

TWO TRANSITIONS IN PINDAR

This paper addresses itself to two transitional passages in Pindar which are frequently misunderstood. In both we appear at first sight to have an awkward change of direction, with the myth terminated abruptly and the following item of praise merely juxtaposed. In reality, both transitions are effected smoothly, and the same technique is employed in both odes.

(i) *O.* 8.52–5

The victory of Alkimedon of Aigina in the boys' wrestling at Olympia in 460 B.C. provided the distinguished trainer Melesias, who had been a moderately successful athlete himself before becoming a professional trainer, with his thirtieth win (*O.* 8.66). Whether the figure of thirty includes Melesias' own victories or simply those won by his pupils is not made clear, but the context suggests the former, for Pindar treats Melesias' activities as athlete and trainer as parts of a single glorious career. Since the prestige of the victor's family is enhanced by their association with such an eminent trainer, and since Alkimedon's victory represents a milestone in Melesias' career, Pindar includes in the ode a lengthy praise of the trainer (54–66), a topos which is normally handled briefly.¹ Unfortunately, Pindar's account of Melesias' career has been misunderstood by virtually all readers since the Alexandrian commentators, and continues to be misunderstood by modern scholars. Of modern discussions available to me I find the correct interpretation only in valuable *obiter dicta* of Blass and von der Mühl and a brief note by Lehnus in his recent edition.² A careful reading of the text reveals that Melesias is praised not only for two Nemean victories won by himself but also for a victory at the Isthmus in the youths' category (*ἀγένοιοι*) and that there is a natural and fluent transition from the myth to the praise of the trainer.

The myth of *O.* 8 tells of the role of Aiakos in the building of the walls of Troy. It closes with Apollo going off to his favourite haunts while Poseidon drives off to the Isthmus of Corinth, depositing Aiakos at Aigina on the way.³ The myth is followed

¹ cf. *O.* 10.16–19, *N.* 4.93–6, *N.* 5.48–9, *N.* 6.64–6, *I.* 4.73f., *I.* 5.59–61, Bakch. 13.191–6. The unusual scale of the praise of Melesias suggests to E. Robbins, *CQ* 36 (1986), 320f. that the ode is a joint tribute to victor and trainer. But here as in other odes where Pindar includes an extended praise of someone instrumental to the patron's success (*P.* 5.26–53, *I.* 2.20–8) the ode is unambiguously dedicated to the victor and his family, as the relative length of treatment indicates.

² F. Blass, *Rh.M.* 53 (1898), 284; P. von der Mühl, *MH* 21 (1964), 54f., who notes the similarity with *N.* 5.37ff. discussed below; L. Lehnus, *Pindaro: Olimpiche* (Milan, 1981), p. 140 (tentatively). Von der Mühl ascribes this view to W. Christ in his commentary of 1896 and H. Bischoff, *Gnomon Pindari* (Würzburg, 1938), pp. 61f., neither of which I have seen.

³ *δεῦπο* line 51 (together with *τάνδε χώραν* 25) is a major stumbling-block for those who believe that *O.* 8 was performed at Olympia, since there is no obvious reason why Aiakos should be deposited at Olympia. Augustus Boeckh, *Pindari opera* 2.ii (Leipzig, 1821), p. 183 states: 'Graeci *δεῦπο* etiam de eo loco dicunt, de quo sermo sit, etsi qui loquitur alio sit loco.' His one parallel, Plat. *Phaid.* 58b, looks like a confusion of dramatic location with place of composition rather than evidence of Greek usage. B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: the Olympian and Pythian Odes*² (New York, 1890), p. 197, Lehnus, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 136 suggest that *δεῦπο* refers to Greece, which would of course include Olympia. But in a context in which Poseidon's goal is specified as the Isthmus it seems most unlikely that Aiakos' goal would be given vaguely as 'Greece'. *δεῦπο* is most naturally taken as a specific reference to Aigina, and we must suppose that the ode was performed there.

by an opaque gnome (τερπνὸν δ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἴσον ἔσσεται οὐδέν 53), which the scholiasts refer to the praise of Melesias which follows; they take it to mean: 'nothing will be equally pleasing among mankind', that is 'nothing pleases everyone'.⁴ The gnome reflects the fact that the praise of Melesias will give offence to some. This interpretation is accepted by a number of modern scholars.⁵ It is however unlikely to be correct. A word for 'everyone' seems called for; cf. *O.* 9.106, *N.* 5.16, *N.* 11.40. Another possibility is to refer the gnome to the uneven distribution of joys among mankind.⁶ But this neither follows well from the myth nor prompts what follows the gnome. There are three plausible interpretations: (i) 'no joy among mankind will be equally great' (to that of Aiaikos, who associated with gods); (ii) 'no joy among mankind will be equally great' (to that of the gods); (iii) 'no joy among mankind will be the same' (i.e. will remain unchanged).⁷ The third of these seems obscure without ἀεί or the like. The first and second alike would follow naturally from the myth. But the second seems more at home in the immediate context. Apollo goes off to his favourite haunts, Poseidon to his festival, while Aiaikos goes back to Aigina. He cannot remain with the gods.⁸ But whichever interpretation we choose, the important point is that the gnome does not refer, or at least does not primarily refer, to Melesias.

The praise begins in line 54: 'If I have retraced in song [or "have gone back in song to"] Melesias' glory from youths, let envy not cast a rough stone at me.' We can dismiss at once the suggestion that this sentence indicates that the praise of Melesias would be unpopular. As a number of recent writers have rightly stressed,⁹ the mention of φθόνος is a topos; the eminence of the individual who is praised is highlighted by a reference to the envy he inspires in lesser men. Pindar proceeds to speak of two victories at Nemea (56–9). These must have been won by Melesias himself, for two reasons. (i) Pindar is clearly referring to specific victories; this is indicated by ἐπειτα, which also suggests that the victories in question were won by the same person (cf. *O.* 9.86). Since Pindar gives us no reason to believe that these victories were won by the victor or anyone connected with him, the natural conclusion is that they were won by Melesias himself. (ii) Pindar proceeds in 59ff. to stress the value of personal experience for a trainer; this makes more sense if he has actually ascribed such personal experience to the trainer whom he is praising. From the specific ἀνδρῶν μάχας in 58 it appears that the victory mentioned in 56–7 was won in the boys' or youths' section. Thus in lines 56–66 we have a fluent chronological and logical progression, from victory in a junior section (56f.) to victory in the senior section (58f.), from athlete (56–9) to trainer (59–64), culminating in the Olympic victory of Alkimedon, which gives Melesias the remarkable total of thirty victories (65–6).

But what of lines 54–5? Boeckh¹⁰ writes of these verses: 'censeo tantum de victoriis

⁴ See schol. 70a, A. B. Drachman, *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina* (Leipzig, 1903–27), i.254.

⁵ cf. Boeckh, op. cit. (n. 3), p. 183, L. Dissen, *Pindari carmina*² ii (Gotha, 1843), p. 115, C. E. M. Fennell, *Pindar: the Olympian and Pythian Odes*² (Cambridge, 1893), p. 90, L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* (London, 1932), i.43, F. J. Nisetich, *Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore, 1980), p. 120.

⁶ Lehnus, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 139.

⁷ C. E. Whitmore, *Studies in Philology* 15 (1918), 346: 'Nothing among men rests equally (that is, uniformly) joyful', C. M. Bowra, *The Odes of Pindar* (Harmondsworth, 1969), p. 212: 'But no joy will stay the same among men.'

⁸ cf. Pelops at *O.* 1.65ff., Perseus at *P.* 10.46ff.

⁹ cf. von der Mühl, op. cit. (n. 2), 55, Lehnus, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 140, W. H. Race, *TAPA* 113 (1983), 110, Robbins, op. cit. (n. 1), 321, n. 23. So already P. B. R. Forbes, *CR* 47 (1933), 167.

¹⁰ Boeckh, op. cit. (n. 3), p. 184. The suggestion that Melesias had also trained Timosthenes (mentioned at *O.* 8.15) is based on the ancient conjecture (recorded as fact in schol. *O.* 8.16, 19b, Drachmann i.241) that Timosthenes was Alkimedon's brother. In 'Prosopographica Pindarica',

Timosthenis et Alcimedontis ceterorumque ex Melesiae disciplina puerorum agi, quibus memorandis Melesiae κύδος ἐξ ἀγενείων percurrit; atque hoc etiam nexui sententiarum aptius est. Sequentia tamen ad ipsius Melesiae victorias pertinent, qui Nemeae vicerit, lucta haud dubie puer, deinde vir pancratio.' But although κύδος ἐξ ἀγενείων could certainly bear the desired sense, it is difficult to see how the opposition between victories won as trainer and victories won as athlete could be expressed without some part of αὐτός in lines 56–8 to distinguish personal from vicarious success (cf. *O.* 2.48–51), or at the very least a verb such as ἔσχεν to indicate that Melesias acquired these victories, in contrast to that/those of 54f., personally rather than through his pupils. It is easier therefore to assume that lines 54f. refer to a victory won by Melesias personally in the class of ἀγένοιοι, probably in wrestling, in view of the fact that Pindar specifies the pankration as the event in which Melesias won as a man (59). So the ancient commentators understood the passage. Schol. 71c¹¹ paraphrases: εἰ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ Μελησίᾳ τὸν ὕμνον ἐφαρμόζων ἐπὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ ἀνέδραμον, ἣν ἔσχεν ἀγωνιζόμενος ἐξ ἀγενείων..., and schol. 71e explains: ὡς τοῦ Μελησίᾳ προηθληκότος καὶ ταῦν ἀλείφοντος καὶ διδάσκοντος τὸν Ἀλκιμέδοντα. That the passage refers to a victory won by Melesias himself is also the view of Dissen and Farnell.¹²

But where was this victory won? Dissen and Farnell would identify the victory in the youths' section in 54f. with that mentioned in 56f., which was clearly won in either the boys' or the youths' section at Nemea. This is not however what one would conclude from an unbiased reading of Pindar's words. In line 56 we find not Νεμέαι γὰρ... explaining the reference to the κύδος won by Melesias but καὶ Νεμέαι γὰρ... Of the combination καὶ γάρ Denniston observes: 'where the particles are separated, καὶ usually goes closely with the following word or words.'¹³ As he notes, this is not invariable. But it is on the whole likely that καὶ emphasizes Νεμέαι, 'for even at Nemea', 'for at Nemea also'.¹⁴ When Pindar adds ὁμῶς, 'in the same way', 'likewise', it is difficult to resist the impression that Nemea is simultaneously being distinguished from and compared to another place. This impression is reinforced by the colometry, which isolates καὶ Νεμέαι γὰρ ὁμῶς (period-end is confirmed by *brevis in longo* in lines 12, 49, 71). The only obvious alternative is that offered by Farnell: 'the function of ὁμῶς (= "equally") is to link up the victory won by Melesias over the boys at Nemea with his victory over the men in the pankration.' But word order does not favour linking ὁμῶς with ταύταν χάριν. Moreover, to express the notion 'A and B alike' Greek uses τε, καί, τε...τε or τε καί/τε...καί (ὁμοίως τὸ δεῖνα καὶ τὸ δεῖνα/τὸ δεῖνα καὶ τὸ δεῖνα ὁμοίως etc.), as one would expect, not δέ.¹⁵ Pindar could have expressed the idea desired by Farnell far more naturally by writing τάν τ' ἔπειτ'

CQ 39 (1989), 1–9 I seek to demonstrate that the conjecture is erroneous. Boeckh is followed in referring 54f. to Melesias' success as trainer by F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig, 1880), p. 381, Gildersleeve, op. cit. (n. 3), pp. 197f., Fennell, op. cit. (n. 5), p. 90, Bowra, op. cit. (n. 7), p. 212, R. Lattimore, *The Odes of Pindar*² (Chicago, 1947), p. 27, Nisetich, op. cit. (n. 5), p. 120. Race, op. cit. (n. 9), p. 110 n. 42, suggests deliberate ambiguity.

¹¹ Drachmann i.256.

¹² Dissen, op. cit. (n. 5), p. 116, Farnell ii.65.

¹³ J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford, 1954), pp. 110f.

¹⁴ Contrast *P.* 9.90f.: Αἰγίναί τε γὰρ φαμι Νίσου τ' ἐν λόφῳ...

¹⁵ cf. *P.* 8.6 and see further e.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.196, 8.214, 9.320, Aisch. *Ag.* 67, *Cho.* 336f., Dem. 21.51, 55, 43.20. The avoidance of δέ in this idiom is due neither to chance nor to caprice. Denniston, op. cit. (n. 13), p. 162 notes: 'δέ usually couples sentences, clauses or phrases, single words being normally joined by καί, and (in some styles) τε.' He adds (162 n. 3): 'Adversative δέ may couple single words, ...continuative δέ hardly ever, if at all.'

or by postponing *ὁμῶς* to the second clause (*τὰν δ' ἔπειτ' ἀνδρῶν ὁμῶς ἐκ παγκρατίου*, 'and [I shall speak of] another afterwards from the men's pankration likewise', or the like). Thus it is likely that *καὶ Νεμέαι...ὁμῶς* compares Nemea with another venue. The absence of any specification of place in 58f. suggests that the victory in the men's pankration was also won at Nemea; so it is likely that the other locale precedes the reference to Nemea. Now there is in fact a reference to an athletic venue in the preceding verses, for the myth closes with a reference to the Isthmus, which is explicitly characterized with reference to its festival in honour of Poseidon, *δαιτικλυτάν*, line 52, the last word of the narrative. In the context of a victory ode, the festival at the Isthmus means above all the athletic competition. If, as seems likely, Nemea is here compared with another athletic venue, then it is probable that this other venue is the Isthmus. *ὁμῶς* indicates that Melesias was victorious alike at both places, and *ἀγενείων* together with *ταύταν* indicates that the victory at each locale was in the youths' section.

On this interpretation of the passage the transition from the central myth becomes considerably less abrupt, since the praise of Melesias is not simply juxtaposed with the close of the myth but arises from it by means of the geographical link of the Isthmus. We must then suppose that the aorist *ἀνέδραμον* refers to the mention of the Isthmian games, with their obvious relevance to Melesias.

(ii) *N.* 5.37–42

The above reading of the praise of Melesias in *O.* 8 receives considerable support from a similar transitional passage in *N.* 5. Unfortunately, the passage in question has itself given rise to prolonged debate. Nonetheless, a careful examination should enable us both to arrive at a clear understanding of the transitional passage in *N.* 5 and to appreciate the essential similarity of procedure in the two odes.

After telling of the attempted seduction of Peleus by Hippolyta, and Peleus' reward from Zeus and Poseidon for resisting the temptation to breach the laws of hospitality, Pindar terminates his myth, as in *O.* 8, with a journey of Poseidon to the Isthmus. Here however the reference to the festival is expanded into a description (*N.* 5.37–41): 'who often goes from Aigai to the Dorian Isthmus, where friendly throngs welcome him, the god, with the sound of the flute, and they compete with bold strength of limbs. Fate born with a man decides in all actions.' We then move to the subject of the victor's uncle Euthymenes. Unfortunately, what follows is marred by textual corruption. However, it is still possible to reconstruct the progress of thought in outline, even if the details remain debatable.

I begin with line 43. The manuscripts offer:

*ἦτοι μεταίξαντα καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει
κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος Πυθέας.*

The text here is clearly corrupt. (1) *μεταίξαντα* has no syntactical connection with the rest of the sentence.¹⁶ (2) The line appears to be addressed to Euthymenes, who is apostrophized in line 41, and *τεὸς μάτρως* must be in apposition to *Πυθέας*. However, as Farnell rightly stresses, although Pindar uses *μάτρως*, 'uncle', in an extended sense ('relative through one's mother', 'relative on the mother's side'), the word is always used of relatives belonging to an older generation.¹⁷ It was

¹⁶ Farnell ii.279 rightly rejects the possibility that *μεταίξαντα* might agree with *ἔθνος* (which would then designate an individual) by a *σχήμα κατὰ σύνεσιν*. Pindar never uses *ἔθνος* of a single individual.

¹⁷ Farnell ii.278. See W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969), p. 315.

Euthymenes who was *μάτρως* of Pytheas, not the reverse, and Euthymenes is so designated at *I.* 6.62. The obvious solution is to read the vocative *Πυθέα*, which restores the proper relationship. The scholiasts in fact attest that not all ancient texts read the nominative (*καταλληλότερον δὲ ἔνιοι γράφουσι, ἢν' ἦι ὁ μήτρως Πυθέας*).¹⁸ The first problem is more difficult. Since the line as presented in the MSS scans, the corruption is presumably not extensive; so drastic solutions should be avoided. Two solutions recommend themselves. (i) We may add *σ'* after *μάτρως* to provide agreement for the masculine accusative participle: 'indeed your uncle honours you, Pytheas for rushing now too after (i.e. following the tradition of) that hero's kindred race.' (ii) We may change *μεταίξαντα* to *μεταίξαις σε*: 'indeed by rushing after you now too your uncle brings honour to that hero's kindred race.' If the first version is accepted, *καὶ νῦν* refers to Pytheas' victory at Nemea which prompted Pindar's ode. If we adopt the second version, we must suppose that *καὶ νῦν* refers to a recent victory by Euthymenes. If the verse is taken in isolation, either reading might stand. For a decision we must examine the verse in context, specifically with reference to the identity of the individual praised in lines 44–6, to which I now turn.

Line 44 begins *Ἄ Νεμέα μὲν ἄραρεν*. In the context of a celebration of the Nemean victory of Pytheas, one would naturally take this as a recapitulatory reference to that victory. There is however a problem. The successful athlete praised in lines 44–6 is referred to in the third person (*ἐκράτει* 45). Pytheas however figures in line 43 in the second person. We might of course assume that Pindar has slipped from second-person address to third-person narrative while still speaking of the same athlete. However, in lines 48–9 Pindar once more addresses Pytheas in the second person. It is unlikely that Pindar would shift from second-person address to third-person narrative and back, referring to the same individual, within the space of six verses. This is especially unlikely since he has referred to another athlete in line 43 in the third person; under the circumstances the use of the third person in lines 44–6 with reference to Pytheas would be especially confusing. We must of course always bear in mind that Pindar's original audience knew all the facts and would probably not be as confused by the syntactical gymnastics described above as the modern reader would be. But we should also bear in mind that Pindar explicitly writes for posterity, and subsequent singers or audiences did not know the facts; nor is it clear what purpose could be served by creating confusion on this issue. I conclude that it is *on the whole* more likely that the individuals mentioned in the third person in lines 43 and 45 are one and the same, and distinct from the addressee in lines 43 and 48. It would appear therefore that the victories listed in lines 44–6 were won by Euthymenes. This conclusion confirms that one of the Nemean victories ascribed to the family at *I.* 6.61 was won by Euthymenes.

We may now return to line 43. We are faced there with two possibilities, either a reference to Pytheas' victory or a reference to a victory by Euthymenes. Now lines 41–2 explicitly deal with Euthymenes, and it was argued above that lines 44–6 likewise deal with his successes. The run of the context therefore favours a reference to a success by Euthymenes in line 43. I therefore prefer the second of the reconstructions offered above. The second reconstruction of course also compliments Pytheas, since his uncle's success is seen to be inspired by his own. If Pindar has in mind a literal imitation of Pytheas by Euthymenes, then it would seem that the Nemean victory of Euthymenes was the most recent, and therefore that *N.* 5 was composed at least two years after Pytheas' victory. It may be however that Pindar is simply saying that the uncle like the nephew has a recent success.

¹⁸ Schol. *N.* 5.78c, Drachmann iii.97.

In line 41 the MSS text is variously reported in modern editions as *Αἰγίναί θεάς*, *αἰγίνα θεάς*, *αἰγυαθεάς*. MS B, which I have examined on microfilm, appears to have *αἰγίνα* (i.e. *Αἰγίνα*) *θεάς separatim*. The accent however clearly presupposes an oblique case of *Αἰγίνα*. The ancient paraphrast had in front of him a text with the dative. The scholium in question is either corrupt or paraphrases loosely, but *Αἰγίναί* is guaranteed as the Alexandrian reading by *ἐν τῇ Αἰγίνῃ* in the scholium and *θεάς... Νίκας* by *τῆς θεάς Νίκης*.¹⁹ However, where *θεάς* stands metre demands *οο*, not *οι*. Farnell²⁰ argues for synezesis (*θεās*). Contraction of the first double short of the hemiepes in dactylo-epitrite is possible at *N.* 8 strophe line 1, fr. 221.2, Bakch. 13 strophe line 3.²¹ However, in two of the three parallels the contraction (if that is what we have) is sustained throughout the ode; this may have been the case also in the ode to which fr. 221 belonged. This does not inspire confidence in an isolated instance of contraction in responsion with the uncontracted hemiepes, particularly since Pindar was free to use *θεοῦ* with the termination shortened in hiatus. The simplest correction is to follow Erasmus Schmid in reading *θεοῦ*. This solves the metrical problem, though semantically the clause is somewhat clumsy, since *θεοῦ* is not necessary for the sense and adds nothing to the personification of Nike, in contrast to the epithet at *I.* 2.26 *χρυσέας ἐν γούνασιν πίπνοντα Νίκας*. However, the transition from the myth is abrupt and the account of the Isthmian games seemingly irrelevant. Moreover, *Αἰγίναί* must then refer to one or more victories won by Euthymenes in Aigina, as the paraphrast saw. But if, as was argued above, lines 44–6 refer to victories won by Euthymenes, Aigina figures twice in a single victory list (*Αἰγίναί* 41, *μεῖς τ' ἐπιχώριος, οἴκοι* 44–5),²² once in its natural order after mention of one of the four national festivals²³ and once out of order preceding the major festival. But Pindar's practice is to gather victories in terms of locale, either by combining them within a single figure or by listing them side by side.²⁴ Where Pindar does depart from this practice, or where he disturbs the normal ordering of festivals according to prestige, there is usually a purpose. Thus at *O.* 7.80f. Rhodes (the victor's home) is listed before the more prestigious Isthmus and Nemea. The reason is a desire to create a smooth transition at the end of the myth by moving from Tlepolemos to the games held in his honour and thence to the victor Diagoras, who won at those games.²⁵ At *P.* 8.65–80 Pindar separates the victory of Aristomenes at

¹⁹ Schol. *N.* 5.75b, Drachmann iii.96f.

²⁰ Farnell ii.278.

²¹ See M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), p. 71.

²² In line 44 *μεῖς τ' ἐπιχώριος*, explained by the scholia as designating the Aiginetan month Delphinios (schol. *N.* 5.81a, b, Drachmann iii.97), must refer to a victory in Aigina (at the Delphinia, according to Farnell ii.279). If *δέ* in line 45 is used for *γάρ* the same victory is referred to in both verses. However, the reference to the victor's age group (which is otiose in the context of a victory by an adult) and the postponement of this detail to line 45 suggest that these verses may list two Aiginetan victories by Euthymenes, one as an adult (line 44) and an earlier victory as a boy (line 45).

²³ According to the data assembled by E. Thummer, *Pindar: die isthmischen Gedichte*, 1 (Heidelberg, 1968), pp. 27f., Aigina should follow games of the *periodos* in victory catalogues, but may either precede (*O.* 7.86, *P.* 9.90f.) or follow (*O.* 13.109) Megara; this vacillation and the close association of the two venues in *O.* 7, *O.* 13, *P.* 9 and *N.* 5 (cf. also *P.* 8.78–80) suggest that they had virtually equal prestige.

²⁴ For victories at the same locale summed up in a single figure cf. *O.* 7.81, 86, *O.* 9.86, *O.* 12.18, *O.* 13.32, 38, 40, 99, 107, *P.* 7.13/14, 16, *P.* 8.80, *P.* 9.91, *P.* 10.13, *N.* 2.19, 22, 23, *N.* 5.52, *N.* 6.19, 20, *N.* 10.24, 27, 28, 42, *I.* 4.70, 71, *I.* 5.17, *I.* 6.61; for such victories listed side by side cf. *P.* 9.97–103 (all local victories), *I.* 4.70–1.

²⁵ For other cases in which more important follow less important victories see Thummer, op. cit. (n. 23), p. 28.

the Delphinia in Aigina from his triple victory in the Aiginetan games in honour of Hera. The effect is to associate the success in local games in honour of Apollo (65–6) closely with Aristomenes' victory in the games of Apollo at Delphi (61–5), thus suggesting a fateful link between victor and deity.²⁶ No such effect is visible in *N.* 5. And the brevity of the victory list makes the apparently purposeless separation of the Aiginetan victories awkward, in contrast to *P.* 8, where any awkwardness is avoided by the substantial interval between the two references to Aiginetan victories. It is difficult to credit Pindar with such a maladroit victory list. One is therefore inclined to suspect that the textual corruption in line 41 includes *Αἰγίνα* as well as *θεᾶς*. I shall deal with the textual problem below. For the moment it will be sufficient to ask whether the immediate context offers any alternative to Aigina as the scene of victory. The answer is of course that the preceding verses supply one in the description of the Isthmian festival in lines 37ff. That Euthymenes had won at the Isthmus had already been conjectured by Alexandrian scholars; this suggestion has been accepted by some moderns.²⁷

This suggestion restores order to the victory list; instead of Aigina, Nemea, Aigina, Megara we have Isthmus, Nemea, Aigina, Megara. Not only does the Isthmus take its natural place in the list as the most prestigious of the festivals mentioned, it also effects a smoother transition after the myth by means of the geographical link between the god Poseidon and the athlete Euthymenes and rescues lines 37ff. from irrelevance. Less obviously, it provides us with a type of transition which is sufficiently common in Pindar to be classed as a stylized structural device. In no less than five other odes we find the same movement at the close of a myth from mythic figure (hero or god) in the past to the cult or activity of this figure in the present, thence to the patron (*O.* 1.90–105, *O.* 3.34–41,²⁸ *O.* 7.77–81, *P.* 9.69–72, *I.* 4.61–72). In all but one

²⁶ cf. *O.* 8.15ff., *N.* 10.32–6.

²⁷ cf. schol. 67a, Drachmann iii.96. For recent arguments for a reference in *N.* 5 to an Isthmian victory by Euthymenes see E. Wüst, *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter* (Tübingen, 1967), pp. 173f., A. Köhnken, *BICS* 22 (1975), 35, n. 21. Mezger, op. cit. (n. 10), p. 337, and J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London, 1890), p. 95 likewise accept the Isthmian victory, but erroneously rewrite the text in order to secure an explicit reference to the Isthmus in line 41. The reference to success at the Isthmus is rejected by R. Hamilton, *Epinikion* (The Hague, 1974), p. 106, who finds in the *gnome* in 40f. a 'shift to a new topic'. But the presence of a *gnome* need not signal a major change of direction; we find *gnomai* alone or in clusters mediating between related themes, such as *O.* 8.8 (linking the divination of athletes at Olympia with the Olympic victory of Alkimedon), *P.* 9.76–9 (between Telesikrates' Pythian victory and the catalogue of earlier successes), *N.* 9.33 (between two elements in the praise of Chromios). The suggestion is also rejected by G. A. Privitera, *Pindaro: le Isthmiche* (Milan, 1982), pp. 211f.

²⁸ The interpretation of the transitional passage in *O.* 3 depends on our understanding of the phrase *ταῦταν ἐορτάν* in line 34, which is often referred to the festival at Akragas at which (probably) *O.* 3 was performed; so most recently E. Robbins, in *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, ed. D. E. Gerber (Chico, 1984), p. 222. Most recent writers refer the phrase to the Olympic games; see Lehnus, op. cit. (n. 2), p. 67, A. Köhnken, *HSCP* 87 (1983), 59, n. 44, W. J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar*, I (*Mnemos. Suppl.* 97, 1987), pp. 32f., S. C. Shelmerdine, *HSCP* 91 (1987), 77. The latter is the correct view. (i) *καὶ νῦν/καὶ νῦν* in transition from past to present or general to particular should establish a logical relationship (parallelism or illustration; cf. *O.* 7.13, *O.* 10.78, *P.* 5.20, *N.* 6.8, *I.* 5.48, *I.* 8.61) between the passages so linked; but if the *ἐορτά* is at Akragas the connection is purely external ('a sweet desire for the trees seized him... And now/now too he comes...'). A reference to the Olympic games gives the expected logical connection (the interest in Olympia demonstrated by Herakles' acquisition of the olive continues in the present). (ii) *ἐμὲ δ' ὦν* in line 38 should signal a transition as at *P.* 9.103. But if lines 34ff. refer to the victory celebration line 38 merely continues a subject begun in line 34. Probably therefore lines 34–8 belong to the myth and continue the tale of Herakles'

of these cases the transitional passage relates to an athletic venue at which the patron won and is followed by a reference to that victory; the exception, *P.* 9, still conforms in that it effects a return to the patron and to a specific victory. *N.* 5 differs only in that the transition relates to the victor's kinsman. It can hardly be a coincidence that an explanation of lines 41–2 based entirely on the internal coherence of the passage immediately following the myth also gives us a stylized transition favoured by Pindar.

The conclusion (subjective but strongly recommended by context and convention) that Euthymenes had at least one Isthmian victory to his credit settles a long-standing disagreement over the interpretation of *I.* 6.60f., where Pindar says of Pytheas, his younger brother Phylakidas and their uncle Euthymenes:

ἀραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου
τρεῖς ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας...

This passage appears to credit the family with three Isthmian victories. One of these is obviously the victory of Phylakidas celebrated in the ode. It is clear from *I.* 6.5–9 and *I.* 5.17 that contrary to the order in the MSS *I.* 6 is the earlier ode and that Phylakidas had won only one Isthmian victory at the date of *I.* 6. Scholars who are not convinced that Euthymenes had won at the Isthmus must therefore dispose of the plurality of Isthmian victories mentioned here. Two solutions are proposed. (1) Bergk punctuated the passage thus:²⁹ *τρεῖς, ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ, τὰς δ'...* 'three, from the Isthmus, others...' This allows for a single victory at the Isthmus (that of Phylakidas). The count of three can then be made up with the Nemean victories of Pytheas (*N.* 5) and Euthymenes (*N.* 5.44), and we must assume that the Nemean victory of Phylakidas mentioned at *I.* 5.18 had yet to be won. (2) Alternatively, the number three defines the victors, not the victories:³⁰ 'they won victories, the three of them, from...' This again allows for a single Isthmian victory for the family (though it is compatible with an assumption that there were more than one). The first suggestion is ugly and unlikely in itself. The verse is clearly intended to achieve a kind of balance: *τρεῖς/τὰς δ', ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ/ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας*, with the adjective added in the second half to avoid a mechanical *pariosis*. The proposed punctuation destroys the run of the verse. The

connection with Olympia (note especially *νῦν δ'... ἐμὲ δὲ... O.* 1.90–100, *καὶ νῦν... ἐμὲ δ' ὦν... O.* 3.34–8). For the performance of *O.* 3 at a feast of the Dioskouroi at Akragas cf. C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York, 1981), p. 19, Robbins, op. cit. (n. 28), p. 220, Verdenius, op. cit. (n. 28), p. 6.

²⁹ T. Bergk, *Poetae lyriici Graeci*⁴ (Leipzig, 1878), p. 352. He is followed by J. B. Bury, *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar* (London, 1892), pp. 116f., W. Christ, *Pindari carmina* (Leipzig, 1899), p. 255, Farnell ii.361, Nisetich, op. cit. (n. 5), p. 318, G. Kirkwood, *Selections from Pindar* (Chico, 1982), p. 295. Kirkwood following Bury finds the imprecision in *τὰς δ'* (if *τρεῖς* refers only to victories at the Isthmus) 'improbable'. But cf. *O.* 7.82, *O.* 9.87, *O.* 13.43ff., 107, *N.* 2.23, *N.* 10.46. A comparison of this list with that in n. 24 above will demonstrate that Pindar not only leaves the number of victories vague on occasion but also mixes precise and vague numerations in a single list, partly no doubt for variety, an important consideration in Pindar's victory lists. T. Cole, *AJP* 108 (1987), 553–68 includes the list in *I.* 6 among a number of passages in which Pindar is deliberately ambiguous about the number of victories. That is, Pindar leaves it unclear whether he means 'three from the Isthmus and others from Nemea' or 'three, (one) from the Isthmus and (two) others from Nemea'. I remain unconvinced by his argument that Pindar persistently indulges in such ambiguity. In the present case (as also at *O.* 9.86f., *N.* 5.52f., *O.* 12.17f., discussed by Cole, 554, 558, 562) he approaches the text as a reader and ignores the effect of *performance*. The presence or absence of a comma in the printed text reflects the presence or absence of a pause in performance. The ambiguity exists only on the page. It is significant that in his translation on p. 554 Cole creates the desired ambiguity by departing from the colometry of Pindar's text.

³⁰ So Hamilton, op. cit. (n. 27), p. 106.

same is true of the second suggestion, which also has the disadvantage of stating the obvious. We may contrast *O.* 9.84f., where the mention of the number of victors has a particular point, since they won on the same day. We would anyway expect, on the basis of other victory lists in Pindar, a reference to the number of victories rather than the number of victors.³¹ Thus the most natural interpretation of *I.* 6.61 taken alone is one which credits the family with a plurality of victories at the Isthmus. This is confirmed by our reading of *N.* 5.37ff. Moreover, since Pytheas evidently had no Isthmian victory (*I.* 5.17–19), we must conclude from *τρεις* that Euthymenes won twice at the Isthmus.

With this in mind we can now turn to the textual problem in *N.* 5.41. The safe solution clearly is to obelize *Αἰγίνα θεᾶς*, particularly since we are unable to date Euthymenes' Isthmian victories relative to the Nemean victory of Pytheas. However, acceptable sense can be restored with minimal change if we read *Αἰγίναθε δῖς*, Schwartz's conjecture,³² which has found favour with most editors this century, though not all who accept this reading see a reference to an Isthmian victory.³³ This provides us with the two Isthmian victories ascribed to Euthymenes in *I.* 6, and corruption is easily explicable as due to false word-division combined with confusion of capital *A* and *Δ*; this accords with the evident antiquity of the corruption, since the scholiasts give no hint of any alternative reading. *Αἰγίναθε* is sometimes attached to *Εὐθύμηνες* ('Euthymenes from Aigina').³⁴ However, word order does not favour this interpretation (contrast *Εὐξένιδα πάτραθε Σώγηνες* *N.* 7.70), which is anyway banal. Probably we should detect in *Αἰγίναθε* the influence of the idea of motion implied in *πίτνων*: 'And you, Euthymenes, twice from Aigina casting yourself/rushing into the arms of Victory made contact with ornate songs'.³⁵ *Αἰγίναθε* is thus a pregnant means of referring to a victory abroad.

The readings of these two transitional passages, each based on a close examination of Pindar's words in their immediate context, receive considerable mutual support from the close similarity of procedure which emerges. In both the myth ends with Poseidon and the Isthmus, from which we move to a victory in the Isthmian games which opens a victory catalogue. In a poet with Pindar's tendency towards stylization, this is a consideration of no small weight.

University of St Andrews

CHRISTOPHER CAREY

³¹ See n. 24 above.

³² E. Schwartz, *Hermes* 39 (1904), 636.

³³ Thus Slater, *op. cit.* (n. 17), p. 16 translates *Αἰγίναθε* 'at Aigina'; cf. Lattimore, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 115, Nisetich, *op. cit.* (n. 5), p. 254. The termination could be locative or separative; for the latter cf. *P.* 4.102, *N.* 3.81, *N.* 7.70, *N.* 9.1, *N.* 10.43, *I.* 3.17.

³⁴ So J. E. Sandys, *Pindar* (London, 1919), p. 363, Wüst, *op. cit.* (n. 27), p. 167.

³⁵ cf. Bowra, *op. cit.* (n. 7), p. 40.