

PRAXIDAMAS' CROWN AND THE OMISSION AT PINDAR, NEMEAN 6.18

Praxidamas of Aegina, Olympic victor in 544 B.C., was one of the first athletes to dedicate a statue at Olympia (Paus. 6.18.7). He was also, according to Pindar, the first Aeginetan to win an Olympic crown, and his accomplishments, including numerous Isthmian and Nemean victories, earned renown for his father Socleidas.

κεῖνος γὰρ Ὀλυμπιόνικος ἔων Αἰακίδαῖς
ἔρνεα πρῶτος <ἐνείκεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ,
καὶ πεντάκις Ἴσθμοῖ στεφανωσάμενος,
Νεμέα δὲ τρεῖς, ἔπαυσε λάθαι
Σαοκλείδα . . .

20
(Nem. 6.17–21)¹

Although most editors now favour Bergk's conjecture *ἐνείκεν* to fill the gap at *Nem.* 6.18, several unconvinced scholars have proposed other transitive, aorist, indicative verbs, all in the same metrical position (— — — — <— — —> — — — —).² Whereas previous conjectures, including *ἐνείκεν*, represent only tentative suggestions, I can reconstruct the verse with significantly increased confidence by considering previously disregarded aspects of prosody, paleography, Pindaric word order and diction, and epinician epigram: *ἔρνεα πρῶτος ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ἄγαγεν>* (— — — — — — — — <— — —> |). This restored reading will appear surprisingly innovative, since Pindarists have complacently persisted in locating the omission in the middle of the line without even considering a different position.³ This newly exposed potential location of the gap at *Nem.* 6.18, which might be filled by a significant number of hitherto ignored words of the shape <— — —>| or even <— × —>||, calls for complete re-examination of the text. My aim is not simply to propose yet another plausible conjecture, but rather to establish definitively the most likely supplement – an ambitious goal that can be reached only through the kind of methodical analysis that scholars have so far failed to apply to the available evidence. Building upon compelling parallels from Pindar's lyrics, an elegiac epinician of Callimachus, and agonistic epigrams, I reconstruct the vocabulary and word order traditionally employed to boast about being 'the first one from my native land to bring home a prize from the games'. I suggest that this epigrammatic language, which might have been inscribed upon Praxidamas' famous Olympic statue, informed Pindar's composition of the commemorative victory list begun at *Nem.* 6.17–18.

¹ In citing Pindar I generally follow B. Snell and H. Maehler, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis. Pars I. Epinicia* (Leipzig, 1987⁸); and H. Maehler, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis. Pars II. Fragmenta. Indices* (Leipzig, 1989).

² For documentation of the history of conjectures to *Nem.* 6.18, see D. E. Gerber, *Emendations in Pindar. 1513–1972* (Amsterdam, 1976), 111 and 7–28. For the most recent treatment of the line, see D. E. Gerber, 'Pindar, *Nemean Six*: a commentary', *HSCP* 99 (1999), 33–91 at 56.

³ For example, C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge, 1883), ad loc.: 'Mss. have lost — — —, not — — —' (sc. after the fifth syllable). J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London, 1890): 'This line is defective in the mss., the word between *πρῶτος* and *ἀπ'* having accidentally dropped out.' L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* (London, 1932), vol. 2 (*Critical Commentary*): 'A word has accidentally fallen out in the middle of the line'. Although the apparatus of Snell and Maehler (n. 1) documents more than one possible location for the omission at *Nem.* 9.17–18, no such ambiguity is recognized at *Nem.* 6.18.

I. ANALYSIS OF NEMEAN 6.18

I begin by reviewing the history of conjectures to the passage, documenting the gradual realization that a transitive verb, apparently one implying motion, is required. The line in question was printed with no indication of an omission as late as Boeckh's monumental edition of Pindar. Readers were compelled to construe *Αἰακίδαῖς / ἔρνεα πρῶτος ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ* with the subsequent participle *στεφανωσάμενος*. This traditional interpretation, however, strained the verb *στεφανόμαι*, which Pindar normally employs with an instrumental dative, never with an accusative like *ἔρνεα*.⁴ In his *editio minor* of 1825, Boeckh finally recognized a trisyllabic metrical gap after the fifth syllable, but he supplied an unneeded genitive (*ἐλαίας*) and restored the wrong rhythm. This faulty scansion was retained in 1840 by Kayser, who saw, however, that an additional verbal form was needed to govern *ἔρνεα*. He therefore proposed the participle *ἐνεγκών*. Following Kayser, Bergk soon realized that the line required not only a different rhythm, but also a finite, past-tense verb, and so he supplied *ἔνεικεν*. The general sense of the verbs conjectured by Kayser and Bergk, it should be noted, had already been anticipated in translations and comments of earlier scholars obviously uncomfortable with the awkward syntax and incomplete expression.⁵

Once Boeckh had pointed to a potential omission after *πρῶτος*, even those who restored a different metre continued to see only that gap. The exception is Mommsen, who unfortunately persisted in positing the incorrect rhythm initiated by Boeckh and rather liberally allowed two light syllables to respond to one heavy. In his editions of 1864 and 1866, Mommsen considered several conjectures, including *<ἐπεὶ δρᾶπεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ* and *ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ἀποδραπών>*. Although in the latter case he followed Kayser in restoring a participle rather than an indicative verb, we should not completely disregard his insight. As Mommsen observed, such a conjecture has more than one paleographic advantage: two words beginning with *ΑΠ*, which could cause scribal confusion; and location at the vulnerable end of the colon, where such omissions often occur. The latter factor deserves more attention. To account for omissions, including that at *Nem.* 6.18, paleographers commonly invoke various species of haplography.⁶ But since haplography can be shown to explain relatively few

⁴ At *Nem.* 6.20, instead of construing the accusative pronoun *τρεῖς* with the immediately preceding *στεφανωσάμενος*, scholars usually assume some sort of ellipsis: *Νεμέα δὲ τρεῖς* (e.g. *τρεῖς νικᾶς ἑλόν or στεφάνους νικάσας*). For a rare instance of *στεφανόμαι* with accusative rather than dative, one might compare *τά τ' οὐρανὸς ἐστεφάνωται* at *Il.* 18.485 (cf. scholia ad loc.) and Hes. *Th.* 382. But M. W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary* (Cambridge, 1991), vol. 5 (*Books 17–20*), prefers interpreting the verb here as middle rather than passive: 'which Uranus has hung up as a wreath' instead of 'with which the sky has been crowned'. For a disputable case in a lacunose Bacchylidean passage, cf. Bacchyl. 13.91–3 and see H. Maehler, *Die Lieder des Bakchylides* (Leiden, 1982), vol. 1.2 (*Kommentar*), ad loc. Late inscriptions containing the construction are weak evidence for Pindar's Greek: *ep. agon.* 76b2 (A.D. 49); cf. 78.10–11 (c. A.D. 120–40), 79.3 (post A.D. 161). I cite all agonistic epigrams as edited by J. Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen* (Berlin, 1972).

⁵ For example, J. Costa, *Pindari Opera* (Padua, 1808), vol. 3, adds in translation *ferens*, anticipating Kayser's *ἐνεγκών*, and paraphrases with *retulit*, also prefiguring Bergk's *ἔνεικεν*. A. Boeckh, *Pindari Carmina Quae Supersunt* (Leipzig, 1811–21), introduces similarly proleptic language in his commentary: *reportaretur*. So does C. D. Beck, *Pindari Carmina et Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1811): *reportavit*.

⁶ For example, Bury (n. 3) proposed *πρῶτος <ἔτοσσεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ* ('on the principle of parablepsia'). J. Nemeč, 'Mehrsilbige Lücken in Pindars handschriftlichen Epinikientext', *LF* 8.1/83 (1960), 34–40 (article in Czech, with brief summary in German at 40) at 38, conjectured

omissions, scholars sometimes conclude that most omissions are simply inexplicable. Agreeing with Mommsen, I maintain that another factor should be considered, at least in manuscript transmission of lyric verse: the colometry itself, apparently initiated by Aristophanes of Byzantium and maintained by editors of Pindar until Boeckh's 1811 edition.⁷ The Alexandrian division of lyric poetry into distinct lines comprised of relatively short metrical units inevitably influenced the scribe's copying unit, and the widely varying length of these cola sometimes strained the copyist's concentration. I calculate that 56 per cent (perhaps as many as 63 per cent) of the polysyllabic gaps in the codices of Pindar's epinicians occur at the very end of the traditional line or colon.⁸ The same phenomenon is observable in the papyrus of Bacchylides, where 60 per cent of the first scribe's omissions of more than one syllable fall at colon's end.⁹ If we eliminate those mistakes prompted by *homoeoarcton*, a common cause of haplography, an even greater percentage of supposedly unexplained gaps falls at colon's end, since that type of error, by its very nature (*saut du même au même*), does not normally lead to omission of a line's concluding portion. Accordingly, many of the larger gaps in the epinicians may tentatively be assigned to post-Aristophanic transmission and attributed to a specific type of *lapsus memoriae*, that is *finis versus oblitio*, the propensity of scribes to copy hastily only the first parts of a colon retained incompletely in short-term memory.

In addition to the paleographic consideration described above, precise analysis of typical Pindaric word order also favours final position for the omitted verb at *Nem.* 6.18. In fact, when a form of *πρῶτος* (or *πρώτιστος*) functions adverbially or as a predicative adjective, placement of the verb just after *πρῶτος* is no more common than postponement of the verb through intervening words, including prepositional phrases. In short, nothing compels us to conclude that the missing verb at *Nem.* 6.18 immediately followed *πρῶτος*. On the other hand, the preposition *ἀπό*, when coupled

<ἐπαλφει> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ. Douglas Young, 'Some types of scribal error in manuscripts of Pindar', *GRBS* 6 (1965), 247–73 (also in W. M. Calder and J. Stern [edd.], *Pindaros und Bakchylides* [Darmstadt, 1970], 96–126) at 254 (= 104), suggested <ἀπαγγελ> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ ('perhaps . . . lost by homoeoarcton'). Young treats omissions at 252–4 (= 101–4), but seems to have overlooked *Nem.* 8.40–1. He lists fourteen disyllabic omissions, fifteen trisyllabic, and one quadrisyllabic (and five omissions of two words), explaining only three or four of them by *homoeoarcton* or *homoeoteleuton*. Young considers the vast majority of polysyllabic omissions 'not obviously explicable'.

⁷ For the Alexandrian colometry of Pindar, see J. Irigoin, *Les scholies métriques de Pindare* (Paris, 1958), 17–34; and G. Zuntz, *Drei Kapitel zur griechischen Metrik* (Vienna, 1984), 50–8.

⁸ Omission of at least three syllables rarely occurs at the beginning of the traditional line or colon, where scribes are apparently more careful: *Ol.* 3.35/63. Such gaps are not uncommon at various random positions within the middle of the line: *Ol.* 2.58/106, 11.1/1, *Pyth.* 3.42/74, 4.231/411, 5.118/159, *Isthm.* 6.52/76. The few polysyllabic omissions confidently attributed by Young (n. 6) to *homoeoarcton* or *homoeoteleuton* all occur in the middle of the line. Final position therefore emerges as a significant, independent factor for error. Excluding *Nem.* 6.18/32, 6.25/43, and 9.17/41, which are theoretically ambiguous, I observe that nine of Young's sixteen polysyllabic omissions occur at the end of the traditional line (56 per cent): *Ol.* 6.51/86, 10.35/43, 11.10/10, *Pyth.* 4.180/320, 11.49/74, 12.7/13, *Nem.* 1.52/80, 9.18/43, 10.84/157. Including the three ambiguous omissions, the figure may be as high as 63 per cent. I do not count *Nem.* 8.40–1/69–70 (a disyllabic omission at the end of one line, followed by a monosyllabic gap at the beginning of the next) or *Isthm.* 4.2–3/4–5 (a trisyllable omitted at the end of one line, and a tetrasyllable at the beginning of the next).

⁹ Omission in Bacchylides' papyrus of at least two syllables at the beginning of a line: Bacchyl. 18.60; in mid-line: 15.55; at the end: 5.129, 11.23 (where the scribe wrote only the first three of thirteen syllables), 18.48. I do not count Bacchyl. 13.85, which involves more than a simple omission of syllables or words, as two lacunose lines have been condensed into one.

by Pindar with a *transitive* verb, precedes that verb roughly 80 per cent of the time. This is neither random nor insignificant, since the same strong tendency also governs Pindar's use of two near synonyms of ἀπό when they indicate place whence: ἐκ and παρά with the genitive (about 85 and 75 per cent, respectively). Conjectural placement of the verb before the prepositional phrase ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ is therefore demonstrably less Pindaric. Accordingly, supplements at the end of the line such as ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ἄγαγεν>|, <ἄρατο>||, or <ἀντίθει>| demand serious consideration. Although each of these conjectures furnishes an acceptable meaning, the first, as we shall see, has more and significantly better parallels.

Returning to Praxidamas' crown, *Nem.* 6.17–18 apparently requires a transitive verb entailing movement, as Kayser recognized. The action performed by the victor (Ὀλυμπιονίκος) governs the accusative object 'garland' (ἔρνεα) and expresses movement from the Alpheus river valley (ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ), the venue of victory, to his homeland, implied in the dative object, 'to or for the Aeacids' (Αἰακίδαις). Accordingly any passage proposed as a precise syntactic parallel should include the following or nearly identical elements: (i) a victor in the nominative, (ii) a victory crown in the accusative, (iii) a prepositional phrase expressing motion from the games, and (iv) an interested party in the dative associated with the victor's home. In searching for such parallels, I have analysed all Pindaric verbs that take a word for 'crown' as an accusative object, and all transitive verbs construed with the preposition ἀπό. Verbs falling into both categories will supply the conjectures to *Nem.* 6.18 that, given our present state of knowledge, must be regarded as the most Pindaric. By this measure the best candidates are ἄγω, δρέπω, λαμβάνω, ὀπάζω, πέμπω, and φέρω. By also considering functional equivalents for 'crown' (such as 'victory', 'glory', and 'honour'), as well as close synonyms of ἀπό (namely ἐκ and παρά), we may expand the field to include ἀείρομαι/ἄρνημαι, δέκομαι, δίδωμι, ἐλεῖν, ἐπαρκέω, ἔχω/σχέθω, κομίζω, and πορεῖν. This slate of more than a dozen verbs can be shortened by eliminating those that do not scan at *Nem.* 6.18 in the aorist or imperfect tense and those that do not appear in a passage showing all or nearly all of the aforementioned syntactical elements.¹⁰ As a result of this analysis, I conclude that the best Pindaric parallels to *Nem.* 6.17–18 derive from four verbs: one strong parallel from ἐπαρκέω, two or three from φέρω, three from πέμπω, and three or four from ἄγω. Below I review the relative weaknesses of conjectures associated with each of these verbs.

Fennell's <ἐπάρκεσ'> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ, despite the close parallel later in the same ode (*Nem.* 6.57b–61), is relatively weak because the compound ἐπαρκέω, which here displays a rather specialized meaning, 'supply', occurs nowhere else in Pindar. In contrast, the three other verbs are quite common. In fact, for the one passage in which ἐπαρκέω does appear, the scholia provide a synonym and a periphrasis, and restate the verb in more familiar form. Actually, every time that Pindar uses ἀρκέω or one of its

¹⁰ J. A. Hartung's <ἐδρέψατ'> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ has a fair parallel at *Nem.* 2.8–9. The conjecture ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ἄρατο>|| shows partial parallels (*Isthm.* 6.60; cf. *Pyth.* 1.75–7, *Isthm.* 1.50), but no indirect object corresponding to Αἰακίδαις is expressed with the middle ἀείρομαι (or ἄρνημαι). Passages partially parallel to *Nem.* 6.18 can be adduced for <ὀπάσσειν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ or ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ὀπάσειν>|, or even for the imperfect <ὀπαζεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ (*Isthm.* 1.10–12, 4.25–7; cf. *Ol.* 8.82–4; also cf. Bacchyl. 1.147–8, 8.26–32). To judge from Pindaric usage, an athlete would be an unusual subject of ὀπάζω, but cf. *ep. agon.* 72.4 and perhaps 69.9 (Ebert). Incomplete parallels can be found for <ἔδωκεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ (*Ol.* 3.38–9, *Pyth.* 2.52, *Isthm.* 7.24; cf. *Pyth.* 5.124, *Nem.* 2.8), and for ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ἐσχεθεν>| or <ἐσχετο>|| or the imperfect <εἴχετο>|| (*Ol.* 1.70–1, 9.88, *Pyth.* 5.105).

compounds, the scholia quote, repeat, or paraphrase the verb. The lack of specific reference to any verb in the scholia for *Nem.* 6.18 proves nothing, but it does at least suggest that the missing word did not display a rare form or unusual meaning.

Bergk's <ἐνεικεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ certainly provides the required sense and syntax (cf. *Ol.* 3.13–15, 8.62–6, *Nem.* 5.52–4?¹¹). Parallels can also be found in authors other than Pindar (Bacchyl. 5.182–6, Eur. *Hipp.* 73–4, *ep. agon.* 81.4–5 [Ebert]). One of the weaknesses of this conjecture, however, is the relative rarity of the aorist stem of φέρω. This verb's present stem occurs roughly ten times more frequently in Pindar than the irregular, suppletive aorist. In contrast the present stem of ἄγω is a little more than twice as common as its present, and the aorist of πέμπω appears as frequently as its present. These significantly different proportions show that Pindar tends to shun the aorist of φέρω. Accordingly, although forms of φέρω occur more frequently in Pindar than those of ἄγω (roughly three to two) and πέμπω (nearly three to one), the aorist of φέρω still occurs only half as often as the aorist of either of those verbs. Similar proportions are evident in agonistic epigrams: while forms of φέρω are roughly three times more frequent than those of ἄγω, the aorist of φέρω is still less common. Such statistics, I realize, do not prove beyond doubt that a particular reading was the original. When dealing with missing syllables, however, the issue is not certainty but rather degree of likelihood. Since all three verbs can function as virtual synonyms,¹² those who previously accepted <ἐνεικεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ ought to prefer <ἐπεμψεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ and ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ἄγαγεν>.

Incidentally, Pindar and Bacchylides repeatedly employ φέρω, πέμπω, and ἄγω to describe the *poet* or, more precisely, the ἐγώ-persona, as 'bringing' (or 'sending') *song* to the patron's homeland.¹³ This topic, whether interpreted as literal arrival or metaphorical voyage, admittedly resembles that of the garlanded athlete's homecoming in *Nemean* 6, especially when the poem is imagined as a figurative chaplet or headband brought or sent by the epinician poet (e.g. *Nem.* 8.13–6; Bacchyl. 5.9–12, fr. 20c2–6).¹⁴ But we should nevertheless attempt to distinguish the two motifs and the disparate roles of *laudator* and *laudandus*. Accordingly, I consider passages announcing the poet's arrival to be weak rather than strong parallels for *Nem.* 6.18. As a whole, however, even these hypothetical parallels support the conjecture <ἐπεμψεν> over

¹¹ If we accept the scholia's interpretation (*Nem.* 5.52–4/94d–f), the passage is parallel to *Nem.* 6.17–18. But many, rightly dissatisfied with this traditional interpretation, have accepted U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's emendation φέρε (imperative), which apparently makes the person carrying the flowery garland someone other than the victorious athlete. In contrast I interpret the manuscripts' φέρειν as meaning 'to win' rather than 'to bring' and as standing in indirect discourse for an imperfect rather than present indicative: 'proclaim . . . that he won'. Such passages—in which φέρω means 'to win' an accusative prize or athletic victory (e.g. *Ol.* 9.97–8, 10.67, *Nem.* 3.18, *Isthm.* 7.21–2)—may not be adduced as precise parallels, since the direct object is normally 'won' or 'carried off' in a particular place, not explicitly carried *from* it to another location, and indirect objects corresponding to Ἀλακιδαις are not expressed.

¹² The Pindaric scholia gloss each of the verbs φέρω, πέμπω, and ἄγω with the same word, κομίζω, 'to bring, convey' (*Pyth.* 5.27/35b, *Nem.* 5.52/94d, 9.52/123a), and use φέρω to gloss the other two (*Nem.* 9.52/123b, *Ol.* 2.51/87h, 89d; cf. *Pyth.* 5.27/40b).

¹³ Song and πέμπω: Pind. *Ol.* 7.7–8, 9.25, *Pyth.* 2.67–8, *Nem.* 3.76–9, *Isthm.* 5.63, fr. 124a1–2; cf. *Ol.* 4.1–3; Bacchyl. 5.9–12, 5.196–7, frs. 20b3–4, 20c2–6; cf. *Dith.* 16.2–4. Song and φέρω: Pind. *Ol.* 14.21, *Pyth.* 2.3–4, *Nem.* 8.13–16; cf. *Nem.* 3.26–8; Bacchyl. 2.1–3. Song and ἄγω: Pind. *Pyth.* 3.73–6, 10.4–6, *Isthm.* 2.34.

¹⁴ For the metaphorical association of crown and song in Pindar, see F. J. Nisetich, 'Olympian 1.8–11. An Epinician metaphor', *HSCP* 79 (1975), 55–68; and D. Steiner, *The Crown of Song. Metaphor in Pindar* (London, 1986), 28–9, 35–6, 54, 118–19.

<ἔνεικεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ, since they employ forms of πέμπω more frequently than those of φέρω.

Although Pindaric parallels for πέμπω (*Nem.* 4.14–21,¹⁵ 9.52–3, *Isthm.* 2.12–17) are at least as persuasive as those for φέρω, the conjectures <ἔπεμψεν> and <ἔπεμπεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ have not previously appeared in print. Such neglect can be attributed to two factors: Pindarists have never systematically studied the syntax of *Nem.* 6.17–18; and they have generally failed to appreciate the ambiguity of πέμπω, which can mean not only 'send', but also 'escort, deliver, bring'.¹⁶ The conjecture ἔπεμπεν must be considered slightly inferior to ἔπεμψεν. Although verbs of bringing and sending are commonly expressed in the imperfect,¹⁷ that tense is still considerably less frequent than the aorist, as illustrated in the parallel passages adduced in this paper. Supplements involving the verbs πέμπω and φέρω share certain relative weaknesses: they present an unlikely word order, since they precede the preposition ἀπό; and they provide no paleographic explanation of the original omission. In contrast not only does ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ἄγαγεν>| fall at the end of the line, where most larger omissions occur, but also the sequence ΑΠΑΑ is sufficiently similar in appearance to ΑΓΑΓ to induce scribal error.

My preferred conjecture, ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ἄγαγεν>, is supported by not only the most parallels in Pindar (*Ol.* 13.29–31, *Pyth.* 5.27–31,¹⁸ 9.73–5; cf. *Ol.* 2.48–51, *Pae.* 1.5–10), but also the strongest non-Pindaric analogues (to be discussed in the following section). To this point I have focused on the simplex forms of φέρω, πέμπω, and ἄγω, since none of their Pindaric compounds supplies a strong semantic parallel to *Nem.* 6.18.¹⁹ Nevertheless one such compound has actually inspired a conjecture, David Young's <ἀπαγεν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ. The virtue of his supplement—that repetition of ΑΠΑ might have caused omission of ἀπαγεν—actually points to a deficiency. Pindar generally avoids compound verbs,²⁰ and the combination <ἀπαγεν> ἀπ' seems excessively prosaic. Since the simplex forms of ἄγω (as of φέρω and πέμπω) occur nearly ten times more frequently in Pindar than the compounds, the conjecture <ἄγαγεν> must be considered superior to <ἀπαγεν>. Moreover, as discussed above, an aorist is preferable to an imperfect, as is placement after ἀπό.

¹⁵ My interpretation rests on Bergk's emendation *νίον* at *Nem.* 4.16. See A. Köhnken, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin and New York, 1971), 215, n. 104.

¹⁶ For the ambiguity of πέμπω, see W. Mullen, *Choreia: Pindar and Dance* (Princeton, 1982), 29–31, 237. Use of πέμπω, whether literal or figurative, does not necessarily imply absence of the verb's grammatical subject (cf. *Ol.* 7.7–8, 13–14; *Pyth.* 2.4–5, 67–8). Compounds of πέμπω function similarly (*Ol.* 8.50, fr. 75.2), as does the cognate noun πομπή (*Ol.* 7.80, *Pyth.* 4.164, *Nem.* 7.29).

¹⁷ For the imperfect of verbs of motion and displacement, see R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* 1 (Hanover, 1898), 143–4; and P. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare* (Paris, 1993), 240.

¹⁸ In *Pythian* 5 the winning charioteer did not return to the Battids' palace bringing (*ἄγων*) Excuse, daughter of Afterthought, but rather capped the hair of the Battid king with the honour of the fastest chariot after a hospitable stay at Delphi. Here Pindar balances ἄγω with a verb for crowning, ἀμφιβάλλω. This litotes, one of Pindar's favourite devices, derives its humour from the expectation that the direct object of ἄγω might be either an excuse or a prize such as a woman or a crown. Although the syntax of *Pyth.* 5.27–31 is somewhat different from that in *Nem.* 6.17–18, the complex of ideas is similar: in effect Carrhotus brings a chaplet from Delphi to the Battids, just as Praxidamas brought one from Olympia to the Aeacids.

¹⁹ A few Pindaric compounds govern accusative objects functioning as figurative equivalents for 'crown' or prize: προσφέρω (*Ol.* 9.108–12); and προσάγω (*Isthm.* 6.69), ἐπάγω (*Pyth.* 8.61–6), and ἀπάγομαι (*Pyth.* 9.118–20).

²⁰ F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (Berlin, 1921), 18 and n. 3.

II. AN EPIGRAMMATIC EXPRESSION: 'THE FIRST . . . TO BRING HOME A PRIZE FROM THE GAMES'

The expression at issue, *Αἰακίδαῖς / ἔρνεα πρῶτος ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ* <ἄγαγεν>, which recalls Praxidamas' homecoming celebration, forms part of a victory catalogue, a special element of Pindar's odes that shares certain characteristics with commemorative athletic inscriptions. Pindaric scholars, however, have generally paid less attention to the lists of relatives' victories than to other elements of the odes, and they have shown little interest in the comparative value of athletic epigrams. But the strongly dactylic rhythm of *Nemean* 6, especially at 17–18, invites direct comparison with athletic elegy. Study of neglected epigraphic sources makes it possible not only to reconstruct Pindar's text, but also to document an agonistic idiom: 'to be the first one to bring home a prize from the games'. This expression, which reflects the established practice of crowned homecoming parades, may be traced over four centuries, from conceivably as early as the victory of Praxidamas (544 B.C.), through the poetry of Pindar and Callimachus, until at least the time of Athenopolis (c. 150 B.C.).

The homecoming once enjoyed by Praxidamas has much in common with the encomiastic parade enacted by *Olympian* 13. Here Zeus, who rules far and wide, is asked to protect the Corinthian folk and receive the celebratory rite of crowns, a celebration that the *laudandus*, the first ever to win both the pentathlon and the sprint at Olympia, is now leading or bringing (ἄγει) from the plains of Pisa: *δέξαι τέ οἱ στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον τεθμόν, τὸν ἄγει πεδίῳ ἐκ Πίσας, / πενταέθλω ἅμα σταδίου νικῶν δρόμον· ἀντεβόλησεν / τῶν ἀνὴρ θνατὸς οὐπω τις πρότερον* (*Ol.* 13.29–31). Pindar blurs the distinction between comiastic procession and victory crown. The recipient is obviously Zeus, even if his name does not appear in the dative. In preceding lines a deictic reference to 'this people' (27) and an earlier address to Corinthians in the vocative (14) clearly identify this procession's goal as Corinth. Much as Praxidamas was the first (πρῶτος) Aeginetan to lead home a crowned procession as an Olympic champion, so Xenophon, as the first (οὐπω τις πρότερον) athlete ever to win his two events at Olympia, also leads a triumphal parade to Corinth.

Comparison with elegiac poetry provides convincing corroboration of my *πρῶτος ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ* <ἄγαγεν>. In a fragmentary elegiac epinician written by Callimachus, a careful student of Pindar and epigram, an aorist form of ἄγω twice governs garlands or prizes. The victor Sosibius brought (home) (ἤγαγεν) another celery (chaplet), a Nemean one, in addition to the one (brought) from the fountain Pirene (at the Isthmus): *ἐπ' αὐτίκ[α δ' ἄλ]λα σέλινα / τοῖς ἀπὸ Πειρήνης ἤγαγεν Ἀ[ργο]λικά* (*Callim.* fr. 384.21–2).²¹ Like *Nem.* 6.17–18 this passage includes an accusative word for crown and the preposition ἀπό followed by a genitive body of water indicating the venue of victory. Although a dative object associated with the victor's homeland is lacking, the final destination of the crowned procession is revealed in the following lines. Callimachus explains that the chaplets have been brought (home) so that North Africans might learn of Sosibius' twin victories at the Isthmus and Nemea (23–6). Immediately thereafter the same constellation of syntactic elements is repeated with

²¹ I endorse the translation of ἐπί adopted by T. Fuhrer, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Choryrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos* (Basel, 1992), 248: 'er brachte sogleich anderen Eppich, argivischen, zusätzlich zu dem von der Peirene'. The scholia, followed by some modern scholars, interpret as if Callimachus had used the compound verb ἐπήγαγε in the sense *adiecit*, 'he added'.

slight variation. Callimachus presents the Nile as boasting that its victorious nursling has paid it a fine honour, since no one has ever brought (ἤγαγ') the city such a prize from these festivals: οὐ] γὰρ πώ τις ἐπὶ πτόλιν ἤγαγ' ἄεθλον / [διπλόον ἐκ]²² ταφίων τῶνδε πανηγυρίων (27–30). Just as Praxidamas brought a garland from the Alpheus river to the Aeacids for the first time, so was Sosibius the first (οὐ] γὰρ πώ τις) to bring home a twofold crown from the Isthmean and Nemean games.²³

Three passages from agonistic epigrams also show striking similarities to *Nem.* 6.17–18. Diotimus, victor with the chariot at Nemea (c. 225 B.C.), is congratulated for donning ever-memorable chaplets (ἄειμνάστους . . . στεφάν[ους *ep. agon.* 64.4 [Ebert]) and for being the very first Sidonian to bring (ἄγαγες) an equestrian boast (that is, prize) from Greece to the home of the noble Agenorids: ἀστῶν γὰρ πράτιστος ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος ἱππικὸν [ε]ὔχος / ἄγαγες εἰς ἀγαθῶν οἶκον Ἀγηνוריδᾶν (5–6). This couplet is especially reminiscent of *Nem.* 6.17–18, since Poseidon's son Agenor was venerated at a heroön in Hellenistic Sidon much as Zeus' son Aeacus was worshiped on Aegina. In another verse inscription (c. 150 B.C.), Athenopolis of Priene boasts about being the first to bring (ἄγαγον) glorious honour from his competitors to his fatherland: πρᾶτος ἀπ' ἀντιπάλων εἰς πατρίδα τάνδε Πριᾶναν / παῖς Πυθοτίμου κλεινὸν ἄγαγον γέρας (*ep. agon.* 73a1–2 [Ebert]). The location of this competition is specified a few lines later: Epidauros crowned Athenopolis with a chaplet, and Greece learned of his victory in wrestling (5–6). A similarly unprecedented victory in the horse race is attributed to Xenombrotus, who became the first Coan to win and bring (ἔσαγάγ[ε]τ[ο]) an Olympic prize to Merops' island: . . . κείναι Ὀλυμπιάδι, / [αἶ] Κώϊων ὁ [Ξ]ε[ιν]ο[δ]ίκου Πισαῖον ἄεθλον / πρῶτος ἐλὼν Μέροπος νᾶσον ἔσαγάγ[ε]τ[ο] (*ep. agon.* 49.2–4 [Ebert]). The hero Merops, eponymous king of the Meropian inhabitants of the island Cos, corresponds closely to Aeacus on Aegina. Admittedly in this passage the prize is not brought expressly from Olympia, but that is clear both from the adjective 'Pisaeon' and the preceding clause's reference to the Olympiad in which Xenombrotus won (c. 420 B.C.?). In slight contrast with the two inscriptions cited above, which employ the preposition εἰς to indicate the crowned procession's destination, this epigram simply prefixes ἐς to the verb.²⁴ The victor Xenombrotus, like Athenopolis and Diotimus in other epigrams, Sosibius in Callimachus, and Xenophon and Praxidamas in Pindar, was the first to bring home a specific type of prize from the games. The verb conventionally used to describe such an achievement seems to have been ἄγω.

A pattern closely resembling *Nem.* 6.18 emerges from the three epigrams and the two Callimachean passages. In all three inscriptions a predicative form of πρῶτος is separated by several syllables from a subsequent aorist of ἄγω. (As rough equivalents of πρῶτος, Callimachus has the temporal adverbs αὐτίκα]α and οὐ] . . . πώ before the aorist.) In all five instances the aorist verb is preceded by a prepositional phrase (or an equivalent noun and pre-verb) indicating the crowned procession's origin and/or destination. Three times the preposition ἀπό appears, twice immediately after πρῶτος,

²² Supplied by C. A. Trypanis, *Callimachus. Fragments* (Cambridge, MA, 1958) (republished unchanged with Musaeus in 1975).

²³ Later in fr. 384, referring to a Panathenaic victory, Callimachus again employs ἄγω to describe a victory revel led by a chorus to Athena's temple (νηὸν ἐπὶ Γλαυκῆς κῶμον ἀγοντι χορῶ 38).

²⁴ Unlike other parallels cited above, this passage employs the middle voice of ἄγω, as does *ep. agon.* 73b2 (Ebert), where the parallel to *Nem.* 6.17–18 is incomplete, since neither the geographical origin nor destination of the prizes is specified: κλεινὰ παλαιμοσύνας [ἀ]γαγόμεν ἄεθλα.

once just before the verb. Furthermore, since Greek agonistic inscriptions show a marked fondness for commemorating unprecedented feats,²⁵ it seems reasonable to suppose that an epigram associated with Praxidamas' Olympic statue, like that of Xenombrotus, mentioned his singular accomplishment. I also suggest that this hypothetical inscription for the prestigious archaic statue of Praxidamas, and perhaps other epigrams known to Pindar, influenced that poet's diction and word order in composing *Nemean* 6 (especially *πρῶτος*, *ἀπό*, and *ἄγαγεν*). Pindar himself points to the common purpose of epinician poetry and agonistic statuary in *Nemean* 5, an ode composed for another Aeginetan. Although the poet contrasts his own more mobile work with a sculptor's statue standing upon its base (*Nem.* 5.1–5), he simultaneously announces the very sort of information normally commemorated in athletic inscriptions: Lampon's son Pytheas won a crown in the pancration at the Nemean games.

III. CONCLUSION

Detailed examination of Pindar's treatment of victory crowns reveals that four verbs supply the strongest parallels to *Nem.* 6.17–18: *ἐπαρκέω*, *φέρω*, *πέμπω*, and *ἄγω*, with the last three providing nearly all the Pindaric examples in roughly comparable proportion. Particular aspects of Pindar's style indicate that some forms are less likely than others. The conjectures *ἐπάρκεσ'* and *ἀπᾶγεν* are compound verbs that our poet otherwise employs only once. While an imperfect such as *ἔπεμπεν* is possible, an aorist remains more probable; and Pindar demonstrably avoids forms like *ἔνεικεν* in comparison with *ἔπεμψεν* and *ἄγαγεν*. Furthermore, of these four verbs, the one with an appearance most likely to induce scribal error is *ἄγω*. Other phenomena confirm that *πρῶτος ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ <ἄγαγεν>* is the best conjecture: scribes' proclivity to omit polysyllabic words at colon's end; Pindar's strong preference of placing transitive verbs after the preposition *ἀπό*, not before it; and the epigrammatic formula of predicate *πρῶτος* followed by preposition of place whence or whither preceding an aorist form of *ἄγω*.²⁶

University of Mississippi, Oxford

J. FENNO
jfenno@olemiss.edu

²⁵ For *πρῶτος* and *μόνος* as typical athletic boasts, see Ebert (n. 4), ad *ep. agon.* 31.2; and Fuhrer (n. 21), 182–3, n. 691.

²⁶ The germ of this paper appeared in note 270 of my doctoral dissertation: J. Fenno, 'Poet, athletes and heroes: Theban and Aeginetan identity in Pindar's Aeginetan Odes' (Los Angeles, 1995), 304. For the opportunity to expand and improve that note, I remain grateful for the hospitality extended at the library of the Department of Classical and Medieval Philology at the University of Bologna, and at the library of the Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington, DC.