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ABSTRACT of THESIS

The bulk of this thesis consists of commentaries on Pindar Pythian 11 and Nemean 2. As a prologue there is a general introduction to Pindar analysing some Pindaric problems, and an analysis of some features of the Pindaric scholia (the ancient commentaries on Pindar).

The INTRODUCTION shows how Pindar tailored the mythical parts of his victory odes to suit the occasion, and how the odes do not nicely conform to a general pattern.

The second part, TITLES and INSCRIPTIONES in the PINDARIC SCHOLIA and the OCCASION of PYTHIAN ELEVEN, shows that the dates and titles given by the scholia for Pindar's odes are an unreliable amalgam of bits of information and guesses (often inferences from the odes themselves).

The COMMENTARY on PYTHIAN ELEVEN tackles the problem posed by Pindar apparently spatchcocking an irrelevant mythical story about Agamemnon into the ode. It is suggested (1) the victor's conquest at the Games has affinities to Orestes's conquest over his father's murderers; (2) when Pindar says he went off-course in telling the myth he is being disingenuous; representing what he thinks would be the attitude to the myth of the victor's family; (3)themes of envy, moderation, success, highlighted in the myth are relevant to the victor.

The COMMENTARY on NEMEAN TWO suggests this short ode (like other short ones) was designed to preface the komos (victory sing-song and celebrations) held for the victor. The ode's compressed thought and obscure allusions are unravelled: Orion
following the Pleiades symbolises how the victor may hope to gain a big win at Olympia after his recent little successes; Hector's submission to Aias is analogous to the submissions gained by the victor over his opponents. Puns and etymologising are shown to be a feature of the poem.

The text of Pindar on which this thesis is based is taken from the Teubner edition of B. Snell – H. Maehler, Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis (Leipzig 1980).
INTRODUCTION

1. The Classification of Pindar's Odes

§1 In the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. Pindar was famous and held in honour all over the Greek world. Herodotus, Plato, Aristotle, Alcidamas, Isocrates, Aristophanes, Menander all quote him, and he led the Hellenistic canon of nine lyric poets.

§2 His output was first (as far as we can tell) classified by Aristophanes of Byzantium; the epinicians were contained in the last four of the total of 17 books. Even in antiquity, however, it was recognised that some poems among the epinicians had been mis-classified: Inscriptio N.9 (referring to Nemeans 9, 10, 11) κ[A]τα[λ] ξ[α] φ[ω] δ[η]τι Νέμενικας ε[κ] γεγραμμέναι; εἰς κειχωρίκεςν θερίζαι; cf. Inscr. a N.11 Ο[ὐ]σ[σ] τῆς ἐπολογίας, ε[κ] Σύμμοιρος, ἔφη δὴ ἡ τῶν Ἰθμιαίων τριών ἐπιτυχόντων αὐτοῖς οὐ γαρ ἐπεὶ ἄγετα Νεμένικην. The implication of these scholia is that in the First Century B.C. Didymus recognised that Nemeans 9-11 were not epinicians for Nemean victories and had separated them from the other Nemeans.

§3 Another piece of evidence for problems in antiquity concerning the classification of Pindar's poems is P.Oxy.2451 A, scraps (probably from a Life of Pindar) forming parts of an ancient commentary on Isthmians and also (P.Oxy. 2451 B fr. 17) on an ῦσχοφορίκαν μέλος. The ῦσχοφορίκα were an Athenian festival. It is a reasonable conjecture that Pindar's ῦσχοφορίκα formed an appendix to his Isthmians as Nemeans 9-11 did to the other Nemeans.

§4 There was a similar problem of classification over some of Pindar's Partheneia, whether to classify some of them as a third book of Partheneia or as a separate appendix. What
These problems in antiquity over the classification of Pindar's poetry should remind us of two things: firstly, the poems which in modern editions are grouped together as epinicians are in many respects a motley collection; secondly, the clear-cut distinctions between genres suggested by classifiers' labels are an anachronism. It is easy to think that because we have four books designated 'epinicians', therefore they are all the same sort of poem; this has led some modern American scholars to try to explain them by reference to a generalised formal model. But these claims have not be substantiated by their authors. (See further below).

2. Recent Pindaric Scholarship

§1. The idea that for all of Pindar's odes there is a single general theory that explains them (such as the modern American scholars claim to have discovered) can be traced back to the 19th Century work of Boeckh and Dissen and the notion that all the odes can be explained by reference to an underlying central thought or Grundgedanke. The theory led Hermann to reject as irrelevant padding anything not in accord with the hypothetical underlying thought and is a similar sort of theory to the theory of Bundy that all parts of all the odes have a single aim, namely to praise the winner, with parts that do not appear to praise the winner functioning as foils to offset those that do.

§2. The Grundgedanke theory was developed in another direction, also followed by modern scholarship, by the theory of F. Mezger that in each ode there are key repeated words which express the essential thought of the poem (cf. D. C. Young recently: "Mezger's theory of the recurrent word is basically correct (though not in the form in which he gave
it) and, I believe, is the greatest single aid for an understanding of a Pindaric ode\(^{18}\). The commentaries of Fennell\(^{19}\) and Bury\(^{20}\) are also strongly influenced by this theory.

§3 In a counter-reaction to this trend, the heterogeneity of the odes was strongly emphasised towards the turn of the century by Drachmann\(^{21}\) who stressed the diversity of the odes' ingredients. This counter-reaction was influenced by a growing interest in trying to establish the diverse historical circumstances surrounding each ode's composition. The main proponent of this risky historicising approach was Wilamowitz\(^{22}\). A result of this counter-reaction was a tendency to see the one part of the poem most obviously not based in documentable history, namely the myth, as an irrelevant digression\(^{23}\). Modern discussions of Pythian 11 have largely centred around this view of its myth, on the assumption that when Pindar says (P.11 38-40) he went off course in telling the myth he is admitting to having made a mistake in telling it (a debatable assumption: see my commentary ad loc.).

§4 Between these two approaches came the theory of subjective and objective unity advocated by Schadewaldt\(^{24}\), though first suggested 98 years earlier by Boeckh, according to which each ode had two competing aims, on the one hand to praise the winner and on the other to express the poet's own personal views. It was Schadewaldt, too, who first drew attention to the conventions of epinician poetry as a genre\(^{25}\). Schadewaldt's work is important for the understanding of Pythian 11: Pindar's apparent apology for having told the myth has to be recognised as a conventional rhetorical device on the one hand enabling
the poet to change themes, on the other highlighting how there is more to Pindar's odes than just personal praise of the winner; the victor may have wanted Pindar to aim at nothing but victor-praise, but Pindar had other ideas.

§ 5 The importance of understanding the conventions of the genre has recently been underlined by Bundy; as mentioned, he insists that praise of the winner was the poet's overriding aim. Some of the dangers inherent in his approach have been well pointed out by Professor Lloyd-Jones in his 1982 lecture on Pindar to the British Academy. Three further dangers should be noticed: firstly, one must be cautious before speaking of the conventions of the epinician genre; apart from Pindar and Bacchylides, other representatives of the genre scarcely exist, and Pindar's technique in constructing his epinicians is different enough from Bacchylides' to make it possible that if more survived of the epinicians of Ibycus and Simonides our views about what should count as a convention of the genre (as opposed to a trait of Pindaric style) would be very different. Secondly, praise is a nebulous concept; different types should be distinguished (e.g. (a) personal commendation, (b) citation of mythical exempla clearly parallel to the victor's situation, (c) mention of heroes etc. with no such parallel) and kept separate from what is clearly not praise (e.g. citation of a mythical exemplum not to praise but to point out the dangers of, say, ἰδαυβθ ὡς or φθατος θνητος). Thirdly, as mentioned, praise of the winner is not Pindar's sole aim: the only way Bundy can substantiate his claim that "there is no passage in Pindar and Bakkhulides that is not in its primary intent enkomiastic - that is, designed to enhance the glory of a particular patron", is by misunderstanding what praise is and widening its meaning so as to include any statement said of someone. His view derives from his unsubstantiated assumption that Pindar is always writing in his epinicians as a laudator of the victor; this assumption is surely disproved by such passages as the last triad of Pythian One (advisory), the tenor of lines 80–115 of Pythian Three (consolatory), or the last triad of Pythian Four (persuading Arcesilaus to change his decision).
which are addressed to the victor but not (on any normal use of the word 'praise') in praise of him.

§6 To maintain his thesis that Pindar is always praising the victor Bundy is forced into the position that much of Pindar is 'foil', that is on topics chosen not per se but to lead up to and highlight the real goal, namely praise and glorification of the victor. But this approach can lead to serious misinterpretation, as when Nisetich applies it to the story of Agamemnon spatchcocked into Pythian II: "The thing to do would be to find something of special value in the victor's way of life. Pindar does this by telling us not only what Thrasydaios of Thebes is, but also what he is not: he is not exposed to the kinds of peril that plagued the great house of Atreus, subject of the myth told in the second triad of Pythian II. On the contrary, it seems to me that the myth in Pythian II is not designed to praise per contrariam but, rather, to show that Thrasydaios as a victor is indeed exposed to the kinds of peril that faced the conqueror Agamemnon: note how line 29, "εἰ Ἀτρέωι θυσίαν δῶρον ἦς μετὰ τινός φθορὰν" while applying to characters in the myth is also relevant to the victor's success.

§7 Post-Bundy American scholarship, which has concentrated on finding a formal structure that underlies all Pindar's odes, has tended to ignore how there is more variation among the odes than the variation in position of their parts. This tendency is exemplified by the naive conclusion of Hamilton, that, "The parts of a Pindaric ode do occur in definite positions. Therefore the form of a particular ode can now be studied with reference to a general model." According to Hamilton, "the shortest odes form a group... They are followed by three odes of intermediate length and then by the rest of the odes, which break into no further groups... The degree of uniformity in length and content among the short odes is so great that it is likely that the group was an accepted type: in other words the poet wrote either long or short odes." The crucial factor, he
says, is the presence of absence of myth.

§9 This is a misleading analysis. There is a range of length. The fact that no ode survives between 142 and 182 words long, or between 237 words long and 282, is uninteresting. It does not warrant grouping together as short the odes of less than 142 words or as long those of more than 282: (1) Not all of Pindar's epinicia survive; (2) Why not group together the odes between 282 and 500 words long, since there is no ode bridging the 500-555 word gap? (3) It is not true that the crucial factor is the presence or absence of myth: Olympian 4, for example, classified as short by Hamilton, tells the story of Erginos winning an athletics victory in old age; (4) arguably a better unit of measurement is the number of triads per ode: it shows that 3-5 triads is the regular length, and stops you overlooking the fact that seven odes are not triadic at all but monostrophic.

3. The Heterogeneity of the Odes

§1 Though the victory for which an ode was written is often a dominant part of the ode, often it is not. Sometimes, as with N.11, P3, P4, the occasion that caused the poem does not seem to have been a victory at all — though in N.11 and P3 Games are mentioned. Pindar himself only once refers to 'epinicians' (ἐπινικίοντως λαχανίκη N.4.78); several times he calls his poems for victors ἔγκωμικοι (P.10.53, 0.2.47; cf. N.1.7, N.8.50), but much more frequently he calls them
The conclusion to be drawn is that the relationships between Pindar and the recipient of the ode, and between the ode and any victory, were very variable, with atypical odes such as N.11 and P.3 standing at one end of a sliding scale.

§2 There is also variety of metrical form. Only one of the 45 epinicians imitates the metrical pattern of any other - none does, if Isthmians 3 and 4 are parts of the same ode. Pindar is also intolerant of identical word-division patterns in verses of the same metrical pattern; this is exemplified by the fifth and sixth lines of all epodes, except the last, of Olympian 6 (fifth: D, caesura, -D, sixth: D-, caesura, D). Contrast Bacchylides: in his dactylo-epitrites he allows line after line to have a word end after the first hemiepes (e.g. in the epodes of B.11. 24-40, 71-82, 113-122); contrast Stesichorus (e.g. the highly dactylic, monotonous and simple rhythm in the Lille Stesichorus, hexametric at times - e.g. line 232). Pindar developed the basic dactylo-epitrite rhythm; he also combines dactylo-epitrites with other rhythms: Olympian 13 starts aeolic, becomes increasingly dactylic through the strophe and antistrophe, and the epode is dactylo-epitritic.

§3 There is great variation, too, in Pindar's mythical diversions. In some odes he has delineated the character of the mythical hero to harmonise with the character of the Games winner; in others, those actions of a mythical person are selected which have a special bearing on the winner; sometimes Pindar gives someone in the myth an ancestry that is new, and not in accord with tradition, in order to insert the mythical figure into the victor's family. Or the myth may be chosen because of the type of event that had been won; violent stories are often for pancratiasts (τὸ δὲν ἔσθιον ὁ παγρίτιον καλέουσιν, Χερσ.2.5).
Pindar did not compose slavishly on the assumption that in each ode there had to be a similar relationship between the myth and the victor or between the myth and any other part of the ode. Like Greek poets before him he was happy to introduce Herakles or Aias into his poems on a variety of pretexts, some trifling. A single word may make clear a connection between myth and victor, but often the myth is developed for its own sake and detail is added not to make subtle allusions to the victor's way of life but to make the myth a good story to listen to. The fluidity of Greek myth and the tolerance and delight of the Greeks in hearing modified versions of old stories must be weighed against the assumption that "How exactly is this relevant to the victor?" is the all-important question.

Pindar's myths also cover a range of length, from the epyllion in Pythian 4 to a couple of words (e.g. 0.10.14). Some writers distinguish between his myths and mythic examples. This is misleading. Even in the long myths, including that in Pythian 4, there may be material pointing out to the recipient of the ode an example he should follow; while some of the very short mythic examples, though short in terms of the number of words they are written in, require the knowledge of a large body of background mythical material before one can understand why they are in the poem. Hamilton attempts to distinguish the two, but the distinction yields nothing and his argument for it is untenable: "there is no apparent difference in content between Myth and Mythic Example. The critical distinction for the audience, we find, is in position: the two types of mythic example have mutually exclusive positions in the ode. Myth normally appears only in the central section and Mythic Example normally appears in either of the other two sections." But later he adds: "Only 6 of the 25 Mythic Examples occur in the Myth section, and only 12 of the 39 Myths do not." This is bad evidence for a critical distinction. Pindar is more subtle and variable with his mythical narrative and characters than Hamilton allows.
The heterogeneity of the odes also appears from the varying styles in which they are written. The grand architecture of the some odes' first lines, with a rambling structure supported by relative pronouns or temporal conjunctions (as in Pythians 11 and 4) contrasts with the staccato beginning of e.g. Olympians 1 and 11 and Nemean 6. Pindar's wide repertoire of openings is indeed striking. Isthmian 7 begins with a question to Thebes followed by seven more questions asking what myth or mythical figures Thebes most wants to hear about. Questions from Pindar abound in the epinicians, but this is one of the only two odes with a question in the opening sentence. He did not shirk a novel structure to his odes, and it is characteristic of him to use a few basic ingredients in a variety of quite different ways.

A barrage of unanswered questions is also fired in Paean 9 asking the sun what his eclipse portends; it, too, was written for Thebans. Eight questions about whom he should sing of start his most fully-surviving Hymn (Fr. 29), also for Thebans. Pindar may have thought such slightly audacious, unusual and unorthodox openings more suitable for a community he knew well and where he could be more adventurous. Pindar's other Theban odes are Isthmians 3, 4 and Pythian 11. Significantly, both Isthmian 7 and Pythian 11 describe people on the move, the former a victory procession (20-1 κακος ἐπιτετείν οὐκ ἦκτορες οὐκ ὑψωθεν ἐπὶ ἐπετειν' ἑαυτῷ), the latter a gathering of Theban heroines at the temple of Ismene; also both start with invocations and have a host of Theban mythical characters crammed into the beginning. Pindar may have thought an initial invocation and a splash of myth (rather than a single prolix story) a good and lively way to get people moving.

Olympian 2 is the only other ode Pindar begins with a question (1.2 τίνα θεόν, τίνα ήρωαν, τίνα δ' ἀνδρα κελεύομαι σοίν) which is immediately answered by a) Zeus, b) Herakles, c) Theron; this is the epic style. Other questions in the epinicians can be classified as (1) rhetorical, an emphatic way of saying 'no one' or 'x, of course' or 'not at all' (0.1.84, 2.100, 6.7-8; P.2.78, 7.5-8; I.1.5, 5.39-42); (2) in dialogue (P.4.97-9, 9.33-5, 9.44; N.10.76); (3) as a means of transition (0.2.89; P.10.4); 4) the enigmatic τί ΕΤΕ τίς; τί δ' οὖν τίς; θεώ τίς; τί δ' οὖν τίς; θεώ τίς; τί δ' οὖν τίς; θεώ τίς; (P.8.95) and the questioning of Clytemnestra's motives (P.11.22-5). Questions emerge as a marked trait of Pindar's style. As with other ingredients in his odes, he uses them in many ways.
4. The Myths and their Relevance

§1 As mentioned above, there are a variety of ways in which the myths in Pindar's odes are relevant to the rest of the poem. Sometimes the relevance is obvious, sometimes it is not, sometimes the myth is clearly relevant to the victor's situation, but sometimes the relevance is more general: any myth about an Aiakid is relevant to an Aiginetan victor because Aiakos was Aigina's son; any myth connected with Delphi, like the myth of Orestes in Pythian 11, is relevant to a Pythian victor; any myth about Heraclides, founder of the Nemean Games, is relevant to a Nemean victor; Poseidon, in whose honour the Isthmian Games were held, is relevant to any Isthmian victor. In addition, myths about Heraclides and the Aiakids are relevant to any victory since they illustrate the physical strength and dependence on the gods that is necessary for any victory. 49

§2 Pindar's flair for allusion and concentration on just a few details when telling a myth means that regularly he does not spell out all the ways in which it is relevant; he prefers to leave the connections unobtrusive. In the first triad of Olympian Two, for instance, he prays to Zeus that Theron's family and descendants should continue to rule Akragas, adding that what has been done cannot be undone and it is futile to cry over spilt milk. In the background is the hostility between Hieron and Theron after Hieron became envious of the success and power of his brother Polyzelos. There was little chance of détente because Hieron drove Polyzelos out of Sicily, annoyed that he had married Theron's daughter; she had been the wife of Hieron's rival, the tyrant Gelon. Theron, concerned for his daughter, and his son Thrasydaios were about to attack Hieron when Simonides intervened. 50 So, inter-family hostility lies behind these words of Pindar, and later come mythical examples of inter-family hostility: first Oedipus and Laios are alluded to, then Eteocles and Polynices.
§3 Pythian One substitutes for a myth a description of the monster Typhon, while in the final epode Phalaris who roasted people is mentioned. Phalaris is an example of the sort of tyrant Hieron should not be, while Typhon illustrates the type of fate suffered by Hieron's enemies.

§4 In Pythian Three, Hieron suffering from a gallstone in the bladder is asked to remember what Kadmos and Peleus had to suffer (Sch. P3, 153b).

§5 The story of the Argonauts in Pythian Four is likewise tailored for the occasion: it reinforces Pindar's effort to persuade Arkesilaos to reinstate Damophilos, who has fled to Thebes, and to realise he has made a wrong decision in banishing him from his homeland. The quarrel between Jason and his second cousin Pelias takes up the greater part of the mythical narrative in the ode and is dramatised in the 4th-7th triads. Why? Because Jason's claim to be allowed to live in his homeland is analogous to Damophilos's. Pindar highlights the repatriation issue when (156f) Pelias orders Jason to bring back not just the Golden Fleece but also Phrixos himself to his homeland (Sch. P4 281a). To emphasise the analogy between Damophilos and Jason, Pindar gives them both similar characteristics: both have been careful speakers not wishing to offend anyone (compare 104-6 and 283); both have been torn away from their homes unnaturally, Jason by being smuggled out at night while still a baby (11lf.), Damophilos like a hewn oak (263f.); both are now dependent on others more powerful than themselves, Jason on Pelias and Aietes, Damophilos on Arkesilasos. But analogies are not Xerox copies, and it is a mistake to search for parallels in every word.
One trick Pindar uses is to invent or unearth a role or lineage for a mythical character that relates him to the victor or the victor's homeland. At 0.9.58 he suggests that Protogeneia is the daughter of Opous, king of Elis. The usual story was different, as the scholiasts noticed (though one cannot always be sure that Pindar had no authority for his versions just because Didymus could not find it): Sch.0.9.86c

The reason for the change is that Epharmostos, for whom Olympian 9 was written, comes from the district of Locris called Opous. Pindar is not as precise as the scholiasts suggest; he does not name Protogeneia as the daughter of Opous, but says merely (57f. Ολυμπιακός ἀγεμόνος θυγατέρα ἔτοι γαίς Επετών Ὑπερθείλας, ἐκεῖος μιᾶθη Μενιλίων ἐν δαιμόνι). The identification of this anonymous girl with Protogeneia is eased by Opous earlier being called the city of Protogeneia (Πρωτογονεία ουτε 41-2) and by the girl's son being named Opous after her father (63-4). Since it was this second Opous who, according to Pindar, gave his name to the city, Protogeneia becomes the city's quasi-mother, and since it was with Zeus that she produced Opous junior, Pindar has strengthened the city's pedigree. Had he stuck to the story that Protogeneia was the daughter of Deukalion and Pyrrha, Epharmostos would have had to tolerate hearing that his city's population derived from stones. But Pindar, as is his wont, does give glimpses of the accepted story. He attempts to accommodate the two versions by saving the stone men were Epharmostos's earlier ancestors, the descendants of Zeus and Protogeneia his later ones (53f. Κείλιος [τοὺς Λιθονίας λόγων] ὄς ἔσον Χαλεπτισθείς ὑμέτεροι πρόγονοι ἐργάζεθαν... ἐγκύριοι βασιλεύεικες ἀνέγειρον Ολυμπιακοῖς ἀγεμονεῖς ἑτα). Pindar is subtle: the story of Deukalion and Pyrrha and their brood of stone men is merely alluded to; Protogeneia is referred to but not called their daughter; the city of Opous is said to be descended from Protogeneia, who by implication is the girl Zeus makes love to; and Opous junior is born to give the victor a divine ancestry that can still cope with a tradition that said his ancestors were stones.
57 Similar subtleties occur in Olympian 8 in which Pindar slips into the myth Aiakos, former king of Aigina where the victor lives: the wall round Troy was not built solely by Poseidon and Apollo, as usually reported, but by Aiakos too; the mortal part built by him would be destructible and the way into the city (31f.). In this way Pindar can say that the whole Aiakid line helped destroy Troy: Πέρ χως ἀρματε τετεθα, ηρως, και Ερμής θυμοντις και τετρας: this last phrase refers to 1) Telamon's sack of Troy (v. N. 4. 25b), 2) the assault on it - subject of the Iliad - by Aias and Achilles, 3) Neoptolemos's final destruction of the city. Andromache's words to Hector (11. 6. 431f.) may have given Pindar his cue: λυκοι δε στηρεν παρτι ἐπί τινα μακροκετε ηρως και ἐπιθετον ἐπιλεκτι τετρα τινα γαι τινα μακροκετε ἐπιθετον τινα μακροκετε ηρως. Aiakos' inclusion of Aiakos in the destruction because of his bad workmanship is, according to Didymus, a Pindaric invention (Sch. O. 8. 41a).

58 Pindar's manufacture of myths is not always aimed at the victor. In Olympian 9 (29-36) he says that round Pylos Herakles fought Poseidon, Apollo and Hades. To make the event an even greater triumph for Herakles, Pindar invents a story that he took on all the gods at once (31-3). Didymus spotted the move: Sch. 0. 9. 44a τις καὶ τουτοι ὅ τι Πύναρω Ἅρην χρὴζει τοις τετελεσμέναις θεοῖς. Σεβάσθω γὰρ ἄνωθεν, ὅφειν ὅ Didymos, περὶ τὴν ὑπὸ Νεκτορ, Πύλοις ευχηθῆκα τὴν μάχην, ὄμηρον τὴν ἐν Ἡδοῖς πολὺν νεκρῶν εἰρήκτος [11. 5. 397] ἐν πολύν ἐν νεκρῶν βιολῶν. Εἶ γὰρ ὅ τι Πύναρω τὰ καὶ τούτοις καὶ Χρόνιοις διερτῶτα ἐπὶ ἐνα ηειρον αἴων ἐνεκτα τοις μεγιστῶς η ἤ ἐσχέ ταῖς ἀληθείαις τὸν Ἡρακλῆς ἐπιμείνειν.
It is Herakles who is usually said to have fought Apollo at Pytho when he stole the Pythia's tripod (v. Sch.0.9.48; the subject is frequent on black-figure vases), and Hades when hauling up Kerberos.

§9 Pindar's idiosyncratic use of myth recurs in Isthmian 8. In praise of the victor's homeland he says the Aiginetans εὐφρονεῖ τῇ ἔγνυετο τινοταὶ τῇ θυμίᾳ (line 26) and that Zeus and Poseidon remembered these qualities when, quarrelling for the hand of Thetis, they took the advice of Themis and left Thetis for Peleus. Why is Poseidon mentioned? The answer is probably simple: Kleandros had won an Isthmian victory, and the Isthmos was where Poseidon lived; the two are never far apart in the Isthmian odes (cf.I.1.32f.; I.2.12-14; I.4.37-41; I.6.5-7; I.7.37-39). Compare the introduction of Poseidon into the Pelops story in Olympian 1: Pindar extols Poseidon as Πηνδή because he wants a horsey story for a victor who won with horses, not for any more profound reason.

§10 Some myths relate to the type of victory commemorated. Isthmian 8 was for a victor in the boys' pankration. Its violence was notorious. Only slightly less violent was the boxing, in which Nikokles, Kleandros's cousin, had won (I.8.61-5). Philostratos, the 3rd-Century A.D. philosopher, puts the two sports into perspective: ἐπείκε τῇ ἔκτων ἐν λύπωνί ὑπετάμελος τῶν τῷ παγκράτιον καὶ τοῖς κυριελέφθοις ἐς ἀτελλὴς παλάς καὶ ἀτελλὴς μυρίλας (Peri. Gymn. ch.11); ἣμας δὲ τούτοις (physically weak men) τῶν μὲν ἀπαθῶς τῶν ἐν λύπωνί — τὸ γὰρ ἐς ἄνδρα ὰν ἀθέμελε — παγκρατίου δὲ καὶ πυγμή μαλίττα (ib.ch.29); τὸ δὲ πυρικέμα καὶ δαράλουμεν, ἐπεὶ τῇ κυριελέφθοις μμαθείσης έθησι τῷ γυμνοσκότου παγκρατίου οὔτε πυγμή Εἴκαστα (ib.ch.58). No surprise, therefore, that Pindar brings Achilles into the poem at his most bloodthirsty and violent, sprinkling the Mysian plain with the blood of Telephos and slashing the sinews of Troy with his spear (49f); and when Pindar says of Nikokles ἐνίκασε ἐν πολλῷ καὶ κεῖτο θυμὸν ἄνδρα καθαρῷ χερὶ κλονέων (I.8.65), real battle and Achilles spring
§11 Nemean 3 similarly links myth and contest. Written for a pankratiast, it emphasises the traits of the event, ἀνάμεσαν (sc. Μυρμήναι) τὴν ἔρινήν καὶ ἄρον σὺν ἀθλητικών ἀνίμως καὶ ἐν Πελετένει μάλαξθεὶς παρακτικῷ καὶ ἐν θέλετεν δεῖ πλαγών ἡμᾶς ἐν βασίλεισιν. Later, when Achilles' upbringing is described (43f.), Pindar highlights his violence, power and speed even though he is only hunting: the point is that both Achilles and Aristokleides excelled because they had innate strength. More obvious is the connection between myth and event in Pythian 12: Midas's victory in the aulos contest leads Pindar to recount how Athene, with Perseus's help, invented the instrument. It is an early ode (490 B.C. when Pindar was 27-8) and the obviousness of the myth's relevance contrasts with the greater complexity and sophistication with which he handles myth in later odes.

§12 Myth and victor are matched in Isthmian 4. With unusual attention to the victor's physique, Pindar says that Melissos was a small man and so was Herakles; both were also stronghearted, wrestlers and from Thebes (67-73). Archilochus's favourite type of soldier shared Melissos's physique (Fr.114W). Pindar regularly stresses Herakles' great strength, but not his smallness; here he is depicting him as a heroic Melissos. This emphasises his constant thesis, that Games victors display super-human qualities and for a moment share heroes' characteristics.

§13 Timasarchos, a wrestler, received Nemean 4. In it a single image gains significance because it is linked with the victor's event. After saying, as he often does, that he must stick to the point and ward off his envious detractors, Pindar goes on: ἐκεῖ τὰς Καίτερ (Καίτερ Χριστό) ἔξις βασιλικὴν πυτίκας ἐλαχίως μεγεριστεῖ νόμον το ἔπιβουλίαν (36-7). The deep sea holds him round the middle like a
wrestler\textsuperscript{64}. Later he says that everyone likes to praise great achievements which they have witnessed, continuing \textit{σῖνα δίκαιω κελεύειν, ἔρισσα στρέφει, ήμαρα πλέκων, ἀπάλαγτων ἐν λόγοι, ἑλκεῖν (93-4), meaning that anyone praising Melesias, the trainer of Timasarchos, would have to plumb the depths of his linguistic ability in his search for the high praise Melesias deserves. Pindar has expressed this in wrestling terminology: \textit{στρέφει} is a technical term (sometimes \textit{ἐσφραγίζειν} \textit{στρέφειν}) for doing a cross-buttock throw;\textsuperscript{65} \textit{πλέκων} maintains the picture\textsuperscript{66} and \textit{ἑλκεῖν} probably means 'to hoist an opponent up by his legs.\textsuperscript{67} Pindar concludes with the hypothetical eulogising spectator saying what he thinks \textit{μακάρα μὲν ἄρονεων ἑλκοῖν, προχύσει ταλιγράτων ἑδερος (Nemean 4, lines 95-6); in wrestling terminology \textit{ἑδερος} denotes the person who sits at the side waiting to take on the winner of the fight in progress. Pindar's epinicians are permeated by athletics practice; sometimes the imagery is not related to the event the winner won in (e.g. N6.6-7, a running metaphor in a poem for a wrestler; N.5.19-20, long-jumping for a pankratiast), but sometimes the vocabulary and imagery have been selected to match the event. Here, as elsewhere, Pindar does not adhere slavishly to one method.

\textsection 14 Isthmian 6 opens by saying that the house of Lamp on has already won a victory at Nemea (Pytheas's celebrated in N.5) and that Isthmian victory is the family's second; there follows a wish that in the future a libation can be offered to Olympian Zeus to celebrate an Olympic victory in the family. The theme is resumed in the myth. In it Pindar shows that prayers to Zeus do not go unanswered: one of the main items in the myth (41f.), Herakles' prayer to Zeus that Telamon may have a son followed by Zeus's eagle revealing that the prayer has been granted, is an oblique way of saying that Phylakidas's Olympic hopes may likewise be granted. There were other stories about Herakles and Telamon which Pindar could have told (cf.N4.25f.); his choice of one, in which a prayer to Zeus by someone victorious at Nemea in his first contest (Herakles had slain the Nemean lion, the first of
his \( \Delta \) is granted, has special relevance.

§15 Myth and victory are again connected in Nemean 10, written for Theaios who had won the wrestling at Argos. A victory at Argos was insignificant compared to one at Olympia, Nemea, Pythia or Isthmia, so unable to say how supreme Theaios's victory was Pindar extols the magnificence of Argos. Hence the unusual opening to the ode, a plethora of mythical references linked to Argos to conceal the pettiness of the victory.

5. Does an Ode's Style and Content depend on the Occasion of its Performance?

§1 It seems likely that different odes were composed for different types of performance. Some seem to have been performed during the komos to the victor's house (e.g. 08, I.8 and the short odes 0.4, 0.11, 0.14 and N.2). Pythians 2 and 3, on the other hand, resemble literary letters and the occasion of their performance could scarcely have been a komos, while Nemean 11 which honours Aristagoras's assumption of the prytany at Tenedos seems to have accompanied festivities held when he first took up office.

§2 The hypothesis that an ode's style depended on the occasion and way it was performed explains some aspects of Isthmian 8. The performance of the ode seems to have begun simultaneously with a victory procession to the home of the victor Kleandros, with one of the group running ahead to tell Kleandros and his friends to get ready: "One of you, lads, run to Kleandros and his mates, and by the splendid porch of his father Telesarchos get the komos going, the fame-brining prize for his efforts" (1-4). The ode ends with the impression that the procession of singers has reached Kleandros's house and that one of them is stepping forward to garland him with his prize (66-7). This doublet of instructions gives the beginning and end of the poem an informal and colloquial flavour. The first instruction, for a messenger to go to someone's home telling him to prepare to celebrate, recurs in the myth
when Themis tells messengers to go to Chiron's with news of the coming marriage of his countryman Peleus (v. 1-4 and 44-6, both instructions starting and ending at the same place in the triad). The colloquial character of Themis' speech maintains the initial stimmung, and she continues in a down-to-earth manner of speech in what she says about Peleus: 44-5 ἐφη τῶν θρών ψωμί: Πελεύς ἔρχεται (ὑψί means here, and at 0.6.35, 'lying below' not 'by' or 'through' as Slater suggests s.v. 72). The occasion for which the ode seems to have been written has influenced its content.

§3 Olympian 4 was also written for a komos; the ingredients of an epinician komos probably included aulos music (cf. Theog. 1065), other noise (cf. Theog. 1045-6), drink and a procession (cf.E.Cycl. 445-6, Aristot. Fr. 558). When in Olympian 4 Pindar appeals to Zeus (8-9 οὐλομάζων Κέρδης, Ἡραίων ἐκάπῃ τοὺς κόμοις), the deictic τοὺς shows the words were written to accompany, or give the appearance of accompanying, the komos itself.

§4 But Pindar's references to komoi have to be treated with care. In Olympian 6 he expresses the hope that Hieron in Sicily will receive Hagesias's komos after its journey from Stymphalis in Arcadia (98f. κῶς καὶ πολύτιμος ἔμμηλος Ἀργαλῆς ἡπίσκοπος καὶ πόλις οἰκεῖθεν οἷκες· ἐπὶ Ἑτυμομέλαις τε-χερὶ ποτίνιοι κόμοι μετὰ κατετιθημένοι λείπουν Ἀρκαδίας). In the context of this poem, written for someone with both Arkadian and Sicilian connections, the expression of this hope has been interpreted to mean that Olympian 6 was performed twice - once in Arkadia and then in Sicily. But though a 'receive the komos' motif is common in Pindar, in this ode there are two important differences: no deictic pronoun accompanies the occurrences of κόμοι in the poem (18,98) and Hieron is not addressed. The hope that Hieron will receive the komos is perhaps a hope that he will put its members up for the night and look after them while they are in Sicily; it does not suggest that Olympian 6 was written to be performed by the komos or immediately preface the komos. Rather, it looks as if Olympian 6 was performed in Stymphalis before
the journey to Sicily and only the komos performed in Sicily (note the prayer to Poseidon at the end of the poem, 103-5; this would have been very relevant if spoken in Stymphalis and if after the performance of Olympia 6 the komos was about to cross the sea to Sicily). The komos comes from Stymphalis because Hagesias's ancestors were thought to have lived there (77-8). Thebes, in Pindar's view, was related to Stymphalis (84-5), and Aineas and his chorus went from Thebes to Sicily with the poem (90-2). The komos has connections with all three places; by mentioning its journey Pindar uses it to help unite the topography of the poem.

§6 Comparable is the beginning of Nemean 9, κυμάσωμεν τακ Αττάλως εὐνοούμεν ἐκ Αἴτνας: Pindar uses the komos to link the venue of the Games where the victor had won (Sikyon) with his home-town (Aitna). As in Olympian 6, no deictic pronoun is attached to the word κυμασσ (50), and through the first three lines (κυμάσωμεν... ἐκ Χρομίου Σώματε) suggest the ode was performed at Aitna, I doubt if it was performed as part of a komos; the instructions contained in it (especially line 50 ἐγκράτεια τις νυ, ὑλικὸν κυμασσ πρὸ-φατάτορε) suggest it prefaced the komos. But contrast Pythian 5: the evidence here suggests the komos did perform the ode and while taking part in the worship of Karneian Apollo: note (a) the deictic pronoun (22); (b) mention of the festival of Karneian Apollo and the Plateia Skyrote along which the procession travelled to Apollo's shrine (Sch.P.5.124c); (c) emphasis given to the effect of the singing of the ode (98f.).

§7 Olympian 8 highlights another problem about the komos. At lines 9-10 Pindar calls on the sacred grove at Pisa to receive it, ἔλλην ἴτις Πικας ἐκδότεσκον ἐπὶ Αἰλεῖν οἴλιοι τοῦτο κυμασσ καὶ τεσσάρων θορίαν δεςκι (Olympian 8.9-10), but later he implies that Aigina, where the recipient of the ode came from, was where it was performed: τεθοξὲ δε τις ἥξινατάς καὶ τῶν ἐκλεγέκα κυμασσ παντοδαίμονον ὑπέτατος σεῦκι δοῦνα... (25-7). The problem arises because it has been thought that the address to Pisa, in which it is asked to
receive this komos, implies the komos is at Pisa, while \(\tau\nu\varsigma\ '\alpha\lambda\iota\eeta\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma\upsilon\nu\upsilon\) implies it is on Aigina. This leads Nisetich\(^77\) to say: "In the opening triad, Pindar prays to the sacred grove of Zeus at Olympia, asking it to welcome the band of singers who come bringing the crown won by the boy victor, Alkimedon. The ode thus seems to have been written for performance at Olympia after the victory;" and Farnell\(^78\) "The manifold signs of haste discernible in this ode may be explained by the fact that it was to be sung at Olympia immediately after the games, which would necessarily hurry the composition;" id.(ib.62): "As regards \(\tau\nu\varsigma\upsilon\tau\epsilon\) (which has misled Wilamowitz) there is no Greek law forbidding people to call a land or city \(\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\upsilon\) , unless at that moment they are on it. Now they are obviously at Olympia, but as the singers may be presumed to be Aeginetan friends of the victor, and in the previous line Aegina had been the theme, they can be allowed to speak of it as "this land", "this land of our hearts". Wilamowitz refuses to play down \(\tau\nu\varsigma\upsilon\tau\epsilon\upsilon\nu\upsilon\upsilon\) , and says that just as at every Delion throughout Greece one would have greeted Delos, so there was a local Olympieion on Aigina where Olympian 8 was performed and where the real Olympia could be greeted.

§§ But Pindaric practice suggests the correct interpretation is different: \(\tau\nu\varsigma\upsilon\tau\epsilon\upsilon\nu\upsilon\upsilon\) means the ode was performed by the komos on Aigina; this is compatible with the grove at Pisa being asked to welcome it, and it is unnecessary to postulate a local Olympieion. First, it is Pindar's practice to use the deictic pronoun to mean "this here".\(^80\) "This sea-girt land here" could not have been spoken at Olympia. Secondly, Olympian 8 is not the only epinician in which the presiding deity or place where the victory was won is addressed immediately prior to a mention of people in the place where the ode was performed (whether the komos or the inhabitants): cf. 0.13.24f. \(\upiota\pi\iota\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta\nu\epsilon\delta\nu\epsilon\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\upsilon\omega\upsilon\varsigma\upsilon\omega\nu\) 'O\(\lambda\iota\mu\iota\tau\iota\kappa\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ερ\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ες\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ε\(\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma\nu\)ετ\(\iota\kappa\iota\varsigm
As Zeus at Olympia in Elis can in Olympian 13 be invoked to welcome the komos performing at Corinth, so the komos performing in Aigina in Olympian 8 is welcomed by an invocation to Pisa; likewise, in Olympian 2 Zeus is called upon at his home in Olympia to care for the Akragantines (12-15), though the poem was performed at Akragas: οἴνοι πελώ τοῦ ἐνδρόν πόταμον τοῦ ἔχει τὸν ἐνδρόν πόταμον 35-6). It is also Pindaric practice to address a deity at the victor's home-town and ask it to welcome "these" fruits of victory, as at P.12.1f. Αἰτώ λε, φιλάγλασ, καλλίταρ βοτεάν τολίων (sc. Akragas) . . . ἡλία . . . δέκα, κτεράζων τόδε έχει Πυθώνοτ; (cf. 0.14.13ff. τρ' τέλεις Εὐχαίλεια, ἀπεκοντάτε ποτάμους . . . ἐκ τούτων κατακόρου. Both practices are possible because both the scene of victory and the victor's home-town shared in the victory. In Olympians 8 and 13 Pisa and Zeus at Olympia were some distance from Aigina and Corinth where the komoi were performing, but could still be asked to welcome the komoi who were performing partly in their honour; in Olympian 4 Zeus on Aitna is asked to receive "this komos" in Kamarina (0.4.8-12). Kamarina is about 150 kilometres from Aitna, Aigina about 100 from Olympia. 81

§4 Reference to "this komos" is one way Pindar has of tying down his poems in time and space. He has other ways which also use the deictic pronoun. He applies it not only to the komos, but also to the victor (e.g.I.1.34); to the place where the poem was performed (e.g.N.6.45-6); to the poem itself (e.g. I.2.44-5); to the audience (e.g. 0.6.101-2). It is significant that apart from αρχή at 0.2.58 no other sort of thing is ever qualified by the deictic pronoun. Though he mentions ἀλοι and φορμίγγα frequently, he never says 'this aulos', 'this phorminx'; he might have added the deictic pronoun at 0.1.17-18 ἀλλη Δωρίαν ἀπὸ φορμίγγα παράλοι πάλι βάρι . . . its absence supports the idea that the phrase is not to be interpreted literally. Probably, also, the address Χρυσέα φορμίγγα at the start of Pythian 1 no more implies the presence of a golden phorminx than the presence of the Graces is required at the start of Olympian 14 or Theia in Isthmian 5 or Olympia in Olympian 8. 83
On the other hand, the presence of the deictic pronoun in Nemean 4, written for Timasarchos, suggests that a victor's father might have been able to play an ode before its official performance: εἰ δὲ ἐκείνης στίχους ἔγραψεν Τιμασάρχους ἐκλίω, κόσμος πατρός ἐραξηπετῶν ποιήθηκεν Κιαράτων θάμα κεῖται, τῷ δὲ μετακαθηθὼν ἔμπροσθεν ἵκαλλίνικον (Nemean 4.13-16). This means, "If your father was now still alive, he would often by now have got his kithara and have sung again and again an epinician, devoted to this very song you now hear." The aorist καλίπεσε refers to a hypothetical past act; hence the sentence appears to mean not merely that a father might recite a Pindaric ode for himself but, more significantly, that Timasarchos's father, if he had been alive, would prior to the performance of Nemean 4, have devoted himself to its μέλος and have sung. The implication is that the victor's father was in a privileged position and could play for himself Pindar's epinician before others could.

What happened to the epinicians after their first performance we do not know. In Rhodes a copy of Olympian 7 was kept; it was inscribed in gold. But Diagoras who received Olympian 7, was no ordinary Olympic victor: the Rhodians also claimed he was a son of Hermes and his feats as a reason why the Hellanodikai should allow her to break the rule preventing women from seeing the Olympic Games. It is dangerous to generalise from Olympian 7 as H. Fraenkel does: "The victor's native city, on whom, according to Greek notions, a great deal of glory was reflected, might place a copy of the ode in its archives. From such manuscripts the poem could be reawakened into life at any time." What archives containing poems were there in Pindar's day? Official documents, e.g. lists of citizens, might have been housed in a building - but poems? We do not know (apart from the exceptional case of Olympian 7) how Pindar's epinicians and other encomia survived till the 3rd Century B.C. Doubtless the families for whom he wrote kept copies - but how would these have been collected from all over Greece? The collection of his poems which Alexandria received is more likely to have been Pindar's own collection kept originally, presumably, in his own house at Thebes.
§12 Another problem connected with the performance of the odes comes from Pindar appearing to say both that he went to where they were performed and that they were sent there. This has led commentators to say that sometimes his talk about his travelling to the victor's homeland for the performance is merely a metaphor. So Wilamowitz on Olympian 7 "Ihm (sc. Pindar) mag dies Missverhältnis kaum zum Bewusstsein gekommen sein, da er die Insel nicht kannte; er schickt sein Lied [...]". So Wilamowitz on Olympian 7 "Ihm (sc. Pindar) mag dies Missverhältnis kaum zum Bewusstsein gekommen sein, da er die Insel nicht kannte; er schickt sein Lied [...]"

13 ὑπὸ Αἴγυπτος, κατέβης ὑπόνεων τὰν [sic] πετὼν, παρὰ Ἀφροδίτη ὑπὸ Ρόδον wird niemand auf eine Reise Pindars nach Rhodos Deuten, der den Gebrauch von κατακλάναυςverfolgt - aber bei der Aufführung mag doch mancher Anstoss genommen haben, denn so soll auf Rhodos stattfinden."93 But πετῶνmean 'to convey' as well as 'to send via another'. Light is thrown on Olympian 7 by Pythian 2: ἡμοὶ τοδὲ τὰν λίθραν ἄναυς ὑπὸ Ὀρμέαν σέκως μέλος ἐρωτικός (3-4) and τοδὲ μὲν καὶ Ὀμήρους ἐκτοιχίσκαν ἐμποδίσαν μέλος ὑπερτήρων, πολίκεια τις περιτέτατο (67-8); compare Nemean 3: ἑστὶν τοι περὶ τῶν μεριμνῶν μὲν λέγω, καί γε λέγω (76-7), which follows a reference to Aigina as τάν πετὼν νὰλο (68), meaning the ode was performed on Aigina.94 Hence there is no reason to doubt that Pindar did go to Rhodes to perform Olympian 7;95 he did get about.96 Sometimes, though, he did only send his poem, cf. P.3.73-9 ἐπὶ κατάτησαν... ἄλτερον, ὀρφείνοι θυμίου τῆλευς ἄλτερον κείσαι δοκεῖ μὲν καὶ βαθῶν πετῶν περασίν. ἄλτερον ἐπομνημονεύσαι μὲν ἑινης ἐμποδίσαι. It is a mistake to suppose he wrote this passage solely as another near-and-far motif;97 it would be very inappropriate as such a motif if in fact he had come to Hieron in Syracuse. The passage is best interpreted both literally and as having thematic relevance to the ode as a whole. It is an example of how events surrounding composition of the poem have influenced the content. There are other examples, and if we knew more about Pindar's life still more would probably surface: Nemean 3 and Olympian 10 were, he says, composed late and behind schedule: 0,10.3-8 ἐγὼ τοδὲ τοῦ... ἐκεῖνη ἐπομνημονεύσαι μὲν κατοικήσαντες βαθῶν ἐπομνημονεύσαι (note how he calls the time of victory κείσαι κατὰ ἤρων 102; N3.76-80 ἑστὶν τοδὲ τοι περὶ τῶν... περὶ δοιμαν αἰλικοῖν ἐκ πυλών αὐ̃λων, ὁπερ...
Pythian 6 gives the impression of having been written for a procession to Apollo's temple at Delphi: P. 6.3-6καλὸν ἐπιβρῶμεν Χρονίς ἐς ναόν προσκυνήμενοι, Πυθιανικε ἐνεβα... But one must tread carefully: 0.10.99-100 ταῖς ἔφαντο. Ὀπλ. 〈§〉 Ἀρχεστράτου κυνηγα, τὸν ἔτην κρατήρια Χερσὶ ἀλάς, suggests Pindar had seen Hagesidamos win; but ἔφανο could here mean 'realised', 'learnt';98 Olympian 4.1-3 Ἐν οἴνοις ἐλλειμένοι, ἐπεμψαν ἅδηλοτάτων μάρτυρι ἥθαλας suggests he had witnessed the Games, but had he?99 The first strophe and antistrophe of Pythian 11 may suggest that the poem was performed during an evening procession to the temple at Thebes of Apollo Ismenios, but thereafter no more is heard of goings-on at the temple and the invocation to Semele and Ino to gather at the temple could be just a dramatic and imaginative way to start the poem.

§13 The idea that Pindar was inspired to write while sitting at home is implausible; so is the idea that what he wrote was influenced neither by preceding events nor by the occasion of the performance.100 But a topos can be conventional - already used elsewhere by the poet or others - and still be grounded in reality: the content of day-to-day life has some recurring events too.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The victor may have wanted to be praised by Pindar throughout the ode; Pindar has other ideas. His epinicians are a varied collection; to speak of the standard form of his odes can mislead. Of course Pindar does make parts of the ode relevant to the victor, but he does so in many different ways; this applies particularly to the myths in them: older versions are regularly altered to suit where the victor came from, or what event he won in, or a special characteristic of his; or the match maybe on a more general basis, Pindar's descriptions
of both myth and victory highlighting shared themes such as success, envy, the vicissitudes of fortune. The odes are written in a variety of styles, the occasion for which the ode was written often influencing the style; special features characterise odes written to accompany a komos or victory procession. The performance of the ode is regularly tied down by the deictic pronoun applied to the poem itself, komoi, or a particular locality. But one must bear in mind that the occasion may have lain not in the Greek world, but only in Pindar's imagination; some of the odes, moreover, do not appear to have been written for any particular performance or venue, real or imagined, or in honour of a particular victory. The Alexandrians classified them all as epinicians, but this should not be allowed to obscure their variety, particularly the variety of ways in which they relate to victory.
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11. See Maehler's commentary 302-3, but see also C. Carey's remark in JHS 103(1982) 165.

12. See Slater s.vv.

13. A Boeckh, Pindari Opera quae Supersunt (Leipzig 1811-21); the commentary on the Nemeans is by C. Dissen who later produced his own Pindari Carmina quae Supersunt (Gotha and Erfurt 1830).


18. Another modern advocate of this theory is M. Lefkowitz in The Victory Ode: an introduction (New Jersey 1976) - see page 3.


22. Especially in his Pindaros (Berlin 1922), but first earlier in his examination of Olympian Six in his Isyllos von
Epidauros (Berlin 1886).

23. The tendency is exemplified by G. Perrotta's Saffo e Pindaro (Bari 1935), reprinted in his Pindaro (Rome 1958).

24. W Schadewaldt, Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion (Halle 1928).


27. PBA 69 (1983) 139-63.


29. See the review of Bundy's work by G.M. Kirkwood in Gnomon 35(1963) 130-3; he classes Bundy as a critic "driven by a compelling idea" and says rightly that, "It is a pity that the initial presentation of a new study of Pindar's art does not undertake to discuss one of its most characteristic features, and one that preeminently challenges the thesis of the universal primary of encomium in the epinician ode."

30. I agree with D.C. Young op. cit.(note 17) 87 that, 'Most of Pindar is, in Bundy's terms, foil, and such an attitude creates a major problem'.


32. See Commentary ad loc.

33. See note 10.


36. This fact is a thorn in the theory of the American scholar W. Mullen in his Choreia: Pindar and Dance (Princeton 1982),
which hinges on the notion that the crucial part of Pindar's epinicians is the epode; his theory cannot cater for the monostrophic odes (see page 99).

37. Cf. Bacchylides 14B, which may have been written (like N.11) to honour someone's assumption of a new office: see Maehler's commentary 302-3, but see also C. Carey's remark in JHS 103 (1983) 165.

38. See Slater s.vv.


40. Compare the story of Niobe in Homer (11.24.602f.); as M.M. Willcock has shown (C.Q. 14, 1964, 140f.) some details have been added to the traditional story to make it more analogous to the plight of Priam, but some (e.g. that she is now in Sipylos where the nymphs live who saunter round Acheloos) are told to embellish it.

41. The reference to Aias and Hector at N.2.14 is an example: a substantial knowledge of Iliad Seven is needed, especially lines 191f. where lots are drawn to decide who should fight Hector, Aias wins, announces to his friends that he expects to beat Hector because he was not born in Salamis for nothing, and then threateningly shouts to Hector to take up the challenge. According to Hamilton (op.cit. in note 10, p29) Nemean 2 lacks myth and only contains a mythic example.

42. Hamilton op.cit.14.


44. The other is Olympian 2.

45. And, perhaps adopt a loftier tone: Paean 9 is cited in part by Dionysius of Halicarnassus to illustrate \( \lambda \epsilon ^{i} \lambda ^{j} \), and questions are a source of \( v \psi \alpha \) for
pseudo-Longinus (πρὸς Λογίνος 18) because they shake the listener's attention.

46. Bacch.18/dith.4 Snell.


48. Not touched on by F. Dornseiff, Pindars Stil (Berlin 1921).

49. For due emphasis on the variety of ways, sometimes more than one, in which a myth may be relevant to the rest of the ode, see Lloyd-Jones loc.cit. (in note 27) 151-3.

50. Hieron was Simonides's host: Sim. Fr. eleg. 7(W). For the background: Sch.0.2.296e quoting Didymus who cited the Sicilian Timaios.

51. The way in which Phalaris is an example for Hieron is made very clear by lines 95-9; in contrast, the relevance to the victor's situation of Agamemnon's fate as described in Pythian 11 is not clearly spelt out.


53. Sch.0.9.86c; cf. Sch. 0.9.86a τὴν Πρωτογενείαν Ὀμάντως τοῖς Ἡλείοις βασιλέως ἡμὶ θυγατέρα, ἄλλων τὴν Πρωτογενείαν Πύρως καὶ Δευκαλίωνος λεγόμεν̄, ὡς Θησεύδης ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ ἐ (FGrH 3F23).

54. The scholiasts take objection to this: they assume γὰρ to be understood after πρὶν and interpret πρὶν as 'before' in the sense 'earlier', and make Zeus's love-making with Protogeneia antecedent the κεῖσθαι ἢ ἔχειν... ἕμετερον πρόχειρων clause (Sch.0.9.85a πρόσθετα σύνθεσις γὰρ, οὔ ἡ συν- ἀρμοστέας δ' λόγος ταῖς ἀνωθέν, καὶ εἰπε' πρὶν γάρ Ὁλύμπως ἄγερναν; Sch. 0.9.85b τὸ γάρ παλαιὸν δ' Ζεὺς...
55. Hes. Fr. 234/frag. epic. in Sch. 0.9.70d ἐτεῖ γὰρ Λακρας
λελέγων ἡμίστηλα λαδον, / τοὺς ἐκ πτερὸς κρόνιδας. Ζεύς ἔδιδε
μῆκος εἰςδὲ/ λεκτος ἐκ γκήλα λαδον πᾶρε Δευκάλων/ ἐκ δὲ
λίθων ἐγένετο βροτι, λοιπον δὲ καλέσται.

56. Sic mss. Ρέκτατι Wil., Von der Mühll, Τετράτης Αḥrens. Lines 45-6 are a notorious crux (see P. Von der Mühll, M.H.21, 1964, 50f.); in favour of Τετράτης is that it gives a significant responation at the same place in the strophe with Τετράτης in line 68 (cf. P.8.2 meγειστάνει, ν. 22 δικαίοστείς; P.11.2 Νηρείδων ὡ τ ήρείδων; O.7.20 Τλαπτέρηων ὡ 77 Τλαπτέρηων; O.6.77 Ἀγίστα ὡ 98 Ἀγίστα).

One then follows the explanation of Sch.0.8.60a ἵνας κατὰ
τὴν ἀρκετὸν ὧ τῶν κατὰς ἀρθρῶν ἑξερθῆται. ὅτε μὲν γὰρ λέγει
πρῶτοι, οὐ συγκαταρθήσεται Ἀρκετ. ὅτε δὲ λέγει, τετράτης, συγκαταρθήσεται ἂν.

Good sense is given by ἀρκετος if the clause is interpreted
as if ἀλλὰ ἀρκετος ἀρκετος. ἀρκετος ἀλήκτεσθαι καὶ
ἀρκετος τετελοσθείς, ἀλήκτεσθαι καὶ
for the ellipse of ἀλήκτεσθαι cf. N.8.21-2
ὤτε ἔλεγον ἐφοντεοίν ἀρτετεί, ἐξ ἐσθεὶν ἐν
(see o. φθόνος).

57. By reading τύμω at 11.5.397, Didymus follows Aristarchos

58. Cf.Sch.I.8.57b διαθέσωσαι ὦ τελ ῥομπες καὶ ἴδε ἐρώτους
tο Πίνδαρος καὶ Ποιητικὰς ὑποθέσας διαθέσωσαι τοῦ γκήλα
η ἑρώτησα τοῦ καθκολοῦθεν καὶ Πίνδαρος.


61. Ἀχιλλῆς ἔκταμνὰς ἰκράπει (1.8.51-2); there are two images here; in (1) ἰκράπει is metaphorical, and the image is of Achilles killing the Trojan sinews or leaders, i.e. Memnon, Hector etc.; in (2) ἰκράπει is literally sinews and the image is of Achilles slashing Trojan hamstrings. Cf.II.17.522 ἰκράπει τῷ ἔμμεσῳ [ἰκράπει] and see M.S. Silk, Interaction in Poetic Imagery (Cambridge 1974) 106.


63. Line 23 ὅνυμας κεφαλῆς πολλὰς νομέας is particularly naive, contrasting with the more allusive pun on the name Iamos at 0.6.47.

64. See LSJ s.v. μέες ἴος; cf. Ar.Nub 1047 εὖθεν γορίς ἐχ' ἴος μέες λαβὼν ἀρικτον.


67. See E.N. Gardiner, JHS 25,190S, 27-8; the verb is used of wrestlers to mean 'wrenched' or 'gripped' in the fight in the Iliad between Aias and Odysseus, 11.23.715

68. Cf.Sch.N.10.35 διατί δὲ εἰς τὰ ἃ ἔρχεται παρειδήματος, ὅτι ἐδίνης ἐν ἐνικῇ ὤ Θεός, τὰ ἐκτρομον, οὐκ ἡ ἐπίθεσις οὔτε ἐκτρομάτε ἔχων.

69. According to Mullen, op.cit. (in note 36) 24, when Pindar speaks of 'this komos' he is not referring to a real komos but speaking metaphorically of the ode: "Thus the ode calls itself a komos here and now .... And, more emphatically, it
uses language suggesting that it is itself only a prelude to the real komos which will take place once its last words are finished". This view is implausible: since komoi included singing, and since Pindar's odes were sung, it is more plausible to suggest that those odes which mention 'this komos' were designed to be sung as part of the komos and that 'this komos' refers to a real komos taking place.

70. This is the implication of lines 1-9.

71. Cf. E. Thummer, Die Isthmischen Gedichte (Heidelberg 1969) i.i.27: "Keine andere Isthmischen Ode beginnt so schmucklos und sachlich"; Sch.I.8.83 (ad 38 τὸ μὲν ἔρμην τὸνο ἱκουμένης ἡ τῆς ἔμμην γύμνην, οἶον τὸ μὲν ἔρημον ἀρέσκεν ἐστὶ τὸνο. ἂν δὲ λέγει ἐγώ κελέω τόι ἰδήνα... cf. I.55 ὁ ἱππότης.\[8\]

72. For the corrupt last sentence (I.8.70) I suggest ἵππον ἁρ ὁδόν ἄπειρον ὑπὸ Χείρον καμάριν διόματοι: 'for, labouring he has conquered by means of his hands some pretty experienced young opposition. διόματοι suggests the sentence is about beating opponents; Χείρον (cf. Fr. 35 ὑπὸ Χείρον) is not otiose seeing the conqueror is a pancratiast; καμάριν picks up καμάριν in line 1: Pindar likes ring composition, to frame a whole ode, cf. N.2.3,25 ἄρχοντας νέος ἄρχοντας; N.1.1,72 σέρνεται σερνέται; P.1.1,97 δρόμοις δρομοῖς.

73. The syntax of this passage is not self-evident, but I think the best interpretation is (1) to understand ἱππος (from line 9) as the subject of ἁρ, (2) to take διόματοι as dependent on ὁδόν ('Psaumis's chariots') and (3) to take ὁδόν as dependent on ἱππος and denoting its cause/origin ('for the komos is coming, the komos caused by the chariot of Psaumis'). For this interpretation of the genitive ὁδόν cf. I.7.20-2 ἱππος ἐπίτειν ἀκομμέλων, εὖν ὕμνοι καὶ στρατιώδεις φέρεται γαρ ἱππος νίκην παγίνοντας; Poth.2.45 ὕμνων ἀκομμέλων πολυγυνών ἐπὶ νίκην. Contra Bowra (Pindar 414), the sentence does not imply that the victor drives to the shrine of Apollo. ἱππος must be the genitive of ἱππος (0.5.3 ἱππότης ἐπὶ νίκης and 0.5.23 ἱππότης are decisive). ὁδόν interpreted as a genitive
plural cannot mean 'on a chariot'; the Greek for that is ἔχειν. W. Oldfather in C.R.24, 1910, 82-3 interprets ἔχειν as an intransitive present participle, citing Xen.Hipp. 4.1:

ἐν γε τὰ ἐργάζεται ἕτερον ἐκ τῶν ἄνθρωπων προοιμίζον ὁπώς ἀναπαύον τῷ ἐπεί ταὐτό ἐστιν ἀναπαύον ἐκ τῶν ἐπεί τῇ βάσιν, μέτριον μὲν ἑχοῦσα, μέτριον δὲ περιπατοῦσα.

"The passage," he says, "must be translated": 'The hipparc must be careful to relieve both horse and man, now riding, now walking'. But this translation is wrong; ἑχοῦσα is causative (as at Ar.Ran.23) not intransitive. The contest shows this: Xenophon is describing how the hipparc must instruct his cavalrymen - the hipparc must get them to dismount every so often; he is not describing how the hipparc himself should ride. An alternative, suggested by M.L. West, is to interpret ἑχοῦσα as nominative (cf. παρηγορεῖ, etc). But the -οιν ending elsewhere always denotes 'place where'. (i.e. ἡρενεώς means 'pig-sty', τάφος means 'burial-ground) and nowhere is it a mere alternative to the -ει ending.

74. So e.g. Gildersleeve, Pindar's Olympian and Pythian Odes 171; Mullen, Choreia: Pindar and Dance 26,77.

75. See Mullen op.cit. 25-6.

76. Cf.N.4.11 where Pindar calls his ode ἐνυκάριον probably meaning 'a song sung before the komos'. (cf. Sch.N.4.14a προοιμίζον ἐν τῷ πρὸ τοῦ κόμου γραφομένον Sch.N.4.17... πρὸς τῷ τοῦτῳ ἧτοι χορεύοντως χορεύει καὶ καμάκις γραφότα.)

77. Pindar's Victory Songs 117.

78. The Works of Pindar, Commentary 59.

79. Pindaros 403.

80. See Slater s.v.: 0.2.58-9 τὰ δ' εὕρεται ὀικῆς ἀρχαὶ ὠλίτρα provides the only unusual usage, but there is still a
deictic force in τὰ ἃ: the phrase means 'here on earth among us living'. Note the preceding phrase ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς μὴν ἑκέρτιν ἀκοδόμων φεῦρεττ θεοῖς εἰσείς: whatever the more profound meaning of the passage, ἑκέρτιν and ἐν τὰ ἃ διὸς ἀρκεῖ refer to the same place; cf. Wilamowitz, Pindaros 248 n.1, "ἐν τὰ ἃ διὸς ἀρκεῖ (ἀρκα ἡ Μητρόπολες 01.13,61) ist die Oberwelt (man bedenke das deiktische Pronomen) im Gegensatz zu κεῖται γαῖαν.

81. Professor Herwig Maehler writes: "in 01.13 (performed at Corinth), Zeus can be asked to welcome a κόμος (ἐγκώμιον ταῦτα), whereas in 01.8, if it was sung on Aegina, ὅποιος...ἀλέες cannot (unless you accept Thummer 's 'poetic fiction'", that the poet imagines that he and the chorus are going to Olympia. - "der Dichter sich selbst und den Zuhörer nur in der poetischen Fiktion nach Olympia versetzt", E. Thummer, Pindar: die Isthmischen Gedichte I.32 n.11). But I am not sure about this; the grove at Pisa can surely (even without Thummer's theory) welcome the komos on Aegina in the sense of 'be favourable towards it', as one might say that London would welcome an American initiative in Iran; here Pisa welcomes the komos because the komos is through its activity glorifying Pisa. ἐκείνος is regularly used to mean 'welcome' in a non-physical sense (v.LSJ s.v.I.6.2 II.1), cf. Ἡδαι.1.6.3 ἡκείνα κακῶς...φίλε ἐκείνα το Χρυσέθα, ἵνα ἡκείνα τον Λιτωνίν; for places being able to ἐκείνος το Σ' Ἀικέας ὑπερηύων ἐκείνο probably referring to Aigina; approving of Pindar's ode.

82. See note 80 above.

83. The implications of the use by poets of the deictic pronoun can be important: lines 98-9 of Page's PMG text of Alkman's Parthenieon read εἰς γαῖαν, ἐνταξι ο ἐνδεξιοποιών νομισματικά το Σ' ἐκείνα ἑκείνα; if ἑκείνα is accepted, it becomes the only deictic pronoun in the poem and, therefore, the only word to tie the poem down to a particular performance; but on page 99 of his edition of the poem (Alcman: The Parthenieon, Oxford 1951) Page describes ἑκείνα as a possible
but not perfect supplement, and it isn't printed in the text. Better than Page's PMG supplement, therefore, is M. Puelma's ἤς (Mus.Hel.34,1977, 46f): Hagesichora sings like a group of ten (a proverbial comparison, cf. 11.2.489). G. Giangrande (Mus. Phil. Lond. 2,1976,156f.) prefers οὖ to ἤς, but he produces no parallel for post- positive οὖ in this sense; I do not agree with his remark in note 25 (loc.cit.157) that, 'the meaning remains the same, regardless of the many possible supplementations.' Hipponax Fr.78.14(W) presents a similar problem: reading with West ἐκ' ἄβου ς' οὖν συκάμιν Ἐπίκλης, καὶ τῷ κριμικῷ τούτῳ ὄντας φοινίκις one must envisage, according to West's interpretation (M.L. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (Berlin and New York 1974) 143) the speaker pointing to the tip of his penis while describing what happened to someone else.

84. An aorist in the apodosis does not always refer to past time (see e.g. W. Goodwin, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb (London 1889), section 414), but here ἄκιβε because its subject, the winner's father, is dead.

85. Contra J.B. Bury (Pindar, Nemean Odes 69), θύει could not, either here or in any Greek author, mean τοιοῦτο.

86. For ἄκιβε cf. 11.6.77-8 πόνοι οὐκ ἔγερκελάτας; Archil.84(W) δύστυς ἐγκέμα, ποθῶ; Pi.Parth.2.36-7 ἀνδρός ὅτου γυναικώ, ἐν ταλέσω ἐγκέμω, ἴπ' με λάθειν λοίθαν προσφέρον; these passages suggest ἄκιβε does not have a technical or specialised meaning.

87. Sch.0.7.init. τοίχυ τῆς θάλαττας ὣν ἕξετε οἷος ἀποκριθοκορομείτης (FGrH515F18) ἐν τῷ τῆς Λυκίας Ἀρισταίο τετράθη. Χρυσοί γράμματι.

88. Sch.0.7.inscr.a.

89. Sch.id.


92. J. Irigoin, Histoire du Texte de Pindare (Paris 1952) 8-9 supposes such copies kept in family archives were the Alexandrians' ultimate source for their texts, but he gives no convincing evidence to support his supposition.

93. Wilamowitz, Pindaros 363.

94. See W. Mullen, Choreia: Pindar and Dance 29-30.

95. Following M. Lefkowitz, HSCP 67, 1963, 177-253 (esp. 195-210), I think κατέβαν (0.7.13) implies that Pindar himself, not just the chorus, went to Rhodes: κατέβαν is a programmatic statement by the poet himself saying he has done his duty by turning up at the victor's homeland—cf.0.14.18, I.5.21.


97. So D.C. Young, Mnemosyne Supp. 9, 1968, 46f.

98. Cf. P.2.54-6; v. LSJ S.V. *εἰσίω Α.ι.

99. Cf. Sch.0.4.3e μάρτυρα δὲ αὐτῷ τῷ ὑμνητῷ; cf. Pi. Parth. 2.39-41.

100. Cf. G. Murray, Ancient Greek Literature 114: "It does not really matter what he writes about ...." "Poems like Lycidas and Olympian 13 are independent of the facts that gave rise to them"; C.M. Bowra, Ancient Greek Literature (Oxford 1933) 28: "whatever his subject or occasion, Pindar did not much alter his manner".
Neither the date nor the nature of the victory commemorated by Pythian 11 is made clear by the scholia. They give three statements:

1) Title: Ἄρεων Ἀρσενίων ἡ παιδία σταδίους (E,G).

2) Inscription a: Γεραττιάν ή ὥς Ἀρεων Ἠραῖον παιδί νικήσας καὶ Πυθιάδα, καὶ λυ βίκυλον ἡ στάδιον λίδρας (B,D,E,G,Q; after παιδί B adds Ἀρσενίων στάδιον τῷ προσφέρειν).

3) Inscription b: Πάλλων Ἀρεων Ἀρσενίων σταδίους χόρταντι μὲν ἡ ὥς τῇ προσφέρειν νικήσας τὴν λυ Πυθιάδα διάλολον. οὔτε εἰ τοῦ διάλολου δὲ νίκην γαλάζων, οὔτε εἰ τοῦ στάδιον (B,D,E,G,Q for the first sentence; B, D,E,G,Q for the second).

The problems: (a) Statement 2) appears to say that P.11 commemorates Thrasydaios's victory as a boy in the 28th Pythian Games, i.e. 474; this conflicts with statement 3) which appears to say (ἡράτταν... διάλολον) P.11 was occasioned by Thrasydaios's victory at the 33rd Pythian Games, i.e. 454.

(b) Both statements 2) and 3) are uncertain whether he won the stadion or the diaulos in 454.

(c) There is doubt, expressed in the difference between 1) and the first part of 3), whether the stadion victory was in the boys' or the men's competition.

The way out of these problems lies in understanding the composition of such introductory statements by the scholiasts. They are an amalgam of pieces of information. This is true both of what are known
as the 'titles' to the odes and of the inscriptiones. The information contained in the titles is of variable quality: in the title to 0.3 the word Θεόνικα is present because a theory proposed by Sch. 0.3.1a has been accepted. But even that scholiast says that this theory is merely what some say is the reason why Pindar addresses the Dioscuri in 0.3; Aristarchus, says the scholiast, had a different solution not involving Θεόνικα. See further H. Fraenkel, Hermes 89(1961) 394-7.

Another example of contamination of a title by inferences made in the inscriptiones affects 0.8. The title in ms.A reads Αλκιμέδονος Παλαίτης και Τιμοθέων παλαίτης, και Μελέσιον παγκρατίστης Μελέσιον, Αλγινήτης νικηφόρος. Inscriptio a, however, says only that Pindar commemorates Alkimedon's brother, Timosthenes, and trainer Melesias who was a pankratiast. The title in A ignores the fact that though Pindar mentions Melesias and Timosthenes he did not write 0.8 to commemorate their victories. Inscriptio b adds significantly ἦταν τοῦ τίτιν δικτός ἐν τοῖς τοῦτοι ἐπιτίμησε τοῦ τρεῖς ἐπεκμάκης. What has happened is that a possible answer to this question - namely that Pindar commemorates the victories of all three - has been put by the composer of the title in A into the form of a title. Likewise, the words Αλγινήτας νικηφόρος are there because they represent another possible answer (given in inscriptio b) to why Pindar honours all three - namely all three came from the same state.

A third example: the title to Olympian 11 reads Τῶν Ἀυτῶν ὁ Τόκος. J. Irigoin (Histoire du Texte de Pindare 101) asserts that it is one of the three titles which "remontent certainement" to the first edition of the epinicians. More likely this title is an inference from Sch.0.10.1b ἦταν δ̣ ο Παντόκρατος ἐν πολλοῖς συμβάσοις γράφειν τῶν ἐπίκιου ὁλιγοργίας τῆς ἀνάλυσις, ἀνωθεν δὲ ἀποδοθοῦν ἄποινος τοιούτω, ὡσπερ τι ἄρεστο.
The word ρόκος derives from 0.10.9; a more probable relationship between the two poems is that 0.11 was composed first soon after the victory, and 0.10 later when Pindar had fulfilled his Sicilian commitments in 476.

A final example: the three titles to 0.4 say the poem commemorates Psamis’s victory a) ἐρματι (A), b) ἱπποις (C,Q); c) ἱπποι... τεθρέψει (B,D,E,Q). ἱπποί is not the usual description of a victory in the chariot race; what has happened is that the composers of b) and c) have used Pindar’s word (14 ἔτει νὸν ἀνο, πάλα μὲν τριθραμμὸν ἰττίαν). This process has also occurred in the title (Μηχαλαῖος Ἀθηναῖος ἱπποῖς Ὀλυμπίας Ἰερομέλια) to Pythian 7 (1–4 κάλλιοτο... κτῆτοι ἀνοικά ἱπποῖς βαλλέςβαι). The words Ὀλυμπία and Ἰερομέλια derive from lines 13–15 ἵπποι τε μετέ τέντε μὲν ἱπποῖο νίκας, μὲν δ’ ἐκπεφαργά θοῖς Ὀλυμπίακα. So too, with the two titles to 0.5, which read a) τοῦ ὁποίου ἀναγνώρισε καὶ κέλητι καὶ τεθρέψει (A,C), b) τοῦ ὁποίου ἀναγνώρισε καὶ κέλητι (B,D,E,Q).

The three-fold division in a) comes from line 7 ἱπποκινόντω τε μονοκατακλίνεις (cf. Sch.0.5.15a... μονοκατακλίνεις, οἴκος κέλητι; the title to Pythian 1 Ἰεράνα Αἰτωνία ἡ Συρακοσιαί ἱεράτης Πύθια (D,E,G) depends in part on a scholion similarly: the double designation Αἰτωνία ἡ Συρακοσιαί presupposes the immediately following story, Ἰεραν ἀνοικεῖ τοι ἡ Συρακοσιαί ἑττί, τοι τε μετε τεθρέψα τινὰ άνακτικὰ ἱπποῖν καὶ τινὰς παρατηθείσας ὁμέρας Ἀιτωνίου προσχρόνεις, καὶ Αἰτωνίου ἀναγνώρισε καὶ τοῦ ἀναγκασθέντος νυκτὸς ἀνεκφάγεσιν (D,E,F,G,Q; inscriptio b briefly repeats the story).

53 The titles to the Olympians and the Pythians sometimes depend on the transmitted order of the poems; the order of the epinicians does not vary in the manuscripts (contrast the manuscripts of Theocritus: see Dover’s edition xvii), and probably goes back to Callimachus (see R.Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship i.130, 183–4; F.Nisetich, Pindar’s Victory Songs 15f.).
Pythian 2's title in D, E, and G denotes Hieron by πην αὖνι. But F has τίγεων Ευρακοσίων νικήταν εὐρακείαν; and in the titles to Pythian 3 while D, E, G and Q have τίνι αὖνι καλητί, F has τίγεων Ευρακοσίων. F is not truer to a hypothetical original title, but adds what D, E, G leave out - and vice versa (cf. Drachmann, Praefatio vi: "F usque ad sch P.111.91 cum E ita facit, ut utrumque ex eodem exemplari descriptum esse appareat; inde a proximo scholio, P.111.96, ad familiam DGQ transit eamque ad finem usque sequitur"). Hence a title like F's to Pythian 2, though fuller than the one reading τίνι αὖνι, is not thereby more reliable: the wording of the one may presuppose the other; they may both be conjectured from the text; they may be inferences from a scholion.

CONCLUSION: the titles may be derived from the inscriptiones or the scholia or the poems themselves.

* * * * *

The inscriptiones regularly contain more information than the titles on the date and the occasion of the epinicians; but how do they relate to the titles, and does their extra information derive from an independent source? Take the entries for 0.10: the title reads Ἀγιοβόμων Λοκρῶν Ἐπιστημών ταξίδι πτύχη (ABCDEQ, παιδός ομ.Α, παιδί πτυχή ομ.Β); inscriptio a reads Ἀγιοβόμων: ὀρθο ἐνίκησεν ἐ้าน κα ἐβδομηκοσίῳ Ολυμπίᾳ (A). To give this extra information the compiler of the inscriptio might be thought to have had access to a source unavailable to the title-compiler; but probably a source common to both title-compiler and inscriptio-compiler read e.g. Ἀγιοβόμων Λοκρῶν Ἐπιστημών ταξίδι πτύχη νικήταν ἐκτυχεὶ κα ἐβδομηκοσίῃ Ολυμπίᾳ. Because the title lacks a date, it does not follow that its compiler lacked access to one. Some of the titles do contain dates; cf. 1) on 0.13: the title in DEFKQ is Συναξάτων κορυζών ἔστιν ἐπιστημών, καὶ πενταθλον νικήταν τὴν Όλυμπίᾳ, though C's title is only
the title in EDEFQ is "Ὅμορφος Ἐρωτευόμενος Πυθικαὶ Ἰσθμιαὶ," whereas in A and C the title is only "Εὔγονος Ἐρωτευόμενος Πυθικαὶ Ἰσθμιαὶ;" 3) for 0.14 both the title in CDEQ and inscription a are nearly identical: "Ἀστυφέλες Ὀρχωμένος στάδιον παλιῷ Κλεοδάμου νικήτης τῆς Οlympiâ.;" whereas in A and C the title is only "Εὔγονος Ἐρωτευόμενος Πυθικαὶ Ἰσθμιαὶ;" 3) for 0.14 both the title in CDEQ and inscription a are nearly identical: "Ἀστυφέλες Ὀρχωμένος στάδιον παλιῷ Κλεοδάμου νικήτης τῆς Οlympiâ.;" whereas in A and C the title is only "Εὔγονος Ἐρωτευόμενος Πυθικαὶ Ἰσθμιαὶ;" 3) for 0.14 both the title in CDEQ and inscription a are nearly identical: "Ἀστυφέλες Ὀρχωμένος στάδιον παλιῷ Κλεοδάμου νικήτης τῆς Οlympiâ.;" whereas in A and C the title is only "Εὔγονος Ἐρωτευόμενος Πυθικαὶ Ἰσθμιαὶ;" 3) for 0.14 both the title in CDEQ and inscription a are nearly identical: "Ἀστυφέλες Ὀρχωμένος στάδιον παλιῷ Κλεοδάμου νικήτης τῆς Οlympiâ.;" whereas in A and C the title is only "Εὔγονος Ἐρωτευόμενος Πυθικαὶ Ἰσθμιαὶ;" 3) for 0.14 both the title in CDEQ and inscription a are nearly identical: "Ἀστυφέλες Ὀρχωμένος στάδιον παλιῷ Κλεοδάμου νικήτης τῆς Οlympiâ.;" whereas in A and C the title is only "Εὔγονος Ἐρωτευόμενος Πυθικαὶ Ἰσθμιαὶ;" 3) for 0.14 both the title in CDEQ and inscription a are nearly identical: "Ἀστυφέλες Ὀρχωμένος στάδιον παλιῷ Κλεοδάμου νικήτης τῆς Οlympiâ.;" whereas in A and C the title is only "Εúdoς Ἐρωτευόμενος Πυθικαὶ Ἰσθμιαὶ;" 3) for 0.14 both the title in CDEQ and inscription a are nearly identical: "Ἀστυφέλες Ὀρχωμένος στάδιον παλιῷ Κλεοδάμου νικήτης τῆς Οlympiâ.;" whereas in A and C the title is only "Εúdoς Ἐρωτευόμενος Πυθικαὶ Ἰσθμιαὶ;"

Many of the Isthmians and Nemeans have no titles. What emerges is the variation in the titles and inscriptiones to individual odes. This is probably fortuitous; possibly it is in part due to variation in the ancient commentaries of e.g. Didymus and Aristarchus to which our scholiasts had access. But some variations are due to carelessness. Inscriptio b (DEEQ) to Pythian 11 begins "ἄλλῳ Ὀλυμπιῶν Ῥωμαίων στάδιον;" yet E and G had given the title as Ὀλυμπιῶν Ῥωμαίων παλιῷ στάδιον. It is possible that E and G had two different sources, one saying Thrasydaios won as a boy, the other not specifying whether as a boy or a man, and that the variation between title and inscription preserves this distinction. But carelessness seems more likely: cf. the relation of title to inscription prefacing the scholia to e.g. 0.10, title Ἀγεσίδαμος, Ἀγαθοραμάτος Παρθένος τιμήτωρ (ABCDEQ), inscr. a Ἀγεσίδαμος οὖσιν ἐνίγμαν ἐκείνην καὶ ἐρήμουσαν Ὀλυμπιάδα (A). The omission from inscription a of τιμήτωρ does not mean its compiler thought Agesidamos won as a man.

Apart from the confused titles to 0.8 (v. supra), the only time an Olympian or Pythian title conflicts with an inscription is on Pythian 7 — a special case, however, the conflict arising not from confusion but because the inscription is refuting the title (the title Μεγαλή Ἀθηναίων ἀντί Ολυμπιάδα shows that its compiler thought the ode honoured an Olympic victory; inscr.a denies this... ἔτη 50 ὦτου ὀνόματι Ὀλυμπιάδα τοῦ Ὀλυμπιάδα νικήτης, ἀλλ' ἔτερον). This suggests that when inter-
preting the title and inscriptiones to an ode one should try and make them compatible. Bowra's interpretation of Pythian 11 (Pindar App.I) not only ignores the title but conflicts with it. He opts for the poem's commemorating the second of the two occasions referred to in inscriptio a; but this is said to be when Thrasydaios won as a man. According to the title he won as a boy.

Sometimes an inscriptio puts into the form of a title what is merely an additional piece of information, e.g. inscr.b to Ps.9: γραμμένον Τελεσίκρατος τεκνικόν νικαίνειν τὴν κ' Πυθιάδα ολίγη, τὴν δὲ η' σταδίων. This could be interpreted as 'Written in honour of the victories of Telesikrates of Cyrene in the hoplite race in the 28th Pythiad and in the stadion in the 30th'. But inscr.a Τερεσκρατες τεκνικόν νικαίνειν κ' Πυθιάδα έντειχε μόνοι καὶ σταδίων τὴν η' Πυθιάδα, shows that b is a degraded version of a and should be interpreted, 'Written in honour of the victories of Telesikrates of Cyrene in the hoplite race in the 28th Pythiad; he also won the stadion in the 30th, by the way'.

This habit has an important bearing on Pythian 11. Inscr.b is best interpreted 'Written in honour of the aforesaid (viz. Thrasydaios the Theban stadium runner), who, by the way, also won later in the 33rd Pythian Games in the diaulos; this poem is not in honour of the diaulos victory, but the earlier stadium victory. On this interpretation inscr.b is nearly compatible with inscr.a (though a wavers between a stadium and a diaulos victory in 454, whereas b is sure it is a diaulos victory).

The inscriptio sometimes gives - as do the titles - information deriving from the poem. Inscr.a to Ps.3 says Τερεσκρατες τον ἐπικίνδυνον ἔφειδεν νικαίνειν κατά τὴν έκκολη έκατον καὶ ἐκείπον έψωνη Πυθιάδα. και φανέρω οὖν εἰς ἀμφιθέραις τὰς νίκας τοῦ ἐπικίνδυνον συνετείχεν, δι' ἐν ὁμογένεις.
This last piece of information comes from line 73 (where, however, all manuscripts read κύμον, and where κυμάνικα could very well refer to a single victory; cf. N.4.17 0.6.26; the plural κύμονες probably results from bad memory and assimilation to the plural κυμάνικα). Another example is the story told in the inscriptio to P.12 Ἰστορούμενοι δὲ τι ἵδιον εὐμάκαιρα εὐμέθερείς περί τὸν αὐλικη θεόν. Εὐαγγελισθέντος ἔργον ἧμετερον ἐνικανίζεσθαι τὰς γυμνικὸς ἀκουσμὸς καὶ προσεκληρισθῆσαι τῶν ὑποανίκησι, μόνῳ τοῖς καλλίμαχος προτόπιον εὐρύης ἀναλήγησι...

This story comes from lines 20-5 of the ode, and is an attempt to establish an historical basis for Pindar's mention of the mouthpiece and reeds that make up an aulos and of the strange noise made by Buryala which he says the instrument imitates. Compare the story told by Sch.N.5.1a on N.5.1f. (οὐκ ἵνδομαντα πόσιν...): Pindar, on telling the victor's family that an epinician by him will cost 3,000 drachma, is told you could buy a bronze statue for that; later the family gave in and gave Pindar the money, and he wrote Nemean 5.

The inscriptiones to Olympian 6 are also based on Pindar: inscr.a begins ὅτι Ἀγγίας ὁ μὲν Εὐριπούλον, ὃς ἐν Στυμφάλιον, inscr.b Ἀγγίας Ἐυριπούλον: ὃς μὲν ἐνιού, Ἐυριπούλον, ἃς ἐν ἔνιοι Στυμφάλιον. The source of the problem is Pindar's own ambivalence, especially οἰκοτεθν
οὶ (99) on which Sch.O.6.167α writes ὅτι Ἀρδαί καὶ Εὐριπούλος ὁ Ἀγγίας. There is no evidence for Agesias not having been born in Stymphalos (cf. 0.6.77f.). Snell's title to the ode ἈΓΘΕΙΑΙ ΣΥΡΑΚΟΥΣΙΩΝ ἈΤΘΗΝΗ is misleading.

§6 The inscriptiones may, however, draw on outside sources. The inscriptio to 0.2 reads τέταρτα, Θῆβαι Ἀρκαδίνων Θηρατάνοι θανάτοι τῷ ὀλυμπιάδα. ἦν δὲ τοῦ Θῆβαι τὸ ἀνέκδοτο ἀπὸ Οἰδίπους. This last piece of information comes from the mention of Oidipous in line 38 (cf. Sch.O.2.70f. which gives an ancestry relating Thebes to Akragas and
adds Πίνδαρος (sc. Pindar) ἐν Ἱμηλίας ὥς Ἕλληνες μαθέας τῶν Ἑλλήνων (Fr.118). For this ancestry and the story of Theban emigration to Sicily the scholiast draws on Timaeus (v. Snell ad Pi.Frs. 118,119). Inscriptio b to P.7 gives a lengthy fable about the victor Megakles drawn from what Herodotus says of Alkmaion, son of Megakles (Hdt.6.125).

§II CONCLUSION: The information in both the titles and the inscriptiones of the scholia may be derived from Pindar; sometimes the format of the title has been influenced by information in the inscriptiones; this latter information may itself derive merely from the scholia on a passage of the poem, which in turn may be guesses answering supposed difficulties or be derived from other sources (e.g. Timaeus, Herodotus). Differing titles or inscriptiones to a poem may result from the second title or inscription reproducing from a source common to both titles or both inscriptiones only the information which the first omits; sometimes the second of two inscriptiones puts into a different form information given in the first. There is great variation in the amount, form and type of information in the titles and inscriptiones. Sometimes their content depends on the order of the odes, as when two or more for the same victor run consecutively. It is unlikely Pindar gave his poems titles; if he had, we would not find, as we do, manuscripts giving alternative titles (P.Oxy.1604 Fr.1.col.ii for one of Pindar’s dithyrambs, Fr.70b, and the Bacchylides papyrus for Bacchylides’s dithyrambs, Frs.15-7), or the method of referring to a poem by its first line (P.Oxy.2506 Fr.26,col.1/PMG192).

§III A further area where the scholia are unreliable is in their dating of the Pythians and Olympians (none of the Isthmians or Nemeans is dated by them). The two inscriptiones to P.11 say Thrasydaios was victorious in 474 and 454. For several reasons both these dates and
the scholia's dates in general must be viewed with more caution than is usually shown: 1) there is not always a means of checking independently the dates they give; 2) where the dates they give for the Olympians can be checked by reference to the Olympic victor list P.Oxy. 222 there are several discrepancies (examples: P.Oxy.222.col.i.37 refutes Sch.0.9.17c on the date of Epharmostos's victory; ib.col.i.16 refutes inscr.a to 0.10 and confirms inscr.b; ib.col.i.18 refutes the inscription to 0.2 on the date of 0.2; ib.col.i.14 says a Spartan won the boys' stadion in 476, a Corinthian in 472, refuting the title and inscrs.a and b to 0.14); 3) the scholia themselves sometimes give alternative dates (e.g. inscrs.a and b to 0.10; cf. inscr.a to P.3); 4) sometimes they give no date (cf. inscr.a 0.6 ἔτος ἀπὸ τῆς ὅρισις Ὀλυμπιακῶν θείας; P.2.inscr. ἔτος ἀπὸ τῆς ὕπαρξης ταύτης); 5) Pindar himself may not have written the ode to commemorate a particular victory (as with P.2, P.3), or there may be a time lag between date of victory and date of composition (as with 0.10, N.3? - cf. 77-80 τέχνη... φῦς περ').

J. Irigoin (Histoire du Texte de Pindare 48) writes: "Aristophane de Byzance avait certainement en main les listes des vainqueurs olympiques et pythiques, deja publiees par Aristote." But the first four of the reasons listed above for doubting the scholia's dates make one wonder what victory lists they in fact had. It is noticeable that when the scholia call into question the date of victory or the event they do not on a regular basis use victory lists (ἀνώγραφο; they only ever refer to ἱσθμικοὶ ἀνώγραφοι (Sch.I.1.11c) and Νηστείου ἀνώγραφοι (inscr.N.8), and both times the ἀνώγραφο are used in a general and negative way: at Sch.I.1.11c to refute the idea that either Herodotus or other Theban athletes had ever won six Isthmian victories (τοὺς ἑδὲ ὀστείτερον ἐν ταῖς ἱσθμικαις ἀνώγραφος ἱστορία), at inscr.N.8 to deny that Deinias and his father were both stadion victors on the grounds
that μὴ δὲν ἔτι τοὺς Νεμεινικοὺς ἀναγράφωσι. It is doubtful if they ever refer to Olympian or Pythian victor lists; the mere use by them of the word ἀναγράφωσι has to be treated with care: Sch.P.11.21c says τείτων δὲ ἕτερον ὅτι ἐπέτευκα τὴν προσήκον τῶν αὐτῶν νικηφόρος. Αὐτὸς γὰρ (sc. Thrasydaios) ἀναγράφεσι Πιόνια νικέει, but it is likely that ἀναγράφεσι here does not refer to a list of Pythian victors but means 'is described by Pindar' (cf. inscr.b 1.5). The Olympic victor list P.Oxy.222 also has some anomalies. On one plausible interpretation it, too, expresses doubt over its attributions of victory to an individual: in col.i.17,36 and 41 at the end of each line is added δὲς, δὲς, δὲς. H.Diels (Hermes 36,1901,75) interpreted these as ὁ ὅπουὶ κράτις, ὁ ὅπουὶ καλλίς, ὁ ὅπουὶ κράτις. Other curiosities are the addition of ἄτις at the end of one entry (col.i.30: ἀναγράφεσι ?), the reading [···]νυμνος εὐρυεότερος προν (col.i.44, for 468 B.C. when Hieron's name should be there according to inscrs.a and b to 0.1), and other slighter variations against other sources over names. The format of the papyrus (like a results-sheet) has been taken to signify its truthfulness; but it is difficult to assess how trustworthy it is because there is little with which to compare its information. Where it and the Pindar scholiasts disagree it is not obvious that it must be right. Grenfell and Hunt ad P.Oxy. 222. col.i.14 say of the statements by the Pindaric scholia that Asopichos of Orchomenos won the boys' stadion in 476 or 472, 'The papyrus proves that this was not the case'. But there is insuf-
Sufficient evidence for such a conclusion.

There are several reasons why the scholia and the papyrus should contain uncertain information: 1) their information derives ultimately from the first list of Olympic victors produced in the Fifth Century by Hippias of Elis (Plut.Num.1/DK86.B3/FGrH 6.F2), which itself is likely to have contained more gaps, mistakes, discrepancies and the like than is generally assumed (Try producing an accurate results-sheet of even a single race-meeting nowadays): Hippias had no firm or reliable evidence to go on (cf. Plut.Num.1.6 ουθ 'ωδεσέν ονόμασαν άλλην παρά νά περίπτων ), probably not even any existing continuous list (v.F.Jacoby, Atthis 58-9); early names were perhaps derived from names inscribed by the victor's family (v. FGrH 416 Fl-9; for their patchiness cf. especially Paus.6.1.1 τῶν δὲ νικήτων ὀλυμπίας ὄνομαν εἰς τὸν ἐκτριβότες ἀνάφηκεν, ἀλλὰ ταύτα διὰ τετράδες λαμπρὰ ἐς τὸν λέγουσα, οἴ τε καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλου ἑργοῦ, ὡμοί οὐ τετράδες ἐικόνων ).

No list of victors is likely to have been kept before the Sixth Century (F.Jacoby, Atthis 88), though Professor West suggests with a question-mark that before Hippias's time a catalogue could have been preserved orally by (Hiero)mnomones. Τὰ Ηλείων ἐς τὸν ὀλυμπιονικὸν θηριον, to which Pausanias several times refers (FGrH 416 Fl-5) have a local bias and go back to Hippias's list (v.F. Jacoby FGrH Commentary 111b. p.222) and are themselves unreliable (v. FGrH 416 Fl,2,3). There is no evidence that Hippias's followers (Aristotle, Timaios, Philochoros, Eratosthenes, Stesikles, Phlegon, Africanus) had any more material to go on than he did (FGrH Commentary 111b. p.225).

2) there may have been doubt at the time of the Games themselves over who was the winner of an event. At the 96th Olym-
piad (396 B.C.) there was according to Pausanias (6.3.7) a scandal over the stadion: two of the Hellanodikai decided in favour of Eupolemos of Elis, a third in favour of Leon of Ambracia. The latter appealed to the Olympic Council; it fined the Hellanodikai. Eupolemos evidently still reckoned he had won since he put up a victory statue. Perhaps the papyrus reflects this sort of controversy.

3) mere eyesight is not the best judge of close finishes. There was no electronic timing or photo-finish equipment. It is hard to see how the judges could have settled a close finish, even if they were not being biased towards local competitors, especially if they remained in their seats during the race (at Olympia their seats are about a third of the way down the stadium, about half-way down at Delphi). Dead heats did happen, when the crown was not awarded but dedicated to a god (expressed by the phrases ἵππον ποίεσε, ἵππον γένεσα; cf. Hdt.5.22, of Alexander a Macedonian prince, κορδής ἅπα κέρατοι — v. LSJ s.v. corunmeans).

Returning to the title and inscriptiones to P.11, I interpret them as follows:

1) For Thrasydaios, a Theban, in the stadion.

2) The poem has been written for Thrasydaios, winner as a boy in the 28th Pythiad, and in the 33rd in the diaulos or stadion as a man.

3) Or: for Thrasydaios, a Theban in the stadion; the poem was written for the aforesaid who also later won in the 33rd Pythiad in the diaulos; but this poem commemorates not the later diaulos victory but the earlier stadion one.

It is not significant that 3) does not say that Thrasydaios's earlier stadion victory was as a boy; the distinction
between men's and boys' events is regularly omitted by the scholia when an inscriptio is written in the light of a title (e.g. on P.10, title Ἰπποτῆς Θέκτους μαίας Ὑκανήσσας; inscr. · · έν ἅρμο
τῇ αὐτῇ ὑμέρᾳ ἐνίκητε καὶ στάδιον).

There are two possible interpretations of the relationships between 1), 2) and 3). One is that both 2) and 3) were composed by someone acquainted with 1), with 3) also written by someone with his eye on 2) - i.e. the writer of inscr.b understood inscr.a to mean 'Written in honour of Thrasydaios's victory as a boy in the 28th Pythiad and in honour of his victory in the 33rd as a man in the stadion or diaulos' and is refuting it saying that the diaulos victory was later and is not commemorated by Pythian 11. Professor West, however, objects: "Why should someone who had one inscr. compose an additional one? The scholia... have brought together alternative recensions. b is better than a, though one has to use both to get back to the original version." Why should someone have composed an additional one? To refute the bits of the first one he disagreed with, while keeping the parts he agreed with, so ending up with what he reckoned was the correct account; on an independent interpretation one takes away the reason why 3) bothers to say it is not Thrasydaios's diaulos victory that is being commemorated (the writer has already said it was in the stadion).

The best solution lies mid-way between these two interpretations: the two inscriptiones are alternative in the sense that b partially contradicts a, but not in the sense of their having independent origins: it looks as if an ancestorial scholion contained b in a form in which all of it was rebutting a, but that its purpose was lost in a later recension and
accretions common to a added to it (cf. on I.5: inscr. & _libes_. καλλίτερονις _πυλίσαντι_ γυνηφίων δή τι .. inscr. i. 28.11 = _πτοιοτέροντες_ έναρ' επὶ _πυλίσαντι_ μόνοι γέρακαται ...).

§ 6. One pseudo-problem found in the inscriptiones can be dismissed. Bowra (Pindar 402) says, "It is surely impossible that a man who won either a _κτείνοις_ or a _σίκωλα_ when he was a boy should win either event later when he was heading towards 40 years of age," (similarly Farnell, Commentary 221, and Burton, Pindar's Pythian Odes 60). But we do not know the age limits for the two classes, boys and men, at Olympia and Python; at Nemea and Isthmia there were _ούρεοι_ also; your beard grows in your third hebdomad of life, according to Solon (27.5): so at Olympia and Python you may have had to run as a man when 14 or over (albeit with scant chance of success for a few years), which would make it very feasible for Thrasydaios to have won as a boy aged 12, and later aged 32 as a man. Damiskos (Pax 62.10) of Messene was 12 when he won the boys' sprint at Olympia in 368 B.C. Aristotle (Pol.1339a) says that only two or three winners in the boys' events at Olympia went on to win in the men's, but J.H. Krause (Hellenica vol.2, 645n.3) lists eight.

A different objection to believing Thrasydaios won twice, in 474 and 454, is Sch.P.11.21c, cit. supr.; but interpreted, as it is above, "...For Thrasydaios is described by Findar in P.11 as having won at Python only once," not as "For in the Python register he is accredited with only one Python victory" the objection disappears (an extra reason for preferring the former interpretation, since it would be strange if Sch.P.11.21c had access to a register saying Thrasydaios won only once, while the composers of the inscriptiones knew of one in which he won twice).

§ 7. Python 11 itself is a source for information on what
event Thrasydaios won, but it is not as informative as Pindar often is and must be treated with special care. When the poem is for a boy’s victory Pindar sometimes makes this clear, e.g. 0.8.68-9, P.10.8-9, N.6.11-13, I.6.6-7; or he may highlight the victor’s youthfulness (0.10.99f., I.8.68f.). In P.11 Pindar says that Thrasydaios won in a boys’ event nor emphasises his youth or beauty. To guess his age from Pindar’s mention of his father, arguing that he must be more than a τάκτη because his father’s victories were παλαιότερα (46), is rash; and it is rash to suggest that he must have won as a boy because the myth is about the conquering act of a youthful Orestes – though the myth may have been suggested by a son renewing his father’s honour.

The event Thrasydaios won was the stadion; lines 49-50 make this clear, Πυθαγόρειος έμπλη τον σταδίον καταβάλετε παλαιότερα; see notes on 46-9 and 49. Pindar attributes the victory to both Thrasydaios and his father (49 καταβάλετε παλαιότερα). One can see how this fusion has developed by looking at 0.13.24-56 esp. 35f.: having said Xenophon won the Olympic pentathlon and stadion, two Isthmian victories and a Nemean one, Pindar continues Πυθαγόρειος έμπλη τον σταδίον καταβάλετε παλαιότερα, Πυθαγόρειος έμπλη τον σταδίον ψυχά τιμώντας; suddenly not Xenophon but his father has become the subject. In lines 41-2 the victories of Xenophon’s grandfather Ptolemeius are alluded to; the whole family is bundled into 43-4 ὡς τ’ ἐν Πτολεμαίοις ἐκπρέπει; ἡ δὲ Πτολεμαίος ἐν λεοντοσά. When the victor’s father or grandfather had also won Pindar regarded the victor’s success as especially dependent on his house and family (cf. 0.8.70-1, P.10.11f.,); at N.8.16f. Pindar gives to Deinias’s victory the accolade of a Lydian headband which is Δεινίδας Πελασγίδας καὶ πατέρας Μέγας Νεκταρίου ἀγαλματίτης. P.1.58-9 ἄγοντα, καὶ τείχων Ἀλεξανδρείαν καθάριζον.
often lumps together the victories of several members of one household (0.13.97f., P.7.13f., N.2.17f., N.4.73f.), and he is not worried about numerical exactitude when listing victories (cf. N.2.23, 0.13.112-3). These practices seem less surprising when one considers he believed a victorious father passed on his natural athletic ability to his son, and since the victorious youngster would have been proclaimed by the herald 'son of x'. To say the father entered the event with his son and won it with him (P.11.49-50) is an extension of these examples and a unique conceit; it is less natural, but an analogous extension, to say the son was also victorious when his father won (the sense of Καλλινικος ἑκέν P.11.46-7).

Sib Bowra, Pindar 403, thinks Pythian 11 must commemorate Thrasydaios's second victory, in 454 if the inscriptiones are right, because (1) the present victory is said (13-14) to be the third in the family; (2) lines 46-8 represent only the first stage in the triple process, needing Thrasydaios's earlier victory to make up three in all. But line 46 τὰ μὲν ἐν ἄνδρι Καλλινικοὶ πάλι is best referred to a first chariot victory by Thrasydaios's father, the plural Καλλινικοὶ following on from τῶν (45) and caused by Pindar's practice of fusing victories within the same family; and 47-8 Ολυμπία ἡ δικαίως τολμήσατε ἑκέν θ' ἀρπάζει υἱὸν οὖν κατῴκει best ascribed to a second and subsequent victory, at Olympia and probably in the horse race (see on 46-8), the third victory being Thrasydaios's in the stadion which occasioned Pythian 11 (see on 46-9).

CONCLUSIONS: the text of Pythian 11, the introductory scholia (inscriptiones) and title to the poem, and other scholia to it, all make it most likely that the poem commemorates Thrasy-
daios's win as a boy in the stadion in 474 B.C. The inscriptiones and titles in the Pindaric scholia are generally an amalgam of bits of information: some of what they say may not derive from any independent authority but from the ode itself or from a guess made in a scholion on another part of the poem. There are often several inscriptiones and titles to each ode; some are degraded versions of others having suffered alterations in the course of transmission; but occasionally it seems that two inscriptiones to an ode are different not because one is a corrupted version of the other but because it was originally refuting the other: inscriptio b to P.ll seems to be refuting part of inscriptio a.

Lists of Olympic and Pythian victors with dates were available to the Pindaric scholiasts but only limited use is made of them; one must be sceptical about the accuracy and completeness of the lists they used: despite using the lists, the scholiasts sometimes give more than one possible date to Olympic and Pythian victories commemorated by Pindar, and even when they are unanimous over a victory's date one must still be sceptical because for the most part there is no means of checking their dates independently; where there is, comparing what they say with P.Oxy.222, the papyrus and the scholia several times conflict. One cannot generalise and say one or the other must be right: it is likely that uncertainty surrounded results at the time of the event, and Hippias's own list, on which the Pindar scholiasts ultimately depend for the Olympians, is likely to have been sometimes conjectural and incomplete due to lack of evidence available to him.
ANCIENT GREEK ATHLETES (plates 1-3)

plate 1 A running man. (On an East Greek amphora found at Fikellura, Rhodes; British Museum Reg. No. 64.10-7.156).


plate 3 Four athletes: a long-jumper, a discus-thrower and two javelin-throwers. (On a Panathenaic amphora c. 525 B.C.; BM Catalogue of Vases B 134).

All three postcards are published by the British Museum.
COMMENTARY on PYTHIAN ELEVEN

1f. The whole of the first triad forms one sentence; it has a complicated and balanced structure: cf. the openings to 0.7, 0.8, P.2, I.2; contrast the staccato openings to P.6, P.10, N.4, N.6; Pindar is unpredictable. The sentence appears to end with Ἐνκον (6) but is immediately resumed by a second address and ἢκα which picks up Ἐνκον.

What the daughters of Kadmos are to sing of is not mentioned until several lines after they have been addressed, (9f.); this contrasts with the epic manner where the first word regularly indicates the singer's subject and prefaces the address, e.g. II.1.1 μῶν, Od.1.1 ἔλθα, Hes.Theog.1 Μοῦσαν.

An address without ἢ followed by a phrase or more in apposition is Pindar's favourite way of beginning his epinicians (12 examples). Opening addresses of all sorts (22 times in the 43/44 epinicians) get the ode off to a vigorous start that demands attention. Of the 22, an address to a divinity or quasi-divinity, e.g. Τύχα, Κάθρινα, starts 19; the victor is addressed in the opening sentence either once or never (depending on whether 1.4 is a continuation of 1.3). In this ode mention of the victor is delayed (13) to provide a later link with Pylades, Crestes and thence the myth. One must be cautious, therefore, before saying that Pindar's first objective in his epinicians was always to praise the winner.

Why is the opening address without ἢ followed (7) by an address with ἢ? Comparison with Pindar's other opening addresses
shows that whenever he gives in the opening address the parentage of the addressee, except in P.8 this is done without ὼ (i.e. πᾶ Ἰάμος Ἐλευθερίου rather than ὼ πᾶ Ἰάμος Ἐλευθερίου). On this criterion, since P.11 opens with an address naming the father of Ino and Semele, one would not expect ὼ: Pindar wants stress to fall on the parent rather than on the addressed child. So here extra stress falls on Ἀδμος, stressed anyway since Κάδμος is first word, because the important thing is the heroines' Theban origin.

At P.8.1-2 Ὑπαγείνει, Δίκας Ἐμμάτετοι Ἑσηχία, Εσηχία, on this criterion, is stressed rather than her mother Δίκα; Εσηχία is further stressed by the weighty adjectives applied to her (ἐπιστροφήν; Ἐμμάτετοι) and by being subject of the opening strophe and antistrophe.

The ὼ in the second address is resumptive, cf. P.12.init.: Ἐλλας after both an address without ὼ and a gap; also 0.8.1...9. But contrast 0.5.1...4, 0.4.1...6 (second address without ὼ): Pindar's style is unpredictable. The idea of A. Kamylis (Anredeformen bei Pindar, ap. Festschrift for K.Vourveris 183f.) that ὼ at the end of one of Pindar's long addresses is intensifying, adding extra oomph, is refuted by K-0.11,para.357.4: an address without ὼ is generally used to express emotion, anger, displeasure or a threat; one with ὼ is more a reminder to the addressed that he is in the audience.

1. Κάδμου κόρη: a stock phrase; it recurs at 0.2.23; cf. Il.3.807 κόρων Κάδμειον; Th.302(Phg) Κάδμη; κόρη; E.Bacch.

2-3 Η Ἀδρίαν κόρη.

1-2. Ἐφελκέντο...ἀνυμήπτης ἦν ὥστε Ναυρεζίκ: So Snell; but why ἀνυμήπτης and not ἀνυμητικός (sic mss.; cf. Inscr.a τὸ καὶ ἀνυμήπτης ὡς τοῦ ἦ λαμπράτις [τις]? Why ἦν (mss.) and not ἦ ὥστε?

Any discussion must distinguish syntax from morphology,
which Kambylis (loc.cit.136-8) fails to do; whether one favours Ἀγαθή (rejected by Kambylis loc.cit.138f.n.3) or Ἀγαθαίς, syntactically Ἐτέλλη is vocative but morphologically it is nominative notwithstanding.

The only reason for reading Ἀγαθή is that the epithet is then morphologically and syntactically parallel to Ino's epithet which is guaranteed by the metre. But is this parallelism a sufficient reason for reading Ἀγαθή?

Sch.P.11.Inscr.a says τῷ Ἀγαθάς ἄντι τὸν ὣς Ἀγαθάτης [ἡνίοι] ὥς ἔριτρος [Ili.3.277] Ἡλέους [Od.17.415] ἦδε διὸ Ἀγαθάς μᾶλλον ἄντι τῷ κόμῳ. But neither Homeric example is relevant: Ἡλέους is justifiably the second of two addresses (see below), or by attraction to the case of τῷ (cf. Ili.394-5 Ἀδριανή, θυγάτηρ, ἐκ τοῦ ἔριτρος, ἶσον τῷ ὥς ...). As for Ἠλέους, Ἠλία would give a different meaning (see M.L.West, Glotta 44, 1966-7, 139-44: Ἠλέους generally means 'please' and is less emotional; Χῖρε Ἠλέους is a set phrase).

There are two defences of Ἀγαθάς. 1) Names in -άς are prone more than other name-formations to the nominative form in an address where syntactically they function as a vocative (cf. P. Maas, Rh.M.68,1913,362-3/Kl.Schr.80f.); note that Zenodotus read Ἐτέλλης at Ili.3.385 τῷ Ἐτέλλῃ ταὐτάτικος, and Aristophanes βοῶμι at Ili.15.49 εἰ τῷ Ἐτέλλῃ τῷ γεγραμμένῳ, βοῶς ποτίνια ἤνη, .... Pindar has the nominative form at 0.6.22 ὁ φείνε, ἄλλα ἰέσων; cf. 0.6.104 τλόν...δῦοι, κρωσιδεκτοῖ τοῖς ἀριθμητικοῖς; in other authors: S. Aj.173 ἐ μεγάλη Ἐτέλλης, Ar.Eq.813/Eur.Telephos 121 Austin ὡς πόλις Ἀρρην, E.Hel.1399 ὡς κανὸν ἠμῖν τοῖς, Mel.Adesp.957 Ἀττερίς, οὕτε ὡς ἀλλέων. But contrast 0.5.23 Ἑλίμην, I.1.1 κουδάμπη Θρής, P.2.58 πρῶτην, κυρίαι, Paean.6.2 κατούσαντες Παῦλοι. The nouns in these examples are usually regarded as nominative forms used as vocatives, but they could be variant vocative forms as Ἐτέλλης and Ἐτέλλης may be (the latter Hom-
eric, the former the prevalent Sophoclean form). 2) υπώρι would leave both hiatus and a short open vowel at period-end 
(hiatus at the end of the opening period elsewhere only in 0.4, 
0.10, 0.12; for his aversion to a short open vowel at period-
end v. M.L.West, Greek Metre 61).

Conclusion: the form of υπώρι is significant; else­
where in Pindar both -ί and -ι occur as a vocative ending, but 
only here does the metre allow either to stand. For a) the 
metrical reasons, b) because all manuscripts and the scholia read 
υπώρι, c) because it seems that υπώρι, since it is an -ικ word, could be used by Pindar as a vocative, for these reasons it 
is best to read υπώρι.

Why ἴνω and not ἴνα? Everywhere else in Pindar feminine 
nouns ending -ω in the nominative form end -άι in the vocative: 
0.14.21 Αἰολί, Fr.940 Λυσί, Paean 6.2 Πυθώ. So too in Bacchydiles: 
8.33 κλέον, 12.2 ζηλοῦν κλέον; cf. II.21.498 Λητόι. 
Since ὑπάπαρμα is guaranteed by the metre one would expect ἴνα.

Sometimes Greek appears to have followed the Indo-European 
rule that only the first of two addressees is put in the vocative 
(v. West ad Hes.Theog.964 νήσοι τ' ἦτεροι τε καὶ ἄμοιρος ἐνδοξή πάντως). 
The rule would account for Od.3.276-7 Ζεώ παππο ... Ηέλιος [Σ]; 
Hym. Hom.29.13 Χαρίς Κρόνου θυγατέρ, σὺ τε καὶ Χανοφράκτης Έρμης; 
PMG 1018b 
The rule is the exception rather than the 

For the nominative and imperative cf. Ar.Ach.155 οἱ θεοί τε σεῦρ
οῖκ Θεοὺς ἰτικεύον. The rule is the exception rather than the
rule in Greek. Contrast Pi.0.14.13f. Α"γυλάκα φιλεύμετρε τ' Ἑφρεώνικα...Θαλ' ἐτε ἐξερέμιστε; [Aesch]P.V.90f. "Σε σίκι καθ' 
καὶ τὰ ὄρτα τινὰ...Τεχνητοὺς... II.6.185 Ξύνθε τε καὶ σὺ Ποδαργε, 
καὶ Αἴτων, Λύμπτε τε δὲ; II.6.77 Αἰνέικα τε καὶ Ἑκάτρα. Examples 
such as S.Phoi.530f. άολματον μὲν ἡμέρ, ἡδονεο δ' ἀνὴρ are differ-
ent: the nominative tends to be used in exclamations. In the 
examples containing the phenomenon the vocative form is metrically 
intractable; in P.11.2 it would not be, and Pindar does not else-
where follow the rule.

Conclusion: the manuscripts and scholia read ἴνοί, but this 
is probably because the word was at an early stage assimilated 
to the apparent case of Ξυάλει and ἔγγυματικ, though both Ξυάλει 
and ἕμπωτικ are syntactically vocatives. Pindaric usage elsewhere 
(vocative form in -ο of words ending -ω in nominative always 
used in addresses), the -ω ending not being necessitated by the 
metre, and Pindar's nowhere else following the Indo-European 
rule all support reading ἴνοί. Pindar might have written Νόι 
in any case, since the nominative was originally-ω: KB 1.453f., 
L.Threatte, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions 358; P.Derveni 

In highlighting the divine status of Ino and Semele, Pindar 
follows epic: Hes.Theog.942, fr.70.2-5?; Od.5.333; cf. Pi. 
0.2.25; Alcman mentioned Ino's metamorphosis, PXG 50(b).

Evidence for a cult of Ino at Thebes is scant. Plut.Mor. 
228E probably refers to her, since she was often known simply as 
Λευκουή (v. P-W s.v.): τοις γε συμβολευμένοις τῶν θεῶν περὶ τῷ 
εἶρωργεῖν καὶ τῷ πένθους, ἢν προσέγγιζ η τῇ Λευκουή, συμβολευμε 
(sc. Lycurgus) εί μὲν θεῶν ἐκοινωνία, μὴ θερενε, εἰ δὲ συνάφιτον, μὴ 
εἰρωργεῖν οὐ τῇ θεώ. Lycurgus's point is that a threnos for 
the dead is unsuitable for an immortal goddess. The saying suggests
she was regarded at Thebes both as a god and as the mortal who had jumped into the sea to her death (v. E.Med.1284-5).

Semele was remembered at Thebes in Euripides's day by an ἀνοδόν spot where she had been struck by lightning: E.Bacch.6-11, Paus. 9.12.3. She was worshipped at Athens: Pi.fr.75.19; but there is no firm evidence for cult practice performed for her at Thebes in Pindar's day (cf. Dodds ad. E.Bacch.6-12). The word 'cult' should not be used indiscriminately; it means active devotion of people to gods and heroes, and you cannot infer that from a few ruins said to be a god's or hero's house (modern Thebans call some ruins next to the modern museum at the north end of the town 'The House of Kadmos') or from the existence of an ἀνοδόν area.

It has been thought that references to an anodos by Semele after her release from Hades by Dionysus (D.S.4.25, Plut.566a, Apollod.3.5.3, Paus.2.31.2, Iophon ap. Sch.Ar.Ran.330/TMG22F3) imply a cult of her at Thebes - so H.Jeanmaire, Dionysos 343f., Roscher 667 s.v.Semele. But stories told by guides of the origin of holes in the ground, or by a tragedian of the reason for Hades' love of myrtle, do not require for their invention a basis in regular ritual.

1. Ἀθηναίοις: 'citizen', cf. Ἀθήνη, -νή 'city': II.5.642 Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνήλιον ἀνήλιον πόλις, Ἀθηναιότητα Ἀθηναίοι, II.20.254 μέν ζωή Ἀθηναία Πολιτεία, Pi.0.9.34-5 Ἀθηναίοι Θεικτεία, city of the dead, i.e. Hades, id.Fr.194.4-5 θείν νέον τε καὶ θεικτείαν Ἀθηναίοι; Bacch.3.16 ρευστὶ Θεικτεία Ἀθηναίοι, id.11.57-8 θείαν νέον ἀληθείαν, καὶ θεικτείαν Ἀθηναίοι id.148.15 ἅτιν ἡμέρας κέρας Ἀθηναίοι; S.O.C.714-5 θείαν τεῦχος κτίριως Ἀθηναίοι 'in this state of Colonus'; cf. Steph.Byz.s.v: τόπος δῆλον τὴν ἐν τῇ πόλει ποτέ περιβάλλων οἰκου̇ν, and see Maehler on B.9.52, translating 'Stadt'. Pindar's and Bacchylides's usage is also paralleled by the end of the Odyssey formula δοξέα τ' ἡμέρα κτισματός τε πάντα Ἀθηναίοι παλαι ἡ πόλις, Od.2.388, 3.467,497, 11.12, 15.185,296,471.
2. Χειράκλης: Pindar follows Homer in giving both names; Od.5.334-5 τὸν ἐκ ἠμνὸν ἱερὸν θυσίαν, καθὼς ἦν Ινώ, Λευκόθα, ἵππα μὲν ἐν τῷ βρόμει Ψιθυρίσσης, νῦν Σίδων ἐν Κυκλάδαις ἔστη ἱερὸς τρίτης.

The epithet may denote the white foam of the sea where she lived; many of the names of Hesiod's Nereids are suggested by the sea (Theog.240ff.).

Semele and Ino, both girls who became immortal, each have two names. Leucothoe alludes to Ino's immortality, and it was as Leucothoe that she was honoured as a god at Megara (Paus.1.44.8) and at the Isthmos (Paus.2.1.3, 2.2.4). Her change of name came after her deranged jump into the sea off Corone, Messenia (Paus.4.34.4; cf. Diod.Sic.5.55.7: Halia changed her name to Leucothoe after jumping into the sea). Semele was renamed Thyone after Dionysus brought her up from Hades to Olympus (Apollod.3.53, Diod.Sic.4.25). Pindar calls her Thyone at P.3.99 as a reminder that though she died after Zeus made love to her she later became a goddess (emphasised by her epithet there ΛΕΥΚΟΘΑ - seven times used of immortals in Pindar and Bacchylides, once of a mortal, Iole at Bacch.16.27).

Εὐρὺλαθείς: by saying she lives with the Nereids, Pindar means she is an immortal divinity; more specifically, the phrase ΛΕΥΚΟΘΑ... Νηρυτῶν alludes to the story that Ino jumped into the sea after going mad. For the background to the story see W.Burkert, Homo Necans (Berlin 1972) 199ff., and Page ad E.Med. 1284.

2. Χρυσογόνος: ΧΡΥΣΟΓΟΝΟΣ Sch.; but the first part of the compound qualifies the second part, and 'having the best offspring' suits Alkmene better than Herakles; cf. Paean 21.4,12,
4-6. ἰππὸς Μελιά... ἀραβαὶ πατῶν Ἑκένος: Pindar here describes the temple of Apollo Ismenios at Thebes. He alludes to its origin in ἔν περίπολε ἐπίσκεψις Πολύκης (4) which hints at the story of Apollo's rape of Melia and the resulting birth of Ismenos-iosk; part of the story in Pa.9.41f. Τάγηνον... ἔτερην λέξεις κοίρα μιγᾶς 'Σκέφτων Μελίας σεό, Θείης.

Sources are confused about Ismenos-iosk: a) was he Melia's brother, or her son? b) Was his name Ismenos or Ismenios? Sch. Pi.P.11.5 ἤ ή Μελία Ἰσμήνου ἀδελφῇ ὑπὸ Ἀπόλλωνος φθαρείς καὶ Υμηνίους Τάγηνος; this is supported by Tzetz. ad Lyc.1211 ἡ Μελίας Τάγηνος υἱός ἦν Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Μελίας, τῆς 'Σκέφτου μὲν θυσίας, Ἰσμήνου γεγονοῦς, Καρνάμου 9.10.5 Ἀπόλλων τε παιδικ εἰς Μελίας γενέσθαι λέξιν τὰ τάγηνος καὶ Ἰσμήνου (Bekker, Ἰσμήνου codd.). H.W.Stoll (ap. Roscher s.v. Melia) says Ismenos was Melia's brother, Ismenios her son (though s.v. Ismenios loc.cit. Stoll equates Ismenos and Ismenios), but he gives no evidence for the distinction. The best explanation is that Melia the fountain nymph originally, so the story went, had as a brother the river Ismenos; then, after the founding of the temple of Apollo Ismenios, the story grew (to give some background and greater prestige to worship of Apollo Ismenios) that Ismenios was Melia's son by Apollo. Ismenos might have been changed to Ismenios because Apollo was called Apollo Ismenios; the change from brother to son enables Apollo to be brought into the genealogy. Gods prefer to rape virgins (Alcmena is an exception), so it is unlikely that the story with Ismenios as Melia's son arose prior to the founding of the temple or to Apollo's rape of her.

The shrine of Apollo Ismenios stood on the Ismenian hill near one of the gates of Thebes; his prophecies were delivered after looking at signs in the flesh of burnt offerings (FGrH326F75,
Philocharus, who was ποιητὴς and ἡγομένος at Athens in 306 B.C.).

The oracular seat in the temple belonged to Teneros, Melia's other son by Apollo who inherited Apollo's prophetic powers:
Paus. 9.10.6; Sch. Pi. P. 11.5; Pi. Pa. 7.12-18, 9.38f.

4-5. Χρυσέως ἐκ Χροσοῦ τειφόνος ἕκκλησεν: Croesus was responsible for the wealth of gold at the temple, Hdt. 1.52 (of Croesus) τὸν Ἀρδεύην τυφώμενον ἀρτῶν τὴν τε ᾑρέτην καὶ τὴν πάθην ἴνηθηκε σάκος τε Χρύσεως πᾶς ἐρμοῖς, καὶ σαφῆνες στερεῖν, πάλαι Χρύσεως, τὸ Χροσὸν τὴν λήγχην ἐπὶ ἐρμοῖς Χρύσεως τὰ έτος καὶ ἀρμίστερα ἐκ ἑρμῶν τὴν κεφαλήν ἐπὶ Θηρωκῆς... ἐκ τῶν θηρών Ἀθηναίων; id. 1.92 εἰς πάντας ἐκ Θηρωκῆς τὴν θυσίαν τειφοῦ Χρύσεως (sc. a dedication by Croesus).

Ἠσσοῦν denotes the shrine generally, not its innermost part (so LSJ s.v. ἐσσός 11.), as at Hdt. 7.140-1 ἐκ τοῦ μέχρου ἐκεῖθεν Ἐσσοῦ (sc. τῶν Ἕβρων ἐθνοποιοῦτο... ὡς τοι ἐπικείμεν ἐκ τῶν Ἐσσῶν (sc. λέγουσι). Pindar imagines the heroines entering the outer hall of the sanctuary of the Isemenion. At Delphi, at least, only the Pythia was allowed in the innermost shrine.

Ἑσσοῦς as an adjective elsewhere only at Strabo, 14.1.44 (of a shrine of Pluto).

The phrase 'enter the sacred treasury of golden tripods' fuses three separable ideas: 'enter the shrine', 'enter the shrine's treasury', 'visit the rich supply of golden tripods.'

In a phrase containing two nouns each qualified by an adjective, Pindar regularly sets each noun next to and after its own adjective, e.g. P. 1.5-6 καὶ τοῦ ἀίματος κεφάλων ἀπευγίδεις άθεείος πυρός; 0.1.11 θυμίτερον ἐκ ἀμφίπετον σκαπτόν ἐν πολυμύλῳ Σιφήνη; P. 11.49-50 γυμνῶν ἐπὶ στάδιον ἐπικεφάλεις ἤλεγχον Ἐλλάνδικα στρατιά. Less common is thin sandwich interlacing, when one adjective plus its noun surrounds the other pair, e.g. 0.9.97 ὕπαρξον ὅποιο εἰδίθην ἄθροισαν αὐτών; 0.13.23 ἐν Σάρδης ἀδέσποτοι νεῖν ηὐλίκαι ἀίματοι αὐτῶν.
0.14.22-4 νέων... κυδίων ἔθην τιτελοῦ καιάν; a variation is e.g. F.9.6-7 ἔνεικέ τε Κρόκοι τιτελοῦ μακαρόνων 500ων everywhere one of the nouns precedes its adjective; the a-A-B interlacing of F.11.4 is rare, but parallel is F.1.1.2 ἀπολόκλασσων ἐνίκουν Μοῖάν κρένων; full-blown thick sandwich interlacing, a-B-A-b, occurs at N.1.7 ὄλυμποιάνων πόλεοι ἑλέων Κρόκοι κυδάκτικα.

6. ἀληθέα: 'truthful', cf. N.1.61 ἀρετοκράτικες Τειρεσίας, P.3.27-9 νυν Βασιλεύς Λοξές, κοινώς τε ἐνθάδε ιφυκεῖν...πελάτων δούλων ὅπερ; 0.8.1 Ὅλυμπα ηδέων ἅλκεικες; Hes. Theogn. 233 Νίμφη εἰς ἄθθεσιν καὶ ἀληθέα.

μαντίνεων: Teneros and his successors, cf. P.fr.51d [τοῦ Τηνέρος] νυνιστάμεν μαντίνεις ἑαυτοῖς ἔμοικλεία, 0.8.1f. Ὅλυμπα ...ἐν μάντινες ἀδὲσπειρε i.e. successive members of the Iamidae, fr.192 Δέλτοι. Θερείους μάντινες Ἀπολλώνιου Cor.654(PM)col.iii.32f.(the succession of occupiers of Apollo Ptoios). In contrast, Trophonius at Lebadea (Paus.9.37.4) and Amphiarraeus at Orôpus (Paus.1.34) were each the original and sole occupiers of their oracular seats (i.e. without predecessors or successors).

ἀὁκο: interpret literally, not as 'seat' in the sense 'source', 'origin'. ἀὁκος(or ἀὔκος or Epic ἀὁκος) is always used to mean 'seat' in the sense 'chair' or 'a sitting' (as in a sitting of Parliament). The μάντις sat down when delivering his prophecies: S. Ant. 999-1000 ἦν τιλείον ἀὁκον ἐκβολικότοιν ἰσον of Teiresias at Thebes; [A]P.V.831 ἀὁκος Διὸς of Dodona. At Delphi the Pythia sat on the lid of the bowl that belonged to the tripod: E. Ion 91 ἄοκον ἐς γονὶ τρίποδα ἄσκεον Δελφικ.

I. Ἀρρυνθείας: cf. Paus.9.12.3 ὑλήμεν ἔσεθε ἐποιήσαμεν(sc. the Thebans) τοῦ μὲν Ἀρρυνθείας ἐρείπηκα καὶ ἑνὶ ἑρέπεις Δακίαν ὕπαθα. Touton ἔκα ἐκ ἑρέπεις ἐτ̄ ἐποιήσαμεν ὑλήμεν ἐποιήσαμεν. The marriage of
Harmonia and Kadmos is a favourite theme of Pindar's: P.3.91, fr.29.6, Dith.2.27f.

καὶ νῦν: a combination Pindar is fond of (8 times), often emphasising a demonstrative, e.g. 0.3.34 καὶ νῦν έστι δύναται, P.4.42 καὶ νῦν έν ταύτῃ, or a person or place, e.g. P.9.71 καὶ νῦν έν τοίς Ποσείδιν, N.6.8 καὶ νῦν Αλεξάνδρε. Here it emphasises ἑνδέξ: just as on past occasions Apollo has called the heroines to assemble at the Isem-ion, so they should assemble there now too. For this cletic use in hymns cf. Sappho 1.25 ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, S.O.T.169 ἔλθε τε καὶ νῦν 8

ἐπίνοιαν: the scholia give two interpretations, Sch.12c ἐπίνοιαν δέ στράτων ἐστί τὰς ἐπινοιάμενας καὶ ἐπιποτευόμενας ταῖς Ὑβέραις; Sch.12d ἡ ἐπίνοιαν τῶν σύνομων ταῖς Ὑβέραις, το ἐπὶ τοῦ λαοῦ νυκτός καὶ τῆς ὕψις ἐπινοια - i.e. 'watching over' or 'native'. LSJ s.v. ἐπίνοια say 'visiting the land'. None of these interpretations is convincing; none gives any point to the adjective. Better to interpret 'spread over the district'; ἐπίνοιαν then contrasts with ὑμαχεῖα, and the latter is proleptic; 'he summons the army of heroines who are spread over the district to come together into a gathering'. ἐπινοεῖσθαι (middle) regularly means 'I am spread over, rage over', of fire and disease.

καὶ ὡς: occupies the same place in the antistrophe as Νομισματικς did in the strophe and rhymes with it; cf. P.11.11 ἐπιστήμοιοι Ὑβέραις 27 ἀλυσίας γλυκεῖαι; P.8.2 ὃ μεγαρωπολὴ ὡς ἐπίκαι-οπολίς; also 0.7.20 Παλαιολόγον ὡς Παλαιόλογον; 0.6.77 Αὐγής ὡς Ἀμφιλοχίας; 0.8.46 τετράκτιος (v.1.) ὡς τετράκτιον (on this example v. Introduction p. ); Bacch.1.115 (end of epode) Κρήτης Ὑμάχης ὡς Ἀμφιλοχίας (end of epode) ὑμαχεῖως Ὑμάχης; id.5.3 ἀπτεφλάνου; 0.98 ἀπτεφλάνου (both at end of 3rd colon of antistrophe); id. 5.122 ἀπτεφλάνου; id.6.6. σταῖον κρατεῖον ὡς 14 σταῖον κρατεῖον. Some of the recurrences in Bacchylides are insignificant, e.g.

B.17.7 (3rd colon of 1st strophe) κλαίστε 73 (3rd colon of 2nd
often used by Pindar to denote merely a large number, e.g. P.10.8 καὶ θείων, I.1.11 καὶ θείων

'Army of heroines' would be a bolder expression than Pindar's, though he does like bold juxtapositions, cf. 0.6.46 οὐκ ἔμαθεν ἕως μελαικῶν, 0.6.43 ὡδεῖσθαι ἐξῆται, 0.9.11-12 ἔσῃ γύναιν Πυθιώδος ἄικτον

2. Ὑπάρχον: Ὑπάρχον here means both the goddess, who in some accounts was an occupier of the Delphic oracle before Apollo (see below), and the idea of justice which Delphi stood for and which is emphasised here by the obvious connection between Ὑπάρχον, ὑπάρχον τοῖς θείοις τίθεναι τίθεναι when the goddess is first personified, then not. See W.J. Verdenius in Illinois Classical Studies vol.7.1, 1982, 19-20: his examples show that personal deity and abstract idea are often fused.

In Greek literature the distinction between abstract and personification is often hazy; look at the pictures of θεία 11.9.504-12, θεία Hes.Op.220-1, γυνοί Solon 36W 4-6, and ἱβερία P.0.8.21-2 (ἐπίθετα παρέχον ἄκηται ἅβερις); the ideas are first personified, then not. See W.J. Verdenius in Illinois Classical Studies vol.7.1, 1982, 19-20: his examples show that personal deity and abstract idea are often fused.

Personification is rejected by Wilamowitz (Pindaros 260): "das Beiwort zeigt, dass die Göttin nicht gemeint ist." But though ἵππος does not in classical Greek qualify the name of an Olympian or higher god, who are ἵπποι come what may, it is used to qualify a part of an Olympian god, e.g. the head - because not only gods have heads - or something which belongs to or derives from the god; it is also used of quasi-divine beings whose names can also mean e.g. a place: Od.15.39 εἰς ἱππος said by Hera to Zeus; Hes.Theog.57 ἱππος λέος εἰς καὶ πάλιν σο. Zeus, id.Op.597.805 άνθρωπος ἱππος ἄκτος, P.195 εὐφράκτες θεοχθόνων ἂπλώτατον ἄλκος ὦ θεία (cf. Sch.P.4.25b τὸ μὲν γὰρ εὐφράκτες τῷ πολεμῷ).
including lesser gods, and divinities like nymphs. Note how Sioe is applied by Homer to Scamander (II.12.21) but not to the higher male gods; Themis, like Scamander, could be mentioned (e.g. at Pi.1.9.5) without a god being meant; the addition of Sioe adds that Themis is also a divinity - Pindar's more usual way of doing this is to say something is related to Zeus, e.g. 0.10.4 θεοὺς Ἀπόλλωνος Δίος; P.8.1 οὐράκτικς Δίκαιος ... Θείοις; 0.12.1 τῷ Ζυγῷ Ἑλένησσον ... Ἑσεῖς; N.7.1 Εἰλεῖνος ... τῷ Θείοις; 0.8.21-2, N.11.8 cit. sup."

Themis the goddess; at first a goddess of orderliness (Od. 2.68, 11.20.4: a herald; 11.15.37f., cf. Hom.Hym.Apol.124: a waitress). From being an attendant on Zeus and summoner to his councils, she developed a closer association with him (Hes.Theog. 901, Pi.fr.30, Hom.Hym.23.2: his wife; E.Med.208-9: his daughter). Her connection with Zeus's justice enabled Aeschylus to spatchcock her into Delphic mythology (A.Eum.1-4); since the 7th Century the oracle had been concerned with Θείοις, regulating problems especially about purification and blood-guilt (v. H.Lloyd-Jones, Greece and Rome 23, 1976, 62-3). Worship of her before the 4th Century is not attested (v. J.Harrison, Themis 580f.).

9-10. Θείοις... τῷ Ἀπόλλωνος γενομένης: Pytho is here the place; γενομένης means the cosmic earth (cf. P.6.3 γενομένης ἀοίδημον; N.7.33-4 ἀοίδημος Εὐρυκάλυπτος...Χρόνος; Pa.6.17.120) and Θείοις the law and order associated with the Delphic oracle (v. supra n.9 fin.; cf. Pi.fr.192 Ἀπέλλος Θείοις πάντες. Απόλλωνιδες, P.9.42 τοῖς Θείοις τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι; Hesych. s.v. Θείοις· θείοις; Θείοις).

Themis, Ge and Pytho are elsewhere recorded as occupiers of the Delphic oracle before Apollo. This fact may have influenced Pindar to juxtapose the three here, though it is not relevant to the present context (which is not concerned with the...
pre-Apolline history of the oracle. The main evidence for the three
asprophetic occupiers of Delphi is given below; it is probably derived
from a local Delphic logos. Some scholars have inferred that there was
a cult of Earth and Themis at Delphi in Pindar's day; I do not think
the evidence supports this (which is not to say there was not such a cult).

Θεώς as a prophetess: Hypoth.a Pythiorum τὸ μαντεῖον εὐς ὑῷ
πραγμάτι Νῦς ἔξορος ἔμεικε, ἔπος Θεώς (one of a collection of fanci-
ful stories about early Delphi); Sch.N.9.123b παράδειγμα ἐτυ τοῦ
Ἀπόλλωνος ὃ Θεώς χάριν τοῦ Χρυστήριον καὶ χερὶ προφητεῖ (a bad
attempt to explain the word Θεώς (at N.9.52); Orph.H.79.2f.
Θεώς ὁ πρῶτος καθάρσει βιοτοικὸς μαντήριον ἄγων... βιοτοικός
βοηθεὶ... καὶ φώναν ἄνωτα βιοτοικός ἄνωτα (etymologising). More
important are P.0.13.8, I.8.31, fr.30.1 (in all of which Themis
is εὐβουλος), and at I.8.31f. she speaks Θεώς (elsewhere in
Pindar only at P.4.71 of the μαντεῖον. Pelias received ἤ μεσω
Ἐπέλον ἐνταύχειος γίνεται μαντέρος).

Python as a prophet (accepted by J.Fontenrose, Python 375):
Hyg.fab.140-1 Python Terrae filius draco ingens; hic ante Apoll-
ines ex oraculo in monte Parnasso responsa dare solitus erat;
Oros.Hist.6.15.14 Pythone...totius vaticinationis auctore et princ-
ipe; Sch.Lyc.Alex.200 (which muddles Python with the prophetic
snake of Il.2.308f.). The pre-Apolline Delphic dragon first
appears at Hym.Hom.Apol.300; Pindar himself probably described
how the oracle changed hands: fr.55 Πυθονὶς Θεώς πρὸς βιοτικὸν
κρατῶν τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, διὸ καὶ παράδειγμα ἐξής αὐτῶν ἤ Γη ; so
too Simonides 573PMG. Ephorus (PGrH7OP31b) is the first defi-
nitely to name the dragon 'Python'.

Prophetic Earth: v. West ad Hes.Theog.463; as an owner of
Delphi she appears first perhaps - cf.Pi.fr.55 cit.supr. - in
Aeschylus (Eum.1f., note line 4 δι' λόγος τυ). Her role in the story
presumably arose after Delphi was reckoned to be the centre of
the earth.
Farnell (ad P.11.9), Roscher (s.v. Themis v.583) and Slater (s.v. θημίς) think Pindar alludes to a cult of Ge-Themis at Delphi. But the only evidence for such a cult is wafer-thin: the words ἱερεῖας Γες Θημίσος on a seat in the theatre at Athens (IG 112 5130 from the Imperial period), and [A]P.V.209f. Ἐφο, γε μνήμη Θημίς καὶ Γαῖα πέλλων ὄνοματιν μορφή μία, τὸ μέλλον ἥν κρίνοντα προστεθεμεῖ which perhaps alludes to the succession story (v. infra) but is irrelevant to a possible cult of Ge-Themis. Other references to a cult of Ge-Themis ap. Roscher v.583 derive from either[A]P.V.209f. or[A]P.V.1091-3 (worthless as evidence for such a cult).

Conclusion: the history of the Delphic oracle before Apollo succeeded to it, how it passed between Ge, Themis and Pytho, seems to be based on imaginative story-telling rather than cult. There is no evidence for a cult of Ge-Themis in Pindar's day. In Pausanias's day Themis had a shrine at Thebes (Paus.9.25.4) and in other parts of Greece (v. J.Harrison, Themis 480-1). Nothing suggests a cult of her at Delphi. The succession Earth, Themis (A.Eum.1f., E.I.T.1259f.) was perhaps suggested by Hesiod's genealogy (Theog.135) where Themis is one of Gaia's very diverse children; the passage may also account for the presence of Themis, with Rheia, at the birth of Apollo (Hym.Hom.Apol.93-4; cf.124-5).

Ωρθόθεικον: a pointed adjective to apply to ἄχυρον, pointing to the oracle's function of deciding blood-guilt problems and purification matters (v. supra on line 9 init.), significant in view of the myth that follows. Elsewhere Pindar describes the navel more mundanely: P.6.4 ναῦσ, N.7.33 μέρα, Pa.6.17 κυίσέντα, Pa.6.120 ἐφοί, P.8.59 νοστίμων.

10. ἦς ἄχυρον: there was, in the Fourth Century at least,

τὸ θηρευτόν: the expression could mean either at the beginning of evening or at the end of it. The three best discussions of the temporal use of θηρευτόν (Gow ad Theoc.11.37, Jebb ad S.Aj.285, Lobeck ad S.Aj.285) all mistakenly allow θηρευτό in temporal expressions to mean 'at the height of', 'in the middle of'. But the misleading idea that e.g. θηρευτό could mean ἡ ἁρπάς 

θηρευτό is an invention of Lobeck inferred from the common, but separable, expression τὸ θηρευτότατον (e.g. τὸ θηρευτότατον τοῦ χειμώνες Ath.3.98.6, Arr.An.4.7.1).

LSJ (s.v. θηρευτίκος), saying θηρευτό usually denotes completeness, translate S.Aj. 285 θηρευτόν 'dead of night' comparing Theoc.11.39 and Hipp.Aph.3.18. But the Theocritus passage does not obviously mean this (v. Glo ad loc.) nor does S.Aj.285 θηρευτόν, ἡ ἄρη τὸ θηρευτόν (v. Lobeck ad loc.); at Hipp.Aph. 3.18 (ὥστ' δὲ τὰς Ἁμίλες, τοῦ μὲν ἦρας καὶ ἄρη τοῦ θερέους, οἱ πάντες καὶ ἔστείθησαν τῆς εἰκότητος, θηρευτόν τε διαγόουσι καὶ φυγιόουσι μαλακτά τοῦ δὲ θέρεος καὶ τοῦ θωνυπώρου, μέχρι μὲν τινος οἱ γεροντες) in the context, θηρευτό τοῦ θέρεου juxtaposed with θηρευτό and opposed to plain θέρεος, suggests ἄνθρ. means 'at the beginning of summer.' It is unlikely that θηρευτό = 'top', 'edge', 'surface' would also mean 'middle' (v. Barrett ad E.Hipp.253).

'At the beginning of evening' is what the words mean here. Singing was often done at evening when the working day was over: cf. Pi.P.3.19, 78-9; Theoc.24.77. (cf. θηρό - in compounds meaning 'at the beginning of': Hes.Op.567 θηροκερομούς; cf. θηροκέφαλος 'at nightfall'). On θηρευτότατον Gow and Scholfield ad Nic.Th.25, Gow ad Theoc.24.77, and Gow and Page, Garland of Philip 1.1867, all follow the explanation of Sch.Nic.Th.25 κατὰ τὴν θηρευτίκον νυκτί.
But 'at the beginning of evening' is more likely in view of the sense gives elsewhere to compounds denoting time.

12. It is commonly believed that here implies that in Pindar's time the athletics as well as the horse races took place not at Delphi but in the Crisaean plain below, and that not until the late Fifth Century or early Fourth were the athletics transferred to a new stadium built at Delphi above the precinct of Apollo. The evidence for this view is very thin: see on line 49.

Pindar uses both (also met. grat. I.2.16) and Bacchylides only the latter form (11.20, 14B7, 4.14cj.); Hym.Hom.Apol.269 et alib. (sic M, mss.cet. ignorant of the vowel quantity). The distinction is purely dialectal in Pindar, and should probably always be so regarded (so Et.Mag. s.v. ; cf. Paus.10.37.5: Krisa merely the older name). is not only Attic (cf. Wilamowitz, Pindaros 71,468.), but it will have been the local Delphic form too (see C.D.Buck, The Greek Dialects 69; for the different forms cf. , , , the meaning 'over-confidence' for is an Attic refinement.).

Some geographers hypothesize two separate towns (Leocrines ap. Et.Mag. loc.cit., Strabo 9.3.3, Ptol.Geog.3.14.4); this is probably based merely on the existence of both forms of the name: note how Strabo reckons Kirrha the older town, Pausanias thinks Krisa the older name, which suggests that the two-town hypothesis is a guess. Frazer (ad Paus.10.37.5) distinguishes the two topographically, but his only criterion is his own convenience: 'although it is really continuous, the plain may conveniently be regarded as divided into two parts...the southern is the Cirrhaen plain...the northern is the Crisaean plain proper' (p.458-9).
The two names were interchangeable in the Fourth Century: Dem. de Cor. 277 and Aeschin.in Ctes. 107; Cirrhaean plain; Isoc. Or. 14. 31; Crisaean.

13-14. ἐνακέφαλε ἐκτιῶν τριῶν ἐπὶ στεφάνων παρθένων βαλὼν: an involuted phrase meaning 'adding a third crown'. ἐνακέφαλον = βαλὼν ἐπιστῆν, and 'throwing on' = 'adding'. ἐν ἀεί rules out a physical act at Thebes. ἐνακέφαλω = 'I add' is regularly followed by a dative or prepositional phrase, but one can understand from ἐκτιῶν παρθένων, cf. Pl.Crat. 409b κύριον γαρ που αἱ ἀρετὲς (the moon) τερμαί (sc. the sun) νέον αἱ ἐνακέφαλε - 'keeps on adding new light'. Slater (s.v. ἐνακέφαλω) says ἐνακέφαλο is used like ἀνεκθιζω with τι'. But there is no evidence it can be used like that with two accusatives; in the sense 'put something round someone' it takes a dative of the person, e.g. Od. 14.520 ἔπι σὲ νήλαιν βαλὼν ἀπόσακαμοι.

ἐνακέφαλω: 'brought to mind'. μνήμησαι in the active has elsewhere a personal accusative = 'remind s.o. of s.t.'; the sense required here, 'cause s.o. else to think of' is found with ἐπομνημονεύω (v. LSJ s.v. I.2). Thrasydaios's victory brought to the spectators' minds his father's hearth because he would have been announced by the herald as 'son of x': cf. Hes.Theog. 438 ὁ δεύτερος ἐπὶ κόσμον ἀπάθεια (sc. ἐν νήλαια); Pi. 0.5.8 ἔν τάχει Ἀπλίκον ἐκάρφη (sc. νήλαια).

Pindar likes tmesis; with ἐπι: P. 2.9-10 ἔπι ... (ten words) τίθηκε κόμμων; ο.8.32 ἐπὶ λίθῳ μελλόντες ἐπὶ στεφάνων παρθένων; 0.2.36-7 ὀρθώνει κύριον ἐπὶ τί καὶ πηγὲς ὀξεῖς; σφ. P. 5.93 προμνημονεύει ἐπὶ δίψα καθένας κείμενοι - either tmesis of ἐπομνημονεύω or ἐπί is a preposition governing τριῶν. He uses tmesis with all prepositions except ἐπὶ and ἐν (Slater, s.v. ἐν, cites 0.7.44 and 0.10.74 as examples, but in both places ἐπὶ διὰ means 'and therewithal'), usually to throw emphasis onto an important word; cf. 0.13.59
of τοῦ τ ραντειοπλήθους, 0.7.75 καὶ γυνὴν περίκολαν. Here the device stresses τρίτον.

The hyperbaton of μακρίνων throws still more emphasis onto τρίτον κτερίνων. Displacement of words in the opening sentence of an ode is common, to lengthen the sentence and give it grandeur: 0.6 init. Χρυσέα…Κλώσα, 0.7.init. φιλάλων καλλίστον; other stressful examples of hyperbaton: 0.9.85, 0.10.50 (Ημηθής), P.1.44, P.9.89-89a, N.2.23-4.

13. Θρικολογός: the name may recur at Pl.Thren.11.1=fr.128b.

15-16. Πύλαδα: Delphi was in Phocis whose king used to be Strophiós, father of Pylades. Pylades' paternal grandfather was Krisos, homonymous with the place Krisa, and his great-grandfather Phokos (Asius ap. Paus.2.29.4). According to Agathon (TrGF39P17) Pylades instituted the religious amphictyony at Delphi to purge the pollution caused by Clytemnestra.

16. νίκαν here represents the imperfect indicative which is the regular tense of νίκαν for referring to a past victory, though the aorist is occasionally used: cf. ἐνίκαν περίκολον in the hypothesais to A.Suppl., Sept., Pers., and in the Αἰδακέλαι = I.G. ii(2).2319-23; but note Sim.Epig.Crucc.43(Page)ἐνίκαν χιλάδις πολε(1-2)...

Αἰκακονος Ορέας: cf. N.11.34 Ἀμάνδους γὰρ ἔχων οἰν Ορέας (sc. Peisandros), and below, 31-2 οἴκειν μὲν αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Αἰτρώως ἀκανθῆσι ἀργῶν κλαμαλ ἐν Ἀμάνδους. Since in the Fifth Century Sparta, not Mycenae, was flourishing, Pindar follows Stesichorus in placing Agamemnon's palace in Lacedaimon (PMG216; Homer puts it in Mycenae, Od.3.304). Herodotus (1.68) says Sparta claimed to own Orestes's bones. To those who knew Stesichorus's story
might have been a hint at what myth was to follow.

17. ον ...: a relative connector often introduces the myth, e.g. 0.1.25, P.10.31. ον' is common after a relative or demonstrative pronoun which introduces, as here, the person or thing just mentioned into a new context: cf. E.Alc.4, [A]P.V.815.

N.B. 1) Pindar does not in P.11 have a gnomic passage linking victor and myth; contrast e.g. P.10.28-9, 0.4.18. 2) Spartan Orestes only indirectly, via Pylades, has any connection with where Thrasydaios won. 3) Pindar begins the myth at the beginning of a new triad; the lack of enjambement emphasises the discontinuity between what is to follow and what has preceded; contrast P.8.39, P.9.5, compare P.12.9.

EXCURSUS on MYTH in PINDAR: mention of mythical exploits in Pindar takes many forms, from 13 triads in P.4 to two words at 0.10.15, and is connected with the rest of the ode in a variety of ways. The myth may be connected in one respect, e.g. syntactically, but not in another; the type of connection varies from ode to ode. Generalisations smudge these differences and have caused them to be neglected: M. E. Lefkowitz, The Victory Ode 156 '...the standard format of the victory ode'; E. L. Bundy, Studia Pindarica I. Univ.Calif.Publ.Class.Phil.18, 1962,3 as far as concerns the epinician 'there is no passage in Pindar and Bakkhulides that is not in its primary intent encomiastic - that is, designed to enhance the glory of a particular patron...It should be evident that the Epinikion must adhere to those principles that have governed enkomia from Homer to Lincoln's Gettysburg address'.

By saying after the Agamemnon myth in P.11 that he must now turn to praise Thrasydaios (44), Pindar emphasises how the myth itself was not wholly aimed at praising Thrasydaios.

The heterogeneity of Pindar's mythical stories and mention
of mythical characters is brought out by the following list; it categorises mythical references in the Olympians and Pythians:

1. Herakles mentioned because he founded the Olympic Games: 0.2.3, 3.11, 6.68; cf. 0.10.24f.

2. Ganymede mentioned because of his beauty: 0.1.44, 10.105.

3. Bare mention (no story) of other characters: 0.2.75 Rhadamanthos, 2.78 Peleus and Kadmos, 9.112 Aias, 10.15-6 Kyknos and Herakles, P.4.291 Titans.

4. Mythical character mentioned, with short story about him; no link with victor given: 0.2.81-3 Achilles.

5. Mythical character mentioned, with short story about him; link with victor made explicit: P.6.28-42 Antilochos, 8.39-56 Amphiaraeus; 1.50-5 Philoktetes; 0.6.12-22 Adrastos.

6. Mythical character matched with victor; no story: 0.10.19 Patroklos; P.6.21-3 Achilles.

7. Mythical character matched with someone else; no story: 0.10.20 Achilles; P.4.289 Atlas.


9. Mythical character illustrates some other gnome, with story: 0.4.19f. Erginos, 2.22f. the daughters of Kadmos; P.2.21f. Ixion, 9.79f. Iolaos, 10.31f. Perseus, 3.86f. the daughters of Kadmos, Achilles.

10. Myth corrects a previous version: 0.1.36f. Pelops, 7.20f. Tla-polemos.

11. Mythical character comes from victor's homeland: 0.4.7 Typhos, 6.36 Aipytos, 7.14 Rhodos, 8.30 Aias, 9.41 Protogeneia, 13.52-3 Sisyphos and Medea; P.1.16 Typhos, 4.6 and 5.55 Battos, 8.99 Aias (cf. P.10.105f., 0.6.24-5).
Pindar also varies the technical connection between the myth and the rest of the ode. Most commonly a relative pronoun is the link: 0.1.25, 2.38, 78, 3.13, 4.19, 8.31, 13.63; P.1.16, 3.5, 4.10, 8.39, 9.5, 10.31, 11.17, 12.6. Sometimes a relative adverb: 0.1.143, 3.26, 4.4, 9.2. Also via 'they say': 0.2.28; P.2.21 (cf. 0.1.47). Sometimes there is asyndeton: P.6.28 (starting a new strophe), 0.7.20 (starting a new triad).

Consideration of these two points alone, Pindar's use of myth in the Pythians and Olympians and how he slots in the mythical characters, shows that he did not stick to one scheme; the form of his odes is unpredictable and varies.

The AGAMEMNON MYTH in PYTHIAN 11 & ELSEWHERE: the Odyssey frequently mentions Agamemnon's death: Od.1.296-300, 3.193-8, 3.234-9, 3.254f., 3.303f., 4.529f., 11.405f. In Books 1 and 3 Orestes's revenge is an example to be followed by Telemachos; in 11 Agamemnon contrasts Penelope's devotion with Clytemnestra's infidelity. Pindar was not the first to draw moral conclusions from the story.

Aigisthos appears to be the main planner of the deed at Od. 11.409-10, 4.529f., 3.261, perhaps to parallel Penelope's male suitors. But Clytemnestra is involved (Od.11.429f.) and is δολαρικός (Od.11.422), κούκλως (Od.3.310) and κυνικός (Od.11.424).

The death of Cassandra is mentioned by Agamemnon (Od.11.421-2), but not her prophetic powers (cf. Sch.II.24.699 οὗ καθευδεν κανίν εποικισεν); they are, however, attested for the Cypria by Proclus (OCT v. p.103, 1.2) and are probable in Stesichorus (SLO133(a).i.6). The Tabula Iliaca Capitolina, a fragmentary marble relief (c. Ist. Century A.D.) containing scenes from the Iliad, Aithiopis, Little Iliad, and Stesichorus's Iliou Persis, includes a scene that has been interpreted as Cass-
andra prophesying as the horse enters Troy (so M. Palucke, De Tabula Iliaca Quaestiones Stesichoreae, 1897; reproductions of the relief in A. Sadvraska, Les Tables Iliques). C. Robert (Griechische Heldensage 997f., 1268n.2) infers she was a prophetess prior to Pindar from her being depicted naked on some 6th and 5th Century vases, but being naked is not a sufficient condition for being prophetic; her nakedness could be a hint at her rape by Lokrian Aias. It is, therefore, likely but not certain that she was portrayed as a prophetess before Pindar; he stresses the prophetic side to her character by putting μάρτυς first word in the third triad.

Aeschylus spells out in detail Agamemnon's death (esp. Ag. 1125f., 1384f.), and the possible motives of Clytemnestra on which Pindar speculates (P. 11.22f.) are suggested by him. Homer is quiet about Iphigeneia's sacrifice, but may hint at it in Il. 71,106f.; the Cypria had it (OCT v. p.104, 1.16), and probably Hesiod (fr.23a,b).

THE RELEVANCE OF THE MYTH:
1. The theme of a son renewing his father's honour is common to both myth and victor.
2. Pindar has tailored the story to suit Thrasydaios, diverging from the Odyssey version (Od. 3.307) in which Crestes is sent away to Athens and sending him to Phocis instead (perhaps already in the Nostoi; cf. OCT Hom. v. p.109, 1.3); this provides the topographical connection since Pytho was in Phocis. Crestes's journey to Strophios, who lives at the foot of Mt. Parnassos (36), and triumphant return later is analogous to Thrasydaios's journey to Parnassos for the Games and his triumphant return. Parnassos, here used to indicate Strophios's residence, is often mentioned by Pindar as the venue for the
3. Also relevant to Thrasydaios is the moralising at lines 28-30
κακολόγοι ζει πολιτεία. τίχερ στ' ήλιο τέλεος ού μείωνα φθονον'
ο δέ ξυμηλα πνείων ξαφνιον βρέμει. Similar sentiments might have
prefaced the myth as an introductory gnome linking myth and
victor (as at e.g. P.10.19f.). In P.11 Pindar choses to insert
a moralising link into the middle of the myth; on the one
hand the lines are relevant to Clytemnestra: the citizens
of Amyklai gossip maliciously about her relationship with
Aigisthos and are envious of her prestigious position as wife
of King Agamemnon. But the lines are couched in general
enough terms to refer also to the victor's success or olbos;
he, too, will get his share of spiteful remarks from his
envious fellow-citizens. Line 30 δε ξυμηλα πνείων ξαφνιον βρέμει
means in the context of athletics: he who stays at home and
does not even try to be successful at the Games remains in-
conspicuous and achieves nothing, a common Pindaric observa-

4. The moralising at 50f. has a similar double function; it implica-
tes Agamemnon's family and household, which was a Τυραννικ
possessing ολφος that attracted envy and which was not above
τραματικ or acting in despite of the gods. On the other hand the
lines are relevant to Thrasydaios: his athletic success depend-
ed on the gods, and he should be moderate in his ambitions
for further success, aspiring to what is feasible and not in
despite of the gods.

5. Line 54 δεινω μ' ἄρηδ' ἀρετα τεγαλαί means 'I'm at full stretch
after virtues that can be shared in'. The underlying thought
in the context of P.11 is that the ολφος of tyrannies is only
enjoyed by a few. But 'shared virtues' have among their
number Thrasydaios's victory which is shared in by the Theban
community (at 10-11 above it was a κήρυκα to Thebes; at P.9, 3 the victories of Telesikrates are for the common good, τοῦ ἐν ἔννοια πολιτείαν εὖ).

17. In typically succinct style Pindar in one line mentions four characters in the myth. Arsinoe's action alludes to a version of the story in which Clytemnestra was about to kill Orestes too.

^Arcivox: Pindar does not choose a servile name (Aeschylus names Orestes's nurse Cilissa at Ch.733, slaves regularly being named after their country of origin) but a heroic name as Stesichorus had done (Laodameia, according to Sch.A.Ch.733). B.Van Groningen, La Composition Littéraire Archaique Grecque 359, considers reading ἀρχινός as an adjective = 'sagace'. But ἄρχο μounded for ἄρχο - do not occur, and it would be -νος not -να.

^Pioiộναί: cf. ἐφευρέω (37) at the end of the myth, an example of ring composition as at 0.7.20-77.

^Klytaimnθτα: "This is the only ancient form of the name...The intrusion of the late form with ν ...is entirely due to the etymologising fancies of a late period", W.Schulze quoted by Fraenkel ad A.Ag.84. Schulze (Kleine Schriften 697-8) points out that the form without is the form found on early vases: see e.g. J.D.Beazley, Paralipomena - Additions to Attic Black-Figure Vase Painters and Attic Red-Figure Vase Painters 367. All mss. here read the form with ν, but at Pi.N.10.6 the oldest ms. B gives ὑπέρτοντα (ὑπερφντα D) and M gives -χιτακ at A.Ag.84.

18. Χειρῶν ὑπὸ καταβούρν emphasising that Clytemnestra killed Agamemnon with her own hands. Pindar says nothing of Aigisthos having a role in the murder (contra Homer).

19-21. The order of the narrative - first, mention of
Kassandra; then, Agamemnon’s journey across Acheron; finally, the comment, ψηλις γονα, on Clytemnestra, follows the sequence of thought expressed by Agamemnon in Hades (Od. 11.421-9).

20. Κασσανδρα: "There can be no doubt that κακκ- is the only genuine form... Attic KATANIPA provides conclusive proof; for only κακκ-, not κακ-, could become Attic κατ(τ)-, Fraenkel ad A.Ag 1035. KATANIPA is found on a black-figure amphora, a plate, and the coins of King Kassander, but possibly both spellings are genuine: κακ - all mss. at Ag.1035, and compare Πυσαοκε, -ακοκ (v. K.-B.i.270).

πολικι μπλοκι: πολικ is used elsewhere by Pindar either of the sea or as a sign of the whiteness of old age (not the greyness: cf. πολικ at Anacreon 395PMG as a synonym for λευκο). Whiteness is its basic colour sense, hence it can also denote brightness, even of Ἐρυχ β. 647 (see West ad loc.) and 492.

Why Homer calls iron πολικ is uncertain (ancient guesses ap. Sch.II.9.366), but perhaps because of iron's brightness or whiteness when heated, cf. λήθως/σάμπος e.g. 11.4.485.

Πολικι χαλακτιrecurs at Pi.P.3.48; Slater (s.v. χαλακτ) suggests the phrase means an iron implement (cf. Sch.P.3.83a Τω λευκτρας/κεβρών), presumably an inference from the Homeric πολικι, σάμπος (Od. 23.3.81, 24.168 etc.); but there it is σάμπος not πολικι, that means iron. More likely, πολικι χαλακτι, both here and at P.3.48 means 'with a bright and shining (because newly sharpened) bronze implement'. It is typical of Pindar to give a new application to a Homeric epithet: cf. P.9.9 ἄγγυφοςτετ' ἀγγυφαί - in Homer the epithet is used only of Thetis; P.4.98 Κάι τις ἄνθρωπος - cf ίναιντιν πολικι ἐκεντρον μιστος, glossed wrongly by Sch.P.4.172, 174b as ψηλικ; rather, 'hoary' i.e. old and beyond the age when she should have been child-bearing - contrary to the regular Homeric
meaning of ἀγαθομένων 'old and venerable' when used of people or their hair, e.g. Il.22.77; cf. Pi.0.4.26, 0.6.15.

20-1. ἀγαθομένων ἔχον: equals ἄγαθομένων ἔχον; a favourite trope of Pindar, cf. 0.2.13 κρόνε τοῦ Πίνδου, 0.10.15 κύκλος μαχαί, 0.10.26-7 Ποσειδίων...κέρας, P.6.32 Νέκτορος άρμα, P.8.19-20 ὑπερφήνου ἔχον, N.7.53 ἄρκτος ἄριστος. In this instance Pindar may have had in mind 0.3.264 πολλά ἔγχρωμον ἄλοχον δεδεκέκατενευ.

21. ἐκμαυρέχοντο 'along the shadowy, sunless shore', cf. Virg. A.6.268-9 ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram/perque domos Ditis vacuas et inania regna. But shadowy ghosts fit well into a shady landscape, and Pindar may have in mind their presence too, i.e. ἐκμαυρεῖν is chosen to mean also 'where there are lots of shades of the dead', cf. Od.10.495 τοῖς ἐκμαυρείσιν, 'the others, in contrast to Teirisias, flit about as shadows'; A.Sept.976 ὡνίπτως εἰς ἐκμαυρεῖν; sa.J.1257 φοί (sc. Aias) ἄνδρες οὐκέτ' οὖντο, ἄλλ' ἡμὶς εἰς ἐκμαυρεῖν.

πορεύοντο: so V and F, followed by e.g. Schroeder and Snell; πορευόντο B and Y (and E originally, before change to πορεύοντο).

Schroeder in support of πορεύοντο notes the paraphrase of Sch.P.11.250 οἵτινες: but this is not significant since Sch.P.11.34 paraphrases the imperfect πορεύοντε (25) by the aorist πορεύοντο.

After ἦσσοτε in a temporal clause referring to the past, Pindar uses both imperfect (0.9.98) and aorist (P.3.91) indicative. Here the imperfect is preferable 1) after έπευγήσεως (17), both tenses thereby viewing the action as going on for some time, 2) the imperfect gives the background against which the act is performed.

22f. By giving these alternative explanations Pindar asks 'Which version of the story are we to believe?' Before Pindar
the legend about Iphigeneia was fluid: in the Iliad (9.145) Agamemnon says he has three daughters Χαυροθέμη καὶ Νυδίνη καὶ Ιφιγένεα and Iphigeneia's sacrifice is not explicitly mentioned (see end of excursus on the Agamemnon myth after note on 1.17); the author of the Cypria said he had two daughters, Iphigeneia and Iphianassa (fr.15 Allen) and that Iphigeneia was the one sacrificed (OCT v. p.104); Hesiod said Iphimele was the girl sacrificed (fr. 23.17) and that Iphianassa was a daughter of Proitos and Stheno-boaia (fr.129.24); he identified Iphimele with Artemis Εὔσθη (fr.23a.26). Stesichorus calls Iphigeneia Hecate (PMG 215), and her father is Theseus (PMG 191). It is likely that Iphigeneia started life as a goddess; she was linked in cult with Artemis (v. Lloyd-Jones, JHS 103,1983,95).


23. ἐκνίςεω: Schroeder's ἐκνίςεω (Lyr.Gr.Prol.11.para.62, p.32) is unlikely to be correct; though the position (2nd of a glyconic) is theoretically anacps, it is short in every other strophe.

βαρύπαθεσιον: with heavy hands', cf. κεράς κατ' ἑκτερῶν (18): her anger was heavy-handed because she wielded the axe that killed Agamemnon.

Χολος: Λάκον (V) may derive from memory of Od.4.529-31 ὤμοκα Ἀγαμέμνων δολίν ἐφαίδευκτο τεχνῆν κενολένησε καὶ δολὸν ἐκέκοι, ἀμίφος ἀρετῶν, ἐκεί λάκον. At 0.7.30-1 Pindar introduces Χολος to exculpate Tlapolémos; cf. Ili.18.108 καὶ Χολος ὡς τ' ἐφέκα τοῦδε ἁπλουργον πόροντο. Aristotle approved of anger in moderation, Nic.Eth. 2.7.10.
24. ἀποκέφαλισμα: applied to women, the verb is regularly used of them being subdued to a man by force, e.g. Il.3.301 ἁλκεύς τ' ἀλλοις ἀπεκατέρω. Pindar here envisages Clytemnestra dominated by Aigisthos. Contrast Aeschylus's view in the Agamemnon, according to which Aigisthos is a weak outsider (perhaps a departure from earlier versions, v. O. Taplin, The Stagecraft of Aeschylus 329-30).

For the verb in this context cf. Od.3.265-9 ἀλκεύς τ' τοί νῦν ἄνω ἀκατάκατά τ' ἄργοι νέης νέκτην...ἐξίσοι τ' ἄργοι θεών ἐπήρηκε δομήκι (so. by Aigisthos).

25f. τὸ σὲ νέαν ἀλκεύς: this has been troublesome on the grounds that Clytemnestra was no longer a young or newly-wed wife when she murdered Agamemnon. But Greek girls married early, cf. Hes.Op.698 σὲ γυνή τετεθ' ἦν ὄντι 'your wife should be 4 years past puberty when you marry her' (see West ad loc. for more examples of girls marrying young). At the time of her elopement with Aigisthos, Clytemnestra was in Pindar's view still a young wife.

The sense is not 'being subject to another man is a sin young wives detest', but 'being subject to another man is a most detestable sin in the case of young wives'. The detestability lies not in the young wives' eyes, but in Pindar's or men's generally. This is a common view of adultery: Hes.Op.702-3 οὐ μὲν γὰρ τι γυνήν ἐκ τῆς δίκαιης, οὐ μὲν γὰρ τι δεικτὴς οὐ δοθήν οὐλλο; Sem.7.110 καθηκότες γὰρ ἀνδρός ("denoting inattention", Lloyd-Jones ad.loc.) ὅπειρεν ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός τ' ἀπευθυνόμενον ἅτιος καὶ τοῦ ἐναχθράσοντος Archil.196A (in Delectus ex iambis et elegis Graecis ed. West) 32-4.

26. ἀμφιλοχία a hapax; its cognates usually denote impiety: Ibycus 310 (PMG) τοι ἅμαρτωλοι cf. Theogn.204, 810. But at Emp.115.3 ἀμφιλοχίας refers to bloodshed, ἔστω τ' ἀμφιλοχίας φίλοις φιλανθρώποις, and at Theogn.630 the word is non-specific, ἅμα κατ' ἄνετης ἐπικουροῦσιν νόον ἀνδρός, συνήθει, σέ ἐξίσοι θεών ἔστω ἀμφιλοχίαν.
For the word in a sexual context cf. A.Ag.1212 ἐπεθύμων οὐδέν, οὐδέν, ὡς ἦν ἷπικένως ever since I erred in my relationship with Apollo', of Cassandra (for the sexual nature of her offence v. Lloyd-Jones ad 1.1202 in his Prentice-Hall translation and commentary).

27-8. καλοὺς τ' ἐνάμαξαν ἀλλοτρίως γυμνάσαν the adultery attracts attention, cf. Sem.loc.cit., Hes.Op.701. In Homer all that is said of the people's reaction to Clytemnestra and Aigisthos is (Od.3.305) γέμισεν εὖ χίλια (sc. Aigisthos).

29. τηρεῖ : each particle to be taken separately, with the Π looking forward to the δέ, cf. Il.23.276-8 ἢτε γὰρ ἐκεῖν ἐμοί ἢρετη περίβαλλετον ἵπποι | θάνατοι τε γὰρ ἐπεις, Πολεμόων δὲ ἐπ θάνοντος | Πατρί ; A lk. 1.92-4 ταύτα τε γὰρ ἐμφάνιον... ἐξικαὶρατάτοι δέ; Πι. 1.79f. ἐκβάς οὐ ἀπελοτεράν νῦν ἐκείνην, ζω ἤ τε πολυτήν ἢπικύριον... ἐμπί δέ... S.Ant.1096-7 τὸ γ᾽ εἰκαζέν γὰρ ἔσεν, ἀντικατάτα τε... The sentence relates to what has preceded because being Agamemnon's wife was ὀλβοκ; therefore people were always on the look-out for something their ἡθόνοι of her could take hold of. For the ὀλβοκ of kings and the envy it was liable to arouse cf. 0.2.95f. of Theron; P.1.81f. & Bacch.5.188-90 of Hieron; A.Ag. 622-3 παῦρος γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ἐστὶ συγγενεῖς τόσος, φίλον τὸν εὔνωξον ἄνων ἡθόνοι σεβίσθην spoken by Agamemnon on his return; S.Aj.154f. esp. 157 πρὸς γὰρ τὸν ἔκονθ᾽ ὁ ἡθόνος ἑρπετή. ὡς μείονα is best interpreted as = ἡθόν ἐκουσά: the greater the ὀλβοκ the more ἡθόνοι it arouses. Hence the next sentence: someone without any ὀλβοκ remains unnoticed.

30. ἐσὲ καθημερινοκτρεόν: not 'one of low spirit' (LSJ), if despondency is meant. καθημερινοκτρεόν recurs in a metaphorical sense at A.P. 7.472.4 (Leonidas) τὴν μοῖρα γυνῆς ὑπολείπεται, ἐν ἔκον ἐκείνον στιγμὴν κα. στιγμῆς εἰ τί καθημερινοκτρεόν, "perhaps 'humbler'" Gow and Page ad.loc.,
but 'more insignificant' is preferable; similarly here ὅ ἄγνως 
πνεῦν means 'an insignificant member of society' in contrast to 
the man who has ἀλφὸς and is a prominent and affluent member of soc-


ciety.

Χάμολος is commoner in classical Greek, but metaphorically 
only at Them.Orat.9.126a Χάμολος καὶ μικρὸπρούεται; cf. Philo ii.17.15 
(Wendland) ὅ ταταλοκαὶ ἄγιοι ⟨Χάμολος⟩ ἰμακὺς, ii.9.13 ἀτατὰ γὰρ ταῦτα ὡς 
καὶ λιμὸν ἄγιος. But this later moral nuance is absent from 

Pindar's other ἄγιοι words: 0.9.11-12 πεπράγη τι 'ὁ ἱκέτης Πυθιδα' 
μικρὸς, εὖ τοι ἄγιον πτετόν λόγον ἐξέφυγε ("uninspired"), P.6.36-7 

βοῦς πτετοῦ 

οὐ, ἄγιοι μικροτετεῖ ὡς ἐποτος οὐκ ἀπεριφέτειν ('ineffective', Nestor's 
timely shout saved Antilochus's life; cf. ἀπεριφέτει μῦθος), N.9.6-7 

Τετελεσθὲν ἐτέον μὴ ἄγιοι συνὶ, καλὸν (where it will remain insig-
nificant).

The phrase is striking because πνεῖω transitively is usually 
used of fierce raging: Pi.P.10.44 θρακεῖα πνεῖων χάρων; [E.]Rh.323 
πρόκειται, Pind.Hymn.139 πνεύσεις μεγάλα; cf. Homer's μένει 
πνεῖως Ill.3.8 al.; 
A.Ag.219 θερεῖ συνί μεγάλα πνεύσεις τροχαῖα; Bacch.10.22 θερεῖ 
μεγάλων ζέλλον τροχ. 

of a race-winner out of breath.

ἀφβασε: πνεῖω can denote either a loud or a soft 
noise, often the sound of sedition e.g. A.Ag.1030, Eum.978. It 
is usually wrongly translated here: 'murmer, grumble' LSJ s.v.; 
'whispers' Bowra, Penguin translation; 'muttereth' Farnell. This 
destroys the point, which is that if you are an insignificant citi-
zen, however hard you clamour you are inconspicuous. Translate 
'roars unnoticed', cf. προφος of the loud and frightened neighing 
of horses A.Sept.476, of the roar of flames II.14.496.

For the idea cf. Pi.Parth.fr.104c.6f. Τιμία δὲ βροτολίθων κεκρυμέναι 
πάντι ὃ ἐπὶ βοῦν ἄρετα θερεῖ, δὲ μὴ ἐξέρχετο ἐν ὑπὸ σήμερο καλὸν κάρα 
κεκρυμέναι (καλὸν suggests the blackness of death: he who achieves nothing 
is as good as dead); Euenus in Theogn.669f.; S.Aj.170-1.
Lines 29-30 are also relevant to the victor's success: see para. 3 of The Relevance of the Myth (at end of notes on 1.17).

31. ἀπειδήθη: Epic, cf. Od. 15.52 ἡ χάρα ἀπειδήθη Σαυρίλαμπος Μενελαος.

Sometimes – it depends on the context – Pindar distinguishes men from heroes: 0.2.2 τινα βιον, τινα καταθλίπτον, fr. 133.3f. ζην.. ἐκ ταυτ.. ἐνδόθη Αὐγος. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ λοιμον ἢρόν ήρος ἀνδρώμενον καλ-έοντι (eschatological passages). Contrast e.g. P. 2.31-7 ἠρώτ.. ἐνδόθη ἠρώτ. of Ixion (v. M. L. West, Hes. Op. Excursus 1, 370-3: ἠρώτ like κόρος has two senses, religious and secular.

Lines 31f. amplify 17f.

32. ἠρώτ.: Pindar is imprecise because his treatment of the story is summary; contrast Od. 3.304f. ἔπειτες δ’ ήρώτες θελυρίου Μυκήνης κείμενι ἀπειδήθη.. τοι δὲ οἰ θυσιώτατον κυριόν ηλίαν Σικυώνος Α.Λιμ. 40f. έξεκατον μὲν ἐτος τοι’.

κυνηγεί ἐν Ἀμύκλαι: cf. PMG 216 Όμηρος δε ἐν Μυκήναις (II. 7. 160, 11.46) ζζί τα βασιλείαν Ἀχαμέμνονος, Σικυώνος καὶ Σικυώνας ἐν Λυκεδαμόνι. This relocation is because in the lyricists' day Lacedaemon, not Mycenae, was flourishing.

Pindar sometimes interchanges Ἀμύκλαι and Sparta: N. 11.33-4 το τε Πελοπόννησος τάλαι κατὰ αἵματα έτερες Ἀμύκλαις χαρέμενον έρευν Ὀλυμπίας Ν. 8.12 οἱ τ’ Άμικλης σταυρομαθείς. But here, when he says Ἀμύκλαι he probably means it, cf. Paus. 3.19.6 Ἀμύκλαις... βήκες ταρατεύτου ἄξιον ἀει Ἄλεξανδρος καὶ Ζωάμος την ήε Ἀλεξανδρος οἱ Ἀμυκλαιοι κασαβραν την Πρώμαυ ήρων εἰκών καὶ κτισματικοτα τεσσαραμ εἰκών καὶ Ἀχαμέμνονος νομισματικόν μνῆμα.

33. γρατίν οὖς ἄλλη ἐκείνη κεράων: for Cassandra's portrayal as a prophetess v. The Agamemnon Myth in Pythian 11 and Elsewhere (ap. notes on 1.17). Pindar may have reported her Trojan prophecy at fr. 521(a) 10f. ζυγικάζει[ν] ζεύγει / σωματίων κερα βλαίοις στοιχεῖοι ταξιακόν κεφάλας, καὶ τούτας κεραζόμενα καρπινεῖν λόγον... ἐξηλεί σέ μ’ [κόμη] (suppl. Schroeder); v.
Fraenkel ad A.Ag.156 (quoting Headlam) "ἐμφάνισθεν like ἐκλέγειν (201) expresses the loud and excited tone of voice which marked the spirit and exultation of the μάρτυς."

Euripides in his Alexandros had a prophetic Cassandria, P.Oxy. 2457 col.i.25f.; so, too, Ennius in his Alexander (v. Vahlen, Alex.fr.8) and Bacchylides (Porphyry. ad.Hor.Od.1.15 ille sc. Bacch. Cassandram facit vaticinari futura bellī Troiani).

'Ολλυμὴ has proved troublesome on the grounds that earlier (19-21) Clytemnestra was said to have killed Cassandra. But ὤλλυμι is a wide-ranging verb: it can mean 'kill', but cf. ὤλλυμι 'I'm done for', not 'I'm killed'. Eάνε early (31) guides us how to interpret ὤλλυμι here: 'led to her death'. As the next phrase shows, Pindar means that Agamemnon's sacking of Troy led to Cassandra's death.

ὦτει: sometimes used by Pindar rather vaguely to link events, cf. 0.1.26, 0.2.79; but here it means 'after'.

Ἥλεω: Homer recognises Helen as a cause of the Trojan war: ll.19.325 ἑκάστα ἡγύεις ἤλεως τρόων πολέμου says Achilles, ll.3.156-7 οἷὸν ἡγύεις...τόιοι ὄμμεν ὄμμεν τόιοι πολέμου πολέμου say the Trojan OAPs; but the Iliad only reports others as saying she was the cause of the war, v. Kakridis, Homer Revisited 25f.; J.Griffin, JHS 97,1977,43. For her causing the war cf. Alc.FLF42, Ibycus

PMG 282, Pi.Paean 6.95f.; for the wooing of her v. Hes.fr.204, Stes.PMG 190. Pindar's six mentions of her are all very briefly made; Bacchylides never names her: she was not a heroine from whom examples of virtuous behaviour came readily to hand.

Ἥλεω = 'because of'. Pindar uses ἦλεω c. dat. freely to denote various connections, v. LSJ s.v. B.111, but always the word in the dative refers to what is literally, or more usually metaphorically, central. Here Pindar may have in mind ll.3.70 ἦλεω;
cf. ib.157 ευλογεῖν (sc. Helen) ἀληθευτέχειν; Alc.42 (LSG) 15-6 of ἀνιὸλοντ' ἦλπεν Ἐλευθ. 

33-4. πυρωθόντας Τρώων ἔλυσε δημοκράτησο: πυρωθόντας is an emendation of Snell and Bergk (v. Schroeder, Lyrici Graeci 264) for πυρωθόνων of the mss. In favour of -θόνων: 1) Sch.P.11.47b ἐνθῆραι ἀνέβων τῇ Τρώῳ καὶ τῶν ἐν χώρον τῶν Τρώων suggests the scholiast read -θόνων (though this is not decisive evidence); 2) Pindar likes the picture of people on fire: P.3.38f. Asclepius inside his blazing mother, P.3.102-3 Achilles on his pyre, N.9.23 the Seven against Thebes on their pyres.

πυρωθόντων Τρώων is not a genitive absolute; Τρώων depends on δημοκράτησο.

34. ἀπόκτατος: ἀπρόκτα and ἀπρός, though used elsewhere by Pindar in a non-pejorative sense, e.g. P.8.89, 0.5.7, are frequently used by other authors of Asiatic extravagance, v. LSJ s.v. ἀπρός; cf. Xenoph.fr.3(68). Here wealth is meant, cf. Ibyc.S.151.1f. Πράγμα τῆς ἔργου κρίνειν ἡμῖν πολιτικῶν...[ἐξ]θαλάκτω σέλεμων περίκλης... Τρώων ἔλυσε δημοκράτησο: ἀπόκτατος is a fusion of two ideas, 'he destroyed the homes of the Trojans', and 'he bereft the homes of their wealth', yielding 'he reft the homes of the Trojans of their wealth'. λῶ = I bereave τινῶς is usually applied to releasing people from physical pain, e.g. Hes.Theog.528 ἔλυσεν Συκέραξον -ἔλυσεν here in an active sense; λῶ = I destroy, annul, usually of non-physical things e.g. νεῖκα. Pindar may have been thinking of II.16.100 Τρόιας ἐστὶ καθετότω λαμπεῖν.


ocrat : 'but he, as already intimated'. For οὐκε separated from its referent (Crestes, 1.16) v. Slater s.v. οὐκε, οὐκ E.l.e.
Σπροβιόν: related to Agamemnon in some accounts, E.I.T. 917-8 Cr. Σπροβιός δ' φωκείς 
ποδε (Pylades) καθηκέρεται ταύτα: Iph. ὃ δ' ἔστιν Ἀτρέως Υπατος, ἐφευγός ἐνός; Asius fr. 5 Kinkel Πυλάδης, Σπροβιόν τε ὡς τοῦ Κρίου καὶ Ἀκατάτλης ἀδελφῆς Αρκεμένος.

He is usually said to be Phocian (A.Ag.879, Ch.679; E.Or. 18, I.T.917), son of Krisos, eponymous founder of Krisa in Phocis. By placing his home at the foot of Mt. Parnassos, Pindar means he lived at Krisa. This way of referring to Krisa is especially suitable for a Pythian ode because 'at the foot of Mt. Parnassos' also suggests Delphi (cf. e.g. 0.13.106 τα ὅπ' ὑπερ' Παρνασσίας), giving a topological link between the myth and the victory; see The Relevance of the Myth (at end of notes on 1.17) para. 2.

Vέξ κεθαλί: Vέξ(κ) κεθαλά(κ) mss. The corruption was probably an attempt to avoid the confusion resulting from the change of gender between άκκ and Βέξ κεθαλί, and from the subject of the sentence άκκ and from the subject of the sentence άκκ having already come.

Vέξ κεθαλί is nominative, in apposition to άκκ; κεθαλά is quasi-figurative, a use more common in friendly addresses, cf. Il.23.94 τίτα μοι, ιθαή κεθαλά, δεῦ' ειληλούβας (Achilles to the soul of Patroclus), Il.8.281 Τεθεῶς, θυλή κεθαλά, Τεθεών; Simon.543.17 Κεθαλαὶ προκόπων; S.Ant.1 καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ E.Or.1380 ἰησοῦν κάρα (of Helen's Phrygian servant); Prop.4.11 Te, dulce caput, mater Scribonia. For other examples v. Wendel, die Gesprächsanrede im griechischen Epos und Drama der Blütezeit.

Κεθαλά was so used because the head was reckoned the dearest part of one; hence its use not in addresses to mean life; Bacch.5.91 (v. Maehler ad loc.; to his examples add Il.18.114 νῦν δ' άκκ ἀδελφ Κεθαλά (Patroclus) διέτριβα κηθεν, 'Εκτορ, Il.11.55 πολλ' ἀδελφῶν Κεθαλά ἀδιὰ προίκοις; cf. Hor.Od.1.24.2 tam cari capitis. Compare τα κεθαλαί, 'the essentials', and see West

36-7. ἀρεί: a précis of seven lines of the Odyssey, Od.3.304f. ἔππλετες Σ Ἓν κε πολυκρύσοιο Μυκήνης/ κτείνας Ἀτρέδων,

37. Orestes's murder of Clytemnestra is dully "not as dully as Pindar!" - MLW told by Hesiod (fr.23a.26-30 λοιπόν οὖν ἐν μεγά-

38-40. ἦν ζήσει: the combination can be either affirmative or interrogative, as can ἦ simpliciter (which is possible for Snell's ζήσει (39) and was read by Bothe). Hence, neither the punctuation after τοτεκά (39), nor the accent on ζήσει (39) nor the punctuation after καίνομεν (40) is obviously as Snell prints it.
There is no certain example of affirmative ἐγκάρ in Pindar (p.4.57 is disputed); prima facie it would be unlikely here since affirmative ἐγκάρ is virtually confined to Homer, v. Denniston, The Greek Particles 284, s.v. iii.(l); the only certain exception seems to be S.Aj.955 in a passage with other Epic language (cf. Τὸν ἄλλο κλίμακα 956).

The most plausible interpretation ... is that ἐγκάρ ... ἐγκαρ is interrogative...assertative, meaning: "Have I wandered off course (sc. unnecessarily, for which I am to blame)? No, what happened was that a wind (over which I had no control) blew me off course as it might a skiff (sc. and I can't be blamed for that any more than it would be the skiff's fault)". Pindar imagines a possible objection to his myth, but because he does not accept it he poses it not as a statement of fact but as a question so he can then answer it; ἐγκάρ ἐγκάρ the answer in the form of a description of what in fact happened. The order 'question...answer' prevents one being left in the lurch, gives a clear answer to the question, and thus fits in with Pindar's usual practice of replying to his questions, cf. (also in reply to questions about digressing) P.10.4 τί κορμέκα παρὰ καιρὸν; ἀλλὰ μὲ Πυθία... N.3.26f. θυμέ, τών πρὸς ἀλλόδαπην ἁερον ἐμὸν πλὰον παρακεθέσει; ἀλλὰς σε φυμῖ... 0.2.99f. ἔπειτα νῦν κοπαί τοῦτον ἕγε χαμέ, τίνα βαδίζομεν...; (answer, 1.95: Θερόν).

Alternatively, ἐγκάρ = 'or...?', and alternative ways of going astray are suggested. Line 41 then recalls the Muse to her duty as at N.3.28, and the anticipated criticisms of irrelevance begin to be countered.

EXCURSUS: Questions in Pindar's epinicians fall into four categories:— 1) Rhetorical, expecting answer 'no one', 'none', 'not at all', 'nothing': 0.1.82-4, 0.2.99-100, 0.6.4-7, P.2.78, P.7.5-8, I.1.5.
2) To introduce a story, modelled on Epic: 0.10.60-3, P.4.70, I.5.39-42.

3) "What's the right subject to sing of?": 0.2.2-89, P.10.4, P.11.38f., N.3.26-7, I.7.1f.


The only question in the epinicians where it is not clear what the expected answer is comes at P.8.95τι ζητοῦσι θεοῖς (cf. fr.140d (secl. Schroeder)τι θεοί).

The above categorisation shows that questions in the epinicians are largely devices to enable Pindar to move on to another theme, or for emphasis (the rhetorical ones). He does not use questions to joke with the reader, (cf. Alcm.1.50,55-6; Sappho 115) or as personal enquiries, cf. Sappho 1.19, ead.129.

Questions in the surviving epinicians of Bacchylides and Simonides are like Pindar's: Sim.506 rhetorical; B.5.86-9 cf. Pi.P. 4.97, P.9.33f.; B.9.53f. v. Maehler ad loc. comparing Pi.I.6.19-25:
"Denselben Gedanken, den Pindar als doppelte Verneinung formt, hat B. zur rhetorischen Frage gewendet, einem von den Chorlyrikern nicht selten benutzten Stilmittel".

38. θρασύδαιος : Thrasydaios and his father, the ones who would have been peeved at Pindar going off course and not praising them, cf. P.1.92f. μη σωλυμάς, ὁ δικη, ἕρεμως ἐντομός addressed to Hieron, the recipient of the ode; N.3.76f. χαίρε, σελερί, ἐγώ τοῦτο τε νηπίων also to the recipient, Aristokleides, and as at P.11.38 preceding a hope from Pindar that the Muse will do her job. (N.3.63).

39. Δικη : Verbs in -ω show forms in -ιω in various dialects; Δικη should be retained as one of several examples of the reverse, a genuine dialect form in -ιω from a verb normally in -ιω, cf. E.Or.1458, B.17.18, Pi.Pa.20.13 σωλυμάς;
Pi.0.6.11ποιήτη: (−ηπής Τ), P.9.93πεοκεόν (−ηκένον Schroeder), 0.6.53γεεν(ν)κένον (−ηκένονährens), 0.13.67, N.10.76φάντας (−εε Schroeder). ξύλες is found on papyrus, at B.17.18 and Pi.Pa. 20.13, and forms in -ω from normally -ω verbs are also found occasionally in inscriptions, v.S. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik i.185n.2.

In Pindar and Bacchylides the -ω form is confined to the aorist and perfect (contrast B.17.107ςύνης, Pi.0.5.20αψων) but is not mandatory (cf. P.4.71Δίξετ; compound adjectives, too, display both forms: B.5.2επινδόνης, Pi.P.4.237διαιρόμαι; but Pi.I.5.6διαινοματικ).

Whether Δύπαξ etc. should be termed hyperdoric (so e.g. H. Maehler, die Lieder des Bakchylides i.10; Snell, ed. Bacch. XIX) depends on it being proven that the only genuine forms known to Pindar were in -ω. K. Strunk, Glotta 42, 1964, 165-9 admits as a hyperdoric form in -ω only ρλα(κ)- (Theocritean) on the grounds that there is no form ρλα analogous to Δύπαξ, ψάξ.

The verb expresses a quick, darting motion and implies change of direction; hence, it is regularly applied to eyes: Α.Α. 368, 11.17.680, Ημ.Ημ.Μερ.45, Pi.Pa.20.13, B.17.17. "Did I go into αςπίν, losing my bearings" is what Pindar means.

H. Forssman, Untersuchungen Zur Sprache Pindars 59, thinks Δύπαξ meaning basically 'rotate' is unconnected in meaning with Δύπαξ = 'thresh' corn (e.g. Ης.Οπ.598); but Greek corn was threshed by the feet of circling oxen (v. West ad Η. loc. cit.).

ποδόν ἐνδικελ Ἡμα. See also Snell's editions of Bacchylides (Praefatio xxii) and of Pindar (Ad Prosodiam 1, p.174); 8 examples of Pindar lengthening final -ον before a vowel (for this phenomenon in general v. M.L.West, Greek Metre 16).

The plural would refer to several different sets of crossroads; τρίδος and τρίδος are not in Classical Greek interchangeable as are English crossroad/roads. Hekate inhabits τρίοδου because her shrine existed at many sets of crossroads. Contra LSJ (s.v. τρίοδος), Moschus 1.2 ἐπὶ τρίδοις πάλαβομεν εἰς Ἐρωταί δραπητίδας ἐμος ἐκεῖνοι, and Epig.Graec.841 (Kaibel) are not examples of pl. pro sg.: the former concerns any of several crossroads where Eros might have been wandering; in the latter, the other plurals (πολλας, σόφοις) show that a statue of the Hero was erected by Claudian's workmen at various crossroads (τον πρὸ πολλας Ἡρως, τον άλκμον ἐν τρίοδοις/τον κλεινον ναετω θηκαν ερχεθενες κλαδινον προ δικοις σοφις[τεχνιες άθρας]. The only possible example of pl. pro sg. is I.C.iii.1418.2 τακτες ποτι ζν τρίοδος σοι κοι επεκτεθησαν; a snippet of verse prefacing a Roman prose inscription.

The singular, read by the scholiasts (Sch.P.11.58a,c,d) and Eustathius (Proem. para.21=Drachmann iii.293): gives better sense: Pindar only once took the wrong road, by embarking on the myth. This is analogous to taking the wrong road at a crossroad, less analogous to repeatedly taking wrong roads at crossroad after crossroad as the plural would imply.

Another metaphorical τρίοδος turns up at Anon.ap.Theogn.911f. εν τριοδω δ' ἐκείτη δ' εἰς το πρόσθεν ἐδοι μοι... η τρικλωνι... η ζύον τεταρτων.

σκέυες'πορον : 'where one has to change direction'. For a discussion of -πορο compounds v. O.Becker, Hermes Einzelschriften 4,1937,23f., esp.50f. Here the underlying idea is the journey of song (cf. O.6.22f., I.4.58 etc.). For the compound cf. fr.24 σκέυες'πον.
39. ὀρθὰν κελεύων: the context, contrasting the ὑ.κ. with a crossroad, a change of direction and going off-course, suggests ὀρθῶν means here both straight and right.

For ὀρθῶν of roads cf. Theogn.945-6 εἰμι τῇ παρ' σταθμῇ ὀρθῶν ὁδῶν οὐσιτερωσα Κλίνομενος; Ar. Av. ὀρθῶν κελεύοντος. For the idea that the straight road is the right road cf. O.745-7 ἔστι μὲν βαίνει τι καὶ λέγα τῇ κεκάμπτος νέφους, καὶ παρέλθει προφέρουσα ὀρθῶν ἐστὶν ἀφρεκτός; B.11.26-7 Σικελ κελεύοντος εἰς μετα κεκαμπτον ὀρθῶν (ὁρθῶν perhaps a transferred epithet ὀρθῶν; see Maehler ad loc.).

PAREMBASIS: Lines 38-40 exemplify one of various devices Pindar uses to preserve a balance between different parts of his odes:—

3. I shall recount only τὰ κέφαλάκια: P.3.80, P.4.116-7.

P.11.38-40 is similar to O.13.93-4 ἐρέεις ἐνδοι ἀκόντων ἱέντα ῥομφον τῷ ὀρθῶν ὑπ' ἄρη...because I must sing of the Oligaithidai; cf. 0.2.89, P.1.42-4, N.6.26-7 ('I must sing of Theron/Hieron/the Bassidai'). Going off-course could incur censure, cf. O.8.54f. εἰ δ' ἐγὼ ἤρηκα ἡμέρα ἐνδοι ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἰδον διὰ τὸ ἔκρεις ὀφθαλμός.

These passages help Pindar resolve a conflict he was faced with: to praise the winner, who was buying the poem; to be free to mention other subjects.

Lines like 38-40 emphasise what a hotch-potch of different items his odes are. The scholiasts, like many modern commentators,
assume that praise of the winner was always Pindar's chief concern.
and are quick to call anything else a παρεκβασίς:

Sch.N.6.94a λέγει δὲ τούτο ὁ Πίνδαρος ὅτι παρεκβασίς εἰς τὸ
ὑμνεῖν τοὺς Ἀκήδας ἐχάρισεν ἐκεῖ ἐστὶν ἐν τούτῳ, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ὑμνεῖν Ἀλκμήνην.
Sch.N.3.45b οὖσαν τὴν περι τοῖς Παρσάδοις ἐπιστρέφειν ἢ προοιμεῖν
εἰς τὸν περὶ τοῖς Παρσάδοις ἐπιστρέφειν τριτέον, δεύον λέγειν περὶ τῶν προοιμίων τοὺς νεκροκόσιοις.

Inschr.P.4 γράφει δὲ καὶ εἰς ταύτην καὶ ἐπιρροην αὐτοῦ νικήν ἐσθήσατο. [P.5]
ήπιο καὶ οἶκετεῖρα ἐστὶν κατὰ τὰ νομισματα καὶ κατὰ τὴν συνομιλίαν
οὐ ἔρχεται εἰς προοιμεῖν ὥσιν ἑπτάρχικαν ἔτη ΠΑΡΕΚΒΑΣΙΣ.

Inschr.P.5 ἑπτάρχις δὲ Σιγυμίας ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις μάλλον ἐπιστρέφειν
οὐ περὶ ἐγκύρων πεποιηθαι τοῖς Πινδάροις καὶ ΠΑΡΕΚΒΑΣΙΣ Σιγυμίης
περὶ τῶν κατὰ ιάσονα, ἑδονεύον αὐτοῦ καὶ δεύοντος χάραξιν ἐπιστρεφομένοι.

Sch.P.8.43a ὑπερβεβένοι, δυσὶ, τῷ ΠΑΡΕΚΒΑΣΕΙ περὶ Ἀγάπης τι εἴπεναι,
μὴ καρπὸς ἐπιδραμήμενοι μοι τοῖς ποιήσισι, οὐ νῦν ἔσχεν ἐργον, τὸ ποιεῖν μοι πρέξον,
ΤΟΥΤΕΩΤΙ (better τούτι ἐστιν, τούτοις referring to o') τῷ προεδρῷ τῇ θεῷ.

These caustic comments on Pindar's παρεκβασίς are in the
same vein as the scholiasts comments on the myth in P.11:

Sch.P.11.23b ἀφίστα δὲ Πίνδαρος ἐν εἰς τοὺς καρποὺς ἐπιστρέφειν παρεκβασίς ἔχρισκατο.

Sch.P.11.58a ὑπαρχοντος γὰρ ἐστιν ἐκείνοις ἡ φανῆ καὶ ἐρμηνείας, μέτε
οὗ σετί παρεκβασίνειν καὶ περὶ καλλων λέγειν, μεσιν εἰληφθαι.

Sch.P.11.58b μετα ἐπιτρέπεις ἐκείνοις μὲν τι ἀκροτριτοί παρεκβασίς ἐρμηνεύον.

Sch.P.11.58c αὐτὶ τοῦ ἐσχαλῆς τοῦ τερόντος παρεκβασίς ἐρμήκαμενος.

The παρεκβασίς in question is lines 17-37, so designated by
the scholiasts because they do not praise the victor or his vict-
ory, of Sch.P.10.46b μετὰ δὲ τούτοις δὲ Πίνδαρος καλῶς τοῦ ἐπιστρεφο-
γραφεῖν ἐπιστρέφει δὲ κατὰ ταύτα ἐκλογαὶ παρεκβασίς ἐρμήκαμενος.

Lack of an obvious connection between a mythical part of an ode
and the rest sometimes led the scholiasts into absurd speculation:

100
CONCLUSION: By censuring lines 17-37 as a *parēbēsia* the scholiasts mean they have no obvious connection with the victor or victory. The use of the term as one of censure contrasts with its application to Roman oratory where the digressio or *parēbēsia* was thought a necessary part of the speech (v. Quint. 4.3.14; cf. the Homeric scholiasts, e.g. II.666, II.444, on Homer's *parēbēsia* as necessary devices to give thematic area; see N. Richardson, CQ 30, 1980, 266f.).

Though the Pindaric scholiasts are taking their cue from Pindar, they are working with a preconceived idea of what is suitable for an epinician. However much the victor himself may have wanted to be praised (cf. the reaction of Skopas to Simonides's praises of Castor and Pollux, PMG 510), it is a mistake to suppose Pindar had no other ideas.

---

41. *Moida* : the address to the Muse prefaces a new section of the poem, as at P.1.58f. *Moida, kal to air Deinoreven* Ἐρείκης μοι ποιήσαι τεβρήσασιν, N.6.27f. Ἐφών ἐπὶ τοῦτου, ἄγε Μοίδα, ὄφον ἐπέλαυ; cf. II.2484f. ἐσπετε νῦν μοι Μοίδα, ... ἄπτες Ἡρείκης Δανάου καὶ κοραύοι διή; Ap. Rh.3.1-2 εἴδε δ' ἄγε νῦν Ἐρατό... ἔνειπε, id.4.1-2; V. Aen. 7.37 Nunc, age, qui reges, Erato...: the Muse is needed to provide new inspiration for the new theme.
41. ἀληθεύει: for the phrase cf. I.6.38-9 ἄριστον Ἐλείτιον Ἐρήμων ὄπισθεν ἡμῶν Ἀινίδιον which is taken by Slater (s.v. ἐρήμων) and Sch. ad loc. as = καὶ ἔρημος or καὶ τὰ ἔρημα γνώμην, but more likely it = ἔρημος ἔρημος (hence the following infinitive) as here τὸ ἀληθεύει ἐρήμων (hence the infinitive ταξιστέμενον and the intrusion of ὄντος into 1.42); cf. A.Sept.232 συν' αὐτῷ τοῦ εὐπρεπεῖον καὶ μένειν εἴπῃ δοῦμεν S.Bl.1470-1 οὐκ ἔρημος τὸν ἀλλὰ σὺν, τὸ τῶν ἐρήμων τε καὶ πρεσβύτερον φίλων.

The postponement of ἀλλά, mainly in serious poetry, is common when the sentence opens with a vocative; ἀλλά then follows the first word in the main clause, so too with ἀλλά e.g. Pio.0.6.22 ἢ δίνεται, ἀλλά ζησόν. See Denniston 22-3,189.

μιθῳ : this reading for μιθῳ of the mss. is attributed by Snell to Christ. Christ's first edition of Pindar was published in 1869. But Bergk in his third edition (1866) had already made the suggestion, though he retracted it in his fourth edition (1878). Snell in his app. crit. writes "cf. paraphr." But though Sch.P.11.63 paraphrases with a genitive μιθῳ (εἰ δὲ μιθῷ, ἢ ἑρετέοι Μοῦδα, μιθῳ καὶ δράματον τὴν ἐν φύλειν ὑπεράνω Παράκλησις) the lemma is εἰ μιθῳ κυνεῦειν.

μιθῳ cannot be retained; an extra short syllable is required and a genitive of price needed, v. K-G i.377-8; cf. Thuc. 7.25. Γοῦν τούτῳ [τοῦτος] καὶ δυνατόν ἡ σφαίραι ἐξέβαλεν μιθῳ, xen.Cy.3.2.7 μιθῳ στάτεσθαι, Th.5.6.2 ἢ ζυγίτα μιθῳ Θράκης ὡς πλέστως.

The genitive ending -ον was particularly liable to corruption to -ον when the last syllable was elided, a non-Homeric freedom: N.9.55κοιτῶν mss., κοιτών Ahrens; I.1.16'ολον mss.,'ολων' Mommsen; but no corruption at 0.13.35'θεκάλον', or P.1.39'άκλον'.

The route of the corruption may have been ΜΙΘΘΟΙΣΥΝ > ΜΙΘΘΟΙΣΥΝ then ΜΙΘΘΙ (in the old alphabet) interpreted as ΜΙΘΘΙ.

cυνεύειν : a strong word implying more than mere agree-
ment, used of formal and important undertakings, e.g. Pl.Rep.359a, Sócr. lóguτεκνίων κυνθέκης; ἀναγκαίον μὴ τίς ἀναγκαίον μὴ ἀναγκαίον, And.4.18; Aristot.Pol.1257a.33f.; also in the historians of treaties.

Pindar regarded his commission to compose as a formal undertaking creating obligations: 0.10.3f, 0.3.4-7, P.4.1f., P.8.33, P.9.103-4. He was no more ashamed to mention the reward or return that he received from such an undertaking than to mention the reward, viz. the ode, that the victor received. Like other Greeks he regarded poetry as a τέχνη comparable to bridge-building etc., cf. 0.6. init., P.6.5-18, P.3.113, fr.194; the practitioner of any τέχνη required payment for his services (note the collocation τέχνη, μοῦς τιμῆς) at Hym.Hom.Herm.4.447-8 τί τέχνη, τί μοῦς ἀρχάγγελον μελετῶσθ' τί τιμῆς;

42. ὑπάρχωρος: "ὑπάρχωρος is nach Analogie von ὑπάρχωρος zu verstehen; wenn das unedle, das darunter liegt, Silber ist, muss es mit Gold plattiert sein. Ein echtes Lied ist natürlich guldiner. O. Schroeder will es nach Analogie von ὑπάρχωρος fassen "unter Silber stehend"; "für Geld", was dem Sinne auch genügt, aber ὑπάρχωρος ist nicht ἀρχώρος und ich zweifle, ob man es so verstehen konnte. Die kauflichen Musen ἀρχώρος/τηρίων, ἡ ἀρχώρον Isthm.2,8 sind geschminkt, haben ἀρχώρον Bleiglanz (Theophrast.λίβαν.56) aufgelegt.

Das ist also nur äußerlich "ähnlich" (Wilamowitz, Pindaros 261-2n.2).

But 1) his first statement is not obviously true. ὑπαρχωρος compounds can mean a) 'with', e.g. ὑπαρχωρος; b) 'under', e.g. ὑπαρχοις, ὑπαρχως; c) 'liable to', e.g. ὑπαρχοις, ὑπαρχως, ὑπαρχως; d) 'somewhat', e.g. ὑπαρχωρος.

2) While ὑπαρχωρος can in some contexts clearly imply counterfeit, e.g. Xen.Oec.10.3 ἔπισταυρεσ τε ἱερών καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ὑπερευροι καὶ πορφυρίσκεις ἐπὶ τῆς, ἐκείνην ἐλθών εἰναί, Men.Per.fr.9 Sandbach, ὑπό plus a word denoting a substance does not necessarily have such an implication, cf. Pl.Rep.415b-c where the context shows 103
εὐπάργυρος, ὑπὸκιλικός and ὑπερχρύσος mean 'with silver/bronze/iron mixed in'.

3) The evidence for εὐπάργυρος = counterfeit, and hence for ὑπερχρύσος = unedele Stimme, is post-Classical and confined to numismatic contexts: Pollux 7.104 εὐπάργυρον δὲ τὸ κιλικὸν χρυσίον = gold coin; Philo iii.105.159 Wendland ὑπερχρύσον (sc.οἱ ἀνεπίπλημτοι) ἐκλαυόντες εἶναι τοὺς ὑπερχρύσους καὶ ὑπερχρύσους θεοὺς, νομίζοντες κεκιβρυθηκέναι τὸν τρόπον; Sex. Emp.2.30 εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο (sc. τὸ βάλτος) ἦν καὶ ὑπέταπτεν, εἰγνωσκόμενον ἢν καὶ τὰ ὑπερχρύσα χρυσία.

4) Something made of silver and covered with gold is not necessarily a counterfeit object, cf. I.G.i(2)280.76 πρόσωπον ὑπερχρύσον κατὰ χρυσον, ib.280.74 κατὰ χρυσον τὸν πουλίμεαν ὑπερχρύσον (422-1 B.C. from an inventory of the treasuries of the Parthenon), ib.276.6-7 τοῦ ὑπερχρύσον κατακλύο (434-3). These inscriptions show that εὐπάργυρος, even when contrasted with gold, can mean 'with silver underneath' without implying that the object is counterfeit.

5) Would Pindar have agreed that 'ein echtes Lied ist natürlich gülden'? Pindar nowhere says his poetry or songs are gold-en; at N.7.77f. gold is a component of his songs along with other substances, ἑκατοκτίς τοις καλλὶς χρυσίν εἰς τὰ λευκὰ ἐλεφάντων ἁμα καὶ λευκίων ἀνθρώπων ποιώνες διάθλοις εἴρηκεν.

6) ὑπερχρύσον here surely cannot be separated from μικῆς; so Schroeder is right. For the idea cf. S.Ant.1077-8 ἄθρησκον εἰς καταργυρώμενος λέγον.

THE PAYMENT of POETS in ANTIQUITY: popular tradition said Simonides was the first to have the idea of composing poetry for money: Sch.A.Pax 696 καὶ γὰρ ἐίμαι λογίης διότι πρῶτος εἰς πολλοὺς εἰς γνώσιν εἰς τὰ τάγματα καὶ γράφει διὰ μία μικῆς. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ Πίνδωρος ἐν τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς πρὸς εὐσυντρόφους (cf. P.I.2.96 καὶ Μοῖρα γὰρ ὃ μικῆς ποιεῖν τὸ τοῖς πρός εἰμίνθων ταῦτα ἐκ πιλάργυρον χρυσί. Sch.ad loc.: λέγω δ' ἀν πρὸς εἰμινθῆν ταῦτα ἐκ πιλάργυρον.
Simonides was renowned as a Scrooge; cf. Ath. 656c-d, "..."tō kōtōn eikēn (sc. Hipparchus) ...". It is relevant that Pindar, Simonides, Lasus, Bacchylides, Anacreon, Ibycus and Timotheus all wrote for rich tyrants.

But Timotheus, too, has a story told about him about his desire to be paid for his poetry, and it would be rash to suppose that Anacreon or Ibycus received nothing in return from Polycrates, cf. FGrH iii.b.539 F2 (Alexis of Samos) μετέτεθη αὐτῷ οὐκ εἰδέν (sc. Polycrates) ἐκ τοῦ μεθὸς μητροκρατίατο πρὸς Τίμωνα, τοῦ μὲν λυχνὸν εὐτυχίαν, τοῦ δὲ δοληθὼς, ὡς διὰ κέρδεις ἐντατολοι, Ν.7.17f. σοφὸν δὲ μελοντα Τριτάιον ἐπεμφύετο ἀπὸ ἄνεμου ἐρτῆν ὄντος κέρδει βλέπετο.

The introduction of payment by rich tyrants and others to poets for poems in their honour, and hence mention that the poem was being written for a μεθὸς, is a frank extension of the poetic commonplace going back to Homer that poets inspired by the Muses deserve esteem and φόροι, cf. Od.8.479f. καὶ Ἄρτεμις τοῦ φάραγμα τοῦ τιτανοῦ θρύλου, καὶ μία προφητεία τοῦ φήμης τῆς ἄφιξας τῆς Ἀθηναίων ἐπικυριάσας ἔπος καὶ τῆς ἐπικυριάσας ἐπικυριάσας ἐπικυριάσας. Μοῦσα ἐδίδαισε, φίλησε δὲ φίλον ἀπόλαυσιν, Ὀδυσσῆα 13.1-4. W. Moodie...

Pindar thought wealth a good thing, provided it was gained virtuously and good use made of it, cf. P. 3.110 εἰς ἰδίον πλοῦτον διὸς αἰφεὺς ὁμελεία, ἐπὶ τᾶς ἐκ τῶν εὐφέρεται κεν ὕφελον πρῶς (so, if a lucrative offer for an ode is given to me), 0.2.53f., P.2.56. ὁ πλούτων ἐν τῇ κυντύχαι ποτάμων καθίσκασίτον 'to be wealthy with what comes from one's lot is the best thing wisdom offers', i.e. ill-gotten wealth is not a good thing. Bowra (Pindar 102) says, "Pindar took it for granted that the men whom he liked and admired should be rich"; equally, he took it for granted that he should be rich. For Greek admiration of virtuous money-making, cf. Hes. Op. 313 and West's note on 320, Alcaeus 360, Sappho 148, Theog. 197-202, 753, Solon 13.7f.

42. Χρή: "Χρῆ non leg. Σ." in Snell's app. crit. refers to Sch. P. 11.66b λέεται τῷ ἐφελείκ. Interpolation into the epinicians of words of substance is rare: 0.2.27a φιλέοντες Μωύς, 0.7.49 Ζεῦς, 0.10.25 ἡμικλής, P. 1.93 πέτακαί, P. 6.46 ἐθείγεν, I. 3.51 πελώς, I. 4.76 Δίου.

Ἀλλοτρὶ ἄλλῳ: a favourite combination in Pindar enabling him to pass from the general to the particular: P. 10.55f. ἐγκαρδίων γὰρ ὀντῶν ὑπὸ ἄλλοτρ' ἄλλον... ὑπὲρ λόγων. ἐπιπανθετον ἡπεωδεῖς; 0.7.11f. ἄλλοτε ἄλλῳ ἐπιτεκνεύει κυρίω... κείων... κόμων Δικέρως κατακράτω.

Ταφακάκετον: "kann ja nur intransitiv sein, wie Eur. Hek. 599 [lect. dub.], Aisch. Ch. 289 [ταφακάκετον, Ταφακάκετον]," Wilamowitz, Pindaros 261n.2. Better (so Schroeder ad loc.), supply φωνή from the preceding phrase (cf. ἔλεησαν φόρμυγις P. 0.9.13, P. 1.4), with πατρί Πυθονικῷ... Θεοματίως indirect objects: 'rouse your
voice for T. and his father', makes better sense than 'be in a state of turmoil for T. and his father'.

Ταρακέω is regularly used when what is being roused comes from more than one source and is able to be mixed: A.Ch.331 πατέρων τε καὶ τεκόντων γόος ἀμφιλότερον ταρακείον. S.Ant.794 νείκος ἄνδρων ταρακέω. 27

Here the Muse is to rouse up praise for Pythonikos and mix it with praise for T. The word harmonises with the earlier sea image (39-40), cf. Od.5.291 ἀράζης τέντον, Archil.105 Πυθ. όμω βριόν γάρ ἔδω Κυρακίν ταρακεία τούτοι.

43. Πυθιονίκων(γ) codd., Πυθονίκωι Triolinius. The reading of the mss. comes from Πυθονίκος/-ης being the usual form of the word. The usual form might have been Πυθονίκος/-ης since Πυθο-, not Πυθε-, is the regular stem for Πυθ- compounds (e.g. Πυθομαντε, Πυθοχρήστης); but the form in -ης may have developed by analogy with Ὀλυμπονίκος/-ης (never Ὀλυμπονίκος/-ης).

Pythonikos (found as a name of an Athenian at Andoc.1.11f., Ath.5.220f.; also J.Kirchner, Prosopographia Attica 12459: a magistrate 186-46 B.C.) is best interpreted here as a name, perhaps given to T's father as a nickname - athletes did get them: Paus. 6.4.1 Σικυώνιος ἐπίτροπος παγκαιζομένης ἀνήρ, ἐπιλέγεται δέ ἦν Ἀρεστράτης ἄνωθεν παραλημβάνομενον γὰρ ἄρεων τοῦ Ἀνταγωνίσκομεν τῶν ἄρεων ἔκλει, καὶ τὸ πρότερον ἄνευ Πραγματεύσαντος; ᾿Αλέξανδρε, ἐξιμικηθή τιτάρη ... ὅνως μὲν τῷ θριώμενῳ Ἀπολλώνιος, ἐπιλέγεται δὲ ἦν Ῥάνταβ (because he sprinkled his opponents with punches?). 28 καὶ ποικιλόστι χείρον τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιλήψεως τοῦ ᾿Αλέξανδρου ἐκείνων.

Against interpreting the word as an adjective meaning 'victorious in the Pythian Games' is that Findar does usually mention the victor's father by name or give the name of the victor's γενεία; only once is the victor's father referred to but not named (P.10.12, but the victor's γενεία had been named at 1.5).
45. Εὐφροσύνα: happiness; Hesiod (Theog. 909) couples Euphrosyne with Thalie and Aglaie. The word is also used to mean 'good cheer' at a banquet; Xenoph. 1.4 κρατήρ ὁ ἔρθηκεν μέσος Εὐφροσύνας; Solon 4.10 Εὐφροσύνας κομμεῖν σάρκις ἐν ζυγύμι; for this sense with reference to the festivities following an athletics victory cf. Bacch. 10.52-3 περικυκλωμένη θυατερίζων Εὐφροσύνας, ib. 11.10-12 καὶ νῦν Μεταμόρφωσιν Εὐφροσύνας θυατερίζων νέων χαίρων τε καὶ Εὐφροσύνας θετήμαν δέοντα. But here, because Εὐφροσύνα is linked with δεκα, the happiness is the joy of being famous.

46-8. Αρμάζει... Πρέποι: these words single out two victories (one Πάλιν, the other denoted by Ὀλυμπίις Τ' ); both by the father and with the chariot —, i.e. Πρέποι is variation for Αρμάζει; the words could refer to a type race, and in fact Pindar often mentions the horses that pulled the chariot to victory: 0.3.3-4, P. 1.37, P. 5.21, N.1.6-7, I.1.14. A failure to distinguish the two victories makes lines 46-9 incomprehensible — see next note.

46-9. Μέν... Τε: the position of the first τε, and the failure to distinguish ἐν Αρμάζει from Πρέποι (see on 46-8), has caused editors to misunderstand the construction of the lines and the number of victories referred to. Problems are resolved if
a comma is placed after τέλειοι, the sentence taken to refer to
three victories, and μέν interpreted as answered first by one τέ
and then by the other: "They were victorious with the chariot
long ago, then at Olympia they won in the horse race, and then at
Pytho they won in the stade race. For μέν...τέ...τέ... cf. P.4.
249ff. κατευθείαν μέν... κλέψει τέ... ἐν τέ... μέν... 0.6.4-6 εἶ δὲ εἴη μέν
Ὀλυμπιονικός, βοώμοι τε κυρτεύσι τημίκι Δίσ εἶν τύχει, κυνοκίνητος τέ...
A verb meaning 'they were', or ἐποιηθεῖσθαι aektin from 1.48, must
then be supplied to 1.46, but ellipse in the enumeration of
victories is common, e.g. 0.13.106f., 0.9.86ff., P.7.14f. It is
not a problem that the location of the first victory is not given;
Pindar is elsewhere sketchy over past victories in the family:
0.13.32-4 mentions two venues but no event; cf. N.2.23 τά σ' ὀκο
μέλειον ἀράμαυον (sc. βιοικές ἐκπομπὰς).

The interpretation of Bowra (Penard 403), and Nisetich
(Pindar's Victory Songs 223) in which κατευθείαν is answered only by
τοῦτο τέ are impossible because they ignore the first τέ after
Ὀλυμπιονικός. To resolve this problem Schroeder and Farnell omit in
their texts the first τέ. But this leaves a most unlikely hiatus:
v. M.L. West, Greek Metre 15.

P. Maas (Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und
Pindar (I), Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin,
1913, 289f.) says, "Das τέ in 47 muss weg, wie Pauw erkannt hat.
Aber der Hiat braucht nicht eingeführt zu werden: 'Ὀλυμπιονικός' ἀράμαυον
ist zu schreiben. τάβ Αἴσθησις ζητεῖσθαι auf den panathenaischen
Vasen; P.5.105 [Τῶν Ῥώμασθαι], N.5.41 [Αἰγράθεως], P.8.19 [Κρίτων]
I.1.65 Τοῦτον, 'Ὀλυμπιονικός' Steph.Byz. But -θ for -αλ(ι) would be
unparalleled (v. K-G.1.i.294: -θ could stand only for -αλ, a form
not found in Pindar).

Boeckh's 'Ὀλυμπιονικός' (adj. agreeing with ἀράμαυον), accepted by
Gildersleeve, is not likely; Ὅλυμπος, -ος always means 'of Mt. Olympus' or 'the Olympian' (i.e. Zeus) in Classical Greek, never 'of the Olympic Games', for which Ὅλυμπικός (e.g. Thuc.1.6 but not in Pi. or Bacch.) or Ὅλυμπικός (Xenophon).

The objection, that if 46-50 refer to three past victories then T.'s present one cannot be the third as Pindar claims (14), is resolved if one takes the Pythian victory of 49-50 to be the present one (καταβάτες ἄλλαξαν plural, because father shares in son's victory; see pages 51-2).

(46) is Triclinius's supplement; but for τὰ μὲν ἐν καταξίωσι one might consider an alternative emendation, τὰ Νέκτα λαμαλλι which would give a location for the first victory and rule out the possibility of 1.46 being taken as part of the same clause as 47-8.

For the neuter plural (sc. ἐλοῦς) with article cf. Dem.59.33 εἰνίκα τὰ Πύθια, Timoc.8.17 Kock τοις ἀλλοτριώμενοι νικώς, Pl.Ion 530b τὰ Πίλακακακα κενείκερα. But in Pindar the n.pl. is always used without the article, e.g. 0.13.34 Νέκτας τ' οὐκ αὐτοῖς.

46. Ταλκί: usually of long ago, e.g. P.6.40 of Nestor's time; but Ταλκί can mean, as here, simply some time ago in contrast with the present: Parth.2.41 Ταλκίν γέρ τὰ Τάλκι τὰ νῦν ζῇ ἀμφικτίονες (Ταλκί referring to the time of the νικει of the victor), Il.5. 104-5 οὖ γάρ τις νῦν ἀλλαὶ ἀμφικτίονα ποῦ ποτὲ νικήσας, ἢ μὲν Τάλκι, ἢ οὐ, καὶ νῦν, A.Ag.587 κακολείπεται μὲν Ταλκίς Χαρέα Υπτώ.

Here Ταλκί probably refers to the time of a past victory by T.'s father. There is no evidence that ταρά (sg.) could mean 'ancestor'; at P.10.2 βασιλείας οἱ ἀμφικτοῖς ἐς ένος ἀμφικτοίων, ἔνος Ηρακλείου, Βασιλείου Herakles is thought of as a father, hence there is no foundation to the comment of Sch.P.11.71 οἱ μὲν πρόγονοι, ψιλάς, αὐτοῦ ἐχον Ὀλυμπικά νικαί.

48. ἔγειρε θαυμάσιες ἀκτικές τιμακ: Θαυμάς is perhaps 'piercing',
17.55 (θόν ἄκρατον) should probably be translated likewise. θόν in the sense 'swift-moving' is inapplicable to ἀκτις and feeble as an epithet transferred from ἐπίσω.

49. γυμνῶν ἐπὶ σταδίων εἰσαβλήτες: 'entering the stade race where one ran naked'. σταδίων in Pindar and Bacchylides always means 'the length of the stadium', never 'stadium' (cf. W.S. Barrett ap. Maehler on B.10.21). In odes for runners Pindar regularly says what sort of race had been won (the short 0.14 is the sole exception): 0.13.37 Ποθοὶ τῷ σταδίῳ τηκών διὰ λίπους θ' , N.8.16 σικεκλυστ' σταδίων , 0.10.64 σταδίον μὲν ἀρίστευσέν, εὔβοι τόναν ποιεῖ πρέπων (εὔβοι denoting the single-stade race).

γυμνῶν because there was a race the length of the stadium where one did not run naked, the race in armour (στάδιονομοίος).

For the distinction cf. I.1.23 λέαπτε βδ κατάκ άρετά εν τε γυμνωτι σταδίων εδείης εν τ' ἀκτικούςποιτιν επιλητιος σοφόοι , Pl.Leg.833a σταδίοσμοιν ς' πρῶτον δ' θρούσῃ θριν, κατάπερ νῦν, εν τοι τ' αὐξάνα παρακαλεί, δ' θα είσατον επίκα εκάνον τ' ἐκιλι α' δο θυσία αυλακερής.

Assuming this phrase refers to the victory P.11 commemorates (see end of note on 46-9), then that victory was in the stade race.

EXCURSUS: Nudity in Greek Athletics - The Naked Truth.

The bare facts have created divided opinions: "The habit of complete nudity in athletic exercises" (E.N.Gardiner, Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals 86); "They have come down into the naked course" (R.Lattimore, The Odes of Pindar 92 - translation of P.11.49). Contra, R.L.Howland, ap. OCD s.v. Athletics: "It seems unlikely that the Greeks would ever have stripped completely naked for events involving running, though it was an artistic convention, even in early times, generally though not always to portray athletes naked": id.C.R.17,1967,382: "The difficulty
and discomfort of running without δυναματα makes it incredible that Greek runners should have dispensed with them, though boxers and wrestlers may well have done so. Howland gives no evidence to support his view; Professor West says, "Certainly no difficulty or discomfort in running naked - quite the opposite. Has H. ever tried it?"

The argument for nudity is supported by Thucydides, Plato and Herodotus: Th.1.6 τὸ δὲ πάλι, καὶ ἐν τοῖς Ὀλυμπιακοῖς ἄγων ἄγων ἕξοντες περὶ τὰ λαὸν οἱ ἄθληται γυμνοί, καὶ ὁ τολμῶν ἐπὶ ἐπειδὴ πεπέφθηναι; Pl.Rep.452 οὐ πολὺς χρόνος ἐγὼ οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐσθότες αἵρεσις εἰς καὶ καὶ ἥξιον, ἀντὶ τοῦ τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν βορβάρων, γυμνοὺς ἀνδραῖς ἔρχεται (the gymnastics context suggests nudity in athletics is meant); cf. Hdt.1.10 περὰ χαρ τότε ἅμα ἄνδρες, σχέσεις δὲ καὶ πάρα τῶν ἄλλων βορβάρων, καὶ ἄνδρας ἔφηβοις γυμνοὶ ἐπὶ αἱρεσιν μεγάλην ἀπέλαυνε, implying that nudity was not thought indecorous among the Greeks.

The date for the beginning of nudity in Greek athletics is sometimes fixed by reference to Orsippus of Megara (or Sparta, Sch.A 11.23.683; cf. Thuc.1.6); he is said to have tripped on his δυναματα; from his day onwards athletes ran naked to avoid tripping (or it fell off, and he was able to run faster and win: Sch.A 11.23.683, Paus.1.44.1). A version of the incident is recorded as an epigram surviving in a Hadrianic inscription (IG 7.52=Kaibel 843=Geffcken 81: a late inscription, but it is uncertain how early the epigram is).

Most sources date this incident to the 15th Olympic Games = 720 B.C. (so Iulius Africanus ap. Euseb.Chron.1.195 Schoene, Eustath.ad Il.1324-15, D.H.7.72.2 substituting Akanthos for Orsippus), but four years earlier according to Sch.T 11.23.683, and 68 years later (Ol.32) according to Et.Mag. s.v. γυμνατα). The words of Thucydides and Plato suggest that running naked started up nearer their own day than 720 B.C. (v. Comme on Thuc.1.6.4,
Boeckh CIG i.p.555, col.2). One explanation is that Orsippus had his loin-cloth accident in 720; nevertheless some runners continued to run with loin-cloths; only in the 5th Century was it normal practice not to; later historians and chronologers erroneously fixed the start of the practice of running naked to post-720 using the Orsippus incident as a peg. There is some uncertain evidence that runners, despite what Plato and Thucidides say, had uncontroversially competed naked from early times: the boxer Euryalos and the wrestlers Ajax and Odysseus wear ἔμμελα in Homer (Il.23.683,710); Homer says nothing about their use by runners (ib.740f.). Hippomenes ran naked in Hes.fr.74 νέωμεν οὖν ἀθλούσας ἔμμελες τὰ Αθηναῖα πόλις.

The Evidence from Art: athletes are usually painted naked; but there is a group of vases, the Perizoma Group, "so called from the large "loin-cloths" worn by athletes and revellers" (J.D. Beazley, Attic Black-Figure Vase Painters 343).

But 1. Only these few vases show athletes in περίφυλλα; 2. These vases are painted by only the Michigan and Beaune painters and their schools (v. Beazley loc.cit.343-6); 3. These painters' subjects, apart from athletes, are predominantly maenads, komasts, symposiasts or satyrs; 4. In many cases what the athletes or komasts are wearing are not loin-cloths, and could not have been used as jock-straps since they reach down to the knees; 5. There is evidence for the portrayal of satyrs as athletes: v. J. Boardman, Athenian Red-Figure Vases: The Archaic Period 115, illust. 163, a crater by the Nikoxenos painter = ARV221,14.

I suggest that the depiction of athletes in absurdly large περίφυλλα reflects comic and exaggerating invention by the painters rather than reality at the Games; that the painters have added absurdly large περίφυλλα to their athletes from their practice.
with revellers, to whom the absurd and titillating was better suited. Supporting the suggestion that the Perizoma artists wanted to add extra spice to their pictures is e.g. the erotic position of the left figure's hand in ABV344.3 (= Philippaki, The Attic Stamnos pl.10.1, cf. pl.10.2) and of the ends of the trainer's whip on a small stamnos (Philippaki pl.11.3). If nudity was the norm, the portrayal of athletes in outsize πετσάκια could have seemed absurd, provocative and sexy (cf. J.D. Beazley and F. Magi, La Raccolta B. Guglielmini nel Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, on Vatican G58 from Vulci: "L'uso del perizoma, non solo come qui sopra il chitonisco, ma anche portato dalle persone ignude, non credo col Mingazzini...che abbia avuto uno scopo ingenioso: i vasi riflettono senza dubbio una moda effimera, manifestazione di quel desiderio di farsi buffo di cui nessuna epoca, quantunque felice, è essente").

Besides the absurdly large πετσάκια, there are some more reasonably sized ones, e.g. on a stamnos in the Ashmolean = ABV 343.6 (for a photo of it v. Ashmolean Museum Exhibition of Antiquities and Coins purchased from the collection of the late Capt. E.G.Spencer-Churchill pl.xii = Philippaki pl.14) and also on Philippaki pl.14 (= de Ridder p.160-1). Sometimes, too, a distinction is made between the size and shape of the πετσάκια of athletes training (see the boxers on ABV343.6) and racing (see the runners on ABV343,6); the large πετσάκια may have functioned like modern track-suits, discarded in competition (cf. the depiction of athletes in 'exercise caps', the description of J. Boardman, Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period 220).

CONCLUSION: Since vase paintings show a) athletes wearing reasonably-sized πετσάκια, b) athletes wearing absurdly large ones, c) non-athletes, e.g. komasts, wearing absurdly large ones; and since the Perizoma Group flourished at the end of the Sixth
Century; and since Plato and Thucydides imply that περιζώματα were worn at about that time - it seems reasonable to conclude:

1. At the end of the Sixth Century some athletes went through a phase of wearing περιζώματα; 2. This inspired vase-painters to add large phallic ones to their pictures of revellers to make the revellers look more obscene than if merely nude; 3. Vase-painters then transferred large περιζώματα from revellers to athletes to add a touch of obscene amusement to their pictures of the latter. For other touches of obscenity in pictures of athletes cf. Martin von Wagner Museum Antikenabteilung L241 = pl.24 in Erika Simon's 'Führer' to the museum = JHS 52,1932,198 fig.18.

The participation of victorious athletes in komoi, and the partiality of the Perizoma Group for painting both athletes and komasts, may have influenced the Group's decision to add features from athletics to their pictures of komasts and komastic features to their athletes. Apart from this phase, nudity seems to have been the norm in the classical period.

49. καταδρόμε: 'entering' the stade race. The verb is also used by Herodotus (5.22) of Alexander of Macedon entering the stade race at Olympia. In neither passage does it mean 'going down': the stadium at Olympia was not below the rest of the site, and the common idea (M.Homolle, BCH 23,1899,613; E.N.Gardiner, Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals 212; Slater s.v. κάκα; Frazer, ed. Paus.v.458) that in Pindar's day the running events in the Pythian Games were held in the Cirra plain below the main site and near the hippodrome, rests on very slender evidence, viz. Pindar's use of κάκα (1.12 supra to denote the venue of Thrasydaios's victory, and at P.10.16 ἔθηκε καταδρόματος καὶ λαθολήματος ὑπὸ κάκα ρήματα 'λοις κρατῇς κρατήσας φίλαν'). These are the only times either Pindar or Bacchylides mentions Cirra in the context of a victory in a
running race. (The relevance of P.10.16 is uncertain, since Φρίκιας may be the name of a horse and the passage refer to a victory in the hippodrome v. Parnell; Commentary 216).

To assume that Κιρρίς (12 supra) is used with topographical precision, rather than as a means of linking the venue of the Games with Pylades's homeland, would be rash; cf. with what freedom Pindar locates other victories, 0.7.17, N.11.24 παρ' Κασταλίω, 0.9.17-8 ἐκ τε, Κασταλίω, παρ' Ἀλκιθυαε τε Ἄλκηθρον, 0.9.86 ἐν Κορίνθων πολιμί, P.9.101-2 βασιλέως Τερέθρου, N.2.21 ἐν έκλοδ Πολυτακτίω, N.5.46 Νέων τ' ἐν εὐγκεκρετῷ λαμψι (=Megara).


50. οὐκάτιν. Θρέθειν ἔρτγκακαλως. Note the asyndeton. Pindar likes to make clear the divisions between the parts of his odes (cf. above, 1.38, after the myth). The amount of asyndeton in Pindar is an important respect in which his odes are not unified. Here it prefaces one of his own opinions; it is common in such a place, also when he addresses himself or a god, and before gnomic passages. Examples from the Olympians and Pythians:

1. Before gnome: 0.1.53, 2.86, 4.18; P.1.81*, 2.49, 72, 3.59, 8.95, 9.89a.
2. After gnome: 0.2.25, 12.13.
3. Before a statement by P. to, or about, himself: 0.1.114, 2.83, 89, 4.17, 5.17*, 7.20; P.1.60, 3.61, 4.246, 11.38.
4. Before advice to another: P.1.86f., 2.72.
5. Before a prayer: 0.13.24*, 14.13*; P.1.29, 38, 8.98.
6. To isolate a single word: 0.1.52; P.2.67, 8.95.

7. In rapid narrative: 0.1.71, 89. (*=between triads)

The asyndeton accompanying gnomic passages lets them stand out from the immediate context, making them a comment not merely on the poem in which they stand. The asyndeton Pindar uses when he says he must move on to a new theme, or stick to his target (sub 3. supra) breaks up the structure of the poem and prepares us for the difference in content of what is to follow. The sudden and unconnected divine invocations are regularly used as a link to a new theme, e.g. the call on Apollo at P.8.61: Apollo, as tenant of Pytho, leads to a re-mention of Aristomenes's recent Pythian victory, then to his earlier win in the Games in Aigina (also sacred to Apollo: Sch.P.8.88 ἐν Πυθνη σὲ πρὸ τοῦ ἐνίκησε τῇ Δεσμίνι Απάλλωνος ἰδίᾳ), then to a resume of his other earlier victories.29


The transition to the first person seems less abrupt when one bears in mind that the καλα' achieved by Thrasyuaios and his father also came Θεόθεν. For the dependence of athletic success on the gods cf. 0.4.10f., 0.8.65f., 0.13.101f., N.6.24f., 0.10.20-1; success in general required the gods: P.1.41-2 ἐκ θεῶν γὰρ μεγαλεὶ πᾶσαι τροπῆς ἀρετῶν, fr.108a.
On the tense of ἐπιθυμία J. Wackernagel (Vorlesungen über Syntax i.60) rightly says, "Der Optativ ist nicht potential, sonst müsste ἐν oder κατο στehen. Potentialität ist auch durch den Gedanken ausgeschlossen: das Begehren ist tatsächlich vorhanden"; but his translation "ich wünsche von der Gottheit Schönes" is wrong. ἐπιθυμία is not the same as ἐπιθυμεῖ. The meaning is 'May I never desire things in despite of the gods'.

ἐπιθυμεῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ : 'aspiring to what is practicable and suitable for how old I am'. For ἐν = 'suitable for', 'in accordance with' cf. P.4.92 ἐν ἀληθείᾳ φασίσθων, ο.2.16 ἐν δίκαιον τέ κατά πράξει ἀληθείᾳ; more examples in Slater s.v. ἐν ἀδβα.

The paraphrase of Sch.P.11.76 gives the jist of the sense: ἐν τῇ τάρασσῃ μείκτῃ ηλικίᾳ, τοῦτο εἰς κακύτειν; for the idea that different aspirations are suitable for different times in life cf. Ν.3.70f.

52-3. τώρα γὰρ: γὰρ connects with ἐπιθυμεῖν, 'one should aspire to what is possible; for in cities I find that moderation flourishes with ἀληθεία for longer (i.e. cut out immoderate aspirations); wherefore I find fault with the lot of tyrannies (s.c. because the ἀληθεία of tyrants is particularly great and therefore particularly liable to be short-lived)'.

The expression has general application and the thought is conventional; it is a justification for why people in general, including Thrasydaios, should be moderate. Pindar, like other Greeks, did not think ἀληθεία was easily kept, especially in large quantities or if wickedly acquired; therefore, one should be moderate in one's desire for ἀληθεία. The relevance of the passage to Thrasydaios is that he should not become too buoyed up over his present success in the Games, and that he should be moderate in his aspirations for future success (e.g. an Olympic win).

The next few notes substantiate this interpretation.
Is Pindar talking about a specific tyranny, a specific polis?

Wilamowitz, Pindaros 263, thinks Pindar is referring to Sicily: "Eben ist er von Syrakus heimgekehrt, als ein wohlhabender Mann; kein Wunder, dass sie davon munkeln, nun wäre er verdorben, wäre ein Agent der Tyrannen und wollte hoch hinaus". This is a groundless guess.

Gildersleeve (ad P.11.52) and Burton (Pindar's Pythian Odes 72) think Thebes is meant, citing Thuc.3.62 for the state of Thebes during the Persian War: Μετά τῶν ἦν οἰκείων, ἦν καὶ τῶν ἐν συμφορέσε ἐν τῷ θερμώ ἐπούστων καὶ τούτων, συναίσθημα οὐκ ἔδειξιν ἐνέχθη πρὸς τὰ πράγματα. But the Thebans are here defending the charge that they medized and are probably exaggerating (v. Gomme ad loc.;Hist.9.86.1 refers to τὰς πράξεις among the Thebans, which suggests that the medizers were just a faction among others, cf. Hist.9.15.4).

Bowra, Pindar 155, dating the poem to 454-3, thinks the set-up in Thebes in 453 after the battle of Oenophyta is meant, citing Aristot.,Pol.1302b.27f. ἔνθεν μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ὀινοφυτώ μέχρι καὶ τὸν Πολιονώμον ἡ δημοκρατία σημώνα. But Aristotle says nothing here of a tyranny at Thebes; Thebes is cited as an example of the effect of contempt in democracies caused by οἱ εὐποροι κατὰ φωνήματα τῆς ἀνάργυρος καὶ ἀναρρύθυλα: the dissolution of democracy caused by the division between well-off democrats and the disordered members of the rest of the democracy is not tyranny, probably merely an incompetent democracy (v. Gomme, Com.Thuc.1.318).

Whether what Pindar says was applicable to Thebes or any other particular city is irrelevant and unprovable from the text. Pindar's point is a general one: tyrants and kings are particularly ὀλίβιοι, not renowned for moderation, and therefore particularly liable to disaster. Note the generality of the form of the expression: αὐτὸς πολιτικός not αὐτὸς τάγμα-πολιτικός, τυραννίσσων not τυραννίσσων τυραννίσσων or τυραννίσσων/οἰκείων/ὑβριστικῶν πράξεων; other general statements
derived from political observations at P.2.86f., fr.210, fr.109.

For the conventionality of the ideas (a) that pursuit of τὰ μέεα is the best way to live, (b) the life of a tyrant is objectionable and undesirable, cf. (a) Thgn.219-20 μηδὲν ἀλλὰ τεταξικόν τερρορισμον πολιτείαν κέρας, μετὰ δ' ἐρρίαν ἧν ὁδὸν ὧσπερ ἐγώ , id.331 μὲνος ὧσπερ ἐγώ μετὰ δ' ἐρρίαν πολιτείαν ; id.335 πάντων μὲνε' ἀρχιτά; Phocyd.ΙΝ πολλα μέεων Κέρας μένος ἀλλὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐκ εἶναι . (b) Archil. 19 οὐ μοι τὰ Γῆς τοῦ πολυκράτους μέεα... μεγάλις οὐκ ἔχει τυραννίδος, Ἀνακ.361 έγώ δ' οὗτι ἐν Ἀμαλκένης βουλοσμον κέρας οὐτί ἐτέκε πεντηκοντατε καλλιτέχνας τε Ταρρεμμοί βασιλέως, Sim.584 τι γὰρ ἡδονὴ ἔτερ βίος πεθένθαι η' ποικ τυραννίς (see D.C.Young, Mmomyosyne Suppl.9, 1968, 13-4).

52. τὰ μέεα: includes moderate behaviour ( Young loc.cit. confines the reference to 'an individual's prominence within a state'), as is shown by Pindar's association of τὰ μέεα with enduring prosperity: he says frequently that the most enduring form of prosperity for a man is that which is a) of moderate amount, b) acquired with moderation; cf. P.3.105-6 ἀλβος οὐκ ἐς μακρὰν ἀνθρῶν ἐρίεται κάσι, πολὺς οὖτι ἐν ἐπιμέρους ἐπηρατί ; cf. the fate of Ixion, μακρὰν οὐχ ὑπερμενεν ἀλβον, μαινομενα ὄρκον 'Ηρας ὡτ' ἐρίσσατο (P.2.26-7) and of Tantalus, θαπτοτεχου μέεν ἀλβον οὐκ ἐδονεύσει Κόροις εἶλεν ἂν ὑπέρπαν (0.1.55-7).

The moderate behaviour he has in mind here is pursuit of what is a) καλεύ, b) not in despite of the gods, c) not too much.

wrong means; for similar ideas from others see West on Hes. Op.320.

53. μερικὴν ἔργον τυραννίδον: 'I find fault with the lot/fate of tyrannies', because tyrannies and their ὄλβοι do not flourish for long. For the history of the word τυραννίς see Fraenkel ad A.Ag.1365. By τυραννίδον Pindar does not mean only 'tyrannies' in the narrow and modern pejorative sense of the word, but he would include any rich and powerful ruler; contra Lloyd-Jones (ad Semon.7.69), a distinction between βασιλεύς and τυραννος is not always preserved in pre-Aristophanic Greek: v. Hdt.1.15-16 where both βασιλεύς and τυραννος are used of both Gyges and Ardus; Pindar calls Hieron both τυραννος (P.3.85) and βασιλεύς (0.1.23).

For details of some of the less pleasant characteristics of some tyrants see Herodotus on Polycrates (3.39,125), Kypselos (5.92.e - but see A.Andrewes, The Greek Tyrants 45f., on Herodotus's anti-Kypselos bias), Periandros (5.92 ), Pheidon (6.127).

For what Pindar might have learnt about the Sicilian tyrants see Diod.Sic.11.67 (on Hieron) ἢ γὰρ καὶ φιλάρφυρος καὶ βιμὼν καὶ καθὸδος τῆς ἐκπόρευσις καὶ καλοκαιρίνθης ἀνετρυπάτης, id.1b. (on Thrasyboulos) ὑπερέβαλε τὴν Καρκίνην [sc.τερψίνα] ... βιοὺς γὰρ ὅλον καὶ φοινικὸς ... λέξας μὲ ἀλλοιον τῶν πολιτῶν ἀπεχθήκεναι, καὶ πολλοὶ μὲν ὑβρίζοντο, τῶν δὲ ἄνδρῶν .... Further condemnation of tyrants at Solon fr.32W, Xenoph.fr.3W, Theogn.823,1181,1203-4.

Hence Young is over-generalising when he says, 'obviously the lives of the extremely wealthy, of the gods, and of the tyrannos or monarch were customarily regarded enviable and desirable' (op.cit.11).
means 'find fault with', not 'blame' (which would imply, non-sensically, that the \( \text{τι μέχρις ἀρσενῶν} \) was the cause of \( \text{τού μέχρις μερεστήριον ὀλβοὶ τεσσελων} \). The fault of tyrannies is that they do not flourish long.

54. \( \text{διὰ τούτου ἄθικος} \) \( \text{τεταμε} \) : 'I'm at full stretch after virtues that can be shared in'; the clause links with the previous one through \( \text{διὰ τούτου} \) \( \text{δριτταί} \) being what tyrannies lack. By 'shared virtues' Pindar here has in mind in particular the victory of Thrasydaios which is shared in by the Theban community: at P.9.93 the victories of Telesikrates are called \( \text{τῷ ἐν ἔναν τεταμε} \) \( \text{τεταμε} \) and above (10-11) Thrasydaios's victory is a \( \text{κώριε} \) to Thebes; cf. Bacch.10.11-12 \( \text{ἐν ἀθώνατον} \) \( \text{μνημένων} \) \( \text{δων} \) \( \text{τεταμε} \) \( \text{τελων} \) \( \text{δριτταί} \) \( \text{κατατρόμου} \text{μονον} \text{ἐπετερονοις} \). In contrast, the \( \text{κάτω} \) of tyrannies is not generally obtained by a display of \( \text{δριτταί} \) or shared by more than a few (the tyrant's cronies).

\( \text{τεταμε} \) : metaphoric from the stretching involved when you sprint. Pindar has not got 'his arms about the prize' (Gildersleeve ad loc.); cf. O.10.64-5 \( \text{τάσιν} \) \( \text{μὲν} \) \( \text{κρίτειν} \), \( \text{καθὼς} \) \( \text{τῶν} \) \( \text{ποιηθέν} \) \( \text{πρέξιαν} \), Il.23.758 \( \text{τοῖς} \) \( \text{δ' ἀπὸ νύσσης} \) \( \text{τέσσαρος} \), Xenoph. 1.20 (v.l.) \( \text{τῶν} \) \( \text{ἀκρίδα} \) \( \text{δριτταί} \).

54-5. \( \text{Φονέροι} \) \( \text{δ' ἀκόμην} \) \( \text{(ἀκόμην} \) \( \text{β' in linea)} \) \( \text{ὑπάρχει, εἰ} \) \( \text{τις} \) ... sic mss.; \( \text{Φονέροι} \) \( \text{δ' ἀκόμην} \) \( \text{καθ' τις} \) ... Snell: after Hermann and Boeckh; \( \text{Φονέροι} \) \( \text{δ' ἀκόμην} \) \( \text{καθ' τις} \) van Groningen; \( \text{Φονέροι} \) \( \text{δ' ἀκόμην} \) \( \text{καθ' τις} \) ... Thiersch; \( \text{Φονέροι} \) \( \text{δ' ἀκόμην} \) \( \text{καθ' τις} \) leg. Sch. (cf. Sch.P.11.83a \( \text{ὅ} \) \( \text{δ' ἀκόμην} \) \( \text{της} \) \( \text{ἐκουσάν} \) \( \text{αὐτή} \) \( \text{καὶ} \) \( \text{βασκανίας} \) \( \text{ἀκόμην} \) \( \text{καὶ} \) \( \text{βασκανίας}) \); alii alia.

This passage is the worst textual crux of the ode. One thing is clear, whatever the envious do or suffer the envy itself...
is directed at the ἡμέρα (54); Pindar regularly follows a reference to successful (athletic) achievement with mention of the envy it will arouse, cf. Parth.1.8-9 τικτή σ' έτιν φθονοί ἡμέρα
κατά, ἡμέρα, 0.8.54-5, I.1.41-5.

The reading of the mss. cannot stand because it makes no sense. But the lemma of Sch.P.11.63a (Ὁθονεροὶ σ' ἁμόνωνταί ἡμέραι) and the paraphrases of the scholiasts ad loc. (λυπομένου Σωκρήτησανι Σκ.83b, βλάπτονταν Sch.83c) show that the dative ἡμέραι was an ancient reading. (N.B. period-end after ἁμόνωνταί means the last syllable of ἁμόνωνταί could not be elided with a dissyllabic word like ἡμέραι). For the synizesis (σ' εἰ ἡμέραι) if ἡμέραι is read cf. Bacch.3.22 θεον θεον τε ἀγαλμάτων ἐν ἑρωτοκράτειος ἑκατών, P1.0.13.5-7 ἐν ταῖς ἑρωτικά ἑυρύχως ἐφέλνα, Ταῦραν ἀνδρίας πλούσιω (sic mss.; τὰῦροι Mommsen), Sappho 1.11-12, 55.1.

But Ἁθονεροὶ σ' ἁμόνωνταί ἡμέραι would be strange Greek for either 'The envious take revenge with ruin to themselves/to others' or 'The envious are warded off with ruin to themselves/to others' or for anything else. (The two ideas, that Ἁθονος and Ἁθονεροὶ are either self-destroying or destructive to others are common; for the former cf. P.2.89f., N.4.37f.; for the latter cf. 0.8.55, N.8.21f.; Bacch.13.199f., 16.31).

The difficulty of construing Ἁθονεροὶ σ' ἁμόνωνταί ἡμέραι (if Δόρος is more difficult) makes it doubtful whether ἡμέραι ever in fact began 1.55. If Δόρος (Boeckh's supplement) was what Pindar wrote, ἡμέραι could have arisen from a misreading of it (𝒜λλα-κότη), thence ἡμέραι. Alternatively, ἡμέραι arose from dittography after the ending of ἁμόνωνταί (-μένη -μένη) and another word began 1.55. Thiersch suggests ἁμόνωνταί ταῦτα εἰς την (Pindar Werke, Übersetzung in den pindarischen Vermaassen und Erläuterungen, following a suggestion of Hermann). This is attractive: the corruption
is explained by \( \tau \nu \) being omitted after \( \tau \eta \); \( \tau \nu \) is the mot juste because elsewhere whenever \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \) is used substantively and metaphorically, a partitive genitive accompanies it: N.1.10-11 \( \tau \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \), N.6.23-4 δ ῥετί \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \alpha \nu \) \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \), Sim.579.7 \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \), Tyrt.12.43 \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \), A.P.7.448 \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \), Peek V.1.1974 \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \). Metaphoric \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \) without a dependent genitive seems to occur only in prepositional phrases (e.g. \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \) Theoc.14.61).

M. Schmidt's \( \tau \nu \) could only refer to women present during the ode's performance, and could not have \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \) as its antecedent. It is unsuitable. Van Groningen's \( \tau \nu \), with \( \tau \nu = \tau \nu \) (Mnemosyne 8, 1947, 250f.) is unconvincing: it leaves \( \mu \dot{\nu} \rho \nu \ldots \tau \nu \) as a paratactic apodosis requiring 'someone who has fled terrible hybris' as its unexpressed subject. This is intolerably obscure.

CONCLUSION: the best solution is to read, after Thiersch, (a) it is likely \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \) had a partitive genitive dependent on it, (b) \( \tau \nu \) produces strange Greek, (c) a clause contrasting the successful person with the \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \) fits well. On this interpretation \( \tau \nu \) is demonstrative, not relative (for the syntax see Slater s.v. \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \), E.B. e.).

Translate: 'I’m at full stretch for virtues open to all; and the envious are warded off. And if someone has managed to achieve the pick of these virtues (i.e. a win at the Games), and has escaped his detractors etc.'

55. \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \): to come first at one of the four major Games was to reach the pinnacle of athletic success, cf. N.6.23-4 cit. supra. There were no prizes for coming second or third.

\( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \) : the manuscripts read \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \nu \nu \), a form more familiar to scribes. Pindar may have had in mind here Hes.Op.119 ῥετί \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \rho \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \) ̓ ενεκο\( \nu \nu \nu \), of men in the Golden Age.

Athletic success, though the crowning achievement, required

55-6. ἄλλων ὑπὲρ ἁγανίας: Pindar means both 'if the successful athlete is not himself insolent' and 'if he has escaped the hybris of the ἱθονετής'. For the former idea cf. 0.7.90 ἐπεὶ ὑπὲρ ἁγανίας Ἐραυ αὐτὸς ἔπεσε τοῖς τεταρτούν ὄρβαι φρένες ἐξ ἀρετῆς ἔρευν (of the victor Diagoras), I.2.35-7 ὥραν Ἑυρώπης ὄπερ ἄνθρωπον γλυκτίναν ἔκρυν; for the latter, N.8.21f. ὁπον δὲ λόγοι φθονοῖς, ἀπετατίσα (sc. φθονος) ὡς ἐκλείραν, Bacch.13.199f. ἐν μη τινα ἐπικρατής φθονος βιώσα, ἀνέτυξεν ἐπὶ νίκης (sc. the winner Pytheas). For the conjunction of both sorts of hybris cf. P.4.297 (of Damophilos) μητὶ πάν τινι πάμα πορὰν, ἀπαθῆς δ' αὐτὸς πρὸς ἀγνῆν.

ἀγανίας does not occur elsewhere in Pindar, but φθονος is common in similar contexts: P.2.52-3 ὁποὶ δὲ ἔρευν φελόγον εἰς ἕκτον κακουρίων, P.9.92 ἐγώ οὐκ ἔμελλεν ἐπικρατής ἐργαῖ φήμων.

56-8. μέλανος ὡς ἐκχάτινων...χάριν ποραί: Pindar here describes the reward awaiting those who have achieved the pinnacle of athletic success and have managed to live trouble-free.

ὁμοιαίας may have been inserted because ἀν...ἀγανίας was taken as the protasis to ἱθονετής...ταῖ and a new clause thought to begin with μέλανος, cf. Sch.P.11.83c τῶν δὲ ἐκέρας εὐθύκοιτα, καὶ μὲν ἡμικίνια ἓν τεταρτούν παρὰ τῶν περιουμνημένων and Sch.P.11.84 εἰ τε, ἀλλὰ, Διαφόρον καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἔξερεν ὁ ἱθονετής τῇ ἁμη μετα ἁμοιονταί.

"del. E.Schmid (cf.Z)" in Snell's app. crit. is misleading. There is no clear evidence the scholiasts knew of a text without the ὡς: Sch.P.11.83c and 84 (cit. supra) construe the text as if they read ὡς (v. supra); and the reason why Sch.86a, despite working from α' lemma (μέλανος ὡς ἐκχάτινων) that includes ὡς, construes the text as if it did not read ὡς, is probably because...
it thought δὲ could be disregarded rather than because it knew of 
a text without δὲ. Alexandrian commentators were prepared to 
overlook or misinterpret awkward words in Pindar, cf. ad 0.3.43: 
δὲ in apodosis is replaced with ye by Sch.0.3.75d, and said to 
mean ἄν by Sch.0.3.77a; ad 1.1.11: Sch.1.1.10c on ἀριθμοῖ " ...περιμένον ἐν τῇ τῆς ἐξ ἀρχόντων ποιήσεως 

\[ \text{καὶ} \text{ἐκχάτων} \ldots \text{<κτείνῳ>} \] 

so Snell. κτείνῳ is Wilamowitz's 

conjecture (v. Schroeder's edition 267); he compares S.Ant.808 

τὰν νεκτάν ἐνον κτείνου (Schroeder adds A.Asg.81 τριβολος μὲν ὡς κτείνου κτείνου). 

But κτείνειν ὡς is one thing; κτείνου ἐκχάτων is a much less likely 

expression, since ἐκχάτων ('limit', 'extremity') lacks the notion 
of spatial length implicit in ὡς. 

Better to read καὶ ἐκχάτων...

κτείνου, Archil.185.3-4 πιθανος ἡς...μονες καὶ ἐκχάτων Pl.frr.172.4-5 

Τριβολος ἢ μενειν...

τριβολος, id.Paedn 7.11 ἵνα τηλαιτε ἅγν κορμῆν. 

An indicative apodosis fits better than an optative after the 

indicative κτείνειν. 

Translate: 'he journeys to an end better than black death'. 

A black death is oblivion, the fate of the unsuccessful, contrast­

ing with the light which fame gives to the successful: cf. Parth. 

1.6f. (which sums P.11.54-8) Τριβολος δὲ βροτοι κεριμένων...παντὶ δὲ ἐν 

Φύλους ἀνάρχι κεριμένων αρετοι...ο δὲ μυθεκ έχειν ὧπο σιγάθε μελαίνας κερι 

κεριμένας. 

For the idea that the successful athlete journeys to limits 
denied to others cf. P.10.22-9, esp. 28-9 οὐκοι δὲ βροτοι ἐκθυν 

ὁμολογοῦσαν ἀποχέων, Τεράνετε πρὸς ἐκχάτων πλούς. 

In place of κτείνειν...οι parts of ἔκθω have been suggested 

(following D's ἐκχέων ἐν ) and θαυμάζετε (as most mss.) read. But the 

expression θαυμάζετε ἔκθω is unattractive; particularly unattractive 
is μελαίκας δὲν ἐκχάτων καλοῖς θαυμάζετε ἔκθω conjectured by E.L.Bundy 

57-8. Even when dead the victor provides honour to future members of his family who, thanks to poetry like Pindar's, will be able to remember their ancestor's achievements.

υἱὸν ἄνδρα γενέσθαι: a family is an invaluable possession, cf. Pi.0.10.86f; a father rejoices when at last a son appears to whom he can bequeath his goods.

The superlative also adds extra pathos, as at P.9.99-100 ἐκ-ἐκεῖθεν φιλάτον παρθένικα, πιὰν ἡ ὅπων ἐυήντο-ἐπιμαγεῖ (cf. Il.20.408f. of the dead Polydorus, son of Priam, νεωτάτος ἐκκε γόνος, καὶ οὗ φιλάτος ἐκεῖ). See F.Dornseiff, Pindars Stil 78f. on the superlative in Pindar as 'mehr Elativ als Superlativ'.

58. εὐόνυμον κτένισμα κρατίταν ἱππό: εὐόνυμος ἱππό is ἱππό that consists in a good ὦνομα; the victor bequeaths to his family a good name which they will take pleasure in (χαίρειν).

κρατίταν is preferable to κρατίστων (B in linea), cf. 0.3.42 εἶ δ' ἀριστεῖτό μὲν ὄσπορι, κτενισμὸν δὲ ἱππός λεγό ἐστίν τοῖς ἐλλοίριοις θυσίαν εὐημέρον ἐπὶ τίγετος; 0.10.88-90 πλοῦτος δὲ λαχῶν τοιμέων ἐπίκαιρον ἐλλοίριοιν δικάσκοντοι εὐημέρωτος; Hes.Theog.614 ὁδόριος, ὃς περὶ καρπεραστὸς ἐπὶ τίγετος, id.Op.279-80 δικάσκον, ἡ πολλὰν ἀρίστα τίγετα, ib.471-2 εὐημεροῦσα ὧρα ἀρίστη τενίριος ἀνθρώποις, καλοθηθείσῃ δὲ καρπετῇ. The ending of the superlative is assimilated to the gender of the noun and the adjective treated as predicative.

Pindar is fond of using apposition to make a striking comparison: 0.2.53f. ὃ μὲν πλοῦτος ... λαχῶν ἱππόληως, ἐτυμώσατο ἄλλης φωκείοις, 0.4.11f. τοῦδε καθώς, ἀρχικότατος φιλός εὐρυσθεόν όφελέτα, 0.7.1f. φίλου... ταύρων καταρθίων κτενισμοῦ εὐποριας τις ἱππό, P.7.1-2 καλλίστον αἱ μεγαλοποιήσα θέλαναι προοίμιον.

59f. The implications of these lines for Thrasydaios are (a) he, too, will be distinguished and remembered because like the
three heroes he has been sung of; (b) he will gain transient blessedness like Castor and Polydeuces; cf. P.10.22f. ἔδειξάμεν δὲ καὶ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἄνδρα γίνεται σοφότερον, ὡς ἂν Ἰχθυῖς ἢ ποδὸν ἲπτόμην ἐπικτῆς τὰ κέρατα ἀέθλων ἔλησ.

59. ἦ τε: the relative connector is more than a means to pass on to a new subject. Just the same (τε) Χήρικ distinguishes and makes famous the three heroes as Thrasydaios gave to his family: the Χήρικ that comes from athletic success. Unless this is appreciated, it is not clear why Pindar mentions the Dioscuri (hence Wilamowitz, Pindaros 262n.3, "Weshalb die spartanischen (nicht einmal die thebanischen) Dioskuren...vermag ich nicht zu rechtfertigen").

The three heroes were renowned for their athleticism; cf. especially I.1.14ff. (also for a Theban victor) Κείνοι (sc. Iolaos and Castor) ἔργον θαυμάζεται Ἀκρεσίαμοι καὶ Ὁμήρης ἐπικυρώθηκεν ἀκραταιοί ἐν γὰρ ἄεθλοις θ' ἔρχεται πλείων θρόνων...ἐγνωρίζοι στρατιώτων πικαδόρων; also I.5.32, I.7.9, N.10.51. Pindar had precedent: Od.11.300 = 11.3.237 Καστόρ' δ' ἵππομαχόν καὶ πολὺ αὔριμον Πολυδείκει, Hes.fr.198.8 = fr.199.1 Καστόρ' δ' ἵππομαχόν καὶ ἄεθλομαχον Πολυδείκει. Horace followed: Od.1.12.25-7 puerosque Ledae, hunc equis, illum superare pugnis nobilem (cf. also Theoc. 22.23-4; P.Oxy.2735fr.1.15ff.; Paus.2.34.10, 5.8.4).

Iolaos was honoured with Games at Thebes: Sch.0.7.153e, Sch. N.4.32; cf. Pi.I.5.32, Paus.9.23.1. For the accompanying festival v. M.P.Nilsson, Griechische Feste 446-7, Wilamowitz, Pindaros 47, 264ff. The Games commemorated Herakles's dead children: Sch. I.4.177 μισθείς στρατανεύων ἐν Ὁμήρῳ στρατανεύωτι, οἱ νικώτεροι τὰ ἱονεῖα... διὰ τὸ ἐπικ. ταύτα τέρατα στρατανεύων.

The text provides no evidence for the idea of Bowra (Pindar 154-5) that Iolaos and the Dioscuri are mentioned as represent-
atives of Thebes and Sparta hinting at an alliance between the two states.

59-60. τῶν Ἱππίκλης ... ἔλαιον: the patronymic enables Pindar to allude to another Theban hero. Iphikles was Herakles’s brother; Herakles’s mother was mentioned at the beginning of the poem (1.3).


Ἰππίκλης was in some places the Dioscuri’s title: Paus.2.36.6 Διοσκουροί ἱερόν ἐστὶν Ἀνδρών (Argos), id.10.38.7 (Amphissa); further evidence in B.Hemberg, Anax, anassa und anakes- als Gottennamen unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung der Attischen Kulte, Uppsala 1955,30f.

The variation between the two ways Pindar refers to the Dioscuri (ἰππίκλης Τολύσευκες) exemplifies his fondness for asymmetrical expressions (v. Dornseiff, loc.cit.103f.); it also reflects the version of the story in which only Polydeuces was an immortal god (Cypria fr.5 Kinkel; cf. Pi.N.10.80f.).

ὑιόι Θεῶν: ήίος Pauw, ήίο Βοθε. But ήίο is vocative, as if Pindar had written καί ἐστὶν Κάστερος βία, ἐστὶν θεός Τολύσευκες, ὡς ήίος Θεῶν; he calls on them both as sons of gods; they were worshipped as gods in Laconia, cf. Aristoph.Lys.81 τοις εἰς (Sch. ad loc. τοις Διοσκουροῖς λέγεται, Λακωνίας Κάστερος εἴη Θεός; Isoc. Helen 63 ἐς τορ Κάστερος Κάστερος, Θεοῖς ἐς Alpha τοις Θεοῖς; τοῖς μετανοοῦσιν, ὡς οἳ ἔρωται ὑπὲρ τὴς θείας ζωῆς τοῖς ἀντιμαθικοῖς; Paus.3.13.1; Plut.Vit.Thes.33; also Od.11.304 τοις καὶ ληθοῦσιν ἠκο Θεοί τινες.

63-4. τὸ μὲν παρὰ ἄνθρωποι τοῦ Θεοῦ παραβρέσετο τὸ ἀλλοτρὶος μὲν ήμοιοι ἐτερήσατο, ἀλλοτρὶος τὸ τῆς θείας τεθνώσεως (Ili.11.302-3) says
Sch.P.11.95. But Pindar's paraphrase is significantly different from Homer; he says nothing about their being dead, which would be unsuitable for mention here in the context of the quasi-immortality to be gained by Thrasydaios; for the same reason there is nothing about their living under the ground, cf. N.10. 55-6 ἐμέραν τὰν μὲν παρὰ θάνατι. ἄλλοι Δί: νεκρον, τὰν δ' ὧν κεῦτο γυναῖκες ἔνυγκλοις θερέως, ib.87; Alcman fr.7. Contrast also Cypria fr.5 Kinkel: Castor mortal, Polydeuces immortal.

The variations in these accounts of the Dioscuri's status may in part reflect variations in local cult (v. Nilsson, Griechische Feste 417f.; id. Greek Popular Religion 66f.; Farnell, Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality), though here Pindar's literary purpose has influenced his version. Their inhabiting both Olympus and a home-town is akin to a strand of belief found in the Iliad about Homer's Olympian deities (cf. J. Griffin, QL&.1978,8 "A great attempt is made in the Iliad to depict all the gods living together on Olympus with Zeus, although it emerges here and there that gods actually have quite separate homes"). The N.10 account takes a different stance, more akin to a belief in the Dioscuri as underground gods (on the Olympian/Chthonic distinction v. Il.20.64-5, Hes.Theog.736-9,766; cf. W. Burkert, Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche 310 "Olympische Göter und Tote haben nichts miteinander zu schaffen; die Göter hassen des Haus des Hades und halten sich fern").

τὸ μὲν πάρ ἅμα... τὸ δ' οἰκεόντα; equivalent to οἰκεόντα, 'by alternate days', not 'by day' which would be κατ' ἅμα, and is expanded by the antithesis. For πα/ in this sense = 'every other/second' v. LSJ s.v. πα/ C.1.9 (where this passage belongs); cf. Dem.49.56 οἰκεύων ἐκτέραι, ἣμέραν πα/ ἥμεραν 'stayed with each on a daily
basis'. The time scheme is the same as the Dioscuri have at
N.10.55-6 ἀκέραιον ταξιμένων παρὰ πάρι φίλοι, άπροσθον, τὰ νεκρὰ

Lines 63-4 are best construed οἰκεῖον παρὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐννυχομένου Ὠμῆρον, with οἰκεῖον taking two constructions, ἐννυχομένου governing Ὠμῆρον and Olympus denoting the settlement of the gods at the top of the mountain, not Mt. Olympus itself, as perhaps at Hes.Theog.37 (v. West ad loc.; he quotes Sch.A.II.1.497 οἵ τοι ἐν πάσῃ τοῦ Ὠμῆρου ἐστιν ὑμνώματος πάλιν Ὠλύμπος). For the two constructions cf. I.5.36-8 οἰκεῖοι ἡμῖν ἥραλδαι πρώτευοι καὶ εὖ ἀγαθίσσονε; for οἰκεῖον c. dat. cf. N.10.58 οἰκεῖον τῷ σφέραν.

63. Οἰκεῖον: Therapne was about two kilometres north of modern Sparta. It was the site of the earliest Sparta (Mycenaean remains, now in the Sparta Museum, have been found in the area) and the Menelaeion where Helen and Menelaos were worshipped; it was also the home of the Dioscuri (cf. N.10.56-7, I.1.31 and the present passage) - Fifth-Century votive reliefs attest to their worship there (v. Tod and Wace, Sparta Museum Catalogue 122f., 178).

The end and the beginning of the ode exemplify ring composition: the first and last lines both refer to the Olympians and Olympus; both Semele and the Dioscuri share Olympus only by special dispensation; two sisters open the ode, two brothers end it. This variety of ring composition, a thematic connection between the end and the beginning of the poem, is quite common in Pindar's odes, cf. O.2.5f.-91f. (Theron's generosity), P.1.1f.-97-8 (the phorminx), N.9.1f.-52f. (Chromios and the Muses), I.8.1f.-65f. (Kleandros and friends), N.2.1-5-23-5 (Zeus); similarly in Alcaeus 42 (Helen), and Sappho 1 (Aphrodite).
Pindar has other types of ring-composition: in 0.7 three myths are told (Tlapolemos, the sons of the sun, Rhodes), then briefly touched on in reverse order (0.7.20f., 39f., 56f., 71, 72f., 77f.). Another type is exemplified in I.1 where mention of Iolaos and Castor (16, 30-1) rings a section of the poem about them (cf. Iamos at 0.6.43, 71; Pelops at 0.1.24, 95).

Repetition of significant words to mark off a section of a poem is a favourite device of Bacchylides in his longer epinicians: B.5.49-16 'λέοντες' ως', ib.200-178 'εις, Δω', B.11.39-1 'ηκουσα' ως', ib.110-41 'μακος', ib.126-114 'οἱκος' ως'; but its effect is diluted by the superabundance of other verbal repetitions throughout the odes (v. H. Maehler, Die Lieder des Bakchylides, introduction (para. 3) to B.11). Pindar's repetitions tend to be expressed with verbal variety; Bacchylides regularly repeats himself with the same phraseology, e.g. B.11.60 'πετωντες' 'πυρος' ως, ib.61-2 'ναιον' ... μηδεις' 'μεν πας' ... 'τυνδαφιδος';

Examples of ring composition are found also in Epic: Hes. Theog. 713-820 (a series of myths told in the form A-B-C-C-B-A; v. West's edition p.358); Il.24.601-2-613, 618-9 (verbal repetition surrounding the story of Niobe; cf. Hes. Theog. 426-7-448-9).

The succinct allusion to a story (here, the Dioscuri's fate) is typically Pindaric (cf. 0.10.15-19), but only occasionally does he end an ode in this way (cf. 0.1.fin. Ganymede; N.1.fin. Hebe; N.8.fin. Seven against Thebes). The ring composition here mitigates the abrupt effect of ending with such a succinct allusion.
COMMENTARY on NEMEAN TWO

Prologue: The date of this poem, like that of all the Nemeans, is not known. Farnell (Commentary 251) writes: "The only evidence as to the date of this ode is the reference to the island of Salamis without any allusion to the great battle 460 B.C. This gives us a terminus ante quem" (similarly Wilamowitz, Pindaros 156, with another, not compelling, argument). But the last sentence does not follow since Pindar was composing for a victory in the pankration at Nemea, not writing a history of Salamis; and the ode is a short one.

A scholiast on line 1 (Sch.N.2.1a) writes: ἔλεγε οὖν Φιόνι, ἔστιν ἄπρο Λιον ἐβράκνιον τῶν ξυνόνων μετὰ τῷ τινι νικήσαν ὃ καὶ ἑγένετο ἐνθεκτικόν γιὰ τὴν Νεμέακοιν νικήσεις ἐκβιβάσθη ἔν τι Ολυμπία. It is unlikely the scholiast is inventing this Olympic victory, because the text - the scholiasts' usual source for inventions - says Timodemos should win in the future, if he follows his father's footsteps, at Isthmia and Pythia (line 9), not at Olympia. The following of the Pleiades by Orion (11-12) is a very oblique hint at a future Olympic win (see ad loc.); but since none of the scholiasts on N.2 is able to see that this is the significance of the passage, it too can be ruled out as a source.

Bowra (Pindar 407) argues that since Timodemos is not among the pankration victors in the list of Olympic victors for 480-68 (P.Oxy.222, which covers 460-68 and 456-48; the names of the victors in the pankration and boxing in 480 are lost from the papyrus, but given by Pausanias 6.6.5, 6.11.5), therefore the victory mentioned by the scholiast must have been before 480, and hence N.2 earlier still. But the Olympic victory might have been in 464 or 460; so the date of N.2 is not certainly before 480.
It does not follow that because Timodemos won at Nemea in the pankration he must have won at Olympia, too, in the pankration. Pausanias (6.11.5) records that Theagenes of Thasos won in the pankration, boxing and long-distance running.

The pankration was a violent sport: "The common English translation, 'trial of strength', is a polite fiction: the contestants punched, slapped, kicked, wrestled (much of the time on the ground) and even - though illegally - bit and gouged each other until one surrendered by tapping the victor on the back or shoulder", (Finley and Pleket, The Olympic Games 40-1). It was reckoned less dangerous than boxing: Artemidorus Oneir. 1.64 το ετε παγκρατίων τα μου την ποντί την γενικό την πλην βλατή, a perverse judgement according to Finley and Pleket (loc. cit.); but even today severe injuries and death occur more often in boxing than in judo to which the pankration has been compared (not wholly accurately: judo forbids bending the fingers; not so the pankration; "Sostratos was nicknamed Fingertips because he used to catch hold of his opponents' fingertips and bend them back, and he never let go until they surrendered", Paus.6.4.1).

Pindar commemorates pankratiasts only in his Nemeans and Isthmians; none of his Olympians or Pythians is for one. This may signify that he wanted to extol this violent event only in moderation and his minor epinicians.

In those Nemeans and Isthmians written for pankratiasts the theme of violence looms large through the violence of the mythical characters, descriptions of war, fighting, death; for example N.3.33f. Τάκενον... καὶ ποντίαν Θείαν Κατεξώρεσθαι ἐγκωμίτη (cf. Sch.N.3.61a ἐγκωμίτη: λατρεία τοῦ ἐνεργοῦ, ἢ μεταφήκα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδραυχέων); ib.43f. Αἰγκρέεν... εὐμετα παρὰ Κενιδῶν Κένιτων ἀειγνωστά καγὼν (cf. I.5.39-42, I.6.31-5, I.7.25f.; Bacch.13.100f.). The detailed
vividness of Pindar’s description in Isthmian 4 of the Theban pankratiast Melissos is unusual: τολμάς γὰρ εἶπον ῥηθημέταν βυγνά λεόνταν ἐν τόνω, ποτίν δ’ ἀλάτης, οἴετο αὖ τ’ ἀνατινωρεῖν ἐμπόροι τ’ ἐκεῖν’ ἔρωταν’ αἴγαρώδεις εἰς τὸν ἐκθέσιν τῷ γὰρ Φιλίν Σταρνίων ἐλκυξίν’ ἔλλοις οὐδ’ ὑπεραίη, ἐσμαρείν δ’ ἀκμῇ βαρύς (I.4.45f.).

Pindar’s attitude to the pankration contrasts with his lack of interest towards the other events in the Games; the odes in honour of pankratiasts highlight the peculiar violence of the event, and how such violence must be delimited and its exponents use brain as well as brawn: cf. I.5.61 ἄρσεν δείλει, νάς ἀντίπαλον [sc. Πυθέας] I.6.66-71 Λάμπας δὲ μελέταν/ἐργυίᾳ ὠπάσων ἦς θαυμᾶν καλὴ τιμαὶ τοὺς ἐπαυματί ὑμῶν τε [sc. the pankratiasts Pytheas and Phylakidas] φράξων παρανικῇ ἐμεχνῶν μὲν γυμνῶν δίωκταν, μετὰ δὲ τοὺς κατέκηκαν/πλάκων δόξῃ ἐξώ εἴρενων; Bacch.13.44-5 ὁπινοῖν υἱόν τοῦτο δίκαι ἀνάρτητον κρίνων Ἀρτεμίς.

Herakles, despite his violence.

This provides a partial explanation for some of the references in Nemean 2: Orion, the mighty hunter; mighty Aias; Timodemus as ἀρχαῖος έμφας; the pankration as producer of resoluteness and strength. Pankratiasts were not garden or common people: "Arrachion’s opponent caught him, held him with a scissors grip and at the same time throttled him with his hands; so Arrachion broke one of the man’s toes. Arrachion died by strangling, and simultaneously the strangler gave in from the pain in his toe" (Paus.8.40.2).
If. Pindar begins three epinicians with a simile for what he is doing (I.6, 0.6, 0.7; cf. Bacch.12 init., id.5.16-36), but only here with one for the victor's achievement; the nearest analogue is the priamel beginning 0.1 (cf. 0.3.42f.). These opening comparisons put the uniqueness of Pindar's epinicians and victory in the Games into the framework of events in general so they become more tangible.

Nisetich (Pindar's Victory Songs 237) says implausibly: "Pindar seems to have intended the ode to be repeated by the chorus as it passed along the way, for the last line is phrased in such a manner as to allow a return to the opening words almost without pause". True, N.2 is unique (to Pindar and Bacchylides) in beginning with a relative clause and ἔσσω μὴ... (1) could follow syntactically after ἔσσω (25); but καὶ ὁ ἐκ... καὶ ὁ... ἔσσω (1-3) would have to be reconstrued 'both...and' (instead of 'this man too' with the first καὶ merely preparatory), and ἄμων ἐκ προοιμίου (3) would have to be taken with ἔσσω to mean, 'begin from where the Homeridai start their songs and from where this man started his victories, viz. with Zeus', a possible construal if lines 6f. consisted of a prooimion to Zeus. But they do not.

Conclusion: the form of N.2 is not evidence that it was designed to be sung repeatedly like a looped tape on a tape-recorder. More probably, like other short odes, it prefaced the kómos held for Timodemos (see on 1.24, and the conclusion after note on 1.25).

1. καὶ: corresponsive with, and preparatory for, καὶ in line 3; so both καὶ's are adverbial (not uncommon in relative clauses as here: see Denniston, The Greek Particles 324).
1-2. Homeridae: a group of rhapsodes specialising in Homer. Sch.N.2.1c Ομηρίδαι ἐλέγον το μὲν ἀρχεῖον ταύτα ἐν τῷ ἀρχεῖῳ Ὀμηρίδαι γένος, οἱ καὶ τὰ ποίημα αὐτῶν ἐκ διαδόχους ἤρθον, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ οἱ διάδοχοι οὐκέτι το γένος εἰς Ὀμηρίδαι καθίστατος. Ἀποφέρεται δὲ ἐγένοντο τοὶ περὶ κύωνδων, οὗς φιλοκ πολλα τῶν ἐπί τῶν ποιημάτων ἐρμηνεύεσθαι ἐν τῷ Ὀμηρίδαι ποίημα. ἦν δὲ οἱ κύωνδων τὸ γένος Χίου, διὰ καὶ τῶν ἐπηγγερόμενων Ὀμηρίδαι ποιημάτων τῶν εἰς Ἀθηναίοις, γείωσαν αὐτῶν. ὧδε εἰς τὸν κύωνδαν πρῶτον ἐν Συρακούσαις ἐρμηνεύεται τῷ Ὀμηρίδαις ἐπὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἱστορίαν [504-8.6], ὡς ἀποφέρεται φησὶν [FGrH 568 F5].

cf. Sch.N.2.1e Ὀμηρίδαι πρῶτον μὲν οἱ Ομηρίδαι παῖδες, ὡτότεν δὲ οἱ περὶ κύωνδων ἐρμηνεύοντες ὧδε γιὰ τὴν Ὀμηρίδαι ποίημα καθήκοντα εἰρμηνεύοντα καὶ σύνθετον ἐρμηνεύοντα ἀπὸ αὐτῶν παῖν.

The beliefs expressed in these parts of the scholia cannot be disproved, are plausible, and probably largely true or near the truth.

The -ιδαί ending properly means 'belonging to the family of', cf. I.3.17 μητρὸς Λησυδίκειον σύνεχος, P.7.2 Ἀλκυμίδας... γενεά. That the Homeridae were once a family on Chios was believed by Acusilaus (FGrH2F2) and Hellanicus (FGrH4F20) and is probable (see T.W. Allen, Homer, The Origins and the Transmission 42f.). This implies a Homer living there in the Sixth Century. The idea that the family was descended from the poet Homer represents the Chian viewpoint, cf. Strabo 14.1.35 ἀκολουθοῦσι καὶ Ομηρίδαι Χίου, μητρὸς μὲν τῶν Ὀμηρίδαι καλούμενοι ἄρα τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ γείωσαν προχειρισμένοι; Certamen 13-5 Allen.

Whether the first Homeridae = 'rhapsodes devoted to Homer' were from the Chian Homeridae family is an open question; for a metaphorical father-poet cf. P.4.176 ὁμογενεῖς ἐντὸς πατὴρ ἔμοιλεν εἰς Ὀμηρίδας ἀρχεῖον (Orpheus generated songs); Musaeus was put at the head of the genealogy of the Eumolpidae, as Eumolpus's father, to create an author of the poetry sung by the Eumolpidae (see M.L. West, The Orphic Poems 41).
After concentrating on Homer it seems that the Homeridai extended their repertoire by reciting their own work under Homer's name and opening the guild to non-family members living in Chios such as Cynaethus. He is known only from the Pindaric scholia; their source, Hippostratus, a Sicilian genealogist, was a Hellenistic historian/antiquarian/fablist and his account is credible (see H.T.Wade-Gery, Essays in Greek History 31-6; FGrH568 Comm.).

The Homeridai's practice of attributing their own output to Homer probably lies behind Pl.Phaed.252b λέγοντες ὡς ὁμηριδαίοι τοῦ χοροῦ τόν ἔρωτα ζών ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος ἔρωτα τοῦ ἔρωτα. The Homeridai are best known to Plato as a group who told stories about Homer and honoured his benefactors; this may represent a change of emphasis by Plato's day in their practice, but interpretation of poems was characteristic of rhapsodes from the Sixth Century onwards (see infra, and West, Hesiod, Works and Days 63).

D.Fehling (Rh.Mus.122,1974,193-9) thinks (1) Pindar was the first to use the word Ὀμηριδαῖοι, and (2) that he is using it here as a synonym for 'rhapsodes'. But the Acusilaus testimonium makes (1) doubtful, and Pindar does not say all rhapsodes were Homeridai (many concentrated on other authors: v. infra).

The type of song Pindar says the Homeridai sung is exemplified by the Homeric Hymns, the short hymn to Zeus prefacing the Works and Days, and the longer one to the Muses at the beginning of the Theogony (cf. the epic poet's practice of invoking a god before starting a new theme e.g. Od.8.499-500). Pindar says they often began with a hymn to Zeus only because of the context of N.2: Nemea, where Timodemos won, being sacred to Zeus. The next earliest reference to a Homeric Hymn (Thuc.3.105) also calls it a prooimion.
2. Ἐπενὼν ἐπένων ἄδοικον: the phrase gives an etymology for ἔμφωσις. A different etymology, implying a connection between ἔμφωσις and ἔμφοις, is suggested by the strange phraseology at I.4.56-7 κατὰ ἔμφωσις ἐπιστολήν ἔπενων ἐπένων [ὑπὸ Φρέματος] (see FGrH T328 F212 Comm.; for the rhapsode’s staff cf. Hes.Theog.30 καὶ μὸι κύντρον ἔσον σάλφυς ἐπὶ θεότητος ὕτων – v. West ad loc. and in JHS111,1981, 124f.).

ἐμφώσις means 'stitched'; something stitched together is made of little pieces. According to M.L.West (CQ21,1971,314n.1 and JHS111,1981,114n.6) ἔμφωσις = 'song-stitcher' refers to creative, viz. formulaic, composition (cf. ἔμφωσις Fr.557). But there are other possibilities: the term could refer (2) to the piecing together, not of formulae, but of smaller poems to make one large one (as our texts of the Iliad and Odyssey were created); (3) to stitching, not as fastening, but as a form of embellishment, implying it was the practice of rhapsodes to elaborate and embroider poems while reciting them. Most likely, I think, is (4): the term was invented to mean 'fabricator of song' and describe in a derogatory way the bad professional reciters and interpreters of poetry common in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries, despised as stupid by Xenophon (Mem.4.2.10, Symp.3.6), whose practice became synonymous with 'rubbish' (cf. Suda s.v. ἔμφωσις ἐμφώσις, ἔμφωσις ἐμφώσις, ἐμφώσις Φιλίππης, ἐμφώσις). The word is not attested until the Fifth Century (Collitz, Griechische Dialektinschriften 5766, Hdt.5.67, S.O.T.391) and may have been suggested by Homeric ἐμφώσις meaning, when used metaphorically, 'conceive', 'fabricate', always in a bad sense. (Further modern discussion on the word's etymology by H.Patzer, Hermes 80,1952,314-25; ancient ideas ap. Sch.N.2.1d).

Rhapsodes' subject-matter included Homer and Hesiod (Hdt. 5.67 κλεῖδην ἣπε, Ἀργείων πολέμησις, τούτῳ μὲν ἔμφωσις ἐπένων
The term ἀρταβολός implies ἀρταβολή, but from the Sixth Century rhapsodes were interpreters as well as singers (v. R. Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship i.10-11,35,55; cf. Pl.Ion 530c τὸν γὰρ ἀρταβολὸν ἐρωτήθη αὐτῷ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῆς δικαιοκρίτης; Isoc.12.18 διαλέγοντο [ἀπὸ ἄχωσιοι συνήθεια] περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν καὶ τῆς Ἡθίδου καὶ τῆς Ὀμηροῦ ποιητῶν, ὡσεὶ μὲν παρ' αὐτῶν λέγοντε, ἔτσι οὖν ἄρταβολον ἀρταβολοῦσι).

4. καθαλόν: subtly chosen, because it can refer both to the opening of a song and generally to the laying of any foundation: cf. Sch.N.2.1a ὅπερ δὲ καθαλόν ἔλεγον τὰς ἀρχὰς εὐσεβῶν ἔτοις, καθαλόν τε διέρης (Fr.392) Ἀριστοφάνες, ὡς δείχνει, γὰρ ὁ καθαλόμος ἀκέραιος, μετρῶσι δὲ καὶ λέγεται αὐτὸ τὸν, τὸν οἷόν κατασκευάζοντα καὶ διδομένον τοῦ καθαλού; E.Hel.164 ὅ μεγαλὸν ἄκρων καθαλόμοις μέχριν οἰκτον.

The word is, therefore, particularly suitable for both the openings of the Homeridae's hymns and Timodemos's first victory.

For its musical sense cf. αὐθωλόμοι which seems to be technical for preliminary notes on the lyre: Od.1.155 = 8.266 ὁ δωρίζων αὐθωλόμος ἐλεφαλέτω ἥλων ἀκέραιος; Pi.N.7.77 ὁ δωρίζων ἀυθωλόμος ἐλεφαλέτω (Sch.N.7.114d ἀμφότεροι τὸν τέχνην καὶ ἀρχαὶ τοῦ λαγεῖν ἐλεφαλέσας); Theoc. 6.20 τοῦ δὲ ἄρνος ἀυθωλόμος ἐλεφαλέτω καὶ τοῦ ἔλεγον ἐλεφαλέσας; similarly αὐθωλή: Pi.P.1.4 ἀναφέροντα δ' ἱδονὶ σὲμείων ἄγγείσιον ὑποταθεί τροχύμη ἐξελομένη (the participation of the chorus suggests ἄρα αὐθωλή were integral to the whole piece, not equivalent to tuning up; v. M.L. West, JHS111,1981,122); pseudo-Stesichorus (PMG 278) refers to the process, ἄρρητα λάθεί τ' ἀρτον ἀποφέκτη θερίστων
cf. Eupolis 5

Analogous to καταβολή. Here is Pindar's metaphorical use of βαλλομενος κρήτης = 'I throw a foundation, begin': P.4.138 βαλλετο κρήτης σουφι ἐπομον, P.7.2-3 προοίμιον... κρήτης ἀουθαν ἰττοιοι βαλλειαι (literally at Fr.51a βαλλομενος κρήτης ἀλεον); cf. N.1.8 δρΧι ες βεβληναι θεον (Sch.N.1.l1a τουτο δε λεγετ δι το απο θεον την Ἀρτέμιδος καταβολης, ειτε δρΧι ται προοιμι την οδησ αυτων λεγειν).

καταβολή governs νικαδορικς (genitive, itself governing ιερων ληονων); Snell's comma after προοιμι should be removed: 'he first received a foundation to victory in the Sacred Games in the famous grove of Nemean Zeus'. For νικαδορικς ιερων ληονων meaning 'victory in...' cf. Homeric μάχη νίκη (I.I.7.26, 8.171).

The word illustrates the influence on Pindar of architecture and its terminology (cf. 0.6.init.).

5. πολυκωνής: not otiose; the grove at Nema was much sung of (a) because of its proximity to the tomb of Opheltes in whose honour the Nemean Games were said to have been founded: ὑπερτης Nεμεων Sch.a (Drachmann iii.1); E.Hyps.Fr.60.ii.101ff.; Call.Fr.383, filled out by P.Lille 62 (v. ZPE25,1977,6ff.) = Lloyd-Jones/Parsons, Supp.Hell.nos.254f. (b) Because Herakles killed the Nemean lion there, cf. esp. Bacch.9.4f. Nεμεων/ Ἰηνος εύζελε πέδων ὕμνειν, ὃς μηδαμίαν/ θέσαε ἐν λευκωλειναι Ἑρακλη̣ς ζέλον ἐβέβαλεν/ προωτον Ἑρακλης βακχοδομος λειαν/ κεκαθον ροινικι- λειας ἐν τοις πρωτοστοι Αργεων κρεοι/ αὐθαν ετ' Ἀρχεμορίς.

Pindar was much attracted by πολυ - compounds; examples are often surprisingly near each other: 0.1.8 πολυβετο se ι2 πολυμήλων, P.9.6-7 πολυμήλου και πολυκρατωτας, ib.69 πολυκρατιων =76 πολυμήλων, N.3.2 πολυκρατων =10 πολυκρατως (So also in Parmenides: Fr.1.2-4;
Fr.7.3-5). He was inventive: seven of his 31 different πολυ- compounds are found in no other author (though πολυνευελος in Et.Mag.); fifteen of the 31 are not found in earlier authors; three that are epic are given a new meaning: πολυμυθελος, 'verbose' (epic), 'famous in story' (Pindar); πολυσεπιτικος, 'very hospitable' and 'much-frequented'; πολυφανες, 'abounding in songs'— 'much-spoken of'.

A similar picture with other of Pindar's intensifying prefixes: all his five κρατης- κρατεπι(κα)-compounds are unique to him; five of his 10 βαπτ- compounds are his alone, three not in earlier authors; of 11 βαθ- compounds, eight not in earlier authors, six unique; only two of his μεγα, μεγαλι(κα)- compounds found earlier; μεγατετοπολει (P.8.2), his only μεγατετο- compound, is unique to him.

Only five of the compounds formed with these prefixes are shared by him with Bacchylides: πολυκτενος, μεγαλοκλεις, βαρυλθογος, μυβονος, μεγαλαμαρ (only the last not epic). When Pindar does form compounds, he tends to form unusual ones; contrast an example of Bacchylides's practice: his only κρατης-κρατεπι- compound is κρατεροθυμος (epic); but note his inventiveness with μεγα(λο)-μεγατετο- compounds: μεγατομακακακα, μεγατοπατατορ, μεγατυατος, μεγαλοκλεις, μεγαλοκλοξος all unique to him, only μεγαλωμος (epic) inherited.

One can tentatively conclude that in his use of these intensifying prefixes Pindar is more regularly innovative than Bacchylides, and shows greater avoidance of common epic formations; when he does use epic compounds, he likes to give them a new meaning or application (besides the examples above, cf. his use of βαρυλθογος: of a lion, Hom.Hym.Aphr.159 followed by Bacchylides 8.9; of a bowstring, Fl.I.6.34; of βαθυκολος: of Trojan
women in Homer, of I. Pi.P.9.101).

*Διος ἀλκες*: the whole site, including both the part where the Games were held and Zeus's precinct; cf. Strabo 9.2.33 of ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμερού ἄλκας καλοῦντες τὰ ἱερὰ πάντα, καὶ ἢ ἡμῖν τοιῶν ἐστι καὶ μαχαίρι θυσίαις μαρτυρούν κρηστίδις ἄλκεων [sc. Apollo] = Pi. Fr.51a.4; Euripides calls the site both a λιπών (Hyps. Fr.1.i.ii.29, ib. Fr.1.iv.21) and an ἀλκες (ib. Fr.1.iv.10).

The history of the sanctuary of Zeus and the temple in Classical times is bipartible (see the reports by Stephen Miller in Hesperia,45-9,1976-80). The extant remains of the temple are Hellenistic, but there was an earlier one sharing the same orientation (Hesp.46,1977,20f.) built in the Sixth Century (ib.48,1979, 62). The sanctuary and the temple were destroyed in the late Fifth or early Fourth Century; bronze arrow-heads, belonging to the second half of the Fifth Century have been found, suggesting violence on the site (ib.46,1977,9). Literary evidence, too, shows that the ἄλκες had a checkered history; both Argos and Kleonai (near Nemea) vied to control the Games: cf. Pi.N.4.17 κλειντικών τ' ἀπί θύσιν; (Sch.N.4.21c λέγεται δὲ τοῦ Νεμέου, κλεινικίου γὰρ κωτὸν διέθηκεν); Xenophon mentions an illegal Nemean Games sacred truce introduced by Argos (ἐπὶ τῶν μνημόνων ὑποκλῆσεν Xen.Hell.4.7.2; cf. Hypothesis Nemeonicarum c = Drachmann iii.3 προέτηκαν δὲ τοῦ θυσίας καὶ Ἀργείῳ καὶ Κορίνθιοι καὶ κλειντικίων).

6-10. ὀρθεὶς ... τινὶ: τινὶ' mas. and Aristarchus (v. infra), τινὶ' oed. c. Hartung. ὀρθεὶς used impersonally is regularly passive (e.g. E.Alc.419 ὃς τὰυτὰ ἑαυτῷ καθάρεται ὀρθεῖται); LSJ (s.v. iii.), Slater (s.v.), and Bury (The Nemean Odes of Pindar, ad loc.) regard ὀρθεῖς here as an impersonal use of the active; so, too, Aristarchus (Sch.N.2.9a Ἄριστος' ὃς ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀνδρᾶς γ'
Hence Hartung’s παλ. Better, retain παλ: as Pindar begins the sentence he thinks of Timodemus as the subject and therefore uses the active of ὀρείν; then after all (and especially the intervening clause which mentions T. in the accusative, τι προκέιται) he uses a construction in which T. is grammatically accusative. This type of anacolouthon has no obvious parallel in Pindar, though common in tragedy (v. Barrett on E.Hipp. 23), but cf. Pind. 0.2.56f.

Pindar may have been influenced in his choice of verb by the story that the Games were established in honour of the death of Opheltes: Hyp.Nem.c init. ἦσαν ὅτι ὁ Ἱππόλυτος ἦσαν Ἀρχέμορος; Bacch.9.10-12 ἐμείχθη (sc. at Nemea) φοίνικον κριόν ἔμειχθη τῇ Αἰδηφοίᾳ; at Callim. Fr.383.1. Ταύτα τα καὶ ἐμείχθη τῇ Χαρίσιονείδεν ὀρέιν and E.Hyps.Fr.60. 12 ὀρέιν ἔμειχθη (sc. Opheltes), ὀρέιν and ὀρέιν pun on Opheltes’s name. For another likely pun in this ode v. on 11 ὀρέιν (penultimate paragraph of note).

6-7. Πατρίνως...καθ’ ἐσθόν: including not only Timodemus’s father, but also his earlier forbears; the family had a history of athletic excellence: v. 17f. (19 victories away from home), and cf. Sch.N.2.9b ἐμείχθη κατὰ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν πατέρων...τῶν προγόνων ἕρων ἱγευόντων (perhaps an inference from the text, but the...
scholiasts do sometimes show knowledge of external evidence relating to the victor's family, e.g. Sch.0.13.58a; cf. Prologue init.).

For the 'following in the footsteps of' idea cf. N.6.15, P.10.12, P.8.35. These passages display the earliest such use of ἰγνωρικόν and ἰγνωρίω (followed later by Pl.Phaedr.276d; cf. Hor.A.F. 286-7: vestigia Graeca ausi deserere), and are perhaps the source for the English expression. Pindar's observation that victories frequently ran in the family may have influenced his dictum that athletic success requires inborn and hereditary ability (as well as training, good luck etc.), e.g. 0.10.20-1 δι' ἢν θεόν καὶ ἄρετα, ποτὲ πελάργοις ὀμφάλους θέσει άνω θεῶν, οὐν παλάμως, 0.13.13 ἀμαξίων δὲ κρύφθην τὸ συγγενές ἑβοκά, Ι.3.13-14 ένδοκέν δ' ἄρεταν συμβαίνον οὐ κατελέγχην.

The clause down to Ἁθανακις (13) means, 'If, as we may hope, T's present victory, which has made him a glory to Athens, means that he is following his father's footsteps'. ἐπερ qualifies ταρτήν καθ' οὖν in particular, and the whole clause refers to the present victory: after winning at Nemea, T. would have been announced by the herald as Ὀθανακις. The thought underlying this and the next strophe is whether T. will continue to follow the pattern of his forbears' victories. For the possibility that a generation might miss out on their father's athletic excellence cf. N.11.37f.

7-8. εὐθυπομάκα δι' αὐτοῦ: proleptic, including Timodemos's future life. Two interpretations are distinguishable: (1) αὖ/ means T.'s own life and εὐθυπομάκα 'straight-guided'. αὖ/ regularly means a man's own life or lifetime in early Greek (e.g. 11.16.453, of Sarpedon, τό άνθρόπος Κρήτης τό κατ' αὔ/; Π.3.86-7 αὔ/ δ' ἐκλυμίς οὐκ ἐγένετ' οὔτ' ἄλκαλος παρ' Πυθεί; Βαρθ.1.153 αὔ/ ἐλυκεύ;) see Fränkel on A.Ag.105f. where сυμβαίνετ' αὔ/ expresses
the idea that a man's lifetime is born, grows up, and ages with him. For ἄνων as subject with a personal object cf. 0.9.60-1 μὴ καθέλοι νῦν (sc. Lokros) ἄνων ποτικὸν ἐκτιμῆσαι ὑπερεῖν γενέσθαι.

(2) ἄνων is conceived as an external power, Life or Time, that changes men's fortunes (including their lives); cf. I.3.18 ἄνων κολυμβημένις ᾠμέρις ὀλλὸν ὑγιὸς ἡλικίαν, I.8.14-5 οὖνος γὰρ ἄνων ἐπὶ ἄνθρωπον ἱκάκηρον ἔλθειν βίου πτερόν; Heracl. Fr.93 ἄνων πατέ ἐστιν, παϊς, πεσσίων παιδί δι βασιληίδ. For ἄνων in this sense see M.L. West. Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient 158-9. ἐνθυτουργός will mean 'straight-guiding'; cf. A.Ag.1005 ἄνων ἐνθυτουργόν; P.0.13.23 Ζεύς πάτερ... Ἑπειδὴνος ἐνθεύει δαίμονες τοὺς, P.1.46 ἐς γὰρ δὲ παρὰ Χρόνου ἄλφον μὲν σου καὶ κτεινῷ δόσιν ἐνθεύει, N.7.29 ἐνθυτουργόν Ζεύς τοῖς ποιματι 'blowing straight'; Bacch.5.6 ἅρ ╿ αὶ ἐνθυτουργία 'straight-judging' (for ἐνθυτουργός='straight-guided' as required by interpretation (1) cf. P.5.90 ἐνθυτουργόν τε κατεδέχεν [sc. ὀδόν'] 'straight-cut', not 'straight-cutting').

Professor M.L. West favours (2) here, but I doubt if the distinction is applicable since an individual's life was not in Pindar's view solely by his own self: he thought both external factors (god; luck, training) and internal ones (skill, strength, hereditary characteristics) contributed to an athlete's ἄνων.

Translate: 'If at any rate it is on his forbears' tracks and a straight course that his life has granted him to be a glory to great Athens...'.

2. ἔκακα μὲν... ἐν θυτωρίτε: cf. 0.7.12 ἔκακα μὲν διὸ ἱσώσθη, ταξιλυντοὶ τ' ἐν ἐντεχνίς ἄλοιν, 0.4.14-16 ἐπεὶ νῦν σκέπασμα μὲν τριφθεῖ ἰχθυίῳ ἐκτιμῆσαι, διεύθυντι τ' ἐνεκίς ταξιδοκοῖς, 0.6.4-6 (μὲν...τε...τε...), P.4.249-52 (μὲν...τε...τε...); Bacch.13.193f. ἔκακα δ'... μαρινὸν τ' ἱπό... The principle of Bury (App.A, 156-61 to his edition of the Isthmians) that μὲν always implies ἐκ, and hence that μὲν...τε would, if
Pindar were regular, be expressed by /,..& is refuted by Dennis- ton (The Greek Particles 474-5): τε is added when addition, not contrast, is uppermost.

2. Ιδομένων: 'Ιδομένη, -υς is adjective at I.8.4 'Ιδομένως τε νική 'Αμφίκ. Thuc. 8.9 καί 'Ιδομένως στοιχ. Used as a noun, as here, καί 'Ιδομένως = 'Ιδομένη sc. εσόχ or κεθλι (cf. 0.13.33 εν 'Ιδομένων). Compare Ολυμπιάδες, -ιδες used (a) as a fem. adj. (e.g. Μούσα, Ολυμπιάδες, Hes. Theog.25), (b) as a noun καί 'Ολυμπιάδες = 'Ολυμπιάκ (e.g. καί νικώ πήγα θύς 'Ολυμπιάδες, Sim.29 Page, Epig. Graec.);

Πυθις, -ίδες used (a) as a fem. adj. (e.g. Π.1.807c καί Πυθις καί 'Ολυμπιάδες νίκης ἐρωμένον), (b) as a noun (e.g. Π.Π.1.32 Πυθις δέν εἴνατον sc. ἔρωτ.), but never in the plural (v. LSJ s.v. Πυθις, for which Πυθις; Νεπεδείς, -ίδες (a fem. adj. at Π. N.3.2 εν τερματικά Νεπεδείς) is never used as a noun.

The feminine plural noun likely to have caused the -ίδες forms to be used substantivally is στοιχία (cf. Thuc.8.9 cit. supra, id.5.49 'Ολυμπιάκαι στοιχία).

'Ιδοτέρ: a favourite word of Pindar (20 times); once in Bacchylides (Dith.23 init.). It means 'the top', 'the pick', 'the best part'; in Homer (whether ιδοτέρ or ιδοτερ is indeterminate) of wool (Il.13.599, 716; Od.1.443, 9.434) or cloth (Il.9.661) meaning 'the surface', 'top' (v.R.A. Raman, Glotta 53,1975,195f.). So ιδοτέρ | -ερ comes to mean a woolen blanket (Od.1.443) because a sheep's fleece is on the surface of the sheep.

It gains its Pindaric meaning because something on the surface is good for picking or plucking, and that which is picked or plucked is generally the best part or the 'pick' (i.e. what is on top literally becomes top metaphorically). This appears to be overlooked by M.S. Silk (CQ N.S.33,1983,316f) who regards ιδοτερ as a word
whose original sense had been lost by the Fifth Century when he thinks it had a range of meanings connected, if at all, by sound association. Pindar's awareness of the word's Homeric meaning appears here and at P.4.130-1 (δραμον...κρεον ευτυχες λωτον - cf. Aesch.Suppl.666 ημες δ' ανδρος κρεοπτον επει δολει Αμης λχενευεν λωτον) through his use of κρεοπτα (cf. also the adjectives he uses with the word, which show that the λωτον is at the top: I.7.18 και εκρον, I.1.51 κερδος εφητον...λωτον, 0.5.1 χερεπι ανταν κε ι στεφανον λωτον). The metaphorical use of height-denoting words is a feature of Pindar's style: 0.1.13 δραμον μεν κορυφας κρεοπον επο ταν, N.1.11 πανομους κερον.

Pindar usually constructs the word with a partitive genitive; so here, 'pluck the best and choicest part of the Isthmian Games' i.e. victory. But at 0.3.4 (Ολυμπιανων ουν ορατωις...επον λωτον) and 0.8.75 (χερεπον λωτον Βλαβιδωις έπεικων) the genitive gives the source of the λωτον: an Olympic victory hymn, the top thing you can obtain from horses; the top sort of victory you can get from hands (contra LSJ s.v. λωτος Ι 'that which gives honour and glory to a thing', 'a song in praise of horses').

10. Τιμοδεμος Τιμόδημος; named at line 14 as Τιμοδήμες; father and son are regularly mentioned close together: 0.6.9.12; 0.7.13.17; 0.10.2.6; 0.12.13.16; P.2.5.,18; P.11.43.44; N.3.15,20; N.4. 10,13; N.5.4; N.7.7,8; N.8.16; N.10.24; I.5.18,21; I.7.21,31; I.8.1,2. Less often in Bacchylides: B.6.1,12; 14.19,21.

Timodemos retains half his father's name, as Aristokleides son of Aristophanes (N.3). See E. Frankel ap. RE s.v. Namenwesen, p. 1624-5; cf. Socrates son of Sophroniskos, Lycurgos son of Lycophron, Aristagores son of Molpagores (Hdt.5.30). According to Sch.N.2.28c, Timodemos was named after an ancestor called Timo-
The syntactic variation in lines 9-10 livens up the colon; v. F. Dornseiff, *Pindar's Stil* 103f.; he might have pointed out that such variation is particularly common when Pindar is enumerating past victories: O.12.18 καὶ δὲ ἐκ Πυθῶνα Ἡθόμοις, O.7.13 πεντά μὲν Ἡθόμοι νίκαι... δύο δ' ἐκ Κιρρα, N.3.64 Νεκραὶ Ἐπυρετῶσιν ἅπας καὶ Μεγαρών, I.1.65 Πυθῶν Ολυμπιάκων ὁ; cf. O.7.81ff., O.9.86ff., O.13.32ff.,106ff.; Bacch.10.26ff.; Sim.Epig.42(Page). Contrast N.4.75 Συλλυμάτικα τοι καὶ Ἡθόμοι Νεκραὶ τε, N.6.19-20, I.5.17-18; Bacch.8.17-18 Πυθῶνα τε μηλοβοτάν ήμένων Νεκρῶν τε καὶ Ἡθόμοι; Sim. Epig.43(Page). See below on 1.19 (end of note).

10-12. Highly allusive, meaning that after the small ones the big one may follow, i.e. an Olympic victory. Timodemos's Nemean victory is a sign of what is to follow, as the Pleiades are a sign that Orion is coming. Since Orion always follows the Pleiades, Timodemos could have deduced that a future Olympic win would be inevitable; but by neither spelling out this consequence nor mentioning Olympia by name Pindar avoids μεγαληπορία (cf. N.10.29-30 ζωὴ χάρα, τῶν μὲν ἔριτραι φησιν ἐστὶν ὁμιλία τὸν Χρόνον). For the succession of victories theme cf. I.6.init. οὐκ Νεκραὶ μὲν πρῶτον, ὡς Ζεὺς, τὰν ἀκτον δεῖξαντοι στερῶσαν, νῦν δὲ μὲν Ἡθόμοι Σετεταί... ἐν δὲ τριῶν σωμάτων πορεύονται Ὀλυμπιάκων ἄρχον κατὰ στεδίβοιν.

Orion and the Pleiades appear in Homer (Od.5.272, 11.18.486); in Hesiod he pursues them (Hes.Op.619-20), and Pindar accounted for the pursuit mythologically (Fr.74 τρεχόντα δὲ μετὰ Πυθῶνας, ἢς 6' αὐτόν νόην quoted by Sch.N.2.17c who adds: διὰς ἦς καὶ κατὰ τὸν Πυθῶνον ἔμεθήνατο αὐτὴν ὡς Φίλον, καὶ διὸς οὐκ ἐπὶ πολλὰς χρόνοις ὑπομνήματα δὲ ἐκ τοῦτον ὡς Ζεὺς κατηχέτησεν).

Wilamowitz (*Pindaros* 157) and Nisetich (*Pindar's Victory Songs* 149)
238) think the clause ἵνα δ' ἑσθοκ... νεκρά looks back to the preceding one: Isthmian and Pythian victories will follow for T. just as Orion follows the Pleiades.37

Orion does not stand for Timodemos in this context, but through his enormous strength and size he shares some of a pankratiast's attributes: Od.11.309-10 οὖς (sc. Otos and Ephialtes) διὰ μυκίτους Βρέφες Ἱδώρος ἀρουρη καὶ πολὺ καλλίτους μετὰ γε ἱλιόν Ἰφιόνα; cf. ib.572f.: Orion hunts and kills wild animals; Virg.Aen.10. 763-7: when Orion walks on the ocean-bed his head reaches the clouds. See the penultimate paragraph of the Prologue.

In Boeotia Orion was a counterpart of Herakles (v. D.L.Page, Corinna 35) and had his grave at Tanagra (Paus.9.20.3); cf. Corinna IMG 662 ἰόκα: ὁ μεγαλοπρεπὴς Ἰλιόν χάρον ἰ ἐν ἐνθέοις πάλαι ὠνομάζεσθαι; ed.673 διὸ οὐκ ἐνεργεῖται τῶν λευτ. αὐτῶν [ἐν Ἰφιόνα] καὶ ἐπειδή οὐ γείτον τῶν ἡρωικῶν καὶ καθημέρων διάφορως Fara summary of his characteristics v. J.Fortenrose, Orion: the myth of the hunter and the huntress, Univ.Cal.Publ. in Class.Phil.23,1981, ch.1.

11. ὅρειλὸς... Πεδίου: τέ pro ye Sch.N.1.3; cf. N.2.16b ἄλλως. Τιμονίου ποιό ἐστι δ' ἑοκός: ἑοκός δε ἐστι τὸν Τιμονίου παῖδα. ἵνα δὲ ἀξιωματικῶς ποιήσῃ τὸν λόγον, ἐκλεπτικῶς ἐπεξ. λείπει γὰρ ὁ τῶν νικῶν αὐτῶν ἔτι; Sch.N.2.16a Τιμονίου παῖς: ἑοκός ἐστι καὶ προσδιορισθεὶς τὸ νική τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς προερχόμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖς. The τέ pro ye seems to have arisen, therefore, after ὅρειλός... νικῶν and Τιμονίου... ἑοκός were taken as separate clauses and a connecting particle then required for line 11.

ὁρείλος was a problem in antiquity: Sch.N.2.17ο ὅρειλός δὲ σιὰ τὶ ὅρειλὸς ἐστὶ τὰς Πεδίους... ἐνος δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς οὐράς τοῦ Τιμονίου κεφαλῆς, κατὰ ὑφετῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τὸ κλήσις ἐκατ. (Fi.Fr.52g(A)7) ἀπὸ τοῦ κλήσιμου ἐπὶ δ' ἐν οὐράς... τέχνη δὲ
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The first two interpretations are impossible: μήρειν is not μήραν and ὄρη - could not stand for ὄρει. Crates's reading (ap. Sch.N.2.17c)μήρειν was probably not a variant but a conjecture deriving from his interest in astronomy (v. R.Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship i, 241-2, for this influence on his textual criticism). It is an attractive conjecture: 'summer' would refer to the period May-June (v. M.L.West, Hes. W.D.253) when the Pleiades are visible before dawn but Orion is not (he would not appear till c. June 20; v. West, op.cit.309). Sch.N.2.17c attempts to refute the conjecture: τοῦτω δὲ ἐντπτάλεω ... τὸ μὴ μένος θερίων ὤνται ἐπίπταλεων ἄλλη καὶ ξεμένος; but if ἐπίπταλεως is understood in its technical sense, referring to a star's once-a-year heliacal rising, then what the scholiast says is not true (for ἐπίπταλεως see West loc.cit.379-80).

But ὄρην γε Πελεόνων (γε qualifies the whole noun-epithet complex) is better explained as Pindaric variatio for Hesiod's version according to which the mountain was the father of the Pleiades: Hes.Op.383 'Πελεόνων Ἀτλαντεων' ; cf. Hes.(?)Fr. 169 (quoted by Sch.N.2.17c) τάκ [ eo.Πελεόνων γενότοι θαλάσσιος Ἄτλας . Two of the Pleiades were mountain nymphs (v. infra).

Ὅρην is supported by the pun it creates on Σάρινω: 'You'd expect Orion to go near the oread Pleiades'. There are several puns on names in Pindar: Fr.105 Σάρινως ὡς τοι λέως, ἱερων Ιερών ἕπον ἐπώνυμη πάτερ ; 1.6.52-3 ἔκκεει τοι ταῖς, ἐν αἴτες, ὡς Τελέμων καὶ νῦν ὄρνις ἰμέντος κέκλεψ ἐπώνυμον ἐπώνυμον Ἀτλαντα ; 0.6.42,47,55 (Ἱεροὶ ὡς, ἷν) . Cf. Od.11.60-2 οἰκεῖσσα... ἰδεέκε; 11.24.730 ἄκεχε, ἔκκεε (alluding to the meaning of Hector's name: v. Macleod ad loc.);

Hes.Theog.775-6 ἀγαθή... ἐπώς ; Bacch.6.1-2 Λύκων... Λάκε ; Hdt.3.62.2
The Pleiades as mountain nymphs: mountains are suggested by the names of two of them, Taygete and Maia. Maia was a mountain nymph because she gave birth to Hermes on Mt. Kyllene in Arcadia: Hes.(?)Fr.170, quoted by Sch.N.2.17c. Sim.Pr.555.2, also from Sch.N.2.17c. Taygete is named after the mountain range separating Laconia and Messene. But Alcyone is named after a Boeotian lake; hence the conclusion of von Blumenthal (Hellanicea: De Atlantide, Diss.1913, 8): 'ergo nymphas illas sc. Maia, Taygete and Alcyone creandas vel marinas vel similis generis fuisse concludendum est'. Of the other four, Asterope has a good name for a star, and Electre could be named after the colour of a star; but Celaeno ('dark') and Merope do not suggest stars. The Pleiades are a motley collection who have come together because they are all daughters of Atlas; their elevation to stardom seems to be a secondary attribute.

12. Τριγλώνα: the lyric version of the epic form Τριγλαν; cf. Pi.1.4.67, Fr.72; Corinna 654.iii.38, 655.1.14 (with synizesis), 622.2; E.Hec.1102. Οκ- (or Ωκ-) must be the original form: importation of the ο into a pre-existing form Τρ- without it would be unparalleled.

For the synizesis cf. P.8.60 Σε σεριμεσκ, I.1.7 Τριτοιμεσκ. Synizesis within a word of a long vowel followed by a short one
is much rarer in Pindar than short-long synizesis and elsewhere restricted to words with οὗτοι: 0.1.5 (v.l.), 0.3.24 (v.l.) ἀτριόν; I.3.17b, P.10.65 πετράσαρ—; I.4.42 ἀρσσοσ (v.l.). See M.L. West, Greek Metre 12-13.

τέλειος: τέλειος TUV; τέλειος BD, Ath. (cod.A), Bergk. τέλειος is better because (a) neither a middle nor passive sense of τέλειο is suitable ('loosen' in the middle, 'be devoted to' in the passive), (b) Sch.N.2.16a τὸν Τρίαντα πορεύεται supports τέλειο (for πορεύεται of the motion of heavenly bodies cf. Pl.Tim.39d; πορεύεται [P.L.] Epin. 982e, Aristot., alii). Cf. τέλειο used of the star Ara, Arat.407.

13f. A tenuous connection of thought is just discernible: Timodemos the mighty fighter was victorious at Nemea, and should also win at Isthmia and Pytho; and he is as likely in the near future to win the big one at Olympia as mighty Orion is to appear soon after the Pleiades; indeed, Salamis is good at rearing fighters: Aias forced Hector, the best of the Trojans, to yield to him in Troy. Fighting spirit has exalted you, too, Timodemos.

13. καὶ μὲν ἢ ἑδυκμεν ἢς: on καὶ μὲν...γι' v. Denniston, The Greek Particles 120, 150, 323f.; Jebb on Soph.Aj.531. καὶ μὲν marks emphatically a new point, and ἢς emphasises ἢ ἑδυκμεν.

The sudden mention of Salamis was a problem in antiquity: Sch.N.2.19 Ἀριστερός μὲν σὸν τὴν Ἀλκαίας φυλής εἶναι (sc. Timodemos), οὐκ ὀρθῶς οὐ γερέος οὐ ἐκείνης ὡς δὲ περὶ Ἀκαδημιαὶς φξίν ὅτι εἶναι ἐκείνου κύπερ ἐν τῷ τῆς Σαλαμίνης κατακαλλήλοντας Ἀθηναίων ἐνεκεὶ ὡς καὶ τὸν γεννηθέντα Ἀθηναῖον τετραθηθαί ἐν Σαλαμίνῃ. Οἱ οὐκ οὐν ἢ ἑδυκμεν ἢς: on καὶ μὲν...γι' v. Denniston, The Greek Particles 120, 150, 323f.; Jebb on Soph.Aj.531. καὶ μὲν marks emphatically a new point, and ἢς emphasises ἢ ἑδυκμεν.

The view of Asclepiades and his supporters is at first sight
supported by the earliest Athenian decree to survive (Meiggs-
Lewis, Greek Historical Inscriptions 14 = IG 1².1, c.520-c.480 B.C.):

Meiggs-Lewis (loc.cit.26-7) write: 'The direct evidence for a
cleruchy on Salamis is slight... It is only a guess by the schol-
liast that Timodemos was a cleruch, but the cleruchy itself is not
questioned by the scholiast or his source'. But (1) the key-
word κλερόχος is only a guess, by Luria; (2) the role of Athens
in the decree is uncertain; therefore (3) it is not certain the
decree relates to an Athenian cleruchy; cf. Hiller von Gaertringen
ad IG i².1: 'Non agitur de cleruchis Atticis Salaminem deductis,
sed de indigenis, qui aut in patria insula habitantes tributa
pendere iubentur, aut, si cum Atheniensibus militant, etiam tribu-
uta eadem quae Athenienses pendent'.

N.G.L.Hammond (JHS76,1956,37) attempts to identify the cler-
uchy from Herodotus 8.95 Ἀριστείδης δὲ ὁ Αθηναῖος ἄνδρα Ἀθηναίος...
πραγματέων πάλιν τῶν ὕπαιθρων οἱ παραστώλασαν παρὰ τὴν ἄκην τῆς
θαλαμώνιας ξύρας, γένος έόντες Αθηναίοι, ἐν τῷ Πεύκιτελείων μήκος ἵππεις
ἀγον. οἱ θεσσαλικοὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ θεσσαλικῇ ταύρῃ κατέφορον καὶ πάντας.
But these hoplites may have been not cleruchs but a force from
Athens that had been transported to Psyttaleia to meet up with
Aristeides; there is insufficient evidence for certainty either
way.

Salamis had an ambivalent status; it seems never to have
been regarded as geographically part of Attica (see Strabo 8.9.11),
despite various Athenian claims for it (and actual secural of it:
see S.Hornblower, The Greek World 479-323 BC 11-12). Solon (Fr.2w),
however, thought he could score a point by saying 'Imagine a man
from Attica throwing away Salamis'; it is best thought of as being
in the Fifth Century a territory adjacent to Attica and subject to Athens (see P.J.Rhodes, Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenian Politeia 610).

It is possible that Pindar introduces Salamis and hence Aias because there was no suitable mythical character from Acharnai itself, but a particularly suitable one (both Aias and Timodemos are excellent fighters) from Salamis close-by, i.e. the proximity and allegiance of Salamis to Athens (T.'s home-city) meant it did not matter that Salamis itself was unconnected with T. or his family. Apart from Peisander the oligarch and the banker Pasion, Acharnai was not well-known for its inhabitants; Pindar often does select mythological characters from the victor's city, but not always (cf. P.11).

But μεν and οὐ (16) bracket Aias and Timodemos together as examples of Salamis rearing fighters, suggesting strongly a connection between Salamis and T.'s upbringing; the precise nature of the connection (e.g. whether he was a cleruch) is impossible to tell.

13. ἐξ Ἡλακτί—μαχητή: extracted from what Aias says to his colleagues before addressing Hector (for which, see on 14 ἐν τῷ χαίρει): οὐ χαίρε τις με βηνι γε ἢκον ἡκοῦν διηρήσα, οὐδὲ τις ἠδρεία, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ ἡμε νινᾶ γ' οὕτως ἐλπιζε, ἐν Ἡλακτίνι γενέθει τέ τρεῖσκεν τε (11.7.197-9).

14. Ἀιας: Aias, son of Telamon, from Salamis, was a renowned strong-man of antiquity, particularly suited for comparison with a pankratiast. He was the best and strongest Achaean after Achilles (11.2.762 et alib., Pi.N.7.27), and threw Hector to the ground with a rock (11.7.268, 14.409f.; cf. Bacch.13.103f.); but he was also straightforward, honest, open and generous (v. Sch. 11.7.192, 199, 226-7, 284; for the interest of the Iliadic scholar-
lasts in these matters see N.J. Richardson, CQ N.S. 30, 1980, 273).
Cf. P.N. 7.26 καὶ περὶ Αἴας, Ι. 4.53b ἵστε μὲν Αἴαντος ἰδὲν, Φρ. 184
ὑπερμενέες ἄλμαντοκόρμαν Αἴαν.

ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἔκτωρ Αἴαντος ἴκουεν: not ἴσχετο τῇ πείρᾳ
(Sch. N. 2.22a), nor 'Hector heard tell of, heard a rumour of, Aias'
(Farnell ad loc.); ἴκουεν here = ἔπικουεν 'had to submit to',
'began subservient to'. For this meaning of ἴκουω LSJ cite
only the technical and idiosyncratic Heph.Astr. (4th C. A.D.), but
the meaning is common: Archil. 115.2; Fl.Fr. 70b.29; A.Suppl. 910,
Sept. 196, Ag. 956 etc. (cf. Ι. 19.256 and Od. 7.11, listed by LSJ
s.v. ἴκουω = 'obey').

These six words are an allusion to Ι. 7.152ff. where lots
are drawn to decide who shall fight Hector; Aias wins the draw,
and (225f.) σὺ μὲν Ἔκτωρ ἰδὺ, ἀνελήμφες δὲ πρὸς τὸν Ἐκτόρ,
νῦν μὲν σὺν καὶ σὰ δέχετε. δὲν ὅσοι καὶ Αἴας ἀνάξιος
μετέχῃς... Pindar's choice of the word ἴκουεν has been motivated by the fact
that at Ι. 7.226f. Hector does actually listen to Aias; but in
the context of Ν. 2 written for a victorious fighter, the six words
are meant to allude also to the result of the Aias v. Hector fight
(a knock-out win for Aias, Ι. 7.271-2, resulting in Hector having
to say he bows to Aias's strength - Ι. 7.288f.); hence 'listened to'
is too weak a translation of ἴκουεν here.

Pindar, as is his wont, compresses 150 lines of epic into
a few words and one sentence.

 disproved: καὶ διοίκησεν Μ. Μ. (and Μ. Μ. Μ. 18, 24); διοίκησις
ap. Sch. (cf. the title
ap. Sch. Τίτασφαν Αἰθικῶι Ἀρμανίως παγκοσμίως).

Schroeder's argument (Prolegomena ii.29 para. 56) is: 'Neque
enim unquam victoris dialecto patriae Pindarus videtur indulsiisse
velut in Neptuni nomine Ποταμεύ η XLIII, in auriga Siculo φυτικ
0 VI, in terminatione thessalica ἱπποκλάες Πχ), quin doricum simul
sermonis colorem quasi extolleret'.

But (1) the mss. do not always atticise names in -δημος (e.g.
no ms. has κλεομοκ at 0.14.22); so when, as here, they do, their
reading is worth extra consideration. (2) cf. other non-Doricised
forms: N.1.70 ᾿ευκλικ (sic all mss.), P.8.1 ᾿Ευκλικ (sic all mss.),
I.1.13 Γηραύνα (sic all mss.), Frs.81, 169.6 Γηραύνα. Contrast
0.2.32 ᾿εκλυχμον (sic Sch.0.2.56a,56c,56g and all mss. except E -κ-
and A -κ-); v. B. Forssman, Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars
46f.), P.1.30 γαίης (γαίη D, γαίη Sch.P.1.57 DOQ).

(3) Timodemos is the only person with a -δημος/-σεμος part
to his name mentioned by Pindar who comes from somewhere where
-σεμος would not have been the normal form. Contra: P.4.261 Δημοθίου
though Sch.P.4.501a et alib. have Δημοθί - (for the Δημο - form in
a Cyrenian name cf. SEG ix.3.12 διοκετίς τιν ἐκμο[ή]; Pi.Fr.49
Δημοδίκα (ΔημοΤ-ιτίκιν codd.); 0.14.22 κλεομον (a Boeotian; cf.
Sch.0.14.26a,26c κλεομοκ, -δημος); 0.10.18,92, 0.11.12, N.1.29
κλεομος, -ε-; -ου( with an α. ap. Sch. too; n.b. 0.11 and 0.12
are for a victor from Locris in West Greece, N.1. for a western
Greek Sicilian); 0.2.46, 0.3.9, I.2.28 Δινθίαμου (so, too, ap.
Sch.; all three odes for Sicilians - Ainesidamos was Theron's
father). Cf. 0.3.16 et alib. δημος.
But Philostratos's information must be used with caution: he lived over 700 years after Pindar.

15. ἀληθικός: Pindaric for Homeric ἄληθέν Θυμόν ἔχων (Il. 5.670 of Odysseus). ἀληθικός occurs only here, Pi.Fr.234.4 (κύρος ἀληθικός), and in the Palatine Anthology (9.472 (πλήρες) also of Odysseus).

16. Ἀχαρναί: Ἀχαρναί TUV, Ἀχαρναί BD (before correction); Schroeder reports that the lemma in the scholia on this passage also reads Ἀχαρναί in B and D, but Drachmann (Sch.N.2.25a) prints Ἀχαρναί and reports no other reading.

The accent is normally Ἀχαρναί (Diod.14.32, Thuc.2.19), but in the singular Ἀχάρνη (Hsch. s.v.) or -νη. Herodian (iii.(i) p.327.27 Lenz) gives Ἀχάρναί, which is analogous to most other place names in -νη, -νη of more than two syllables (cf. Steph. Byz. Ἀχάρναερας (Ἀχάρνας vulgo) ἴμαρας Οὐβίνδας θυληκές Ἡρμίσινδες Ἀχάρνας (-εις v.l.; Ἀχάρναι cf. Meineke) ἐκτοτοτον). The accent of the singular form seems to have sometimes influenced the accent of the plural form.

Acharnai was the largest deme of Attica; see below on (17) and ΤΟ ... ὅρατο (24).

Παλαιόκτενος: the scholiasts' Παλαιόκτενος (Sch.N.2.25c BD, -κτεν τοῦ) is not an explicit varia lectio, but probably represents an assimilation of Παλαιόκτενος into the syntax of the paraphrase (Παλαιόκτενος ἐπὶ άντι τοῦ ἔξω ἄρχης λέγοντι Sch.N.2.25c).

17. εὐδορεικτος: could mean (1) 'full of men', 'well-populated', as probably εὐδορόβος at P.1.40, N.5.9 (cf. εὐδορής P.2.62,
The latter sense is more relevant here, because complimentary to Timodemos. For the fighting qualities of the Acharnians cf. Ar. Ach.180-1 '_above all, ctitioi yevenite primivoi/ περίμονος μακροσκόμιαι χρενδόμινιοι; for Acharnai's manpower cf. Thuc.2.19: it could arm 3,000 hoplites (but perhaps a corruption for 1,000 - see Comme ad loc.). Because it was the largest deme of Attica, Acharnai had 22 bouleutai at Athens - more than any other deme.

**OCCX** : Pindar was not very interested in the Games per se, and it would be tedious if he spelt out the characteristics of the various Games each time he wanted to mention them. For a different use of **OCCX** to avoid detail cf. 0.13.106f. "Δ' ὑπὸ δορίων Τιργανικὸν ἐξ Ἰππεί ὑπὸ δοκεῖ καὶ ἐν Θηραίων ὑπὸ τῷ Ἀρκείων ἔνακτο χαράπηκεν Λυκαίου βωμὸς ἔνεξ.

18: **Τιμοδημίου** : for the non-Doricised form v. supra on 14 **Τιμοδήμου**. The family was still flourishing in the Fourth Century: IG.ii.1347 (4th.C.) ὁ δήμος ἐν Νικαιώ Τιμοδημος ὁ Αἰγρευτος ἐπερ. (cf. J.Toepffer, Attische Genealogie 313; seventeen Timodemoi are listed in J. Kirchner's Prosopographia Attica, but none by J.K. Davies, Athenian Propertied Families: so they were not among the wealthiest Athenians).

Pindar likes to bring in, if he can, other victories in the family (cf. 0.13.97f.); it is a specially suitable and necessary ploy here, since Timodemos himself had not won any other victories; the list shows what glories lie in store for him, if he follows his forbears' footsteps.
προλέγοντα: the verb can mean (a) 'select', e.g. Il.13.689 ὑπ' οὐκ Ἀθηναίων προλέγομαι; (b) 'say before', e.g. Pl.Rep.337a ἕως... ἦν προλέγον; (c) 'proclaim', e.g. A.Sept.336-7 τὸν Ἀμφαύον γὰρ προλέγομεν βελτίων τῶν ἀνάκτοιν.

The context favours (b), the verb picking up the meaning of ταλείφατον: 'the T. are already said to be the best', i.e. have a reputation in athletics. The chain of thought is that the Acharnians in general have long been spoken of as fine men, and when it comes to athletics in particular the T. have been spoken of before as outstanding; Pindar then goes on to describe the past victories that make them outstanding. Perhaps earlier poems had been written in honour of their past victories, cf. 0.10.78 ἠρρίῳ καὶ προτέραις ἐπηγορεν τα' πον ἐπιλογίου, Χήρεν κελαμέμενοι; but προλέγοντα is an odd way to express the idea.

In the third strophe and part of the fourth Pindar changes from long to short sentences, another way he varies the style in which he writes his odes. The short sentences enable him to move quickly from theme to theme.

19. ὑψιμέδοντα: the mountain is high-ruling because its height sets limits to what one can do on it or by it; cf. Pi. Paean 2.97 ἄρρητ' τε Πελοπ. ἡν τετραχ υψιμέδει. The epithet is more regularly applied to Zeus: Bacch.15.51 ζεύς ὑψιμέδων καὶ ἄνωθεν ἑρέτης; Hes.Theog.529 ὅτι ξένη τι Ζηνὸς ὁλυμπίου ὑψιμέδοντος [ὑπ' ἐχάνεται]. Ar.Nub. 563-4 ὑψιμέδοντα μὲν θεῶν Ζηνὰς τύραννοι.

The unusual use of ὑψιμέδοντα, the metaphorical νῖκας ἐκφράζειν, the bold phrase ἐν Πελοποντε ἐκφράζειν ( = Peloponness) and the variation of the syntax (παρ'... ὑπ'... ἐν... ἐν... οἴκοι... ) liven up an otherwise boring victory list.

21. ἐν εἰδώλι Πελοποντε ἐκφράζειν: Pelops regularly denotes
Olympia, e.g. 0.1.94-5 ἐν ὑπὸμοι Ἑλοπος; but the addition of Ἑλοπος ὑπὸμοι shows that the Isthmian Games, also held in the Peloponnese, are meant. For the expression cf. P.6.18 Κρικεύς ἐν πτυχαί, P.9.15 πίθου κλεμοῖ ἐν πτυχαί.

The idea is of hilly land folding itself round a place; here, the hills by the Isthmos (at the edge of the Peloponnese) fold themselves round Pelops's north-eastern border; Pelops, whose tomb was at Olympia (0.1.24,93) is imagined to be in the middle of the folds. Cf. 0.1.103-5 ἡμοῦ...κλειφθεὶ πεδιλακεύεν ἄνω πτυχαί: Pindar's song will fold round, embrace, touch closely on Hieron.

Mss. often offer a v. 1.ἐχθοθ/ἱ/ο/ετδε., e.g. 0.13.100 ἐχθοθ A, ἐχθοτ cet.; 0.2.63 ἐχθοθ' CD, ἐχθοτ cet.; but no alternative is offered here. For variant forms of various words (κελ/σευκ/ἐ-ευκ, γλεύκρον/βλέψαρον et al.) in the text of Pindar v. N.S. Grünbaum, Μαζνυκ Δρενεγρέςκεσκοι Χοροβον Λιρικ (Pindar) 90; his book shows the danger of thinking Pindar's vocabulary must be homogenised in such cases: he could have used one form at one time, another form in another place - though copying is likely to have been responsible for a greater number of inconsistencies.

22. ἐκείσθη: a favourite word of Pindar (32 occurrences), used similarly at N.1.17-18 διά τα τῇ Ἱλιστικῶν ἔλιοιν ἡμείοικοι μαχθείρα [sc. Sicily].

23-4. Syntactically it is possible to take ἄντι ζῆν in apposition to ὁκει (so e.g. Boecki, Dissen, Bury, following Sch.Ν.2.35 Τῆς ζῆς ἃντι ἔφθασα διὰ ἔχων τουτεύτερ τῇ Ὡλυμπίᾳ), but more likely it is in apposition to ἐν Νέρει, with τά...ἀρματ a parenthesis: none of the inscriptions referring to Games at the Olympia at Athens is older than the time of Hadrian (see L.Deubner, Ἀττίσχα Φεστά, Berlin
1932,177; cf. E. Simon, Festivals of Athens, an archaeological commentary, Wisconsin 1983,15-16); this fact plus (a) the lack of victor dedications, (b) silence in Ath. Pol. about which magistrate organised the Games, and (c) the local Athenian Games being for Pindar the Panathenaia, all suggests that the scholion is a late note and not true of Pindar's day (I owe these last three points to Dr. R. Parker). For oikos referring unqualified to the victor's home Games cf. N.5.45 ἰδικές ἑσθήνουσα σημείο; for the parenthesis cf. 0.8.28, P.10.45 and see Slater s.v.Σε 2.1f. (Cf. Wilamowitz, Pindaros 157n.5 'Sehr elegant ist das letzte Glied der Aufzählung unterbrochen ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμὸν. Die Masse drängt sich vor').

24. τῶν Ἰπποτίτων, κυρήσαντος Τιμόδεμον κων εὐθύνει νικῶν: 'Sing of Zeus during the komos held in honour of T. at the time of his triumphant homecoming'. Timodemos receives a civic reception. τῶν refers to θρήνος (so Bury, Parnell, Nisetich etc.), not ἱματισμὸν: Zeus, not the θρήνος, is to be thanked in the komos for Timodemos's safe return. For κων denoting time when cf. P.11.10 κοινωνία κων ἑπιτεθείση and see Slater s.v. l.c.β. The dative Τιμόδεμος is used with κων because T. has an interest in the singing, cf. P.9.69 τοις (sc. Herakles and Iphikles) κυρήσαντοι; 1.7.20-1 κων ἑπετεθείση ἑθυμιδέα κων ἱματισμὸν κων ἑπετεθείση; similar is Pindar's use of the dative with ἵππος 'accept s.t. from s.o.': P.8.5 Πινδώνιος Τιμόδεμος Ἰπποτίτων ἂντικρόνει σκέφτεσ�, P.12.5-6 σκέφτεσσα τε φίλοι ἐκ Πινδώνιος ἑμεθύνεια Μίθας. See Gildersleeve ad 0.13.29.

Timodemos's name may be mentioned again at this point to create a pun: with his successful return he brings honour to his deme; but the address is Ἰπποτίτων rather than Ἰπποτίτων because (1) there would have been living in Acharnai Athenian citizens who were not by birth demesmen of Acharnia (on the existence of movement between demes, see A.W. Gomme, The Population of Athens 37f.), (2) the performance of a Pindaric ode in Athens doubtless attracted an audience from further afield than merely the victor's own deme.
The performance of the ode could have prefaced the komos held for Timodemos, cf. 0.4.9, 0.11.16, 0.14.16 — three more mentions of komoi in short odes; the implication is that Pindar's shortest odes were designed for a different type of occasion compared with the rest. See also on εἰσφρέτει below.

25. εἰσφρέτει: sc. τεοῦ, i.e. ἄιος (not ρομιαίος, so LSJ s.v. εἰσφρετω). The word suggests that the performance of N.2 was a prooimion to further singing which began with praise of Zeus — perhaps during the komos (see end of previous note, and also on 1f.).

N.2 is monostrophic, not triadic; why Pindar chose which structure is not always clear: though none of the longer odes is monostrophic (too monotonous; N.9, eleven strophes/55 lines, is the longest), some of the short ones are triadic: 0.4, 0.11, 0.12, P.7. But N.2 is monostrophic because three into five won't go.

The themes of Zeus, singing, victory, recur at both the beginning and end of the ode; for the ring-composition return to notes on line 1f.

**BRIEF EVALUATION of the ODE as a WHOLE**

Nemean 2 is a very concentrated ode. Though short, all of it is relevant to Timodemos; there are no gnomic passages. It is also very allusive: one has to see through the mention of the Pleiades and Orion first to the underlying astronomical phenomenon and then to that phenomenon's symbolic meaning in the context of the poem; ἐκπαιδείων ἰπιών ἠλλος alludes to ἐπιφανής; Hector's submission to Aias alludes to 150 lines of the Iliad. In a longer version of the ode, Orion's pursuit of the Pleiades and/or the Aias episode would have been expanded into stories.

The allusive and stand-offish stance adopted by Pindar down to line 14 is reinforced by there being no address to anyone.
in these lines, Timodemos being referred to only as ὅς ζηνεῖ, Ἰμνήων
παῖς, and no mention by Pindar of himself or his own poetry.

With the address to the victor, at last, at line 14, Pindar opens
his stance; from then on the poem is in all respects more direct.
The last clause (τῶθ...φωτα) breaks clean away from the earlier
e莉iptical syntax and allusive style; it looks like a call to
begin the komos (so Wilamowitz, Pindaros 158); the ode, therefore,
was probably sung before the komos. There is no evidence for the
idea of Nisetich (Pindar's Victory Songs 237) that, 'The ode was
designed to be sung by a chorus in procession through the streets
of Acharnai, either to the victor's home or to some local shrine'.

The poem as a whole illustrates Pindar's exceptional
ability to honour a victor and his victory while keeping talk
of either victor or victory to a minimum. Pindar concentrates
on the past successes of Timodemos's family and on Timodemos's
possible future successes. And he preserves an excellent balance
between the poem's different themes, without making it rigidly
structured: roughly a strophe's worth to (a) Nemea being the
scene of Timodemos's first victory, (b) following his forbears'
footsteps, (c) an Olympic win probable, (d) the family's athletic
prowess; but only roughly: sense pauses at the end of strophes
one and three, enjambment between 2 and 3 and four and five.
NOTES to COMMENTARIES

1. In other cases, of course, P. Oxy. 222 does confirm the
scholiasts' dates, as does Pausanias (he also confirms P. Oxy. 2381.2,
part of a victor-list for 396 B.C. and perhaps from the same papyrus
roll as P. Oxy. 222). See Grenfell's and Hunt's introductory comments
to P. Oxy. 222.

2. J. Jüthner plausibly suggests that during the race the judges
watched while standing by the end-post (Die Athletischen Leibübungen
der Griechen, Vienna 1968 (reprint) 2.98f.).

3. Note, however, that 1) omits some data which 2) and 3) have.

4. It is hard to generalise from the evidence. ɔ in Homeric
addresses expresses brusqueness according to P. Chantraine, Gram-
maire Homérique, Paris 1953, 2. para.47. I note that in Bacchylides
in the one certain occurrence of an opening address with ɔ where
the papyrus has not mutilated the context (Bacch. 9), the addressed
is asked to do something (so, too, probably in B. 2; but note
contra B. 3 and B. 12). More often than not in Bacchylides, in open-
ning addresses without ɔ the addressed is not asked to act (so
B. 5, 14B and probably B. 10 and 11; also B. 18). Applying this
distinction to opening addresses in Pindar's epinicians, I note
that a call to action occurs 5 times without ɔ and with ɔ 6 times,
and that when the addressed is not asked to act ɔ is used 4 times
and not used 9 times. I therefore tentatively conclude that (a)
P. and B. tend to use ɔ in opening addresses when action is called
for, (b) there is no rigid distinction.
5. However, it is scarcely credible that she was not worshipped at Thebes, and I note that Dodds (ad E. Bacch. 6-12) concludes, 'Eur. clearly has some knowledge of the Theban cult and cult-places' sc. of Semele.

6. Cf. Il. 18.54 Σωκρατόπολει (Sch. a ad loc: Ἐν κένων τῶν Ἀριστοκράτων, Τεκνών); Bacch. 10.106 Ἀριστοτέρης (of Artemis) 'having the best father'. Pindar's epithet here perhaps suggested Theocritus's Ἀριστοτέρης (Theoc. 24.73) also of Alcmene. The scholiasts' slip was perhaps caused by a reminiscence of P. 10.3 Ἀριστοτέρης γενόμεν Ἑρμικάτες.

7. A. Schachter, Cults of Boiotia i, 1981, 77f. (BICS suppl. 38.1) thinks several types of cult took place at the Ismenion, attracted from other parts of Boiotia and symbolising the growth in Thebes's influence.

A victory procession by Thrasydaios to the Ismenion would have been particularly fitting if he had borne his victory laurel, because every eight years the sanctuary of Apollo Ismenios was the scene of a daphnephoria (perhaps the occasion for Pi. Fr. 94B; see Schachter op. cit. 83-5).

8. Alternatively, κα’ νου picks up Apollo's past interest in the shrine (mentioned in the preceding lines); I owe this suggestion to Dr. R. Parker. I am undecided between the two interpretations.

9. Another objection to the interpretation 'watching over' is that there is no evidence ἐπίγονον could mean this; the scholiasts' paraphrase ἐπίγονον could only mean 'allotted' or 'spread over' (see LSJ s. v.). ἐπίγονον as an adjective does not with certainty occur elsewhere; as a noun both it and cognate words refer to grazing rights (i.e. rights for one's flock to spread over the land).
10. Note also E. Alc. 75-6 ἱερός γὰρ ὀντος τῶν Ἐφοιτῶν Ἰερόν Ἰερόν / ἀττικὸν Ἐγκυκλον Τρίκλων; Carm. Pop. 862 (PMC) ἵππος ἐπάτοε ποτίνως Ῥώην

11. For ἱερός applied to people cf. IL. 24. 681 ἱερός πολικώς. 'Here, as often elsewhere in Homer, the epithet is extended outside the religious sphere; it often conveys no more than a feeling of dignity or awesomeness such as is proper to many epic persons, animals, things or places', Macleod ad loc. P. Wülfing-v. Martitz, Glotta 38, 1960, 272-307 esp. 300-4, compares ἱερός οὐρανός (Od. 24. 81).

12. So was there a Ga-Themis cult at Delphi in Pindar's day? It seems to me dangerous to argue from the literary evidence for the succession-of-prophets story that therefore there were cults of Ge and Themis at Delphi. The only firm archaeological evidence for a cult of them at Delphi (for the evidence see F. W. Hamdorf, Griechische Kultpersonifikationen der vorhellenistischen Zeit, Mainz 1964, 50-1, 108-10) seems to be two statue bases found at Delphi inscribed Ga and Themis (see P. de la Coste-Messelière and R. Flacelière, BCH 54, 1930, 283-95: they give no date for the inscription Γα and date the word 'Themis' to the Fourth Century (p. 287; so too, for 'Themis', F. Schober, RE suppl. 5, p. 106 para. 171).

Pausanias saw an ancient cult image of Γα at Aigai, Achaia, (Paus. 7. 25. 13), reports sanctuaries of Themis at Athens (1. 22), Corinth (2. 27. 5), Tanagra (9. 22. 1) and Thebes (9. 25. 4), and found an altar to Ge and Themis at Olympia (5. 14. 10); but none of this is evidence for a cult of either Ge or Themis at Delphi in the Fifth Century. At a lecture in London in 1983, Dr. Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, too, said the archaeological evidence did not support the view that Fifth Century cults of Ge or Themis existed at Delphi.
13. Cf. N. Robertson, *The Myth of the First Sacred War*, CQ 28, 1978, 48, 'The two names are used interchangeably in most ancient sources... Late writers who say or hint otherwise are palpably confused'.

14. For Iphigeneia see A. Ag. 1414-18, 1432; whereas Pindar gives as an alternative motive the effects of Clytemnestra's relationship with Aigisthos (P. 11.24f.), the alternative in Aeschylus is the effect on Clytemnestra with Cassandra (see Ag. 1441-2).

15. This is not to say that the myth itself was primarily aimed at praising Thrasydaios (see para. 2 of Excursus on Myth in Pindar-appended to note on τον Σάμο, line 17): the partial analogy between the actions of Thrasydaios and Orestes does not in my view equate to praise of Thrasydaios.

16. Pindar elsewhere spatchcocks into a myth gnomic phrases relevant to the victor: cf. 0.1.64, 0.7.25-6 (lines 94-5 resume the theme), P.2.34 (cf. line 72, resuming the theme and spoken to Hieron), P.3.21-3. For χόλακος of success or victory cf. N.9.45: χόλακος includes both κτάμακα and ἐπίθεσις τινος - cf. Bacch. 5.50-3; cf. χόλακος at P.9.4, 0.7.10.

17. ὁ δὲ κακόν ἔτι ἀκριβῶς also, of course, takes up τῷ καλῷ: the phrase is relevant both to the citizens in the myth and to citizens without (athletic) aspirations contemporary with Pindar.

18. 'One of sexual omission, not commission - a different matter', Dr. R. Parker points out.
19. Clytemnestra's γυναικεία derived from her being a queen, a status bestowed on her as wife of Agamemnon. Alternatively (so Professor H. Maehler), her γυναικεία was due to her being in control with Aigisthos as consort. I find the latter interpretation less likely because in Pythian 11 it is Agamemnon, not Aigisthos, who is portrayed as the hero who amasses γυναικεία (cf. 31 ἡ γυναικεία Ἀτρειδεία 33-4 ἡ γυναικεία γυναικεία διακτικος); in contrast to Homer (Od. 3.304ff.), Pindar does not say anything about Clytemnestra being in control with Aigisthos, who in P. 11 is not portrayed as a powerful or substantial figure.

20. Note how Pindar does not recount the episodes of the myth in chronological order, e.g. the description of Agamemnon's death (20-1) precedes his arrival home and sacking Troy (32-4).

21. But Professor Maehler points out to me that Achilles, Semele and the Seven were dead when on fire, whereas the implication of — ἦμετρον would be that the Trojans were burnt alive; hence I agree with him that — ἦμετρον is preferable.

22. ἦμετρον ... τὸ πρὸ — ἦμετρον is to be interpreted (Professor Maehler tells me) as interrogative ἦμετρον alternative ἦμετρον (as in I.7.5-12): 'Did I go astray, or did a wind blow me off course?' I find the punctuation of the Teubner text at odds with this interpretation which surely demands a comma or a question-mark, not a high stop, after τὸ πρὸ.

23. This is the interpretation intended by the Snell-Maehler text (see previous note).
24. D.C. Young (Mnemosyne suppl. 9, 1968, 16-7) thinks the myth illustrates the horrors of a tyrant's life (in contrast to Thrasydaios's). This view is only partly correct, I believe; the myth also shows that Thrasydaios, qua victor, will be exposed to some of the same opposition (†ΟΙΝΩΝ, ΚΑΚΟΛΟΓΙΑ) as Agamemnon. It is a mistake to seek a single purpose of the myth or a single way in which it is relevant; it has several purposes and is relevant in a variety of ways.

25. See J. Irigoin, Histoire du Texte de Pindare, Paris 1952, 25-7 'Traces du Metagrammatisme', suggesting that †ΑΓΩΝ is an error of interpretation rather than due to carelessness; cf. Sch. N. 1. 34b for Aristarchus's recognition of misinterpretation of the old alphabet as a source of error.

26. But Davison takes too seriously the apocryphal story (Sch. N. 5. 1a) that Pindar charged 3,000 drachma for Nemean 5; see M. Lefkowitz, Lives of the Greek Poets, London 1981, 49f., 58f.

27. Note how ῾ΙΑΜΒΟΚΟΣ is frequently coupled with ΚΟΒΩ 'mix', 'stir': [A] P. V. 994 ΚΟΒΩΝ ΠΑΝΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΡΑΚΕΤΑΙ, Ar. Pax 320 ΚΟΒΩΝ ΠΑΝΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΡΑΚΕΤΑΙ; v. LSJ s.v. ΤΑΡΑΚΕΤΑΙ.

28. But Cf. ΠΙΘΟΒΙΚΟΣ in P. Oxy. 222. col. 11. 32 (for 01. 83 = 448 B.C.); this evidence, coupled with the other attestations of ΠΙΘΟΒΙΚΟΣ make it more likely that ΠΙΘΟΒΙΚΩΝ in Pythian 11 is a proper name than merely a nickname. Cf. other suitable names for victors, e.g. Dromeus (a victor in the long-distance in 484; a victor in 480 in the pankration); Eurybates (victor in the stadion, 672); Poulydamas (multi-victor in the pankration). The names are from L. Moretti, Olympionikai, Rome 1957.
29. The asyndeton here - before a statement (as often, in the first person) effecting a transfer to a new subject - is one of the four main types of asyndeton recognised by L. Dissen; see his edition of Pindar (Gotha 1830) I. Excursus 2, still the basis for any discussion on Pindar's use of asyndeton. The other three main types are 1) in explanations, 2) when enumerating or re-iterating (common in maxims - see Macleod on Il.24.354), 3) to add gravity to the end of a section (often the end of the whole ode).

Further references to discussions of the subject in J.C. Howie, ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers, and Monographs 3 (Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar vol.2, 1979) 338 n.21; Howie notes the use of asyndeton to exhibit strong emotion (op.cit. 308 - 10). In general, asyndeton tends to add emphasis to the following clause, because it throws it into relief or makes it appear as a necessary result (see K-C ii.344f.), but that is not its function here where it is to move on to a new topic (see K-C ii.346); asyndeton is common in Pindar and Bacchylides after enumeration of victories: B.1.159, 4.16, 8.26, 13.199; Pi. 0.13.114, I.1.64.

30. An alternative interpretation is to take ΘεῷΘεῷ not with καλῷ but closely with ἐκκαλῷ, i.e. 'may the gods inspire me with a desire for καλῷ' - for what καλῷ do not come from the gods? But I think the context militates against this view; the implied contrast is not between a) καλῷ that come from the gods and b) καλῷ that come from elsewhere, but between a) καλῷ that come from the gods and b) καλῷ, ἐκκαλῷ et al. sim. that come from the gods (cf. P.3.61-2). At the back of Pindar's mind is the overhybristic victor over-aspiring for future successes (to his own detriment), or the selfish and cruel tyrant.
31. For the idea that the envious must be thrust away cf. Bacch.5 187f. ζνός ἄλλων χαίρειν ἀδενεῖν, ὑθοῦν ἄρμαντος ἔρχείν ἀποκαλέσαι, εἴ τι εἴ τι πράξοι βρέως.

32. He concludes that since, from Homer onwards, ἀδυνατεῖ is used to address a variety of gods and goddesses, it cannot have been the case that originally ἀδυνατεῖ was used solely to address the Dioscuri.

33. For ἀνά used of motion rather than along cf. Od.22.239-40 ἀνά μεγάρον μελάθρον ἐκεί ἀνάλαβε.

34. For my interpretation of σκόρπα in this context (καταβολή νίκων see έκείναι = νίκαν σκόπερται καταβολής) cf. N.2.19 νίκας έκείνην: in both phrases the verb is used eliptically, applying really to the fruits of victory (cf. P.4.125 πολλ' ἐν προοθεν πέτρα σκέψει νίκαν), not the victory itself; compare a similar use of κρέας, e.g. P.10.24 τὰ μέγα ἀθάνατα ἐλαττ., P.11.55 κρέαν ἔλατο, N.5.52 έλατεν συμφόρτι νίκον άφέκα, 0.8.63-6 κυρά, γένες Ἀλκιμεδόνι νίκαν τριφορτί ἐλάω (cf. 0.2.49 Ὀλυμπία, γένες έδέκα). For further refutation of Bury’s comment (ad loc.) that σκόπερται here cannot refer to winning victories, cf. Bacch.8.24-5 τεύχες έσπειρα νίκαν.

Against the view that καταβολή here means ‘earnest-money’ = 'down-payment' (so e.g. Slater s.v.), is the fact that that (viz. a down-payment) is what Pindar should receive, not the victor.

35. But Dr.R.Parker points out to me that anacolouthon in tragedy is not accidental, but a device to imitate the informality of colloquial speech; therefore, in retrospect I agree that ὑθοῦν here is best regarded as passive in sense = ὑθοῦν.
Orion had no particular connections with Olympia, but in
the context of a) the Games circuit (Ol., Py., Nem., Isth.) and
b) 'big following little things', I think that here mention of his
post-Pleiades appearance does allude to a future Olympic win for
Timodemos. According to the scholia he did later win at Olympia:
Sch.N.2.1a μετὰ γὰρ τὴν Ἐρεχθείαν νίκην ἔκτεθη ὑπὸ Ολυμπίας (this
statement is presumably derived from the victor-lists rather than
inferred from Pindar's text - the scholia do not interpret lines
11-12 as referring to an Olympic win).

This interpretation requires ε' (10) to be an explanatory
connector equal to γαρ - for which cf. N.10,19-20 βραχὺ μείο
πάντ' ἀναγ'κασθ' — ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἑγούμενον βαρὺς ἀντίκας. But
this interpretation is less good than the one given in the last
note, because, unlike the other, the point it expresses (that as
Orion always follows the Pleiades, so T. will follow in his
father's footsteps) has already been made by Pindar (lines 6-10).

The form Πελείκων (for Πλε-) is frequent in poetry:
Hes.Fr.268, 269, 290; Alc.Fr.1,60; Sim.555,5 PMG; Aes.Fr.172;
therefore, I do not think it has any special significance (e.g.
punning implications) here. The Πε- for Πλε- form is the result
of etymologising, the constellation often being fancifully thought
of as doves (see Aes.Fr.172 and Lloyd-Jones ad loc., H.Gundel
Though, as Dr. R. Parker points out to me, in the absence of contradictory evidence neither the scholiasts' guess, nor the Meiggs-Lewis identification of the cleruchy in the inscription with that mentioned by the scholia, is actually disqualified. Dr. Parker thinks that the existence of a cleruchy is also implied by the fact that the assassins of Peisistratos's daughter received plots of land in Salamis as a gift (and, hence, may be regarded as some of the cleruchs; see R. Parker, *Miasma*, Oxford 1983, 368-9).

Another possibility is that Timodemos belonged to the genos Salaminioi: an inscription of 363-2 B.C. (SEG vol. 21, 527) refers to Σαλαμίνιων whose ancestors lived in 508-7 in Acharnai (lines 77-8). The inscription also mentions how the cult of Eurytess (Aias) was administered by the genos; if Timodemos did belong to the genos, and if the cult existed in his day, this would give special relevance to Pindar's praise of Aias in *Nemean* 2 (13-14).

I am indebted to Dr. Parker for this possibility.

Professor H. Maehler thinks that τελεοφοροντες means here 'are mentioned first (before others) as outstanding'. But I think that in the context (τελεοφοροντες preceding, narration of past victories following) the words mean 'are spoken of already as outstanding'; cf. 0.13.101-2 τελεοφοροντες ὦ Ολυμπίας ἐν χοίρειν ἔχουσι τάρτην λέοντις ἐξ οὗ.

41. On a less literal interpretation of τελεοφοροντες, the ode itself could have formed the first part of the komos.
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