

## THE DATE OF PINDAR'S FIFTH NEMEAN AND BACCHYLIDES' THIRTEENTH ODE

### I. STATUS QUÆSTIONIS

Just about every odd year in the early fifth century B.C. has been proposed as the date of the Nemean victory of Pytheas from Aegina, celebrated in Pindar's Fifth Nemean and Bacchylides' thirteenth ode. Scholars have attempted to date both odes with the help of *Isthmian* 6 and 5, which celebrate victories of a member of the same family and the latter of which at 48ff. refers to Salamis as a recent event. Various interpretations of the victory catalogues in *I.* 6 and 5 have led to various dates for *N.* 5 and *B.* 13.<sup>1</sup> The fullest analysis of the material is that by Severyns,<sup>2</sup> who argues that *N.* 5 and *B.* 13 must be at least seven years earlier than *I.* 5. In his conclusion (pp. 50–51), however, he still suggests three possible dates for *N.* 5 and *B.* 13: 487, 489, and 485 B.C., in what he considers to be the order of likelihood.

Several scholars have attempted to date *N.* 5 and *B.* 13 by reconstructing the historical background of the performance of both odes on the basis of the internal evidence of the text. It has been argued that the words of praise bestowed on the Athenian trainer Menander (*N.* 5.48–9, *B.* 13.191–8) would have been impossible in a climate of hostility between Aegina and Athens. Gaspar,<sup>3</sup> T. Mommsen<sup>4</sup> and Farnell<sup>5</sup> have therefore dated both odes before 488 B.C., Mommsen to 493 B.C., Gaspar and Farnell to 489 B.C. Thomas Cole, too, in his recent study *Pindar's Feasts or the Music of Power* (Rome, 1992), assumes that this ode contains a complimentary reference to Athens, the native city of the trainer Menander (p. 42); but this leads him to date this ode to 481 B.C., when the news of the arrival of Xerxes' army at Sardis led to a congress of anti-Medizing states at the Isthmus, where a (temporary) reconciliation between Athens and Aegina was brought about (p. 43).

It is my objective to combine both approaches. The confusion with respect to the interpretation of the victory catalogues in *N.* 5, *I.* 6 and 5 calls for a detailed re-examination of the material. In this way it is possible, as I intend to demonstrate, to arrive at a *terminus ad quem* for *N.* 5 and *B.* 13. Internal evidence enables us to reconstruct the historical setting of both odes and to date them more precisely.

<sup>1</sup> Most often proposed is 485: A. Körte, 'Bacchylidea', *Hermes* 53 (1918), 133–47, esp. p. 142; W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (W. Schmid & O. Stählin), I, i (München, 1929), p. 524; A. Turyn, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis* (Cracow, 1948), p. 164, C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford, 1964), p. 407. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1932), p. 169: 483, but more likely 485. B. Snell & H. Maehler, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Pars I Epinicia (Leipzig, 1987<sup>8</sup>), print '483?' above the text of *N.* 5; however, in the *praefatio* of their Bacchylides edition (*Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis* [Leipzig, 1970<sup>10</sup>]), p. xlv, they give 485 as the most likely date. H. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides. Erster Teil, die Siegeslieder*, 2 vols. (*Mnemosyne Supplement* 62, Leiden, 1982), II, pp. 250–51, gives 483 as the latest possible date. 481 has been proposed by: L. Bornemann, 'Pindar (1903–1927) und Bakchylides (1908ff.)', *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 54 (1928), 216. Band, pp. 131–86, esp. p. 173; R. C. Jebb, *Bacchylides, The Poems and Fragments* (Cambridge, 1905), pp. 214–15; A. Taccone, *Bacchilide, Epinici, Ditirambi e Frammenti* (Turin, 1907).

<sup>2</sup> A. Severyns, *Bacchylide, Essai biographique* (Liège, 1933), pp. 41–51.

<sup>3</sup> C. Gaspar, *Essai de chronologie pindarique* (Brussels, 1900), pp. 63–4.

<sup>4</sup> T. Mommsen, *Pindaros: zur Geschichte des Dichters* (Kiel, 1845), p. 47.

<sup>5</sup> L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, vol. 2 (commentary) (London, 1932), p. 274.

## II. THE VICTORY CATALOGUES IN THE FOUR ODES FOR THE SONS OF LAMPON

Pindar's fifth *Nemean* was written in honour of the Nemean victory of Pytheas of Aegina, Bacchylides' thirteenth ode for the same occasion. *I.* 5 and *I.* 6 were written for Pytheas' younger (cf. *I.* 6.6–7) brother, Phylacidas (*I.* 5.17–21, *I.* 6.57–62). Euthymenes was a maternal uncle of Pytheas and Phylacidas (*I.* 6.58–62, *N.* 5.41, 43).

### *Nemean* 5

This ode celebrates Pytheas' Nemean victory in the pancration, in the category of adolescents (lines 4–6). Phylacidas is not mentioned in this ode. There are two passages, mentioning earlier victories, that are much disputed: (i) τὸ δ' Αἰγίναθε δῖς,<sup>6</sup> Εὐθύμενες, | Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσιν πίτνων ποικίλων ἔψαυας ὕμνων, 41–2; (ii) Ἀ Νεμέα μὲν ἄραρεν μείς τ' ἐπιχώριος, ὃν φίλης' Ἀπόλλων· | ἄλικας δ' ἐλθόντας οἴκοι τ' ἐκράτει | Νίκου τ' ἐν εὐαγκεῖ λόφῳ, 44–6. I take (i) lines 41–2 to refer to two victories of Euthymenes at Aeginetan games,<sup>7</sup> and (ii) lines 45–6 to record an unspecified number of victories of Pytheas in Aegina and Megara.

(i) *Αἰγίναθε δῖς* is not always interpreted as referring to two Aeginetan victories of Euthymenes. *Αἰγίναθε* is sometimes construed with *Εὐθύμενες*.<sup>8</sup> However, as Carey<sup>9</sup> rightly observes, 'word order does not favour this interpretation (contrast *Εὐξένιδα πάτραθε* *Ῥώγενε*, *N.* 7.70), which is anyway banal' (p. 295). Carey's own suggestion is that 'we should detect in *Αἰγίναθε* the influence of the idea of motion implied in *πίτνων* (42): 'And you, Euthymenes, twice from Aigina casting yourself/rushing into the arms of Victory made contact with ornate songs'. *Αἰγίναθε* is thus a pregnant means of referring to a victory abroad' (ibid.).<sup>10</sup> He suggests that the place where Euthymenes is said to have won twice, can be deduced from the preceding passage where the Isthmian Games are being referred to.<sup>11</sup> However, both these interpretations are open to the objection that it is highly unlikely that Pindar refers to victories without indicating precisely where they have been won. On the other hand, in the case of victories won by other members of the victor's family the home-town

<sup>6</sup> In line 41 the MSS. read *Αἰγίναυ θεᾶς contra metrum*; E. Schwartz' emendation *Αἰγίναθε δῖς* ('Zu Bacchylides', *Hermes* 39 [1904], 636) is generally accepted.

<sup>7</sup> The text of line 43 is very uncertain. With the text of the Snell-Maehler edition, *ἤτοι μεταίξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τοὺς μάτρως ἀγάλλει κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα* ('[Surprisingly?] your uncle [Euthymenes] has now too rushed after you, Pytheas, doing honour to that hero's [i.e. Peleus'] kindred race [i.e. the Aeginetans]'), this line probably means that Euthymenes' Aeginetan victories are posterior to Pytheas' Nemean victory (cf. C. Carey, *CQ* 39 [1989], 291; see also n. 13 below). This does not affect my argument.

<sup>8</sup> 'Euthymenes from Aegina'; thus J. E. Sandys, *Pindar* (London, 1919), p. 363; E. Wüst, *Pindar als geschichtschreibender Dichter* (Diss. Tübingen, 1967), p. 167.

<sup>9</sup> C. Carey, 'Two Transitions in Pindar, *O.* 8.52–5, *N.* 5.37–42', *CQ* 39 (1989), 287–95.

<sup>10</sup> Thus also T. Cole, '1 + 1 = 3: Studies in Pindar's Arithmetic', *AJPh* 108 (1987), 553–68, esp. p. 564, with n. 15.

<sup>11</sup> T. Cole, *AJPh* 108 (1987), 564–5, does not take this passage to refer to two Isthmian victories of Euthymenes. He supposes Euthymenes' victories to be identified in lines 44–6. See also Cole's criticism of Carey in *Pindar's Feasts or the Music of Power* (Rome, 1992), p. 139. The scholia on line 37 (*Εὐθυμένης ὃς ἐνίκησεν Ἰσθμια*, 67a, III 96 Dr.) and 38 (*εἴτα ἐποίει διὰ τί τοῦ Ἰσθμοῦ ἐμνήσθη*, 70b, III 96 Dr.) refer to an Isthmian victory of Euthymenes. These remarks can be understood perfectly well without any reference in this ode to an Isthmian victory of Euthymenes. From *I.* 6 it can be deduced that Euthymenes has won twice on the Isthmus (and at least once in Nemea). So the remark of the scholiast on line 37 is in fact true, although Euthymenes' Isthmian victories must be posterior to this ode. See below.

of these kinsmen need not be mentioned, since it is the same as the victor's (cf. e.g. Themistius, lines 50–54). Moreover, 'separative' or 'ablative' expressions referring to the place where the victory has been won—whence, so to speak, the price has been carried away—, are not uncommon.<sup>12</sup>

(ii) Some scholars have suggested that lines 44–6 (ἀ Νεμέα μὲν ἄραρεν, μείς τ' ἐπιχώριος, δὲν φίλης' Ἀπόλλων· | ἄλικας δ' ἐλθόντας οἴκοι τ' ἐκράτει | Νίκου τ' ἐν εὐαγκεί λόφωι) refer to one Nemean victory and an indefinite number of victories in Aegina and Megara won by Euthymenes. As has been noted by Carey, the third person ἐκράτει is problematic, if a vocative (Πυθέα) is read in line 43.<sup>13</sup> Carey's conclusion is that the third person does not refer to the same individual as the one addressed in the second person, and that Euthymenes (referred to in the third person in line 43) is the subject of ἐκράτει. If this were true, the line would refer to an Aeginetan victory won by Euthymenes, which would make it a peculiarly vague reformulation of lines 41–2. This problem is solved by Carey by taking lines 41–2 to refer to an Isthmian victory instead of one won at a local festival in Aegina. This, however, is extremely unlikely, as I have argued above. So, if lines 41–2 refer to two Aeginetan victories of Euthymenes, the only possibility is that Pytheas is the subject of ἐκράτει. An additional argument for this is the fact that Pytheas' opponents are described as ἄλικας, as boys of the same age. Pancratiasts, like wrestlers and boxers, competed in their own age categories. As a rule Pindar does not refer to this principle in the case of a victory in the men's category, as in Euthymenes' case, but he always does if the victor was successful in the category of boys or adolescents, as Pytheas (line 6). Moreover, as Carey himself remarks, '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' (ibid.). To my mind, the third person reference to Pytheas is understandable.<sup>14</sup>

If Pytheas is the subject of ἐκράτει in line 45, lines 45–6 refer to an unspecified number of Aeginetan and Megarean victories won by him. Line 44, then, may be interpreted in two ways. Since no complement of ἄραρεν is expressed, one may think of Pytheas, mentioned in the preceding line, as the complement of ἄραρεν, interpreting the line as 'the Nemean and Delphinian Games are firmly fixed to him', i.e. he has won at both (cf. *I.* 2.19). A disadvantage of this interpretation is that line 45 contains the same factual information as the second half of line 44. It is preferable to take this passage to mean 'Nemea and the month of this land, loved by Apollo (i.e. the Delphinian Games), are firmly fixed (i.e. famous, cf. *N.* 3.64); that is where you have

<sup>12</sup> Cf. ἔχοντα Πυθωνόθεν | τὸ καλλίνικον λυτήριον δαπανᾶν | μέλος χαρίεν, *P.* 5.105–7; εἴη νῦν εὐφώνων περύγεσσι ἀερθέντ' ἀγλαίαι | Πιερίδων, ἔτι καὶ Πυθῶθεν Ὀλυμπιάδων τ' ἐξαιρέτοις | Ἀλφειοῦ ἔρνεσι φράσαι χεῖρα τιμῶν ἐπταπύλοισι | Θήβαισι τεύχοντ', *I.* 1.64–7 νῦν δ' Ὀλυμπία στεφανωσάμενος | καὶ δις ἐκ Πυθῶνος Ἰσθμοὶ τ', *O.* 12.17–18; ἐπεὶ στεφάνουσι | ἔξ ὧσασεν Κόδμου στρατῶι ἐξ ἀέθλων, *I.* 1.10–11.

<sup>13</sup> C. Carey, *CQ* 39 (1989), 291. Mss BD read the nominative Πυθέας, but the Σ. ad loc. (78c, III 97 Dr.) attests that not all ancient texts read the nominative: καταλληλότερον δὲ ἐνιοι γράφουσι, ἢν' ἥι ὁ μήτρως Πυθέας, which practically gives the vocative (first restored by Mignarelli) the status of an ancient *varia lectio*. It is certainly correct, because 'Euthymenes... was μάτρως of Pytheas, not the reverse' (Carey, *ibid.*); cf. *I.* 6.62 (cited below). See also n. 7 above.

<sup>14</sup> All the same, Kayser's easy conjecture ἐκράτεις deserves consideration. This presupposes a corruption from a second person to a third person, which might be accounted for by the second person reference to Pytheas in line 43 already having been corrupted into a third person (the nominative Πυθέας instead of the vocative Πυθέα) in most of the texts the scholiasts had at their disposal.

won'. Praising the importance of the games where a victor has won is not uncommon at all (cf. e.g. the opening lines of *O.* 1). The fact that Pytheas has won in Nemea need not be expressed here, for it has already been expressed in lines 4–5, and his victory on Aegina is mentioned unambiguously in line 45. Moreover, the coordination of both phrases by means of μέν...δέ strongly supports this interpretation.

### *Bacchylides 13*

Bacchylides' thirteenth ode was written for the same occasion as Pindar's fifth *Nemean*. Pytheas is mentioned as the victor in 190. In 67–9 he is called Lampon's son and is said to have been victorious at the Nemean Games in the pancration. Of earlier victories of Pytheas at local festivals or of Euthymenes no mention has survived.

### *Isthmian 6*

In *I.* 6 Phylacidas' victory is said to be the second victory of Lampon's sons in the Great Games (line 2). A victory catalogue is given in lines 60–62: ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου | τρεῖς ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας, | ἀγλαοὶ παῖδες τε καὶ μάτρω. This must mean that Pytheas, Phylacidas and Euthymenes (their μάτρω, cf. *N.* 5.43) together have won thrice on the Isthmus and more than once in Nemea. Bergk, however, has suggested putting a comma after τρεῖς, thus getting a total of three victories, i.e. one on the Isthmus of Phylacidas (*I.* 6) and two in Nemea, one of Pytheas (*N.* 5) and one of Euthymenes. Bury defended Bergk's punctuation as follows: 'The decisive consideration is that, if τρεῖς qualifies νίκας ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ, the following τὰς δέ is perfectly indefinite and may mean any number from two upward. If anything is certain in such a matter, it is certain that Pindar told the exact number of such rare and important victories'.<sup>15</sup> This interpretation, however, is an unacceptable violation of Greek syntax. Τρεῖς is balanced by τὰς δ'. Pindar did not write commas, and there is no signal prohibiting the construction of τρεῖς with ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ.<sup>16</sup>

More recently two scholars have adopted Bury's interpretation, though being aware of the syntactic problems involved. Thummer makes these lines refer to a total of three victories, as Bury does, but he rejects Bergk's punctuation: 'Dadurch geht zwar die Rechnung auf, es wird jedoch eine Sinnpause eingelegt, die im Preislied wohl kaum gemacht wurde und von Pindar auch nicht beabsichtigt war. Die unklare Ausdrucksweise (die durch das Komma beseitigt würde) erhöht vielmehr den Ruhm der Sieger, weil sie den Eindruck erweckt, als lägen drei isthmische und eine unbestimmte Zahl nemeischer Siege vor'.<sup>17</sup> Why not interpret a sentence according to the 'Eindruck' it makes? Cole's approach (*AJPh* 108 [1987], 554) is similar: 'It is as if Pindar were at some pains to suggest, through the collocation of τρεῖς and ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ, the higher number and, at the same time, not to commit himself to it.' The passages he cites as parallels to prove that the syntax suggests a higher number than what he considers to be the true number<sup>18</sup> can equally well be regarded as proving that

<sup>15</sup> J. B. Bury, *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar* (London, 1892), p. 117. Thus also Maehler on B.13 (II p. 251).

<sup>16</sup> Thus also P. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare* (Paris, 1993), p. 402 (§510). If Pindar had intended to say that the three men had won a total of three victories, he would have written something like: ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου τρεῖς, τὰν μὲν ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας, ἀγλαοὶ παῖδες τε καὶ μάτρω, as even Bury (ad loc., p. 117) admits.

<sup>17</sup> E. Thummer, *Die isthmischen Gedichte* (Heidelberg, 1968–9), II, p. 109.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. esp. ἄλλαι δὲ δὴ ἐν Κορίνθου πύλαις ἐγένοντ' ἔπειτα χάρμαι, | ταὶ δὲ καὶ Νεμέας Ἐφαρμόστωι κατὰ κόλπον, *O.* 9.86–7; cf. also *N.* 6.61–3, *P.* 11.46–50.

the poet does not tell the exact number, and as a refutation of Bury's certainty in this respect. Cole considers it an 'advantage' of his interpretation that 'the reference is thereby confined to the particular Isthmian victory (that of the boy Phylacidas) for which this poem was composed, and to the two Nemean victories, one by his brother Pytheas, the other by his uncle Euthymenes, which are mentioned in the previously composed *N. 5* (4–5 and 43–4). Neither ode hints elsewhere at more than one Isthmian victory' (pp. 553–4). But, in the first place, there is no objection to assuming that Euthymenes had won twice on the Isthmus and at least once in Nemea in the period between *N. 5/B. 13* and *I. 6*. Secondly, even with Bergk's comma we are left with one Nemean victory by Euthymenes unaccounted for, since *N. 5.44* does not refer to a Nemean victory by Euthymenes, as I have argued above.

Bergk's comma is to be rejected. The passage refers to three Isthmian victories (one by Phylacidas celebrated in this ode, both others by Euthymenes) and at least two Nemean victories (one by Pytheas and at least one by Euthymenes).<sup>19</sup> If we assume the minimum to be the true number, this still allows us to take Pindar as suggesting a higher number than the true one.

### *Isthmian 5*

In *I. 5*, for Phylacidas, Pytheas is said to have won once in Nemea and Phylacidas to have been twice successful at the Isthmian Games and once in Nemea (τὴν δ' ἐν Ἴσθμῳ διπλόα θάλλοις ἀρετά, | Φυλακίδ', ἀγκείται, Νεμέαι δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν | Πυθέαι τε, παγκρατίου, 17–19). During his latest Isthmian competition his brother Pytheas was his trainer (59–60).

### *Conclusion. The latest possible date for N. 5 and B. 13*

Pytheas' Nemean victory celebrated in *N.5* and *B.13* was the first one for the sons of Lampon and probably Pytheas' only victory at the Great Games.<sup>20</sup> Phylacidas' victory celebrated in *I. 6* was his first one, and by this time Euthymenes had won twice on the Isthmus and at least once (and, therefore, probably only once) in Nemea. Between *I. 6* and *I. 5* Phylacidas had won in Nemea. His Isthmian victory celebrated in *I. 5* was his second one.

In *I.5* Aegina is praised for its courage in the Battle of Salamis (48–50) in the fall (September?) of 480. Pindar gives the impression that this was quite a recent event (cf. καὶ νῦν, 48). The Isthmian Games took place every even year, in spring (April?). The earliest possible date for *I. 5* is 478, unless we assume that Phylacidas had won in April 480 B.C. and that the celebrations took place after the battle in September.<sup>21</sup>

On the basis of these data it is possible to arrive at a *terminus ad quem* for the date

<sup>19</sup> Phylacidas' Isthmian victory, celebrated in *I.6*, is said to be the second victory of the sons of Lampon (line 2). As the first one must be Pytheas' Nemean victory, celebrated in *N.5* and *B.13*, two Isthmian victories (and at least one Nemean victory) remain for Euthymenes.

<sup>20</sup> Σ. inscr. *ad I.5* (III 241 Dr.) speaks of an Isthmian victory for Pytheas as well: ἐν γὰρ τῇ γεγραμμένῃ Μίδα ὠιδι ὡς οἰκείῳ ἀντὶ ἱστορεῖ, ὅτι καὶ ὁ Πυθέας Ἴσθμια ἐνίκησε. λέγει δὲ ἤδη τετελευτηκότος τοῦ Πυθέα· κεί μοι τιν' ἄνδρα τῶν θανόντων (=fr. 4), καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. If this is true, one must assume that Pytheas had won this victory after the one of Phylacidas celebrated in *I. 5*. If 478 is assumed as the date of *I. 5*, the earliest possible date for Pytheas' Isthmian victory is 476.

<sup>21</sup> This has been suggested by Gaspar, p. 62 n. 3. See further Severyns, p. 46, and Maehler on *B.13* (op. cit. II, pp. 250–51).

Table 1. *The latest possible dates*

485	Nemean 45	Pytheas	<i>N. 5, B.13</i>
484	Isthmian 49	Euthymenes	
483	Nemean 46	(Euthymenes)	
482	Isthmian 50	Euthymenes	
481	Nemean 47	(Euthymenes) <sup>22</sup>	
480	Isthmian 51	Phylacidas	<i>I. 6</i>
479	Nemean 48	Phylacidas	
478	Isthmian 52	Phylacidas	<i>I. 5</i>

of *N. 5* and *B. 13*, by counting back the victories of both brothers and their uncle on the following premises: (i) *I. 5* was performed in 478, the later of the two possible dates; (ii) the victories follow one another as closely as possible; (iii) *I. 6.60–62* refers to two Nemean victories by Euthymenes at the most. This line of reasoning shows that Severyns was right in concluding that *N.5* and *B.13* must be at least seven years earlier than *I. 5*, so that the latest possible date for *N. 5* and *B. 13* is 485 B.C.

### III. INTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE DATE OF PINDAR'S NEMEAN V

The latest possible date we arrived at for *N. 5*, 485, is reconstructed solely on the basis of counting back victories from *I. 5*. This, however, is not the only evidence we have for the date of *N. 5*. In this section I intend to demonstrate that certain passages in this ode enable us to reconstruct the historical setting of its performance.

#### I

ἴσθι, γλυκεῖάν τοι Μενάνδρου σὺν τύχαι μόχθων ἀμοιβὰν  
ἐπαύρεο. χρῆ δ' ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν τέκτον' ἀεθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν·  
εἰ δὲ Θεμίστιον ἴκεῖς ὥστ' αἰεῖδεν, μηκέτι ῥίγει· δίδοι 50  
φωνάν, ... (lines 48–51)

After briefly dealing with the victor's Athenian trainer Menander in 48–9 ('Know this: sweet was the recompense for your labours that you got with the help of Menander.<sup>23</sup> It is necessary that an architect of athletes comes from Athens.'), Pindar turns to Themistius, the victor's maternal grandfather:<sup>24</sup> 'But if you come to sing of Themistius, shrink no longer. Give your voice' (50–51). By means of *μηκέτι ῥίγει* in line 50, 'shrink no longer', Pindar explicitly characterizes his treatment of the Athenian trainer Menander in 48–9, in retrospect, as cold; there he did 'shrink

<sup>22</sup> If Euthymenes has won only once in Nemea, he may have won either in 483 or in 481 B.C.

<sup>23</sup> Not 'through the good fortune of Menander'; cf. e.g. *ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει*, | *ὅ τι κε σὺν Χαρίτων τύχαι* | *γλώσσα φρενὸς βαθείας*, *N.4.6–8*; *τύχαι θεῶν* | *ἀφίξεται λαῶι σὺν ἀβλαβεί* | *Ἄβαντος εὐρυχόρους ἀγνιάς*, *P. 8.53–5*; *σὺν θεοῦ δὲ τύχαι* | *ἔτερον οὐ τίνα οἶκον ἀπεφάνατο πυγμαχία* <*πλεόνων*> | *ταμίαν στεφάνων μυχῶι* *Ἑλλάδος ἀπάσας*, *N. 6.24–6*; *ὅς τύχαι μὲν δαίμονος, ἀνορέας δ' οὐκ ἀμπλακῶν* | *ἐν τέτρασιν παίδων ἀπεθήκατο γυίοις* | *νόστον ἔχθιστον*, *O. 8.67–9*; cf. also *O. 13.105*, etc.

<sup>24</sup> *Οὗτος δὲ λέγεται πάππος τῷ Πυθείᾳ πρὸς μητρός*, *Σ.91* (III p. 99 Dr.).

back'.<sup>25</sup> That Pindar did perform the action of *ρίγειν* before is implied by *ἔτι* and by the use of the *present* imperative.<sup>26</sup>

It has often been argued that *ἔτι* in most cases is merely a rhetorical reinforcement of *μή*,<sup>27</sup> in other words, that *ἔτι* does not necessarily imply that the action negated by *μηκέτι* actually was performed before. This idea may have originated in a number of instances where the verb negated by *μηκέτι* is accompanied by a comparative (*μηκέθ' αἰλίον κόπει* | ἄλλο θαλπνότερον... ἄστρον, *O.* 1.5–6; *μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρριον*, *O.* 1.114; *μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν*, *I.* 4.13). In these cases *ἔτι* is called 'superfluous', because the denotation of *ἔτι*, 'further, longer', is also expressed by the comparative.<sup>28</sup> However, renderings like 'do not look further for another star, warmer than the sun', 'do not strive for more any longer', 'do not strive any longer for a result greater than this' demonstrate the dubious character of the notion 'superfluous' even in these cases. And even if a certain amount of redundancy is conceded in the instances with a comparative, one should not use these instances as an argument to eliminate the denotation of *ἔτι* in instances without a comparative, like this (cf. also *ἀρχοὶ δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἔσαν Ταλαοῦ παῖδες, βιασθέντες λύαι* | *κρέεων δὲ καππαῦει δίκαν τὰν πρόσθεν ἀνήρ*, *N.* 9.14–15).<sup>29</sup>

It is, of course, extremely harsh that Pindar says that he was shrinking back when he had to mention Menander.<sup>30</sup> This is almost the same as saying that he was unwilling to praise him. Such a refusal to praise is unacceptable on the part of an epinician poet, unless it gives voice to the opinions of his commissioner and his audience. Motifs of personal dislike are out of the question. There must have been a

<sup>25</sup> Thus also Wilamowitz, p. 170. Bury (p. 97) too interprets *μηκέτι ῥίγει* correctly ("Be reserved no longer" implies that there were reasons for reserve in reference to somebody else"), but he does not draw the obvious conclusion that this applies to the preceding section of the poem, where Menander is mentioned.

<sup>26</sup> See e.g. C. M. J. Sicking, 'The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms, Especially in the Imperative', *Glotta* 69 (1991), 14–43 and 154–70, esp. p. 157 with his examples 78–80, pp. 160–61.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. e.g. Dissen, Gerber, Verdenius, *ad O.* 1.5; Verdenius, 'Tyrtaeus 6–7D. A Commentary', *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969), 345, speaks of 'rhetorical *μηκέτι*'.

<sup>28</sup> See e.g. O. Becker, *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (Hermes Einzelschriften, Heft 4; Berlin, 1937), p. 71 n. 58; P. Maas, 'Zu den neuen Bruchstücken des Bakchylides', *Jahresberichte Philol. Verein Berlin* 45 (1919), 39 n. 8 (= *Kleine Schriften* [München, 1973], 30–31 n. 8), who regards *ἔτι* here as 'abundierend', referring to *O.* 1.5, and denies that earlier, in 48–9 where Menander is mentioned, Pindar 'shuddered' ('Dann ist *μηκέτι ῥίγει* einfache Litotes'). W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikions* (Halle, 1928), p. 25 n. 2 (= *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse* 5.2, 259–343, at p. 283 n. 2), disapproves of Maas's 'abundierend', but does not draw the conclusion that Pindar implicitly characterizes his act of praising Menander as an act of *ρίγειν*: "Vielmehr: "gilt's den Themistios zu preisen, dann heraus mit der Stimme, so daß sie (im Vergleich zu solchem Jubel) vorher klamm gewesen zu sein scheint". Es gilt also nicht, Früheres abzuschwächen..., sondern das Neue hervorzuheben. Lebendige und prachtvoll "unlogische" Steigerung des Motivs *O.* 9.109." But if Pindar wanted to give emphasis to his praise of Themistios without detracting anything from the praise of Menander, this would have been a rather tactless means of doing so.

<sup>29</sup> For *ἔλπετο δ' οὐκέτι οἱ κείνόν γε πράξασθαι πόνον*, *P.* 4.243 (Jason had mastered the fire-breathing bulls, but when it came to the serpent that guarded the fleece, Aietes did not expect him to accomplish that), B. K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin and New York, 1988), p. 332, suggested: 'not "no longer"... but "not now"'. The reference is not to the continuation of an action already begun, but to the execution of it at a particular time.' The point is, however, that *ἔτι* underscores the contrast with the other labour that Jason did accomplish earlier. See also M. L. West on Hes. *Op.* 174 (p. 196), with further examples.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Severys, pp. 47–8, n. 30.

general Aeginetan antipathy against Menander and the reason for this must have been that he was an Athenian.

The trainer passage itself (48–9) justifies the assumption that Menander is only mentioned by virtue of epinician conventions, notwithstanding a general Aeginetan antipathy against his Athenian origin. The passage devoted to Menander is remarkably short in comparison with other trainer-passages.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, *χρή δ' ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν τέκτον' ἀεθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν* (49), 'it is necessary that the architect of athletes comes from Athens', is a surprising way of praising him. Nothing is said about his qualities and his Athenian origin can hardly be regarded as a personal merit. Because *χρή* is used, instead of just *ἐστὶ* or the like, this statement gives the impression that Menander's Athenian origin is regarded as an unfortunate coincidence; it almost sounds like an excuse.<sup>32</sup>

One must conclude that the way in which Pindar praises the Athenian trainer suggests that something more was going on than just the usual feud between Aegina and Athens.<sup>33</sup> What exactly, can be reconstructed with the aid of verses 46–7 and 19–20.

## II

*χαίρω δ' ὅτι  
ἐκλοῖσι μάρνεται πέρι πάσα πόλις.*

(46–7)

The verb *μάρναμαι* means 'to fight'. It is used literally for fighting a war.<sup>34</sup> It may also be used metaphorically in the sense of 'contending' at the games,<sup>35</sup> or with reference to a less specific situation, in the sense of 'fighting for something, striving, exerting oneself'.<sup>36</sup> Here *μάρνεται* is generally taken in a metaphorical sense, 'I rejoice that the whole city joins in the conflict for noble prizes'.<sup>37</sup> Apart from the fact that this is a bold exaggeration, an objection against this interpretation is that the idea of a city contending at the games is unparalleled in Pindar. The contestants are invariably presented as individuals (who, of course, do honour to their cities when they are successful) and Pindar nowhere says that a city as a whole takes part in the games.

The fact that *πάσα πόλις* is the subject of *μάρνεται* is strongly in favour of a literal interpretation of the verb. A literal interpretation is to be preferred on theoretical grounds as well. In general, a word is used metaphorically only if the denotation of that word does not make sense in the context, its use being motivated by the relevance of its connotations. According to the 'cooperative principle' described by H. P. Grice,<sup>38</sup> the hearer will test the possibility whether a word might be used metaphorically only if the literal interpretation of the word proves to be irrelevant in the context. A literal interpretation here results in 'I am glad that the whole city is

<sup>31</sup> *N.* 4.93–6, *N.* 6.64–6, *I.* 4.72–4, *I.* 5.59–61, *O.* 8.54–66, *O.* 10.16–21.

<sup>32</sup> Another indication may be the use of *τοί* in 48. As this particle has a special affinity for statements that are in a way surprising (e.g. *N.* 9.32, *I.* 4.37, *P.* 1.87, *O.* 8.72, *N.* 5.16), it may present the assertion 'sweet was the recompense you got because you had Menander' as something surprising to say and something which may be expected to meet with disbelief.

<sup>33</sup> For the maritime rivalry between Athens and Aegina see my 'Pindar's Eighth Pythian. The Relevance of the Historical Setting', *Hermes* 123 (1995), 156–65. Further references are to be found therein.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *O.* 6.17, *P.* 2.65, *P.* 8.43.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *I.* 4.31 (= 3/4.49); *I.* 5.54.

<sup>37</sup> Bury *ad loc.*, p. 96.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *O.* 5.15, *N.* 1.25, *N.* 10.86.

<sup>38</sup> H. P. Grice, 'Logic and Conversation', in: P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (edd.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (New York, 1975), pp. 41–58. See also my 'The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides', *CPh* 89 (1994), 305–17, esp. pp. 306–7.



fighting for things worth fighting for'. This is to be understood as referring to Aegina fighting a war and a declaration of Pindar's solidarity and sympathy with Aegina, in concord defending its own cause against its big enemy.

This interpretation has the advantage of providing an explanation for the observations made above with respect to the trainer passage. If this ode was performed during a war between Aegina and Athens,<sup>39</sup> it is not surprising that Menander's Athenian origin was regarded as an unfortunate coincidence. In fact, a war with Athens seems to be the only conceivable historical circumstance justifying the extremely harsh treatment of the Athenian trainer in this ode.

### III

εἰ δ' ὄλβον ἢ χειρῶν βίαν ἢ κιδαρίταν ἐπαινήσαι  
πόλεμον δεδόκηται, μακρά μοι  
αὐτόθεν ἄλμαθ' ὑποσκάπτοι τις.

20  
(19–20)

In line 19, after the break-off of the story of Peleus and Telamon murdering their half-brother Phocus (14–18), three examples are given of subjects that are laudable and that rouse Pindar's enthusiasm as a poet of *epinicia*:<sup>40</sup> 'happiness', 'strength of hands', and 'iron-clad war'. These subjects clearly are examples of laudable subjects in general. However, we are entitled to ask why these three examples are given in this particular ode; in other words, are these examples in any way related to the themes of this ode? This question has puzzled a number of interpreters.<sup>41</sup> It has been suggested that the three subjects mentioned in line 19 all apply to Peleus and are chosen in order to anticipate the main myth.<sup>42</sup> It is true that marrying a goddess and celebrating the wedding in the presence of divine guests is the greatest kind of ὄλβος a mortal can achieve (cf. *P.* 3.89–95); it is true that Peleus displayed his χειρῶν βίαν when he had to struggle with Thetis turning herself into fire, water, a lion, and a serpent (cf. *N.* 4.62–5); and it is true that Peleus later returned to Iolcus and fought a war with Acastus (cf. *N.* 3.34). But, apart from the wedding on Mount Pelion (22–6), not one of these events is mentioned in this ode. Have these three examples perhaps been chosen because they apply to the current situation? χειρῶν βίαν ἐπαινήσαι is in fact an apposite description of performing an ode for a victor in the pancration. ὄλβος, too, applies to Pytheas, for one of the ways to ὄλβος open to a man is a victory at the Great Games (cf. *N.* 8.17, *O.* 7.10). If this ode was in fact performed during a war between Aegina and Athens, κιδαρίταν πόλεμον, likewise, has reference to the current situation.

### IV. INTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE DATE OF BACCHYLIDES XIII

If Pindar's fifth *Nemean* was performed during a war between Aegina and Athens, indications of this are likely to be found also in Bacchylides' thirteenth ode, which was written for the same occasion.

<sup>39</sup> That this ode, *pace* Wilamowitz (*Pindaros*, p. 170), was performed *during* the war can be deduced from the present tense μάρνεται in line 47.

<sup>40</sup> For an interpretation of the eagle-image in line 21 see *CPh* 89 (1994), pp. 309–11.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. J. Stern, 'The Structure of Pindar's *Nemean* 5', *CPh* 66 (1971), 169–73: 'Pindar ... turns to new themes, or at least appears to do so (vs. 19). But here too the poet sets a program which he does not follow. In general terms it might be said that Peleus achieves ὄλβος, but there is in the myth which follows no reference to war and physical might.' (p. 172).

<sup>42</sup> R. Stoneman, 'The "Theban Eagle"', *CQ* 26 (1976), 188–97, esp. pp. 194–5.

In the first place, it is to be observed that in this ode war is exploited as a theme in the main narrative section of the poem. More than three whole triads (cola 98–169) are dedicated to the accomplishments of the Aeacids in the Trojan war.

The Athenian trainer Menander is praised in cola 191–8. The lines immediately following this passage suggest that Bacchylides, like Pindar, was conscious of the fact that Menander's Athenian origin constituted a problem:

## I

εἰ μὴ τίνα θερσι[ε]πῆς  
 φθόνος βιάται, 200  
 αἰνείτω σοφὸν ἄνδρα  
 ζὺν δίκαι. βροτῶν δὲ μῶμος  
 πάντεσσι μὲν ἔστιν ἔπ' ἔργοις·  
 ἃ δ' ἀλαθεία φιλεῖ  
 νικᾶν, ὃ τε πανδ[α]μάτωρ 205  
 χρόνος τὸ καλῶς  
 ἐργόμενον αἰὲν ἀνίσχει.<sup>43</sup>  
 δ,υ,ς,μενέ,ω,ν δὲ μα[ταία  
 γλώσσῃ] αἰδ,ῆς μιν[ύθει<sup>44</sup> ...  
 (*desunt* vv. x)

(199–209)

The formulations are gnomic, to the extent that they are meant to be generally applicable to a number of human activities. *σοφὸς ἀνὴρ* (201) in principle refers to any man endowed with special skills. The passage, however, follows immediately upon the praise of the Athenian trainer Menander, and this makes it *a priori* likely that the passage applies also—and perhaps pre-eminently—to him. In other words, *σοφὸς ἀνὴρ* refers especially to the 'skilled man' mentioned in the preceding lines. Such a man must be praised. It is emphatically stated that it is *δίκαι* to do so (202),<sup>45</sup> but *φθόνος* is recognized as a possible interfering factor (199–200). This suggests that Menander is seen as liable to *φθόνος*. The poet's emphatic appeal to *δίκαι* gives the impression that he feels a justification of the praise of Menander to be necessary. Then, the *φθόνος*-motif is further elaborated upon. *πάντεσσι* is given relief by means of *hyperbaton* and by being placed in the marked position directly before *μὲν. μῶμος*, 'censure', is said to attend *every* human activity, which may very well be taken to imply the thought 'not only in the present case of Menander'.

Then, in 204–7, the poet returns to the *δίκαι*-motif. Truth must win, time will always bring out the truth.<sup>46</sup> In 208–9, if the restoration is correct, the speech of the *δυςμενεῖς* is stated to be 'ineffective' (*ματαία*) and 'invisible' (*αἰδῆς*), i.e. in time attention will no longer be paid to it, according to the principle formulated in 204–7. For reasons of textual coherence, *δυςμενεῖς* must refer to the same persons as those who are overcome by *φθόνος* or *μῶμος*. The use of *δυςμενής* is significant. In early authors *δυςμενής* has a strong affinity with war-related contexts, referring to an enemy whom one faces, has faced or might face on the battle-field.<sup>47</sup> If *δυςμενέων* does evoke

<sup>43</sup> Suppl. Maehler: *ἀέξει* Kenyon.

<sup>44</sup> Suppl. Blass, cf. *βαρυτόνως τὸ 'Αίδης· τὸ γὰρ ἐπιθετικὸν ὀξύνεται. δυςμενέων δ' αἰδῆς λέγει* Βακχυλίδης, Cram. An. Ox. 1.65.22.

<sup>45</sup> *ζὺν δίκαι* is emphatically placed at the very end of the sentence.

<sup>46</sup> For the idea cf. Pi. O. 10.53–5, O. 1.33–4, fr. 159.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. B. 5.129–35, B. 18.3–7, B. fr. dub. 60.9 with line 12, Pi. N. 9.37–9, Pae. 2.68–70, in P. 8.8–12 Hesychia's hostile behaviour towards those overcome by *κότος* and *ὑβρις* is described in martial terms. Cf. also Sim. Epigr. 6.215.1–2, Sol. 4.19–22 W., A. Th. 233–4 (cf. 366), etc. In the

associations of war, it cannot be understood as being merely part of the negative pole of the contrast developed in the gnomic passage as a whole. Rather, the noun has deliberately been chosen in order to emphasize the applicability of these general principles to the specific case in point. The *δυςμενεῖς*, who are the same as those overcome by *φθόνος* or *μῶμος*, are the ones who refuse to do credit to Menander's contribution to the victory. They are the poet's Aeginetan audience, who at a moment when Aegina is at war with Athens may be expected to begrudge Menander his share in the festivities because of his Athenian origin. If the gnomic passage as a whole is applied to this situation, the choice of *δυςμενέων* can be very well understood, since in that case those resenting the praise of Menander are in fact his enemies, because they have to face his compatriots on the battlefield.<sup>48</sup>

So in the gnomic passage directly following the praise of Menander, Bacchylides defends the very fact that he has praised him.<sup>49</sup> He does so in general terms, appealing to his impartial *ethos* of Panhellenic<sup>50</sup> epinician poet, and presenting general principles as *δίκη* and *ἀλάθεια* as compelling him to contribute due praise to everyone who deserves it and as surpassing momentary conflicts between two *poleis*.

The hypothesis that this ode was performed while Aegina was at war with Athens may help to explain also the following passage:

## II

(Ἄρετὰ)  
καὶ μὰν φερεκυδέα νῆαρον  
Αἰακοῦ τιμᾶι, σὺν Εὐ-  
κλείαι δὲ φιλοστεφάνωι  
πόλιν κυβερνᾶι,  
Εὐνομία τε καὶ σοφῶν,  
ἂ θαλίας τε λέλογχεν  
ἄσπετά τ' εὐσεβέων  
ἀνδρῶν ἐν εἰρήνῃσι φυλάσσει.

185

(182–9).

The description of *ἀρετά* (176) as governing the city together with *Εὐκλεία φιλοστεφάνος* (183–4) does fit the situation in Aegina during the festivities held in honour of Pytheas. The mention of *Εὐνομία καὶ σοφῶν* (186) as a third relevant characteristic of the current festivities is at first sight somewhat surprising,<sup>51</sup> especially

*Iliad* *δυςμενής* is exclusively used to refer to the relationship between Greeks and Trojans (3.51, 5.488, 6.453, 10.40, 100, 193, 221, 395, 13.263, 16.521, 17.158, 19.62, 168, 232, 22.403, 24.288, 365), whereas *ἐχθρός* may also refer to hostile relations within one and the same camp (9.312, of Achilles calling Agamemnon *ἐχθρός*; 1.176, *vice versa*; 2.200, of Thersites being *ἐχθιστος* to Achilles and Odysseus; 5.890, of Ares being *ἐχθιστος* to Zeus).

<sup>48</sup> Maehler, on 199–220 and on 199–201 (II, pp. 286–7), explicitly rejects this interpretation ('es wäre abwegig, daraus etwa auf eine feindselige Stimmung der Aegineten gegen den athenischen Trainer zu schließen', p. 286).

<sup>49</sup> F. G. Kenyon, *Bacchylides* (Oxford, 1898), too, interprets this passage as an apology for praising an Athenian. See also M. Woloch, 'Athenian Trainers in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides', *CW* 56 (1963), 102–4 and 121. On p. 103 Woloch argues that Bacchylides does not praise Menander willingly. Surprisingly, he takes Pindar as being unequivocally complimentary with respect to Menander.

<sup>50</sup> Bacchylides emphasizes the Panhellenic character of the festivals in 198, in connection with Menander.

<sup>51</sup> Later sources for a combined cult of Eukleia and Eunomia in Athens (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 5059, cf. 4193.13–14 and 4874, quoted by Jebb and Maehler ad loc.) explain nothing in this respect.

since peace (189), together with festivities (*θαλῖαι*, 187), is presented as the result (or as 'Begleiterscheinung')<sup>52</sup> of this 'abiding by the laws in a reasonable manner'. This may, however, be explained if it is assumed that this ode was performed while Aegina was at war with Athens. In general, emphasis upon the preferability of peace is far more functional in such a situation than in one in which peace is not absent or at least endangered. The close association of peace with festivities perhaps suggests that there is more to it. If Menander himself was present on Aegina during the festivities—admittedly, there is no positive evidence for that—, it is understandable that *Εὐνομία καὶ φρον* was presented as crucial to making the party a success. In that case one can imagine Menander being tolerated, in spite of his officially being a state-enemy, which naturally put a considerable strain on Aeginetan forbearance. *Εὐνομία* would then refer to abiding by laws like *ξενία*,<sup>53</sup> i.e. honouring a guest from a hostile city who is taking part in celebrations in honour of a victory win at a Panhellenic festival. The choice of the nouns *εἰρήνη* would then be significant. The fact that Menander's presence was tolerated was a manifestation of *εἰρήνη*, in so far as it was a member of a community at war with Aegina who was tolerated.

Both passages from Bacchylides 13, together with the fact that Aeginetan successes in war are exploited as a theme in this ode, confirm the hypothesis formulated on the basis of Pindar's fifth *Nemean*, that both odes were performed while Aegina was at war with Athens. Identifying and dating this war constitutes independent evidence for the date of both odes.

## V. THE WAR BETWEEN ATHENS AND AEGINA

The naval rivalry between Athens and Aegina is well known. Herodotus (5.81) speaks of a *πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος* in this connection, which is generally taken as referring to some kind of unorganized piratical warfare, consisting of irregular raids on each other's ships and coastal areas.<sup>54</sup> This situation of mutual hostility escalated into a fierce war, described by Herodotus in book 6 (73, 85–93). The gist of his narrative is as follows:

Cleomenes and Leotychidas, Kings of Sparta, took ten of the most esteemed Aeginetans as hostages, including the two most powerful men. They were entrusted to the Athenians, because Athens was Aegina's fiercest enemy (73). Shortly after Cleomenes' death the Aeginetans sent messengers to Sparta, in order to get back the hostages. Leotychidas agreed to co-operate, and he went to Athens to demand the hostages back (85). However, the Athenians refused and Leotychidas left Athens without success (86). The Aeginetans captured an Athenian procession ship, near Sounion, carrying *θεωροί*, whom they took prisoner (87). Because of suffering this insult, the Athenians began an all-out war against Aegina. They laid a plot with an Aeginetan of high birth, Nicodromus, who had been exiled by the Aeginetan rulers. He planned to give Aegina over to the Athenians. They agreed upon an appointed moment in time when their forces would come and help him. In the meanwhile, he conspired with the *δῆμος* against the Aeginetan rulers (91) and captured the so-called old city (88). But the Athenian troops arrived one day late

<sup>52</sup> Maehler ad loc.

<sup>53</sup> *Ξενία* is mentioned in colon 224. The concept plays a crucial role in *N. 5* too (8, 33).

<sup>54</sup> According to H. W. Singor, *Oorsprong en betekenis van de hoplietenphalanx in het archaische Griekenland*, Diss. (Leiden, 1988), pp. 241–5, a *πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος* is not a war that has not officially been declared, but a war that was unimpeded by any formal regulations, an all-out war in which anything was allowed. If this is true, Herodotus' qualification can hardly apply to the war following the events of 506, which merely consisted of Aeginetan raids on the Attic coasts, while Athens did not strike back (5.81, 89–90). See also below.

(89). Nicodromus and his followers fled and took refuge in Sounion (90). The Aeginetan rulers arrested seven hundred of Nicodromus' followers and butchered them (91). After this setback the Athenians attacked Aegina once again and defeated the Aeginetan fleet. Aegina called upon the Argives to come to their help. Argos sent one thousand volunteers. A battle took place on the island and most of the Argive force was slain (92). The Aeginetan fleet attacked the Athenian ships, which were not in battle-order, and captured four of them, including their crews (93).

The references to a war between Aegina and Athens in *N.* 5 and *B.* 13 are hardly understandable in a situation of unorganized piratical warfare, which may have existed from the late sixth century onward. The harsh treatment of Menander in *N.* 5.48–50, and especially the emphatic portrayal of the *entire* state fighting for things worth fighting for (ἐκλοῖσι μάρνεται περί πᾶσα πόλις, *N.* 5.47) implies a more serious conflict than that.<sup>55</sup> The all-out war, especially the hard fighting described in 92–3, would be exactly the type of situation that would explain these far-reaching statements. An additional argument for taking the events described by Herodotus as the specific historical setting of *N.* 5 and *B.* 13 may be the role played by the Aeginetan exile Nicodromus. Exile is a main theme in the first half of Pindar's *N.* 5. Moreover, the situation of an Aeginetan exile conspiring with the δῆμος against the Aeginetan rulers would explain the emphasis upon internal solidarity in *N.* 5.<sup>56</sup>

Unfortunately, the date of this war between Athens and Aegina is much disputed. Time references in the preceding part of Herodotus' account of the Ionian revolt give 491, the year before Marathon, and chapter 94, describing events directly leading up to Marathon, gives the reader the impression that the whole episode of the conflict between Athens and Aegina immediately precedes the battle. However, both historians and commentators on Herodotus have demonstrated that a pre-Marathon date is untenable.<sup>57</sup> The events described by Herodotus are generally dated to the years 488–486 B.C.<sup>58</sup>

Recently, Thomas J. Figueira, 'The Chronology of the Conflict between Athens and Aegina in Herodotus Bk. 6', *QUCC* 28 (1988), pp. 49–89, has made a detailed re-examination of the material, with the conclusion that Cleomenes' death, prior to the Aeginetan–Athenian war, cannot possibly have occurred earlier than winter 490/489 B.C.<sup>59</sup> The only other event mentioned by Herodotus that can be dated by

<sup>55</sup> This phrase excludes the (in itself unlikely) possibility of Pindar referring to the war following the events of 506, which merely consisted of Aeginetan raids on the Attic coasts, while Athens did not strike back (5.81, 89–90).

<sup>56</sup> Peleus and Telamon were exiled from Aegina after slaying their half-brother Phocus, because of their violation of internal Aeginetan solidarity (9–16). This is made clear by the portrayal of the three sons of Aeacus praying together in harmony (line 11, esp. ἀμᾶ), immediately preceding the reference to their crime. The implicit allusion to their crime (15–16) and the *praeteritio* do but emphasize this point. πᾶσα in line 47 and κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος in line 43 emphasize internal Aeginetan solidarity too.

<sup>57</sup> The pre-Marathon chronology is defended by some scholars, notably by N. G. L. Hammond, 'Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C. V. The War between Athens and Aegina, c. 505–481', *Historia* 4 (1955), 406–11. For a detailed criticism of his arguments, see T. J. Figueira, *QUCC* 28 (1988), 49–89. Further references are to be found therein.

<sup>58</sup> The most recent discussions are: M. Amit, *Great and Small Poleis. A Study in the Relations between the Great Powers and the Small Cities in Ancient Greece* (Collection Latomus 134) (Brussels, 1973), 17–29; H.-J. Gehrke, *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Munich, 1985), 15–16 with n. 4; Figueira, art. cit. Further references are to be found therein.

<sup>59</sup> Cleomenes' death is frequently dated to 488 B.C., e.g. by S. Luria, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 1928, 27ff.; A. Giusti, *Atene e Roma* 10 (1929), 54ff.; T. Lenschau, *Klio* 31 (1938), 412ff.; H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit* (Munich, 1960<sup>2</sup>), p. 156.

means of external historical data is the ambush of the *theoris* to Sounion. This penteteric *theoris* has been connected with a boat race, attested by Lysias (21.5). Depending on the date of the victory in this boat race, Figueira arrives at spring 489 or 488 B.C. as the date of the ambush.<sup>60</sup> As Figueira argues (esp. pp. 52–4), a period of at least several months must be allowed for the plotting of the Athenians against Aegina, for the capture of the old city by Nicodromus, for the buying of twenty ships by Athens from Corinth, and for the arrest and massacre of the rebels by the Aeginetan rulers. After the first sea battle, won by Athens (92), some time must be allowed for the Aeginetan appeal to Argos and for the arrival of one thousand volunteers to Aegina. If it is assumed that *N.* 5 and *B.* 13 were performed during the hard fighting posterior to these events, and that the festivities meant to honour Pytheas did not take place very long after his Nemean victory,<sup>61</sup> both odes—taking into account that the Nemean Games were organized in summer (July?) of every odd year—must have been performed either in 489 or 487 B.C., presumably in late summer. 489, then, is the less probable of the two, since in that case too many events would have taken place between the ambush of the *theoris* in spring and the fighting in late summer. The assumption that this ambush occurred in spring 488 and that the fighting took place in late summer 487 B.C. would not overstrain the chronological scheme. Moreover, the oracle recorded in *Hdt.* 5.89, advising the Athenians not to make war upon Aegina for a period of thirty years and promising them the conquest of Aegina in the thirty-first year, seems to confirm this date. If we accept the opinion of many scholars that this is a *vaticinium post eventum*, the oracle must have been delivered in 487, since Aegina was conquered by Athens in 457/6 B.C., when, as a result of the Athenian victory over the Boeotians at Oenophyta, Aegina was forced to join the Delian League on harsh conditions.<sup>62</sup> If Singor<sup>63</sup> is right in arguing that the expression *πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος* (5.81) refers to an all-out war in which everything was allowed, this characterization would perfectly fit the events of 487, as described in 6.85–93, whereas it can hardly apply to the war following the events of 506, which merely consisted of Aeginetan raids on the Attic coasts, while Athens did not strike back (5.81, 89–90). Especially the capture of the Athenian *theoris* is conceivable only in such an all-out war,<sup>64</sup> and it also helps to explain the excessively brutal behaviour of the Aeginetan rulers towards Nicodromus' followers, killing even one who had taken refuge in the temple of Demeter (6.91). This would suggest that Herodotus has wrongly transferred the qualification *ἀκήρυκτος* from the war in 487 to the one in 506. And, if he has transferred the qualification, he may also have transferred the oracle. The reason why Athens did not strike back in 506 is adequately explained by the Spartan plot (5.90ff.), whereas it is very strange indeed that Athens waited for thirty years to strike back after the defeat in 487. If the oracle was indeed delivered in 487 instead of in 506, it would explain the Athenian attitude.

## VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

An analysis of the victory catalogues of the four odes written for the sons of Lampon shows that 485 B.C. is the latest possible date for Pindar's fifth *Nemean* and Bacchylides' thirteenth ode. Certain passages in both odes indicate that they were

<sup>60</sup> See pp. 56–9, 84. See also his chronological table, pp. 88–9.

<sup>61</sup> No indication of this occurs in either ode. Contrast *O.* 10 and *N.* 3.80.

<sup>62</sup> Th. 1.108.4; R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1972), p. 98; Bengtson, p. 211. See also my 'Pindar's Eighth Pythian. The Relevance of the Historical Setting', *Hermes* 123 (1995), 156–65.

<sup>63</sup> Singor, op. cit., pp. 241–5.

<sup>64</sup> See Singor, pp. 243–4.

performed while Aegina was at war with Athens. Pindar unequivocally declares his solidarity with Aegina against Athens, whereas Bacchylides appeals to his impartial *ethos* of Panhellenic epinician poet, presenting the general principles of his profession as surpassing momentary conflicts between two *poleis*. The Athenian–Aeginetan war described by Herodotus (6.73, 85–93) gives a historical setting that accounts for these passages, as well as for some of the thematic characteristics of B.13 and N.5. This war took place after the death of Cleomenes, the earliest possible date of which is winter 490/489 B.C., and at least several months after the ambush of the Athenian *theoris* to Sounion, which may be dated to spring 489 or 488 B.C. This results in either 489 or 487 B.C. as the date of Pytheas' Nemean victory. 489 as the date for Pytheas' victory seems to imply a somewhat overstrained chronological scheme. This would not be the case if summer 487 B.C. is taken as the date for Pytheas' victory. Moreover, this date has the advantage of concurring exactly with the oracle recorded in Hdt. 5.89.<sup>65</sup>

*Leiden University*

ILJA LEONARD PFEIJFFER

<sup>65</sup> I would like to thank Professor C. Carey and Dr H. W. Singor for their valuable advice. Thanks are due also to Dr Peter Stork, Professor C. M. J. Sicking, Anne-Marie Smakman, and Michel Buijs. Flaws and imperfections are solely mine. The research for this article was made possible through a grant of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (N.W.O.).