἐπηράτου ἔνδοθι νήσου / τοὺς ἄνδρας ποίησε βαθυζώνους τε γυναῖκας. The identification of the Myrmidons with ants is recounted by Theogenes [FGrHist 300 F 1]. Carnes⁵² proposes that the phrase Μυρμιδόνες πρότεροι can mean "the earlier Myrmidons" and thus "reminds and reassures the audience that the Thessalian Myrmidons (and thus Peleus, Achilles and Neoptolemus) are in fact Aiginetan in origin." The agora is thought to emphasize the governmental/organizational aspect of the ant-Myrmidons over their militaristic aspect, and although this seems to be a somewhat far-fetched interpretation, Carnes is right in his observation that this is the only ode which mentions both the Dorian and Myrmidonian aspects of Aigina together.

Instone's⁵³ suggestion is perhaps more useful in that he deems it to be an allusion to Il.7.126 which describes Peleus as ἐσθλὸς Μυρμιδόνων βουλήφορος ἢ δ' ἀγορητής.

The verb ἐμίανε is unusual: how could the physical work of competing in the pancration have stained or dirtied in any way the ancient *agora*? More specifically, how would failure to win have polluted a place of assembly? Why does Pindar associate Aristokleides with the possibilities of reproach?

The verb μαιίνω embraces the modality of a moral stain or blemish, but what is more compelling in this context is its primary sense: "to paint over a white body another colour," the example cited [LSJ], is Il.4.141: Ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοινίκι μίλην, where the vermillion-streaked cheek-pieces of the horses are compared to the wounded soldier. Another example is Aesch. Ag.208-211, δόμων ἄγαλμα, μαιίνων παρθενοσφάγοισιν ρείθροις βωμοῦ, where the chorus refers to Iphigeneia as the "delight" of her family, her blood staining her father's hands at the altar. Perhaps similarly we might understand Pindar to be referring to the stain as though it were on a statue which may have stood in the *agora*.

First of all physical place is emphasized here; χώρας. ἵνα πρότεροι ᾤκησαν, παλαιόφατον ἀγορὰν, and even αἶσαν, a word which signifies destined share or allotment, might be considered to possess some spatial dimension. The phrase τεὰν κατ' αἶσαν is variously understood to mean "by the grace of "the Muse or by Zeus' " allotment [of good fortune].⁵⁴ Both Bury and Farnell suggest that what is meant is that the Muse, Kleio, has marked Aristokleides by his name as one destined for glory; it serves nevertheless, as an expression, to mark the bounds of destiny. That this allotment or portion, whether of Zeus or of the Muse, is meant in its very basic sense of physical limits is made clear at v.22 where the Pillars of Herakles are cited. Moreover, lest we understand these pillars merely metaphorically, Pindar is explicit about the concrete, physical nature of these limits: ἐπέβα παῖς Ἀριστοφάνεος, the son of Aristophanes walks upon the earth, and οὐκέτι πρόσω ἀβάταν ἄλα κιόνων ὑπὲρ Ἡρακλέος περὶ εὐμαρές, and no longer further, beyond the *unwalkable* sea, is it easy [for him] to go. He is as bound by the limits of destiny as by the limits of land.

17-18. παγκρατίου στόλῳ· καματωδέων δὲ πλαγᾶν | ἄκος ὑγιερὸν ἐν βαθυπεδίῳ Νεμέα τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει: παγκρατίου στόλῳ cf. N.9.28, φοινικοστόλων, "the group or team of wrestlers." That the participle μαλαχθεῖς of the previous line describes the softening of muscles from fatigue is made clear now by καματωδέων. The healing remedy is to carry the crown of victory. This presents us with a situation somewhat similar to the one in N.4.1-2 where happiness or well-being is the remedy [ἄριστος ἰατρός] for the exertions of

the games. Here τὸ καλλίνικον, [cf. N.4.13-16, P.5.105-7] must refer to an actual token of victory.

19-20. εἰ δ' ὦν καλὸς ἔδων τ' ἐουκότα μορφῇ | ἀγοραίς ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα παῖς Ἀριστοφάνεος: "If being noble/handsome and enacting deeds suited to his shape, then the son of Aristophanes mounted/came to the highest qualities of masculine prowess." The line, with its marked reference to the physical shape of the athlete, lends support to the imagery of statuary. Furthermore, the verb ἐπέβα speaks of walking or stepping upon something. I would understand this to mean that Aristokleides has mounted—as a statue or carved likeness of himself—a base or pedestal.

To return to οὐκ μαιίνω: the weariness derives from blows, πλαγᾶν, which need a healing remedy, ἄκος ὑγιηρὸν. From this we might infer that Aristokleides was bloodied or in some way injured from the boxing part of the pancration, just as we might surmise that μαλαχθεὶς is a reference to the wrestling match and with οὐκ μαιίνω means that he was not thrown to the ground. This could account for the idea of "staining" or "sullyng." But there remains the word ἐλεγχεῖσιν, which is generally understood as "reproaches, shameful things." If we accept this reading, then the staining is more reasonably that of shameful nature: the opprobrium of losing a contest. However, since ἔλεγχος can also mean "trial, test," then, possibly, the overall sense might be the combination of the two, i.e. that Aristokleides has not been injured in public and not brought shame to the community by losing.

19-22. οἰκέτι πρόσω | ὄβησαν ἄλα . . ἦρως θεὸς ὃς ἔθηκε ναυτιλίας ἑσχάτας | μάρτυρας κλυτὰς: Herakles' pillars, which here function to separate the present victory of the *laudandum* from the mythical portion of the ode as much as to separate his human from divine exploits, are symbolic of limitations, cf. O.3.44f., N.4.69, I.4.12f. The cautionary information that Aristokleides will not get beyond easily, περᾶν εὐμαρές, ends the first triad, while ἦρως θεός, or god-hero, begins this triad, thus inscribing a cleanly-drawn line of demarcation which serves to seal off Aristokleides and to keep him within the bounds of his deeds much the same way that Herakles is kept within the limits that sent him home. Hubbard reasons that within the structural polarity of *oikeon/allottrion* the pillars act as much as determinants of Aristokleides limits in the away-from-home world of athletic endeavours [allottrion] as they act for the limits of Herakles' return [oikeon].⁵⁵ Pfeiffer describes ἦρως θεός as an oxymoron and notices the exceptional quality of Pindar's language here⁵⁶. We should note that the very order

of the words follows Herakles' life, for he began as hero and was later apotheosized.

There has been some controversy as to why Pindar breaks off at v.26 the comparison between Aristokleides and Herakles. Erbse and Ruck, following Bundy,⁵⁷ see it as a foil to the glorification of Aiginetan heroes which is to come. Carey⁵⁸ contends that Herakles is relevant to Aristokleides in that he is the great "toiler" and as such exemplifies the qualities, both moral and physical, that the games require. He cautions moreover, against taking Pindar's "irrelevance-motif" literally: "That Pindar uses this motif to end myths which have a thematic significance indicates that this type of break-off does not reject the narrative which it terminates."⁵⁹

The pillars are renowned witnesses to the limits of sea voyages. ἔθηκε is also a reference to the work of setting up stone images or walls. Herakles is now a τέκτων within the ode of his own exploits as song is the architect of Aristokleides' praise.

23-4. δάμασε δὲ θήρας ἐν πελάγει | ὑπερόχος: ὑπερόχος is the Dor. acc. pl. qualifying θήρας [Fennell]. Herakles conquers in the depths of the sea; Aristokleides, in deep-plained Nemea, ἐν βαθυπεδίῳ Νεμέᾳ.

24-5. ἰδίᾳ τ' ἐρεῦνασε τεναγῶν | ῥοάς: Fennell rejects ἰδίᾳ which is the mss. reading, in favour of διὰ τε, another reading offered by the scholiasts, saying that "there is no support for ἰδίᾳ meaning 'by oneself' opposed to 'with aid'. . . The Greeks would hardly imagine Herakles taking a long voyage by himself." However, this requires emending the verb to ἐξερεῦνασε. Moreover, Herakles' conquests form a parallel with those of Peleus and Achilles, both of whom are to be noted in this poem for the solitary nature of their exploits.

Searching the streams of shallows does seem an odd activity for a tamer of monsters and probably is meant to describe Herakles' exploration of the straits of Gibraltar. Yet it offers a fair contrast with the deep waters of the sea and as such may be understood to represent the paths to the completion point of his exploration.

25-6. ὅπῃ πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόστου τέλος, | καὶ γὰρ φράδασε: "from where he arrived at the end [which] sent him home, and made known the land." φράδασε, a hapax. κατέβαινε is impf., whereas all the other verbs accompanying Herakles are aor., which implies that he did not reach the end. In its action κατέβαινε is the antithesis to ἐπέβα, v.20; Herakles steps down, goes down at the point where Aristokleides steps up. For Herakles, his point of return marks the sea's limits and those of his travels; for Aristokleides, his personal limits of

deeds of manly power. They both return in their *nostoi* to their homeland after deeds of conquest. In the context of this parallel I take κατέβαινε to mean "to disembark from the ship." This interpretation is made evident in the phrase which immediately follows, καὶ γὰρ φράδασε, and made known, i.e. explored, the land—just as he had searched the channels.⁶⁰

Since the theme of heroic return is articulated with the poet's "return" to himself in the next line, we can note a secondary relevance to the the phrase καὶ γὰρ φράδασε, in that the land that the poet is to make known is to be Aigina.

26-7. Θυμέ, τύνα πρὸς ἄλλοδαπὸν | ἄκραν ἑμὸν πλῶον παραμείβει: Pindar situates himself as a fellow sea-explorer and addresses his soul. His ship is his song of praise. He has already asked the Muse to come to Aigina; now he bids himself to bring the Muse i.e. the poem / ship to the "race of Aiakos." παραμείβει, "change course, side-track." παραμείβει is Boeckh's emendation for mss. παραμείβηι.

28-9. Αἰακῶ σε φημι γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν. / ἔπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος, "ἔσλὸν αἰνεῖν": This maxim escorts and lends dynamic force to Pindar's exhortation to his soul to turn the poem around to bringing praise to Aigina like the πόμπιμον νόστου τέλος which causes Herakles to turn back; he accordingly employs the verb, ἔπεται. The expression δίκας ἄωτος is somewhat unusual: "the choicest part of justice" is to praise the noble. The phrase ἔσλὸς αἰνεῖν also presents difficulty. The mss. and scholiasts have ἔσλὸς and ἔσλὸν (which Farnell inexplicably gives as ἔσθλὸς / ἔσθλὸν) with equal authority. The choice of ἔσλὸν makes for the easiest reading, as above. However, if one chooses ἔσλὸς as acc. pl. ἔσλούς [Farnell]—the nominative is very problematic⁶¹—then the phrase can be interpreted to mean something a little different from the ordinary: the flower of justice follows the maxim praising noble men.

Pfeiffer⁶² argues for ἔσλὸν, since there is not conclusive evidence for Pindar's use of the short vowel accusative and that in any case Pindar would not have used it here because of the resultant ambiguity with the nominative.⁶³

οὐδ' ἄλλοτρίων ἔρωτες ἀνδρὶ φέρειν κρέσσονες: The repetition of the verb φέρειν continues and corroborates v.28. Here it is put in terms of negation: Pindar is not going to praise a stranger, for "longings for foreign themes are not better for a man to bear." This is Race's translation and, while it certainly makes sense, I would like to point out some curious features of the Greek that may offer a slightly different interpretation.

In v.28 φέρειν has as its recipient Αἰακῷ. . γένει τε, which Fennell characterizes as "almost hendiadys." The poet, in any case, brings the Muse to Aiakos and his race. Here, I think there is meant a similar construction, i.e. ἀνδρὶ φέρειν means "to bring to a man." If we also understand ἀλλοτρίων to mean, "belonging to another," then we have: "the desires/ passions that belong to another are not better [as praise] to bring to a man."

It can be argued that this reading is no more worthy or sensible than any other, and that all examinations of these lines have at least apprehended the essential meaning, i.e. that the poet, wandering upon the tales of Herakles stops himself with the admonition that one need not look far for material or men to praise but can start at home. Yet the Greek of these lines [vv.28-9] does not make this reading obvious. As one commentator observes⁶⁴ his translation, ("the best of justice accompanies the word, praise the noble"), makes the recipient of the praise more explicit than Pindar did. My sentiments are that any complexity, or lack of explicit and direct language in Pindar, is not a result of careless or deliberately obtruse writing on the part of the poet, but very purposeful and exact expression.

Let us return to v.29., δίκας ἄωτος, a combination unique in Pindar, for ἄωτος is usually found in the environment of song, time or victory: of music: μουσικᾶς ἐν ἁώτῳ, "full-bloom of song" [O.1.15]; ἄωτος ὕμνων ἐγκωμίων, "blossom of these hymns of praise" [P.10.53]; γλώσσας ἄωτον, "choicest praise[of citizens and strangers]." [I.1.51]; Χαρίτων ἄωτον ὕμνον, "best song of the Graces." [I.8.16]; μέλιτος ἄωτον "choicest and sweetest meed [of song]. [Pae.6.59]; ὕμνον. . ἵππων ἄωτον "song. . choicest prize for the horses [that won]." [O.3.4]; σοφίας ἄωτον, "perfect bloom of poetry [yoked to music]." [I.7.18]. of time: ἱερὸν εὐζοίας ἄωτον, "sacred prime of festal life." [P.4.131]; ζωᾶς ἄωτον, "sweetest bloom of life." [I.5.12]; of victory itself: στεφάνων ἄωτον, "choicest crowns." [O.5.1, O.9.19, I.6.4]; χειρῶν ἄωτον, "best flower [deed] of hands" [O.8.75]; κάλλιστον ἄωτον, "fairest flower" [N.2.9]; of victors: ποτέρων ἄωτον [O.2.7] ναυτᾶν ἄωτος [P.4.188] ἡρώων ἄωτοι [N.8.9 cf. fr.111a.7 γενναίων ἄωτος [fr.6 b].

None of these uses comes close to the expression δίκας ἄωτος. It is clear from the catalogue of examples that ἄωτος refers to the peak or culminating point of something. A flower is that part of a plant which represents the best, most beautiful qualities of the organism. The question to be asked then is, what can the best, choicest, full-bloom of justice mean? what does justice have to do with the poem at this juncture? One possible answer is that this describes one of the four virtues that

are yoked to mortal life at vv.74-5: ἔλα δὲ καὶ τέσσαρας ἀρετὰς ὁ θνατὸς αἰών.

Perhaps the line might be read as: "the best poet follows a tale of justice to praise noble deeds not to bring to an individual the greater longings that belonging to another's life." The idea of boundaries, the *oikeon/allotrion*, near and far polarity reflected here are those of the epinikion: to return to the praise of the victor at hand.

31-2. οἴκοθεν μάτευε. ποτίφορον δὲ κόσμον | ἔλαχες γλυκύ τι γαρυέμεν: Pindar continues to address his soul, ἔλαχες "you have by lot." The injunction, "seek at home" effectively brings the focus of the poem to Aigina, the return of praise to the victor's homeland. γλυκύ τι γαρυέμεν, "something sweet to speak" recalls v.4, μελιγαρύων.

32-6. παλαιαῖσι δ' ἐν ἀρεταῖς | γέγαθε Πηλεὺς ἄναξ ὑπέρᾶλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών. . . ὅς καὶ Ἴωλκον. . . ἐγκονητί: The phrase παλαιαῖσι δ' ἐν ἀρεταῖς γέγαθε echoes v. 20, ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα, in that both clusters have words with same number of syllables and function to connect Aristokleides to his ancestral past. The names of the respective heroes also occur: Πηλεὺς ἄναξ; παῖς Ἀριστοφάνεος. The word παλαιαῖσι fits the motif of πρότεροι at vv.13; 52. The verbal affinity generates parity between Aristokleides, son of Aristophanes and his more remote ancestor, Peleus. Pindar starts the story of Peleus with his cutting of the spear from Mt Pelion, the spear being as much an emblem of Peleus' story as the pillar is of Herakles'. We should add that this detail differs from the Homeric version, Il.16.140-144 and 19.387-391, where it is from Cheiron that Peleus receives the spear as a gift. This Pindaric variation indicates how deliberately the poet seeks to connect the three myths of Aiakid heroes. The additional variation that Peleus alone captured Iolkos, μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς, and that he held down Thetis, who was, if not a monster, certainly a prodigy of the sea allows us to equate Peleus' exploits with those of Herakles'. κατέμαρψεν ἐγκονητί has its equivalent in δάμασε δὲ θήρας ὑπερόχους as μόνος has in ἰδίᾳ. As most commentaries observe, the adverb ἐγκονητί is Pindar's innovation from the verb ἐγκονέω, and has been deemed to have various meanings, ranging from Dissen's "non sine pulvere," to Bury's "with haste" and Farnell's "with perserverence." Whichever definition allies the adverb with Herakles' struggle is the one to be preferred. Pfeiffer's [318] also suggests that an association should be made with the wrestling and dust-raising of the pancration, especially since the verb καταμάρπτω, "grab and hold down" is related to that athletic activity.

I would add that there is a second associative connection to be made. Herakles steps down onto land, κατέβαινε, v.25, after conquering the water's limits whereas Peleus conquers the sea monster Thetis on land, κατέμαρπεν ἐγκορητί. He "lands" her, i.e. he takes her wateriness and dusts or "earthens" it.

36–40. Λαομέδοντα δ' εὐρυσθενὴς Τελαμὼν Ἰόλα. . φρενῶν: The exemplum of Telamon, brother to Peleus, here fighting with Iolaos / Iphikles, twin brother to Herakles instead of Herakles himself [cf. N.4.25; I.5.37.], as in the mythological canon, illustrates Pindar's characteristic way of tailoring myth to his needs. Here we might assume it is the need to play down Herakles' part since it has already been noted and relegated to a story not specifically Aiginetan. Telamon is εὐρυσθενὴς, "broad of strength," a quality close to that of the requirements of the pancration and, by extension, Aristokleides, namely περισθενεῖ, which fact serves to build up the idea of inherited bravery and strength whose theme Pindar is about to elaborate.

38–40. καὶ ποτε. . οὐδέ νῦν ποτε φόβος ἀνδροδάμας ἔπαυσεν ἀκμὰν φρενῶν: provide a balance to the next lines: the encounter of Telamon against the Amazons, female warriors tagged as a bronze-bowed force, χαλκότητον ἀλκὰν, is neatly counterbalanced by the fear that conquers a man, φόβος ἀνδροδάμας. Telamon resists such fear. Pindar is specific: the fear does "not ever stop him or the courage of his thoughts." We should note Herakles omission from this battle with the Amazons, one of the canon of his 12 labours.

40–41. συγγενεὶ δέ τις εὐδοξία μέγα βρίθει. | ὅς δὲ διδάκτ' ἔχει, ψεφεννὸς ἀνὴρ: "A man acquires great weight by his innate valour and nobility. He however who has learning is a shadow-man." This has been variously identified as a φύσις vs. διδαχή, φύσις/τεχνή, φύσις/νόμος polarity. The dialectics of opposites always has implications of order, i.e. that the one term is superior to the other while the fact is that one does not exist without the other⁶⁵. What is of particular note is that this inherent and naturally occurring quality of φύσις is said to have weight: μέγα βρίθει, "it ponderates greatly," i.e. it has solidity and mass, whereas that of the man who learns his nobility or valour is "shadowy"—ὅς δὲ διδάκτ' ἔχει, ψεφεννὸς ἀνὴρ. Instone⁶⁶ notes that both μέγα βρίθει and ἀτρεκέϊ ποδί are particularly suited to the build and sure-footedness required of a pancratiast. Again, the image of excellence has a quality like statuary which has weight and solid mass as contrasted to that which is without substance and does not endure. ψεφεννὸς is a hapax.

41-2. ἄλλοτ' ἄλλα πνέων οὐ ποτ' ἀτρεκέϊ | κατέβα ποδῶ: "breathing now one thing and then another, he does not ever place his foot down precisely." πνέων here might be regarded as not merely breathing or living, but being transient of mind: one idea or another comes into his spirit.⁶⁷ That his lack of weight is measured by how inexactly he places his foot contrasts with the sure-footedness⁶⁸ of Aristokleides' attributes at vv.19-20:

εἰ δ' ἔων καλὸς ἔρδων τ' εἰκότα μορφῇ
ἀνορέαις ὑπερτάταις ἐπέβα παῖς Ἀριστοφάνεος

and also recalls Herakles at v.25: ὁπᾶ πόμπιμον κατέβαινε νόστου τέλος.

42. μυριᾶν δ' ἀρετῶν ἀτελεῖ νόῳ γεύεται: Pindar attributes physicality to the shadow-man's waywardness of thought: he *tastes* ten thousand virtues. The verb need not be watered down to "attempts" [Race] "essaying" [Sandys] "experiences" [Slater]. We are reminded of v.6., where different deeds are said to thirst for different rewards. It is indeed odd to describe that which lacks "substance" in terms so markedly physical, but the poet thereby expresses an element of the imagination that we might call day-dreaming. The imagined glories are in effect an interior experience which is not exteriorized or made visible to the outside world. To describe it as tasting, a very individual experience, perfectly associates these qualities or talents with the hidden or dark regions of a man's private mind. Moreover, with an ἀτελεῖ νόῳ or a mind and imagination without bounds or limits, such an individual cannot bring an idea to its end.

43. ξανθὸς δ' Ἀχιλεὺς τὰ μὲν μένων Φιλύρας ἐν δόμοις: The poem now passes on to its third exemplum of heroic valour. ξανθὸς is used by Pindar for Achilles only here. [Cf. N.7.28, Menelaus, N.10.7, Athena, N.5.54, the Graces]. Certainly in Homer it invariably accompanies Menelaus. It no doubt bespeaks a physically attractive quality.

44-7. παῖς ἔων ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα. . ἔναιρε. Although the story of Achilles being raised in Cheiron's cave is found first in Pindar, [P.3 63-66; P.4.102-103; P.9. 29- 37; P.6. 21-23], it was however known to have been carved in a stone relief on the throne of Amyclaeon Apollo [Paus.3.18.12.] which would have pre-dated Pindar. There also exists the wall painting from the Basilica of Herculaneum depicting Cheiron teaching Achilles the lyre. Although late and Roman it was probably based upon a Greek model and certainly executed by a Greek artist. Philyra was Cheiron's mother.

There is some discussion generated about the construction τὰ μὲν μένων [43] which itself waits for the responding τὰ δὲ. Fennell suggests that this is an

example of parechesis, i.e. the repetition of μέν μέν-ων and is not designed to have an answering δέ. Farnell argues with Boeckh and Dissen that τὰ μέν is meant to contrast with Achilles' later feats, but harms the argument by his proposal that Pindar forgot the contrasting clause and views this as yet another example of careless writing on the part of the poet. Bury sides with Mezger in proposing that the δέ clause occurs at v.49, reasoning that the earlier lines represent Achilles within the confines of a cave and that v.49 marks the period of his outdoor hunting. This argument is entirely impractical. What is perhaps slightly better is to take v.47 as the requisite δέ clause since it can then be argued that 1) Achilles killed—ἔπρασσε φόνον, ἔναιρε—under Cheiron's mother's roof, but then, 2) brought living, not-yet-dead bodies back to Cheiron himself. More particularly, we might understand the initial clause to describe Achilles at play, ἄθυρε μεγάλα ἔργα and hence that these are imaginary animals that he pretend-kills which is implicit in the expression, ἔπρασσε φόνον, i.e. he made or fabricated killing. The imperfect tense of both verbs, ἔπρασσε and ἔναιρε, along with θαμινὰ, indicates that he did it over and over again, a feature distinctive of fantasy and child's play. Notably his weapon is characterized as βραχυσίδαρον, short-steeled, one that is clearly suited to a small child and Pindar embellishes Peleus' weapon with another word coined by him, ὑπέραλλον. Both phrases moreover employ a parallel construction: βραχυσίδαρον ἄκοντα πάλλων; ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών. This syntactical and generational alliance between Achilles and his father is deepened historically in that the father has a wooden spear whereas his son has one of iron, σίδαρος.

47. σώματα δὲ παρὰ Κρονίδαν Κένταυρον ἀσθμαίνοντα κόμιζεν: One can hear the death rattle in the sequence of "k's", and in the pace of the line which becomes more laboured as the consonant clusters increase. The verse that follows is also characterized by a panting, breathless quality: the spiritus on ἐξέτης, ὄλον and the repetition of the vowel "o".

ἀσθμαίνοντα has been the subject of some debate. Triclinius' paraphrasing which suggests, σώματι. . . ἀσθμαίνοντι has met with general rejection. All the mss. have ἀσθμαίνοντα and most σώματα. Bury's reading, σώματα. . . ἀσθμαίνων ἐκόμιζεν, which was Rauchenstein's, is motivated by what seems to make more sense; Bury explains that it is more reasonable that a little boy-Achilles breathes hard from the exertion of dragging dead bodies than that the animals should be characterized by Pindar as still alive. Yet, as Dissen points out, ἄσθμα usually applies to the wounded or dying. Robertson⁶⁹ observes that the verb ἀσθμαίνειν has, from Homer on, the sense of the last gasp and of panting from exertion. He

offers the parallel of N.10.74 where Castor's dying is presented as: ἄσθματι—φρίσσοντα πνόας.

Privitera's⁷⁰ analysis of this triad [vv.43-63] concludes that it is articulated in two movements of almost equal length [10 and 11 lines respectively]. He notes that the fact of Cheiron's name being suppressed underlines the idea that Achilles' abilities are inborn.

ἐξέτης τὸ πρῶτον, ὅλον δ' ἔπειτ' ἄν χρόνον: This temporal detail serves to distinguish the younger Achilles at play-killing [vv.44-47] from the six-year old who brought his first actual kill to Cheiron. The phrase ὅλον δ' ἔπειτ' ἄν χρόνον, marks the time ever after that Achilles would be a master slayer.

50-51. τὸν ἐθάμβεον Ἄρτεμις τε καὶ θρασεῖ 'Αθήνα, / κτείνοντ' ἐλάφους ἄνευ κυνῶν δολίων θ' ἐρκέων: The two goddesses are amazed that he slays deer without dogs and the treachery of nets. This has iconographical significance in that Artemis, huntress, can be associated with hunting dogs, and Athena is associated with nets and "tricks." Like the single-handedness of Peleus' and Herakles' exploits, Achilles acts alone and this forms yet another link in the connective chain between the myths. The gaze of admiration and wonder on the act of Achilles killing, κτείνοντα, fixes the moment of action in the present; the verb κράτεσκε looks to the future of Achilles' exploits.

52. ποσσὶ γὰρ κράτεσκε: As an explanatory [γὰρ] statement: "for he surpasses them on foot." κράτεσκε, an iterative verb⁷¹, looks forward to the future when Achilles will hunt down Trojans, outrunning them without dogs or nets. Achilles' speed in running while firmly based on the epic tradition, here offers another allusion to sure-footedness, to Aristokleides, Herakles and the man who is unsure of his footing because he has only learning. Achilles, like those other exempla substantiates the principle of συγγενῆς εὐδοξία: he has the athletic abilities that surpass others because he is of an extraordinary nature.

52-55. λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων | ἔπος ἔχω: βαθυμήτα Χείρων τράφε λιθίνῳ. . μαλακόχειρα νόμον: The narrative of Achilles appears to be interrupted. While Farnell's opinion that here "Pindar shows more than his usual carelessness in respect to the order of events," is harsh and judgmental, most commentators have difficulty in uncovering the logic of this interruption. What is certain is that it can not be out of carelessness.

The difficulty begins with the line, λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων ἔπος ἔχω, which may mean, "I have this story told by former poets, προτέρων." Given this reading, however, there is not much sense to what follows; the tale of Cheiron

before and after this statement belongs equally to previous poetic tradition. Then what does distinguish what follows from what precedes?

The better reading of *προτέρων*, is that it mean "of earlier, previous men/heroes." The lines that follow then gain definition. It begins with Cheiron's education of Jason and Asklepios—both of whom are of a much older generation than Achilles. The tale then goes forward to the time of Peleus' marriage to Thetis, already hinted at at v.35. The difference there is that we have the background to it; here attention centres on its arrangement by Cheiron—neither bride nor groom is named—and then to Achilles, also unnamed, and his upbringing. With completion of the triad, at epode gamma, the narrative then proceeds to Achilles' greatness at Troy.

It is then clear from this, that the sense of *προτέρων* as "of former men/heroes" is defined by what follows. All the incidents narrated in vv.51-58 precede in time those that have been narrated in the ode at vv.32-39. Both portions are finely balanced with seven lines. The first portion contains Peleus' cutting of his spear, capturing Iolkos and getting hold of Thetis, then Telamon and Iolaus destroying Laomedon and fighting the Amazons. The story of Achilles' childhood, vv.43-51, in its intervening position forms a developmental transition between the two parts.

The events of the second part are, chronologically, anterior to these: Jason and Asklepios' care under Cheiron; the arrangement of the marriage of Thetis and Peleus, which presumably preceded Peleus' capturing her; the undertaking of Achilles' nurture, which, as it is expressed [vv.57-8], *γόνον τέ οἱ φέρτατον ἀτίταλλεν, ἐν ἀρμένοισι πᾶσι θυμὸν αὔξων*, clearly describes a condition antecedent to that of Achilles as a boy at play. At strophe 4, the narrative continues with Achilles, taking up the latter part of his life as he sets off to fight in Troy.

This effectively shapes the story of the Aiakidai into something like a double-fold. The generations are doubled back on each other with Cheiron common to both. It is in fact shaped something like a cave. Cheiron occupies the space in between, belonging to each line at various points and both curves end with Achilles.

53-4. *βαθυμήτα Χείρων τράφε λιθίνῳ Ἰάσον ἔνδον τέγει*: Cheiron is deeply wise, *βαθυμήτα*, an adjective appropriate not only to the skills which Cheiron taught, but to the place of nurture and instruction, his cave: "within a stone roofed place," *λιθίνῳ . . ἔνδον τέγει*.

54-5. καὶ ἔπειτεν Ἀσκληπίον | τὸν φαρμάκων δίδασκε μαλακόχειρα νόμον: Cheiron raised Jason, but taught Asklepios the "gentle-handed art of medicines". This word, μαλακόχειρα, as Bury puts it, is another "Pindaric compound," no doubt meant to distinguish the skilled application of drugs from surgery or other less than painless medical practices known to Greeks. It is also certainly a play of words on Cheiron's name.

56-7. νύμφευσε δ' αὖτις ἀγλαόκολπον Νηρέος θύγατρα: There are many mss. variants attested for ἀγλαόκολπον, all of which revolve on the second part of the adjective, viz. -καρπον, -κρανον, -καρνον. Modern editors incline to "radiant-breasted" [Turyn, Bowra, Snell-Maehler], yet the arguments for that choice [Farnell] and against [Fennell; Bury; Williams] do not provide reasons directly related to poetic thought, but rely on icono-mythology. I think that -κόλπος is the best choice because of its correlation to the sea, in which the daughter of Nereus lived, and the cave, in which Cheiron lived. Since κόλπος signifies anything of a concave shape: a fold, a bay, a valley, a hollow, the interior between a woman's breasts, and later, by extension, the womb, it offers in the immediate context a tetrad of connectedness: a Nereid of shining breasts, a bay of water, a cave, a radiant product of her womb. This latter sense of "matrix" is so well suited to the arguments in favour of ἀγλαόκαρπον, "radiant fruited," that it supports all the more the current choice of ἀγλαόκολπον.

57-8. γόνον τέ οἱ φέρτατον ἀτίταλλεν: Peleus and Achilles are conspicuous by their not being named. Cheiron rears or fosters, ἀτίταλλεν, the fruit of Thetis' womb. The verb is etymologically kin to ἄταλος which is akin to ἄπαλος [LSJ] and has the combined sense of something young and of tenderness. Cheiron's rearing of young Achilles has thus the quality of indulgence and gentleness which has an earlier reflection in μαλακόχειρα.

Privitera has noted the progression of the verbs, τράφε, δίδασκε, νύμφευσε, ἀτίταλλεν as a form of ring-composition and observes: "La progressione racchiude, ad anello, un intero ciclo generalzionale, con i suoi momenti salienti: la crescita, l'apprendimento, il matrimonio. Dopo le nozze nasce una nuova vita e il ciclo ricomincia."⁷¹

58. <έν> ἀρμένοισι πᾶσι θυμὸν αὖξων: This reconnects the Achillean part of the narrative which paused at v.52; Cheiron here in his role of mentor increases the soul of Achilles in all things fitting. The language of this passage looks ahead to the words of vv.74-5: ἐλα δὲ καὶ τέσσαρας ἀρετὰς ὁ θνατὸς αἰὼν where ἐλα, "drives," clearly imparts the image of a chariot, (4 presumably drawn by four

horses since there are four virtues), and the participle here, ἀρμένοισι, itself fits in well with this later metaphor.

<ἐν> is the correction of E. Schmid, for an omission in the mss. which Schroeder attributes *per haplographiam* after ἀτίταλλεν. πᾶσι is Mingarelli's emendation for πάντα. Schroeder cites Theogn.275, 695, Hes. *Scut.* 84, *Theog.* 639 to establish that ἄρμενα πάντα is a standard post-Homeric phrase for "all fitting nourishment." The scholiasts' paraphrase, ὁ Χείρων ἄρμοστὰ αὐτῷ πάντα παρέχων is thought to support the emendation. Williams⁷² disagrees, following Mommsen and Heyne. His argument pivots around the metrical placement of ἄρμενα πάντα and he observes that the phrase is, in the loci cited by Schroeder, invariably linked with a form of the verb: παρέχων. He notes that the phrase always fills out the second half of a dactylic hexameter line and that contrary to this, the metrical pattern of ἀρμένοισι πᾶσι is: — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ . While it is

obvious that this pattern could not fit within the context of a dactylic metre of any number of feet, it is not very clear how this proves the case against ἀρμένοισι πᾶσι, nor how Pindar's not using a form of παρέχων supports it in any way. What Schroeder demonstrates I believe is that such a pairing of words occurs; there in the accusative, here in the dative. The sense of the line with πάντα is either: increasing his entire soul in fitting things, or, increasing entirely his soul with fitting things. But since Pindar is so explicit in this ode [vv.74-5] that there are four virtues, I think it makes eminent sense to rely on Mingarelli's emendation.

59-63. ὄφρα θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι πεμφθεὶς . . πάλιν οὐκὰδ' ἀνεψιὸς ζαμενῆς Ἑλένοιο Μένων μῶλοι. With this epode, which is an entire and unbroken utterance, we return to the Trojan war. Like the previous epode, the exploits of Telamon and Iolaos, Achilles sets an example of a determined warrior and demonstrates by this the effect of Cheiron's instruction. ὄφρα—προσμένοι. — ἐν φρασὶ πάσαιθ', ὅπως—μὴ—Μένων μῶλοι, "so that he might withstand—and fix it in his mind that—Memnon would not go" back home. Fixing, or more literally, planting in his mind, much the same way one would "plant" or "fix" a spear, a sword in an enemy is a vivid figure. At N.7.26-7: Αἴας ἔπαξε διὰ φρενῶν / λευρὸν ξίφος, Aias kills himself using the same verb. In the case of Achilles, the action is one of sticking his thoughts—or his heart—on one thing. He uses a focus and penetration of will that is a duplicate of Telamon's [v39]: οὐδέ νῦν ποτε φόβος ἀνδροδάμας ἔπαυσεν ἀκμὰν φρενῶν. This is in sharp contrast with the ψεφηνὸς ἀνὴρ who is constantly altering the attention of his mind, ἄλλοτ' ἄλλα πνέων, whose mind is without an end, ἀτελεῖ νόω. And here I think we

may understand more clearly this expression. In the case of both Achilles and Telamon, the metaphor for thoughts that are firm and unshakeable has an edge: ἀκμὰν φρενῶν, ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιτο. The νοῦς ἀτελός, by contrast, has no edge; it is not defined or bounded and is therefore a mind incapable of incisive thought. The man cannot put his foot down with confidence because he lacks sure judgment and decision.

Remarkable in this epode is the energy of Pindar's language: Achilles is "sent by the blasts of the winds at sea" [Race], but the Greek actually confuses the wind and water, "sent on sea-waves of winds" which gives the effect of wind and water merging in one mass of movement.

60. ὑπὸ Τρωίαν δορίκτυπον ἀλαλὰν Λυκίων τε προσμένοι καὶ Φρυγῶν Δαρδάνων τε: Fennell understands δορίκτυπον ἀλαλὰν to mean either the clash of the battle itself or the clash of spears as the battle cry goes up. Either way, the battle cry, ἀλαλὰν, comes before the on-rush of Lykians, Phrygians, Dardanians and Aithiopians, and their names come in succession like the waves of wind and sea; the repetition of τε and καὶ add to the sense of confusion; Achilles will "mix hands with the spear-bearing" Aithiopians.

In the next verses, 61-3, the high concentration of stop-sibilants, [σ ξ ζ ψ] καὶ ἐγχεσφόροις ἐπιμίξαις Αἰθιόπεσσι χείρας etc., gives the lines an overall hissing quality—one of intense anger. The intensity of Achilles' determination that Memnon not return home is made even more apparent by the concentration of words for the return: ὀπίσω, πάλιν, οὔκαδε. The suspense in the final clause for the name of Memnon is considerable, his attributes—κοῖρανός, ἀνεψιὸς, ζαμενῆς—leader, cousin, fierce,—intervene, all of which contributes to the general tension and vigour of the epode's end.

ζαμενῆς, "inspired" or "strong, fierce" (of things) [Slater] is an adjective at P.9.38 that is applied to Cheiron, and at P.4.10 to Medea, denotes in these loci the inspiration of seers. At N.4.13 however, ζαμενῆς as an attribute of the Sun, ζαμενῆϊ ἀλίῳ, must signify the second definition of fierce or strong; and at N.6.52, Memnon is the son of shining Dawn: φαεννᾶς υἱὸν Ἀόος. Which of these attributes does Pindar intend? Those that prefer prophetic qualities refer to the fact that Memnon is here the cousin of Helenos, one of Priam's sons who is endowed with prophetic abilities. On the other hand, to argue that Memnon is here qualified as strong/fierce in his role as a warrior confronting Achilles has the reason of the obvious. I prefer to accept that both shades of meaning are meant to enrich

the encounter: that Memnon, like the sun and the dawn's light, has a fierce splendor and that his death at Achilles' hand is prophetically known to him.

64. **τηλαυγὲς ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν**: Just as Achilles has "fixed" his thoughts, so now the light of the Aiakidai is fixed, ἄραρε, thus articulating with the general theme of "fitting", is "far-shining," τηλαυγὲς, and comes from here, αὐτόθεν, the distant point of Troy, site of their ancestors' heroic exploits. A second, deeper level of meaning adheres to αὐτόθεν: it is from this point here in the poem that Pindar's praise of Aristokleides becomes fixed and will focus on him. Achilles carries the centre of light. At v.50, the end of the third strophe, both Artemis and Athena gaze in wonder and admiration upon him: τὸν ἑθάμβεον Ἄρτεμις τε καὶ θρασεῖ Ἀθάνα. Here, beginning the fourth strophe, the light of all the generations of Aiakidai who were glorious in the conduct of their lives shines through the distance of the past and shifts from the past to the present. The light, unlike Memnon, has made the journey home.

65-6. **Ζεῦ, τεὸν γὰρ αἶμα, σέο δ' ἄγών, τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν | ὅπῃ νέων ἐπιχώριον χάρμα κελαδέων**: As often in that part of the program of praise that informs the structure of the epinikion, Pindar begins with diffuse praise of a god before returning to the focused praise of the victor. We can appreciate the rhythmic variation, the poem's change of pace after the long, climactic celebration of Achilles, which actually flows without stopping from his mother's betrothal to Memnon [v.56-64]; by contrast, this line is staggered in measures of increasing length: 1, 5, 4, 6. It marks the transition from mythological narrative to the present and its circumstances.

τὸν here refers to ἄγών, i.e. it is *your* contest which the hymn has started to sing, ἔβαλεν, with a voice of young men sounding the joy of the land, ὅπῃ νέων ἐπιχώριον χάρμα κελαδέων. The poem is brought full circle: the song awaiting in the first strophe the voice of the Muse, is now actualized. χάρμα, which conveys the sound as much as the concept of joy and celebration is linked to the exultant ἀλαλάν, or battle cry of the preceding stanza. The triumph of Aristokleides is thus connected to that of Achilles, as is his victory in the pancration. The word ἐπιχώριον emphasizes the centrality that Aigina has in the victory and in the ode.

67. **βοᾷ δὲ νικαφόρῳ σὺν Ἀριστοκλείδῃ πρέπει**: "a shout is fitting for prize-winning Aristokleides" recalls vv. 7-8:

ἀθλονικία δὲ μάλιστ' ἀοιδὰν φιλεῖ,
στεφάνων ἀρετᾶν τε δεξιωτάταν ὀπαδόν·

σὺν, tmesis: συμπρέπει, a verb coined apparently by Pindar. The adjective συμπρέπης occurs in Aesch. *Sept.* 13, and *Suppl.* 458. Again the theme of "fitting" occurs. The praise of Aristokleides is being "fitted" to his victory.

68–70. ὃς τάνδε νῆσον εἰκλᾶ προσέθηκε λόγῳ . . Πυθίου Θεάριον. The meaning of προσέθηκε is "linked" [Farnell]; "made the theme of" [Fennell]; "linked with" [Slater]. It is worth noting the number of verbs that begin this final stanza that can be construed as denoting construction: ἀραρίσκω, βάλλω, συμπρέπω, προστίθημι. The μελιγαρύων τέκτονες κώμων have constructed a poem that links, builds into its structure of ancient glory the stone of Aristokleides. He is the one who finishes the four-pillared, four-walled structure of Aiakid fame: Peleus, Telamon, Achilles and Aristokleides. Their foundation is Zeus: his the blood and the ἀγών, the games, but may also signify any struggle destined to a hero. The light of Achilles "fits" or "hangs" from afar; the hymn "casts" its form into the voices onto the land, ἐπιχώριον; the shout of celebration "fits with" the victory of Aristokleides; his glorious tale is "put, fitted onto" the island of Aigina.

69–70. καὶ σεμνὸν ἀγλααῖσι μερίμναις | Πυθίου Θεάριον: "and to the solemn Delegation of Delphi." This would have in fact been a guildhall or college of sacred ambassadors to Delphi. The scholiasts state that the Θεάριον at Aigina was used for public entertainment from which Farnell supposes that Aristokleides was entertained within there. μερίμναις is usually understood to mean active thoughts, i.e. intentions on the part of Aristokleides to compete at the Pythian games.

70–1. ἐν δὲ πείρᾳ τέλος διαφαίνεται: It is in the trial that the end shows itself clearly. In other words, the quality or qualities involved in the achievement of an end show themselves when they are tested. Farnell characterizes this and the following lines [vv. 71–6] as Pindar's "deepest and most striking" statement on the quality and measure of excellence in a man. It offers a final contrast with that man who, μυριάν δ' ἀρετᾶν ἀτελεῖ νόῳ γεύεται, and elucidates the difference between the truly noble accomplishment from one that is not: it has no edge; it is untried.

There is an additional comment on the differences between true and false nobility: the false kind is that of a "shadow-man", ψέφεννος ἀνὴρ, whereas the true kind "shines through", "is transparent", διαφαίνεται. It is important that the real thing be obvious to everyone, that it be visible and audible to the observer.

71-75. ὦν τις ἑξοχώτερος γένηται, | ἐν παισὶ νέοισι παῖς, . . φρονεῖν δ' ἐνέπει τὸ παρκεείμενον: The four virtues are, as suggested by Farnell and others, likely to be those of the canon found in Plato's *Leges* 660e:

ὕμιν ἐν πάσῃ παιδείᾳ καὶ μουσικῇ τὰ λεγόμενά ἐστι τάδε
τοὺς ποιητὰς ἀναγκάζετε λέγειν ὡς ὁ μὲν ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ
σώφρων ὦν καὶ δίκαιος εὐδαίμων ἐστὶ καὶ μακάριος, ἕαντε
μέγας καὶ ἰσχυρὸς ἕαντε μικρὸς καὶ ἀσθενὴς ἦ . . .

but certainly enumerated earlier by Aeschylus in *Sept.* 610: σώφρων, δίκαιος, ἀγαθὸς, εὐσεβὴς ἀνὴρ, which qualities are attributed to the seer, Amphiaraios, son of Oikles. Pindar relates that there are three ages of man: boyhood, manhood and old age. Each of these has its share of the four cardinal qualities. Yet there is some dispute as to the correlation of these ages and virtues. It has been assumed by many that φρονεῖν δ' ἐνέπει τὸ παρκεείμενον, the disposition to take thought for the present circumstances, represents the fourth virtue. Pindar lists within three categories the ages and the respective abilities to be tested: a boy amongst young boys, a man amongst men etc. I agree with Farnell that there is no reason why Pindar should be specific about one virtue without naming the others, and so I understand the four qualities to be coordinated to the four pillars or four walls that construct and consolidate this ode. The models of the four Aiakidai must be viewed within this context: Peleus and Telamon are seen as men of ancient times, the παλαιότεροι; Achilles passes through all the ages: we see him as a child, a man and as an ancestor. Aristokleides must in fact represent τὸ παρκεείμενον.

76. τῶν οὐκ ἄπεσσι: Bergk's conjecture for mss. ἄπεστι; ἄπεσσι, which, "of these [qualities] you have no lack," (accepted by Christ, Schroeder, Turyn, Snell-Maehler, Slater and Race). Farnell objects that the obscurity of τῶν οὐκ ἄπεστι is not improved by τῶν οὐκ ἄπεσσι. The argument for the second person is motivated by the address that follows. The argument for the third person is that until this point it has been used and understood to refer to Aristokleides.

I think the less direct and impersonal ἄπεστι is to be preferred because of its indirectness. Pindar avoids in this way any abrupt change: he eases his way to the business of praise. The next sentence is also somewhat oblique: 76. χαῖρε, φίλος, by not using the vocative—although the nominative for vocative is certainly meant—presents an address at one remove from the more direct one.

77-9. ἐγὼ τόδε τοι πέμπω μεμιγμένον, κτλ: The metaphor refers to mixed song and words. The poem is a πόμ' ἀοίδιμον, [79], a drink of song, which recalls the verses of the first strophe where deeds "thirst" for their reward of song. The phrase κίρναμένα δ' ἔερσ' ἀμφέπει, invites us to visualize the "stirred

dews" of honey and milk mixture as embracing or hugging [ἀμφέπει] the sides of the krater in which they are mixed, i.e. the ode itself.

It is the genius of Pindar to end an ode which has so much weight in its figures of construction and its references to feet and solidity with a smooth transition to images of flight and airborne things. It begins with the lightness of the foam or dew-froth of the drink of song, moves to the breaths of Aiolian auloi, Αἰολῆσιν ἐν πνοαῖσιν αὐλῶν, and quickly takes off with the flight of the swift eagle. There is an added urgency to the transition, prompted by ὀψέ περ, "although late". I don't think that this need be read as an actual fact that Pindar was tardy in delivering his poem; rather it is a rhetorical statement or literary device. It serves to motivate the lift and speed with which the poem accelerates to completion.

80-81. ἔστι δ' αἰετὸς ὥκῃς ἐν ποτανοῖς | ὃς ἔλαβεν αἶψα, τηλόθε μεταμαιόμενος, δαφαινὸν ἄγραν ποσίν: The eagle grabs its prey with a sudden move, ὃς ἔλαβεν αἶψα, and by the use of this verb, Pindar connects the eagle to Aristokleides who at vv. 31-2 has seized by his victory an adornment fitting for sweet song: ποτίφορον δὲ κόσμον ἔλαβες γλυκύ τι γαρνέμεν. The eagle here is a metaphor for the poet who earlier seeks the Muse, and, like the eagle, Pindar has seized his prey swiftly. τηλόθε μεταμαιόμενος recalls by its imagery and language the young men eagerly awaiting the Muse by the waters of Asopos and the light of the Aiakidai, especially Achilles, which shines from far. The image of the bloodied wild prey in its talons, δαφαινὸν ἄγραν ποσίν, gives sure closure to the many references to feet; in particular, one suspects, to Achilles whose excellence as a hunter has been prominent in the poem.

82. κραγέται δὲ κολιοὶ ταπεινὰ νέμονται: κραγέται δὲ κολιοὶ has wonderful onomatopoetic value. Some have understood Pindar to be making a reference to Bakkhylides, and the cry is of lesser birds, lesser poets. But an evaluation of Bakkhylides as a lesser poet is, in my opinion, more likely to be the assessment of the different merits of the two poets by ancient and modern critics, than by Pindar himself. Even if we understand the reference to be to other poets, what Pindar is saying is that the object and opportunity of praise has been seized first by himself, a swifter poet. If the daws are envious it is of the eagle's prey and not of the eagle himself. The next line confirms this.

83-4. τίν γε μέν, εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς θελοῖσας, ἀθλοφόρου λήματος ἔνεκεν / Νεμῆϊς Ἐπιδαυρῶθεν τ' ἄπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος: The last triad matches the first in its characterization of song as drink [vv.1,83; 6-7, 76-9.] and in its motif of late arrival [vv.1-5, 80-81.]. But here the expression, δέδορκεν φάος,

recalls v.64 where the glory of Achilles shines from far. Aristokleides' connection with the glorious past of his ancestors is made apparent by his light which has shone from Nemea, Epidauros and Megara. The poem concludes in a geographical sweep that imitates nothing less than an eagle's flight. The speed and lightness of being which are applied to Arisokleides betray the true nobility which weighs heavily, μέγα βρίθει.

1. Fennell provides as examples of judging victors: O.3.21; N.10.23; O.7.80. For the sense of distinction: N.7.7; I.4.11. To this last should be added N.6.2. where gods and men are distinct in their powers, διείργει δὲ πᾶσα κεκριμένα δύναμις.

2. Fennell, Farnell, Slater.

3. Mezger, F., *Pindars Siegeslieder*, Leipzig 1880.

4. Machemer, G.A., "Medicine, Music, and Magic: The Healing Grace of Pindar's *Fourth Nemean*," *HSCP* 95, 1993, 114-119.

5. Hubbard, T.K., *The Pindaric Mind*, 76-81.

6. For a careful summary of the various positions taken by past scholars see: Williams, F. "A Critical Edition of Nemean Odes 1-4 of Pindar," Diss. Cornell 1970. 168-174. His argument for τεύχει as a reflection of τυχα is elaborate and well-argued but neglects what I feel to be the essential feature of the physicality of the poem's language which is well supported by τέγγει / τέγγει.

7. Op.cit. 76.

8. For a discussion of the possibilities of inscribed monuments to victors of the games and the various references to their existence to be found in Pindar's odes, see Deborah Steiner, "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti'," *HSCP* 95, 1993, 159-180.

9. Bulman, P., *Phthonos in Pindar*, Berkeley 1992, 60.

10. Hubbard, op.cit.77f.

11. Vid. Williams, op. cit. 179-80.

12. Cf. Arist. *Acharn* 639-40, Εἰ δέ τις ὑμᾶς ὑποθωπεύσας λιπαρὰς καλέσειεν Ἀθήνας, | ἤρτετο πᾶν ἂν διὰ τὰς λιπαράς, ἀφύων τιμὴν περιάψας; *Eq.*1329, ὦ ται λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ ἀριζήλωτοι Ἀθῆναι; *Nub.*300, ἔλθωμεν λιπαρὰν χθόνα Παλλάδος, εὐανδρον γᾶν; Eur. *Alc.*452, λιπαραῖσιν τ' ἐν ὀλβίαις Ἀθάναις. *Tro.*803, οὐράνιον στέφανον λιπαραῖσιν τε κόσμον Ἀθῆναις; *Iph Taur.*1130-1, αἰείδων ἄξει λιπαρὰν | εὐ σ' Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ γᾶν.; Herodotus 8.77.6, "ἐλπίδι μαινομένη λιπαρὰς πέρσαντες Ἀθήνας.

13. Δίδυμος δὲ φησιν -οὐκ- ἄγεσθαι Ἰολαία ἐν Θήβαις ἀγῶνα γυμνικόν, αὐτὸ δὲ μόνον τὸ στάδιον καὶ γυμνάσιον εἶναι Ἰολαεῖον, καθὼς ὁ περὶ ἀγῶνων ἀναγραψάμενος οὐκ Ἰολαεῖα φησιν ἄγεσθαι ἀλλ' Ἡράκλεια. τὸν ἀγῶνα οὖν τῶν Ἡρακλείων φησὶν ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἰολάου γυμνασίῳ διαλεῖσθαι παρὰ τὸ τοῦ Ἀμφιτρύωνος μνῆμα, ἐνθα φασὶ καὶ τὸν Ἰολάον κεκενοταγῆσθαι τὸ γάρ κατ' ἀλήθειαν αὐποῦ μνῆμα ἐν Σαρδοῖ εἶναι.

14. There is no such emendation in Schroeder's text of 1900.

15. *Iliad* 5.83, 629; 16.334, 853; 19.410; 20.477; 21.110; 24.132, 209: κραταιή. At 11.119, κραταιῶ describes a lion. The one exception is 13.345, where κραταιῶ is used of Idomeneus and Meriones.

16. Bulman, 61n15.

17. Cf. Carey, C., "Three Myths in Pindar: *N.* 4, *O.* 9, *N.* 3," *Eranos* 78, 1980, 146.

18. Of Achilles, ἐκπαγλότατος, *Iliad* 1.146; 18.170; of Iphition, son of Orynteus, 20.389.

19. ἐκπαγλόν, of threats: *Iliad*: 13.417, 445; 14.453, 478; 15.198: [ἐκπάγλοις | 21.452, *Od.*10.448; 17.216: of a storm: 14.522:

20. For an interesting discussion of the phenomenon of the four as opposed to three-horse chariot in Greek literature, vid. Fennell ad loc.
21. Schroeder's note ad loc. is: ἥρως, quod non magis corrigendum esse duxi, quam τόσσους 30, ubi τόσσους edunt c Tricl.
22. Bundy, E.L., *Studia Pindarica* I, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1962, 3n11.
23. Miller, A.M., "N.4.33-43 and the Defense of Digressive Leisure," *CJ* 78, 1982/3, 202-220. 207f.
24. Bulman, 63.
25. Ibid.64.
26. Carey, op.cit. 148.
27. Contra cf. Miller 204n7; 205n13 and 207n18.
28. Burkert, W., *Greek Religion*, Cambridge, Mass., 1985, 171; 200.
29. Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 500f; Theocr. 2.12 and Schol. ad loc.=Callim. fr.466; Sophron (Kaibel) *cgf* I 161; Orph. Hymn 41.5; Richardson 84; 156; Aesch. *Supp.* 676; Eur. *Phoen.* 109; Eur. *Med.* 395-7; *Hel.* 569f.
30. Köhnken, A., *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*, de Gruyter 1971, 212
31. Paus. 3.19.11, ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Εὐξείνῳ νήσος κατὰ τοῦ Ἰστροῦ τὰς ἐκβολὰς Ἀχιλλέως ἱερά· ὄνομα μὲν τῇ νήσῳ Λευκὴ, περίπλους δὲ αὐτῇ σταδίων εἴκοσι, δασεῖα δὲ ὅλη πάσα καὶ πλήρης ζώων ἀγρίων καὶ ἡμέρων, καὶ ναὸς Ἀχιλλέως καὶ ἄγαλμα ἐν αὐτῇ.
32. So Dissen, Bury and Carey [150].
33. Also Köhnken, 203ff., Nisetich, *Victory Songs*, 248.
34. πότνια is used in Pindar of Ἀγλαΐα, O.14.13, Ὠρα, N.8.1, Aphrodite P.4.213, Persephone fr.37, Λιβύα, P.9.55 and Paeon 9.10.
35. Gianotti, G. F., "Il terzo Carme Nemeo di Pindaro," *AAT* 109, 1975, 33.
36. Privitera, G. A., "Eracle e gli Eacidi nella III 'Nemea,'" *GIF* 29, 1977, 258.
37. Privitera, op. cit., 260.
38. Also noted by Privitera, loc. cit., p. 259.
39. Cf. Paus. 2.29.5, who gives it as Argives from Epidaurios led by Deiphontes, Strab. 8.6.16, Argives, Cretans, and Epidaurians who colonized it.
40. See Privitera, 259n.23.
41. Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, 277n2.
42. Privitera, G. A., "Pindaro, *Nem.* III 1-5, e l'acqua di Egina," *QUCC* 29, 1988, 63-75.
43. See Instone, S., "Problems in Pindar's *Third Nemean*," *Eranos* 91, 1994, 15.
44. See esp. Lefkowitz, M., *First -Person Fictions*, Oxford, 1991. M. Heath, and M. Lefkowitz, "Epiniian Performance," *CP* 86, 1991, 173-91; Heath, M., "Receiving the κῶμος: The Context and Performance of Epiniian," *AJP* 109, 1988, 180-95; Lefkowitz, "Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?," *AJP* 109, 1988, 1-11; Burnett, A. P., "Performing Pindar's Odes," *CP* 84, 1989, 283-93; Carey, C., "The Performance of the Victory Ode," *AJP* 110, 1989, 545-65; "The Victory Ode in Performance: The Case for the Chorus," *CP* 86, 1991, 192-200.
45. Morgan, K., "Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ," *CP* 88, 1993, 2.
46. Carey, C., "Three Myths in Pindar: N. 4, O. 9, N. 3," *Eranos* 78, 1980, 154.
47. Williams F. L., *A Critical Edition of Nemean Odes 1-4 of Pindar*, Diss., Cornell 1976. (ad. loc.) argues for the dative by cataloguing and comparing the kind and quality of cloud-related epithets Pindar gives to Zeus and to σὺρανός, concluding that the poet is more likely to have qualified Zeus as πολὺνεφέλας than the sky. The argument relies too heavily in my opinion upon the case of the missing iota subscript. Moreover, he ignores the one outstanding feature of his evidence, which is that Pindar never uses an epithet of Zeus, other than one of rank, such as βασιλεύς, σωτήρ, πατήρ, that is so closely related to Homer's νεφέληγε πέτα.
48. E.g. a building contract from Lebadeia—the longest inscription of its kind. IG vii.3073, coll 34, ὁ τῆς θέσεως ἐργῶνης, ἕτερον ἀποκαταστήσει δόκιμον τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνηλώμασιν οὐθὲν ἐπικωλύοντα τὸ ἔργον, τὸν δὲ διαφθαρέντα λίθον ἐξάξει ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐντὸς ἡμερῶν πέντε, εἰ δὲ μή, ἱερὸς ὁ λίθος ἔσται; coll.60: ἐὰν δέ τι πρόσεργον δῆι γενέσθαι συμφέρον τῷ ἔργῳ, ποιήσει ἐκ τοῦ ἴσου λόγου καὶ προσκομίζεται τὸ γινόμενον αὐτῷ, ἀποδείξας δόκιμον. IG vii 3074.13 ἕτερον ἀποκαταστήσει δόκιμον τοῖς ἰδίοις.

49. See Steiner, D., "Pindar's 'Ogetti Parlanti,'" *HSCP* 95, 1993, 159-180, and "Moving Images: Fifth-Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure," *CA* 17, 1998, 123-149.
50. Hubbard, T., "Pindar and the Aeginetan Chorus," *Phoenix* 41, 1987, 6.
51. This ambiguity of the word has also been noted by Hubbard, loc. cit., 6-7n.18.
52. Carnes, J. S., "The Aeginetan Genesis of the Myrmidons: A Note on *Nemean* 3.13-16," *CW* 84, 1990, 41-44.
53. Instone, p.17.
54. Pfeijffer, I.L., *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III & Pythian VIII*, Leiden 1999, 626-630, argues against the unanimous mss. reading for the emendation γ' ἔαν | . . . κατ' αἴσαν, [Negris] on the basis that the Muse is not noted elsewhere as a patron of the games, cf. Farnell. He therefore considers the mss. τεάν untenable. Why could it not be Zeus who is referred to? After all the Muse is called the daughters of Zeus v.10.
55. Hubbard, T.K., *The Pindaric Mind*, 38.
56. Pfeijffer, op. cit. 289-292; 227-8.
57. Erbse, H., "Pindars dritte nemeische Ode," *Hermes* 97, 1969, 278f.; Ruck, C.A.P., "Marginalia Pindarica IV-VI," *Hermes* 100, 1972, 156; Bundy, "Studia Pindarica II," 44; *ibid.* n11.
58. Carey, op. cit., 155. and n. 50. His judgement of Bundy's term "foil" sums up so masterfully my own I will repeat it: " 'Foil' is one of the most unhelpful terms which have been introduced into Pindaric criticism; it subordinates elements which Pindar merely juxtaposes, without any justification in the text."
59. *Ibid.* 156.
60. See Farnell's note ad loc. on the meaning of φράδασσε and its implications for the mythic character of Herakles. He also notes that here and at O.3.44 is the earliest mention in literature of the "Pillars of Herakles."
61. Carnes, J. S., "Aiakos, Flower of Justice: A Reading of *Nemean* 3.29," *Hermes* 122, 1994, 360-363. Carnes does attempt to resolve the difficult nominative reading, taking the infinitive αἰνεῖν as epexegetical and referring the phrase δίκας ἄωτοστο Aiakos, rendering: "Aiakos, the flower of justice, good to praise, follows the λόγος" This however requires that we accept three subjects/nominatives for the sentence: Aiakos, [understood] in apposition to "flower" in apposition to "noble," and while an explanatory infinitive is possible, my sense of this reading is that it is unGreek. Carnes' objection to assuming the phrase ἐσλὸς αἰνεῖν to be a maxim is however attractive.
62. Pfeijffer, 630-638.
63. Cf. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare*, 277§347n3 where he identifies N.3.24 and 29 as both being two short-vowel accusatives, ὑπερόχος for metrical reasons and hic locus because the scholia analyze it to be so.
64. Williams, F., *Commentary*, 116.
65. Cf. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind*, 108f.
66. Instone, .21.
67. Both Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise* 25 and Steiner, *The Crown of Song*, 69, understand πνέων as an allusion to sea-faring and the dangers therein.
68. Carey, "Three Myths in Pindar," notes that καταβαίνω can mean "enter the list" of the pancration and that the phrase ἀπρεκεῖ | κατὰ πόδι is a reference to the ability of one wrestler to trip another, causing him to fall.
69. Robertson, D. S., "The Food of Achilles," *CR* 54, 1940, 177-180. Robertson also suggests that the still-breathing beasts are in that state because Achilles intends to eat their marrow in order to acquire the qualities of the animals. This idea is based particularly on a much later tradition [Philostratus. *Heroica*, xx.2; Etym. Magnum, s.v. Ἀχιλλεύς where Achilles was said to have been nurtured on the marrows of fawns or deer.
70. Privitera, 261.
71. See Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, 505-7; Szemerényi, K., *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, 273-4. I owe this note to Prof. Annette Tefeteller.
72. Privitera, 263.
73. Williams, ad loc.

Nemean 5

1. **Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ**': By announcing that he is not a sculptor, Pindar is working for rhetorical as well as structural effect, since the poet indeed means to create a song memorial/monument to his victor. As Steiner has noted there are marked references to statuary in the Aiginetan odes, particularly the Nemeans¹. A feature of this ode is the rhythmic variation of its lines as well as their metrically ordered layout. The first line of each strophe and antistrophe is disparately long in comparison with the others which has the effect of shaping each strophe like the base of a statue on which the other lines are built. Of course in the context of a written text that part of the figure which stands appears as pendant lines.

1. **ὥστ' ἑλινύσσοντα**: "stationary, unmoving," fut. part. said by Hummel to convey "une nuance d'intention."² However, in the context of a negative principal clause, this result clause, **ὥστ' ἑλινύσσοντα ἐργάζεσθαι ἀγάλματα**, etc., has the sense, "I am not a sculptor to create immobile statues which stand on the same base".³ The important distinction in this reading is that it states that Pindar *is* a sculptor, but of moving, not still statuary. Moreover, as **ἀνδριαντοποιός** specifies, these statues are of men, not things, for the poet creates moving representations of victors. For Fennell, the phrase **ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος** is directed to a statue's spatial limitations i.e. "on the base and nowhere else."

2. **ἔσταότα**, pf. part., then is directed to its temporal limitations: it anchors the statue to its base in that the perfect reflects time past frozen in the present. This dual immobility of space and time is in opposition to the song which travels **ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος** [v.2], and further qualifies poetry as a form of statuary, in that it can endure, as does stone or bronze, but, unlike them, is highly mobile and travels. That poetry's mobility is seen as a modality of commerce is suggested by the phrase **ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος**, "on every merchant ship"; by contrast, **ἐν τ' ἀκάτῳ**, "in a boat" indicates that humbler, less grandiose or commercially expensive means can be used to move a poem.

3. **στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας, διαγγέλλοισ'**: Pindar sends the song with an imperative, **στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας**, "go from Aigina". Fennell points out that the verb **στείχω**, is used of a voyage only here and at Il.2.287. Indeed, what this observation overlooks is the poetic riches which arise from keeping the verb to its

usual sense "to walk." Since Pindar has just stated that he does not create human sculptures which are immobile, then it is only appropriate that his injunction to the sculpted song be that it "walk" from Aigina. Moreover, this verb sits directly beneath the participle ἐσταότ' thereby connecting their relationship more firmly. The pres. part. διαγγέλλοισα, "announcing, spreading the news" which gives the song an interactive quality denied mute stone. It acts as a herald or messenger.

3-5. ὅτι Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενῆς νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον: νίκη, Heyne's emendation [impf. 3s. from Doric form of the verb, νίκημι], of mss. νικῇ, contra Bergk's νικῇ, pres. 3s >νικάω, who kept the present tense as that of the herald announcing the victory, "repetit poeta praeconis vocem: itaque et praes. et dor. contr. retinent, qua alias non utitur." but, as Farnell explains, this would be νικᾷ in Pindar. I am not sure that Bergk should be rejected, based on the occurrence of νίκη in Theocr. 6.46; 7.40. It makes more sense to have this announcement of Pytheas' victory in the present than it does in the imperfect.⁴ Pytheas is also identified as the son of Lampon at I.5.21, I.6.3 and Lampon as son of Kleonikas at I.6.16.

4. εὐρυσθενῆς: cf. N.3.36, an adjective suited to the athletic build of a pancratiast.⁵ The adjective, used of Poseidon in Homer and by Pindar of Poseidon, O.13.80, Apollo, I.2.18 and Telamon, N.3.36.

6. οὐπω γέννυσι φαίνων τέρειναν ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὁπώραν: "not yet does the summer season, tender mother of the grape-bloom, appear on his cheeks." Although the general sense of these striking lines is that Pytheas is still a boy without a beard, Pindar does not use an elaborate metaphor carelessly. As Segal has noted, the reference to seasonal change roots the athlete in living nature, and the fact that he is still to grow and develop distinguishes him from a lifeless statue.⁶ Furthermore the characterization of summer as the tender mother, τέρειναν ματέρα, contrasts with the male terminology of a word like ἀνδριαντοποιός.⁷

7. ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέντας καὶ ἀπὸ χρυσεᾶν Νηρηίδων: The Aiakid heroes share the association with nature in that they are "planted," φυτευθέντας, by Zeus and the golden Nereids. Their lances, αἰχματὰς, are like the vine tendrils, οἰνάνθας.

The imagery of this ode is rich in "standing" similes and metaphors and this antistrophe begins as a base to the living sculpture of Aigina—the spears and lances of the range of sons of Aiakos standing like stalks from the land where they have been planted—and sculpts the features of the ancestral past of the victor, the body of heroes, in a verse-sentence that is unbroken until the first line of the epode.

8. Αἰακίδας ἐγέραιρεν ματρόπολιν τε: The unusually prominent mother / matrilineal interest in this poem dictates that it be the mother-city, ματρόπολιν, which the victor glorifies. She cares for the growth and development of the Aiakidai as does the summer the vine. [8] **φῖλαν ξένων ἄρουραν:** Aigina is the mother of the Aiakid clan and is the land that welcomes strangers. It is noteworthy that the land is ἄρουραν, i.e. land suitable for ploughing.⁸

9-13. τάν ποτ' εὐανδρόν τε καὶ ναυσικλύταν. . ὄν ψαμάθεια τίκτ' ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πόντου. This long verse-sentence describes Peleus and Telamon, and Phokos, standing by the altar of their father, Zeus Hellanios,⁹ their hands stretched to the sky in prayer, together. The picture, like a tableau vivant, incorporates the stillness of sculpture [v.11 **στάντες**] and the movement of imprecation. It is again noticeable that Peleus and Telamon are not themselves named, but are signified by their mother's name, Endais, as is Psamatheia named mother of Phokos. It is also notable that Pindar [v.14] will not tell the story of the one hero he has named: the names of those who have done the reprehensible deed are pre-suppressed.

10. θέσσαντο: "to pray" an archaic defective aorist verb which Farnell, following the scholia, claims Pindar to have found in Hesiod [fr.201 θεσσάμενοι γενεήν] and Archilochos [fr.11 γλυκερὸν νόστον]. The construction is pred. accusative, they pray that: τάν ποτ' εὐανδρόν τε καὶ ναυσικλύταν, Aigina become well-manned, full of heroes and glorious in seamanship.

Farnell's note on Pindar's genealogy of the Aiakidai points out that it is not Homeric in that Aias and Achilles are described as friends not kin. The story of Phokos is derived from Hesiod *Theog.* 1004. Pausanias 2.29.9 describes that by the Aiakeion in Aigina was a stone mound said to be the grave of Phokos.

10. πατέρος Ἑλλανίου: Dissen's note, Myrmidones quum in Aiginam venissent condiderunt ibi Jovis Hellenii fanum, patrii sibi numinis, cuius religiones secum adduxerant, describes Zeus Hellanios as worshipped from the time of the Myrmidons [cf. Paean 6.125.].

11. πῖτναν: for ἐπίτνασαν > *πίτνημι, an assumed form of πετάννυμι, describes the action of extending the arms [Eng. fathom].

12. δρίγνωτες: a Homeric word, cf. Il.13.70-2, Od.6.300-1, 17.265, "well-known," "easily seen" [Slater].

13. ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ, ὄν ψαμάθεια τίκτ' ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι πόντου: Pindar describes the birth of Phokos, breaking it up in the line, ὁ τᾶς θεοῦ, ὄν ψαμάθεια τίκτ', in poetic sympathy with his birthplace. The word ῥηγμῖν from

ρήγνυμι, "to break" denotes anything broken or edged, such as the surf as it hits the beach. As Segal has commented,¹⁰ this description registers Phokos as the negative counterpart to Pytheas: although he too is born of a goddess, he will not fulfill the promise of a hero's life. Moreover, apart from the very basic differences of land and sea, earth and water as elements of nature, the place of his birth is lonely and wild. There is no mention of tenderness or nurture; he is born at the edge between the stable land-world and the unstable sea. The word *κεκινδυνευμένον*, in the next verse, although not directly related to Phokos' coming into this world, certainly reflects the perilous nature of [his] life.

14. *αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν ἐν δίκῃ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον*: This represents a "hush-passage." The poet claims to be ashamed to speak of some great or mighty deed, *μέγα εἰπεῖν*, risked not justly, *ἐν δίκῃ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον*. Bury understands the statement to mean that the deed was great, the doing of it hazardous [*κεκινδυνευμένον*], and the ethical questionability of its accomplishment "peradventure, not justly": this is the "mild and tentative" force of *μὴ ἐν δίκῃ*. Fennell reads "a great venture, and such as is not undertaken upon just grounds." Farnell agrees that *μὴ* does not express anything tentative or doubtful, but must be read with the participle. The impression of the perfect pass. participle is perhaps meant to be one of ambiguity. Since the passage refers to murder, it is not ventured without injustice.

15–16. *πῶς δὲ λίπον εὐκλέα νᾶσον, καὶ τίς ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους | δαίμων ἀπ' Οἰνῶνας ἔλασεν*: As Fennell explains, the particle *δὲ* indicates that part of the tale which Pindar chooses to relate¹¹. The departure of the Peleus and Telamon from Aigina is to be seen as a contrast to v.3, the expedition of the poem by sea wherein Pytheas' victory is broadcast, *διαγγέλλοισα*. Here the story is not told "how they left the glorious island and what divinity drove brave men from Aigina." This refusal to relate unsavoury events is similar to the situation at O.1.52, where Pindar stands apart from [*ἀφίσταμαι*] detailing the cannibalistic meal of the gods dining on Tantalos. *τίς δαίμων*, adds further mystery and silence to the incident as perhaps the poet's use of the old name of Aigina, Oinone, deflects from direct connection.

16. *στάσομαι*. The verb stands apart from its context much the way a statue stands. Pindar also mimics in his prayer the stance and attitude of the unnamed brothers, *στάσομαι*. Furthermore there is a progression in the verbal complex of "standing" from the pf. *ἔσταότα*, aor. *στάντες*, to fut. *στάσομαι*, implicitly running the modality of movement through time as it refers to progressive

"aliveness", i.e. from the non-living statue, to the remembered image of once living now dead brothers, to a present and living narrator.

16-17. οὐ τοι ἅπασα κερδίων φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει ἄτρεκῆς: This gnomic statement is important: "Truly not all truth is better for showing its precise face " Most translators take ἀτρεκῆς to mean "exact, precise" but we must note here the relationship between this gnome and the idea of a statue. The word πρόσωπον fits neatly into the triadic scheme of the inverted figure that stands, its base as the strophe, its body as the antistrophe and the epode forming the head. It then is appropriate that the face of truth be ἀτρεκῆς, or exact, precise, strict, in the sense of something sculpted to an exact reality. This points to something suggested earlier by Pindar's opening verse, that he is not a sculptor to create statues that are unmoving, ἐλινύσσοντα, standing immobile on the same base, and implies that the fixed reality of a representation is not more truthful for its being fixed; and that truth is by its and our nature of subjective interpretation not the more visible or accessible to understanding when its appearance is static. It suggests that truth is not an absolute, cannot be told in words or chiseled stone with precision: it has a mobile and therefore changeable quality.¹²

18. καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώτατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι: The further reflection that truth is considered, νοῆσαι, by humankind most wisely, or most intelligently by silence, expands upon the previous statement. That the poet is comparing this philosophical study to that of sculpture is implicit in such features of his description as φαίνοισα and νοῆσαι, the latter verb which generally signifies an object that is observed or looked upon. Appearances are deceptive, even when they are close to a realistic portrayal. Silence includes both the observed and the observer.

19. εἰ δ' ὄλβον ἢ χειρῶν βίαν ἢ σιδαρίταν ἐπαινῆσαι πόλεμον δεδόκηται: δεδόκηται is a rare form of δεδόκηται, pf. ind. 3 s. > δοκέω. similar to a decree, "if it has been decided / decreed". The phrase χειρῶν βίαν is well suited to the pancratiast's praise as σιδαρίταν πόλεμον, "iron-hard war", is to the frozen quality of statues.

19-20. μακρὰ μοι αὐτόθεν ἄλμαθ' ὑποσκάπτοι τις: αὐτόθεν refers to Aigina; Pindar is about to commence his uninhibited praise of the island and its heroes. It also refers to the leap—unlike a standing and immovable statue—which is to be made by the poet: "Let someone dig me a broad pit for jumping." He is not confined to the same base, ἐπ' αὐτᾶς.

20. ἔχω γονάτων ἐλαφρόν ὀρμάν: Pindar's poetic abilities to praise are like those of an athlete ready to jump, with a spring in his knees. The leap provides a kinetic contrast to the static position he has taken in the previous strophe with regard to the unfavourable mythic material.

21. καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί: "even eagles fly beyond the sea." The verb, πάλλοντι, used of javelins and their flight, and the eagle, symbol of the poet and, by extension, his poetry, is thus about to make its leap, its trajectory to the myth of Peleus, i.e. from Aigina to Thessaly.¹³ Both images are clearly bound to the athletic activities of the games, perhaps as the scholia suggest, the pentathlon. Fennell notes the alliteration of "π".

22-3. πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείνοις αἶειδ' ἐν Παλίῳ | Μοισᾶν δὲ κάλλιστος χορός: The "leap / flight beyond the sea is Mt. Pelion where Peleus' wedding feast was celebrated; κείνοις is generally understood to refer to the Aiakidai who were present. Fogelmark, crediting Dissen [ut olim Cadmo] with being the first to recognize it, thinks that καὶ κείνοις must be an allusion to the wedding of Cadmus and Harmonia, for, he argues, their wedding was the only other [mortal / immortal] union at which the Muses sang,[P.3.86ff.]. He also notes that the wedding of Cadmus is often described in terms that are similar to that of Peleus.¹⁴ But his assumption that the audience, presumably Aiginetan, would have been "unlikely to have missed the point" that this oblique reference is to a fundamental part of Greek mythology is a point not easily made. We can ask why Pindar did not make the allusion more specific, since his recounting of myths that were part of the "elementary knowledge of Greek mythology" regularly contains elements that are both common to and at variance with the perceived canon. Moreover, it is on Mt. Pelion [both here and at P.3.86ff.] that the "most beautiful chorus of the Muses" sings for Peleus and Thetis, whereas it is in seven-gated Thebes [καὶ ἐν ἑπταπύλοισι ἅϊον Θήβαις ὁπόθ' Ἀρμονίαν γάμεν βοῶπιν P.3.90-91] that Harmonia and Cadmus are married.

The point may also be made that Pindar has just previously spoken of his "leap" which he will make over this abundant [μακρά] mythic material, flying like an eagle beyond the sea. The implication of the Muses singing "for them too" is that the poet has heard the Muses and that on this occasion the wedding party heard them as well. πρόφρων indicates the willingness of the Muses, cf. I.4.43.

23-5. ἐν δὲ μέσαις | φόρμιγγ' Ἀπόλλων ἐπτάγλωσσον χρυσέῳ πλάκτρῳ διώκων | ἀγείτο παντοίων νόμων: "in their midst Apollo, pursuing the seven-tongued phorminx with his golden plectrum, leads all the

various songs." Both verbs ἄειδ' and ἀγείτο are imperfect, one which Fennell denotes as "graphic". The description is dynamic, particularly the image of chasing the seven strings of a lyre with a plectrum. The sequence of gutturals " γ, κ, χ " and long "ο" also lend a liveliness to the dance, as does the variety of metre, παντοίων νόμων.¹⁵

25-6. αἱ δὲ πρῶτιστον μὲν ὕμνησαν Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν
Θέτιν | Πηλέα θ' : All things begin from Zeus, a common formula in Greek poetry. This myth / story certainly begins with Zeus as the creative force behind the marriage of Peleus to Thetis. It was a well-known subject in Greek literature, starting with Il.18.84, 24.62-3, *Cypria* [Kinkel fr.2], Hesiod's *Cat.* fr. 81. It is also the subject of the François Vase, which includes other exploits of Peleus' life, and where the singing Muses can be seen as part of the wedding procession [band C]. Pindar describes the wedding elsewhere in N.4.64-68; P.3.90-95; I.8.27-48.

According to the Hesiodic version, Zeus resolves his conflict with Poseidon over Thetis by [see Jennifer March] having her marry a mortal. In another version he reduces her to marriage with a mortal because she refuses his advances—a corollary to which is the later? variant with Thetis raised by Hera and out of loyalty to her adoptive mother refusing to mate with Zeus. Whichever version is original, and I am not sure that it is always necessary with mythological material to determine the primary version, particularly when in this case all versions contain some element of prohibited seduction and deception, it presents a meaningful start to the tale about to be told of Hippolyta's attempted seduction of Peleus. Zeus as the beginning of things mortal and immortal, although a ritual formulation in poetry, is here exploited on two juxtaposed planes. And in turn, Hippolyta's treachery, variegated schemes and efforts to bind or shackle Peleus reflect Thetis' efforts to evade Peleus.¹⁶

26. ὥς τέ νιν ἄβρα Κρηθεῖς Ἰππολύτα δόλῳ πεδᾶσαι: ἄβρα, translated as "elegant" or "delicate" connotes the luxurious, sensual qualities attributed to the Greeks of Asia Minor, and here the seductive powers of Hippolyta.¹⁷ The verb πεδᾶσαι which, as mentioned in the previous note, foretells the way in which Peleus will attempt to trap and restrain Thetis, also speaks to the poet's theme of statuary: Hippolyta, by binding the feet,—πεδᾶσαι >πέδῃ> πέζα [πέδον] "foot; the ground or base of anything"—will immobilize Peleus into a standing statue, in order to contain and possess him.

27-8. ἤθελε ξυνᾶνα Μαγνήτων σκοπὸν | πείσαισ' ἀκοίταν
ποικίλοις βουλευμασιν: ξυνᾶνα, "companion" [Slater]. The general reading

is that the "companion" is Akastos, her husband. Dissen preferred *ξυνᾶνα* to mean 'sodalem et amicum Pelei', the friend and companion of Peleus, i.e. with *πείσαισα* "persuading her husband to be the friend of Peleus." Farnell reflects on whether *ξυνᾶνα* should be as above taken as a predicate with *πείσαισα*, or as a qualifier of *σκοπὸν* with the slightly different sense of the word as "shared, common", thus: "the warder of the Magnesian commonweal." If we accept the first reading, which is less strained than that of Dissen or Farnell, translating *ξυνᾶνα*, which has the additional sense of partner or part proprietor, as "accomplice," then we can observe an interesting feature of these verses that expend so many words in reference to Akastos and his relationship to Hippolyta and the state. *σκοπὸν* is first of all interesting in that apart from its strictly functionary sense of "overseer", embraces the duties of a lesser dignitary in its sense of "look-out," someone given the task of watching or guarding against an ambush or surprise attack. There is a particular irony to this in that Hippolyta effectively deceives her husband about Peleus as a deceiver. Akastos, overseer, does not see the ambush of his wife. *ἀκοίταν*, establishes that it is her husband, lit. "bed-mate" who is persuaded to be an accomplice. The explicit sexual nature of the deception is evident from the words at v. 30-31 *νυμφείας, ἐν λέκτρος, εὐνᾶς*. She persuades with various, shifting schemes, *ποικίλοις βουλευμασιν*, the nature of *ποικίλος* being one of attractive and subtle qualities, which also [*ἄβρᾶ*] contributes to Hippolyta's seductive attributes.

29. *ψεύσαν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον*: She concocted a created, or one might say, made-up, tale of deception. The verb *συνέπαξε* > *συνπύγνυμι* combined with *πεδᾶσαι*, indicates the force of her plans, to both fetter Peleus and to make solid her plan. This action of constraint and fixity contrasts with the changeability of *ποικίλοις* and, implicitly, that of *σεμνὰν Θέτιν*.

30-1. *ὥς ἄρα νυμφείας ἐπείρα κείνος ἐν λέκτρος Ἀκάστου | εὐνᾶς*: The subject of the clause is Peleus, unnamed as *κείνος* who [she claims] "attempted" her sexually. Her marital status is strongly urged by the phrase, *νυμφείας. . ἐν λέκτρος. . εὐνᾶς*. It is interesting to note that both *κείνος* and Ἀκάστου are placed between these maritally-charged words, illustrating and imitating graphically within the text the [alleged] attempt of Peleus to get into Akastos' bed. They also give us a sense of Hippolyta's actual words to her husband, her *ψεύσαν ποιητὸν λόγον*.

31-2. *τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκειν· πολλὰ γὰρ παντὶ θυμῷ | παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν*: The lengthy and complex sentence which has formed the antistrophe

and characterizes Hippolyta's scheme, is now counterpointed by short, direct and relatively uncomplicated statements. *παρφαμένα*, "things said to the side of something," expressions of deceit and beguilement.¹⁸ *λιτάνευεν*, impf. indicating her repeated pleadings with Peleus, addressed to him *παντὶ θυμῷ*, with all her heart. Surely this is put ironically, since it is clear from the previous strophe that Hippolyta is not sincere: she feels no passion for Peleus. The begging or supplicating stance of *λιτάνευεν* is betrayed by the content of her ungodly request. Carnes has noted that only here and at N.8.8 is *λιτανεύω* used to entreat a mortal and not the gods. He rightly observes that Hippolyta represents a disruption of male society and male standards of speech and suggests that *παρφαμένα* denotes not the insincerity but impropriety of her words.¹⁹

Importantly this wordiness or over-articulation on the part of Hippolyta exposes a deeper meaning to the gnomic injunction at v.18 where silence is the wisest thing for a man to contemplate.

32. τοῖο δὲ ὄργαν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι: Turyn and Snell-Maehler follow Hermann's *τοῖο δ' ὄργαν* which earlier [Hermann ap Heyne:1798] he observes "non est mutandum." Hermann's emendation is to avoid the "intolerable" [Farnell] hiatus that occurs otherwise. Other editors attempt to avoid the hiatus, proposing *τοῦ μὲν* [Boeckh]; *τοῦ δ' ὑπ'* [Bergk, from P.10.60 ἔρως ὑπεκνίσε, Boeckh's reading]; *τοῦ δ' ἄρ'* [Rauchenstein, Fennell]. Those who, like Bury, accept the mss. reading, *τοῦ δὲ ὄργαν*, consider that *ὄργαν* was preceded by a digamma. The evidence for this is somewhat slim, but Bury proffers the adjective *ἀόργητος*; Schroeder, the Homeric hero, *Λυκόφοργον*. Farnell resolves the problem, declaring the digammatic evasion of the hiatus unacceptable, by transposing *κνίζον* with *ὄργαν*.

These judgments and scholarly considerations overlook one possible explanation for such an "intolerable" hiatus and, as is often the case, embody a discussion of philological issues rather than poetic expression. Peleus is here "stung, scratched, provoked" to anger, or, as Stern favours, "passion."²⁰ The words which Hippolyta uses are *αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι*, "bold", "repugnant". In fact, although I do not agree with Stern's conclusions, I must agree that the words, *ὄργαν* and *κνίζον*, characterize a strong emotional response of Peleus and are central to an understanding of his response to Hippolyta's solicitation. *κνίζω*, "prick; distress" [Slater] indicates that some physical pain is experienced. This is confirmed by all the meanings that range within "provoke, sting, prick and scratch." What could be more appropriate to such pain than a hiatus, especially one

that is intolerable? It must represent that quick intake of breath that Peleus took hearing the shameless proposals of his would-be seductress.

33-4. εὐθὺς δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν, ξεινίου πατρὸς χόλαν | δείσαις: His rejection is immediate: εὐθὺς; ἀπανάνατο > ἀπαναίνομαι: ἀπηνήνομην, he refused utterly. His refusal being motivated by the fear of the anger of Zeus Xenios brings us back to the murder of Phocus, since that incident too appears in the context of *xenia*, first antistrophe, v.8, φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν. The image there is that of Peleus and Telamon standing by the altar of Zeus with their hands outstretched—a ritual stance of supplication. Furthermore because this picture of the brothers' prayerful attitude directly precedes their unspoken/unspeakable deed of murder, it articulates perfectly with this mythic event in that Peleus is confronted with the opportunity, if not the temptation, to commit another crime against Zeus, against divine law. As Stern puts it: "Finally the point is illustrated by a clear instance of *Ringkomposition*. The Phocus episode is introduced by a group portrait of three brothers offering prayer at the altar of Zeus; the deadly sequel is, of course, known. Following the Hippolyta episode a parallel group portrait appears."²¹ The εὐφρονες ἴλαι of v.38 will welcome Poseidon to the isthmus.

34-5. ὁ δ' εὖ φράσθη κατένευσέν τέ οἱ ὀρσινεφῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεύς: Zeus considered it well, εὖ φράσθη, and nodded "yes", κατένευσέν. Zeus, from his kingly heights grants a marriage to Peleus quickly, ἐν τάχει, the speed of which responds to that of Peleus' refusal, εὐθὺς, immediately. We should also note that ὀρσινεφῆς is a hapax.

35-6. ὥστ' ἐν τάχει ποντίαν χρυσαλακάτων τινὰ Νηρείδων πράξειν ἄκοιτιν γαμβρὸν Ποσειδάωνα πείσαις: The promise is that Zeus will make, πράξειν, a sea creature, from among the Nereiadai of the golden distaffs, a mate to Peleus. Peleus' marriage to a Nereid provides a form of closure to the life of Peleus and in a sense replaces Phocus, son of a Nereid, whom Peleus has murdered and thus offers regeneration. The words ἄκοιτιν . . . πείσαις recalls that of v. 28, πείσαισ' ἀκοίταν, giving another turn to the narrative and therefore allowing us to recognize this as a reward to Peleus for his righteous refusal of Hippolyta's test of his virtue. It is of course Poseidon who is persuaded; he is γαμβρὸν to the Nereidai because of his marriage to Amphitrite. The adjective χρυσαλακάτων is remarkable and indeed reflects the earlier description of the Nereidai at v.7, χρυσεῶν Νηρηίδων. The distaffs that are golden implies weaving in gold. Robbins has suggested that since gold has an enduring quality this may be

taken to mean that the excellence that is spun enduringly from generation to generation within the Aiakidai has as its source the maternal bloodline.²² While it is true that there are several references to mothers and to the maternal qualities of the island of Aigina, there is perhaps a different motive for the golden association with the Nereidai at this juncture. At vv.23-25, it is Apollo who, with his golden plectrum, leads the chorus of Muses in their celebration of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. There follows Peleus' rejection of Hippolyta. Here we re-enter a cause of celebration, with Poseidon as the god whose arrival is sung and it is fitting that this celebration be preceded by the gold of the Nereidai for their brother-in-law.

37. ὅς Αἰγᾶθεν ποτὶ κλειτὰν θαμὰ νίσεται Ἴσθμὸν Δωρίαν: Αἰγᾶθεν is understood to be the Aegae, Il.8.203, of Achaea, but as Farnell suggests, it may also be the Euboean city of the same name which Pindar has in mind. The Dorian Isthmus is Corinth, the Isthmian games being held there in honour of Poseidon.

38. ἔνθα μιν εὐφρονες ἴλαι σὺν καλάμοιο βοᾷ θεὸν δέκονται: Od.6.48 is cited as an example of double accusatives, μιν and θεὸν. Farnell suggests that the phrase θεὸν δέκονται, might be read as "give him a god's welcome." The beautiful chorus of Muses at vv.22-23 are πρόφρων; here the crowds are εὐφρονες; there Apollo plays the phorminx; here we have the "shout of the reed."

40. πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενῆς ἔργων περὶ πάντων: The verb κρίνει has here both the sense "distinguishes" and "judges". In the context of wrestling,—a struggle of daring strength of limbs—πότμος also affords the double meaning of "fall" and "destiny". The gnomic statement that inherited ability decides the destiny/fall of every deed is immediately amplified in the next line.

41-2. τὸ δ' Αἰγίναθε δῖς, Εὐθύμενες, Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσιν πίτνων ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων: Euthymenes is named along with Pytheas and Phylakidas as co-victors in I.6.62. Αἰγίναθε δῖς is Eduard Schwartz's emendation [Turyn, Snell-Maehler] for mss. [BD] Αἰγίνα θεᾶς which, although confirmed by the scholiast, is unmetrical, a dactyl being present in the corresponding verses.²³

What is particular to this verse is the physicality of the imagery related to Euthymenes' winning at the games. The falling sense of πότμος is made explicit in the phrase ἐν ἀγκώνεσσιν πίτνων, falling into the arms, embrace of Victory. This idea is in large measure a legitimate embrace like that of the marriage offered to Peleus, sanctioned by the gods and one of physical union. The physical and tactile

quality of victory is emphatically stated, ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων, "you once touched splendid songs," and the sensual dimension of victory underscored by ἔψαυσας which unites the physicality of wrestling, σθένει γυίων ἐρίζονται θρασεί [39], and the idea of a tactile, concrete reward for winning. The adjective ποικίλος, enhancing the visual and concrete aspect of the music of praise, and therefore suggesting that the poem is more than mere words and song, ties in this praise of a victor with the imagery of the opening strophe. Since ποικίλος also occurs in the context of Hippolyta's deception of Peleus, it completes even further the cycle of ancestral community.

43. ἦτοι μεταίξαντα καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει κείνου δόμοσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέας: This line, which is here given as the mss. have it, has received much comment.²⁴ The verb μεταίξαντα, "followed after," as well as the subject, τεὸς μάτρως. . Πυθέας are the primary cause of trouble: it appears to make Pytheas the maternal uncle of Euthymenes—a difficult and, as far as we know, unlikely situation. The scholiasts however explain that μήτρως can mean both maternal uncle and anyone related to someone on the mother's side: μήτρως ἢ ὁ μήτρος ἀδελφὸς ἢ ὁ κατὰ μητέρα συγγενής· χρῆται οὕτως ὁ Πίνδαρος. Pindar certainly uses this word in both senses and here I reproduce Slater's catalogue: O.9.63, mother's father; N.4.80, I.6.62, I.7.24, uncle on the mother's side; O.6.77, N.10.37, N.11.37, Paean.7c b.2, ancestor on mother's side. Although the line is not completely resolved of all its problems this initial difficulty is alleviated if we read the vocative, Πυθέα [Mingarelli], thereby designating Euthymenes as the maternal uncle of Pytheas. This is the preference of most editors. If we examine I.6.62, ἀγλαοὶ παῖδες τε καὶ μάτρως, which refers to lines 57-59 of the same ode where Phylakidas, the victor to whom the ode is dedicated, Pytheas, and Euthymenes are all named, Φυλακιδᾶ γὰρ ἦλθον ὦ Μοῖσα ταμίας/Πυθέα τε κώμων Εὐθυμένει τε, what seems clear is that they are all related to Lampon, and what is certain from I.6 and I.5 where Pytheas is praised as the trainer or coach of Phylakidas is that they are brothers, and that Pytheas is the elder. What is not clear is Euthymenes' relationship apart from the paternal side of things but it is certain that one of them is μάτρως.

If we read the line as it is in the mss. it is addressed to Euthymenes: "Surely even now Pytheas, your relative {on your mother's side} glorifies his clan of the same bloodline that has followed after that one [sc.Peleus]." If we read it with the first phase of emendation, Πυθέα, voc: "Surely, Pytheas, even now your maternal uncle glorifies the clan and same bloodline as having followed after that one

[sc.Peleus]." The main difference between the two is the addressee. The other emendation, μεταίξαις σὲ [Snell-Maehler] for μεταίξαντα, being added for additional clarity that Euthymenes is the one that followed after Peleus.

The only objection that I have to the emendation is that it does not make clear sense within the context of the ode. If indeed Pytheas is now addressed, why does Pindar then go on to discuss Euthymenes' victory saying that Nemea now stands firm for him and that he defeated those of his same age. This cannot easily be meant to refer to Euthymenes. The Nemean victory alluded to is that celebrated in I.6., yet it is one in which both participated. Moreover, at vv.48-50, Pytheas is clearly addressed in the second person, ἴσθι, γλυκεῖάν τοι μενάνδρου σὺν τύχῃ μόχθων ἀμοιβὰν ἐπαύρεο. What would be the point of reminding Pytheas that his older relative won at Nemea?

In my opinion it makes more sense that Euthymenes be addressed and that Pytheas be the subject of this verse. The point is that there is a line of victors related to Peleus and the Aiakidai, κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος. And it is Pytheas' present, καὶ νῦν, victory that glorifies the continuity of that inheritance, that it has followed after directly. Thus we have the sequence of thought: inherited abilities determine destiny; Euthymenes, you are an example: you won twice at Nemea; and now Pytheas' present victory is a proof of the inherited qualities of the ethnos, that they all belong to the same ancestral root.

44. ἃ Νεμέα μὲν ἄραρεν μείς τ' ἐπιχώριος, ὃν φίλας Ἀπολλων: ἄραρεν, "fitted" "fixed" is a verb suited to the general image of building. The month is Delphinios and hence "one which Apollo loved."

45-6. αἰλικας δ' ἐλθόντας οἶκοι τ' ἐκράτει | Νίσου τ' ἐν εὐαγκεῖ λόφῳ: "in the beautiful glens of Nisos," the standard rendering for Pindar's unusual formulation. εὐαγκῆς means a "beautiful bend or hollow", primarily the bend or hollow of one's arm and, by extension, the glen or hollow of a mountainous region. What directs us to question this translation is the juxtaposition εὐαγκεῖ λόφῳ—"beautiful hollow ridge." λόφος also has more than one meaning: the back of the neck; the neck; a ridge of ground or brow of a mountain; the crest of a helmet. Together they describe two separate things: a depression and a height. Why would the poet combine them? Is he merely describing in poetic terms a mountain with its base and peak as "beautifully hollowed"? What is suggested by their juxtaposition is perhaps something more. The lines pertain to the competition at Megara where Euthymenes won against those of his own age in the pancration. The beautiful bend of an arm and ridge of a neck

might well describe such a competition. The context of a pancration, and, more certainly, the wrestling match that was involved, is more likely to call up such a particular combination of words than a mountain glen.

46–7. χαίρω δ' ὅτι | ἐσλοῖσι μάρναται πέρι πᾶσα πόλις: "I rejoice that the whole city strives for noble prizes." Up to this point, from the beginning of the third triad, the various victories have been celebrated according to their geographical location. In fact, place take precedence over the events in this final triad: Aegae, Corinth, Aigina, Nemea, Megara, Athens, Epidauros. We might also observe that Pytheas is only mentioned in relation to his uncle; the other names that surround him—Euthymenes, Menander, Themistios,—and the record of their victories accompany him. It is curious that a song of victory to one victor should be shared by so many. But this may seem more reasonable when we recognize that Pindar's program of celebration to the Aiakidai and to Aigina invokes the past and present participation of its citizens more strongly than his odes to other patrons. In light of this consideration, the present invocation of the entire polis strives is perfectly appropriate.

48–9. ἴσθι, γλυκεῖάν τοι Μενάνδρου σὺν τύχῃ μόχθων ἀμοιβάν | ἐπαύρεο: The sentence begins with an imperative, ἴσθι, "know," and ends with ἐπαύρεο, "you partook of, shared in." The object, γλυκεῖάν ἀμοιβάν, or sweet exchange for the labours of Menander marks the degree to which victory is shared. The Aiginetans have a victor thanks to the labour of an Athenian trainer—ἀμοιβάν can be read as exchange or recompense. The phrase σὺν τύχῃ serves to distinguish that part of victory which belongs to divine participation.

49. χρῆ δ' ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν τέκτον' ἀθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν: That Menander be styled as a τέκτων, builder, is appropriate to the structure of the ode as a whole, reflecting the opening statement that the poet is a sculptor of statues that move. It is also relevant to Pindar's efforts to "build" the victor's status as a member of the Aiginetan community of victors at home and at large. It is difficult for the ear to understand the words Ἀθανᾶν and ἀθληταῖσιν to express, as Bury puts it, "manifest paronomasia": their only aural similarity resides in the phoneme "ath." This final epode in fact travels far from Pytheas' victory at Nemea to that of Themistios' at Epidauros and in so doing expands the theme of victory and celebration. To cite Athens at this juncture sets the tone and site for the expansion. Like the moving statue this is a victory that does not stay unmoving on its base, Aigina, but scans the compass of the Greek world.

50. εἰ δὲ θεμίστιον ἵκεις, ὥστ' ἀείδειν, μηκέτι ῥίγει: "If you came for Themistios, to sing his praises, then be no longer stiff/ still with cold." The verb ῥιγέω means literally "to shiver with cold; to grow cold". This sense, better than the more common and prosaic rendering of "hold back," fortifies the theme of the initial lines of the ode and marks the mobility with which Pindar has invested his ἀγάλμα. An unmoving statue is easily equated with cold and the idea of something frozen. Here, as in the first strophe, the poet enjoins himself.

50-51. δίδοι | φωνάν, ἀνὰ δ' ἱστίᾳ τείνον πρὸς ζυγὸν καρχασίου: This and the following lines echo those of vv.2-8. δίδοι φωνάν is a reflex of διαγγέλοισα [v.3]; ἀνὰ δ' ἱστίᾳ τείνον πρὸς ζυγὸν καρχασίου is a parallel of ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ. . . στείχ' [v. 2]; as does the phrase [52], πύκταν τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίῳ φθέγγξαι ἐλεῖν Ἐπιδαύρῳ διπλόαν νικῶντ' ἀρετάν serve as a double for v.5, νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον; and as προθύροισιν δ' Αἰακοῦ ἀνθέων ποιάεντα φέρε στεφανώματα σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισιν parallels οὐπω γένυσι φαίνων τέρειναν ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὁπώραν. . . ἀπὸ χρυσεᾶν Νηρηίδων Αἰακίδας ἐγέραιρεν ματρόπολιν τε, φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν [vv.6-8]. The present lines reflect the imagery—ships setting sail, the victory of the pancration, the garland that has been won, the coming into the home of Aigina, the imagery of vegetation and growth, and the matching gold of the Nereidai and the Charitai.

The imagery of sailing serves to redirect the ode to its destination of Aigina, cf. v.9 where Aigina is characterized as a land of brave men famous for sailing, and like a ship returning from a voyage to foreign lands, shifting from Athens and Epidauros, the poem now sails home. Pindar makes this a climactic ending: it is spoken in one unbroken sentence. The return is swift and direct.

54. προθύροισιν δ' Αἰακοῦ ἀνθέων ποιάεντα φέρε στεφανώματα σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισιν: The second imperative φέρε, Wilamowitz' emendation for the infinitive φέρειν, gives force and drive to this conclusion. We are led to the very doors of the Aiakidai, προθύροισιν δ' Αἰακοῦ, and the flowers that are to adorn it.

1. Steiner, D., "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti'," *HSCP* 95, 1993, 159-180 and "Moving Images: Fifth-Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure," *CA* 17, 1998, 123-149.
2. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare*, §315, p.251.
3. Of the four examples of consecutive ὥστε + infinitive clauses three are in this ode, v.1, 35, 50. The fourth, O.9.74.
4. Pfeiffer's comment 140f., [Pfeiffer, I.L., *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III & Pythian VIII*, Leiden 1999.] that the impf. νίκη is without focus-function is beside the point and moreover argues for a focused present functioning within the context of a herald's announcement (He wins!).
5. Cf. Pfeiffer, 104 ad loc. who mistakenly identifies this locus as Pindar's only use of the adjective for a mortal. Telamon is certainly not a god.
6. Segal, C., "Arrest and Movement: Pindar's Fifth Nemean," *Hermes* 102, 1974, 397-411. p.399.
7. Pfeiffer ad loc. reads ματέρι and identifies this as a dative-object of φαίνων, "to his mother he does not yet show a beard." He adds that γένουσι is also a locative. His argument against the usual accusative reading of ματέρ' is that "there is no exact parallel for a purely metaphorical usage of μάτηρ. Although the examples of metaphorical use are certainly in the vocative, e.g. N.3.1, of the muse as mother of poets, O.8.1, of Olympia as mother of athletic contests, P.8.98, of Aigina, and I.1.1, of Thebes as Pindar's mother, and have in common for the most part the personification of places this does not argue against the metaphor. The qualification at Paean 9.2 of the rays of the sun as mother of the eyes and at fr.6b, μάτηρ ἀκοντων, although this phrase is without any verifiable context, nevertheless present further evidence of metaphorical use. Apart from spoiling a perfectly good and striking poetic metaphor, I also suspect that identifying both "mother" and "cheeks" as datives risks at the very least leading the listener to confuse the two.
8. Cf. N.3.2, πολυξένα; N.4.23, ξένιον ἄστυ.
9. Cf. Paean 6.125-6, Aigina is "the shining star of Zeus Hellanios," ὦ Διὸς Ἑλλανίου φαεινὸν ἄπτηρον.
10. Op. cit. 400.
11. Cf. Hummel, op.cit. 404-5, §515.
12. Segal, op.cit. 402 notes this "face not showing" itself is in contrast to v.6, the cheeks of young Pytheas. It presents a point of stasis in the ode which is continually marked by passages of kinesis.
13. Stoneman, R., "The Theban Eagle," *CQ* n.s.26, 1976, 195, applies the image of eagle to the victor and that it is the victor's fame which flies. Hubbard, T. K., *The Pindaric Mind*, Leiden 1985, 152, recognizes the eagle to represent the preeminence of the victor and poet.
14. Fogelmark, S., "καὶ κείνοις: Pindar, *Nemean* 5.22," *Arktouros* 1979, 71-80. p.78nn.19 & 20.
15. See Pfeiffer op. cit., 138-9 for an informative description and catalogue of plectra to be seen on vase paintings.
16. See March, J.R., *The Creative Poet. Studies in the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry*, *BICS* Suppl. 49, London 1987, 3-26 for a full discussion of the myths related to Peleus and Thetis.
17. Cf. Kurke, L., "The Politics of ἀβροσύνη in Archaic Greece," *CA* 11.1, 1992, 91-120.
18. Cf. N.8.32, πάρφασις, P.9.42-3, παρφάμεν; O.7.65, παρφάμεν.
19. Carnes, J.S., "The Ends of the Earth: Fathers, Ephebes and Wild Women in *Nemean* 4 and 5," *Arethusa* 29, 1996, esp. 43-45.
20. Stern, J. "The Structure of Pindar's 'Nemean' 5," *CPh* 66, 1971, 169-173.171
21. Op. cit. 170.
22. Robbins, E.I. "Nereids with Golden distaffs: Pindar, *Nem.* 5," *QUCC* 54-55, 1987, 33.
23. Several other proposals have been made: Αἰγίνα θεοῦ [Er. Schmid] which preserves the dactylic foot but disobey's the rule [Monk's] that θεός is not fem. when applied to a proper name, Νίκας. As Fennell [Cookeyley] notes, this rule has exceptions, notably Soph.*Ant.* 800: θεός Ἀφροδίτα.
24. Gerber, D.E., *Emendations in Pindar 1513-1972*, Amsterdam 1976, 109-110, lists thirty different emendations to this line.

NEMEAN 8

1. Ὡρα πότνια, κάρυξ Ἀφροδίτας ἀμβροσιᾶν φιλοτάτων: Ὡρα, lit., "time, hour," and by extension, "youthfulness," is here characterized as a divinity with the title πότνια. Pindar does not elsewhere extend this title to an abstract quality: he applies it to a nymph, Libya [P.9.55]; to one of the Graces, Aglaia [O.14.13]; to the Muse [N.3.1]; to Persephone [fr. 37]; to a ray of the sun [Paeon 9.10]; and to Aphrodite [P.4.213.]. κάρυξ further qualifies Hora as a functionary of the goddess of love, "herald of the ambrosial embraces of Aphrodite," much in the same way as Eros is styled as her assistant.¹

This opening of the ode sets the tone: one of intimacy and sensuality. The phrase ἀμβροσιᾶν φιλοτάτων is unusual combining as it does the embraces of lovers and ambrosia, the food of immortals. As such it offers the notion that love is of a divine order.

2. ἃ τε παρθενίοις παίδων τ' ἐφίζοις γλεφάροις: Youthfulness is characterized as sitting upon the eyes of young girls and boys. Yet, if we look more closely, παρθενίοις is, by its case, directly connected with the eyes; παίδων τε then, by its different ending, although young boys are understood grammatically to have youthfulness also sitting upon their eyes, is made distinct from girls. The implication seems to be that the eyes of young maidens are what act as the attracting force. The word ἀνάγκη, necessity, reflects the magical power of love as it is known within the realm of love charms and potions:² the notion of attraction as a physical force acting upon an individual is prevalent in all the ancient literature of magical incantations and spells. This forceful aspect of Aphrodite's power is further indicated by the verb βαστάζεις which gives the active sense that one is attracted or drawn to another by a force that is physically not one's own.

3. τὸν μὲν ἡμέροις ἀνάγκης χερσὶ βαστάζεις, ἕτερον δ' ἑτέροις: βαστάζεις, "you handle, touch" with gentle hands of necessity the one, but with different hands another. The idea that sexual desire has the ability to touch physically is reflected in the fragment of Alcman fr. 58.1-2: Ἀφροδίτα μὲν οὐκ ἔστι, μάργος δ' Ἔρως οἷα <παῖς> παῖσδει, / ἄκρ' ἐπ' ἄνθη καθαίνων, ἃ μή μοι θίγῃς, τῷ κυπαιρίσκῳ. Its ungentle nature is also reflected in the poetry of Sappho fr.47.1-2. and Ibycus fr. 286.6-12 where it is compared to a violent

wind.³ Ibycus fr. 287 also speaks of the inescapable nets of Aphrodite,⁴ and Anacreon fr. 413 attributes even rougher handling to Eros⁵:

Pindar seems to be deflecting onto Hora some of the traditional qualities of Eros. That physical desire is reflected in these lines can be understood from the physicality of "sitting on" and "gentle hands."

4-5. ἀγαπατὰ δὲ καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα πρὸς ἔργον ἕκαστον | τῶν ἀρειόνων ἐρώτων ἐπικρατεῖν δύνασθαι: ἀγαπατὰ, "it is desirable" sets this sentence in apposition to the ἀμβροσιῶν φιλότατοι of the first; καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα πρὸς ἔργον ἕκαστον then apposes ἀνάγκας, the necessity which acts between the gentle hands and the "other" kind, by its warning that timeliness and not wandering from the venture at hand enables one to master the very best desires. The sense of parallel is further developed by the parallels between ἕτερον δ' ἑτέραις and πρὸς ἔργον ἕκαστον, and Ἀφροδίτας ἀμβροσιῶν φιλοτάτων and τῶν ἀρειόνων ἐρώτων. In both cases the sensual delight of desire is tempered: by the hands of Hora and necessity and by the measured quality of nobler desires. The word καιρός resonates with ὦρα: the right moment, the sense of time within the context of one's life is always uppermost in the poet's universe. The verb ἐπικρατεῖν which bears the sense "to master," "to gain mastery over," invites us to think that the nobler desires are those that relate to victory in the games. The cautionary phrase καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα conveys the idea that inattention will cause one to miss the moment that is propitious.

6. οἶοι καὶ Δίος Αἰγίνας τε λέκτρον ποιμένες ἀμφεπόλησαν Κυπρίας δώρων: The desires of Aphrodite are here characterized as shepherds of her gifts. ἀμφεπόλησαν adds to the shepherding quality as they surround or hover around to serve. The desire of Zeus for the nymph Aigina is thus an exemplum of the nobler or better passions of v.5.

7-8. ἔβλασεν δ' υἱὸς Οἰνῶνας βασιλεύς χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς ἄριστος: Aiakos is the best χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς. It is curious that Pindar uses ἔβλασεν for the birth of Aiakos, a verb which generally refers to the growth of plants. On the only other occasion it occurs in Pindar, O.7.69, it describes the island of Rhodes [the rose] rising out of the sea. In N.7.77-79 the "lily flower which the Muse has taken up from the sea bottom" is in all likelihood a reference to the island of Aigina, so we might perhaps reasonably assume that Aigina by her ancestral name of Oinone is here being spoken of as a flower.

8. πολλά νιν πολλοὶ λιτάνευον ἰδεῖν: "Many prayed many times to behold him." The verb λιτάνευον is remarkable: it is normally used of those

supplicating the gods and here suggests forcefully that Aiakos is possessed of divine qualities. The phrase itself, πολλά νιν πολλοὶ, with the pronoun surrounded by the "many," plastically re-enacts the bustle of begging and by the very placement of the words, reproduces the physical difficulty those seeking him had to see him.

9. ἀβοατὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἄωτοι περιναιεταόντων: ἀβοατὶ, "without sound/ shouting" means at first that there was no herald to announce to the heroes the wishes of their leader, and, by implication that the will of a leader such as Aiakos was so well-known to the surrounding subjects that he did not need to call or summon them. On another level of interpretation however, ἀβοατὶ has a meaning relevant to the ode itself: Aiakos has not been named thus far, and will not be, until the poet himself as suppliant calls upon him at v. 13. This may serve to dramatize the poet's words and action of supplication and also serve to distinguish the past from the present as that which is silent from that which is audible.

ἡρώων ἄωτοι περιναιεταόντων: The word ἄωτοι continues the image of flowering, the "flowers" of heroes again encircling, περιναιεταόντων, "dwelling around" Aiakos, who is himself the flower of Aigina. Taking the image more fully, as it is expressed in the verses that follow, it becomes apparent that the encompassing flowers of heroes is like the fillet or garland to be given to Aiakos by the poet.

10. ἤθελον κείνου γε πείθεσθ' ἀναξίαις ἐκόντες: "they came willing, persuaded by his worthy commands."

11-12. οἳ τε κρανααῖς ἐν Ἀθάναισιν ἄρμοζον στρατόν | οἳ τ' ἀνὰ Σπάρταν Πελοπηιάδαι: Although the Pelopids were not known to be contemporary with Aiakos and, as Fennell [& Bury] suggests, Pindar is perhaps deriving this from an unknown source, the point is still made that the suppliants came from the north and south of Aigina. The sites of Athens and Sparta hence form a sort of geographical garland surrounding Aigina. The adjective, κρανααῖς, rocky, induces this image of a towering or looming land of Athens as does the preposition ἀνὰ in ἀνὰ Σπάρταν with Sparta.⁶ This image is enhanced by the next verse, Λυδῖαν μίτραν. . . πεποικιλμέναν, which clearly describes a garland as a richly fashioned headdress.

The words ἄρμοζον στρατόν fix the nature of the garland as union of men, the neighbouring heroes who came without summons to Aiakos and Aigina. We should observe the careful modulation of the garland as it passes from a geo-political to a personal-poetic key.

13-15. **ἱκέτας Αἰακοῦ σεμνῶν γονάτων πολίος θ' ὑπὲρ φίλας |
ἀστῶν θ' ὑπὲρ τῶνδ' ἄπτομαι φέρων | μίτρην καναχηδὰ
πεποικιλμέναν**: The poet closes the circle of the fillet as he himself clasps the knees of Aiakos. The present and the past are thus connected in seamless fashion with the actual "touch" of the poet. The poet's characterizing himself as a suppliant links him with the many who prayed, πολλοὶ λιτάνευον, to see Aiakos. The explicitly physical action of the verb ἄπτομαι dramatizes this as an actual act, giving a theatrical flair to the fictitious situation. Moreover as a gesture it connects with the opening lines that characterize Aphrodite as the herald of ἀμβροσίων φιλοτάτων. The poet's embrace is one of love and friendship. The Lydian fillet is described as πεποικιλμέναν and καναχηδὰ both to emphasize the visual aspect of the tableau vivant and its musical properties. This latter is in direct contrast with the earlier [v.9] silence of ἄβοατὶ. The word καναχηδὰ occurs once elsewhere in Pindar to describe the sound of flutes and auloi and suggests that Λυδίαν may also be a musical reference to the Lydian mode, which was accompanied by flutes.⁷ We should also note the musicality of the line with its repetition of "k", "l" and "n", the omnipresence of "a", of the "rhyming" endings in -an, and its formal cadence present in the progression of words of lengthening syllables.

16. **Δείνιος δισσῶν σταδίων καὶ πατρὸς Μέγα Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα**: δισσῶν, "twice" may refer to the diaulos [as Farnell suggests following the scholia] or to the two foot- races of father and son. The gnome of the next verse persuades us to the latter: the happiness that has been "planted" [φυτευθεῖς] suggests a quality that is hereditary and accentuates the generational tie. Moreover, the fact that both Deinias and Megas share in the praise within the strictures of a line of poetry corresponds to the "variegated fillet" of the previous one: father and son are woven together in the poet's praise as concretely [Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα] as the μίτρην πεποικιλμέναν.

17. **σὺν θεῷ γὰρ τοι φυτευθεῖς ὄλβος ἀνθρώποισι παρμονώτερος**: φυτευθεῖς corresponds to ἔβλασεν, v.7, and thus serves to link Deinias and father to Aiakos. The phrase, σὺν θεῷ γὰρ τοι, "for indeed by the god's help" provides a easy allusion to Zeus as both the founder of Aigina and as the source of all Aiginetan success. The comparative παρμονώτερος, from παρμονος, "abiding" has implications that are significant. The first is that ὄλβος, which can mean "happiness, bliss, blessedness, or wealth" is more enduring for mortals if it is brought about by a god; the second, that ὄλβος which comes from achieving great things through divine sanction, is more lasting than the joys of Aphrodite and Eros.

[Cf. P.3.105-106; ὄλβος οὐκ ἐς μακρὸν ἀνδρῶν ἔρχεται]. This second is justified by the context of the ode's beginning and the next verse.

ὄλβος and πλοῦτος are often found in association in Pindar, [e.g. O.1; 2; P.1; 3; 4; I.3] and it was an archaic convention that happiness, at least in part, manifested itself with material prosperity.

18. ὅσπερ καὶ Κινύραν ἔβρισε πλούτῳ ποντία ἔν ποτε Κύπρῳ: Kinyras, the mythical king of Cyprus was a priest of Aphrodite and known to be rich⁸. He is here "weighed down" with wealth. This verse connects itself with the opening and equates wealth of gold to erotic desire and sensual delights.

19. ἴσταμαι δὴ ποσσὶ κούφοις, ἀμπνέων τε πρὶν τι φάμεν: The poet now presents us with another tableau vivant: poised in the stance typical of the runner—and therefore associating himself with the victor, Deinias, as earlier he associates himself with the suppliants to Aiakos—he is about to "run" on the track of the Aiakid past. He stands on light feet [ποσσὶ κούφοις] and takes a deep breath just as a runner might at the starting line. This statement functions to dramatize the transition from the previous material of the ode, from victor to myth. Pindar often uses such athletic imagery for transitional purposes.⁹

More importantly it offers a contrast to the preceding image of Kinyras who was heavy with wealth, and by this contrast of images Pindar shifts not only the subject matter, but places himself in some measure as the harbinger of wealth of both kinds: material and spiritual—or poetic.

20-21. πολλὰ γὰρ πολλᾷ λέλεκται, νεαρὰ δ' ἐξευρόντα δόμεν βασάνῳ | ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος: "Many tales have been told in many versions /forms but to give new ideas to the touchstone for testing—that is entirely dangerous." The initial πολλὰ γὰρ πολλᾷ λέλεκται recalls in some measure the πολλά νιν πολλοὶ λιτάνευον at v.8 and provides a further link between the poet's narration and the prayers or supplicatory requests of Aiakos' neighbouring nobles. The expression δόμεν βασάνῳ ἐς ἔλεγχον, "to give to the test on the touchstone" is a curious one. It describes the assaying of gold or other precious metals by rubbing them on a *lapis Lydius* and comparing the respective marks they left. It is reminiscent of the whetstone in O.6.82, δόξαν ἔχω τιν' ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ λιγυρᾷς ἀκόνας, and the anvil in P.1.86, ἀψευδεῖ δὲ πρὸς ἄκμονι χάλκευε γλώσσαν. These passages share a similar tactile oxymoron in that the soft and sensual tongue is being conditioned by something normally used for metal. The tongue is here however implied: it is the the νεαρὰ δ' ἐξευρόντα that are to be tested.

These words have nevertheless caused some consternation to scholars. Is the poet referring to the originality of his ideas, of his mythological data or to something else? Most scholars have interpreted it to be a reflection of new elements in the narrative of Ajax, but are not able to agree as to just what those new elements are. Miller argues that by νεαρά Pindar refers to neither Ajax nor Kinyras but to the victor whose praise will provoke envy.¹⁰ He argues that νεαρά as opposed to παλαιά are, as new to ancient themes, more relevant and therefore more emotionally involving for the audience and that envy is more likely to be aroused in them by elements which are contemporary.¹¹ Moreover, ἐξευρίσκω is used to describe the newness or originality of epinikia at P.1.60 and Bakk. fr.5.4.¹²

In favour of the argument that the νεαρά ἐξευρόντα refer to the victory song itself is the fact that the myth of the judgement of arms and Ajax's subsequent suicide alluded to in the following lines does not indicate any deviation. It is in fact alluded to without details to argue for any new version. Furthermore, one might But one may ask, what is so entirely dangerous, ἅπας κίνδυνος, about new "material" whether by this is meant new mythic treatment or a new song of praise?

Nisetich argues more convincingly in my opinion that νεαρά cannot reasonably apply exclusively to the victor and the material of this poetic celebration, first because every epinikion composed to a victor is of necessity new and second, even more persuasively, because it is very unlikely that the poet would suggest to an audience that their envy of both poet and victor an anticipated emotional response. Moreover, to use the exemplum of an Aiginetan hero in order to illustrate such expectations is borders on the outrageous.¹³

While I must confess to not having any radical solution to the perhaps deliberate ambiguity of Pindar's language, I do think that the context is the only way in which to examine and come to a modicum of understanding of such lines. Within the immediate context, Kinyras is weighed down by wealth which, compounded by his association with Aphrodite who is figures in the opening strophe and again in the following strophe with Zeus and Aigina, implies that his prosperity was both emotional and material. Moreover, with the reference to the βασάνος it is only reasonable to suppose that the poet is specifying gold as the metal to be tested.¹⁴ This is confirmed by v.27 where Aias is said to have met death deprived of his golden armour, and at v.37-8, χρυσὸν εὔχονταί, πεδίον δ' ἕτεροι ἀπέραντον.

Gold as a metaphor for the riches of poetic ideas which Pindar possesses is then to be tested for its quality. The line which the gold would have marked on the

touchstone can easily be allied with the image of a runner on a starting line. Moreover, the idea of stone and speaking is also germane to the poet's stated construction of this ode as resonating sculpture, a musical monument of praise, vv.15-16 and vv.46-48, λίθον Μουσαῖον, and the very physicality of the metaphor of the touchstone resonates with the following verses, where words are linked to the experience of tasting.

I don't think it necessary to the poet's intent to specify what exactly the new things are. It is clear that Pindar is catching the listener with an arresting image which will always predominate over construing sense. Moreover, in his rhetorically brilliant condemnation of Odysseus Pindar does indeed employ a number of new-found words, coined for the occasion.

21-22. ὄψον δὲ λόγοι φθονεροῖσιν, | ἄπτεται δ' ἐσλῶν δαί, χερώνεσσι δ' οὐκ ἐρίζει: "Words / narrative accounts are the relish, side-dish of the envious, always seizing on the noble ones but never in conflict with the baser." The initial difficulty is in deciding just what *logos* denotes: what kind of words? poetic expressions? simple truth or falsehood? or criticism?

The general consensus is that this passage refers to the actual performance of the ode and either the conflict that Pindar perceived to exist between himself and other rival poets or the conflict which praise of a victor brings: the "envious" are those poetic or athletic rivals. Carey states "Suddenly, with brusque asyndeton, we are back at the scene of performance" and adds that it serves as a pivot point looking back at the example of Deinias and Aiakos and forward to that of Ajax.¹⁵

A problem with this interpretation is that the envious should consider noble men and the tales of their valour as a side-dish, "relish" [Sl.] "delicacy". In that case what we might ask was the main course for their envy? What could exist to challenge their jealousy more than outstanding figures of myth or athletic prowess? Pindar uses the verb γεύομαι, "to taste" with the sense of tasting or experiencing victory or the ability to win¹⁶: At N.3.42 it describes the man without a firm mind who tastes μυριάων δ' ἀρετῶν. Here the verb, ἄπτεται, "touches," expresses the experience of envy in directly tactile, physical terms. And it should be noted, the poet separates the tasting of noble deeds or stories from the action of conflict by the two different oblique cases.

23. κείνος καὶ Τελαμῶνος δάψεν υἱόν, φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις: The verb δάψεν, "feasted on" clearly continues the theme vv.21-22, and κείνος is understood by most scholars to refer to the φθόνος of the previous line: envy has caused Ajax' death. Carey sees the use of the active ἀμφικυλίσαις with the subject

κείνος, i.e. φθόνος as a definite inditement of Odysseus as murderer in that he murders Ajax with envy.¹⁷

If we accept that λόγοι in this instance is the subject of ἄπτεται and ἐρίζει, λόγος and λόγοι being used as an indefinite singular by Pindar on occasion¹⁸, then we read, "such envy feasted on the son of Telamon."

If we decide however that κείνος refers to Odysseus we have something more striking and increased clarity in the poetry. First of all it eliminates the need to characterize the previous two verses as gnomic. On the contrary, they are very specifically forecasting the circumstances and themes of the story that follows. The sentence κείνος καὶ Τελαμῶνος δάψεν υἱόν, φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις now reads: "Odysseus too feasted on the son of Telamon, once he had rolled him on a sword." The active sense of the verb is thus retained but with Odysseus, κείνος, a term of some contempt and familiarity "that one" as the direct cause of Ajax's death. This not only states a stronger case against Odysseus, undoubtedly the culprit in Pindar's file, but relates the line much more closely in its imagery, action and sense to the "gnomic" lines above. The phrase φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις continues the physical aspect of feasting "tossed onto his sword." The feasting theme is explicit here: Ajax is not "planted" on his sword [as in N.7.26] but rolled on it, like meat on a spit. Furthermore we have a more concrete, tangible interpretation re-enacting the verbs ἄπτεται and ἐρίζει: touching is something that Odysseus does in actuality: he grabs the prize of a noble man and he does not engage in a struggle with an inferior rival. These verbs now more perfectly describe the judgement of arms and Odysseus' unfair winning of them than they do a mere quality of "envy" and the behaviour of the envious. Thence the vv.20-21 are further elucidated: the danger of a test is that of death, ἅπας κίνδυνος. Pindar is thus specific in his delegation of meaning and not merely making a general observation on human failings.

Further related to the theme of feasting is the fact that Ajax is literally without a tongue, ἦ τιν' ἄγλωσσον μέν. His lack of eloquence or words to that effect causes him to be the one who does not enjoy the ὄψον of words.

24. ἦτορ δ' ἄλκιμον, λάθα κατέχει ἐν λυγρῇ νείκει: "Although courageous, oblivion pins him down in a painful struggle." The concept of λάθα, "forgetfulness" or oblivion is an important one—the *raison d' être*—of praise poetry. Without poetic celebration of greatness, we do not remember it. λάθα represents not only the immediate forgetfulness of the Greeks on that day of judgement, but the collective memory of humankind. Ajax exemplifies what happens to the hero who is unsung. ἄγλωσσον describes both the condition of

being forgotten and Ajax's inability to articulate. The adjective λύγρος "deadly" [Sl.] or "mournful" in the company of ἄγλωσσον, λάθα, and κατέχει is evocative of darkness and the Underworld.

25. μέγιστον δ' αἰόλῳ ψεύδει γέρας ἀντέταται: This verse condemns Odysseus as a liar which, although the Homeric tradition qualifies him as a master of deceit, it is Pindar's invention that he won the arms of Achilles by false words and, as expressed in v.26, by secret votes. The word αἰόλος combining the notion of flashing light and speed renders αἰόλῳ ψεύδει as "multi-flashing lie" and contrasts the light and speed of fast-talking Odysseus' with the mute, unseen and unyielding, ἦτορ δ' ἄλκιμον, qualities of Ajax. The verb ἀντέταται, pass. ἀνατείνω, "to hold up, offer" by its direct opposition to κατέχει "hold down" strengthens the counterpoint of contrasts between the two men.

26. κρυφαῖσι γὰρ ἐν ψάφοις Ὀδυσσῇ Δαναοὶ θεράπευσαν: This detail, the hidden or secret votes, underscores the injustice which Ajax experienced. The verb θεράπευσαν allows us to understand that Odysseus had followers and that they were responsible for the decision. The secret quality of the voting here, a practice after all that was developed in 5th-century Athens with the introduction of two voting pebbles so that voters could not be swayed by what they would see was the trend in the decision as the ballots were cast, is not undemocratic but acts as a reflection of the hidden quality of envy and the oblivion ascribed to Ajax's fame. By far the stronger condemnation is in the αἰόλος ψεύδος, the able lying of Odysseus.

We should also note the consonants in ψεύδει, κρυφαῖσι, and ψάφοις which convey the whispering quality of the judgment.

27. χρυσέων δ' Αἴας στερηθεὶς ὅπλων φόνῳ πάλαισεν: The phrase φόνῳ πάλαισεν develops φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις of v.23: the verb πάλαισεν shares the complexity of ἀμφικυλίσαις in that it literally means that Ajax wrestled with death. Since suicide is the kind of death that is by choice, it does not readily follow that Ajax struggled with it. It suggests that not mere death is to be implied by φόνος but murder and like v.23 carries the implication that Odysseus is responsible. The participle στερηθεὶς moreover clearly underscores Ajax as the rightful owner of the arms. The sentence itself, as the words Αἴας στερηθεὶς are positioned between χρυσέων and ὅπλων, act to separate Ajax from the prize he deserved.

28. ἧ μὰν ἀνόμοιά γε δάοισιν ἐν θερμῷ χροῖ: What follows here is not only praise of Ajax. By its vivid language, no doubt designed to heighten the

horror of his death and the outrage to be felt at Odysseus' conduct, and by its theatrical build-up, it has the tone and rhetorical virtuosity of a lawyer's concluding argument to a jury. Pindar presents the case against Odysseus with every rhetorical device at his disposal. The poet is emphatic: ἦ μὰν "yes, indeed", ἀνόμοιά, "unequal" i.e. the number of wounds or wounded. With this word we immediately have the poet's judgment. This comparison is not unlike vv.21-22 and gives additional weight to the likelihood that there that it alludes in its contrast of ἐσλῶν and χειρόνεσσι to these two men. They tear wounds into warm flesh surrounded or beset by enemies. The word order is telling: we have first the enemy flesh, warm because it is still living; then, the wounds which they break open while being hard pressed. The participle, πελεμιζόμενοι, read by the scholia for mss. πολεμιζόμενοι, makes vivid the action in the thick of battle.

30. ὑπ' ἀλεξιμβρότῳ λόγχῃ: "by / under the man-guarding spear" is a phrase which Farnell suggests refers to the Trojans pressing around the Greeks, since πελεμίζεσθαι is often used in Homer to describe a retreat from the enemy. This seems most reasonable in light of the immediate context, τὰ μὲν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλεῖ νεοκτόνῳ, "those i.e. wounds effected on the enemy surrounding the just-slain Achilles" [30] which recalls the scene of Ajax fighting off the Trojans who were attempting to take Achilles' body. The passage in Od.5.309 would confirm the case here that Odysseus was too hard-pressed himself at the time to have participated in guarding Achilles' dead body.

31-2. ἄλλων τε μόχθων ἐν πολυφθόροις | ἀμέραις: "and in those days of much destruction during other battle engagements" reinforces the argument for Ajax as the superior fighter. The images have moved from the particulars of flesh wounds, to the protection of fallen Achilles, to the general toil of the Trojan/Danaan engagement.

32. ἐχθρὰ δ' ἄρα πάρφασις ἦν καὶ πάλαι: "hateful was deceit, even then". The implication that deceit has happened in the past—καὶ πάλαι indicates that it is the distant past of legend and myth, with the added nuance that then too, it was hated,—is that dishonest words have can have effect even now. Essentially, Pindar is substantiating the truth of his praise of Deinias and his power as a poet. The term πάρφασις which means literally speech that is to the side, looks forward to vv.35-36 where the poet asks that he always travel the single road, i.e. the straight path of true speaking.

33. αἰμύλων μύθων όμόφοιτος, δολοφραδής, κακοποιὸν ὄνειδος: The condemnation here is clear: the language is strong and vivid, "seething with

moral indignation" [Carey p.32] and words are here that are not used elsewhere in Pindar. *ὁμόφοιτος*, a word perhaps coined by Pindar, conveys the sense of pacing along with, or moving in a pattern that changes with whatever shifting there is, or, as we might say, in whatever direction the wind blows, and bespeaks Odysseus' readiness to suit his words to the occasion. *αἰμύλος* has the sense of wily or cunning, shifty; *μῦθος* is usually used by Pindar for tales or mythic material. *δολοφραδής* "treachery of mind" forms the second unit of negative qualities and occurs in the *hHerm.*1.282; *κακοποιὸν ὄνειδος* "evil-doing outrage" where *κακοποιὸς* is another word that does not occur before Pindar.

If we examine the oral quality of the build-up of *indignatio* by measuring the syllables then, *ὁμόφοιτος*, *δολοφραδής*, *κακοποιὸν*, each form four-syllable blocks. The words must have had an impact being heard for the first time and in a string. We should also note their *voces* of "o" which occurs 11 times. The line has a splendid rhetorical flourish.

34. ἃ τὸ μὲν λαμπρὸν βιάται, τῶν δ' ἀφάντων κῦδος ἀντείνει σαθρόν: "doing violence to the light and holding up for those who are gone from the the light, a glory that is rotten." The last word, *σαθρόν* which describes rotting or decaying matter is in a particularly strong position and counterbalances perfectly with *ὄψον*, the word which begins this section of the ode. Neatly, the dainty dish on which the envious feast has become something disgusting and inedible.

There is another point of correspondence between these verses: *κῦδος ἀντείνει*, *γέρας ἀντέταται*: both phrases use the same verb, *ἀντείνω*, and both *γέρας* and *κῦδος* describe the rewards of valour and both are qualified, albeit with contrasting virtues, respectively: *μέγιστον* and *σαθρόν*. What is expressed in ἃ τὸ μὲν λαμπρὸν βιάται might be construed as a reflex of *χρυσέων δ' Αἴας στερηθεὶς ὅπλων* in that it contains the essential elements of something resplendent and shining that is obscured. To do violence to τὸ μὲν λαμπρὸν is to harm something or some quality that is brilliant; Achilles' armour was a thing of brilliance and represented his brilliant qualities as a hero. The verb *βιάται* with its connotation of violation in the use of force makes it clear that invisibility of τῶν δ' ἀφάντων is due not only to death but to an obscurity directly related to lies and injustice.

35. εἴη μὴ ποτέ μοι τοιοῦτον ἦθος, Ζεῦ πατέρ: With this prayer to Zeus the poet divides the poem's construction, marking off the end of the negative portion of the narrative from the positive part which precedes [Aiakos] and the praise which is now to follow [Deinias and Megas]. Thus the two positive sections

effectively frame the negative one: like the two outer panels of a triptych. And like a triptych the three panels are both separate and interconnected.

Pindar begins the Aiakos part by πολλά νιν πολλοὶ λιτάνευον ἰδεῖν; the negative or Odysseus/Ajax section with πολλὰ γὰρ πολλὰ λέλεκται. The poet comes as a suppliant at v.13 to Aiakos; here to Zeus.

The panels are interconnected thus: Hora, strophe 1 carries or handles people differently: some with gentle necessity, others roughly: τὸν μὲν ἡμέροις ἀνάγκας χερσὶ βαστάζεις, ἕτερον δ' ἑτέραις Str. 2, again with a verb denoting physical handling, there is a contrast between the noble and lesser: ἄπτεται δ' ἐσλῶν ἀεὶ, χειρόνεσσι δ' οὐκ ἐρίζει. Ep.1 the poet grasps the knees of Aiakos: ὑπὲρ τῶνδ' ἄπτομαι. Str. 3 the poet prays that he always stick to the single path and not grab onto bad onto bad-speaking: ἀπλόαις ζωᾷς ἐφαπτοίμαν. . . μὴ τὸ δύσφαιμον προσάψω. In the antist.1 Aiakos summons his loyal followers ἄβοατι; Ajax in the antist.2 is ἄγλωσσον. Aiakos' birth is described in terms of a growing plant in ant. 1 ἔβλασεν δ' υἱὸς Οἰνῶνας βασιλεύς and Pindar notes at the end of the epode: σὺν θεῷ γὰρ τοι φυτευθεὶς ὄλβος ἀνθρώποισι. Similarly at the end of str. 3 the poet wishes that once he is in the earth, he may seed i.e. cause to grow [ἐπισπείρων] blame on those who are wicked: χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι—μομφὰν δ' ἐπισπείρων ἀλιτροῖς. The following ant. 3 carries the image of excellence which shoots up like a tree to dew, αὖξεται δ' ἀρετά, χλωραῖς ἐέρσαις ὡς ὃ δένδρεον ἄσσει.

In epode 1 the poet promises a sounding fillet: φέρων Λυδῖαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν; in epode 3, a stone that resonates: λάβρον ὑπερεῖσαι λίθον Μοισαῖον ἑκατι ποδῶν εὐωνύμων. In ep. 1 it is dedicated to the two racers: Δείνιος δισσῶν σταδίων καὶ πατρὸς Μέγα Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα, and in the ep.3, οἷς δὴ δυοῖν.

In str.2 the weight of wealth is heavy in the context of a sea-girt island, ὅσπερ καὶ Κινύραν ἔβρισε πλούτῳ ποντία ἔν ποτε Κύπρῳ; in ant. 3 the tree is lifted to the the watery heaven, ἐν σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν ἀερθεῖς' ἐν δικαίοις τε πρὸς ὑγρόν αἰθέρα.

Ep.2, ἐχθρὰ δ' ἄρα πάρφασις parallels str. 3, μὴ τὸ δύσφαιμον.

The triads and their thematic material are fitted together with joints or points of articulation similar to an architectural design. The central triad which develops the negative or shadow material is first of all connected with the other outside or surrounding triads by verbs which appropriately denote physical handling: the handling of youth, the grasping of Aiakos' knees in triad 1 to the physical grasping

of noble things and non-grasping of lesser by envious people in triad 2 to the path that is grasped in triad 3. The direct connection between Aiakos and Ajax at the juncture of the first two antistrophes and the growth theme which extends across the board at the level of all three antistrophes and evolves into a full form from Aiakos planted at birth to the wealth planted by a god to the example of Kinyrus ant.2 until it is excellence fully grown as a tree in ant.3. The theme of the stone or agalma which is musical is bridged between the first and third epodes as is the expression of the two races run by Mega and Deinias.

Thus we have a structure that is bound at the top, in the middle and at the base. [Str.1-2-3; Ant. 1-2-3; Ep. 1-3, twice.] There are other perhaps less obvious levels of joinery: the physical bonds [ἀπτομαι and related verbs] are, as one descends the ode, respectively related to the eyes, to the belly and to the feet, following thus the general body of the poem from top to bottom. The middle triad in particular is bound vertically within itself [discussed above] as well as horizontally with the outside "panels". The design is definite and architectural.

35-36. ἀλλὰ κελεύθους | ἀπλόαις ζωᾷς ἐφαπτοίμαν: The word, ἀπλόαις, or the simple paths, specifically of life, ζωᾷς, on which the poet wishes to cling, offers a contrast with the dishonest and crooked situation of the preceding epode. In the second epode it is by shifting and untruthful words [πάρφασις] that the light is harmed; here it is with words of truth and due measure that the poet will celebrate the light: μὴ τὸ δύσφαιμον προσάψω. There is good reason for the repeated verbal root in ἐφαπτοίμαν and προσάψω: it links this quality of speaking truth with physical fixity: "so that I will not fasten upon" "may I stick to" and provides a distinctly differing quality from the wealth of words associated with Odysseus' speech, which stress the shifting, mobile and multi-valent talk of a gifted liar. As well, the phrase [36] θανὼν ὡς παῖσι κλέος devolves from τῶν δ' ἀφάντων κῦδος of the previous verse, since it too refers to the renown or glory that, immortalized in verse [or truth] can be handed down to later generations. This points directly to the recurrent theme of Pindar's task to create in verse a poetic monument that endures and bears witness through the ages to the noble deeds and character of great men. This necessitates in Pindar's program of poetic and artistic justice that his words be exacting in their truth and celebration, a concept which is stated—albeit in a slightly different context—at the beginning of the ode: ἀγαπατὰ δὲ καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα πρὸς ἔργον ἕκαστον/τῶν ἀρειόνων ἐρώτων ἐπικρατεῖν δύνασθαι. Desire, or the attraction that the poet feels when faced with the beauty of noble and extraordinary qualities of human character, is the basis, the

the last foot being allowed a long or short. If we accept the mss. line we have, for vv.40-41:

αὐξεται δ' ἄρετά, χλωραῖς ἑέρσαις ὥς ὅτε δένδρεον αἰσσει

If we examine the sense of the line it is that excellence like fresh dew from a tree shoots within wise and just men aloft into the moist air. Another point of contention centres on the word αἰσσει [Slater, "rising up"] which means primarily a quick darting movement of light, of glances of men. To most commentators it affords difficult sense. The sense of rising up is suggested by the scholia b: ὁ δὲ νοῦς αὐξεται δὲ καὶ ἀρετὴ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑψωθείσα τοῖς σοφοῖς καὶ δικαίοις λόγοις τῶν ποιητῶν etc. The more fundamental sense however of quick movement need not be altered: "Excellence increases in men, raising them among wise and just men to the moist heavens as fresh dew quickens a tree." First of all this combines two essential ideas in this ode: one of excellence being implanted by the gods and the other of the timeliness of youth. The dews, χλωραῖς, are as fresh as Hora, goddess of youth, is young and herald of love's embraces. The simile of the tree "quickened" by dew is carefully worked to correspond to the erotic imagery of the first strophe. Hora sits upon youthful eyes, ἐφίζοισα γλεφάροις, the way dew sits upon leaves. Mingling excellence or nobility of character with the heavens is in contrast to what falls upon the wicked, ἐπισπείρων ἀλιτροῖς.

41-2. <ἐν>σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν ἀεθεῖσ' ἐν δικαίοις τε πρὸς ὕγρον | αἰθέρα. χρεῖαι δὲ παντοῖαι φίλων ἀνδρῶν. Every need comes from men we love. This statement is generally understood to mean every use or need for or from friends. The sexual overtones of this passage however should not be overlooked. The χρεῖαι δὲ παντοῖαι are allied with the "gentle hands of necessity" in the first strophe and φίλων ἀνδρῶν is an echo of ἀμβροσιᾶν φιλοτάτων.

42-4. τὰ μὲν ἀμφὶ πόνοις | ὑπερώτατα, μαστεύει δὲ καὶ τέρψις ἐν ὄμμασι θέσθαι | πιστόν. Further alliance with the first strophe occurs with this reference to delight placed in the eyes, lit., "delight too seeks to place reliable evidence in the eyes." The verb μαστεύει, to seek or search after, implicitly denotes using the eyes. Delight τέρψις with its strong associations with the erotic and here, seeking to establish [θέσθαι] something trustworthy in the eyes, is closely related to the sitting of youth on the eyes v.2 while the expression, τὰ μὲν ἀμφὶ πόνοις ὑπερώτατα, "the things necessary for the labours in noble accomplishments are of the highest order", reflects the sentiment of vv. 4-5: πρὸς ἔργον ἕκαστον τῶν ἀρειόνων ἐρώτων. There is a further connection between the erotic amalgamation of strophe 1 and these lines; the embraces which develop from

the best of desires are those which produced Aiakos; the things that are done [by poets] to celebrate the best of noble efforts seek to confirm it by something that is, to the eyes, trustworthy i.e. bears a reliable resemblance. The order is chiasmatically managed: in the first instance, the desire in the eyes leads to embraces of love and to the production of Aiakos; in the second, the descendant of Aiakos embraces the greatest accomplishments and there is something beautiful for the eyes as a result. There are three separate "embraces" within the ode: ἀμφεπόλησαν, in the context of Zeus and Aigina; ἀμφικυλίσαις, which describes Ajax on his sword; ἀμφὶ πόνους which begins the context of praise for the victor and his father. Although this last phrase is not strictly speaking a verb it nevertheless belongs to the tripartite distribution of exempla and clearly imitates and echoes those instances.

Finally the indication that *arete* raises one, ἐν σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν ἀερεῖσ' ἐν δικαίοις τε, one among those who are truthful and just, counters the negative examples in vv. 25 and 34. The poet is not only alluding to Aiakos but also to his own work.

44-5. ὦ Μέγα, τὸ δ' αἶψις τεὰν ψυχὰν κομίζαι οὐ μοι δυνατόν. Bundy [*Studia Pindarica*, 40n.16] has called this "the climactic name cap promised since the foil of v.20." Were a poet like Pindar to have as bureaucratic a soul as Bundy would have us believe there would be little point in exploring the nature of any poetry except as a collection of lexical items poorly restored and fastidiously catalogued from a dead and curious language. The transparent purpose of "naming" Megas is that the τέρψις ἐν ὄμμασι θέσθαι πιστόν describes the commemorative stele that the poet is erecting and dedicating to him—not because he won in the games, but because he is dead. The prosaic but clear logic of these lines is that, although Megas' soul cannot be brought back to life, his physical likeness in stone, with, no doubt, this poem inscribed on it, will.

45. κενεᾶν δ' ἐλπιδῶν χαῦνον τέλος: "this is the idle goal of empty hopes".

46-7. σεῦ δὲ πάτρα Χαριδαίης τε λάβρον ὑπερεῖσαι λίθον Μοισαῖον: "for your homeland and the Charidai, it is possible for me to set up a loud stone of the Muse". The verb, ὑπερεῖσαι, if read literally "to put under as a prop, to support", rather than glossed as "set up, erect" [SI], is particularly apt since it is ἕκατι ποδῶν εὐωνύμων δις δὴ δυοῖν. A stone stele to support two runners is in fact an accurate description of the starting stones found at various sites. We know [Gardiner, 1955] that there have been found stone sills 18 inches wide and 4 feet apart for each runner placed along the breadth of the course at the stadia at Olympia, Delphi and

Epidauros. There have also been found at the excavations at Corinth stone slabs of a slightly different order.

It perhaps implies that they run off into the heavens as would be the case were an image of Deinias and Megas sculpted on the stele or were there are two figures of marble or bronze poised upon a stele. This calls to mind v.19 where the poet pictures himself as a runner lightly poised. This might better explain the *δῖς δὴ δυοῖν* if we imagine one stele with two figures poised on them or two separate stelai: twice for two.

λάβρον since it means variously boisterous, turbulent, ravenous, gluttonous, greedy, presents a difficulty and has been emended [Sandys, cf.N.7.77] to *ἐλαφρόν*, light, easy [*τε λάβρον > τ' ἐλαφρόν*]. This emendation however loses the force of the *lectio difficilior* and denies the carefully marked connection with vv.15-16.

Λυδίαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν
Δείνιος δισσῶν σταδίων καὶ πατρός Μέγα Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα

A term like *καναχηδα* is as noisy and as extraordinary to the Lydian mitra as *λάβρον* is to *λίθον Μοισαῖον*, the Muse [or Music] stone. In both these instances the victors are cited, *δισσῶν σταδίων*, *δῖς δὴ δυοῖν*, as the recipients of the *ἄγαλμα*. Moreover, the greedy and gluttonous connotations of the *λάβρον* counteract the *ὄφον/σασθρόν* dichotomy. And it is made clear in the next lines that the poet here underpins the runners with a resounding celebration of their victory. This is a feast in which they can indulge noisily and with gusto.

48-9. *χαίρω δὲ πρόσφορον | ἐν μὲν ἔργῳ κόμπον ἰεῖς*: "I rejoice sending forth a fitting boast to this accomplishment." *ἰεῖς* > *ἵημι*, to send forth; shoot; utter. The boast of victory following the precepts of v.5, *καιροῦ μὴ πλαναθέντα πρὸς ἔργον ἔκαστον*, is fitting in the sense of its timeliness, and its directedness to the deed. Indeed, the sense of *ἵημι* in "shooting forth" or setting into motion renders an even richer lode of significance by likening the athletes—whether in stone relief or free-standing statuary—to the tree of excellence, and hence the encomiastic poem allows them to be raised, *ἀερεῖσθαι* to the moisture-laden heavens. The words of the victory song are then implied by *ἐν σοφοῖς*, and poetry acts like fresh dew the excellence of noble men.

49-50. *ἐπαιδαῖς δ' ἀνὴρ νώδυνον καὶ τις κάματον θῆκεν*. "any man with songs makes even weariness free of pain." The healing effect of songs²⁰, while a convention within Pindar, [N.4.1-6; N.3.17-18; P.1.5-12] in this ode is directed to the pain of Ajax' and Megas' death. It must therefore be seen as a

remedy against φθόνος. The pain then is of a death of oblivion: λάθα κατέχει ἐν λυγρῷ νείκει. We can know that the poet is making specific reference to that episode of envy by the verbal echoes of the final lines.

50-51. ἦν γε μὰν ἐπικώμιος ὕμνος δὴ πάλαι καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι τὰν Ἀδράστου τάν τε Καδμείων ἔριν: ἦν γε μὰν is an echo of v.28, ἦ μὰν, which begins the poet's condemnation of envy, Odysseus and the judgement of arms. δὴ πάλαι καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι recalls and expands the words in the same second epode [ἐχθρὰ δ' ἄρα παράφασις] ἦν καὶ πάλαι, here rectifying the hateful and deceitful words by a song of praise, ἐπικώμιος ὕμνος. The particle δὴ asserts affirmatively the less definite ἄρα. . ἦν καὶ πάλαι and sets this past apart from the other. Deceit is given only an indefinite past; but praise is given a past that is firmly rooted in Adrastus and Kadmos—a Theban past. Furthermore, the word ἔριν recalls ἐρίζει of v.22 of the second strophe. The exemplum of Adrastus and Kadmos might be read as a positive or clean struggle—one without deceit or treachery. Moreover Adrastus is said to have initiated the Nemean games on his way to Thebes.

1. Hora and Aphrodite dance hand in hand in the *hAphr.* 194-6, αὐτὰρ ἐνπλόκαμοι Χάριτες καὶ εὐφρονες ὦραι | Ἀρμονίη θ' Ἥβη τε Διὸς θυγάτηρ τ' Ἀφροδίτη | ὀρχεῦντ' ἀλλήλων ἐπὶ καρπῷ χεῖρας ἔχουσιν.

2. Cf. fr.122.9

3. Sappho fr.47.1-2: Ἔρος δ' ἐτίναξέ μοι / φρένας, ὥς ἄνεμος κάτ' ὄρος δρύϊν ἐμπέτων. Ibycus fr. 286.6-12, ἐμοὶ δ' ἔρος | οὐδεμίαν κατάκοιτος ὥραν | ἄθ' ὑπὸ στεροπᾶς φλέγων | Θρηίκιος βορέας αἰσῶν παρὰ Κύπριδος ἀζαλέαις μανίαισιν ἐρεμνὸς ἀθαμβῆς | ἐγκρατέως πεδόσθεν φυλάσσει ἡμετέρας φρένας.

4. fr. 287, Ἔρος αὐτὲ με κυανέοισιν ὑπὸ βλεφάροις τακέρ' ὄμμασι δερκόμενος κηλήμασι παντοδαποῖς ἐς ἄπειρα δίκτυα Κύπριδος ἐσβάλλει.

5. Anacreon fr. 413, μεγάλῳ δὴντέ μ' Ἔρως ἔκοφεν ὥστε χαλκεὺς / πελέκει, χειμερὶν δ' ἔλουδεν ἐν χαράδρῳ.

6. Fennell ad loc. thinks this "appropriate to the scattered quarters" of those cities in the Peloponnese.

7. P.10.39: λυρᾶν τε βοὰν καναχαί τ' αὐλῶν.

8. For his wealth, cf. Tyr. 12.6, πλουτοίη δὲ Μιδέω καὶ Κινυρέω μαλιον; as the king of Byblos, cf. Strabo *Geogr.* 16.2.18.14-15: ἡ μὲν οὖν Βύβλος, τὸ τοῦ Κινύρου βασίλειον, ἱερὰ ἐστὶ τοῦ Ἀδώνιδος; as son of Sandokos, the Syrian, cf. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.181.4f., τοῦ δὲ Σάνδοκος, ὃς ἐκ Συρίας ἔλθων εἰς Κιλικίαν, πόλιν ἔκτισε Κελένδεριν, καὶ γήμας Φαρνάκην τὴν Μεγασσάρου τοῦ Ὑριέων βασιλέως ἐγέννησε Κινύραν.

9. Cf. N.6.26-28; O.13.93-95; I.2.35-37; O.8.54-55; N.5.19-21; O.6.22-24.

10. Miller, A., M., "Phthonos and Paraphrasis: The Argument of *Nemean* 8.19-34," *GRBS* 23, 1982, 111ff. Cf. also Schmidt, A. M., *Pindar, The Eighth Nemean*, Diss. Bryn Mawr 1968 and Bulman, P., *Phthonos in Pindar*, Berkeley 1992.chap.3.

11. Citing [114] Aristotle's *Rhet.* 2.10.5, τοῖς γὰρ ἐγγύς καὶ χρόνῳ τόπῳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ δόξῃ φθονοῦσιν.
12. See also O.3.4-5 a new fashion νεοσίγαλον εὐρόντι τρόπον.
13. Nisetich, F. J., *Pindar and Homer*, Baltimore and London 1989, 19 & n19-22.
14. Cf. P.3.55, πειρώντι δὲ καὶ χρυσὸς ἐν βασάνῳ πρόπει καὶ νόος ὀρθός; Pagan 14.38, βασανισθέντι δὲ χρυσῷ τέλος; fr.122.16, διδάξαμεν χρυσὸν καθαρᾷ βασάνῳ
15. Carey, C., "Pindar's Eighth Nemean Ode," *PCPhS* n.s. 22, 1976, p.30-31
16. Cf. P.9.35; P 10.7; N.3.42; N.6.24; I.1.21.
17. Norman O. Brown, "Pindar, Sophokles, and the Thirty Years' Peace," *TAPA* 82, 1951, 1-28, first focused attention on the Odysseus and Ajax episode in this ode as representing respectively the Athenian and Aeginetan positions during the historical period 446/445 when Athens and Sparta signed an agreement known as the Thirty Years' peace which agreement left Aigina under the control of imperialist Athens. More recently, Mullen, W., "Pindar and Athens: A Reading in the Aeginetan Odes," *Arion* n.s.1, 1973-74, 484-495, has argued for the historical interpretation of N. 8. The dangers of biographical-historical interpretations of poetry in any age are well-known and in this case, I must agree with J.S. Carnes, "Why Should I Mention Aiakos? Myth and Politics in Pindar's *Nemean* 8 [Part II]," *QUCC* n.s.52, 1996, 83-92, who states that "...agnosticism is the only tenable position as regards the real-world referents of the myth in *Nemean* 8..." p.92.
18. Cf. P.4.101; N.11.17; O.3.16.
19. οἱ μὲν ἵππων στρότον οἱ δὲ πῆσδων | οἱ δὲ νάων φαῖς' ἐπὶ γᾶν μέλαιναν | ἔμμεναι κάλλιστον' ἔγω δὲ κῆν' ὅττω τις ἔραται.
20. We should not overlook the significance of this word within the realm of magic and incantations, e.g. Plato *Charm.* 155c-156c where Sokrates tells of a headache charm he learned of a Thracian. A fuller account of such incantations is to be found in *Magika Hiera* edd.Faraone and Obbink, Oxford 1991.

NEMEAN 10

1-2. Δαναοῦ πόλιν ἀγλαοθρόνων τε πεντήκοντα κοῤῃν, Χάριτες, | Ἄργος Ἥρας δῶμα θεοπρεπὲς ὑμνεῖτε. The splendor of this opening lies in its formal and majestic contours; the names stacked together in the middle—Charites, Argos, Hera—give it fullness until the final verb, ὑμνεῖτε. The poet starts from Danaos, his city, the fifty daughters who are throned on brightness, the Graces, Argos, Hera's home god-suited—and then the verb, hymn! The phrase of v.1, Δαναοῦ πόλιν ἀγλαοθρόνων, is neatly counterbalanced by v.2, Ἄργος Ἥρας δῶμα θεοπρεπὲς, each of ten syllables, while the second part of v.1, also comprised of ten syllables, τε πεντήκοντα κοῤῃν, Χάριτες, shifts or delays the measure slightly by the vocative Χάριτες which delay trips over into the next line of names, fixing the final verb in an emphatic and climactic position. It is a fine example of carefully balanced asymmetry.

Danaos, as well as the other mythical figures named throughout this ode, is associated with Argos, sacred to Hera, where he and his daughters were received when they fled from the sons of Aegyptus. The adjective ἀγλαοθρόνων is used once of the Muses [O.13.96] but here we are to imagine fifty women enthroned. The seated position of deities is well-attested to in art works of various kind, but not of the Danaidai. Pindar represents various throned figures: O.2.22 of the daughters of Kadmos: εὐθρόνοις Κάδμοιο κούραις; P.3.94 of the sons of Kronos: καὶ Κρόνου παῖδας βασιλῆας ἴδον χρυσέαις ἐν ἔδραις; N.4.65 of the Nereidai: ἔγαμεν ὑψιθρόνων μίαν Νηρείδων. However, we can be sure that there were monumental representations of Hypermnestra, Lynkeos and Danaos at both Delphi and Argos [Paus.10.10.5] and that Medusa's tomb was in the agora of Argos [Paus.2.21.5; 20.7], the monuments of Amphiaraios, Diomedes, Talaos, and the house of Adrastos [2.21.2; 23.2.] and there is every possibility that Pindar saw them.

Paus.2.17.3 describes the statues of the Charites as they stood in the *pronaos* of the Heraion near Mt. Euboeia: ἐν δὲ τῷ προνάῳ τῇ μὲν Χάριτες. ἀγαλματὰ ἐστὶν ἀρχαῖα, ἐν δεξιᾷ δὲ κλίνη τῆς Ἥρας. The crown of the seated figure of Hera within the temple made by Polykleitos was ornamented with

sculptured figures of the Charites and Horai. Moreover, [Paus.2.19.3] Danaos is said to have built a temple to Apollo Lykeos at Argos with a figure of Danaos seated, θρόνος Δαναοῦ. We can observe that Hera is accompanied here by women and that the feminine side of things will in some measure figure in this ode.

2-3. φλέγεται δ' ἀρεταῖς | μυρίαῖς ἔργων θρασέων ἔνεκεν: "it burns because of the ten thousand excellent qualities of daring deeds." The Charites, whose place within the divine system, particularly as patrons of epinikia, is most fully accounted for in O.14, are often found in association with burning or shining e.g. P.5.45, σὲ δ' ἠύκομοι φλέγοντι Χάριτες; P.9.89, Χαρίτων κελαδεννᾶν μή με λίποι καθαρὸν φέγγος; N.6.37, παρὰ Κασταλία τε Χαρίτων ἑσπέριος ὁμάδῃ φλέγεν; I.6.63, τὰν Ψαλυχιδᾶν δὲ πάτρην Χαρίτων ἄρδοντι καλλίστα δρόσῳ. Here φλέγεται develops the bright quality of ἀγλαοθρόνων, the name Ἄργος itself, which means "bright", confirming the picture of shining and resplendence.

4. μακρὰ μὲν τὰ Περσέος ἀμφὶ Μεδοίσας Γοργόνης: μακρὰ μὲν τὰ, "long are those things related to Perseus and the Gorgon Medusa," stands in apposition to πολλὰ δ' . . ἄστη, "many the cities" etc. Both μακρὰ and πολλὰ evolve from the μυρίαῖς ἀρεταῖς. The Gorgon's eyes which, in the case of Medusa, were able to turn men to stone, are always prominent and staring in their pictorial representations and continue the idea of brightness and shining.

5. πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ καταοίκησεν ἄστη ταῖς Ἐπάφου παλάμαις: καταοίκησεν is Maas' conjecture [accepted in Snell-Maehler] for the mss. κατώκισθεν, which violates the metre and which a later hand in one ms. [cod. B] has written as κατώκισεν above the word and which the schol. has paraphrased κατωκίσθησαν. There have been several other conjectures, notably: καταφοίκησθεν [Schroeder]; Αἰγύπτιοι κατώκισεν [Heyne; Turyn]; τὰ κατώκισεν [Boeckh] and other less probable solutions. Maas' conjecture however requires that Argos be the subject which is difficult. And yet there is furthermore the problem that otherwise ἄστη is the plural subject of a singular active verb. Although the difficulty with the mss. version is based on metrical inconsistency, we are at least assured of the sense of "settling" or "colonizing". Both different readings can be summarized as: a) καταοίκησεν: Argos, home of Hera, etc., many the cities [Argos] colonized/ settled in Egypt by the hands of Epaphos; b) κατώκισθεν: many the cities in Egypt settled by Epaphos with his palms. In a) Argos as subject is difficult because of the subjects that intervene and the forced interruption of the syntax of vv.4-5 that results. In the case of b) the phrase μακρὰ μὲν τὰ Περσέος is

paralleled by πολλὰ δ' ἄσπερ. Ἐπάφου and the construction of these lines is followed by the subject Hypermnestra. For the sake of the parallels of construction, as well as the parallels of subjects, Δαναοῦ πόλιν, ἥρας δῶμα, κατώκισθεν although it breaks the metrical symmetry is the preferable reading since it retains the symmetry of style and syntax.

The sense of ταῖς Ἐπάφου παλάμαις should be taken literally as with the hands or by the touch of Eraphos, cf. Aesch. *PV*. 846-852.

6. οὐδ' Ἵπερμήστρα παρεπλάγχθη, μονόφαφον ἐν κολεῷ κατασχοῖσα ξίφος: παρεπλάγχθη, with the sense of being made to wander from the path, stray to the side, lends particular force to her directed and unswerving purpose which is expanded by μονόφαφον and κατασχοῖσα. It is interesting that Pindar has given the attribute μονόφαφον, single vote to the sword. In Aesch. *Sept.* 529, the sword is also an independent thinker, ὅμνυσι δ' αἰχμὴν and μονόφρητος occurs in *Suppl.* 373, μονοφρήτοισι νεύμασιν σέθεν, where the chorus of Danaidai instructs the king of Argos that he alone decides State business. Pindar's intention here may be related to the myth that the Danaidai were said to have the task in the Underworld of carrying water in jars that leaked. The fact that the sword is contained so thoroughly, i.e. by its own will and that of Hypermnestra, κατασχοῖσα, in its sheath, which here can be seen to double as the jar into which votes were cast in the Athenian law-courts, offers a connection to this later destiny. Hypermnestra's place at the end of the strophe which begins with Danaos and her 49 other sisters forms an effective climax.

We should note also that Zeus is involved in nearly all the myths related in this ode: he is the father of Perseus with Danaë, of Eraphos with Io;

7. Διομήδεα δ' ἄμβροτον ξανθά ποτε Γλαυκῶπις ἔθηκε θεόν: "blond, grey-eyed Athena once made Diomedes an immortal god." Diomedes is separated from his divine end θεόν by the intervention of Athena with her Homeric attributes. Word placement imitates the distance from immortality and the necessity for divine assistance. Athena, characterized only by her eyes (grey / bright) and ξανθά which comprises colour shades ranging from yellow, golden, chestnut or yellow-red, continues the light-associated imagery. It also affords a play on words, in that Diomedes fights and exchanges courtesies with Glaukos in the *aristeia* recounted in *Il.* 6.119ff. He is moreover connected to the Argive expedition against Thebes.

8. γαῖα δ' ἐν Θήβαις ὑπέδεκτο κεραυνωθείσα Διὸς βέλεσιν: γαῖα . . . κεραυνωθείσα, the land was thunderbolted. It received, "welcomed" [Sl.]

ὑπέδεκτο, Amphiaraios, son of the seer, Oikles, [cf.O.6.17] and one of the Seven. πολέμοιο νέφος, [9] is a phrase found only at Il.17.243.¹

10. καὶ γυναιξὶν καλλικόμοισιν ἀριστεύει πάλαι: Some take Argos as subject, others Zeus. I favour Zeus since ἀριστεύει can mean to be victorious as well as to excel in. If the conjunction καὶ is related to the immediate context it best reflects Zeus' activity.

11. Ζεὺς ἐπ' Ἀλκμήναν Δανάαν τε μολῶν τοῦτον κατέφανε λόγον: κατέφανε, "brought down and made apparent" which, although a bit awkward as a translation, conserves the downwards, vertical motion, recurrent in these two strophes: καταοίκησεν, κατασχοῖσα, ὑπέδεκτο. The general verticality in this ode, of movement of the divine downwards to earth and movement up to the divine element, has been noted by Stern² as a central idea. He notes that the communication between the worlds is expressed by the verbs of motion at vv.11, 14, 16, 18 and 6.³

I think that in addition to this, but more prevalent, is the imagery of containers or jars: Theban earth, split by the thunderbolts of Zeus, welcomes beneath it Amphiaraios; Hypermnestra keeps her sword within its sheath; Egypt is settled, or made to contain people, by the touch of Epaphos; Zeus makes his divinity apparent in the "containers" of Alkmene and Danaë. In the case of Danaë she is literally confined to a bronze chamber when her father Acrisios learns from an oracle that a son of hers will murder him. When he discovers that she has had Perseus in spite of his precautions, he puts both of them in a chest and sets them out to sea. Here the idea of descent into or on is reinforced by the preposition ἐπὶ, "upon" and μολῶν, "coming", which in the case of Danaë, is as a shower and in the case of Alkmene, as her husband.

12. πατρὶ δ' Ἀδράστοιο Λυγκεῖ τε φρενῶν καρπὸν εὐθείᾳ συνάρμοξεν δίκᾳ: Adrastus' father was Talaos and Lynkeos, husband of Hypermnestra, son of Aegyptos [as opposed to the other Lynkeos, v. 61ff., son of Amphiaraios and one of the Argonauts]. They are together by word placement in this line in imitation of their being joined together or harmonized, εὐθείᾳ συνάρμοξεν δίκᾳ by Zeus, who must be the subject here rather than Argos, as he must be the subject of the following line. The verse explains that the fruit of their thoughts, φρενῶν καρπὸν was joined together in straightforward justice.

13. θρέψε δ' αἰχμὰν Ἀμφιτρύωνος: "he nourished / raised the spear of Amphitryon". This is generally read "he raised the spearman, Amphitryon" but this

reading denies vigour of the actual Greek. The personification of Amphitryon's spear is similar to that of Hypermnestra's sword.

13-14. ὁ δ' ὄλβῳ φέρτατος ἵκετ' ἐς κείνου γενεάν. Some controversy has arisen concerning the subjects of these lines. If Zeus rather than Argos is retained as the author of the preceding action, then he must also be the subject of κείνου γενεάν; it is Amphitryon who, although the mightiest in wealth and prosperity [ὁ δ' ὄλβῳ φέρτατος], comes into the race of Zeus, ἵκετ' ἐς κείνου γενεάν. In fact, he comes as close to the "race of Zeus" as is possible, since Zeus takes on his form and sleeps with his wife. It was during his expedition against the Taphiai and Teleboai, a condition that his wife Alkmene set before the consummation of their marriage, to avenge the deaths of her brothers, that, in his absence Zeus came in the guise of Amphitryon.

There is another important aspect within these myths: that of their connection to Thebes. Amphitryon and Alkmene leave Argos for Thebes after he has accidentally killed her father. Adrastos and Amphiaraos are both Argives who agree to restore Polyneikes to the Theban throne when he is a guest in Argos. Adrastos institutes the Nemean games on his way to Thebes.

These myths also involve several sets of brothers: a) Danaos and Aegyptos [Pherekydes fr.21 Jacoby: Belus< Damno, Aegyptos, Danaos; Agenor + Damno< Phoinix, Isae, Melia; Danaos marries Melia and has 50 daughters; Aegyptos marries Isae and has 50 sons]; b) Polyneikos and Eteokles; c) Kastor and Polydeukes; (Herakles and Iphikles;) d) Ptoitos and Akrisios; e) Idas and Lynkeos².

14-15. ἐπεὶ ἐν χαλκέοις ὅπλοις Τηλεβόας ἔναρεν: "when he slew Teleboans while in bronze armour." It is entirely relevant to the imagery of jars / containers in this ode — particularly those of bronze — that Amphitryon be encased in the "jar" or container of armour before he is admitted to the race of Zeus.

15. τῷ ὄψιν ἐειδόμενος: "taking on his likeness" i.e. Zeus' spirit contained within the shell of Amphitryon.

16. ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς αὐτὰν ἐσήλθεν, "the king of immortal gods strode into his courtyard". Entering into the outer court of his house, mimics the act of entering the fake body of Amphitryon, and, by extension, the body of his wife: [17] **σπέρμ' ἀδείμαντον φέρων Ἡρακλέος,** "carrying the fearless seed of Herakles". Zeus has become a container himself, carrying Herakles within him.

17–18. οὐ κατ' Ὀλυμπον ἄλοχος Ἥβα τελεία παρὰ μητέρι βαίνοιο ἔστι, καλλίστα θεῶν: Mobility between immortals and earth has been downward so far; at this point it is both downward, κατ' Ὀλυμπον, and horizontally, Ἥβα τελεία παρὰ μητέρι βαίνοιο ἔστι, Hebe walks forever beside her mother, the Fulfiller. βαίνοιο ἔστι as noted by Fennell is an adjectival participle and means that the action of walking beside Hera, παρὰ μητέρι forms a continuous present. The attribute of Hebe, καλλίστα θεῶν, is balanced by τελεία μητέρι, which most translators, following the scholion who quoting Aesch. fr.383 [Ἥρα τελεία, Ζηνὸς εὐναία δάμαρ] notes, ἔστι γὰρ αὕτη γαμηλία καὶ ζυγία,⁴ take to mean "bringing to fulfillment". However it is perhaps preferable that Hera, with whom the ode begins and the triad now ends, be characterized as "perfect, complete." This offers greater counterweight to Hebe's quality of being the most beautiful and is more appropriate to the vision of the two goddesses walking side by side on Olympus in never-ending concourse.

19. βραχύ μοι στόμα πάντ' ἀναγῆσασθ': "My mouth is small to recount everything." [Race]. The word στόμα is translated as mouth, and nothing further is noted. However, if we examine this simple word, "mouth", carefully fixing it within the imagery of the poem, it becomes clear that there is an underlying image. Jars, in Greek, have a mouth, στόμα, and the poet claims that his is βραχύ, "little" or "short" to "bring, guide everything up", πάντ' ἀναγῆσασθαι > ἀνά + ἡγέομαι. The same verb occurs at O.9.80–81, εἶην εὐρησιεπὴς ἀναγείσθαι πρόσφορος ἐν Μοισᾶν δίφρῳ, where it is read as "drive up along with", a combination of upwards and ἡγέομαι, drive, lead, conduct. There the sense of "drive" is encouraged by the image of the Muses' chariot. Here however, I believe it is mistranslated, or at best, reduced to the more prosaic and mundane sense of "relate" or "narrate", which misses the opportunity of exploiting the essential poetic imagery. It does in fact make excellent sense if the image of a container or jar is understood, for then the mouth of the jar's opening is too short to conduct all the material contained in it out through it, and we can understand the poet as a container of all these stories who pours them out for poems.

19–20. ὅσων Ἀργεῖον ἔχει τέμενος | μοῖραν ἐσλῶν: The idea of restriction or containment is repeated: τέμενος, μοῖραν. The precinct of a sanctuary was an enclosure and μοῖρα, "portion", can be seen as an enclosure of destiny. The poet expands the entire area of Argos to be sacred, closed-off grounds.

20. ἔστι δὲ καὶ κόρος ἀνθρώπων βαρὺς ἀντιάσαι: ἀντιάσαι > ἀντιάω, possesses two basic senses: "to meet" with persons or things and "to

match or measure oneself with" c.gen. The first is the usual choice in translation, "furthermore, men's satiety is grievous to encounter" [Race], but within the context of these lines, the second is preferable. One reason is that κόρος and βαρὺς, satiety and heaviness, are more easily suited to the sense if we understand ἀντιάσαι as meaning measure rather than encountering. The poet has just stated that [like a jar] his mouth is too small to empty all the contents of his mind / memory of all the noble men held within the precinct of Argos. Now he adds that even a sense of fullness of men is a measure that is heavy. I don't think that Pindar is expressing a gnomic reflection that satiety is a heavy thing to encounter. Rather, he continues the idea of poets as storage containers of memory and noble deeds with this consideration: there is a point where even poets can feel burdened and replete with such knowledge. This ties in with the next verse:

21. ἀλλ' ὅμως εὐχορδον ἔγειρε λύραν: "But, nevertheless, awaken the well-strung lyre". There would be no need to characterize this as an artificially appointed pivot or sudden shift in the narrative. Seated within the above context it makes for a smooth transition: in spite of his "heaviness" of poetic ideas, ἀλλ' ὅμως, the poet urges himself to strike up the song, καὶ παλαισμάτων λάβε φροντίδ' [22] and grasp, λάβε, take hold of thoughts of wrestling.

22-3. ἀγών τοι χάλκεος δάμον ὀτρύνει ποτὶ βουθυσίαν Ἥρας ἀέθλων τε κρίσιν: "indeed, the bronze contest arouses the people to the sacrifice of oxen and judging of the games of Hera." ὀτρύνει, "arouse" follows the sense of ἔγειρε, v.21. The Hekatombaia and bronze shield as a prize were features of the Heraia in Argos.

24. Οὐλία παῖς ἔνθα νικάσας δις ἔσχεν Θεαῖος εὐφόρων λάθαν πόνων: The catalogue of Theiaos' victories and that of his ancestors is exceptional for its number. It takes up nearly one third of the ode, starting here in the second strophe through to the third antistrophe. εὐφόρων and εὐφρόνων are both attested to in the mss. The scholia interpret the latter as εὐφραντικῶν, "delightful to", "cheering"; the former as winning the best prizes, explaining the line as meaning: men forget their efforts in the games whenever they have won.⁵ Farnell argues for εὐφόρων, on the basis that it would be inappropriate to say that the toils were pleasant. However it is also inappropriate to say that "well-borne" or "patiently endured" toils bring oblivion or are forgotten, that he "won forgetfulness of his bravely borne labors" [Race]. λάθα is the very thing that victors should not win or be rewarded with according to the conscious agenda of Pindar and his epinikia. Besides, the Greek specifically states that once he had won, he held, ἔσχεν, [2

aor.] forgetfulness. Slater suggests "escape" for λάθρα and "acquire for oneself" for ἔσχεν which would yield: after he had won twice he acquired for himself an escape from his labours. This certainly makes the most reasonable reading.

25-28. ἐκράτησε δὲ καὶ ποθ' Ἑλλανα στρατὸν Πυθῶνι, . . ἐν Ἀδραστείῳ νόμῳ: Pindar now catalogues the past victories of Theaios, at the Pythian, three times each at the Nemean and Isthmian games. The phrase, Μοῖσαισί τ' ἔδωκ' ἀρόσαι, "he gave the Muses something to plow" [cf. P.6.2 and N6.33] reflects the idea that as the earth yields fruit to the cultivator so do victors yield fruit to poets that celebrate them. The poet proceeds to produce what are in effect two furrows of verse [27-8]:

τρίς μὲν ἐν πάντοιο πύλαισι λαχών,
τρίς δὲ καὶ σεμνοῖς δαπέδοις ἐν Ἀδραστείῳ νόμῳ.

The very deliberate parallelism of these lines in addition to their site-specific references, "by the gates to the sea" and "in sacred plains of Adrastus' pasture," makes clear that they are the very furrows provided for the Muses' plow.

29. Ζεῦ πάτερ, τῶν μὰν ἔραται φρενί, σιγᾷ οἱ στόμα: The στόμα of the victor is silent as that of the poet is narrow. That the victor has desire for victory in his heart and yet does not express it by his words is here a proof of his sincerity. What is contained within the will should in fact not be expressed verbally but by action. It is the poet's prayer to Zeus that will be most effective. In any case, words do not lead to victory, πᾶν δὲ τέλος ἐν τὶν ἔργων [29-30], "every accomplishment is brought to fruition by the will of Zeus." And we should note that this is expressed literally as "every end of working is *in you*", which again specifies the image of a container, the outcome of efforts being contained within Zeus. This is especially the case since ἔργων can be derived from ἔργω, meaning "to work" and ἔργω, "to enclose within" and should be considered a play on words.

30. οὐδ' ἀμόχθῳ καρδίᾳ προσφέρων τόλμαν παραιτεῖται χάριν: "he does not ask for your favour bringing as an offering the courage of heart untried." The verb παραιτέομαι, "to beg for oneself" [Sl. > *παραιτέω, med.] has been translated variously as "to ask amiss" [Mezger, Bury] and "to decline from" or "to beg off" [LSJ], while the older sense is "to entreat from". The context guides us to the sense: the poet is himself praying to Zeus on behalf of Theaios; παραιτέομαι, must mean that Theaios is not only not doing the asking himself, οὐδε, but that he is also not asking the poet to do it for him. The present tense

further allies this sentence to the immediate context. προσφέρων τόλμαν, offering or putting forward his courage as an offering.

31. γνῶτ' αἰδέω θεῷ τε καὶ ὅστις ἀμιλλᾶται περὶ ἐσχάτων ἀέθλων κορυφαῖς: "I sing what is known to a god and to whomever strives for the crowns of the highest contests."

32-3. ὕπατον δ' ἔσχεν Πίσσα Ἡρακλέος τεθμόν: Pisa in Elis, site of the Olympic games, the "highest ordinance" of Herakles.

33-4. ἀδείαι γε μὲν ἀμβολάδαν | ἐν τελεταῖς δὲ Ἀθηναίων νιν ὀμφαί κώμασαν: The word of interest here is the adverb ἀμβολάδαν, which is usually translated as "as a prelude" [ἀναβολάς], and has the primary sense of bubbling up, as in boiling water or earth thrown up. This innate sense of the adverb is befits the detailed description which follows of the amphorae won at the Panathenaia.⁶

35-6. γαῖα δὲ καυθείσα πυρὶ καρπὸς ἐλαίας | ἔμολεν Ἥρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν ἐν ἀγγέων | ἔρκεσιν παμποικίλοις: The phrase γαῖα δὲ καυθείσα πυρὶ, "in fire-burned earth", bears some resemblance to the earth that opened up to Amphiaros: γαῖα. . . κεραυνωθείσα. The jars are described as being decorated on their walls, ἔρκεσιν παμποικίλοις. What is noteworthy is the use of ἔρκος, which generally refers to walls or other defensive means of enclosure, to describe the outside of a vase. It is used at Soph. *Trach.* 615 to describe a box that contains a tunic from Deianeira and has her seal [σφραγίς] on the outside [ἔρκος]. This points not only back to Amphiaros, who is in every sense in the protective custody of the earth, but also the earth and heaven exchange of Castor and Polydeukes. Here, in the context of Theiaios' victories at the Panathenaia, the praise of him and his ancestors which is about to begin, the jars must symbolize that inborn quality that enables him to be victorious at the games. It is in the protective custody of the earth i.e. his generation from noble stock, the heritage of Argos. The protective walls of the container are like the earth [or music] cast up for him. And this casting up, or bubbling up from the earth, presents another instance of the vertical dynamic in this poem, explicit earlier in ἐσχάτων. . . κορυφαῖς, and ὕπατον. The fact that the exterior of the jars is παμποικίλοις, lavishly or brilliantly decorated, within the metaphor reflects the externalization or visible evidence of those inborn qualities. It can also be seen as a reflection of Argos. In vv. 11-12 the language is similar enough to suggest that there might be a parallel: Ζεὺς ἐπ' Ἀλκιμήναν Δανάαν τε μολῶν τοῦτον κατέφανε λόγον | πατρὶ δ'

Ἄδραστοιο Λυγκεῖ τε φρενῶν καρπὸν εὐθείᾳ συνάρμοξεν δίκᾳ. Zeus makes apparent his divinity as the fruit of the olive.

We should also note here that the syntax is somewhat unusual in that the verb ἔμολεν is here used transitively, with Ἦρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν as its object, in what Hummel describes as an *accusatif allatif*.⁷ Other examples with μολ- and ἔρχομαι include O.9.71; 14.20-21; P.4.52; 5.52-53; I.2.48. In all these instances however, the verb has a place to go to or is accompanied by a participle: 1) O.9.71, πεδίον μολῶν ἔστα; O.14.20-21, μελανοτειχεά νῦν δόμον Φερσεφόνας ἔλθ' φέροισ' ἀγγελίαν; P.4.52, νᾶσον ἔλθοντες τέκωνται φῶτα; P.5.52-53, ἦλθες ἤδη Λιβύας πεδίον; I.2.48, ἀπόνειμον, ὅταν ξείνον ἐμὸν ἡθαῖον ἔλθης. But in this sentence the fruit of the olive goes to a rather undefined destination—λαὸς, a crowd or host. This is surely not an accusative of the type that follows an intransitive verb of motion with an adverbial sense of destination. The poet is doing something more extraordinary. In both this and the following verse the accusative use may be an example of catachresis.

37. ἔπεται δέ, Θεαῖε, ματρώων πολύγνωντον γένος ὑμετέρων. This verse also features a verb unusually with an accusative; all other occasions Pindar uses ἔπεται with the dative. There is further discomfort with θαμάκις, since it appears redundant to ἔπεται. More important, Theaios is named in the vocative, which signals the seal of his name placed on the object that contains the illustrious past of his ancestors—the jar has become an urn. That honour should follow the well-known race of ancestors on his mother's side suggests another allusion to a "vessel"—the jar being a symbol [if not a name] for the womb. εὐάγων in this light might be seen as another example of word-play: εὐάγων=εὐάγγων??

The perceived difficulty with ἔπεται has led to a number of emendations, notably ἐπέβα, "honour went to" [Wilamowitz, Snell-Mahler] which resolves the problem of the accusative while ἐφέπει, "honour pursued" [Bury], which also takes an accusative and retains the original sense has not been widely received. Turyn keeps ἔπεται and alters πολύγνωντον γένος to the dative; Schroeder reads it as nominative and separates it from the main text by parenthetical dashes. Pindar does use ἔπεται with a similar construction in O.6.70-71: ἐξ οὗ πολύκλειτον καθ' Ἑλλανας γένος Ἰαμιδᾶν ὄλβος ἅμ' ἔσπετο, but these lines have been reconstituted with a stop after Ἰαμιδᾶν. However, as with the previous explanation of an *accusatif allatif* or an accusative of place with a verb of motion [ἔπεται ἐς γένος] these emendations are most probably unnecessary. Moreover, if we take a closer look at the context, it might be possible to find a more useful explanation.

We have the following images: 1) sweet voices casting up their sound like a protective wall around Theaiaos; 2) the harvest of the olive tree in fire-burned earth, in jars with elaborately decorated walls; 3) honour follows the well-known race of your mothers' kin; 4) not hiding the light of my eyes in Argos; 5) the *penetralia* of Korinth, τρόφος and θάλησεν. All these images can be said and seen to resonate with the idea of vessels. The force of the accusative in this context with ἔπεται is one of all-encompassing containment: it acts to indicate that honour follows the well-known race of Theaiaos whole and entire to Argos.⁸

Honour comes many times: θαμάκις [38] serves as a numerical term, as τετράκις, δίς, τρίς, and does not present any difficulty. That honour is assisted by the Graces and the Tyndaridai ties in two themes, the one associated with Argos at the beginning, Charites and a female line of descent, and the tale of Kastor and Polydeukes which is to be introduced.

39–41. ἀξιωθείην κεν, . . . Ἄργεϊ μὴ κρύπτειν φάος ὀμμάτων. This is certainly word-play on Argos, the hundred-eyed monster, to which we may include an allusion to the traditional veiling of women, especially at the marriage ceremony, since on his mother's side Theaiaios is related to Thrasyklos and Antias.

41–2. νικαφορίαις γὰρ Προίτιο τόδ' ἵπποτρόφον | ἄστν
θάλησεν Κορίνθου τ' ἐν μυχοῖς, καὶ Κλεωναίων πρὸς ἀνδρῶν
τετράκις: The verb θάλησεν is a direct descendent of the theme of birth and kinship: Proitos and his twin brother, Acrisios, were contenders for Argos, a horse-rearing city, and as such were the midwives of its birth; the city is ἵπποτρόφον, distinguishing its nurturing nature; ἐν μυχοῖς, has the double meaning of a corner [Fennell explains it as the gulf] of Korinth and of rooms, *penetralia*, exclusively for women within a household.

43. Σικυνόθε δ' ἀργυρωθέντες σὺν οἰνηραῖς φιάλαις ἀπέβαν:
"they left *silvered* with wine cups." This is not an example of caprice or nicety of poetic expression.⁹ Pindar deliberately, explicitly states that the men are silvered *because* they themselves are vessels. They leave from Sikyon as "vesselled" as Theaiaos' victories are contained within jars. Attempts to renegotiate the specifics of poetic language to ordinary usage impair not only the sense within the particular moment of its expression, but equally misinform the direction and sense of thematic agenda.

44. ἐκ δὲ Πελλάνας ἐπιεσσάμενοι νῶτον μαλακαῖσι κρόκαις:
Again the victors are contained—covered in—the garments won. ἐπιεσσάμενοι, the participle has the added preposition ἐπί making their cover more complete.

The tactile quality of this victory prize by is made specific by "back" and "with soft threads".

45–48. ἀλλὰ χαλκὸν μυρίον οὐ δυνατόν ἐξελέγχειν. . σθένει: χαλκὸν μυρίον recalls the burning ἀρεταῖς μυρίαῖς of ν.2. And, like the first strophe, this is followed by a statement concerning the inability of the poet to enumerate the details [μακρὰ μὲν τὰ Περσέος, etc.], and a subsequent catalogue [Perseus, Medusa, Epaphos, Egypt, Hypermnestra]. Here he states, μακροτέρας γὰρ ἀριθμῆσαι σχολᾶς, and lists, Kleitor, Tegea, lofty Achaian cities and Lykaion. The physical conjoining of ποδῶν χειρῶν makes manifest the close physical contact of the athletic endeavours. The verbal and thematic resonances of the this third antistrophe to the first strophe is an indication of the ode's structural design. With the first half—and the poem is exactly at its half-way mark—the poet reviewed the exploits of Argive heroes; here he is about to begin the myth of Kastor and Polydeukes.

49. Κάστορος δ' ἐλθόντος ἐπὶ ξενίαν παρ Παμφάη: Pamphaës, maternal ancestor of Theiaios, whose name means "all-shining light" is a counterpart in her reception of the Dioskouri to the brightness of Argos and its reception of the Danaidai. The split of the ode is characterized by the opposing direction of the verbs that converge on Argos: the victors of the past leave Sikyon, ἀπέβαν, to come home to Argos while here the brothers arrive as guests, ἐλθόντος ἐπὶ ξενίαν.

50–51. οὐ θαῦμα σφίσιν | ἐγγενὲς ἔμμεν ἀθληταῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν: "it is no wonder for them to be born with good athletic abilities." What is significant, apart from the Pindar's somewhat standard statement concerning the inborn abilities of victors actual and figures mythological in his poetry, is that here he qualifies these not with the usual συγγενής but with ἐγγενής, a word that he uses only once again in N.4.68, whereas συγγενής and σύγγονος occur [both as subst. and adj.] 18 times. Clearly ἐγγενής is motivated by the jar-imagery. The athletic abilities of Kastor and Polydeukes are thus described as specifically as possible as belonging to their "insides", as being contained within them.

51–53. ἐπεὶ | εὐρυχόρου ταμίαι Σπάρτας ἀγώνων | μοῖραν Ἑρμᾶ καὶ σὺν Ἡρακλεῖ διέποντι θάλειαν: There are interesting echoes in this verse with the second strophe. The ἀγώνων μοῖραν of Sparta is a close copy of the μοῖραν ἐσλῶν of Argos; the adjective εὐρυχόρου, spacious for dancing, which here qualifies Sparta, resonates, albeit less markedly, with εὐχορδον, the well-strung lyre; the Dioskouroi are stewards, ταμίαι, while Argos is the τέμενος of

the its athletes: in the second strophe the call to awaken song is for the Hekatombaia to Hera; here with Hermes and Herakles, the Dioskouroi manage, διέποντι, the contests.

54. μάλα μὲν ἀνδρῶν δικαίων περικαδόμενοι: "they are especially concerned with men of justice." This characterization of the Dioskouroi is most apt since their story involves sharing of a particularly generous kind—unlike the other brothers who figure in this ode. Their system of justice, to share their mortal and immortal destiny, allies itself with the quality or story Zeus makes apparent [κατέφανε λόγον] in v.12: πατρὶ δ' Ἀδράστοιο Λυγκεῖ τε φρενῶν καρπὸν εἰθεία συνάρμοξεν δίκῃ. An aspect to be noted here is the fact that the only thing that Adrastus and Lynkeos share is a tomb in Argos [Paus. 2.23.2] and that this Lynkeos is a double in name only with the Lynkeos associated with the Dioskouroi.

καὶ μὲν θεῶν πιστὸν γένος:

55–6. μεταμειβόμενοι δ' ἐναλλάξ ἀμέραν τὰν μὲν παρὰ πατρὶ φίλῳ | Δὶ νέμονται: "Exchanging in turn, they dwell one day with their beloved father Zeus." This line is closely allied with v.17–18 where Hebe spends time with Hera on Olympus: οὐ κατ' Ὀλυμπον ἄλοχος Ἥβα τελεία παρὰ μητέρι βαίνοισ' ἔστι. It enjoys the same horizontality. Furthermore, adhering to the outward expansion of direction in the ode, we can see that in v.17–18, Hebe's vertical passagewith her divine mother follows the earth's reception of Amphiaraios, whereas here it is the reverse.

56. τὰν δ' ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης ἐν γυάλοις Θεράπνας: "in the hollows of Therapna" is explained by the scholia as ὑπόγεια, an underground vault or chamber tomb. Fennell dispenses with this explanation as tautological, claiming that Therapna lies in the Lakedaimonian valley.

57. πότμον ἀμπιπλάντες ὁμοῖον: "fulfilling the same fate". We should note that the participle literally means "filling up" which sense is again highly suited to the poem's pervasive imagery of vessels. Moreover, πότμον which has the original sense of falling, is entirely appropriate to the particulars of this myth, since Polydeukes shares death, or the earthly, downward state of his brother.

57–9. ἐπεὶ | τοῦτον, ἢ πάνπαν θεὸς ἔμμεναι οἰκεῖν τ' οὐρανῷ εἶλετ' αἰῶνα φθιμένον Πολυδεύκης Κάστορος ἐν πολέμῳ: The line is interrupted, ἐπεὶ, as indeed the lives of Kastor and his twin brother are by temporality. ἢ πάνπαν, lit. "or/than entirely" functions like a comparative with the usual μάλλον suppressed and is dependent on εἶλετο "chose" which verb is

strategically placed at the beginning of the line. The phrase, θεὸς ἔμμεναι οἰκεῖν τ' οὐρανῷ describes the horizontal existence of eternal life and contrasts with the phrase, αἰῶνα φθιμένου. . ἐν πολέμῳ "lifetime destroyed in battle". The difference between the two fates of mortal and immortal is contained in the word αἰῶνα which denotes a lifetime that is limited, whereas immortality is expressed by a god's simply "being", θεὸς ἔμμεναι. The situation of the brothers is further clarified by the placement of their names: Polydeukes is first and, in the verse as in fact, steps in between Kastor and his death. The end-lines can also be paired vertically, οὐρανῷ and πολέμῳ.

60. τὸν γὰρ Ἴδας ἀμφὶ βουσίη πως χολωθείς ἔτρωσεν χαλκίας λόγχας ἀκμῇ: "For Idas somehow angered about cattle wounded him with the point of a bronze lance". This story of the cattle is similar to Hes. *Scut. Herc.* 12: χασάμενος περὶ βουσί. The presence of πως is an indication that the details of the origin of the quarrel are not necessary to Pindar's point.

61. ἀπὸ Ταυγέτου πεδαιγάζων ἶδεν Λυγκεὺς δρυὸς ἐν στελέχει ἡμένους: The initial problem here is ἡμένους, Boeckh's emendation of the mss. ἡμένος which, were it in the nominative ἡμενος, would then describe Lynkeos sitting in the tree. The objection to this is that it is in conflict with Lynkeos' unusual powers of vision—in the Kypria he is said to have had the ability to see through the wood of the oak in which both brothers were hiding—whereas the form ἡμένος, suggested by Didymos as a form of the Boiotian acc. plural, attributes the sitting to the two brothers; ἡμενον, by Aristarchos [acc. s.] since he thought Polydeukes sat alone in the oak because of the phrase, ἦλθε Λήδας παῖς διώκων. While it is clear that in the context of this ode the participle cannot refer to Lynkeos, the question of whether it is one or both brothers is nevertheless not made apparent by the phrase cited above. This states only the fact that one of the brothers pursued the sons of Aphareos. The verb πεδαιγάζων is a Boiotianism suggested by Triclinius for the mss. ποδ' αὐγάζων and generally accepted. This emendation however disallows a certain poetic feature of the mss. version. With πεδαιγάζων the sense is, "From Taygetos, Lynkeos, watching, saw them sitting in the hollow of an oak tree."; with ποδ' αὐγάζων, the sense is "discerning the foot" of one of the men.

That the twins sit in the hollow of an oak not only adheres to the vessel imagery of the ode but also conforms to imagery associated with their birth; the oak, symbol of Zeus, their father, provides them with a hollow just as the eggs did from which they were born. For this reason I think the line improved by the uncorrected mss. reading: Lynkeos' spotting a foot protruding from a tree, a living

thing from an inanimate [relatively inanimate] form, suggests an image like that of life hatching from an egg.

62-3. κείνου γὰρ ἐπιχθονίων πάντων γένετ' ὀξύτατον | ὄμμα:
The far-sighted ability of Lynkeos aligns itself with the Argos theme.

64-5. λαιψηροῖς δὲ πόδεσσιν ἄφαρ ἐξικέσθαι καὶ μέγα ἔργον
ἐμήσαντ' ὠκέως καὶ πάθον δεινὸν παλάμαις Ἀφαρητίδαι Διός:
Bury's suggestion that ἄφαρ is a play on words with Ἀφαρητίδαι is one of the few such "verbal echoes" of his with which one can agree. What is more remarkable is the accumulation of words which denote the speed and the vigour with which the action takes place, λαιψηροῖς, ἄφαρ, ὠκέως, αὐτίκα. The verb ἐξικέσθαι > ἐξικνέομαι means "to arrive at, reach, get to"; the aorist gives the action immediacy and the repetition of καὶ conjoins two aspects of their activity with paratactic alacrity: they planned an important event; they suffered terrible consequences—καὶ μέγα ἔργον: καὶ πάθον δεινόν. The names Ἀφαρητίδαι Διός are opportunistically mingled as the sons of Aphareos meet up with Zeus. The collision, matched by the speed with which they arrive, is dramatized by the interruption of the phrase παλάμαις Διός by Ἀφαρητίδαι which in effect places them between the hands of Zeus.

65-6. αὐτίκα γάρ | ἦλθε Λήδας παῖς διώκων: The brevity of this and the next sentence adds to the quick pace of the action. Leda, the mother of both sons, counterpoises Zeus.

66. τοῖ δ' ἔναντα στάθεν τύμβῳ σχεδὸν πατρώϊω: The tomb of Aphareus.

67-8. ἔνθεν ἀρπάξαντες ἄγαλμ' Ἀΐδα, ξεστὸν πέτρον ἔμβαλον
στέρνῳ Πολυδεύκεος: The phrase ἄγαλμ' Ἀΐδα, the monument of Hades, or death, is interesting since the account given in Apollodoros describes the weapon only as a rock. Whether or not, as Farnell suggested, this is because the poet knew a local folkloric version of the tale, Pindar is redirecting the poem's action to the vertical mode, downwards to death. The crasis or collision of the two nouns causes the monument to lose a vowel and symbolically crushes the nouns in the same way as Polydeukes is about to be crushed.

That the stone is polished is a detail which may mean that the stone was worked, i.e. that it had some image upon it, or that the site was frequently visited and the stone worn from human contact and time.

68-9. ἀλλ' οὐ νιν φλάσαν οὐδ' ἀνέχασσαν: The equal number of syllables in both negative statements lends a quality of heroic measure to the

resistance of Polydeukes. He is neither crushed nor pushed back and drives his spear into the side of Lynkeus.

71. Ζεὺς δ' ἐπ' Ἴδα πυρφόρον πλᾶξε πολόεντα κεραυνόν: Zeus strikes Idas with a smoking, fiery thunderbolt; the consonants of πλᾶξε, πολόεντα, fairly sizzle with the event. As Bury has noted, both πυρφόρος, πολόεις and πλήσσω are ἅπαξ εἰρημένα in Pindar's work. Zeus' thunderbolt here is not to deify or to honour—as in the case of Amphiaraios—but to destroy and punish. The verb ἐπλάσσω in tmesis effectively shatters the life of Idas. The two brothers, Lynkeos and Idas, burn alone and at the same time: ἅμα δ' ἐκαίοντ' ἐρῆμοι. This last sentence is in stark contrast to the shared destiny of the other brothers. The word ἐρῆμοι is particularly touching since it denotes a condition of desertion, abandonment and emptiness further qualified by the imperfect ἐκαίοντι, i.e. they continued to burn. The power of ἐρῆμοι, in some sense contradicted by ἅμα, which implies a situation that is shared, is in the nothingness it connotes. They have vanished; Zeus has indeed annihilated them.

72. χαλεπὰ δ' ἔρις ἀνθρώποις ὀμιλεῖν κρεσσόνων: The implications of this statement are that mortals do not fare well in any contest with the gods, and by extension, that those who, like athletes, compete with their superiors in strength and ability, will lose. The annihilation of the Apharaidai is an example in mythic form of the "annihilation" or darkness of oblivion which befalls those uncelebrated in epinkia, and in the example of Kastor and Polydeukes, Pindar is perhaps alluding to the sharing of victory by the victor's community.

The verb ὀμιλεῖν is telling: it does not only mean "to encounter in battle" but primarily "to keep company with" [met. "have as companion", SI.], "to associate" with a community or group. Pindar carefully directs the narrative of the hostile encounter of the Apharaidai and Tyndaridai to the distinction that must be made between divine and mortal. The strife that is difficult is that of association with mightier, more powerful forces. It also describes the struggle that Polydeukes is about to experience as he witnesses his mortal brother dying.

73. ταχέως δ' ἐπ' ἀδελφεοῦ βίαν πάλιν χώρησεν ὁ Τυνδαρίδας: The beginning corresponds to v.71, Ζεὺς δ' ἐπ' Ἴδα and creates a parallel between the rescue of Polydeukes by Zeus and now Kastor by his brother. The sense of ἐπ' ἀδελφεοῦ βίαν πάλιν χώρησεν ὁ Τυνδαρίδας is in reverse: to his brother, mighty, back, went, the son of Tyndareos. The word βίαν used in a periphrastic construction with the genitive to mean "mighty brother", is significantly positioned between Polydeukes and Kastor with the adverb πάλιν,

and the two words meet in the exact middle of the line, each part comprising ten syllables. It cannot be fortuitous but by design that the words "life-force, strength" and "back" are conjoined mid-line in this context of Kastor's being brought back to life.

74. καὶ νιν οὐπω τεθναότ' ἄσθματι δὲ φρίσσοντα πνοᾶς ἔκιχεν:
He is not yet dead, but shudders with his last breaths. The mss. give, φρίσσοντ' ἀμπνοᾶς [B] and φρίσσοντ' ἀναπνοᾶς [D]. The problem with the mss. versions is that they do not scan e—D—D but interrupt the final dactylic dimeter, D, with a longum for a brevis: — — — — — .

φρίσ-σοντ' ἀμπνοᾶς ἔκιχεν as opposed to φρίσ-σοντᾶ πνοᾶς ἔκιχεν. What the mss. version does, apart from troubling editors, is cause the death rattle of Kastor to be represented metrically. The interruption or irregularity is perfectly suited to someone whose breathing has become laboured. The correction, which dates from E. Schmid, and has been, with the exception of Mommsen's substitution of γένυας for πνοᾶς, universally accepted, seems to me to ignore the inherent value of such a disregard for strict metrical rules.

75. θερμὰ δὴ τέγγων δάκρυα στοναχαῖς ὄρθιον φώνασε: The word ὄρθιον directs upwards in final ascending dynamic of the narrative. The mss. version has again been emended[E. Schmid] for reasons of metre, the particle δὴ replacing the mss. δέ. However, although it has been accepted by most editors with the exception of Schroeder and Bury, as Bury notes, δὴ occurs in the next verse and is unlikely to have been repeated in such close quarters. Moreover, as has been suggested above, the interruption of the metrical correspondence is at this point most appropriate to the emotional tenor of the text: Polydeukes weeps and groans with grief for his fallen brother.

76-8. Πάτερ Κρονίων, τίς δὴ λύσις ἔσσεται πενθέων; . . οἷχεται τιμὰ φίλων τατωμένῳ φωτί: The participle, τατωμένῳ "to be deprived, bereaved" is of interest as it stands in the phrase, φίλων τατωμένῳ φωτί, for a mortal deprived of friends, for it describes the situation of the other brothers, Lynkeos and Idas who have died ἐρημοί. The designation of φώς indicates that Polydeukes is identifying with his mortal brother. Even the question he poses to Zeus, "What release will there ever be from sorrows?" belies his destiny of carefree immortality. οἷχεται τιμὰ honour dies for a mortal deprived of those he loves.

78-9. παῦροι δ' ἐν πόνῃ πιστοὶ βροτῶν | καμάτου μεταλαμβάνειν: "few mortals are loyal in sharing difficulty." These lines, and those of this antistrophe to the final epode, the only run-on lines in the ode,

resonate with v. 54, καὶ μὰν θεῶν πιστὸν γένος, and with their games-specific vocabulary [πόνος, καμάτος] constitute a reflection of the noble athlete. It forms thus a juncture between the mortal and immortal cultures and ethics as it joins Polydeukes and Kastor in shared life and death.

79-. ὥς ἦνεπε Ζεὺς δ' ἀντίος ἦλυθέ οἱ: There is a Homeric quality to these words as well as a meeting of the vertical and horizontal planes within the ode. Zeus came opposite him, i.e. descends to earth and presents himself on the same level, καὶ τόδ' ἐξαύδασ' ἔπος, "and spoke this word".

80-82. The distinction of birth is made in a forthright manner by Zeus. "You are my son; then the husband, hero, when he had approached your mother, dripped this man's mortal seed." The recurrent vessel imagery is now made perfectly clear. The very words σπέρμα θνατὸν[81], "mortal seed," placed together and positioned beside ματρὶ τεῇ, are located centrally within the stanza, the shortest line surrounded on either side of it by lines of increasing length. This physical fact is integral to the poem's overall structure; for the idea of a vessel that has been illustrated, or one might better say, shaped, in every strophe throughout the ode, is now brought to its fullest account. That the womb itself was a vessel, a kind of upside down jar in which female and male seed were mixed, was common to the Greek notion of reproduction¹⁰. The jar had a mouth, στόμα, a neck, ἀντήν, and a fundus or bottom, πυθμήν.¹¹ The verb στάζω, to drip or drop into, conforms to this principle, for it describes an action that is more suited to pouring liquid into a container than to sexual congress. Furthermore, the terms πόσις and ἥρως are separated, each in a line of verse that together forms pictorially like an embrace around the central verse, the greater male elements surrounding and confining the lesser female, thus defining the inner nature of conception and, by extension, the inherent qualities of one's nature. For it is not so much the condition of male / female relations that is involved, but the principle of inner and outer; the nature of the exterior man is determined by his interior and the presence of the divine is, in human or part-human nature determined always by the inner. What is contained in the vessel determines its nature.

The sense of the participle πελάσας to "having come near to" resonates with ἀντίος, and since it describes a sexual embrace in spatial terms of proximity, of the active male approaching the passive/fixed female, reaffirms the close relationship of Zeus to Polydeukes.

82. ἀλλ' ἄγε τῶνδ' ἐμοὶ ἔμπαν αἵρεσιν παρδίδωμι : The verb παρδίδωμι which literally means to give from beside, reasserts the shared planes of influence between Zeus and Polydeukes.

83. εἰ μὲν θάνατόν τε φυγὼν καὶ γῆρας ἀπεχθόμενον: This follows the tradition that immortals not only did not experience death but also remained forever young.

84. αὐτὸς Οὐλύμπου θέλεις <ναίειν ἐμοὶ> σὺν τ' Ἀθαναίᾳ κελαινεγχεῖ τ' Ἄρει: Zeus describes the togetherness of Olympian life by the example of Athena and Ares, two warriors, male and female. The bracketed words [Boeckh] compensate for what has been assessed as four missing syllables in the mss., and have generally been deemed the most reasonable reconstruction, especially since the scholiasts' paraphrase οἰκεῖν ἐμοὶ suggests that this was the sense of the missing part. There is of course no absolute way in which to judge what Pindar had in mind, nor whether in fact there is a lacuna. It is again the metrical demands that require three longa and one brevis to be supplied here. What is less obvious is the banality of the correction and the fact that it is not needed for sense to be made of the sentence. Without it, the line would read "if you wish, fleeing death and hateful old age, Olympus for yourself, with Athena and black-speared Ares, then the destiny of these is yours." The ἐμοὶ seems particularly otiose. As it stands, what has been overlooked and is perhaps the more likely—in my view—missing link, is an adjective with Athena. The fact that scholiasts paraphrased is in no way a guarantee that those words or sense of those words was in the text; on the contrary, an explanation is usually necessitated by their absence.

The allusion to Ares' spear as blackened [with blood] might serve to bring Polydeukes' kinship with the gods into focus, since he too has just "blackened" his spear in Lynkeos' side.

85. εἰ δὲ κασιγνήτου πέρι μάρνασαι: the verb "to strive or contend," another battle verb, again fixes Polydeukes among the warrior group of Athena and Ares; it also implies that some struggle is involved in choosing mortality.

86-7. ἥμισυ μὲν κε πνέοις γαίης ὑπένερθεν ἑών | ἥμισυ δ' οὐρανοῦ ἐν χρυσεῖς δόμοισιν: With perfect neatness these form the mid-section of the final epode and finalize the inherent significance of the vessel imagery. By repeating the same "half" at the beginning of each line they reflect the double yet equal nature of their lives. Half of Polydeukes' life will be breathing beneath the earth; half in the golden homes of heaven. Beneath the earth, γαίης ὑπένερθεν, is easily imagined as within a container, especially since it is specified

that he will *live* there by the participle ἐών and the verb πνέοις. The gold of heaven's domiciles is, to argue the image further, specific to the exterior of the vessel. Just as the sky surrounds the earth in an embrace of gold, so too the vase [or urn] embraces the hollow dark interior to which no light has access.

89. ὥς ἄρ' αὐδάσαντος οὐ γνώμα διπλόαν θέτο βουλάν: The contention of editors that it is Polydeukes who is the one undivided in decision and not Zeus is made difficult by two factors, the one αὐδάσαντος, whose subject by must be Zeus and by the final verse ἔλυσεν which some contend is Zeus, others Polydeukes.

90. ἀνὰ δ' ἔλυσεν μὲν ὀφθαλμόν, ἔπειτα δὲ φωνὰν χαλκομίτρα Καστόρος: It is less likely that Polydeukes releases the eyes and voice of Kastor than Zeus. However one decides, a change of subject here is abrupt within a short space. What is most relevant is that *voice* of Kastor is described as χαλκομίτρα, "bronze-helmeted". These words should not be dissembled to mean that he is wearing a helmet. In the same way that the members of Theaios' family are "silvered" vessels when they return from Sikyon, so too the voice of Kastor as he is called back from death is "bronzed". Pindar is moreover making one last yet important connection with this arresting language. At v.29 he prays to Zeus on behalf of Theaios, τῶν μὲν ἔραται φρενί, σιγᾷ οἱ στόμα, he longs for these things but his mouth is silent. Theaios desires immortality just as Kastor does but has no voice. The poet has released Theaios' voice just as Polydeukes has released that of Kastor's. The poet has the power to bestow immortality, to speak for the ineffable desires of the earthen heart.

1. Stern, J., "The Myths of Pindar's *Nemean 10*," *GRBS* 10, 1969, 126n4 observes that the expression θανάτου νέφος is more common, e.g. Il.16.350; Od.4.180. I disagree however, that the expression used here is common to other epic and lyric poets. On the contrary, "cloud of war" cannot not equal "cloud of death" especially since it is only used once in epic and once here by Pindar.

2. Op.cit.125.

3. For a general overview of other thematic ideas in this ode, see, Young, D.C., "The Myth of *Nemean 10*," *GRBS* 35, 1994, 123f.

4. Drachmann, 31, p.170.

5. Drachmann, 39, p171. γράφεται δὲ καὶ εὐφρόνων· εὐφόρων μὲν, ἐπεὶ εὐφοροί εἰσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι πόνοι τῷ ἄριστα ἄθλα ἐνηνοχέειν· εὐφρόνων δὲ, τῶν εὐφραντικῶν.

6. Cf. ἀμβολάδαν: Il.21.364, boiling cauldron; *hHerm*:426.

7. Hummel, p.102.

8. "A noun stands in the accusative when the idea it expresses is most immediately . . . and most completely . . . under the influence of the verbal conception. . . ." Smyth, H.W., *Greek Grammar*, Cambridge, Mass. 1984, p. 353f.1552.

9. Carne-Ross, D.S., "Three Preludes for Pindar," *Arion* n.s.2, 1975, 179, has noticed the value and pictorial [or metaphorical] imperative of this line.

10. E.g. Hipp. *De natura mul.*, 21.1-3. Ἦν δὲ τὸ στόμα τῶν ὑστερέων σκληρὸν γένηται ἢ ὁ αὐχὴν, τὸν δάκτυλον παρεισάγων, γνώσῃ καὶ ἐπὶ πρὸς τὸ ἰσχίον ἔωσιν ἀπεστραμμέναι. Sor. *Gyn.* 3.17.2.3-6: φλεγμαίνει γὰρ ποτὲ μὲν ὅλη, ποτὲ δὲ τὸ στόμιον αὐτῆς, ποτὲ δὲ ὁ τράχηλος, ποτὲ δὲ ὁ πυθμὴν, ποτὲ δὲ τὸ κύτος ἥτοι ἄνωθεν ἢ κάτωθεν ἢ ἐκ πλαγίων, ποτὲ δὲ τινα τούτων ἢ τὰ πλείστα μέρη.

11. For a discussion and bibliography of the literature see Hanson, A.E., "The Medical Writers' Woman," in *Before Sexuality*, edd. D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler, F.I. Zeitlin, Princeton, 1990, 309-338.

NEMEAN 1

1-2. Ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφειοῦ. . Ὀρτυγία: The poem starts with an image of relaxation: the river Alpheos breathes out in a fountain, [Arethousa, on the island of Ortygia], while flowing underneath the earth, lit. "sacred breathing up of Alpheos," ἄμπνευμα > ἄνα πνευμα, a breathing up. The fountain/spring represents what one might call the blow-hole of the groundwater. The expression may also have implications of relaxing or catching one's breath.¹

Ortygia is called the shoot or offspring, θάλος, of famous Syracuse because the island was the site of the first Greek colony of Syracuse and later was attached by bridge to the mainland. Braswell suggests this to be the most likely sense of the word rather than "bloom" or "blossom" especially given the firm structure to this ode.²

3. δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος: δέμνιον, "couch" or bed of Artemis. Ortygia and Delos, both islands sacred to Artemis, are characterized here as where she sleeps or rests, presumably describes a temple to the goddess.³ There has been some speculation whether the temple had a statue of the goddess reclining but there is no evidence for this. It is in any case not so relevant to the poetry and poetic design whether the bed existed in situ or not; what is relevant is the idea of foundations and bridges, and that the earth, here in the form of an island, like a bed, lies upon water.

It should also be noted that Arethousa, whom Alpheos in love pursued from his headwaters in Arcadia to Syracuse in Sicily, was one of Artemis' nymphs. Ortygia and Delos are said to be sister islands because of their association with Artemis. Why the islands (and Artemis) should be associated with quails, ὀρτυγες, is a matter that is still not fully understood.

4-6. σέθεν ἀδυεπῆς | ὕμνος ὀρμάται θέμεν | αἶνον ἀελλοπόδων μέγαν ἵππων: The verb ὀρμάται, "to start from" [Sl.] states that the sweet-worded hymn starts from Ortygia and lays the foundation of great praise for storm-footed horses. The epexegetical infinitive θέμεν is here used in its architectural sense of construction, to lay the base or foundation for something.⁴ The "path of song" is thus laid down and makes its way to Syracuse in the same way as the river Alpheos has made his way from Arcadia. And just as Alpheus pursued one that he loved, so too the poet pursues the victor with his praise.

7. ἄρμα δ' ὀτρύνει Χρομίου Νεμέα τ' ἔργασιν νικαφόροις ἐγκώμιον ζεῦξαι μέλος: Similar to the path of Alpheus, this one runs from

mainland (Argolid) Nemea to Sicily. The verb ὀτρύνει lends some sense of urgency to the passage. The poet states that he is driven to harness a song by the chariot of Chromios and Nemea. Examined closely, both ὀρμάται and ὀτρύνει describe the poem as something that creates itself or motivates itself. The first verb by its middle voice is functionally passive; it is somewhat like water, which does not appear to have a beginning and drives itself; the second by virtue of its subject, the chariot, drives, urges itself. There is no personal pronoun for the poet: he is conspicuously absent.

This line can be studied for the sheer genius of its physical construction. The first word, ἄρμα, chariot is in fact yoked to the final word μέλος, song [or limb], which in turn is "yoked" to ἐγκώμιον by the verb "to yoke." The two ends of the line are thus joined to form a vehicle of poetic direction.

Moreover, the image of yoking a song to deeds is allied to the yoking not only of horses to chariots, or drivers to chariots, which is obviously relevant here to the praise of Chromios' racing victory, but also of island to mainland, of one site to another, Delos to Ortygia.

8. ἀρχαὶ δὲ βέβληνται θεῶν: The beginnings, ἀρχαί, are here definitely the structural foundations of the ode's architecture. They have been laid down, βέβληνται, with the names of the gods, Zeus of Aitna and Artemis, both of whom are described in their relation to Syracuse, home of Chromios. The mention of Zeus Aitnaios, which a scholiast explains as a festival when the ode was performed, suggests that this ode was composed during or after Hieron's founding of Aitna.⁵

9. κείνου σὺν ἀνδρὸς δαιμονίαις ἀρεταῖς: Chromios, qualified as one who has godlike attributes. That his abilities are δαιμονίαι suggests comparison with those of Herakles, v.34, ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετῶν μεγάλαις.

10–11. ἔστι δ' ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ / πανδοξίας ἄκρον: ἄκρον, another term of architectural import, is the peak or summit of a structure. Chromios' victory represents the top part of the Syracusan edifice. It is εὐτυχία, good fortune, that has built the reputation or fame that can be recognized or seen by all, πανδοξίας, a hapax legomenon. It combines in this statement with εὐτυχία, the prefixes εὐ and παν regulating the sense of the superlative in ἄκρον.

11–12. μεγάλων δ' ἀέθλων | Μοῖσα μεμνᾶσθαι φιλεῖ: The muse loves to remember great athletic victories. The verb φιλέω, here functions as a yoke: it is love that binds or yokes the victor to his praise, the poet to his muse.

13. σπεῖρέ νυν ἀγλαίαν τινὰ νάσῳ: The poet addresses the Muse. This imperative, "sow" is seen as related to the agricultural metaphors in other odes

[O.9.26; P.6.1-3; N.6.32-34; 10.26] and to the particular fertility of this island v.14. However, there is an even more obvious reason for the poet to enjoin the Muse to "sow now". We have moved from the foundations to the peak—an outline or sketch of the building—and now from that peak the Muse is enjoined to pour down seed. The point is that the Muse, and Pindar's poem, shed down onto the island something that will shine. The action is downward from on high in correlation to the nodding down of Zeus [14], κατένευσέν, to Persephone. The very fact that the antistrophe and epode are conjoined in a run-on line effects the fertility granted.

13-14. τὰν Ὀλύμπου δεσπότης / Ζεὺς ἔδωκεν Φερσεφόνα, κατένευσέν τέ οἱ χαίταις ἀριστεύσαν εὐκάρπου χθονός: Persephone was given Sicily as a wedding present from Zeus for her marriage to Plouton.⁶ This suits well the statement at v.16 where the poet says that Zeus granted her a people/bridegroom of bronzed war, μναστήρᾳ οἱ χαλκεντέος λαόν. The phrase κατένευσέν τέ οἱ χαίταις, "he nodded to her with his hair", is thought to be modeled on Il.1.528-30 [Braswell] or alternately 524 [Carey] but this overlooks an even closer connection with v.68 where Herakles fouls the bright hair of the Giants with the earth. The locks of Zeus as he nods "yes" signal the great gifts that can be granted by him whereas the Giants who fought against him, their fouled hair is a sign of their lack of power.

15. Σικελίαν πείραν ὀρθώσιν κορυφαῖς πολίων ἀφνεαῖς: The "seed" rises in buildings ὀρθώσιν κορυφαῖς πολίων ἀφνεαῖς, with rich peaks or crowns or cities. The expression ἀριστεύοισαν εὐκάρπου, to excel in crops, is readily related to ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ . . . ἄκρον; the richness of the Sicilian soil is as much its people as its produce.

There is a further link to the chain of association. Persephone was traditionally made off with by Hades while she gathered flowers in the Nysaeen fields, near Enna in Sicily.⁷ Also Artemis and Athena were among her companions⁸ Additionally, the Orphic tradition tells a story of Zeus approaching Persephone in the form of a serpent and begetting Zagreus.⁹ The story goes that Hera, wrathful and jealous of the child, to whom Zeus had promised power over the entire universe, sent the Titans on a mission of destruction, and they, distracting the boy with toys managed to dismember and devour him.

16-18. ὧπασε δὲ Κρονίων πολέμου μναστήρᾳ οἱ χαλκεντέος | λαὸν ἵππαιχμον θαμὰ δὴ καὶ Ὀλυμπιάδων φύλλοις ἐλαιᾶν χρυσεῖς μιχθέντα: "The son of Kronos granted [her] a horse-armed host to

be the suitor /bridegroom of bronze war many times and to mingle with the golden leaves of the olive trees of Olympia." The word *μναστῆρά* is usually read as "reminders" of war or "enamoured"[Race]. I prefer the sense of suitor or bridegroom [supra v.13-14] since the participle, *μιχθέντα*, "mingled" is, in Pindaric language, always associated with the idea of marriage and by extension, the wedding of the victor with his victory. Here the combination is replete not only by the "marriage" of Sicily with victory in war, and in the games, Chromios with his victory and now with the poet's praise, but includes the myth of Persephone's marriage to Hades/Plouton. The leaves are golden and war is bronzed since metals shine and the Muse has been told to sow something resplendent.

18. *πολλῶν ἐπέβαν καιρὸν οὐ φεύδει βαλὼν*: The poet states literally that he has stepped upon the right moment or the right theme, having cast it down. It difficult to translate *καιρὸς* as anything other than whatever is the most appropriate in the sense of time, space and matter. The poet usually employs the word in a concrete sense, as in a marked target and, by extension, subject matter or theme.

For Gallet, who relates the word to its use in weaving, this passage uses the word to mean "on a quelques raisons de croire qu' il a dans l' esprit, bien plus que les notions d' opportunité, de juste mesure, de tact ou de cible, bien plus que celle de brièveté qui n' épuise pas tout le sens du mot, la notion de fil conducteur, de lien qui assure la cohésion d' éléments en apparence disparates."¹⁰

Braswell¹¹ does not accept Wilson's¹² "striking the appropriate target unerringly" but elects for "opportunity" or "occasion", translating: "having embarked on many themes I have not touched the occasion with falsehood."

I prefer the more literal, less metaphorical reading of the line. The participle *βαλὼν* should be read with *ἐπέβαν*, "having cast the foundation, I set foot upon what is fitting to many themes with accuracy." This interpretation delineates the primary idea of construction in the ode, but is not meant to preclude the other levels of meaning, such as are generally understood, that the poet has taken a position with respect to the several associated elements within the poem and relates them to the essential element of praise without deflection, with truth. Even if *οὐ φεύδει* is to be taken in conjunction with *βαλὼν*, the general idea remains that the foundations to praise have been laid down in true matters. The principle reason why it is best to follow the literal sense is motivated by the subsequent verse: the poet stands before the door of the court of Chromios and the path to the door, the path of the epinikion, has been laid with care. Each section is fitted one to another

the way stones are be fitted to form an arch. The action of ἐπέβαν connects with and is fitted in supremely concrete terms to the stasis of ἔσταν[19]. What he has stepped upon he will now stand on—the repetition of ἐπί localizes and confirms this field.

If in fact we examine the deeper structure of the ode, then the courtyard is the entrance to the ode's central celebration—or banquet room—and the feast which the poet sees prepared and awaiting for him, is all those qualities of Chromios worthy of praise.

19–20. ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις / ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου καλὰ μελπόμενος: "I stand before the door of the courtyard of a man that welcomes guests singing beautiful songs." The door, which would have been the front door, represents the introduction and induction of the poet into the heart of his praise of Chromios. He "arrives" like the river Alpheos and the chariot of his host.

21–22. ἔνθα μοι ἀρμόδιον / δεῖπνον κεκόσμηται: The feast that has been prepared to welcome the poet is of course, apart from an actual victory feast at which the epinikion would be performed, by extension, the feast of his host's qualities of excellence which he can praise. The term ἀρμόδιον corresponds to ἄρμα of the final line of the first strophe, ἀρμόδιον also being a "fitting", and the participle, μελπόμενος, equally recalls μέλος: both song and victory are again yoked.

22–24. θαμὰ δ' ἄλλοδαπῶν | οὐκ ἀπείρατοι δόμοι | ἐντί: The repetition of θαμὰ suggests that the home is no less experienced in exercising its duties hosting strangers than the cavalry in vv.16–18 in being wedded to victory at the Olympic games. They receive visitors from abroad as often as they receive rewards in the games far from home.

24–25. λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἔσλοῦς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον: As Farnell has put it: "The sentence itself is perhaps the most serious conundrum that Pindar has left us, and taxes scholarship¹³." There have been two main interpretations, the one taking Chromios to be the subject of λέλογχε and ἔσλοῦς as its object; the other reads λέλογχε as impersonal. Exceptionally, Braswell reads καλὰ from the previous line as the object: "He [sc. Chromios] has obtained by lot the καλὰ i.e. the victory, praise, noble rewards etc.¹⁴

First, ἔσλοῦς, Aristarchus' emendation for the mss. ἔσλῶς, an otherwise unmetrical Doric short-vowel accusative, seems to have met with universal acceptance. The explanation for the corruption is that the archaic O used for classical o, ω, ου, was often difficult for the Alexandrine copyists to transcribe

[Williams, p.29-30: O.1.53; N.3. 23-24 (difficult) O.3.10; N.3.51; I.6.41(not)] when the context was uncertain¹⁵. Radt gives a history of interpretations.¹⁶ 1) λέλογχε personal with Chromios as subject, [Bury, Bowra and Slater]; 2a) λέλογχε impersonal with μεμφομένοις as subject of φέρειν and ἐσλοὺς as the object of μεμφομένοις and equated with Chromios [Mezger, Mommsen, Schroeder, Farnell]; 2b) λέλογχε impersonal with μεμφομένοις as dative of disadvantage, ἐσλοὺς equated with Pindar and subject of φέρειν [Heyne, Radt]; 2c) λέλογχε impersonal with ἐσλοὺς as an accusative of advantage and equal to Pindar, μεμφομένοις analogous to καπνῶ [Fennell, Lattimore].

The problem of sense, if we ignore for the moment the issue of subject and whether or not λέλογχε is a personal or impersonal construction, is that of bringing water against smoke. There is no known proverb in antiquity and so it must be accepted as Pindar's invention. What does the expression mean? And who would be doing it? The context of the ode's imagery may prove more useful than anything else.

First of all water is well represented by the opening lines with the journey of Alpheus and the fountain that the river creates: Ἄμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφειοῦ the breathing up of the river. The end of this opening line is Ζηνὸς Αἰτναίου χάριν, thanks to Zeus of Aitna, another instance of "breathing up" of fire. Moreover, what is normally seen from volcanic activity—as opposed to an eruption—is the smoke rising from the underground fire, just as the fountain of Arethousa is understood to be the issue of underground water. The water versus smoke must then be related to these elements.

There is also the fact of Pindar's strong association of water with poetry and the Muses [O.14.1-4; I.6.74-76; O.6.83-87; N.4.4-5; N.7.61-63.] In the context of N.1 it is particularly cogent; the water of praise poetry is brought by Pindar to Chromios. It is the feast of praise which will counter the smoke of envious or critical talk. But why does Pindar specifically qualify this as smoke? Carey suggests that Pindar probably has all the possible associations of smoke in mind: a) as a quality of the envious, of blame, b) as a function of criticism i.e. the ability of smoke to obscure and c) as something which is insubstantial.¹⁷

While these associations all have merit, there is just one other that I find might be considered. At Call. fr.494, ἄκαπνα γὰρ αἰὲν ἀοιδοὶ θύομεν, the sacrifice of singers is described as "smokeless" and in the *Anth.Graec.* 6.321.3 Καλλιόπης γὰρ ἄκαπνον ἀεὶ θύος.¹⁸ Although these represent evidence that is later than 5th-century, the tradition of the hymn [ἀδυεπιῆς ὕμνος] as an offering or

sacrifice to the gods is not. In this context what Pindar might mean is that water, i.e. his poetry, is superior to the the sacrifices or offerings of others and, by extension, that Chromios in inviting him brings good men or good praise as against those who at home criticize him. The comparison between foreign praise and home criticism is also implicit in the immediate context of ἄλλοδαπῶν οὐκ ἀπείρατοι δόμοι and the "foreign" water of Alpheus and the "home" smoke of Aitna.

25. τέχνηαι δ' ἑτέρων ἕτεραι: This phrase in some measure explains the previous statement; the abilities of poets are not those of victors or heroes. Everyone has different talents or skills. The statement with vv. 26-30, characterizes what Bundy [*Studia Pindarica*, 7] terms a summary priamel.

25. χρῆ δ' ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα μάρνασθαι φυᾷ: The moral tenet that one's nature is something to strive with along a straight path is counterpoised by v.64ff. It is clear that Chromios is considered as an example of this precept. It also contrasts with the slithering approach of the snakes that Hera sends against Herakles. The concept of nature is constituted by inborn, native abilities.

26. πράσσει γὰρ ἔργῳ μὲν σθένος: The particle γὰρ indicates that what follows explains the preceding statement about nature. "For physical strength works through action" exemplifies both the prime qualities of Herakles, his inborn physical strength and, by extension, the athletic abilities of Chromios.

27-8. βουλαῖσι δὲ φρήν, ἐσσόμενον προῖδεῖν | συγγενὲς οἷς ἔπεται: "intelligence follows through the advice of those born with the ability to foresee the future." The opposition of the physical and mental abilities is significant to the ode on two planes. Like the first quality, this second, that of the wisdom or intelligence that requires foresight, relates again to the narrative of Herakles, specifically to the introduction of Tiresias in vv.60-61, who is said moreover, to be an ὀρθόμαντιν, a "straight-speaking prophet".

29-30. Ἀγησιδάμου παῖ, σέο δ' ἀμφὶ τρόπῳ | τῶν τε καὶ τῶν χρήσιες: Chromios is endowed with both these qualities through his inborn nature and his education, ἀμφὶ τρόπῳ. Braswell notes that τῶν τε καὶ τῶν are not indefinite pronouns but demonstrative and refer to the antecedent qualities. What we should not overlook is the majestic ring to this phrase: τῶν τε καὶ τῶν.

31. οὐκ ἔραμαι πολὺν ἐν μεγάρῳ πλοῦτον κατακρύπταις ἔχειν: The great hall or megaron is distinct from the bedroom scene in which the story of Herakles takes place and within the context of the architectural motif affords us a median. The megaron is somewhat more intimate than the stand outside the front

door and not yet as intimate as the inner chamber. It also metaphorically relates to the qualities of Chromios. Just as the banquet the poet knows is prepared refers on a deeper level to the exploits and character of the victor, the megaron which hides great wealth refers to Chromios as a public personality. Although the poet could also be alluding to the actual wealth of the individual he is praising, he is especially reflecting on the riches of character and community whose praise he is singing.

The specific way that Pindar words the phrase, "I do not love to keep great wealth *hidden down* [κατακρύπτω] in a megaron," indicates that we can read deeper into its significance. Sicily, noted earlier as Zeus' gift to Persephone, is characterized as ἀριστεύοισαν εἰκάρπου χθονὸς ἥ Σικελίαν πείραν ὀρθώσειν κορυφαῖς πολίων ἀφνεαῖς, "the best of most fertile land, rich Sicily. . .with wealthy crowns of cities." In the present line the elements of desire/love [ἔραμαι], wealth [πολὺν. . . πλοῦτον], and its being hidden below [κατακρύπτω] correspond to the known story of Persephone's abduction: Πλοῦτον, one of the names for Hades, was motivated by his desire for Persephone and relinquished his keeping her hidden in the Underworld. Although there is no phrase in which the Underworld is called the megaron of Hades/Plouton, in epic and tragedy it is commonly referred to as the house [δομὸς] or the gates [πύλας] of Hades and Hades is characterized as a host who receives guests [ξένος]. And if we look closely at the imagery of the poem, there is I believe justification for this correlation.

The myth of Herakles, who is present admittedly in many of Pindar's epinikia, is nevertheless recounted here with his apotheosis in view, that is, his ascent to the realm of the divine. His encounter with the snakes is a preview of his encounter with the beasts of the underworld. The line about smoke and water is an allusion to the function of the poet as a means of restoring to living memory those who are no longer. The smoke then might also allude to the spirits of the dead, the water that of the Muse-song-memory.¹⁹ And these elements are present in the locale of Sicily, both Etna and the spring of Arethousa are fed from the underworld i.e. from under the earth.

Also Herakles is swaddled—in the same way that the dead are wrapped in linen. Alkmene's rising from her bed, *aeplos*, and throwing off the covers, is as though she rises from her death bed. Amphitryon stands in front of the scene of his son's victory with amazement that is pained and delighted simultaneously and in every sense he imitates the stance of the poet before the banquet prepared for *his* victor. The wedding feast of Herakles which concludes the poem recentres the

narrative on the banquet and joyous celebration which in turn reflects the "immortals back-saying" the ascent of Herakles to the ranks of immortals rather than descent to mortal death which is often referred to as wedding with Hades. Moreover the poet has taken care to relate this to the human condition.

32. ἀλλ' ἐόντων εὖ τε παθεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φίλοις ἐξαρκέων:

This expresses the contrast with hiding wealth; "to benefit from what I possess" is the usual translation of an idiom which means literally "to experience enjoyment from those that exist," the participle ἐόντων, partitive genitive. In keeping with our interpretation of the preceding portion of this line, this participle should be understood to refer not to "those things which I possess" but to "those people who are still living". The second infinitive, ἀκοῦσαι, then can have the sense "hearing good things from those who live," the particle εὖ serving both verbal forms. The participle ἐξαρκέων, "being sufficient or satisfying" or "helping" friends with ἐόντων frames the phrase.

32–33. κοιναὶ γὰρ ἐλπίδες | πολυπόνων ἀνδρῶν: "For the hopes of men who struggle and toil are common." This caps the previous interpretation for it would serve no purpose just to tag on a gnomic reflection and express something banal. This statement does not so much express a commonplace of traditional Greek thought and social conduct as reflect specifically the special sense of these verses. Keeping the story of exploits buried or hidden out of the eye of the community is tantamount to death: oblivion and obscurity are the negative forces against which the poet fights.

33. ἐγὼ δ' Ἡρακλέος ἀντέχομαι προφρόνως: The verb ἀντέχομαι is of particular interest. ἀντέχω, lit: "I hold against," in the middle voice has been held to mean hence "I cleave, cling." Hence the commonly accepted "embrace"—"I embrace the ancient story of Herakles"—but this sense fails to exploit the more literal and subsequently more informative "I hold up against myself," since this describes the action of someone holding up something in front of their eyes, something seen, as in a picture—perhaps on a vase or on a wall. This is a valid reading with the presence of ὀτρύνων which would have λόγον as its object, [Fennell: "I claim pre-eminence in devotion to"]. προφρόνως, customarily translated as "kindly or willingly" should also retain some of its integral sense of forward-looking. Pindar is, like a seer, seeing a vision before his eyes and is in turn painting one for this audience.

34. ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετᾶν μεγάλαις ἀρχαῖον ὀτρύνων λόγον: "in rousing the ancient tale of the high peaks of great deeds of valour," the participle denotes that the poet will make the peaks, again an architectural metaphor, rise up.

35-6. ὥς, ἐπεὶ σπλάγχνων ὑπο μητέρος αὐτίκα θαητὰν ἐς αἴγλαν παῖς Διὸς. . μόλεν: The description marvellously imitates the experience of birth from Herakles' point of view: from the insides beneath the mother immediately dazed into the brightness, the verb μόλεν "he came" delayed until the end of the second verse. The phrase ὠδῖνα φεύγων [36] has received attention in the form of a critical analysis of child-birthing and the question of whether or not an infant experiences any of the pain of labour that his mother does. Carey's opinion that "the pain of labour is, to Pindar's imagination, shared by the child", is countered by Braswell's that "it would be strange to claim that we have a share in what we avoid" which hinges on the interpretation of φεύγων as fleeing from something that has been experienced or avoiding it altogether. Modern medical opinion favours the position that the infant does to some extent experience the stress of being born. Clearly, arguing against Braswell's assertion is the fact that there is no need to avoid what we can't experience.

37-8. ὥς οὐ λάθων χρυσόθρονον | ἦραν κροκωτὸν σπάργανον ἐγκατέβα: This run-on line forming a link-up between the end of the second traid with the beginning of the third denotes the speed with which Hera responds to the birth. In effect, Hera makes her appearance with the same subtlety and insidious quality as the snakes she is to despatch. ὥς beginning both parts of the Heraklean narrative also indicates the simultaneity of the events. The sense of the phrase ὥς οὐ λάθων counterbalances that of ὠδῖνα φεύγων: Herakles escapes from one difficult situation only to enter a dangerous one.

The attribute χρυσόθρονον, "golden-throned" is interesting in that it shares the colour of Herakles' swaddling, κροκωτὸν σπάργανον. Homer uses the epithet of Hera only in the *Iliad* [1.611; 14.153; 15.5], and of Eos in the *Odyssey* [Od.10.541; 12.142; 14.502; 15.56, 250; 19.319; 20.91; 22.198; 23.244, 347.]. Similarly of Hera in the *h.Apoll.* 305, and *h.Jun.*1. Artemis is so qualified at Il.9.533 and Od.5.123. Pindar uses it in Fr. 346b.4 of Persephone and Bacchylides 14b.1 of Hestia.²⁰

What might be deduced from the epic use of this exclusively feminine attribute is that it indicates not only royal rank, but a radiance, or specifically in the case of Eos, a golden, sun-like quality. However, more significantly, the colour κροκωτὸν, saffron, was a colour exclusively used for feminine clothing. Although

some commentators [Braswell; Henderson, his commentary to Aristophanes *Lys.* 44.] have noted saffron as a royal colour, the evidence for this is by no means certain. The only place in tragedy in which it occurs describing a male is at Aesch. *Pers.* 660, where it is used in an invocation of the semitic god Baal, who presumably is Persian for Aeschylus, and is perhaps Aeschylus' way of treating the Persian god as effeminate, or else describes the sun touching the top of Darius' tomb: ἔλθ' ἐπ' ἄκρον κόρυμβον ὄχθου, κροκόβαπτον ποδὸς εὐμαριν αἰείρων / βασιλείου τήρας. In Ag. 1121, it refers to the colour of blood: ἐπὶ δὲ καρδίαν ἔδραμε κροκοβαφῆς. Otherwise the epithet in early lyric, epic and fifth-century tragedy and comedy is used exclusively to describe garments worn by women—deities or nobles.²¹ The fact that Dionysos is feminized being clad in female garments²² and that Herakles is given a *peplos* by Deianeira²³ only proves the rule by the exceptions.

Clearly there is a connection to be made between the golden-throned Hera and saffron-wrapped Herakles beyond a simple relationship. Herakles is in effect effeminized by his swaddling—as he is by his name and as he was in mythology²⁴. This is particularly noticeable from the verb, ἐγκατέβα, he went / stepped within. The cross-dressing in which Herakles engaged was a well-established tradition²⁵ and the verb here suggests that he stepped or went into the swaddling much as he would enter into a woman's dress²⁶.

39–40. ἀλλὰ θεῶν βασίλεια | σπερχθείσα θυμῷ πέμπε δράκοντας
ἄφαρ: ἀλλὰ strengthens the above interpretation since it functions here to present a situation that is contrary to what we have been led to expect [κείται ἀντὶ τοῦ δέ (sch.59)]. In spite of his feminine garb, Hera nevertheless sees him as a threat. The participle σπερχθείσα > σπέρχω usually indicates haste and impatience, although it clearly denotes anger in this context. The imperfect πέμπε suggests that her will was not to be fulfilled. The last word ἄφαρ conveys the silent yet deadly sound of serpents on the move.

41–2. τοὶ μὲν οἰχθισᾶν πυλᾶν | ἐς θαλάμου μυχὸν εὐρὺν ἔβαν:
We now enter the inner room of the home and the poem. The μυχὸς, an even more interior room than the θαλάμος, is broad and the doors have been opened.

Braswell argues against this as a phenomenon of Türwunder²⁷, i.e. the magical opening of doors at the entrance of or by the will of a divinity. He argues that in all those cases it is expressed as automatic. The fact that here Pindar, unlike Homer [Il.5.749; 8.393;] and later poets [Apoll. Rhod.4.41; Q.S. 12.511; Nonn.*Dionys.*7.317, 44.21,45.283, 46.140] does not use the words αὐτόματα

or αὐταί or any other linguistic clues as to the miraculous aspect of their opening, does not justify dismissal of the idea. First of all, without these explicit indications, the *fact* of their already being opened, the aorist passive, is made more unsettling and eerie and is much more appropriate to Pindar's dense and economical style. It is his particular genius to forego explicit linguistic signposts and simply to relate the circumstance as it would have happened. That the doors have been already opened without any apparent agency is expressly the way the serpents enter the room: swiftly, amazingly and without preparation. Secondly, it allows for the miracle of Herakles' strength to have full command at centre stage of the narrative: it is not superceded by any reference to prior marvels. Finally, although the laws of désinence are morphological and not subject to change, the paraliel aor. pass. endings of σπερχθείσα and οἰχθείσᾱν form a magico-grammatical bond between Hera's quick anger and doors opened to the innermost chamber.

42-3. τέκνοισιν ὠκείας γνάθους | ἀμφελίσσασθαι μεμαῶτες: The serpents, who are evidently large enough to swallow infants and thus of monstrous size, are described in terms of their jaws and devouring nature. The participle μεμαῶτες, with its "m"s and the double vowels' shift to the back of the throat, is especially sinister in its imitation of swallowing or gulping down whole. ἀμφελίσσασθαι, to be coiled around > ἀμφελίσσω, has been noted for its ambiguity in that it indicates that the serpents are eager to have their "swift jaws" coiled around the children in order to swallow them and also to wrap themselves around i.e. they ingest the bodies.

43. ὁ δ' ὀρθὸν μὲν ἄντεινεν κᾶρα, πειρᾶτο δὲ πρῶτον μάχας: Herakles holds his head upright as he is depicted on several Attic vases standing in what appears to be a small bed with his brother Iphikles, grasping the serpents in both hands, one aloft and the other lower.²⁸

44-5. δισσαῖσι δοιοῦς αὐχένων / μάρψαις ἀφύκτοις χερσὶν ἑαῖς ὄφιας: The number of adjectives that are used to qualify Herakles' hands should be noted, δισσαῖσι. . μάρψαις ἀφύκτοις χερσὶν ἑαῖς, as well as the accumulation of sibilants in the lines. The adjective ἀφύκτοις, > alpha priv. + φεύγω, "inescapable," belongs to the diction of tragedy and not epic and here resonates in Herakles' tale with ὠδῖνα φεύγων and οὐ λάθων.

It has been noted [Braswell] for δισσαῖσι δοιοῦς that Greek likes to juxtapose related words, especially numerals. More importantly, is the fact that here the poet is surrounding the two necks—δισσαῖσι δοιοῦς αὐχένων μάρψαις—physically wrapping them with Herakles' grip. And if numerals are to

figure in the discussion, we might note that there are five "hand" words—one for each digit?—around the monster's neck.

46–7. ἀγχομένοις δὲ χρόνος | ψυχὰς ἀπέπνευσεν μελέων ἀφάτων: Much discussion has pursued the sense of this clause and scholarship has been divided as to whether time can do what Pindar states that it did. Gerber²⁹ argues that time can be an active force in Pindar, being considered as something concrete, not abstract, and cites several examples from the poet's works in which this is the case: Pae.2.27; O.10.8; 6.97; N.4.43; fr.159. Rose is concerned with the issue of speed as contrasted with the durative aspect of time: "...the poet puts such emphasis on the speed and ease of the hero's activity in the immediately preceding" that the idea of time drawing out the life of the serpents seems of too much duration.³⁰ Segal, combining Gerber's evaluation and Vivante's observation that time in Pindar is an expression of "mythical design" not to be measured in real time but by its accomplishment³¹, finds a connection between the time of v.46 and v.69. where Herakles has peace for all time, τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον³².

I think that the idea of mythical as opposed to calculable time is right but in a different way. First of all the emphasis is not so much on Herakles' speed as on Hera's and her charges who suddenly slither in. If there is poetic emphasis it is on the hands of Herakles and the sinister, devouring character of the monstrous serpents. This passage slows down all the dramatic dynamism of the previous lines. What is of greater interest is the attention paid by the poet to the size of the serpents, μελέων ἀφάτων, of unspeakable limbs. The words ἀγχομένοις δὲ χρόνος ψυχὰς ἀπέπνευσεν, in fact stress their enormous length and the length of time—if duration is understood by it—is a clear way of imaging the serpents as huge and the process of strangulation as an act of considerable strength. It serves as a freeze-frame on the action much as it would be frozen on a vase painting. And it is within this context, the timeless imaging of myth where the action is beyond or outside real, experienced time, where time is arrested that Herakles performs his feat. The quality of Herakles' hands, ἀφύκτοις χερσὶν is matched with the serpents' size μελέων ἀφάτων. The verb ἀπέπνευσεν reminds us of the very first word of the poem, Ἄμπνευμα and, as Fennell remarks, is not the most appropriate word to strangulation. But it does suggest the image of the serpents as fountains uprising and their breath as something that is squeezed out of them. This is not necessarily designed so that we fashion an equation between the elements of Alpheus and Arethousa to Herakles and snakes. But it does operate within a

continuum of images of things that rise from Sicilian soil: crops of cities, fountains, Aetna.

48. ἐκ δ' ἄρ' ἄτλατον δέος: The word δέος appears in more mss. [BDU & Vpc] than βέλος [Vac and Moschopulean mss.] but, as Bury observes, agreeing with Dissen and Fennell, βέλος could not have replaced the less difficult δέος. Bury however, chooses another word altogether [πέλος] which has met with no acceptance. The only passage anterior to Pindar in which βέλος is used in a similar sense of "pang" of labour pains is at Il.11.269: ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ὠδίνουσιν ἔχη βέλος ὁξὺ γυναιῖκα δριμύ, τό τε προΐεισι μογαστόκοι Εἰλείθυιαι, and Ibycus, Frag S167.81 κεν ἄδινοῖς βελέεσσι. Clearly, the *lectio difficilior* is not impossible of sense particularly given the context of childbirth in the Homeric passage which in its general tenor is well-suited to this one in Pindar. What might explain the general rejection of βέλος is that there is no example of its use in an absolute sense of fear. A sharp dart of pain in childbirth is acceptable, but not a dart of fear.

There are however several examples where βέλος is used as a dart of sound³³, of glances³⁴, the pangs of love and desire.³⁵ What is a difficult or awkward word for prosaic sense yields a rich harvest of poetic sense. As the word describes anything flying with direction, it could be the sound, it could represent the "shafts" of the serpents whose arrival was so fast, it could be the frozen glance or the sudden intake of breath at the sign of such portents. Whatever the reading, simple "fear" doesn't hold the same value. The verb is in tmesis, which Braswell³⁶ explains as metrically convenient but in fact, if the reading for βέλος is sustained, offers the "dart" or "sting" a central placement appropriate to its meaning. The sting which is unendurable ἄτλατον strikes the women. Moreover, the sense of "unendurable" or "insufferable" is not as suitable to fear as it is to pain. How can fear be sustainable? Finally, the verb ἐκπλήσσω, "strike," makes more sense with a word like βέλος, which is clearly something that can hit.

49. ὅσαι τύχον Ἀλκμήνας ἀρήγοισαι λέχει: "those attending Alkmene in her bed."

50. καὶ γὰρ αὐτά, ποσσὶν ἄπεπλος ὀρούσαις ἄπὸ στρωμνᾶς, ὅμως ἄμυνεν ὕβριν κνωδάλων: "And even she herself, roused to her feet, undressed, from the covers, in spite of her condition, was in the course of warding off the violence of the monsters." The fact of her being without a *peplos* emphasizes the speed with which she responds, illustrates her courage to encounter the monsters in a state of less than usual protective clothing, and contrasts with

Herakles swaddling. This detail, otherwise overlooked, confirms the previous observation, that Herakles, because of the exclusive association of saffron with women's dress, is effeminized or at least at an early stage of his cross-dressing career, and here by contrast, Alkmene, ἄπεπλος—and the peplos was exclusively female attire—is masculinized. Clearly the reversed dress code is not meant to interfere with the male domain of physical strength and courage, but to reinforce it.

The imperfective ἄμυνεν denotes that the action of the verb is in development and not completed. ὅμως can have the sense of "in spite of her condition", i.e. having just given birth, or, being in a state of undress. ὕβρις offers as much a sense of violence as sexual violation. The nuance of sexual violation plays well with the other aspects of sexual ambiguity: it is a woman after all who rushes effectively to protect her sons without thought for her own safety. As can be seen in the next verses, Amphitryon is somewhat confused and far less directly physical in his response to the danger.

51. ταχὺ δὲ Καδμείων ἀγοὶ χαλκείοις σὺν ὅπλοις ἔδραμον ἄθροοι: Pindar's description is replete with the clanging noise of armed men running. The verb is in the imperfective aspect as is ἄμυνεν indicating that the two sides of parental interest are in the course of rescue but not yet arrived.

52. ἐν χερὶ δ' Ἀμφιτρυῶν κολεοῦ γυμνὸν τινάσσων <φάσσανον>: The last word supplied [Mosch.] for an omission in the mss. Amphitryon's sword is naked, γυμνὸν, an adjective that does not occur in epic to modify a weapon or to mean that it is unsheathed or bared. When it does occur it describes a man without armour and has the additional sense of womanliness, e.g. at Il.22.124-5 where Hektor is rehearsing in an internal dialogue what might happen in his encounter with Achilles:

οὐδέ τί μ' αἰδέσεται, κτενέει δέ με γυμνὸν ἔόντα
αὐτῶς ὥς τε γυναῖκα, ἐπεὶ κ' ἀπὸ τεύχεα δύω.

Here the epithet marks Amphitryon as the husband and counterpart to Alkmene, only it is his sword that is naked, i.e. womanly³⁷.

53. ἔκετ', ὀξείαις ἀνίαισι τυπείς: He too is struck, τυπείς, with sharp anguish. The fact that the ἀνίαι, distressed or painful feelings, are characterized as sharp strengthens the earlier reading of βέλος.

53-4. τὸ γὰρ οἰκεῖον πῖεζι πάνθ' ὁμῶς· | εὐθὺς δ' ἀπήμων κραδία κᾶδος ἀμφ' ἀλλότριον: This is a somewhat curious statement: "For what is one's own presses upon every man alike; immediately, when it is another's concern, the heart is relieved." The phrase εὐθὺς δ' ἀπήμων κραδία might also be

rendered "one is immediately light-of-heart" upon realizing that it is another man's misfortune. As Braswell correctly observes, the point of this is the relief that Amphytryon will feel. The force of *πίζει* is countered by *ἀπῆμων* as *οἰκείον* is countered by *ἀλλότριον*; the pressing or weighing down of distress counteracted by the release of pressure when it is gone.

55. *ἔστα δὲ θάμβει δυσφόρῳ τερπνῷ τε μιχθείς*: The explanation that *ἔστα* shares the same position as *ἔσαν* v.19 by reason of metrical convenience overlooks the poetically and structurally motivated techniques and imaginatively cogent art of genius. Such comments fail to make the connection and observe that it creates a definite parallel between the stance of the poet before the doors of Chromios' palace and Amphytryon before the inner chamber where his infant son is doing something extraordinary.

Hubbard, in his discussion of the general polarity of *οἰκείον*/*ἀλλότριον* as it is particularly illustrated in this ode, notes that what is *ἀλλότριον* [from Amphytryon's point of view] is Herakles and what is *οἰκείον*, Iphikles. As Hubbard observes the tautometry of vv.19 and 55, *ἔσαν*, *ἔστα*, provides a clear relationship between the poet and Amphytryon, but one of contrast, not similarity. Amphytryon stands in a confused state: he is not certain of what is *οἰκείον*, what *ἀλλότριον*, whereas the poet can readily distinguish them and knows the values they represent.³⁸

What the poet contemplates at the outer guest-room is directly linked to what Amphytryon sees taking place within the inner room. The banquet, a celebration in honour of Chromios' exploits, his struggle for victory at the games and Herakles' struggle and victory with the serpents are made into a single monument: the exterior reflects the interior. The interior of Chromios' house is "not inexperienced in strangers." What we have in Herakles is the forerunner, the inner chamber of the outer palace of Chromios'. The myth provides a deep link to Chromios and his ancestry—the treasure which should not be kept buried. For Herakles will fight on behalf of the common good; his generosity extended to what is *ἀλλότριον*.³⁹

Amphytryon sees the extraordinary determination and power of his son. The words *λῆμά τε καὶ δύναμιν* correspond to *σθένος* and *φρήν* of vv. 26-7 and thus substantiate the statement at v. 25: *τέχναι δ' ἑτέρων ἔτεραι· χρὴ δ' ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα μάρνασθαι φυᾶ*. The word *λῆμά*, "determination, resolve," related to the Doric *λῶ*—*θέλω*, bespeaks willfulness as elsewhere in Pindar [P.8.44; N.3.83]. Amphytryon's mixed feelings of joy and distress are given reason: his sons abilities are *ἐκνόμιον*, outside of the customary and were

not predicted. His subsequent consultation with Teireisias fulfills the phrase at vv.26-7, βουλαῖσι δὲ φρήν, ἐσσόμενον προῖδεῖν συγγενὲς οἷς ἔπεται.

58-9. παλίγλωσσον δέ οἱ ἀθάνατοι ἀγγέλων ῥῆσιν θέσαν: The term παλίγλωσσον, a word that to is found only in Pindar, is usually understood to mean "contrary to fact, lying"—cf. I.6.24. However, at *Parth.* 2.94b.61-65 it has been glossed as "unrelenting" [Wilamowitz].

ἐνῆκεν καὶ ἔπειτ [.] λος
 τῶνδ' ἄνδρῶν ἐνε[κε]ν μερίμνας σώφρονος
 ἐχθρῶν ἔριν οὐ παλίγ-
 γλωσσον, ἀλλὰ δίκας [ό]δους
 π[ισ]τὰς ἐφίλη[σε]ν.

Obviously the text is not free of problems, yet παλίγλωσσον is one of the few words to be made out clearly. Nevertheless, translating it as Wilamowitz did does not do this term full justice. At I.6.24 it is used thus: οὐδ' ἔστιν οὕτω βάρβαρος οὔτε παλίγλωσσος πόλις, "there is no city so foreign in its speech nor backward speaking" that it does not know of Peleus or Aias. It is clearer in this citation that παλίγλωσσος is meant like βάρβαρος to describe a quality of speech that is not understood, either by reason of its incomprehensible sounds or by the deliberate disarrangement of recognizable phonemes so as not to make sense. This suggests that in all three loci the term is used by Pindar to denote the babble of magical or oracular formulations, which would often deliberately, in order to effect a reverse-binding curse or a reversal of bad fortune, spell or write the names or curses backwards. Here we can understand that the immortals have made the speech, the ῥῆσις of the messengers backwards for him [Amph.] i.e. they had reversed into babble the disaster announced to Amphitryon.

60-2. γείτονα δ' ἐκκάλεσαν | Διὸς ὑψίστου προφάταν ἔξοχον / ὀρθόμαντιν Τειρεσίαν: It should be noted that the expression ὀρθόμαντιν, another hapax, is designed to distinguish Teiresias' speech from παλίγλωσσον, the chaotic and incomprehensible. Moreover, we should note that within the complex of οἰκεῖον | ἀλλότριον [supra] it is significant that Tiresias be characterized as a neighbour, γείτων.

61-65. ποίαις ὁμιλήσει τύχαις: This begins Teireisias' prophesy and it possesses the rhetoric and rhythm of oracular pronouncements: ὅσσους μὲν; ὅσσους δὲ: ἐν χέρσῳ; πόντῳ. The following phrase, σὺν πλαγίῳ. . . κόρῳ στείχοντα, corresponds to the phrase at v.25, ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα. Here, the "one who walks in crooked excess" is the contrary of the earlier example of one who walks the straight paths of his natural ability. We might therefore

understand the crookedness and excess defines an unnatural character. *κόρος* also has the connotation of "arrogant, insolent". The sch. 97b suggests that Pindar is referring to Antaios and Bousiris, both giants.

The words *θηρᾶς αἰδοδίκας* [63] may offer a further clarification. *αἰδοδίκας*, appears to be yet another invention of Pindar's, although it does occur in Soph.fr. 985.1 as a single word entry. The term has the overt sense of "lawless" which, in its application here to beasts and, taking into consideration the import of v.25, may be taken to have the extended sense of "against the laws of nature". This is not to make too fine a point, but to contextualize the superhuman struggles of Herakles with the paranatural phenomena that he encounters in the catalogue of his labours, with the general ethical/moral sentiment that Pindar states in v.25 and expands in the second antistrophe. With this in mind, we might well understand *μάρνασθαι φύα* to mean not only the individual's struggle with *his* nature, but, like Herakles, the battle with Nature as it is manifested in "unnatural" monsters.

64–6. καὶ τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον φράσέ νιν δώσειν μόρον: The grammatical construction, the identity of *τινα*, the question of which noun is modified by *ἐχθρότατον*, the semantic sense of *κόρος*, all contribute to make this a difficult and much disputed passage.

The first problem that should be discussed is the mss. *δώσειν μόρον* which some editors, because this gives two accusatives with *δώσειν*, and is thus considered problematic, have avoided by changing it to the dative, *μόρῳ* [Hermann, 307: *Locus hic plane barbarus est, nisi emendatione adiuvetur*]. The second problem, the absolute use of the accusative [*τινα—στείχοντα* or *τὸν ἐχθρότατον—μόρον*], has been corrected by others and either phrase—depending on the general reading—altered to the dative⁴⁰. Both these "solutions" do violence to the text in the name of convention and standard grammar. Moreover, the scholia ad loc. [Dr.II.97c] explain: *ἀντὶ αἰτιατικῆς τὴν δοτικὴν ἀκουστέον, ἢ καὶ τινι ἀδίκῳ ἀνδρὶ αὐτὸν, τὸν Ἡρακλέα, ἔφασκε δώσειν μόρον*.

This explanation certainly leaves no doubt that there were two accusatives before the eyes of the scholia and the translated sense makes clear that the death that Herakles was going to give was to a certain unjust man. This clarification however does not resolve the problem of determining with which noun *τὸν ἐχθρότατον* should go: a most hateful someone or most hateful death/fate. And we are not convinced that the semantic units, *τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα*, should necessarily be read as *τινα ἀνδρῶν* and *σὺν πλαγίῳ κόρῳ* since this,

although it gives good immediate sense, does not give good general, contextual sense.

There is agreement that this passage, without being specific, like the prior pronouncements of Teiresias, refers to the labours of Herakles.

Braswell's note that κόρος was virtually identified as ὕβρις based upon fr.169a, οὐ κό]ρω, ἀλλ' ἀρετᾷ [supp. Lobel because of the sch. comment : οὐκ ἐπὶ ὕβρει, ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα] and Theogn. 153., ignores all other Pindaric passages in which κόρος clearly has the sense of surfeit or greed, [O.2.95; P.1.82; P.8.32; N.7.52; N.10.20; O.1.56; I.3.2; O.13.10.].

Moreover, πλαγίος means by the side, aslant, and this is difficult to construe with arrogant, i.e. that arrogance steps to the side of a way or path, whether it be an actual one or a metaphor for "way of life".

τινα . . . τὸν ἐχθρότατον and I suggest that this deliberately unspecified labour of Herakles refers to Diomedes; the literal translation of the lines, καὶ τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον φράσέ νιν δώσειν μόρῳ, is " and he said he would give death to that one walking, the most hateful, *with crooked surfeit of men.* "

67. καὶ γὰρ ὅταν θεοὶ ἐν πεδίῳ Φλέγρας Γιγάντεσσιν μάχαν ἀντιάζωσιν: Although this represents the first textual reference to Herakles' participating on the side of the gods in the Gigantomachy, there is abundant 6th-century iconographical evidence for it. The site, Phlegra, mentioned at I.6.33 and Aesch. Eum. 295, was identified with Pallene in Thrace / Macedonia [Hdt. 7.123.1] and later with a site in Campania. The identification of the battle of the giants in Thrace offers, I believe, a clue or possibility to identify the mystery of the previous verses. Of the canon of Herakles' labours, [cf. Eur. *Her.* 352-427] the only one that takes place in Thrace is that of the man-eating Mares of Diomedes. Herakles tames the horses and feeds Diomedes to them. The Gigantomachy is one of the *parerga*. ἀντιάζωσιν, pres. subj. *repraesentatio* of vivid narration. μάχαν is cognate accusative or acc. of respect.

68. βελέων ὑπὸ ῥιπαῖσι κείνου φαιδίμαν γαίᾳ πεφύρσεσθαι κόμαν ἔνεπεν: The detail that their shining hair will be fouled with earth is a colourful way of indicating the Giants' fall to their death. It also coordinates with the image of flying waves of arrows, βελέων ὑπὸ ῥιπαῖσι, which itself invites a comparison with hair streaming in the wind.

The narrative ends with ἔνεπεν in an emphatic position, there being three verbs denoting the act of speaking throughout Teiresias' oracular account: φράζε,

φᾶσε, ἔνεπεν. I suspect that this threefold repetition has some significance within the tradition of prophetic pronouncements. It bespeaks in any case the tri-partite division of Herakles' labours: slaying of monsters; the death of Diomedes or someone else; killing the Giants. We should also note the progressively more detailed way in which Herakles vanquishes. In the first case it is merely κτανών; in the second it is the somewhat more elaborate, δώσειν μόνον; and in the third, the most elaborate of all, φαιδίμαν γαίᾳ πεφύρσεσθαι κόμαν.

69–71. αὐτὸν μὰν ἐν εἰράνᾳ καμάτων μεγάλων <ἐν>σχερῶ: <ἐν> supp. Hermann, cf. N.11.39; I.6.22, meaning in a single, continuous and unbroken line, one after another, is an apt way of expressing the reward for a hero whose life was composed of continuous labours. καμάτων μεγάλων parallels v.11 μεγάλων δ' ἀέλθων, as, perhaps to a lesser extent ἀσυχίαν. . . ποιναὶν λαχόντ' ἐξαιρετον reflects v.24 λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἔσλοῦς ὕδωρ καπνῶ φέρειν ἀντίον. Much clearer are the parallels made between the happiness of Herakles' wedded eternal bliss and Chromios "wedding" to his victory and fame. ὀλβίοις ἐν δώμασι [71], is, like the house of Chromios that is not inexperienced of frequent guests, materially and spiritually rich.

71–2. δεξάμενον θαλερὰν Ἥβαν ἄκοιτιν καὶ γάμον | δαΐσαντα παρ Δι Κρονίδα, σεμνὸν αἰνήσειν δόμον: θαλερὰν recalls θάλος of v.2. In fact the respite from labours is not dissimilar to that of the river Alpheus in his pursuit of Arethousa. σεμνὸν δόμον resonates with vv.1–2, σεμνόν. . . θάλος, αἰνήσειν with αἶνον, v.6., Ἥβαν ἄκοιτιν καὶ γάμον matches that of δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος Δάλου κασιγνήτα, vv.3–4 [ἄκοιτιν as a bed-mate is a close fit with δέμνιον, while the relationship of marriage γάμον repeats the relationship of κασιγνήτα], παρ Δι Κρονίδα has its correspondance in Ζηνὸς Αἰτναίου χάριν. Pindar apotheosizes Herakles in a climactic blaze of positive blessings. "For all time", "peace", "serenity", "reward" "choicest" etc. The marriage feast, δαΐσαντα mirrors the feast that awaits the poet at Chromios' palace and Herakles is fitted to Zeus at this event as is Chromios to his.

1. Carey, C., *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*, New York, 1981, 104.

2. Braswell, B. K., *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One*, Fribourg, 1992, 34.

3. Cf. Braswell, 35.

4. Cf. Carey, 106.

5. See Braswell, Carey ad loc.

6. Cf. Zuntz, G., *Persephone*, Oxford, 1971, 70-75.
7. *hHom. Dem.* 17; Burkert, GR. 159ff.; Cic. *Verr.* 4.107.
8. *hHom. Dem.* 427.
9. Orphicorum fragmenta, Kern, nos. 209ff., and by later authors, Nonn. *Dionys.* 6.155ff; Firmicus Maternus, *De Errore*, 6.
10. Gallet, B., *Recherches sur Kairos et l'ambiguïté dans la poésie de Pindare*, Bordeaux, 1990, 116-118.
11. Braswell, 45f.
12. Wilson, J.R., "Kairos as Due Measure," *Glotta* 58, 1980.182
13. For the fullest account of the problems and the various readings see Carey, 111-114. Also Stoneman, R., "The Niceties of Praise: Notes on Pindar's *Nemean* 1," *QUCC* n.s. 2, 1979, 65-70.
14. Braswell, p.49.
15. Williams, p. 29-30 gives as examples of difficult loci: O.1.53; N.3. 23-24; not difficult: O.3.10; N.3.51; I.6.41
16. Radt, S.L., "Pindars erste Nemeische Ode," *Mnemosyne* 19, 1966, p.154-160.
17. Carey, 113-114. He cites for these qualities of smoke, respectively: a) Il.18.110; Alcacus 74; b) *Plut. Mor.* 787c, 804d; c) 'Simon.' 541.1-3.
18. See also Eust. *De vit. monach.*, in *Opusc.* p.235, 32 Tafel: ἔχει παλαιὰν παροιμίαν παραξέσας ὁ τὴν κηρὸν ἀνάπτων, καθ' ἣν ταῖς Μούσαις ἄκαπνα θύουσιν οἱ ἀοιδοί.
19. E.g. *Odyssey* 11.204-6: τρεῖς μὲν ἐφωρμήθη, ἔλαιν τέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει, | τρεῖς δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιὴ εἴκελον ἦ καὶ ὀνείρω | ἔπτατ'; *Iliad* 23: 98-99: Ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας ὠρέξατο χερσὶ φίλησιν | οὐδ' ἔλαβε ψυχὴ δὲ κατὰ χθονὸς ἥτε καπνὸς ὥχετο τετριγυῖα.
20. These are fairly fragmentary lines: Pindar: 'Ἐλευσίνοθι φερομένην ματρὶ [τε χρυσοθρόνῳ; Bakchylides: 'Ἐστία χρυσοθρόνῳ, εὐδόξων Ἀγαθοκλέαδαν ἄτ' ἀφ' ἡνέων
21. Since I discovered no exceptions I include the list here. Alc. Fr.46.1: Μῶσαι κροκόπεπλοι; *Iliad* 8.1: Ἦως μὲν κροκόπεπλος ἐκίδνατο πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν; 19.1: Ἦως μὲν κροκόπεπλος ἀπ' Ὠκεανοῦ ῥοάων; 23.227: ὅν τε μέτα κροκόπεπλος ὑπεῖρ ἄλλα κίδναται ἦως; 24.695: Ἦως δὲ κροκόπεπλος ἐκίδνατο πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν. Hesiod *Theog.* 273, 358: Μῆτις τ' Εὐρυνόμη τε Τελεστώ τε κροκόπεπλος; Περφορηδὴ τ' εὐπεπλον Ἐννὴ τε κροκόπεπλον; *hDem.* 178: ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται / ὥμοις αἰσσοῦντο κροκῆν ἄνθει ὁμοῖαι.
- Orph. Hym. 1.2: Εἰνοδίαν Ἐκάτην κλήζω, τριοδίτην, ἔρανην, οὐρανίαν χθονίαν τε καὶ εἰναλίαν, κροκόπεπλον. 71.1: Μηλινόην καλέω, νύμφην χθονίαν, κροκόπεπλον. Eur. *Hecuba*, 468; *Ion*, Line 889; *Phoen.* 1491; *IA.* 210; *Frag.* 282.12; *Soph. OC.* 474, 685; *Aristoph. Lys.* 44ff., 645; *Thesm.* 138, 253; 941, 945, 1220; *Ran.* 46; *Eccl.* 332, 879.
22. Eur. *Bakk.* 150, 233-36, 353, 453-69, 464. Arist. *Ran.* 45-57, 108-9
23. *Soph. Trakh.* 602, 613, 674, 758, 774.
24. For a full discussion of this issue, see Nicole Loraux, "Herakles: The Super-Male and the Feminine" in *Before Sexuality: The Construction of the Erotic Experience in the Ancient World*, edd. Halperin, D.M., J.I. Winkler, and F.I. Zeitlin, Princeton 1990. 21-52.
25. The arguments that the episode of Herakles and Omphale is a Hellenistic and therefore late version of the myth have been countered by those that find pictorial evidence for its being known in the classical period. Cf. Schauenburg, K. "Herakles und Omphale," *RhM* 103, 1960, 57-76.
26. Carey [contra Illig] finds the literal and active "stepped into" as grotesque and finds with Fennell that it would detract from Herakles' miraculous feat of strength.
27. See Herter, H. "Ein Neues Türwunder," *Zu Pind. Nem. I und Theokrit. id. XXIV*," *RhM* 89, 1940, 152-157. He sees a parallel with Theok. *Herakliskos* 14-16: κυανέαις φρίσσοντας ὑπὸ σπείραισι δράκοντας, | ὥρσεν ἐπὶ πλατὺν οὐδόν, ὅθι σταθμὰ κοῖλα θυράων | οἴκου, ἀπειλήσασα φαγεῖν βρέφος Ἡρακλῆα. See also Segal, C., "Time and the Hero: The Myth of *Nemean* 1," *RhM* 117, 1974, 35-6 & n19.
28. A stamnos by the Berlin painter, Louvre G 192; a column-krater, Perugia 73; a hydria, New York 25. 28 (Capua) by the Nausikaa Painter.
29. "What Time Can Do" (Pindar, *Nemean* 1.46-47) *TAPA* 93.1962. 30-33.

-
30. Rose: "The Myth of Pindar's First Nemean: Sportsmen, Poetry and Paideia" *HSCP* 78.1974.145-175
31. Vivante, P., "On Time in Pindar," *Arethusa* 5, 1972, 107-31.
32. Segal, op.cit.29-30.
33. Aesch. *Choe*.380-1, τοῦτο διαμπερὲς οὖς | ἵκεθ' ἅπερ τε βέλος, where Orestes says that this will pierce the ears of Agamemnon.
34. Aesch. *Ag*.240-1, ἔβαλλ' ἑκάστον θυτήρων ἀπ' ὀμματος βέλει φιλοῦκτω, which describes Iphigeneia's glances at her sacrificers and 742, μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος | δηξίθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος, where the chorus describes a sense of calm coming to Ilium. *Choe*.286, τὸ γὰρ σκοτεινὸν τῶν ἐνεργέων βέλος describing the darkling look/glance of the Furies.
- 35 Aesch. *PV* 649-50, Ζεὺς γὰρ ἡμέρου βέλει πρὸς σοῦ τέθαλπται καὶ συναίρεσθαι Κύπριν.
36. "... which allows greater metrical flexibility than would an undivided compound," Braswell ad loc.
37. Segal, 32n10 notes the "symmetrical balance between the male and female sides of the episode."
38. Hubbard, T. K., *The Pindaric Mind*, Leiden 1985, 51-3.
39. Ibid, 56-7.
40. Cf. Bergk, p.251; Puech, p.27, στείχοντα τῷ ἐχθρότατῳ φᾶσέ νιν δώσειν μόρῳ. Also Hummel: p.95-96. 91; Jacquinod, B., *Le double accusatif*, 1989; Clapp. "Pindar's accusative constructions," *TAPhA* 32, 1901; Schroeder, *Proleg.* II, 98, p.44-45.

NEMEAN 9

1. **Κωμάσομεν παρ' Ἀπόλλωνος Σικυωνόθε, Μοῖσαι:** *Κωμάσομεν* is judged to be a short-vowel subjunctive¹: "let us celebrate, revel in". Since the celebration is on the anniversary of Chromios' victory, the Muses are said to be at the Sicyonian Pythia with Apollo and are thence called to come to Aitna. We have a date for the founding of Aitna by Hieron, 476, whose brother-in-law was Chromios.

Hubbard² [79ff] has suggested that there is a particular need to interpret this ode in light of its historical background. Chromios as governor of the colony of Aitna, one that comprised Dorian settlers equally from Syracuse and from the Peloponnese, may have entered the Sikyonian contest, a somewhat minor and local event compared to the panhellenic games³, and commissioned this ode for the purpose of consolidating the relations between Aitna and the Peloponnese. The opening invitation to the Muses to bring the victory celebration from Sikyon to Aitna reflects this diplomatic agenda, as does the agenda of Pindar's mythic material.

2. **ἔνθ' ἀναπεπταμένοι ξείνων νενίκανται θύραι:** "where the doors flung open are won over by guests" is a striking image: the guests to be entertained are victorious over the doors. Significantly, Pindar expresses it from the viewpoint of the doors: they are beaten back in the contest and are opened up. This produces an interesting effect: the verb [νικάω] and the participle [ἀναπεπταμένοι] are reduplicated, or we might say, doubled back, thus resembling, reduplicating the double doors to a banquet hall. It is a small point but valid since the weight [i.e. length] of words, ἀναπεπταμένοι, νενίκανται, gives character to an otherwise inanimate object.

Moreover, the double doors, like the double performance of the ode at Sikyon and Aitna, continues the political thesis of double settlement. The ξείνοι are then reasonably both the guests for the actual celebration and the "invités" of Peloponnesian settlers.

3. ὄλβιον ἐς Χρομίου δῶμ' : Cf. N.1.71 for the home of Herakles and, by extension, Chromios.⁴

3. ἀλλ' ἐπέων γλυκὺν ὕμνον πρᾶσσετε: πρᾶσσετε has equal footing with πρᾶσσεται in the best mss. but the scholiasts favour the former. If the latter were used we would have the statement "he exacts as a debt due", whereas with πρᾶσσετε the poet enjoins the Muses to perform. Most editors favour the former. Fennell argues that ἀλλά encourages the latter choice. The conjunction "but" usually indicates a modality of opposition or contrast, and here would apply to a condition of Chromios' hospitality. This makes better sense than the poet demanding that the Muses perform. I would however, agreeing with Fennell's argument for πρᾶσσεται, continue the animation of the inanimate and have it to be the *house* of Chromios that exacts or expects the song. The sense of this is that although the house is rich in guests and generous in its hospitality, it nevertheless expects as its due a poem of celebration to be performed by these guests.

4. τὸ κρατήσιππον γὰρ ἐς ἄρμ' ἀναβαίνων: The particle γὰρ tells us that what follows is explanatory of what preceded: "for he [Chromios], mounting the winning-horse chariot" gives the signal for song. αὐδὰν μανύει, the verb μανύω has the sense of "declare" [Sl., who also gives "donne le signale du chant" Puech] and to make known. It is likely that Chromios, as Farnell suggests, invokes Artemis and Apollo. The point of this is that a voice, a sound, is to be activated, since v.6 notes that glorious accomplishments should not be buried in silence.

4. ματέρι καὶ διδύμοις παίδεσσιν: Pindar emphasizes Leto's divine children as twins in keeping with the political agenda. Moreover, the fact that he does not name them allows us to infer that the mother symbolizes Aitna and that her twins are the Syracusan and Peloponnesian colonists.

5. ὁμοκλάρους ἐπόπταις: They have equal share in the duty of overseeing the Pythian games because they are twins διδύμοις παίδεσσιν. This also looks forward to Pindar's "re-instatement" of Adrastos, a Peloponnesian hero as founder of the Sikyonian games.

6-7. ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, τετελεσμένον ἔσλὸν | μὴ χαμαὶ σιγᾷ καλύψαι: Cf. N.1.31 where the poet states that he does not like to bury treasure beneath the palace; here, it is specified not to bury in the earth in silence. The statement that "there is a saying among men" in fact contradicts silence and while the context is the joyous celebration of Chromios' victory, I think that there is a covert allusion to Amphiaraios here. ἔσλὸν might be read "the noble man" [cf. O.2.63, 97, N.1.24, N.3.29.] and the perf. participle τετελεσμένον apply

then to his translation into the earth. Amphiaraos does not die in any conventional sense nor is he buried in the usual fashion: the phrase τετελεσμένον ἐσλὸν. . . καλύψαι perfectly reflects this fact: he is "made into" someone noble the moment the earth swallows him. Moreover the nature of the perfect is more appropriate to what has been done in a distant past than to the recent accomplishment of the victor. In this way the poet manages to incorporate with consummate skill his programme of praise with that of myth.

7. **θεσπεσία δ' ἐπέων καύχας ἀοιδὰ πρόσφορος**: The mss. and scholiasts give καύχας, altered to καύχαις by Benedictus [and accepted by Bergk, Boeckh, Bury, Fennell] since a dative is usually required with πρόσφορος. Farnell argues that such an emendation is unnecessary. The double genitive of ἐπέων, yields "a divine song of words / verses of proud vaunts" and moreover continues the motif of doubleness. καύχας contrasts with the silence, cf. I.5.51, ἀλλ' ὅμως καύχημα κατὰβρεχε σιγα.

8. **ἀλλ' ἀνὰ μὲν βρομίαν φόρμιγγ', ἀνὰ δ' αὐλὸν ἐπ' αὐτὰν ὄρσομεν**: If the alpha elided from φόρμιγγ' is counted in, the phrase divides evenly into 10 syllables each half: ἀλλ' ἀνὰ μὲν βρομίαν φόρμιγγα, ἀνὰ δ' αὐλὸν ἐπ' αὐτὰν ὄρσομεν. The verb is in tmesis: ἀνώρσομεν. With the following words, ἱππίων ἀέθλων κορυφάν, it is possible to perceive an internal rhyme with "an" which gives the lines a musical resonance like that of an echo down a long corridor or in a large hall: ἀνὰ. . βρομίαν. . φόρμιγγ', ἀν. . ἐπ' αὐτὰν. . κορυφάν.

9. **ἃ τε Φοῖβω θῆκεν Ἄδραστος ἐπ' Ἀσωποῦ ῥεέθοις**: Pindar makes a connection between his native Thebes and Sicily by stating that the chariot races were established by Adrastus. He also creates a link to the other heroes, the Seven, Herakles, and Chromios, all of whose glory is in close association with rivers, vv.22, 39, 40-42.⁵

9-10. **ὦν ἐγὼ μνασθεῖς ἐπασκῆσω κλυταῖς ἥρωα τιμαῖς**: The verb ἐπασκῆσω is rendered as "exalt" [Sl.] and although this sense, as Bury notes, may derive from the language of the mysteries, its other senses, "to finish carefully; adorn, decorate" [LSJ. I & II] are more appropriate to this ode since they evoke the imagery of architecture. Pindar's fr. 194. 1-5 best illustrates this architectural sense: κεκρότῃται χρυσέα κρητὶς ἱεραῖσιν ἀοιδαῖς | ἔα τειχίζωμεν ἦδη ποικίλον | κόσμον αὐδάεντα λόγων | ὃς καὶ πολυκλείταν περ ἔοισαν ὅμως | Θῆβαν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπασκῆσει θεῶν | καὶ κατ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγυιάς. There is an environment of terms denoting architecture, κεκρότῃται, κρητὶς, τειχίζωμεν,

ἀγυιάς; denoting ornamentation ποικίλον κόσμον, and the phrase, ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπασκήσει, "even more decorated or adorned" in streets of men and of gods. At Parth.2.71 the evidence is very fragmentary and the verb in v.71, Ἀνδαισιστρότα ἄν ἐπάσκησε μήδεσ[ι.] leaves it difficult to determine the usual translation of "trained", "she whom Andaisistrotta trained in [various?] skills". It seems to me equally probable that "finished" or "adorned" with skills could be read.⁶

In the present context with θῆκεν and ὄρσομεν, ἐπασκέω has clearly an architectural rather than ritual sense. θῆκεν is regularly used of a foundation while ὄρσομεν has the sense of raise up. The poet is in effect constructing a foundation myth much as Chromios and Hieron have constructed a colony: the base or foundation being laid and the structure raised, the sense of ἐπασκέω as finishing or decorating is perfectly appropriate. We should also note that as in fr. 194, the adornment is in fact the song of the poet.

11. ὅς τότε μὲν βασιλεύων κείθι νέαισί θ' ἑορταῖς: Qualifying the festivals as νέαισί creates a further link between Adrastos, king of Sikyon and Chromios, governor of Aitna, νεοκτίσταν, v.2.

12. ἰσχυος τ' ἀνδρῶν ἀμιλλαῖς ἄρμασί τε γλαφυροῖς ἄμφαινε κυδαίνων πόλιν: The phrase "in the contests of the strength of men" not only means the athletic contests but foreshadows the conflict of war between the two men just as ἄρμασί τε γλαφυροῖς, "with hollowed chariots" foreshadows the death of Amphiaraios. The adjective γλαφυρός means both "hollow" i.e. carved out and "polished smooth". Reading it as hollow / carved out rather than polished is more germane to the ode's mythological agenda: Amphiaraios and his chariot are buried in the "hollow" of the earth.

13–14. φεῦγε γὰρ Ἀμφαιρῇ ποτε θρασυμήδεα καὶ δεινὰν στάσιν | πατρίων οἴκων ἀπό τ' Ἄργεος: Adrastos fled from Amphiaraios to Argos to avoid δεινὰν στάσιν, terrible civil war. Amphiaraios is characterized by the poet as bold or rash thinking, θρασυμήδεα. The tmesis of ἀπό from φεῦγε imitates the distance and separation of the two men as the words, πατρίων οἴκων, emphasize that it is civil strife among kin.⁷

14. ἀρχοὶ δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἔσαν Ταλαοῦ παῖδες, βιασθέντες λύα: The final words of this verse are in fact a play on words: βιασθέντες means forced or compelled by physical force; λύα, etymologically allied to λύω, meaning στάσις, civil strife or destruction, yet has the sense of release or dissolution—one part breaking off, dissolved from another.⁸ The pun is in βιασθέντες since Adrastos

his brothers were the sons of Bias [Amphiaraos and his brothers, sons of Melampos] and were displaced or usurped by force.

15. κρέσσων δὲ καππαύει δίκην τὰν πρόσθεν ἀνὴρ: There is some difference of opinion as to exactly what this line means. The basic sense is that the stronger man stops or suppresses the right of the former's rule. This is the reading by a scholiast, Thiersch and Mezger but, as Fennell notes, why would Pindar state that might is right? Especially since the next line speaks of the reconciliation, that is the giving in marriage of Eriphyle [Adrastos' sister] to Amphiaraos. Others take it to mean that the stronger man puts an end to the former dispute. This too is supported by the scholia, although it requires that δίκη be given an exceptional sense. In the former and more generally accepted reading it is Amphiaraos who is the subject; in the latter, Adrastos.

The verb καππαύει is less ambiguous, the dynamic downward force of κατὰ with παύει adds a suppressive quality. This, and the fact that, although the next verse deals with the act of reconciliation, Eriphyle is styled as ἀνδροδάμαντα, "man-conquering", a clear reflection of her role in Amphiaraos' death—one that presumably he would otherwise have been able to avoid—and the fact that Amphiaraos is indeed put into the ground, literally and figuratively, the stronger man must be Adrastos.

Nevertheless, the statement of v. 15 reflects a certain obscurity and the ambiguous way in which the poet has stated the case of this contest of power is, it must be assumed, deliberate. If we examine the story of Adrastos and Amphiaraos it does in fact have several features that are not those of a clear-cut enmity. They are reconciled by intermarriage, but this in turn leads to the brother-in-law's downfall. The expedition against Thebes is clearly not in the best interests of the men: the divine signs are inauspicious; they are warned by Zeus: nevertheless they go. Hubbard⁵ points out that the narrative changes its focus from Adrastos to Amphiaraos. The connection to be made between the mythological data as it is recounted by Pindar and Chromios in his present political situation is very relevant to the poem.

There are in fact other themes within the ode dealing with power: the mention of the Phoenicians and prospective battle with them are clearly contemporary to Sicilian politics and the poet relates them to the Theban disaster. The souls of the Sicilians are said to be superior to possessions. Conflict, it is said [v.38], is difficult to get out of once started. Once glory and possessions have been obtained [v.46] there is nowhere to stand: a mortal has reached his limits.

16. **ἀνδροδάμαντ' Ἐριφύλαν, ὄρκιον ὥς ὅτε πιστόν:** The words ὄρκιον ὥς ὅτε πιστόν belie the deceit which Eriphyle was to work on her husband. She was in fact neither a guarantee nor faithful. As Carey observes, the audience would not have missed the pointed reference of her attribute here since her role in the Theban affair was known from epic, cf. *Od.* 11.326-7, 15.247. Also the qualifier repeats the ἀνὴρ of v.15.⁶ The adjective ἀνδροδάμαντ' is the reading of B, ἀνδροδάμαν τ' of D. Farnell argues against the "strong asyndeton of B's reading". The word occurs in N.3.39 and fr.166. From these it is not clear what the accusative form of the word was—ἀνδροδάμαν or ἀνδροδάμαντα.

17. **δόντες. . ἦσαν μέγιστοι:** once she was given in marriage the Danaans were the greatest. The lacuna after μέγιστοι requires a cretic and has been variously filled.

18-19. **καί ποτ' ἐς ἐπταπύλους Θήβας. . αἰσιᾶν οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν:** Lit. "not on the path / not according to the path of birds of good omen" [cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 104; *Eum.* 770]. The syntax is somewhat convoluted, αἰσιᾶν must be taken with ὀρνίχων [as a genitive of quality] and οὐ κατὰ with ὁδόν, and hence reflects the inherent muddle of the motive for the expedition. Moreover the expression αἰσιᾶν οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν is not obvious: one does not go in the direction of auspicious omens, on their path. What we would like to translate is that the army of men was led on a path not favoured by birds of good omen. κατὰ with the genitive indicates motion downwards. Similar confusion occurs in the next line.

19-20. **οὐδὲ Κρονίων ἀστεροπὰν ἐλελίξαις οἴκοθεν μαργουμένους . . ἄλλὰ φείσασθαι κελεύθου:** "nor had the son of Kronos wheeled a shaft of lightning to urge them already greedy to march from home, but to turn away from the path." This has been variously understood as Zeus not favouring the expedition by sending a bolt of lightning [which they ignore] and by his not sending a bolt. In the latter case, which is preferable, the negative must be read with ἐλελίξαις and ἐπώτρυνε. This is a distinctive collection of non-signs: they are therefore guided by what they did not see. This interpretation of the poet's meaning is made apparent by the emphatic φαινομένην immediately following.⁷

19. **μαργάω:** which has both the sense of greed and gluttony, is significant since it resonates with the fires [v. 24] that will feast on their bodies and the statements at vv.32-4 against greed for gain and possessions.

21. **φαινομένην δ' ἄρ' ἐς ἅταν σπεῦδεν ὄμιλος ἰκέσθαι:** The word ἅτη, one rich in signifying those elements of human error that cause catastrophe

even to good men, serves to indicate the destined misfortune of the expedition. The error is φαινομένην, apparent, visible, and the army hastens, σπεύδεν ὄμιλος, to reach that destination, ἐς ἅταν. . ἰκέσθαι. The additional detail of χαλκίοις ὅπλοισιν ἰππείοις τε σὺν ἔντεσιν lends a certain noisy bustle to their doom.

22-23. Ἴσμηνοῦ δ' ἐπ' ὄχθαισι γλυκὺν | νόστον ἐρυσάμενοι λευκανθέα σώμασι πῖαναν καπνόν: The mss. readings are ἐρυσάμενοι [B] and ἐρυσάμενοι [D] which Hermann corrected to ἐρυσάμενοι. Numerous emendations have been suggested⁸, but primarily the "problem" has had to do with the inability of scholars to make sense of Pindar's statement—taking B as the *lectio difficilior*—that the soldiers "planted their return on the banks of the Ismenos." Of the several meanings of ἐρείδω the one that has the sense of planting, fixing into the ground serves this passage best, cf. P.4.267; P.10.51, where the verb is used to describe the fixing of a column and an anchor. While the sense of "fixing" in the ground has an architectural dimension to it, i.e. something is set into the earth with a view to permanence, here, understanding the sweet return is to be "planted" by the river banks is best argued by the poet's striking image of the white-flowered smoke. Describing the smoke of burning bodies as "white-flowered" is an arresting image but not altogether strange to the ode. At vv.39-40 we are told that Hektor's glory *flowered*, κλέος ἀνθήσαι, near the streams of the Skamandros. Moreover, that this is the most appropriate reading is suggested by the fact that the poet places the participle immediately between γλυκὺν νόστον and λευκανθέα: the sweet return and white flowering are contextually implicated in the poetic idea that although they did not return alive, the glory of their expedition survived. The white-flowers or bloom of smoke is commemorative: it was, as we shall see, the seven pyres of their dead bodies that gave them fame. That the poet uses a word that denotes a more permanent fixing than is generally associated with flowers [or smoke] does not in any way undermine this connotation. As Hubbard⁹ has observed, there is tension created by conjoining a static verb with a direct object that denotes active movement. And this same tension is inherent in the image of burning bodies which "bloom": they return once they vanish.

The verb **παιίνω** meaning "to fatten or enrich", echoes the previous characterization of the warriors as μαργουμένους, greedy, for the conflict.

24. ἐπτα γὰρ δαΐσαντο πυρὰι νεογυίους φῶτας: Seven fires feasted on the young-limbed men. The repetition of νεο- in νεογυίους forms a linguistic connection with vv.2,11.

24-27. **ὁ δ' Ἀμφιαρεῖ σχίσσεν. . θυμὸν αἰσχυνθῆμεν**: The earth is described as **βαθύστερνον**, deep-chested, a characteristic which in this context implies that the earth is in some way generous, as in N.10.8. it is said to welcome, receive, **ὑπέδεκτο**, Amphiaraios. This idea is further supported by the careful consideration the poet gives to Zeus, stating that he did it to spare Amphiaraios humiliation to his warrior spirit, **μαχατὰν**.

27. **θυμὸν αἰσχυνθῆμεν**. Amphiaraios is buried, horses and all, in the split earth as he is running away from battle. That he would otherwise have been struck in the back clearly indicates that he was in retreat.¹⁰ There is moreover a suggestion of haste in Zeus' intervention in the phrase at v.25. **κρίψεν δ' ἄμ' ἵπποις**, the force of **ἅμα** "at once, at the same time", and the detail that the pronoun for Amphiaraios is omitted, contribute to the sense of urgency. The shame inherent in **αἰσχυνθῆμεν** resonates with **αἰδῶς** at v.33 in the next strophe.

24. **παμβία**, a word of Pindaric coinage, suggests word-play again on Adrastus' father's name.

27. **ἐν γὰρ δαιμονίοισι φόβοις φεύγοντι καὶ παῖδες θεῶν**: By stating that even the sons of immortals flee with fears that are of divine proportions Pindar diminishes the possibility of condemnation for Amphiaraios' less-than-heroic retreat. Amphiaraios was certainly not the son of a god. Yet, Amphiaraios was gifted with prophetic abilities [cf. O.6.13,17; P.8.39-55; N.9.24-7; N.10.8-9] and foresaw his own death, the survival of Adrastus, and his [Amph.'s] son, Alkmaeon, entering Thebes in a second expedition. This divine gift suggests that fears that are **δαιμονίοι** are, in this context, those known and experienced by a seer. If we accept this sense of the phrase the translation remains the same, that even the sons of gods flee when disaster—not death—is prophesized by men divinely inspired with foresight, but is directly related to Amphiaraios and explains his flight and Zeus' rescue of him.

Carey points out that we should note the disappearance of Adrastus in this account, although it is announced as his tale vv.14-17. This is probably because, he suggests, Pindar has created a parallel between Chromios and Adrastus and because of that downplays his participation in an ill-fated military expedition. Adrastus is emphatically the leader elsewhere in Pindar, cf. O.6.13, P.8.48-54, N.8.52.¹¹

28. **εἰ δυνατὸν, Κρονίων, πείραν μὲν ἀγάγορα Φοινικοστόλων**: Most modern editors have interpreted this to mean a Phoenician army [**στόλος**]; others, following Mezger's "mit Blut überzogen", reading **στολή**, have rendered it as a mantle or other form of dress that is "purple"—a Phoenician colour—or

"blood-red", "bloody". The presence of ἐγγέων suggests that that στόλος / στολή be read as an army or host rather than dress and lower-case φοινικο—as "bloody". Elsewhere Pindar uses φοινικο-compounds exclusively to indicate colour: O.6.39, ἅ δὲ φοινικόκροκον ζώναν καταθηκαμένα; O.6.94, φοινικόπεζαν; O.9.6, Δία τε φοινικοστερόπαν σεμνόν τ' ἐπίνειμαι; P.4.64, ὥτε φοινικανθέμου ἦρος ἀκμῇ; I.4. 36, χθὼν ὥτε φοινικέοισιν ἄνθησεν ῥόδοις; Paean fr.52b.77, ἄγγελε δὲ φοινικόπεζα λόγον παρθένος; Dith. fr.75.14, φοινικοεάνων ὀπότη οἰχθέντος Ὀρᾶν θαλάμου; Thren. fr.129.3, φοινικορόδοις <δ> ἐνὶ λειμώνεσσι προάστιον αὐτῶν.¹² From this evidence we might assume that the passage read: "the bloodied / blood-red host of spears."

However, there is a definite parallel to be made in the poem at this juncture between the present Carthaginian threat to the Greeks on Sicily and the past expedition of the Seven against Thebes¹³. Moreover, not to lose sight of the visual possibilities inherent in much of Pindar's poetic expression, the "redness" of an army or spear-bearing host forms a fine parallel with the "whiteness" flowering from each of the seven pyres. It is best in any case to interpret φοινικο—in its fullest sense of both Phoenician and bloody.

That a parallel between the past and present situation is to be made is reinforced by the prayer that follows. The first point is that the poet is speaking in the present: εἰ δυνατόν, if it is possible, ἀναβάλλομαι ὥς πόρσιστα, I am postponing [in time: in space] to the farthest point this proud trial of life and death, αἰτέω σε. . . ὀπάζειν and I am asking you to grant. The second is the mood.

The verb ἀναβάλλομαι is interpreted here as "postpone" [cf. O.1.80 only], yet in Pindar and elsewhere [cf. LSJ. II med;] it more frequently means to begin or start up a song, "lift up one's voice", the action described by the middle voice, cf. Od.1.155; 8.266; Hes. *OD*: 410,412. The verb is not used by the Lyric poets. In fact the sense "postpone" occurs generally in prose in the active or passive voice. [Cf. Od.19. 584 where it is used in the active sense and with the temporal indicator μηκετι]. From this evidence I suggest that ἀναβάλλομαι be rendered as "I sing, I cast aloft this trial". The phrase ὥς πόρσιστα, which, expressed as a superlative preceded by ὥς, occurs in Pindar first [equivalent to the Homeric ὅττι¹⁴] must have the sense of "the farthest" and should not be rendered "as far as possible" in time. In other words, Pindar is stating that the expedition of the Seven is the most distant in time or, what is more likely, is the most extreme case of "heroic trial" πείραν μὲν ἀγάνορα. Finally, the context-specific ταύταν induces us to consider that the πείραν is that of the Seven just narrated and the addition of θανάτου περί

καὶ ζωᾶς, "of death and life"—a somewhat overdramatic pleonasm if it refers to a present Greek-Carthaginian possibility of war—is better suited to the finished tale of battle.

The conditional outset, εἰ δυνατόν is more difficult. Most translations use a subjunctive to express this: "I would postpone" but this is not in the Greek. Dissen explains it as "Dicuntur facere precantes id quod precibus effectum volunt". I contend that this is not the prayer part of the verse which occurs a line later with αἰτέω σε followed by the vocative.

29–30. μοῖραν δ' εὖνομον | αἰτέω σε παισὶν δαρὸν Αἰτναίων ὀπάζειν: μοῖραν δ' εὖνομον balances with πείραν μὲν ἀγάνορα not only by its μὲν / δέ relationship, but also by virtue of the word parallels: the sense of μοῖραν δ' εὖνομον, one of measure, destiny, civic peace and order, contrasts with the ordeal of proud conflict, based on competition for goods. We can establish an equation such that μοῖραν is to πείραν what εὖνομον is to ἀγάνορα. Μοῖρα is what is destined, allotted to man, and has limits. Within the context of the conservative political values of Pindar and his patrons, this might represent divinely ordered fate: what should happen. Πείρα on the other hand, as a trial or test, bespeaks the values and power struggle of an aristocratic past, one that is chosen by men and not bound by fate. (This is particularly true of the Theban expedition which, as is clear in this ode, was in defiance of all negative celestial signs.) The agenda of a trial that is ἀγάνορα, heroic and glorying in heroic display is very different from that of εὖνομος a quality of social and civic order, law, justice—all ideals of a peaceful society.

31–2. ἀγλαΐαισιν δ' ἀστυνόμοις ἐπιμίξαι | λαόν: The verb ἐπιμείζαι so often used by Pindar in the context of victory has overtones of a physical union, such as marriage, and here ἀγλαΐαισιν δ' ἀστυνόμοις "public festivities" the citizenry are to participate or "mingle" in the triumphs of her leaders. The celebrations are thought to be those of victory at the games rather than war, but this distinction does not serve the context or the poem's structure well. What is structurally important is that this [and the following verses] reflects the earlier description of Sikyon under Adrastus: ὃς τότε μὲν βασιλεύων κεῖθι νέαισιν θ' ἑορταῖς | ἰσχύος τ' ἀνδρῶν ἀμίλλαις ἄρμασί τε γλαφυροῖς ἄμφαινε | κυδαίνων πόλιν.

32–3. ἐντί τοι φίλιπποί τ' αὐτόθι καὶ κτεάνων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κρέσσονας ἄνδρες: That the poet is forming a parallel with the Theban material [esp. strophe 3] is further evident from this statement. αὐτόθι emphatically

indicates that he is addressing the qualities of Sicily, whereas at v.11 κείθι refers to Sikyon. The allusion to these men's souls being greater than their possessions recalls and develops what was said at v.15 which introduces the story of the Theban expedition, already marked as motivated by greed [cf. supra μαργουμένους]. Here that motive is generalized by a statement about the character of Sicilian Greeks. What is happening is a subtle development of association. First the split between Adrastus and Amphiaraus [δαινᾶν στάσιν]; the stronger man putting down the right of the former's rule; their reconciliation [ὄρκιον ὡς ὅτε πιστόν] in the questionable character of Eriphyle; their greed for battle; the burial of the men and of Amphiaraus.¹⁵

33. ἄπιστον ἔειπ': Recalls the pledge of Eriphyle. The poet is in fact saying that his words are to be trusted; his version of things is reliable.

33. αἰδῶς γὰρ ὑπὸ κρύφα κέρδει κλέπτεται: A sense of shame, ἡ φέρει δόξαν, which brings good repute, is stolen in secret by gain: although given in general terms, this statement inflects the story of Eriphyle / Adrastus / Amphiaraus. While Pindar does not specifically mention the incident of the necklace, nor spell out for us the reasons for the civil strife, the terms κρέσσονας ἄνδρες, ἄπιστον, κέρδει, αἰδῶς γὰρ ὑπὸ κρύφα, δόξαν clearly match κρέσσων ἀνὴρ, ὄρκιον πιστόν, μαργουμένους, φαινομένην δ' ἄρ' ἐς ἅταν, δίκαν. The difference—or development—at this verse is the clear attribution to theft and greed for gain as the underlying and hidden reason for civil strife. αἰδῶς as a concept is as rich in ethical connotations as is ἄτη, and the verb κλέπτεται leaves no doubt as to the immorality of such situations. That αἰδῶς is stolen secretly, ὑπὸ κρύφα, counters neatly the ἄτη which is φαινομένη: the motive that is hidden leads to the moral error that is apparent. We should also note the cumulation of "k" in the phrase κρύφα κέρδει κλέπτεται which gives it a fine rhetorico-poetical flourish. And taking into consideration the parallels drawn, the poet's statement ἄπιστον ἔειπ' takes on a deeper significance. His words are not trusted or believed *because* greed for gain—whether for the advantage of wealth or of power—works through deception. And this can only be judged to be so if there exists an idea of right to that power. The poet is not simply expressing a gnomic statement of moral conduct: he has created a direct and unmistakable connection with the tale of the Theban expedition and its underlying motives and is applying them to the present situation.

It has often been posited that Pindar reflects the aristocratic and hence conservative values of his time. Yet here he appears to be, albeit somewhat indirectly, in conflict with that ideology and its idealization of war.

34–5. **Χρομίῳ κεν ὑπασπίζων. . ἔκρινας ἂν κίνδυνον ἀξείας αὐτᾶς**: Had you been with Chromios in the thick of battle you would have judged, etc. This is addressed to no one in particular of an audience that would have been composed of Chromios' soldier friends and noble retainers of the Aitnian court. **ὑπασπίζων**, "shield-bearing" is unlikely to denote anyone of the actual audience of the ode, since this describes a servant of a commander and not a fighting man. What is noteworthy is that the poet now places the action into a battlefield.

There are a few technical difficulties: the combination of **κεν** (which is rare post-Homer) and **ἂν**; interpreting **οὐνεκεν** as causal, "because" or introducing an indirect statement, "that". Some editors [following Bergk] have read **ἂν** as syncopated **ἀνὰ** which alters the translation to "in time of danger" from "you would have been able to judge the danger". Reading **ἂν** for **ἄν** yields: "Were you the shield-bearer for Chromios. . .you would have been able to judge [sc. him] in time of danger. . .that etc." The essential difficulty however with **οὐνεκεν** as "because" is that it rarely occurs "en contexte completif".¹⁶ Equally rare is the combination of **κεν** and **ἂν**. Whatever change to the text is decided, one is still left with a rare expression.

If we accept the rare and archaic constructions of the text, then there are, poetically speaking, more important features to note. Pindar lists the various theatres of war—on the ground, on horseback and at sea—which altogether suggest the confusion of several battles at once. The din of battle is also noted in **ἀξείας αὐτᾶς** and **πεζοβόαις**; in fact the danger to be assessed is firmly centred on the sound of fighting, specifically the screams. **ἔκρινας ἂν κίνδυνον ἀξείας αὐτᾶς**, "you would judge or assess the danger *from* the shrill shouts / war-cries". **οὐνεκεν**, "because of which", **κείνα θεός**, or **αἰδώς** personified, urged the warrior spirit of Chromios to fight. One might recall v. 4 where Chromios signals with his voice, **αὐδᾶν μανύει**, for the singing to begin. The verb **ἐντυεν>ἐντύω; ἐντύνω**, "to equip, arm [**ἐντεα**]; urge, impel" is generally translated as the latter [Sl., Race] since the former sense is found mostly in Epic. However, it might be best to assume the older sense in this context since what Aidos does is arm Chromios with a spirit that is a spear, i.e. "speared", **θυμὸν αἰχματὰν**. Though this is usually glossed "warrior / martial spirit" the more literal image of a spirit that becomes a lance is more vivid and striking. This phrase also connects with the **μαχατὰν θυμόν** of Amphiaraios at v.26 and provides a connection between the two men.

37. **λοιγὸν Ἐνυαλίου:** Bury notes that the only other use of *λοιγὸς* in Pindar [I.6.28] describes a cloud hailing blood [*νεφέλα χάλαζαν αἵματος*] and here too there is a cloud of imminent death, *φόνου παρποδίου νεφέλαν*.

37–8. **παῦροι δὲ βουλευῶσαι φόνου παρποδίου νεφέλαν τρέψαι ποτὶ δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν στίχας χερσὶ καὶ ψυχῇ δυνατοί:** *παῦροι*, few, and *δυνατοί*, are able: the physical separation of the words imitates the difficulty encountered. *παρποδίου*, literally, "at one's feet", expresses vividly the closeness of danger in combat. Since clouds do rain down, the death at one's feet are the fallen comrades or enemies. This image is the reverse of that of the smoke that rises in the form of a flower of white atop the pyres of the Seven. *χερσὶ καὶ ψυχῇ* conforms to the idea present here that there is a spiritual—Enyalios being the spirit of war—as well as a physical dimension at work in war.

39–42. **λέγεται μὰν Ἑκτορι . . . Ἀγαιδάμου φέγγος ἐν ἀλικίᾳ πρώτα:** As noted earlier, Hektor's glory blossoming by the streams of Skamander forms a parallel with vv.22–3. *βαθικρήμνοισι δ' ἄμφ' ἅκταις Ἑλώρου*, but by the deep-welled shores of the Heloros this light has shone, *δέδορκεν . . . φέγγος*. Chromios is being compared to Hektor in very flattering terms: Hektor's glory bloomed but that of Chromios is a light shining forth. The frequent equation in the epinikia of light and victory suggests that this battle victory is greater than that of even Hektor, who after all was defeated. Hektor's glory is associated with blooming perhaps because he died defeated, just as did the expedition of the Seven. Real glory, the fame that accompanies winners, is associated with light, a kind of mystical shining that can be seen by others and does not die. *δέδορκεν* is used intransitively.

The location of the ford of Areia, *Ἀρείας πόρον* has been subject to much disagreement. Some, accepting the variation in the scholion, *ἔνθα Ῥείας πόρον*, have designated it as the Ionian Sea [cf. Aesch. *PV* 837], others argue that it is unlikely that *πόρος* be used of a sea and that the Heloros, a river in Sicily, flows SE into a different sea. Whether this other body of water was also known as the Ionian [our Adriatic] sea or not is not certain, but the fact that Chromios' glory shone forth must point to a locale near Sicily and on the water since the poet explicitly states that he will recount Chromios' exploits on dry land and others on the neighbouring sea: *πολλὰ μὲν ἐν κονίᾳ χέρσω, τὰ δὲ γείτονι πόντῳ φάσομαι*. The sea neighbouring the Ionian indicates that this is likely a reference to the battle at Cumae 474 BC where the Greeks defeated the Etruscans [cf. P.1.71–75].

Fennell argues that ἐν ἀλικίᾳ πρώτῃ means "in his earliest prime" explaining that the date of the battle of Heloros fought by Hippokrates of Gela against Syracuse was prior to 491BC [Herod. 7.154.17] and Chromios would then have been a young man under his command.

44. ἐκ πόνων δ', οἷ σὺν νεότατι γένωνται σὺν τε δίκῃ, τελέθει πρὸς γῆρας αἰὼν ἡμέρα: "A gentle life in old age is the achievement for those whose labours were made in youth and with justice." The translation cannot do justice to the phrase οἷ σὺν νεότατι γένωνται σὺν τε δίκῃ, which balances the concepts of having been young and just.

45. ἴστω λαχὼν πρὸς δαιμόνων θαυμαστὸν ὄλβον: "Let him know that he has been allotted wonderful happiness from the gods." The poet explains what this happiness is in the next strophe: it is wealth and fame.

45-6. εἰ γὰρ ἅμα κτεάνοις πολλοῖς ἐπίδοξον ἄρηται | κῦδος: The particle γὰρ indicates that this statement is an explanation for the preceding one. Many possessions are of course not the goal of a man of noble character—that has been condemned by the poet at v.32—but winning a famous reputation is.

46. οὐκ ἔστι πρόσωθεν θνατὸν: οὐκ ἔστι πρόσωθεν is Ed Boehmer's emendation of the mss. readings, οὐκέτι πόρσω [B] and οὐκ ἔστι πρόσω, [D], both metrically unsound. Triclinius proposed οὐκέτ' ἔστι πρόσω; Boeckh, οὐκ ἔστιν τι πόρσω; Mommsen, οὐκ ἔστιν πέραν τοῦ; Bergk, <ὡς> οὐκ ἔστι, changing the punctuation to have ὄλβον followed by a comma and a colon at κῦδος. These emendations are motivated by the metrical demands and to avoid the otherwise repeated ἔστι. Fennell has οὐκ ἔνεστι.

The image of the line is that of physical boundaries in that the phrase ἐφάπασθαι ποδοῖν, means "to touch both feet upon", and both πρόσωθεν and the mss. πόρσω / πρόσω express "further": there is not for a mortal a lookout of land to touch both feet upon. The poet equates the end of the land with the boundary of mortal happiness from achievement.

48. ἡσυχία δὲ φιλεῖ μὲν συμπόσιον: The ritual of communal drinking is characterized as the opposite of war. Pindar inverts this to: Peace loves [or is accustomed to] the symposium. He thus prepares the way to the details of celebration with which the ode began.

48-9. νεοθαλῆς δ' αὖξεται | μαλθακᾷ νικαφορία σὺν δοιδᾷ: That victory increases with a new bloom νεοθαλῆς, directs us to connect the Chromios' present state of accomplishments with those of Hektor and, by extension, the Seven. The bloom is said to be new or young because it is in the present and not the

past. The notion of growth and increase with poetic commemoration is omnipresent in Pindar's epinikia. The soft or gentle song contrasts with the harshness of war and the physical strength necessary for competitive activity; there is a physical quality to *μαλθακά*, a word otherwise used elsewhere to describe the softness of feelings [O.1.90 *φρενός*], an ensemble of voices [P.1.98 *κοινωνία*], or the voice itself [P.4.137; P.8.31; I.2.8: *φωναί*, *φθέγμα*, *μαλθακόφωνος*].

49. *θαρσαλέα δὲ παρὰ κρατῆρα φωνὰ γίνεται*: Wine encourages the voice.

50. *ἐγκρινάτω τίς νιν, γλυκὺν κώμου προφάταν*: This injunction, *ἐγκρινάτω τίς νιν*, let someone mix it, places the ode firmly in the present time of the actual celebration. The tentative quality that opens the poem with an invitation to revelry is now an order that the wine be prepared. The wine is said to be the "sweet interpreter" of the celebration. There is a facet to this metaphor that has been overlooked. *προφήμι* means "to speak on behalf of", and the injunction is that someone "mix in" the krater the *γλυκὺν κώμου προφάταν*. In other words the krater itself or the voice beside the krater can be understood to be the interpreter, although the easiest sense is had by simply saying it is the wine mixed with water. But there is something to be gained by being less conventional. The krater's shape is that of a flower and that image within the poem speaks on behalf of the victor's glory. The wine is metaphorically the "powerful son of the vine" which idea is easily transferred to mean Chromios. We have a convergence of metaphors: the flowering of glory, the flowering of lineage. As the flowers of smoke and those of the glory of Hektor are both placed beside streams, the construct of the image is enhanced, since liquid is to be poured into the krater and to be distributed. The voice that is emboldened is that of the poet: being *παρὰ κρατῆρα*, beside the krater, it stands in the same relation to the victor and his glory. The symposium in effect is a sharing of that glory.

Moreover, the notable emphasis at this point that Pindar places on the physical aspects of the symposium—the krater, the mixing and distribution of its contents, the silver cups—are all an added indication that this interpretation of his symbolic language is appropriate and not far-fetched.

52–3. *ἄς ποθ' ἵπποι κτησάμεναι Χρομίου. . ἔκ τὰς ἱερᾶς Σικυῶνος*: Pindar states that the horses have won the silver cups for Chromios, but in using the verb *κτάομαι* he connects this instance of gain with the previous negative examples of possession to reinforce the positive, i.e. disinterested, ungreedy aspect of this one. The acquisition or winning of them is deflected to his

horses precisely with that purpose in mind. Carey has suggested that ποτε may be seen as an indication that there was an interval of time elapsed between the victory and the ode.¹⁷ **θεμιπλέκτοισι**, "woven according to law" is uniquely Pindaric. Themis /themis suggests that it might signify a ritual of religious significance [consecration?] performed on the wreath. Themis as a goddess was associated with Apollo at Delphi but not with Apollo at Sikyon.¹⁸

52. ἀμᾶ, Doric for ἅμα, "at once, at the same time," is an emendation [Fel Vogt] of the restoration [ἅμα: Ed Schmid] for mss. ἀμφὶ, which is metrically suspect.

53-4. Ζεῦ πάτερ, εὐχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδῆσαι: This is the second part of the prayer, εὐχομαι, "I pray" rather than "I boast" since Zeus is addressed and provides a more likely context to prayers than to vaunts. κελαδῆσαι, to make sound or noise, here of celebration, recalls v.4 and if we look at the two loci it further indicates this to be an act of prayer: at v.4 Chromios is said to start the song, αὐδὰν μανύει invoking Artemis and Apollo. Bury notes that ταύταν ἀρετὰν stands in opposition to πείραν μὲν ἀγάνορα. . ταύταν at v.29 and that in both cases ταύταν holds the same position in the line. While Bury's and Mezger's systems for interpretive sleuthing have fallen into disuse and disfavour, there is a valid observation made by Bury to the effect that both lines are in the context of prayers to Zeus and that the poet here is praising the qualities necessary to victory at the games as qualities opposed to and preferable to those required for winning wars.

54-5. ὑπὲρ πολλῶν τε τιμαλφεῖν λόγοις | νίκαν: τιμαλφεῖν, "to honour solemnly". Again Bury notes that this is a rare word and cannot mean merely "honour" but has a nuance of solemnity and religious observance.

55. ἀκοντίζων σκοποῖ ἄγχιστα Μοισᾶν: The word ἄγχιστα contrasts with the earlier πόρσιστα v.29 and the opposition of furthest and nearest is deliberate. At v.29 the poet sings / casts up [ἀναβάλλομαι | furthest the tale of the ill-fated Seven; here he casts his lance closest to the target of the Muses. There too, lances φοινικοστόλων ἐγχείων, figure in the line. The poet has taken as a metaphor the very imagery of war and turns it to the advantage of words.

As a poet Pindar makes remarkable exits to his odes. They are built with care and detail and even ponderate with words and images that crowd the senses. Yet he never fails to suddenly and swiftly end. This particular climax, one of the many dramatic flourishes, speeds to its end with the pointed force of something thrown directly into a target. The word order emphasizes this since the phrase starts with the participle ἀκοντίζων "throwing a lance", next the target itself, σκοποῖ

which because of the very nature of its elision with ἄγχιστα suggests that the target has been hit dead-centre, and ends with Μοισᾶν, the Muses. The position of ἄγχιστα is also of interest since it appears to mean both "nearest the Muses" but can also mean "nearest the target of the Muses," since both are genitive.

1. Cf. Hummel, p.264-65. 330: "[κωμάσομεν etc.] le contexte et l'environnement sont nettement exhortatifs." See also Gerber, D.E., "Short-Vowel Subjunctives in Pindar," *HSCP* 91, 1987, 83-90; Braswell, *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine*, de Gruyter, 1998, 45.
2. Hubbard, T.K., "Remaking Myth and Rewriting History: Cult Tradition in Pindar's *Ninth Nemean*," *HSCP* 94, 1992, 77-110.
3. Chromios' victory in the Nemea games, N.1 is generally considered to pre-date N.9 in that it the resettlement of Aitna after the conquest of Catana does not appear to have happened yet.
4. Braswell ad loc. notes that, as in N.1.31 and 71, Pindar here implies that Chromios is very rich.
5. For a full discussion as to the traditions surrounding the founding of the Pythian games at Sikyon, see Braswell, 59f.
6. At Od.17.266-8, describing the house of Odysseus, we have another example from epic that clearly favours this architectural sense of ἐπασκέω: ἐξ ἑτέρων ἕτερ' ἐστίν, ἐπήσκηται δέ οἱ αὐλὴ | τοίχῳ καὶ θριγκοῖσι, θύραι δ' εὐερκέες εἰσὶ | δικλίδες.
7. See Braswell, 27-44 for a detailed account of the legend of Amphiaraos.
8. Moreover, as Braswell points out, it is a rare word occurring elsewhere only in Aeolic, cf. Alc.36.11 V. and 70.10f.
9. Op.cit. 109 & n89.
10. Carey, C. "Pindar's Ninth Nemean Ode," in *Tria Lustra* Liverpool Classical Papers no.3, essays and notes presented to John Pinsent, Liverpool 1993, 97-107.99.
11. Carey, op. cit. 99f., argues against this saying that negative omens are meant, i.e. Zeus sent thunder and/or lightning. It gives the passage more effectively an atmosphere of foreboding, increases the disastrous element in that they hasten to their destruction and is in accordance with a tradition of bad omens, cf. Il.8.133, 4.381.
12. Gerber, D.E., *Emendations in Pindar, 1513-1972*, Amsterdam, 1976, 120f. lists 16.
13. Op.cit. 92-3.
14. Stoneman, R., "Pindar and the Mythological Tradition, p.50 & n33, notes that there is a lekythos with a scene of Amphiaraos being struck with a lance from behind by Periclymenos. He cites Haspels, E., *Attic Black-figured Lekythoi*, Paris, 1936, pl.50.3.
15. Carey, 100.
16. Cf. also Bacch. 5.102 φοινικονώτων; 9.10 φοινικιάσπιδες; 11.98, 105. φοινικοκ[ραδέμνο]ιο; 12.40; 13.91, 222.
17. Cf. Renehan, R.F. "Conscious Ambiguities in Pindar and Bacchylides," 223f.
18. Cf. Hummel, §148 & nn6,7.
19. Carey, 103, attributes the Sicilian superiority to possessions as a reflex of the expense of chariot racing which expenditure is regularly referred to in those odes that celebrate victories in chariot events, e.g. O.5.15, P.5.106, N.1.31, I.1.42, 67, I.3.17f., I.4.29.
20. Hummel: 333-4 & §415
21. Carey, 97.
22. Themis: fr.30; Hes. Theog. 901; re: *themis* and *ou themis* Burkert, *GR*, 273 & n54: o-u-te-mi, Mycenaean, disputed in Gérard-Rousseau, M., *Les mentions religieuses dans les tablettes mycéniennes*, Rome 1968, 158f. For the etymology, Frisk, I 660f., Chantraine, 427f.

NEMEAN 11

1. Παῖ Ῥέας, ἃ τε πρυτανεῖα λέλογχας, Ἑστία: Hestia is the divinity of the hearth: the fireplace of home and the sacred fire of the State. Her genealogy as daughter of Rhea is Hesiodic [*Theog.*453-4: Ῥεῖη δὲ δμηθεῖσα Κρόνῳ τέκε φαίδιμα τέκνα | Ἰστίην Δήμητρα καὶ Ἥρην χρυσοπέδιλον. Also the Homeric hymns 24, 29 and *hAph.* 29-34]. The prytaneum was the called the κοινὴ ἑστία, and the part of it which would have held the sacred fire, her *thalamos*.

λέλογχας, pf. "have allotted to you" but as Verdenius¹ notes often can mean "to have under one's care" particularly with respect to tutelary deities [cf. O.9.15].

2. Ζηνὸς ὑψίστου κασιγνήτα καὶ ὁμοθρόνου Ἥρας: An important feature of this opening is the balanced setting of deities within the two first lines: Rhea / Hestia; Zeus / Hera. The gods sit at the ends of the lines much as we might assume the placement of dignitaries at a table or within a room². The purpose of this might be to imitate the formal and egalitarian treatment of dignitaries accepted into the Prytaneion. The ode celebrates an investiture—the donning of the robes of office—and it will be seen that much of the poem is concerned with dress and adornment and the "look" or outside appearance of things, and so it is very appropriate to this theme to have this structured arrangement. Rhea is mentioned first as the elder of the gods; Hestia is then characterized as the sister of loftiest, most supreme Zeus and of Hera who is equal or likewise on a throne, ὁμοθρόνου Ἥρας, both these divinities decorated with an adjective. Gods and especially goddesses are frequently represented as seated and the position that Aristagoras has received is in fact a seat at the Prytaneion.

3. εὖ μὲν Ἀρισταγόραν δέξαι τεὸν ἐς θάλαμον: As noted above the θάλαμος probably housed a shrine within the Prytaneion [cf. Farnell; Verdenius³]. Whether indeed δέξαι τεὸν ἐς θάλαμον designates the whole Prytaneion or a specific shrine room, it is clear that the poet wants Hestia to receive Aristagoras into

her inner, special chamber. Moreover, as the next line indicates, this is most likely to have been a room with a statue of Hestia holding a sceptre.

The anaphora of εὖ μὲν, εὖ δὲ continues the system of formal balance, which is recurs at vv. 6-7 with πολλὰ. As well as emphasizing the ritualistic nature of a hymn, it provides the invocation with an incantatory cadence.

4. εὖ δ' ἑταίρους ἀγλάῳ σκάπτῳ πέλας: "welcome his companions beside your shining sceptre." The reference to a sceptre, which is Hestia's, was perhaps to an actual one of statuary, although statues of Hestia were rare. Pausanias I.18.3 mentions a statue of Hestia in the Prytaneion at Athens⁴ and it is not unlikely that one existed in the Prytaneion at Tenedos. Farnell argues against this on the basis of the rarity of Hestia's cult and thinks that Pindar refers to an imaginary figure of the goddess, cf. Theba in I.1.1. Verdenius argues that in the context of an invocation of the goddess a real sceptre is implied. Whether it existed or not, the sceptre looks forward to ὀρθάν in the following line.

5. οἱ σε γεραίροντες ὀρθάν φυλάσσοισιν Τένεδον: "those who honouring you protect / preserve Tenedos upright." Cf. N.1.15, Σικελίαν πείραν ὀρθώσιν, I.6.65, ὀρθώσαντες οἶκον. The sense is one of collective protection.

6. πολλὰ μὲν λοιβαῖσιν ἀγαζόμενοι πρῶταν θεῶν: ἀγαζόμενοι, a rare, poetic form for ἄγαμαι, "worship", forms a pair with γεραίροντες as πολλὰ μὲν λοιβαῖσιν does with v.7, πολλὰ δὲ κνῖσα, the many libations and burnt offerings. These are the material signs of reverence.⁵ The words πολλὰ δὲ κνῖσα specify in fact that it is the savour or odour of the smoke from the sacrifice.

7. λύρα δέ σφι βρέμεται καὶ αἰοῖδα: βρέμω is used variously to describe the sound of the waves, wind, battle clashes, and a seditious crowd. Pindar uses it at P.11.30 for the sound of the man of low estate who πνέων ἄφαντον βρέμει, "murmurs, grumbling [Slater] unnoticed". It is however a curious word to describe the sound of the lyre. Perhaps we should understand it to represent sounds that, because they are in the background and because they are numerous, are of indeterminate pitch and indistinct timbre: a dull roar. The accompaniment of a lyre, were it to be strummed with rapidly repeated notes or a figure, while the singer sang the melody, might then qualify as a background rumbling. It is also conceivable, although distinctly more banal, taking into account the material of the following line, that βρέμω describe the bustle of servants removing and renewing dishes. It would at least provide aural competition for a musical performance.

8. καὶ ξενίου Διὸς ἀσκεῖται θέμις αἰενάοις ἐν τραπέζαις: "and the law of Zeus Xenios is respected at the tables that are ever-flowing". The verb

ἀσκέϊται, variously translated as, "venerated" [Sandys, Race], "cultivated, practised" [Verdenius], "honoured" [SI], has however the primary sense of working, crafting [LSJ. 1] and to adorn, dress, decorate [LSJ. 2]. Because this ode is concerned with the dress and outward show of office, I think that this second sense is the most suited. The law of hospitality adorns or dresses the tables: they are literally "ever-flowing", i.e. always laden or adorned with food.⁶

Themis is understood here as an abstract [lower-case] noun, but at O.8.21-22, both the abstract and personal sense are found.⁷

The material signs for Hestia's and Aristagoras' office have been catalogued: the shining sceptre, lyre and song, feasts on the tables, the libations and sacrifices made by the ἐταίρους to her. We have all the sounds and sights of ceremony.

9-10. ἀλλὰ σὺν δόξῃ τέλος | δωδεκάμηνον περᾶσαι νιν ἀτρώτῳ κραδίῃ: "And get him through the 12-month period of office with honour, σὺν δόξῃ, and with unwounded heart, ἀτρώτῳ κραδίῃ." Here ἀλλὰ does not indicate a transition from present to future nor a shift from the preceding conditions, but is progressive.⁸ It is a conjunctive "and" not "but". περᾶσαι νιν is the emendation of Dissen for the mss. περάσαι σὺν, which is considered to present two difficulties: 1) the verb is 3s. aor. opt. which requires Aristagoras as subject, "may he", and not the members of the Prytaneion; 2) the phrase σὺν ἀτρώτῳ κραδίῃ by repeating σὺν δόξῃ is felt to be unnecessary and lacking in elegance of style. The infinitive requires νιν as dir. obj.

The objections to this emendation are: a) the optative makes good sense. The only other examples of the rare infinitive in prayer in Pindar are: fr. 106.7, Σικελίας ὄχημα δαιδάλεον ματεύειν; fr. 180.1, μὴ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀναρρήξαι λόγον; P.1.67-68, Ζεῦ τέλει', αἰεὶ δὲ τοιαύταν Ἀμένα παρ' ὕδωρ | αἶσαν ἀστοῖς καὶ βασιλεῦσιν διακρίνειν⁹ ἔτυμον λόγον ἀνθρώπων. This latter example is itself subject to dispute, the scholiasts adding an imperative παράσχου to explain the sense of the line.¹⁰ Furthermore, the same imperative, παράσχου, is used in the scholiast's paraphrase of the passage at hand, παράσχου οὖν αὐτοῖς σὺν εὐδοξίᾳ ἐξενιαυτῆσαι τὴν πρυτανείαν etc.¹¹ b) the paired phrases with σὺν since they are eminently suited to the pattern already established, are much to be preferred. The prayer, which extends over two strophes, comes to an end here and the concinnity achieved with this third, final and somewhat less apparent repetition demonstrates a fine rhetorical flourish. The first pairing relates to Aristagoras, the

second to Hestia, and the final one again to Aristagoras. Such symmetry need not be altered into grammatical impoverishment.

The verb, **τιτρώσκω** is curious. Various commentaries have tried to manage to "damage" or "injury" its literal meaning of "wound." After all, since Aristagoras is not on the battlefield, what is meant by an unwounded heart? Does Pindar wish that he not suffer criticism, or does it refer to something else?¹²

11-12. ἄνδρα δ' ἐγὼ μακαρίζω μὲν πατέρ' Ἀγερσίλαν. . . σύγγονον: Farnell qualifies this sentence as "brilliant, but the syntax is complicated." ἄνδρα cannot [as the scholiasts appear to have read it] refer to Arkesilas, father of Aristagoras; the physical attributes also belong to the son. But the two accusatives lead to a certain confusion which is perhaps deliberate. After all, Aristagoras' wondrous and untrembling body, τὸ θαητὸν δέμας ἀτρεμίαν, is inherited, σύγγονον. The phrase, especially ἀτρεμίαν can be noted to represent the qualities of a statue: something marvellous to look upon and unmoving.¹³ The verb μακαρίζω, "blessed", has a double acc. elsewhere only in *Ar. Vesp.* 588.¹⁴ Lefkowitz¹⁵ argues that πατέρα, δέμας, and ἀτρεμίαν are accusatives of respect; Verdenius¹⁶ following Wilamowitz describes this as parathesis, a σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον μέρος; Hummel¹⁷ speaks of an *accusatif de relation*; Fennell calls ἄνδρα an *accusativus pendens*. If there is no confusion as to whom and what must be blessed, clearly there is some controversy as to the grammatical nomenclature of the phenomenon.

What is clear apart from the strict measure of grammar is that the poet has deliberately blurred the lines of lineage and deliberately fused the objects of his praise, and what more precise way to do this than to use the same case so that the direct objects of a single verb are indistinguishable from one another? More significantly for this ode in which the external measure of a man predominates in the thematic agenda, and in which we are to learn that, for all his athletic build Aristagoras did not enter the lists of panhellenic athletic competition, this verse establishes the visibly inherited ability of Aristagoras in this regard.

13. εἰ δέ τις ὄλβον ἔχων μορφῇ παραμεύσεται ἄλλους: The particle ἔδε answers to μὲν supra. παραμεύσεται, Doric for παραμείβομαι, which is variously read as a future[Fennell] or aor. subj.[Verdenius], in which case the indicative mood of ἐπέδειξεν would indicate more real and actualized results. The sense is: if one who has wealth surpasses others in his physical form.

14. ἔν τ' ἀέθλοισιν ἀριστεύων ἐπέδειξεν βίαν: "and bests them in athletic contests, he [definitely] shows his strength." This epode focuses on the

physical attributes of Aristagoras, his wondrous outward form [τὸ θαυτὸν δέμας], his poise, or whatever one might sense of his physical courage [ἀτρεμίαν], his shape / build [μορφῇ] and his strength [βίαν].

15-16. **θνατὰ μεμνάσθω περιστέλλων μέλη. . ἐπιεσσόμενος:** "let him remember that the limbs he is adorning/decorating are mortal and that at the end of everything he will be dressed/clothed/wrapped with earth." This is an arresting idea: the earth as our body's place of investiture, death as our robe of office. Aristagoras will wear the earth as he now wears those outward signs of success. He is indeed one of the "beautiful people." The outside of things is mortal; what is not inborn is subject to death. *περιστέλλων* means to wrap around, as in wearing robes of office and to dress out for burial.

Verdenius contra Lefkowitz's statement¹⁸ that *περιστέλλων* "can denote decking out a corpse for burial" argues that this is irrelevant "for there is no evidence for the assumption that the word was especially used in this sense." It seems however that Verdenius objects primarily to Lefkowitz's references to *Soph. Ant.* 903; *Ai.* 821, 1170 as not specifically to do with dressing. At *Ant.* 900-2 Antigone describes how she buried her parents: *ἐπεὶ θανόντας αὐτόχειρ ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ / ἔλουσα κάκoσμησα κάπτιμβίους / χοᾶς ἔδωκα*. In the next line, she distinguishes her treatment her brother Polyneikes as *δέμας περιστέλλουσα*. From this it is clear in the first case that *κάκoσμησα* means "dressing" or "adorning"; it is also clear that in this same context *περιστέλλουσα* does not. We know from the play that Antigone is not able to bury or wrap in a shroud but only able to cover the bare body with earth and pour libations over it: 256-7; 426-431. The passages cited from *Aias* are less illuminating.

Neither commentator cites *Hdt.* 2.90, which describes the treatment by the Egyptians of a body of anyone found drowned or killed by a crocodile: *τούτους πᾶσα ἀνάγκη ἐστὶ ταριχεύσαντας αὐτὸν καὶ περιστεύλαντας ὡς κάλλιστα θάψαι ἐν ἱρήσι θήκησι*; nor 6.30 which describes Darius' orders with respect to the burial of Histaios' pickled head: *τὴν κεφαλὴν τὴν Ἰστιαίου λούσαντάς τε καὶ περιστεύλαντας εὖ ἐνετείλατο θάψαι ὡς ἀνδρὸς μεγάλως ἐωυτῷ τε καὶ Πέρσῃσι εὐεργέτῃ*. Also *Plat. Hipp. Maj.* *Steph.* 291.e, *Anth. Graec.* 7.162.5-6, and 613.5-6.¹⁹

All these passages have to do with the preparation of the body for burial, and while it may be argued that *περιστέλλων* does not have to do exclusively and invariably with clothing, dressing or adorning the dead body, it is clear from the above that it is relevant to burial, which is after all a kind of covering. Pindar's

context makes it evident that just as the robe of investiture is to be wrapped around Aristagoras as a visible and outward sign of his status and new-won rank, so too at the end of his life the earth will wrap his limbs. Furthermore, the participle ἐπιεσσόμενος rightly has the sense "to be *additionally* clothed" and that implies that the initial dressing is that of περιστέλλων.

16-17. ἐν λόγοις δ' ἄστων ἀγαθοῖσιν ἐπαινείσθαι... δαιδαλθέντα μελίζειν ἀοιδαῖς: Aristagoras is now to be adorned with words and songs. By their position the very words ἐν λόγοις and ἀοιδαῖς wrap around the one to be praised. δαιδαλθέντα refers properly to things and not people that are decorated, hence we have another instance where Aristagoras is described as a monument or a work of art. The phrase μελιγδούποισι δαιδαλθέντα μελίζειν ἀοιδαῖς contains a studied succession of "d" "m" and "l" and proves in μελιγδούπος the earlier sense of βρέμεται: the sound of praise is loud and sweet.

18-21. ἐκ δὲ περικτιόνων ἕξ καὶ δέκ' Ἀρισταγόραν...παγκρατῖ: ἐκ δὲ περικτιόνων, "In the local games 16 shining victories crowned Aristagoras and his famous clan / fatherland in wrestling and the great pancration." Consistent with the theme of outward signs of Aristagoras' abilities, Pindar has made the victories the subject and qualified them as "shining": they decorate Aristagoras with the garland of victory. εὐώνυμον, literally "well-named" or "famous"; Bury understands it to mean a name of good omen and that the phrase πάτρην τ' εὐώνυμον refers to the Peisandridai at v.33.

21. μεγαυχεῖ means "great" and "boast" which is rendered as glorious or proud. But αὐχέω in meaning to boast or declare proudly implicitly describes the loud voice of confidence. There is a connection here to v. 29, κενεόφρονες αὐχαι, the man of empty-minded boasts and to the loud [joyous] sounds of celebration, βρέμεται, μελιγδούποισι above.

22. ἐλπίδες δ' ὀκνηρότεραι γονέων παῖδος βίαν: His parents' hopes, expectations for their son were too narrow. The word ὀκνηρότεραι, best translated as "too shrinking", is interesting and particularly cogent since it implies those kinds of restriction that confine the arms and legs—one's movement—and restrictions are increasingly relevant to the ode's design. To gloss it as "too hesitant" [Verdenius; Lefkowitz], "overly cautious" [Race] "halting" [Bury] defines the word emotionally rather than physically. The point of physical restraint or confinement is more compelling in light of the warning of vv.15-16. Moreover, they held his strength from testing itself in the Olympian and Pythian games, βίαν ἔσχον ἐν Πυθῶνι πειρᾶσθαι καὶ Ὀλυμπίᾳ ἀέθλων. This closely parallels v.14: ἐν τ' ἀέθλοισιν

ἀριστεύων ἐπέδειξεν βίαν. In both cases his βία, physical strength or power is what, on the surface at least, would have won him honour and glory.

24. **ναὶ μὰ γὰρ ὄρκον:** "Ὀρκον, the god of oaths, [Farnell, Verdenius] cf. Hes.*Theog.*231; *Op.*219; Hdt.6.86.2. The γὰρ explains ὀκνηρότεροι, "for otherwise".

An important element to consider at this juncture is the oath itself. Why does the poet swear? This is the only time that Pindar uses the formula for oath-taking, **ναὶ μὰ** + acc.²⁰ It should also be noted that this occurs exactly at the mid-point of the ode [v.24 / 48]. The poet is deliberate in doing this and its significance should not be overlooked.

There is one other feature of this poem that is distinct from all the other odes—the lack of mythic material. And although this is not an epinikion *per se* but an installation ode, Pindar does make reference to the athletic abilities of his client. No doubt the institution of Aristagoras into the Prytaneion, in addition to the robes of office, would have included his taking an oath. Here the poet has his own oath and what he swears to has to do with the usual substance of epinikia, i.e. the panhellenic games. In some measure this must be the poet's way of managing two agenda at once: formulating an epinikion without the usual victory and shaping it to suit—dress—Aristagoras. Since an oath is necessary before otherwise doubting witnesses, the poet would be taking it in the presence of that very lack of confidence he has noted. And because it is stated at mid-point of the poem we must construe it to have pivotal force.

24. **ἐμὰν δόξαν:** an accusative of "extent, range, sphere" [Fennell], "adverbial" [Bury], "absolute" [Farnell], originating from a "prosthetic" nominative [Schwyzer II 86], in "apposition to an unexpressed internal object" [Verdenius 28].

24–25. **παρὰ Κασταλία | καὶ παρ' εὐδένδρῳ μολὼν ὄχθῳ Κρόνου:** The parallel expressions **παρὰ Κασταλία** and **παρ' εὐδένδρῳ** mirror the repeated pairs noted earlier. The function of this, apart from its elegance of diction, may be to connect the language of Pindar's oath to that of the opening invocation. Both speeches are solmen and stately in tone. The scene of Kastalian waters and the lush grove of trees on the hill is one of picturesque abundance. The equation of natural fertility and human success is made more apparent in the third antistrophe.

26. **κάλλιον ἂν δηριώντων ἐνόστησ' ἀντιπάλων:** "he would have returned more noble than his opponents in wrestling." **δηριώντων**, from **δηριάω**, the active form of epic **δηρίαομαι** occurs only here; Pindar uses the form **δηρίομαι** in O.13.4. The theme of return is a well known *topos* in epinikia and here has the

additional purpose of creating a bridge between Aristagoras and his illustrious ancestors. This small scene in fact—the streams of Kastalia, the well-wooded hill, and the noble return—are all to be repeated with increased significance in the third strophe and antistrophe.

27–29. πενταετηρίδ' ἑορτὰν Ἡρακλέος τέθμιον | κωμάσαις ἀνδησάμενός τε κόμαν ἐν πορφυρέοις ἔρνεσιν: "and celebrated the 4-year festival ordained by Herakles with his hair bound up with purple [or shining] shoots." The argument that shine²¹ rather than colour is meant here deprives the moment of just that splash of purple. Moreover, there is one passage in Pindar where the colour purple is clearly meant by πορφυρέος and, although the poem is fragmentary, the lines are specifically to do with hair and flowers being bound in it and in fact have the same participle, ἀνδησάμεναι: Paean 52n.a. 15–19:

δων τανυα[. . .]σὺν κτύπῳ[(— —) ~ — ἀν-
δησάμεναι πλ[ο]κάμους
μυρτων ὑπ[. . .]σφιν ἔγειρον
αἰθέρ', ἑλικ[. . .]δὲ πορφυ-
ρέα σὺν κρόκ[α . . .] etc.

Moreover, the other passages where Pindar uses πορφυρέος, P.4.114, 183, σπαργάνοις ἐν πορφυρέοις, in purple swaddling, and πτεροῖσιν. . . πορφυρέοις, with purple wings, and esp. O.6.55, παμπόρφυρος, are loci in which colour rather than shine or glow is designated. In the first example, the speaker is the "stranger" Jason giving the account of his being smuggled out of his home secretly to Chiron's cave under cover of darkness and wrapped in swaddling. It would be highly unlikely that any secrecy could have been obtained had his swaddling glowed in the dark. In the second, purple is the colour of the wings rippling down the backs of the sons of Boreas, the north wind. If possible yet it is eccentric to qualify the wings of the wind as shining or brilliant rather than a colour like the deep sky. In the third instance, O.6.55–6, ἴων ξανθαῖσι καὶ παμπόρφυροις ἀκτῖσι βεβρεγμένος ἄβρον σῶμα, Verdenius sees that ἀκτῖσι suggests that shining is meant, rather than colour. But this is perverse. Colour, especially in flowers, can be particularly brilliant, and here, since the flower is thought to be a pansy, ἀκτῖσι could reasonably refer to the way the flower's dual colours are seen on the petals as radiating out—like beams or shafts of light—from the centre.²²

Here then, we must read "purple" and understand that purple garlands are woven into the hair of Aristagoras. He is in effect dressed in the hypothetical

victory. ἀνδησάμενός, "being tied up" continues the theme of restrictions and binding.

29-32. ἀλλὰ βροτῶν τὸν μὲν κενεόφρονες αὖχαι | ἐξ ἀγαθῶν
ἔβαλον· τὸν δ' αὖ καταμεμθέντ' ἄγαν | ἰσχὺν οἰκείων
παρέσφαλεν καλῶν | χειρὸς ἔλκων ὀπίσσω θυμὸς ἄτολμος ἐών:
"But among mortals empty-minded boasts cast one man, τὸν μὲν, from good things, another, τὸν δέ, his strength underrated too much, his spirit undaring and dragging him backwards by the hand, he falls from noble deeds within reach." θυμὸς ἄτολμος contrasts with the earlier σύγγονον ἀτρεμίαν. These two exempla which form pairs similar to vv. 3,4; 6,7; 24, 25, are like two limbs—the two legs of mortality that are from the earth and will return to it.

In the first case the idea is of empty imagining and talk without actual action. The verb, in tmesis, ἐκβάλλομαι, means "throw or cast out". That man is cast out of good things and, by extension, from the company of noble men. It is in fact his empty-headed boasts that cast him out. In the second case, it is the undaring spirit and hand that drag him back from accomplishment. Both καλός and ἀγαθός are part of the traditional formulation of a great and noble man, καλοκάγαθός, and essentially describe the outer and inner qualities to be attributed to him.²³ His inner beauty of character was evident from his physical good looks; the interior goodness ἀγαθός was reflected in the exterior, καλός. In these examples of failure, the first has no good interior; his inner world, i.e. his thoughts, feelings, imaginings—all of which are contained in the term φρήν—are full of empty boasts. In the second case, the exterior is one of strength, yet it is his own unadventurous spirit [ἔλκων / ἐών] which actively drags him back by the hand.

Verdenius [30] understands the θυμὸς ἄτολμος to belong to the parents and sees in this second example a reference to their failure to allow Aristagoras to enter the Great games. But I do not think this makes sense: surely the poet did not intend to pointedly [and publicly] disparage his parents a second time. Moreover, the comparison is between empty imaginings never coming to reality and a real potential that falls short because of failing courage, both being the fault of the individual and not that of circumstances. As Bury states it: "Over-confidence expels: over-diffidence leads astray."

33. συμβαλεῖν μὰν εὐμαρὲς ἦν τό τε Πεισάνδρου πάλαι: "Surely it was easy to deduce the ancient blood of Peisandros from Sparta—for he came from Amyklai with Orestes, leading here the bronzed army of Aiolians—and mixed the streams of Ismenos with those of Melanippos, his mother's ancestor." The mixing

of blood is that of Sparta and Thebes, the former represented on the father's side by Peisander, the latter by Melanippus, a Theban hero who fought against the Seven [Aesch. *Sept.* 407-414].²⁴ The blood inheritance of Aristagoras is compared to that of streams mixing.

33. εὐμαρὲς ἦν: This contrasts with a later statement at v.43-44 that [from Zeus to men] there is no clear sign, σαφὲς οὐχ ἔπεται τέκμαρ. The poet makes it clear that in the case of Aristagoras his descent from illustrious ancestors is easy to put together, συμβαλεῖν. The verb should also be read in its primary sense of "cast together" since in this it reflects back to the negative exempla and forward to the throwing together of ancestral blood-lines. And it is this clarity with which his ancestral quality is noted that further contradicts the suggestion that the second example is meant to recall Aristagoras' parents.

37-8. ἀρχαῖαι δ' ἄρεται | ἀμφέρONT' ἀλλασσόμεναι γενεαῖς ἀνδρῶν σθένος: This notion of alternate generations producing greatness is also stated in N.6.8-11. ἀμφέρONTι has the connotation here of raising up from the earth, giving forth. σθένος is to be read with γενεαῖς [dat. of interest] and not ἀνδρῶν. The pronounced assonance of "a" and "ai" in the two lines should also be noted.

39. ἐν σχερῷ δ' οὔτ' ὦν μέλαιναι καρπὸν ἔδωκαν ἄρουραι: The phrase/verse divides evenly: ἐν σχερῷ δ' οὔτ' ὦν μέλαιναι, [8 syllables], καρπὸν ἔδωκαν ἄρουραι [8] and might be considered to have internal rhyme μέλαιναι, ἄρουραι. This gives it not only a majestic or solemn quality but also imitates the very nature of even-handed alternation, of greater and lesser growth. ἐν σχερῷ δ' οὔτ' ὦν, not being one after the other. Verdenius [p.32], agreeing with Turyn, reads ἐνσχερῷ, arguing that the mss. do not have an iota here nor at N.1.69b or I.6.21. The word occurs elsewhere in this form only at Ap.Rh. 1.91, where it describes rowers sitting in a row, λάζοντο δὲ χερσὶν ἐρετμά / ἐνσχερῷ ἐζόμενοι, and in Antimach. fr. 20.4-6 (quoted in Athen. *Deipno.* 11.33.8-10 [Kaibel]) where the Achaian kings stand in a row to receive gobelets and pour a libation, νώμησαν δὲ δέπαστρα θοῶς βασιλεῦσιν Ἀχαιῶν / ἐνσχερῷ ἐστηῶσι, καὶ ἐς λουβὴν χέον εἶθαρ / χρυσείῃ προχόωι. In either case it does not alter the sense of "not one after the other", the image of rows that are full of corn alternating with rows that are empty.

40-42. δένδρεά τ' οὐκ ἐθέλει πάσαις ἐτέων περόδοις ἄνθος εὐώδες φέρειν πλούτῳ ἴσον ἀλλ' ἐν ἀμείβοντι: The observation that the trees do not *wish* to bear blossoms, δένδρεα τ' οὐκ ἐθέλει, every year as

lavishly as the previous season, is an interesting one. There is a double allusion: to the garlands of the games, v.25, καὶ παρ' εὐδένδρῳ μολῶν ὄχθῃ Κρόνου, and to the generations within a family or clan. The phrase οὐκ ἐθέλει is sometimes glossed as "not wont" [cf. Verdenius, Fennell] but here [cf. Lefkowitz, 54; Nisetich, 62;²⁵ Slater.] it is preferable that it denote volition. The idea of negative will and emotions as reasons for failure has been stated at vv. 22-3, 31-2 and here has confluence in the past of Aristagoras. Moreover, it is particular to the investiture of Aristagoras and all prior references to dress and ornament, for the flowers are certainly the dress or ornament of trees and the poet is deliberate in qualifying them as ἄνθος εὐώδες, fragrant flower, and associating the flowering with wealth, πλούτος. The construction ἐν ἀμείβοντι offers another example of paired parallels with ἐν σχεῖρω, and the parallel should be kept, so: ἐνσχερῶ, ἐναμείβοντι ²⁶

42-3. καὶ θνατὸν οὕτως ἔθνος ἄγει | μοῖρα: The concepts of limitations and destiny are contained in μοῖρα; the bounded nature of human life. The poet encompasses in the natural world the flowering of individuals from time to time and now makes the more general observation that our lives, since we are mortal, are governed by the destined limitation of death.

43-44. τὸ δ' ἐκ Διὸς ἀνθρώποις σαφὲς οὐχ ἔπεται | τέκμαρ: No clear sign, or omen-marker from Zeus makes itself known to mankind. Péron²⁷ has suggested that τέκμαρ was a guiding star [contra Verd.]. Fennell [Bury; Verd.] note ἐμβαίνομεν as a nautical metaphor, "we embark upon", looking forward to v.46. So perhaps, in this context, τέκμαρ can be thought of as a star, one by which we might guide our life's voyage. μοῖρα is said to drive or govern, ἄγει, the race of mortals. And the sense of τὸ δ' ἐκ Διὸς. . . τέκμαρ is that yet from Zeus a clear [or reliable] guiding sign does not follow. Our lives are driven or governed by boundaries and limits, yet there follows no clear sign from Zeus as to where we can or ought to go.

44-5. ἀλλ' ἔμπαν μεγαλanoρίας ἐμβαίνομεν | ἔργα τε πολλὰ μενοινώτες: nevertheless, we embark on completely ambitious undertakings, longing for many deeds. The word, μεγαλanoρία, a rare one and used only here by Pindar, represents over-weening ambitions in a suitably polysyllabic form. It also contains within it the idea of the ambition to be known as a great man. Every would-be great man requires the opportunity to perform great deeds and so the participle μενοινώτες:

45-6. δέδεται γὰρ ἀναιδεῖ ἐλπίδι γυῖα: "For our legs are bound by shameless hope." This is directly tied in turn to the image and language of vv.14-5. Our limbs are bound, fettered by hope and expectations that know no limits. This recalls the image of restriction at v.23, ἐλπίδες δ' ὀκνηρότεραι. In both cases the restraint is expressed concretely as a physical one, yet in the first it is hopes that are too confined and in the second, too unconfined. Although ἀναιδώς literally means "without shame" and is translated generally to that effect [wanton, importunate, shameless, insolent], it is preferable, especially within an ode so focused upon restrictions and their consequences, to understand it as "unbounded, unrestrained".²⁸ The shameless quality is really related to ambitions and the ends to which men will go to fulfill them. More importantly, if those ambitions are not matched by the divine design and will of the gods, then this is a violation of μοῖρα, or one's allotted destiny.

46. προμαθείας δ' ἀπόκεινται ῥοαί: "And the streams of foreknowing lie distant." We cannot know the future and what is visible is not necessarily a clear, easily-read sign of the divine. We embark on our life's journey and do not know the way or the limits of the sea. The streams of foreknowledge must be associated with poetry and its practice. For it is the poet who is able to see the divine in human affairs which shows itself in the accomplishment of great deeds. 47-8. κερδέων δὲ χρὴ μέτρον θηρευέμεν· | ἀπροσίκτων δ' ἐρώτων ὀξύτεροι μανίαι: Verdenius qualifies rightly δὲ as "strongly adversative". Pindar is offering a solution to the difficulties of the human condition: it is necessary to seek for gain with due measure. μέτρον is the measure of μοῖρα. θηρευέμεν, "to hunt" for gain continues the emotional tenor of μενοινῶντες. We seek the ends of our ambitions like hunters after prey.

And here is another dimension to the ode's study of dress—the exterior of the man, the honours he is adorned with which mark him as one favoured by the gods—is not necessarily a true or reliable sign, σαφὲς τέκμαρ. We cannot judge from external markers whether a man is excellent or not. The robes of office, like the crowns and wreaths of the victors should reflect, display the inner quality and virtue of the wearer. The inner man must have a heart equal to divine accomplishments. Measure, a sense of our physical and emotional limits is necessary, or we rave, we experience the sharp, cutting madness of desire.

The phrase ἀπροσίκτων ἐρώτων ὀξύτεροι μανίαι, "the too-cutting mania of passions for the unattainable" which ends the ode dramatically, explains the expression which occurred earlier, ἀτρώτῳ κραδίᾳ: Aristagoras can only have an

"unwounded" heart if he keeps his desires for gain, his ambitions for advancement within the measure of his inner abilities. The madness of passion, desire that cannot be fulfilled wounds like a weapon puncturing our heart. The hunting metaphor [θηρευόμεν] turns around and captures us. The very intensity with which we seek or pursue the prey of our heart's longings will makes us its victim. The line itself is balanced evenly in seven syllables, like the two limbs of mortality. We are bound by the power of expectations beyond measure and self-control [ἀναιδεῖ ἐλπίδι] and by passion for the unattainable [ἀπροσίκτων δ' ἐρώτων] both of which contain inherently the suggestion of intense and out-of-control desire like that of sexual passion. Pindar expresses this as a concrete limiting of our limbs, our movement, since the inner world always controls or orders the exterior. If we give way to the passions that are larger or greater than our destiny, our bodies are enthralled. Life must be lived according to both the inside and outside, both spirit and body because the body belongs to the earth. We are all children of Rhea: our limbs are grounded on and in the earth—we grow, like trees, blossoming this year, not the next, rooted and robed in mortality which is our measure, our μέτρον.

This ode wraps around Aristagoras and clothes him. Every triad contains the praise that is to adorn him and the reminder of limits of time, of space, and of movement.

1. Verdenius, W.J., "Pindar's Eleventh Nemean Ode: A Commentary," ad loc.
2. Miller, G.S., *The Prytaneion*, 35ff. describes the prytaneion at Athens and in particular the *Tholos* where the dining arrangement of some 37 couches and tables is in the form of a large circle surrounding an inner circle.
3. Verdenius, ad loc., cites Miller.36, where Miller asserts the likelihood that of the two main rooms within the Prytaneion one would be the hearth room, doubts that that room would have been called Hestia's *thalamos*.
4. πλησίον δὲ πρυτανείον ἐστίν, ἐν ᾧ νόμοι τε οἱ Σόλωνός εἰσι γεγραμμένοι καὶ θεῶν Εἰρήνης ἀγάλματα κεῖται καὶ Ἑστίας.
5. Lefkowitz, "Pindar's *Nemean xi*," 51, suggests that burnt offerings as opposed to blood-sacrifices qualify communal political associations: "men stand around the altar, celebrating death and the gods' gift to them of life." This seems to be giving the words much greater scope of meaning than the context can supply. Sacrifices of any kind to the gods were inherently political in that they were intent upon manipulating the gods and were organized around the collective and individual interests of the sacrificer. The principle of *do ut des* is contractual and materially specific.
6. Those who enjoyed the privileges of prytaneic office were called ἀείσιτοι, which did not mean "eating forever" but for the term of office.
7. Cf. Verd. 19-20 for a full discussion and bibliography of Themis /themis.
8. Denniston, J.D., *The Greek Particles*, Oxford, 1950, 21-22.
9. διακρίνειν being judged by most editors as an absolute infinitive. Cf. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare*, p.280-1.353 and nn.2-4.
10. Thus: τοιαύτην μερίδα βασιλευσί τε καὶ δημόταις παράσχου, ὥστε τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λόγον διακρίνειν τοῦτο καὶ ἀληθὲς ἀποφαίνειν [Drach. II, p.22.130a].
11. Drach. III, p.187. 10b. Farnell gives this as: παράσχου οὖν αὐτοῖς διανῦσαι.
12. I answer this question at v. 48.
13. For a discussion of the evidence for this and other possible references in Pindar to actual likenesses of victors or, in this case, prominent citizens see Steiner, D., "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti'" and "Moving Images: Fifth-Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure."
14. τοῦτ' ἄρ' σε μόνον, τοῦτων ὧν εἴρηκας μακαρίζω, if we accept the emendation [σε μόνον] of Reiske.
15. Op. cit. 52n19.
16. Op. cit. 21-2.
17. Op. cit. p.98: 93.
18. Verd. p.25 / Lefkowitz 52.
19. Plat. *Hipp. Maj.* Steph. 291.c: ἀφικομένῳ εἰς γῆρας, τοὺς αὐτοῦ γονέας τελευτήσαντας καλῶς περυσφείλεται., ἵππῳ τῷδε, αὐτοῦ ἐκκρήννε, καλῶς, ἄλλοι μεγαλοπρεπῶς ταφῆναι, and *Anth. Graec.* 7. 162.5-6: ἀλλὰ περιστείλας με δίδου χθονί, μηδ' ἐπὶ νεκρῷ | λουτρὰ χέης; 613.5-6: ὅς σε περιστείλας ἱερῇ παλάμῃ τε καὶ εὐχῇ | γείτονα τῆς μακάρων θῆκε χοροστασίης.
20. There are other instances where the verb ὄμνυμι or the word ὄρκος occurs [O.6. 20; P.4.166-7; O.7.65] but in those instances the fact of an oath is reported, or in the case of P.4, quoted.

-
21. Cf. Verdenius p.29.
 22. See also Fogelmark, *Studies in Pindar*, 25-7 and Von der Mühl, P., "Bemerkungen zu Pindars Nemeen und Isthmien," 194-6.
 23. For a general study of the terms see Donlan, W. "The Origin of καλὸς κάγαθός," *AJPh* 94, 1973, 365-74. esp.373n24.
 24. Lefkowitz p.54 mistakenly claims that he fought and died in the battle against the Epigonoι. Aeschylus has him fight at the gate of Proteus against Tydeus.
 25. Nisetich, F.J., *Pindar's Victory Songs*, Baltimore 1980.
 26. Cf. Verdenius 33.
 27. Péron, J., *Les images maritimes de Pindare*, Paris 1974.42n.1
 28. Cf. Verdenius ad loc.

NEMEAN 2

1. ὅθεν περ καὶ Ὀμηρίδαι: The ode begins from the same place from which the Homeridai ¹ start their sewn-together words of epic, that is it starts from Zeus. As Bury observes, this opening is constructed on a double thesis: the Homeridai start their poems from Zeus just as Timodemos in his career of victories at the games starts from the Nemean grove of Zeus. The link is from the divine to the mortal. This statement contains not only the idea that time starts from somewhere within the reach of memory, but also shows that Pindar is considering his own place as a poet within a context of the monumental: Homer and Zeus, i.e. within the context of creation and poetic antiquity. This is rather a grand entrance for such a modest ode² Moreover, although the idea that Zeus is the beginning of things is conventional, that he be the beginning of Timodemos' first victory at Nemea is a striking thought. And I think there are many parallels of construction in this first strophe to support this unusual pairing of Timodemos and Zeus.

The very opening phrase, ὅθεν περ καὶ, has an immediate rhythmic and rhyming echo in the next word Ὀμηρίδαι, and this phrase-pair in turn, has its 4-syllable rhythmic and thematic counterpart in καὶ ὅδ' ἀνὴρ, "and this man" and καταβολὰν, "has laid down / established". Moreover there is a sewing together of the parallels by the repeated καὶ: καὶ Ὀμηρίδαι; καὶ ὅδ' ἀνὴρ. The pairing of Timodemos and Zeus is further developed by their similar yet independent starting points, ὅθεν and ὅδε where the regular parallel construction would be ὅθεν, τὸθεν. The differing grammatical constructions perfectly imitate their sameness and distinctions.

2. ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων: These "stitched words" [cf. Hesiod fr.265, ῥάπτειν ἀοιδήν] are matched in sound and rhythm by ἱερῶν ἀγώνων, "sacred games" at v.4. Both phrases continue the idea that Timodemos and Zeus share beginnings: the words of poetry are stitched together as the sacred or divine games are sewn together with, stitched to, Zeus. Timodemos is connected to and continuous with Zeus because he has participated and won in the games sacred to Zeus. The 5-syllable phrase τὰ πόλλ' ἀοιδοὶ "many singers" is also neatly balanced in sound and sense by πολυμνήτῳ "much-sung".

3. ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προσιμίου, καὶ ὃδ' ἀνήρ: ἄρχονται, "they begin", has its parallel in v.5 δέδεκται πρῶτον "he wins a first". Just as the rhapsodists begin their songs so too Timodemos has won the first of what can be assumed to be a string of victories. That his victories will be stitched together like lines of epic poetry is implicit in the parallel between ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων / ἱερῶν ἀγώνων noted above.

It is instructive too to note that in both halves of the first strophe Zeus comes at the end of the phrase; in the first, Διὸς ἐκ προσιμίου, "from the opening song of Zeus" in the second, Νεμεαίου ἐν πολυῦμνήτῳ Διὸς ἄλσει, "in the much-sung grove of Nemean Zeus" the dynamic of transference from immortal to mortal, from Zeus to Timodemos is made clear by the prepositions ἐκ and ἐν—out of Zeus and in the grove of his Nemean games, from song to victory.

4. καταβολὰν: The word has possible meanings: a) foundation cf. N.1.8f., and b) down payment [Farnell; Race "first installment"]. Farnell's argument for this latter sense, because the phrase refers not to songs but to the games, overlooks the deeper sense of foundation and the beginnings of things. ὅθεν clearly refers to a point *from where* the Homeridai begin their songs, and Timodemos is clearly meant to imitate their action: he has received his first basis in victory winning, the point from where he begins. Moreover, καταβολή has an even more primary sense of "throwing down" as a term appropriate to the pancration: "and this man too has thrown down a first of victories in the sacred games."

Deborah Steiner³ considers that καταβολή can refer to a plinth or foundation stone on which the dedicatory statue of the athlete would be mounted. This interpretation has added value in view of the statement at v.8 that the victor will given [or dedicated] as a κόσμος to the city of Athens⁴.

6. ὀφείλει δ' ἔτι: an impersonal construction, "it is owed", "it must be (that)" [Slater], or, a personal one, "he is still indebted" [Race]. Attaching a sense of debt or obligation on the part of Timodemos however construed makes less sense than the impersonal construction and is not justified by reading "down payment" for καταβολή. This is the only locus in which ὀφείλω is used impersonally in Pindar and is based upon the scholiast's report of the opinion of Aristarchos, ὡς ἂν τις ἔποι· ὀφειλόμενον δ' ἔτι ἐστίν. With the impersonal construction the subject of the sentence is hidden and does not appear in fact until the middle of the strophe, αἰῶν, "life" "destiny" which guides one directly along the path of the father and grants him to be a decoration to the great city of Athens. The person who is grammatically the object of the verb δέδωκε has his identity concealed by νιν. The

construction continues with δέδωκε as the *verbum regnans*, Τιμονόου παῖδα, son of Timonoüs, its object and the subject within the acc. and inf. construction with δρέπεσθαι. The subject's identity and function, already syntactically confused is further secluded by the verb's middle voice: he culls for himself the finest flower of the Isthmian and Pythian victories. Not until the last line do we have the brief information that he is the son of Timonoüs.

7-8. εἴπερ καθ' ὁδόν νιν εὐθυπομπός | αἰὼν ταῖς μεγάλαις
δέδωκε κόσμον Ἀθάναις: αἰὼν means as much the time as the course of life and therefore implicitly, one's destined or fated span [cf. Bury who thinks it cannot mean fate]. The adjective εὐθυπομπός, "straight-escorting / guiding", a *hapax legomenon*, gives the added sense of tracking or following a trail. This idea of following in the path of one's ancestors also occurs at P.10.12, τὸ δὲ συγγενὲς ἐμβέβακεν ἵχνεσιν πατρὸς and at N.6.14-16, οὐκ ἄμμορος ἀμφὶ πάλα κυναγέτας | ἵχνεσιν ἐν Πραξιδάμαντος ἐὼν πόδα νέμων | πατροπάτορος ὁμαιμίου, where the word for hunter [which occurs only here in Pindar] makes the image specific. Here the notion of pursuit looks forward to the example in the adjacent strophe of Orion pursuing the Pleiades.

εἴπερ, "if in fact", fate has given him to be an adornment to great Athens. The relation of this clause to that of ὀφείλει δ' ἔτι . . . θαμὰ μὲν Ἰσθμιάδων δρέπεσθαι serves to underline the fact that Timodemos is still to win other ever more prestigious victories. But it is stated in conditional terms. This is not a reflection of doubt, but of future deeds not yet accomplished and is rhetorically necessary for the treatment of the mythical and epic exempla that follow. There is also the grammatical connection created by the δὲ / μὲν of this clause which surrounds the extrapositioned εἴπερ . . . Ἀθάναις clause, and gives added coherence.

9. θαμὰ μὲν Ἰσθμιάδων δρέπεσθαι κάλλιστον ἄωτον ἐν Πυθίοισι
τε νικᾶν: νικᾶν is read as gen. pl. or inf. The infinitive reading is preferable since it reflects the balanced nature of the line: to cull the finest flower of the Isthmian games and to be victorious in the Pythian. Arranging two infinitives to two events whose difference is reflected in the asymmetry of their inflection is the more elegant expression, whereas fitting νικᾶν with Ἰσθμιάδων, although technically correct, is not.

10. Τιμονόου παῖδ : Although the name of the victor is frequently delayed until later in an ode for dramatic reasons, in this poem it is done for particular effect. Timodemos will not be named as such until the very middle.

ἔστι δ' ἔοικός: "it is fitting", a phrase that mimics the strophe's opening, ὀφείλει δ' ἔτι, "it must be": it is syntactically separate from the central part, it also forms an impersonal expression, and has the same number (5) of syllables. These two phrases form an enclosure. The identity of Timodemos is neatly ringed by two oblique statements that encircle him as they encircle the strophe.

11. ὄρειαν γε Πελειάδων μὴ τηλόθεν Ὠαρίωνα νείσθαι: The mss. B and D have Ὠαρίων' ἀνείσθαι and there is a strong argument in favour of this reading. First, ἀνείσθαι is the *lectio difficilior* and is either an apocopate form of ἀνανείσθαι > ἀνανέομαι/ ἀννέομαι or the perfect medio-passive of ἀνίημι. In the first case, ἀνέομαι for ἀννέομαι [e.g. κάπετον for κάππετον, O.8.38], the sense would be "move or travel up"; in the second, "be sent up, forth; be awakened". Secondly, the mss. reading has the support of the scholia at N.1.3 and codex A of Athenaeus 11.490f.⁵ Finally, the sense of either "moving up" or "being sent up" offers much better sense to the movement of stars as they mount the night sky appearing above the horizon and is superior to the less specific action of νείσθαι.⁶ μὴ τηλόθεν provides a connection with ὅθεν, v.l. in that it locates Orion at a point in space as well as time. In the same sense that Orion, the hunter, is not far from the Pleiades whom he pursues, Timodemos is not far from the victories he pursues, and by extension, the poet is not far from the epic tradition. Furthermore, if we read ἀνείσθαι, there is the added sense that Timodemos will ascend to higher and greater victories, corresponding to the ascending order of the second strophe, Nemean, Isthmian, Pythian and perhaps now, Olympian games.⁷ There is perhaps a further connection between Orion and Timodemos in that there are seven Pleiades and at v.23, ἑπτὰ δ' ἐν Νεμέᾳ, seven victories at Nemea have been won by his family.⁸

What is interesting is that Pindar has here created an image that combines immovable closeness with active pursuit, a moment camera-frozen between live takes. The constellations of Orion and the Pleiades are fixed; the inherited path, ὁδὸς πατρία is also fixed. What is to be pursued appears, and although not visible, as surely as Orion follows the Doves, the pursuer will arrive. The very word order imitates the pursuit: the Pleiades are followed by Orion, Salamis is followed by φῶτα μαχατάν. At v.14 Timodemos himself will appear like a "star."

13. καὶ μὰν ἂ Σαλαμὶς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατάν | δυνατός: καὶ μὰν. . γε, "and yes, didn't Salamis" have the power to raise a fighting man. The repeated γε clearly designates that the mountain Pleiades and Salamis are to be considered as parallel, and as the Pleiades cause an Orion to rise in their train, so

too Salamis "raised" a warrior, Aias.⁹ Moreover, as Krischer has noted, we have within an ode that is a model of ring-composition an inner ring formed of Timodemos [v.10], Orion, Aias, Timodemos, [v.14], as well as Salamis-Aias, Timodemos-Akharnai [v.16].

The masculine δυνατός qualifying fem. Σαλαμῖς presents no real difficulty. Similar combinations occur at O.9.26: μοιριδίῳ παλάμα; P.9.92: σιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν; and N.5.20: ἐλαφρὸν ὄρμάν.

14. ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἑκτώρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν. ὦ Τιμόδημε, σε δ' ἄλκᾳ: There has been much scholarly debate over the exact meaning of these words, although the phrase is simple enough: in Troy, Hektor heard Aias. But the difficulty is based partly on the misleading gloss of the scholium, ἥσθετο τῇ πείρᾳ, "learned by experience", which gloss is not justified by the verb ἀκούω which designates what or who is audible. To learn from hearing seems to be very different, if not exclusive of learning from experience. Even if the translation is altered slightly to mean "hear of by actual experience" it is still combining two different modes of sensation. Every possible angle has since been proposed as an alternative to the obvious: Hektor heard *of* Aias, i.e. in rumour [Farnell], Hektor *listened for* Aias [Mezger], Hektor *heeded* i.e. recognized the superiority of Aias, was beaten by Aias [Méautis; Krischer]¹⁰, Hektor heard the call from Aias, as in a challenge [Puech: Hector entendit l'appel d'Ajax], Hektor heard *from* Aias [Race].

What all these proposed translations overlook is the context of what immediately follows: ὦ Τιμόδημε. Timodemos' name is the one we hear; it is called out in exactly the way Aias is supposed to have called out and is juxtaposed as immediately and closely as is physically possible in language—oral or written—to that of Aias. Pindar invokes, calls out for Timodemos and we hear *him* just as Hektor heard Aias. Past and present are fused in one: the epic past of the Homeridai, of Troy, and the present of Timodemos and Akharnai. The example of Aias who beats Hektor in battle, the example of Timodemos who conquers his opponent in the pancration are positioned together with as much clarity as is possible by the poet. Even more significantly, following the structure of an oral tradition, Pindar not only shapes this ode in the form of a ring, but strategically places at its centre the victor and calls out his name, a poetic tactic, if you will, that illustrates the nature of orality in that its import relies entirely on the ear of the listener. The difficulty experienced by commentators, which must here include the scholia, is the loss of refined oral comprehension to the literate mind. I cannot conceive of a more remarkable and apt illustration of just what that loss is and the

difficulty encountered by a literate culture trying to grasp what constitutes the oral experience.

14-15. σε δ' ἄλκᾳ | παγκρατίου τλάθυμος ἀέξει: The words τλάθυμος ἄλκᾳ seem reminiscent of the world of Homer and epic heroes and certainly can be said to be further the association made between Aias and Timodemos, between the context of Greek heroes fighting in the Trojan war and Timodemos' victory in the pancration.¹¹ The word ἄλκῃ and ἄλκιμον in fact occur with both Aias, son of Telamon, and son of Oileos in the Iliad,¹² but the adjective τλάθυμος does not occur before Pindar and would appear to have been coined by him. This does not cast doubt upon the parallels to be made between fighting heroes of the past and present wrestlers, but it does weaken the argument for Homeric echoes.

The combination of ἄλκᾳ and τλάθυμος indicates that heroic qualities are not only physical strength but courage as well. "O Timodemos, the brave-hearted strength of the pancration increases you." The verb ἀέξω, "increases, makes to grow," parallels in sense and function τρέφω, v.13.

15-16. Ἀχάρναι δὲ παλαιόφατον | εὐάνορες: As has been noted above [v.13] the inner ring of Salamis-Aias, Timodemos-Akharnai is central to the outer ring-composition from of this ode. Several scholars have studied the exquisite symmetry of this ode and it is best that at this point it should be noted. Newman / Newman have formulated the following system: vv.1-10 (49 words); vv. 10-15 (27); vv.16-25 (49).¹³ The tripartite division noted by this calculation can be grouped 1) Homeridai, 2) Orion-Aias-Timodemos, 3) Timodemidai. They offer a second schema whereby the word-count also proves only slightly less symmetrical: vv.1-3; 3-10; 10-12; 13-14; 14-15; 16-24; 24-25—words: 12, 37, 8, 12, 7, 38, 11.¹⁴

The symmetry that surrounds the centred name of Timodemos can be pictured as radiating out from the centre to the ends of the ode in increasing order of words. It also can be imagined as a piece of relief sculpture or a vase-painting that features the face of a young man. In the first case, the images arrange themselves on either side facing in the direction of a central frontally sculpted face; in the second, perhaps more appropriate to ring composition, the vase must be turned for the full effect. As Deborah Steiner's latest study observes with reference to Timodemos as κόσμος: "While the poet's appeal to the victory monument most broadly signals the fact that the singer, no different from the statue-maker "fixes" his subject for all time, freezing him at the moment of his of his glory. . ." ¹⁵ In this

ode Timodemos is "fixed" both in the oral performance of the poem and in the plastic form which the poem takes as its structure.

The phrase παλαίφατον εὐάνορος of Akharnai corresponds to the φῶτα μαχατάν of Salamis.

17-18. ὅσα δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις | Τιμοδαμίδαι ἐξοχώτατοι προ-
λέγονται: The term ὅσα δὲ echoes θαμὰ μὲν v.9: "as many things that pertain to the athletic contests." The superlative ἐξοχώτατοι, "most distinguished, most outstanding" also has its parallel in v.9, κάλλιστον ἄωτον.

19. παρὰ μὲν ὑψιμέδοντι Παρνασσῷ. . ἐκόμισαν: The verb κομίζω signals the *nostos* or return of the victor to his home: he conveys or carries the prizes back to his community. The poet has begun to actualize or re-enact the return by his own return to the praise of the clan of Timodemos. The path of the forefather, ὁδὸς πατρία, is now being traced in detail: four times from lofty-ruling Parnassos. The mountain-image, which distinguished the Pleiades as on the ascent and Orion to follow, is here reversed. The path for the victors now *descends* from on high.

20-21. ἀλλὰ Κορινθίων. . ἐν ἐσλοῦ Πέλοπος πτυχαῖς: The phrase, ἐν ἐσλοῦ Πέλοπος πτυχαῖς, "in the folds of noble Pelops," forms a correspondance with the phrase of v. 5, ἐν πολὺμνῆτῳ Διὸς ἄλσει. The word order is exactly the same and the image of an enclosed space/sanctuary [mountain folds, valley; grove] is also similar.

22. ὀκτὼ στεφάνοις ἔμιχθεν ἤδη: The verb ἔμιχθεν, "mingled, mixed" always has sexual overtones in that it purveys the sense of closeness and intimacy. Krischer has noted that the order of the games mentioned "ganz deutliches ὕστερον πρότερον Ὀμηρικῶς" in the ode forms its own ring: N, I, P, P, I, N, at vv. 4, 9, 19, 20 and 23.¹⁶

24. τὸν, ᾧ πολῖται, κωμάξατε Τιμοδάμῳ σὺν εὐκλεί νόστῳ: τὸν refers to Zeus, "O citizens, celebrate Zeus with the glorious return of Timodemos. The arguments of Kurke¹⁷ for the loop of *nostos* wherein the glory of the victor is brought home to his community and shared in by them, is here especially evident. The words that dominate this agenda, οἴκοι, πολῖται, and νόστος are all contained within two verses.

25. ἀδυμελεῖ δ' ἐξάρχετε φωνᾷ: As is only appropriate in this final line of an poem that is a paragon of ring-composition, there are elements which lead us back to the very opening. The poet commands the citizens regaling their winning athlete to begin, to start up, ἐξάρχετε, which verb responds to v.3, ἄρχονται. The

phrase "sweet musical voice" naturally leads into the beginning verse, ὄθεν περ καὶ Ὀμηρίδαι, and it has been noted that running the end and beginning of the ode together is grammatically viable.¹⁸ The loop of the ring is complete.

1. For an examination of the evidence for the school of Homeric bards in general and the importance of the testimony of the scholium to N.2 see. Notopoulos, J.A., "The Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry: A Study of the Post-Homeric Oral Tradition," *JPh* 83, 1962, 337-368, and Allen, T.W., W.R. Halliday, E.E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns*² Oxford 1936, p.lxxvii.
2. Wilamowitz' opinion (*Pindaros*, 157; 315) was: "Es ist ein ganz schlichtes Lied" and "Pindars einfachstes Siegeslied". It is a very modest ode; Pindar's most simple victory ode.
3. Steiner, "Pindar's 'Oggetti Parlanti'," *HCSP* 95, 1993, 166.
4. See note vv.15-16.
5. For these references and full discussion see Bury ad loc. and Williams, F.L., *A Critical Edition of Nemean 1-4 of Pindar*, (Diss.) Cornell 1976, 80-83.
6. I must disagree here with Kurke, L., *The Traffic in Praise*, Cornell 1991, 41&n12, who follows Bury's [and Mezger's] interpretation of ὀρεῖαν and Ὠαρίωνα as word-play. Bury is least reliable in his associative word/sound analyses and cannot be trusted at all when he invents emendations on the basis of these aural etymologies. More significantly, she dismisses as an "unnecessary emendation" the one instance in which Bury does *not* do that and when he relies strictly—and in my opinion, correctly—on the mss. evidence, i.e. Ὠαρίων ἀνεῖσθαι. Her argument for the double meaning of the verb, "rise up; return", which is based on Bury's introductory remarks to the ode [p.30], fails entirely to notice that the verb under discussion is ἀνεῖσθαι.
7. See also Kirscher, T., "Pindars Rhapsodengedicht (Zu Nem. 2)," *WS* 78, 1965, 34n5.
8. Farnell dismisses this as not having any relevance.
9. Krischer, op.cit., "Salamis entspricht dem Sternenhimmel, das θρέψαι dem Aufgang der Gestirne, Aias dem Orion," 35.
10. Méautis G., "Pindarica," *RPh* ser. 3, 30, 1956, takes the verb obéir as an alternate sense of ἀκούω and renders: "[Hector] dut reconnaître son inferiorité, fut vaincu par lui," 330.
11. Cf. Krischer, op.cit. 36.
12. 11.566, Αἴας δ' ἄλλοτε μὲν μνησάσκετο θούριδος ἀλκῆς; 12.349 & 362, ἀλλά περ οἷος ἔτω Τελαμώνιος ἄλκιμος Αἴας; 7.164 & 8.262, τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' Αἴαντες θοῦριν ἐπιδιμένον ἀλκὴν; 10.110, ἡδ' Αἴαντα ταχὺν καὶ φυλῆος ἄλκιμον υἱόν; 13.197 Ἴμβριον αὐτ' Αἴαντε μεμαότε θούριδος ἀλκῆς; 13.157-8, τρίς δὲ δὴ Αἴαντες θοῦριν ἐπιδιμένον ἀλκὴν | νεκροῦ ἀπεστυφέλίζαν· ὃ δ' ἔμπεδον ἀλκὴ πεποιθώς.
13. Newman, F.S., & J.K., "L'unité musicale dans les odes de Pindare. La deuxième Néméenne," *IJC* 42, 1974, 10-11.
14. Ellen Scholz, "Zum Aufbau eines pindarischen Epinikion. Nemean 2," *WS* 82, 1969, 18-27, has a less arithmetical but equally valuable discussion of the ring structure.
15. Steiner, "Moving Images: Fifth-Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure," *CA* 17, 1998, 139.
16. Krischer, op. cit. 37.
17. See esp. 40-43
18. Cf. Fränkel, H., *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, trans. M. Hadas and J. Willis, New York 1973, 429n6 and Heath, M., "Receiving the κῶμος: The Context and Performance of Epinician," *AJP* 109, 1988, 192.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, T.W., W.R. Halliday, and E. E. Sikes, eds., *The Homeric Hymns*, Oxford 1936.
- Arrighetti, G., "In tema di poetica greca arcaica e tardo-arcaica," *SCO* 25, 1976, 255-314.
- Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, ed. J. Henderson, Oxford 1987.
- Becker, O., "Das Bild des Weges," *Hermes-Einzelschriften* 4, Berlin 1937.
- Bergk, T., *Pindari Carmina*, Lipsiae 1878.
- Berkquist, B., *The Archaic Greek Temenos*, Lund 1967.
- Bernardini, P.A., "L'attualità agonistica negli epinici di Pindaro," *Pindare*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31, 1985, 117-149.
- Bernardini, P.A., *Mito e attualità nelle odi di Pindaro: La Nemea 4, l'Olimpica 9, l'Olimpica 7*, Roma 1983.
- Betz, H.D. ed., *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*, Chicago 1986.
- Bieler, L., "Σκῆψ ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος," *Pindaros und Bacchylides* edd. W.M. Calder III & J. Stern, Darmstadt 1970, 191-3.
- Bowra, C.M., "An Alleged Anomaly in Pindar's Metric," *CQ* 24, 1930, 174-182.
- Bowra, C.M., *Greek Lyric Poetry*, Oxford 1961.
- Bowra, C.M., *Pindar*, Oxford 1964.
- Bowra, C.M., ed., *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, Oxford 1935.
- Braswell, B.K., *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine*, de Gruyter, 1998.
- Braswell, B.K., *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One*, Fribourg 1992.
- Brennan, C.J., "A peculiarity of choric response," *CR* 20, 1906, 386-92.
- Briggs, W. W. Jr., "B.L. Gildersleeve on Pindar *Nemean* 3.74-75," *GRBS* 25, 1984, 233-242.
- Broneer, O., "Starting Devices in Greek Stadia," *AJA* 76, 1972.
- Brown, N.O., "Pindar, Sophocles, and the Thirty Years' Peace," *TAPhA* 82, 1951, 1-28.
- Bulman, P., *Phthonos in Pindar*, Berkeley 1992.
- Bultmann, R., "Zur Geschichte der Lichtsymbolik im Altertum," *Philologus* 97, 1948, 1-36.
- Bundy, E. L., "Studia Pindarica I and II," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 18, 1962, 1-34, 35-92.
- Burkert, W., *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Berkeley 1979.
- Burkert, W., *Greek Religion*, Cambridge, Mass., 1985.
- Burkert, W., *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge, Mass., 1987.
- Burnett, A.P., *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus and Sappho*, Cambridge, Mass. 1983.
- Burnett, A. P., "Performing Pindar's Odes," *CP* 84 1989, 283-93.
- Burton, R. W. B., *Pindar's Pythian Odes: Essays in Interpretation*, Oxford 1962.
- Bury, J. B., *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*, London-New York, 1890.

- Cairns, D. L., *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford 1993.
- Calabrese De Feo, M.R., "Interpretazione e restauro testuale in Pindaro *Py.* I 92-94 e *Ne.* VI 29-30," *Ricerche di filologia classica* 3, Pisa 1987, 25-44.
- Calabrese De Feo, M.R., "La figura di Aiace in Pindaro," *PP* 39, 1984, 120-132.
- Calvani Mariotti, G., "Ricerche sulla tecnica esegetica degli *scholia vetera* a Pindaro," *Ricerche di filologia classica* 3, Pisa 1987, 83-167.
- Campbell, D. A., ed., *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection*, London 1967.
- Carey, C., *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*, New York 1981.
- Carey, C., "The Victory Ode in Performance: The Case for the Chorus," *CP* 86, 1991, 192-200.
- Carey, C., "The Performance of the Victory Ode," *AJP* 110, 1989, 545-65.
- Carey, C., "Pindar's Eighth Nemean Ode," *PCPhS* n.s. 22, 1976, 26-41.
- Carey, C., "Pindarica," *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry*, edd. R.D. Dawe, J. Diggle, P.E. Easterling, Cambridge 1978, 26-42.
- Carey, C., "Pindar's Ninth Nemean Ode," in *Tria Lustra*. Essays and notes presented to John Pinsent, ed. H.D. Jocelyn, asst'd Helen Hunt, *Liverpool Classical Papers* no.3, Liverpool 1993, 97-107.
- Carey, C., "Three Myths in Pindar: *N.* 4, *O.* 9, *N.* 3," *Eranos* 78, 1980, 143-162.
- Carne-Ross, D. S., *Pindar*, New Haven, Conn., 1985.
- Carnes, J.S., "The Ends of the Earth: Fathers, Ephebes and Wild Women in *Nemean* 4 and 5," *Arethusa* 29, 1996, 15-55.
- Carnes, J.S., "Why Should I Mention Aiakos? Myth and Politics in Pindar's *Nemean* 8 [Part II]," *QUCC* n.s.52, 1996, 83-92.
- Carnes, J. S., "Aiakos, Flower of Justice: A Reading of *Nemean* 3.29," *Hermes* 122, 1994, 360-363.
- Carnes, J. S., "The Aeginetan Genesis of the Myrmidons: A Note on *Nemean* 3.13-16," *CW* 84, 1990, 41-44.
- Carnevali, P., *Didimo e Pindaro*, Roma 1980.
- Carson, A., *Eros the Bittersweet*, Princeton 1986.
- Càssola, F., *Inni Omerici*, Milano 1981.
- Casson, L., *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*, Princeton 1971.
- Cavallini, E., "Pind. *N.* X. 75 ss.," *GFF* 9, 1986, 3-5.
- Cerri, G., "A proposito del futuro e della litote in Pindaro: *Nem.* 7, 102 sgg.," *QUCC* 22, 1979, 83-90.
- Chantraine, P., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, 4 vols., Paris 1968-80.
- Christ, W., *Pindari carmina prolegomenis et commentariis instructa*, Lipsiae 1896.
- Cingano, E., "Problemi di critica pindarica," *QUCC* n.s. 2, 1979, 169-182.
- Cingano, E., "Interpretazioni pindariche," *QUCC* 36, 1990, 143-162.
- Clayton, F., "Pindar, *Nem.* IX.32," *CR* 50, 1936, 5-6.

- Cole, S.C., "The uses of water in Greek sanctuaries," in *Early Greek Cult Practice*, R. Hagg and others edd., Stockholm 1988, 161-165.
- Cole, T., *Pindar's Feasts or the Music of Power*, Roma 1992.
- Cole, T., "1+1=3: Studies in Pindar's Arithmetic," *AJP* 108, 1987, 553-568.
- Conway, G.S., *The Odes of Pindar*, London 1972.
- Croiset, A., *La poésie et Pindare et les lois du lyrisme grec*, Paris 1880.
- Crotty, K., *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar*, Baltimore 1982.
- Danielewicz, J., "Deixis in Greek Choral Lyric," *QUCC*, 1990, 1-17.
- Davies, J. K., *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-800 B. C.*, Oxford 1971.
- Deas, H. T., "The Scholia Vetera to Pindar," *HSCP* XLII, 1931, 1-78.
- Defixionum tabellae*, collegit comm. instruxit, Augustus Audollent, Frankfurt 1967.
- Denniston, J. D., *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1950.
- Denniston, J. D., *Greek Prose Style*, Oxford 1960.
- Des Places, É., *Le pronom chez Pindare. Recherches philologiques et critiques*, Paris 1947.
- Devine, A.M., "Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Compositione Verborum* XI: Reconstructing the Phonetics of the Greek Accent," *TAPA* 121, 1991, 229-286.
- Dickie, M. W., "On the Meaning of *Ephēmeros*," *ICS* 1, 1976, 7-14.
- Dickie, M.W., "Hēsychia and hybris in Pindar," *Greek Poetry & Philosophy, Studies in honour of L. Woodbury*, ed., D. E. Gerber, Chico 1984, 83-109.
- Dickson, K. M., "Voice and Sign in Pindar," *Ramus* 19-20, 1990-91, 109-129.
- Diels, H., and W. Kranz, edd., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th ed., 3 vols. Zurich 1951-1952.
- Dieterich, A., *Mutter Erde*, Berlin 1913.
- Dissen, L. ap. Boeckh, *Pindar opera quae supersunt*, vol.iii, 1821.
- Dissen, L., *Pindari Carmina*, Gotha and Erfurt 1830.
- Dodds, E. R., *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1951.
- Donlan, W. "The Origin of *καλὸς κάγαθός*," *AJPh* 94, 1973, 365-74.
- Dornseiff, F., *Pindars Stil*, Berlin 1921.
- Drachmann, A. B., *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, vol.3 *Scholia in Nemeonicas et Isthmionicas*, Leipzig 1966.
- Duchemin, J., *Pindare, poète et prophète*, Paris 1935.
- Edlund, E.M., *The Gods and the Place*, Stockholm 1987.
- Erbse, H., "Pindars dritte nemeische Ode," *Hermes* 97, 1969, 272-291.
- Faraone, C. A. & D. Obbink eds., *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, New York 1991.
- Farnell, L. A., *The Works of Pindar*, 3 vols., London 1930.
- Farnell, L. A., *The Cults of the Greek States*, vol.2., Oxford 1921.

- Fennell, C., *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes*, Cambridge 1899.
- Fennell, C., *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, Cambridge 1893.
- Figueira, T. J., *Aegina: Society and Politics*, New York 1981.
- Figueira, T.J., *Athens and Aegina in the Age of Imperial Colonization*, Baltimore & London 1992.
- Finley, J. H., *Pindar and Aeschylus*, Cambridge 1955.
- Finley, M. I. & Pleket, H. W., *The Olympic Games: The First Thousand Years*, London 1976.
- Finnegan, R.H., *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context*, Cambridge 1977.
- Fitzgerald, W. *Agonistic Poetry: The Pindaric Mode in Pindar, Horace, Hölderlin, and the English Ode*, Berkeley, Calif., 1987.
- Floyd, Edwin D. "Pindar's Oath to Sogenes (*Nemean* 7.70–74)," *TAPhA* 96, 1965, 139–151.
- Fogelmark, S., *Studies in Pindar with Particular Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII*, Lund 1972.
- Fogelmark, S., "καὶ κείνους" Pindar, *Nemean* 5.22," *Arktouros* 1979, 71–80.
- Fogelmark, S. "Pindar, *Nemean*, 7, 50–52," *Antiquité Classique* 45, 1976, 121–132.
- Fowler, B. H., *Archaic Greek Poetry. An Anthology*, Madison 1993.
- Fraccaroli, G., *Le Odi di Pindaro dichiarotte e tradotte*, Verona 1894.
- Fränkel, H., *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, trans., M. Hadas & J. Willis, New York 1973.
- Fränkel, H., "Man's 'Ephemeros' Nature according to Pindar and Others," *TAPA* 77, 1964, 131–145.
- Fränkel, H., "Schrullen in den Scholien zu Pindars Nemeen 7 und Olympien 3," *Hermes* 89, 1961, 385–394.
- Frisk, H., *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols., Heidelberg 1950–1972.
- Gager, John G. ed., *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, New York 1992.
- Gallet, B., *Recherches sur Kairos et l'ambiguïté dans la poésie de Pindare*, Bordeaux 1990.
- Gardiner, N., *Athletics of the Ancient World*, Oxford 1955.
- Gaspar, C., *Essai de chronologie pindarique*, Bruxelles 1900.
- Gelzer, T., "Μοῦσα ἀθύρνης. Bemerkungen zu einem Typ Pindarischer und Bacchylideischer Epinikien," *MH* 42, 1985, 95–120.
- Gentili, B., *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*, trans., A. Cole, Baltimore 1988.
- Gentili, B., "Trittico pindarico," *QUCC* 31, 1979, 7–33.
- Gerber, D.E., "What time can do, (Pindar, *Nemean* 1.46–7)," *TAPhA* 93, 1962, 30–33.
- Gerber, D. E., "Pindar *Nemean* 7.31," *AJPh* 84, 1963, 182–188.
- Gerber, D.E., *A Bibliography of Pindar 1513–1966*, Cleveland 1969.
- Gerber, D.E., *Emendations in Pindar 1513–1972*, Amsterdam 1976.
- Gerber, D.E., *Pindar's Olympina 1: A Commentary*, Toronto 1982.
- Gerber, D.E., "Emendations in the Odes of Pindar: A Historical Analysis," *Pindare*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31, 1985, 1–32.
- Gerber, D.E., "Short-Vowel Subjunctives in Pindar," *HSCP* 91, 1987, 83–90.

- Gerber, D.E., "Pindar and Bacchylides 1934-1987," *Lustrum* 31, 1989, 97-269; 32, 1990, 7-98.
- Gernet, L., *Droit et Société dans la Grèce Ancienne*, Paris 1955.
- Gianotti, G. F., *Per una poetica pindarica*, Torino, 1975.
- Gianotti, G. F., "Il terzo Carme Nemeo di Pindaro," *AAT* 109, 1975, 29-65.
- Gianotti, G. F., "La Nemea Settima di Pindaro," *RFIC* 94, 1966, 385-406.
- Gildersleeve, B. L., *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, New York 1885.
- Goldhill, S., *The Poet's Voice*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Goldhill, S., & Osborne, R. G., ed., *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, Cambridge 1994.
- Goodison, L., *Death, Women and the Sun*, BICS Suppl. 53, 1989.
- Grant, M.A., *Folktale and Hero-tale Motifs in the Odes of Pindar*, Kansas 1967.
- Grassi, E., "Inediti di Eugenio Grassi: Pindaro, N. III 69," *A & R* 20, 1970.
- Gundert, H., *Pindar un sein Dichterberuf*, Frankfurt 1935.
- Gundert, H., "Der alte Pindar," *Mnemosynon Th. Wiegand*, München 1938, 1-13; reprinted Utrecht 1978.
- Guthrie, W. K. C., *The Greeks and their Gods*, London 1950.
- Hadley, J., *Greek Grammar*, New York 1866.
- Hamilton, R., *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar*, The Hague 1974.
- Harris, H.A., *Sport in Greece and Rome*, London 1972.
- Harris, H.A., "Stadia and Starting Grooves," *G&R* 7, 1960, 25-35.
- Heath, M., "Receiving the κῶμος: The Context and Performance of Epinician," *AJP* 109, 1988, 180-95.
- Heath, M., Mary Lefkowitz, "Epinician Performance," *CP* 86, 1991, 173-91.
- Heitsch, E., ed. *Hesiod*, Darmstadt 1966.
- Herington, C. J., *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*, Berkeley 1985.
- Hermann, G., *Opuscula*, vol.8, Leipzig 1877.
- Herter, H., "Ein neues Türwunder. Zu Pind. Nem. 1 und Theokrit. id. XXIV," *RhM* 89, 1940, 152-157.
- Hightet, G., *The Classical Tradition. Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*, Oxford 1949.
- Himmelman, N., *Reading Greek Art*, Princeton 1998.
- Hoffmann, H., *Sexual and Asexual Pursuit*, London 1977.
- Hubbard, T. K., *The Pindaric Mind*, Leiden 1985.
- Hubbard, T.K. "Pindar and the Aeginetan Chorus," *Phoenix* 41, 1987, 1-9.
- Hubbard, T.K., "Remaking Myth and Rewriting History: Cult and Tradition in Pindar's Ninth Nemean," *HCSP* 94, 1992, 77-110.
- Hummel, P., *La syntaxe de Pindare*, Louvain & Paris 1993.
- Humphreys, S.C., *Anthropology and the Greeks*, London 1978.
- Humphreys, S.C., *The Family, Women and Death: Comparative Studies*, London 1983.

- Hurst, A., "Aspects du temps chez Pindare," *Pindare*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31, 1985, 155-205.
- Instone, S., "Problems in Pindar's *Third Nemean*," *Eranos* 91, 1994, 13-31.
- Instone, S., "Pindar's Enigmatic *Second Nemean*," *BICS* 36, 1989, 109-116.
- Irigoin, J., *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, Paris 1952.
- Janko, R., "Another Path of Song: Pindar, *Nemean* 7.51," *AJP* 112, 1991, 301-2.
- Kierdorf, W., *Erlebnis und Darstellung der Perserkriege*, Göttingen 1966, 29-47.
- Kirkwood, G. M., ed., *Selections from Pindar*, Chico 1982.
- Kirkwood, G. M., "Blame and Envy in the Pindaric Epinician," *Greek Poetry & Philosophy: Studies in honour of L. Woodbury*, ed., D. E. Gerber, Chico, 1984, 169-183.
- Kirkwood, G. M., "*Nemean* 7 and the Theme of Vicissitude in Pindar," in *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance*, ed. Kirkwood. Ithaca 1975.
- Kirkwood, G.M., "*Nemean* 4, 93 and *eris* in Pindar," *QUCC* 30, 1989, 7-12.
- Köhnken, A., *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*, de Gruyter 1971, 188-219.
- Krischer, T., "Pindars Rhapsodengedicht (Zu Nem. 2)," *WS* 78, 1965, 32-39.
- Kromer, G. "Homer and Odysseus in *Nemean* 7.20-27," *CW* 68, 1974/75, 437-438.
- Kurke, L., *The Traffic in Praise*, Cornell 1991.
- Kurke, L., "Fathers and Sons: A Note on Pindaric Ambiguity," *AJP* 112, 1991, 287-300.
- Kurke, L., "The Politics of ἀβροσύνη in Archaic Greece," *CA* 11.1, 1992, 91-120.
- Kyle, D.G., *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, (*Mnemosyne Supp.* 95), Leiden 1987.
- Lasky, E.D., "A Note on Pindar *Nemean* 1.24-25," *CPh* 68, 1973, 219.
- Lasso de la Vega, José S., "La séptima Nemea y la unidad de la oda pindárica," *E Clás* 21, 1977, 59-13.
- Lasso de la Vega, José S., "Repeticiones verbales en la Nemea Séptima," *Helmantica* 28, 1977, 281-29.
- Lattimore, R., "Pindar *Nemean* 7.70-74," *CPh* 40, 1945, 121-122.
- Lattimore, R., *The Odes of Pindar*, 2nd ed., Chicago 1976.
- Lee, H.M., "The 'Historical' Bundy and Encomiastic Relevance in Pindar," *CW* 72, 1978, 65-70.
- Lee, H.M., "The *ἑρμα* and the Javelin in Pindar, *Nemean* vii 70-3, and Greek Athletics," *JHS* 96, 1976, 70-79.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., *The Victory Ode: An Introduction*, Park Ridge, N. J., 1976.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., "Pindar's *Nemean* xi," *JHS* 99, 1979, 49-56.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., "Autobiographical Fiction in Pindar," *HSPH* 84, 1980, 29-49.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., "Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?," *AJP* 109, 1988, 1-11.
- Lefkowitz, M., *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I"*, Oxford 1991.
- Lehnus, L., *L'Inno a Pan di Pindaro*, Milano 1979.
- Livrea, E., "Pind. 'Nem.' III 52-8.," *GIF* 30 (1978), 260-266.
- Lloyd-Jones, H., "Pindar and the After-Life," *Pindare*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31, 1985, 245-79.

- Lloyd-Jones, H., "Modern Interpretation of Pindar: The *Second Pythian* and *Seventh Nemean* Odes," *JHS* 93, 1973, 109-37.
- Loraux, N. "Herakles: The Super-male and the Feminine" in *Before Sexuality: The Construction of the Erotic Experience in the Ancient World*, edd. Halperin, D.M., J.I. Winkler, and F.I. Zeitlin, Princeton 1990. 21-52.
- Machemer, G.A., "Medicine, Music, and Magic: The Healing Grace of Pindar's *Fourth Nemean*," *HSCP* 95, 1993, 113-141.
- Mackay, A.E., ed., *Signs of Orality*, Leiden 1999.
- Maehler, H., "Zu Pindar, N.4.22," *Hermes* 101, 1973, 380-382.
- Maloney, G., "Sur l'unité de la *Quatrième Néméenne* de Pindare," *Phoenix* 18, 1964, 173-182.
- Mann, R., "Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths," *GRBS* 35, 1994, 313ff.
- March, J.R., *The Creative Poet. Studies in the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry*, *BICS* Suppl. 49, London 1987.
- Marg, W., *Der 'Charakter' in der Sprache Die Frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Darmstadt, 1968, 80-99.
- Méautis, G., "Pindarica," *RPh* ser. 3, 30, 1956, 228-230.
- Méautis, G., *Pindare le Dorien*. Neuchatel 1962.
- Merkelbach, R., "Der Anlaß zu Pindars zehnter Nemee," *Le monde grec. Hommages à Claire Préaux*, Bruxelles 1975, 94-101.
- Miller, A.M., "N.4.33-43 and the Defense of Digressive Leisure," *CJ* 78, 1982/3, 202-220.
- Miller, A. M., "Phthonos and Paraphrasis : The Argument of *Nemean* 8.19-34," *GRBS* 23, 1982.
- Miller, A. M., "Pindaric Mimesis: The Associative Mode," *CJ* 89, 1993, 21-53.
- Miller, S. G., ed., *Nemea: A Guide to the Site and the Museum*, Berkeley 1990.
- Miller, S. G., *The Prytaneion: Its Function and Architectural Form*, Berkeley 1978.
- Morgan, K. A., "Pindar the Professional and the Rhetoric of the ΚΩΜΟΣ," *CPh* 88, 1993, 1-15.
- Morris, I., *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-State*, Cambridge 1987.
- Morrison, J., R. Williams, *Greek Oared Ships*, Cambridge 1968.
- Most, G.W., "Pindar, Nem.7. 31-36," *Hermes* 114, 1986, 262-271.
- Most, G.W., "Pindar, *Nemean* 7.64-67," *GRBS* 26, 1985, 315-331.
- Most, G.W., *The Measures of Praise*. Göttingen 1985. [N.7: Ch.3, 133-213]
- Mugler, C., "La lumière et la vision dans la poésie grecque," *REG* 73, 1960, 40-72.
- Mühl, P. Von der, "Bemerkungen zu Pindars Nemeen und Isthmien," *Ausgew. Kl. Schriften*, Basel 1976, 196-8.
- Mühl, P., Von der "Weitere pindarische Notizien," *Museum Helveticum* 21, 1964, 96-97.
- Mullen, W., *Choreia : Pindar and Dance*, Princeton 1982.
- Mullen, W. C., "Pindar's and Athens. A Reading in the Aeginetan Odes," *Arion* 1, 1973/4, 446-495.

- Nagy, G., *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*, Baltimore 1990.
- Newman, F.S., & J.K., "L'unité musicale dans les odes de Pindare. La deuxième Néméenne," *LEC* 42, 1974, 3-12.
- Newman, J.K. & F.S., "Chromius and Herakles: Comic Elements in Pindar's First Nemean," *Eos* 70, 1982, 209-211.
- Nisetich, F. J., *Pindar's Victory Songs*, Baltimore 1980.
- Nisetich, F. J., *Pindar and Homer*, Baltimore and London 1989.
- Norwood, G., *Pindar*, Berkeley 1945.
- Norwood, G., "Pindar *Nemean* 1.64ff.," *CPh* 37, 1942, 428-429.
- Norwood, G., "'Pindar *Nemean* 3.28f.," *CPh* 38, 1943, 138-9.
- Notopoulos, J.A., "The Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry: A Study of the Post-Homeric Oral Tradition," *AJPh* 83, 1962, 337-368.
- Onians, R. B., *The Origins of European Thought*, Cambridge 1954.
- Parke, H. W., D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 2 vols., Oxford 1956.
- Parker, L.P.E., "Some recent researches on the versification of Pindar and Bacchylides," *BICS* 5, 1958, 13-24.
- Parry, H., *Thelxis: magic and imagination in Greek myth and society*, United Press of America, 1992.
- Pearson, L., "Catalexis and Anceps in Pindar: A Search for Rhythmical Logic," *GRBS* 15, 1974, 171-191.
- Pearson, L., "Hiatus and its purposes in Attic Oratory," *AJP* 96, 1975, 138-159.
- Pearson, L., "The Dynamics of Pindar's Music: Ninth Nemean and Third Olympian," *ICS* 2, 1977, 54-69.
- Pelliccia, H., *Mind, Body and Speech in Homer and Pindar*, Göttingen 1995.
- Pelliccia, H., "Pindar, *Nemean* 7.31-36 and the Syntax of Aetiology," *HCSP* 92, 1989, 71-101.
- Péron, J., *Les images maritimes de Pindare*, Paris 1974.
- Petrucione, J., "The Role of the Poet and his Song in *Nemean* 1," *AJPh* 107, 1986, 34-45.
- Pfeijffer, I.L., *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III & Pythian VIII*, Leiden 1999.
- Phillip, H., *Tektonon Daidala*, Berlin 1968.
- Podlecki, A. J., "Athens and Aegina," *Historia* 25, 1976, 396-413.
- Pohlsander, H.A., "The Dating of Pindaric Odes by Comparison," *GRBS* 4, 1963, 131-140.
- Pörtulas, J., "La condition héroïque et le statut religieux de la louange, *Pindare*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 31, 1985, 207-243.
- Pratt, L.H., *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar*, Michigan 1993.
- Pritchett, W.K., *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography III, Roads*, University of California Publications, Classical Studies 22, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1980.
- Privitera, G.A., "Eracle nella prima Nemea," *GIF* n.s. 3, 1972, 28-51.
- Privitera, G.A., "Tre Note alla prima Nemea (vv.18, 37, 64) *Hermes* 103, 1975, 286-292.
- Privitera, G. A., "Eracle e gli Eacidi nella III 'Nemea,'" *GIF* 29, 1977, 249-273.

- Privitera, G. A., "Pindaro, *Nem.* III 1-5, e l'acqua di Egina," *QUCC* 29, 1988, 63-75.
- Puech, A., *Pindare, Néméennes, Isthmiques*, Paris 1923.
- Race, W. H., *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*, Mnemosyne, Supp. 74, Leiden 1982.
- Race, W. H., *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*, *APA* 24, Atlanta 1990.
- Race, W. H., "How Greek poems begin," *YCS* 29, 1992, 13-38.
- Race, W. H., "Climactic elements in Pindar's verse," *HSPH* 92, 1989, 43-70.
- Race, W. H., *Pindar*, Boston 1986.
- Radt, S. L., *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian*, Amsterdam 1958.
- Radt, S.L., "Pindars erste Nemeische Ode: Versuch einer Interpretation," *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 19, 1966, 148-174.
- Rehahan, R. F., "Conscious Ambiguities in Pindar and Bacchylides," *GRBS* 19, 1969, 217-228.
- Richardson, N. J., ed., *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford 1974.
- Richardson, N. J., "Pindar and Later Literary Criticism in Antiquity," *PLLS* 5, 1985, 383-401.
- Rivier, A., "Mythe et poésie: Leurs rapports et leur fonction dans trois épinicies de Pindare," *BAGB* 9, 1950, 60-96.
- Robbins, E.I. "Nereids with Golden distaffs: Pindar, *Nem.* 5," *QUCC* 54-55, 1987, 25-33.
- Robertson, D. S., "The Food of Achilles," *CR* 54, 1940, 177-180.
- Robinson, D.M., "New Greek Bronze Vases: A Commentary on Pindar," *AJA* 46, 1942, 172-197.
- Romano, D.G., *Athletics and Mathematix of Ancient Corinth: The Origins of the Greek Stadion*, American Philosophical Society Memoirs series, vol. 86, 1993.
- Roos, P., "The Start of the Greek Foot-Race," *Opuscula Atheniensis* 6, 1965, 149-156.
- Rose, P.W., "The Myth of Pindar's First Nemean: Sportsmen, Poetry, and Paideia," *HSPH* 78, 1974, 145-175.
- Rosenmeyer, T.G., "The Rookie: A Reading of Pindar *Nemean* 1," *CSCA* 2, 1969, 233-246.
- Rouse, W.H.D., "The First Triad of Nemean 1," *ABSA* 37, 1936/37, 207-211.
- Roux, G., ed., *Temples et Sanctuaires*, Lyons 1984.
- Ruck, C.A.P., "Marginalia Pindarica IV-VI," *Hermes* 100, 1972.
- Rusten, J. S., "ΓΕΙΤΩΝ ΗΡΩΣ: Pindar's Prayer to Heracles (*N.* 7.86-101) and Greek Popular Religion," *HSCP* 87 (1983). 289-297.
- Sandys, Sir John, *The Odes of Pindar*, Loeb Classical Library, London 1919.
- Sansone, D., *Greek Athletics and the Genesis of Sport*, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1988.
- Schachter, A., *The Cults of Boiotia*, 4 vols. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1981-
- Schadewald, W., *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*, Darmstadt 1966.
- Schauenburg, K. "Herakles und Omphale," *RhM* 103, 1960, 57-76.
- Schmidt, A. M., *Pindar, The Eighth Nemean*, Diss. Bryn Mawr 1968.
- Scholz, E., "Zum Aufbau eines pindarischen Epinikion. Nemean 2," *WS* 82, 1969, 18-27.

- Schroeder, O., *Pindari carmina*, Leipzig 1900-23.
- Scully, V., *The Earth, The Temple and the Gods: Greek Sacred Architecture*, Yale 1979.
- Segal, C., *Aglaia: The Poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna*, Oxford 1998.
- Segal, C., "Arrest and Movement: Pindar's Fifth Nemean," *Hermes* 102, 1974, 397-411.
- Segal, C., "Pindar's Seventh Nemean," *TAPhA* 98, 1967, 431-480.
- Segal, C., "Two Agonistic Problems in Pindar, *Nemean* 7.70-74 and *Pythian* 1.42-45," *GRBS* 9 (1968), 31-45.
- Segal, C., "Time and the Hero: The Myth of *Nemean* I," *RhM* 117, 1974, 29-39.
- Sicking, C.M.J., "The Distribution of the Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms in Greek, Especially in the Imperative," *Glotta* 69-70, 1991-92, 14-43.
- Slater, N., "The Vase as Ventriloquist: *kalos*-Inscriptions and the Culture of Fame," *BICS* 143-161.
- Slater, W.J. "Futures in Pindar," *CQ* 19, 1969, 86-94.
- Slater, W.J., *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin 1969.
- Slater, W.J., "Doubts About Pindaric Interpretation," *CJ* 72, 1977, 193-208.
- Slater, W.J., "Pindar's Myths: Two pragmatic explanations," *Arktouros; Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, edd. G. W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, M.C.J. Putnam, Berlin & New York, 1979, 63-70.
- Slater, W.J., "*Nemean One*: The Victor's Return in Poetry and Politics," *Greek Poetry & Philosophy, Studies in honour of L. Woodbury*, ed., D. E. Gerber, Chico 1984, 241-264.
- Slings, S. R., "Written and Spoken Language: An Exercise in the Pragmatics of the Greek Sentence," *CPh* 87, 1992, 95-109.
- Snell, B., H. Maehler, ed., *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, Leipzig, corr. repr. Pars I, 1984.
- Stansbury-O'Donnell, M.D., *Pictorial Narrative in Ancient Greek Art*, Cambridge 1999.
- Steiner, D., *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*, London 1986.
- Steiner, D., "Pindar's 'Ogetti Parlanti,'" *HSCP* 95, 1993, 159-180.
- Steiner, D., "Moving Images: Fifth-Century Victory Monuments and the Athlete's Allure," *CA* 17, 1998, 123-149.
- Stern, J., "The Myths of Pindar's *Nemean* 10," *GRBS* 10, 1969, 125-132.
- Stern, J. "The Structure of Pindar's 'Nemean' 5," *CPh* 66, 1971, 169-173.
- Stone, W.A., "Notes on Pindar," *CR* 48, 1934, 166.
- Stoneman, R., "The Niceties of Praise: Notes On Pindar's *Nemeans*," *QUCC* n.s. 2, 1979.
- Stoneman, R., "Mythology and Interpretation: Two Notes on Pindar's *Nemeans*," *Maia* 28, 1976, 229-232.
- Stoneman, R., "The Theban Eagle," *CQ* n.s.26, 1976, 188-197.
- Sweet, W.E., *Sport and Recreation in Ancient Greece*, New York 1987.
- Tarrant, D., "Greek Metaphors of Light," *CQ* 10, 1960, 181-187.
- Tedeschi, A., "L'invio del carne nella poesia lirica arcaica: Pindaro e Bacchilide," *SIFC* 3rd series, v.3 (1985), 29-54.

- Theiler, W., "Die Gliederung der griechischen Chorliedstrophe. Eine metrische Übung," *MH* 12, 1955, 181-200.
- Thomas, R., *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 1989.
- Thummer, E., *Die Religiosität Pindars*, Innsbruck 1957.
- Tomlinson, R.A., *Greek Sanctuaries*, London 1976.
- Tugendhat, E., "Zum Rechtfertigungsproblem in Pindars 7. Nemeischen Gedicht," *Hermes* 88, 1960, 385-409.
- Turyn, A., *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, Oxford 1952.
- Van der Weiden, M.J.H., *The Dithyrambs of Pindar*, Amsterdam 1991.
- Van Straten, F., "Votives and Votaries in Greek Sanctuaries," *Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, 37, 1992, 247-284.
- Verdenius, W.J., "Pindar, *Nemean XI* 48," *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 36, 1983, 153-4.
- Verdenius, W. J., *Commentaries on Pindar* ii. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 101, Leiden 1988.
- Verdier, C., *Les éolismes non-épiques de la langue de Pindare*, Innsbruck 1972.
- Vernant, J-P., *Mythe et Pensée chez les Grecs*. Paris 1965.
- Vernant, J-P., *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne*. Paris 1974.
- Vernant, J-P., *La Mort dans les yeux*, Paris 1985.
- Vivante, P., "On Time in Pindar," *Arethusa* 5, 1972, 107-131.
- Von der Mühl, P., "Weitere pindarische Notizen," *Museum Helveticum* 20, 1963, 101-2, 197-204 = *Kl. Schr.*, 203-15.
- Vries, G.J. de, "Het feest van Aristagoras. Een ode van Pindarus," *Hermeneus* 36, 1964/65, 149-157.
- Vries, G.J. de, "Pindar, *Nemean XI* 48," *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 36, 1983, 153.
- Vries, G.J. de, "Pindar, *Nemean XI* 48, once more," *Mnemosyne* ser. 4, 37, 1984, 143.
- Wade-Gery, H. T., "Thucydides the son of Melesias." *JHS* 52:205-233. 1932.
- Waring, P., "Pindar, *Nemean* 1.24 - Smoke without fire," *CQ* n.s. 32, 1982, 270-277.
- West, M. L. ed., *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford 1966.
- West, M. L. ed., *Iambi et elegi graeci*, 2 vols., Oxford 1971-72.
- West, M. L. ed., *Hesiod: Works and Days*, Oxford 1978.
- West, M. L. ed., *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford 1978.
- West, M. L., *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982.
- West, M. L., *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, V. von, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U von. "Pindars siebentes nemeisches Gedicht,"
- Willcock, M.M., "Second Reading of Pindar: *The Fourth Nemean*," *G&R* ser.2, 29, 1982, 1-10.
- Williams, F. L., *A Critical Edition of Nemean Odes 1-4 of Pindar*, Diss., Cornell 1976.
- Woloch, M., "Athenian Trainers in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides," *CW* 56,

1963, 102-104, 121.

Woodbury, L. E., *Collected Writings*, ed. by C.G. Brown et al., Atlanta 1991.

Woodbury, Leonard. "Neoptolemus at Delphi: Pindar, *Nem.* 7.30ff.," *Phoenix* 33, 1979, 95-133.

Worthington, I., ed., *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*, Leiden 1996.

Young, D.C., "Some Types of Scribal Error in Manuscripts of Pindar," *GRBS* 6, 1965, 247-73.

Young, D.C., "Pindar *Pythians* 2 and 3: Inscriptional $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ and the 'Poetic Epistle'," *HSPH* 87, 1983, 31-48.

Young, D.C., "A Note on Pindar *Nemean* 7.30f.," *CSCA* 4 (1971).249-253.

Young, D.C., "Pindar *Nemean* 7: Some Preliminary Remarks (vv.1-20)," *TAPhA* 101, 1970, 633-643.

Young, D.C., "The Myth of *Nemean* 10," *GRBS* 35, 1994, 123-132.

Yourcenar, M., *Pindare*, Paris 1932.