

XXVI.—Pindar, *Isthmian* 4.19 f.

LEONARD WOODBURY

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

It is concluded, after some consideration of Pindar's use of contrasts, that the reading of the MSS is to be rejected, and Hartung's emendation *ποικίλα* is to be accepted in its place.

- 16 ἀλλ' ἀμέρᾳ γὰρ ἐν μιᾷ
 τραχεῖα νιφὰς πολέμοιο τεσσάρων
 ἀνδρῶν ἐρήμωσεν μάκαιραν ἐστίαν
 νῦν δ' αὖ μετὰ χειμέριον ποικίλα μηνῶν ζόφον
- 20 χθῶν ὧτε φοινικέουσιν ἄνθησεν ῥόδοις
 δαιμόνων βουλαῖς. ὁ κινητὴρ δὲ γὰς Ὀρχηστὸν οἰκέων
 καὶ γέφυραν ποντιάδα πρὸ Κορίνθου τειχέων,
 τόνδε πορῶν γενεᾷ θαυμαστὸν ὕμνον
 ἐκ λεχέων ἀνάγει φάμαν παλαιὰν
- 25 εὐκλέων ἔργων· ἐν ὕπνῳ
 γὰρ πέσεν· ἀλλ' ἀνεγειρομένα χρῶτα λάμπει,
 Ὀσφόροσ θαητὸς ὥς ἄστροις ἐν ἄλλοις.

The beginning of this ode is a study in contrasts.¹ First, there is the contrast between the ancient honour and fame of the victor's house and that more melancholy time when, in a single day, the *τραχεῖα νιφὰς πολέμοιο* bereft his home of four of its champions. Secondly, there is the contrast between that overwhelming disaster in the past and the present happy occasion of victory. Then, in lines 19 f., this occasion itself is represented as a contrast between *χειμέριον ποικίλων μηνῶν ζόφον* (as the MSS² have it) and the flowering of the ground that has now ensued. If *μηνῶν* depends upon *ζόφον*, as

¹ The following editions of Pindar are cited hereafter by the name of the editor: E. Schmid, *ΠΙΝΔΑΡΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΟΔΟΣ* (Wittenberg, 1616); A. Boeckh, *Pindari Opera* (Leipzig, 1811–21); J. B. Bury, *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar* (London and New York, 1892); O. Schroeder, *Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1923); L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* (London, 1930–32); C. M. Bowra, *Pindari Carmina* (Oxford, 1935); A. Turyn, *Pindari Epinicia* (New York, 1944). All references to Pindar are to the text of Bowra's Oxford edition.

² Hartung conjectured *χειμερίων ποικίλα*.

Pindar's usage in regard to enclosed genitives seems to require,³ then the earlier time is looked upon, not as a single day (as in line 16), but as a period of time. This is explicable on the (otherwise reasonable) assumption that the Isthmian victory did not follow immediately after the disastrous battle.⁴ Furthermore, it is poetically just, because we get not merely a contrast between disaster and victory, but an aesthetic and therefore a psychological contrast between the gloom long endured and the new splendour that has come to relieve it.

Last of all, in the lines that follow, Poseidon, the shaker of the earth (and the god of the Isthmian Games), is said to have aroused from its couch the ancient renown of glorious deeds, which had fallen asleep, but is now aroused in splendour, conspicuous as the star of morning among the other stars. This, of course, he is said to have done because Melissus won the victory at the god's own games, and thus won honour for his family. His ancestors, or the older members of his family, had won victories at Athens and Sicyon, and had competed in the Panhellenic games as well⁵ — apparently unsuccessfully, since all that Pindar can say⁶ is that they rejoiced in expenditure on horses, and that those who make no trial win no renown; indeed, *τύχη* is uncertain even for those who do compete, until one reaches the end, and the worse often defeats the better man. It appears, therefore, that the family of Melissus

³ For a normal enclosed (and dependent) genitive, cf. *O.* 6.59: τοξοφόρον Δάλου θεοδμάτας σκοπόν. Cf. also *O.* 1.24; *P.* 4.12, 28 f., 45, 52 f. Genitives in some way enclosed, although not dependent on the enclosing phrase, are sometimes found: cf. *O.* 2.77: πόσις ὁ πάντων ῥέας ὑπέρτατον ἐχούσας θρόνον; even a double genitive: cf. *O.* 2.92–95: αὐδάσσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεί νόψ, τεκεῖν μή τιν' ἑκατόν γε ἐτέων πόλις φίλοις ἀνδρα μᾶλλον εὐεργέταν πραπίσιν ἀφθονέστερόν τε χέρα Θήρωνος. It should be observed, however, that in the last example the position of ἑκατόν γε ἐτέων is not haphazard; like τιν', it serves to support and qualify the preceding negative. It would be difficult to find in Pindar another example of a non-dependent double genitive firmly enclosed in a prepositional phrase. Cf. also *N.* 2.21; 4.71 f.

⁴ It is generally assumed that the νιφὰς πολέμοιο is the battle of Plataea of 479. The date of the victory is unknown. Some would put it a number of years after the battle: cf. C. Gaspar, *Essai de chronologie pindarique* (Brussels, 1900) 85; U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1922) 341; Farnell 1.261; Turyn 203; G. Norwood, *Pindar* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1945) 269. Others assign it to a date as early as 478: cf. Schroeder 71 f. This would give a literal quality to the figure of *I.* 4.19 f.: after the winter of 479–8 has come the spring, and with it the Isthmian victory. In any case there would seem to be little doubt that there was an interval, of a number of months at least, between the battle and the victory.

⁵ Cf. *I.* 4.27–31.

⁶ Cf. *I.* 4.14, 31 f.

had been unsuccessful in Panhellenic competition, and perhaps had not won even a lesser prize for some time.⁷ It is true that Pindar speaks of their nobility and honour ἀρχαῖεν. But as to achievements, he can say only (14 f.) that they were breeders of horses, and in the favour of bronze-clad Ares. Here, then, is the contrast between sleep and waking.

There is, therefore, a contrast in the structure of the poem between the victory and an equally striking event in the past (war and death). But, in addition to this contrast between two positive forces, the victory itself is twice represented under figures — the flowering of the ground and the awakening of the ancient renown. Obviously, both refer to the Isthmian victory. But what of the contrasted past in these two figures? Is the ζόφον the same as the sleep of the family's renown? Certainly, it may be said that there is a similarity between them in that the one explicitly represents what the other suggests (by the λάμπει of line 25) — the darkness out of which the new splendour has arisen. But, as often, Pindar is not sufficiently definite for us to be sure. It must be sufficient to say that Pindar sees the central motif — the victory — in two images which express, each within its own context, the idea of a radical and glorious emergence. This is what Pindar thought important. The background from which the family has now emerged is of little interest to him; it exists only by contrast, a dark and negative ground: the winter's darkness that precedes the spring blossoms, the sleep that precedes the splendid and heroic awakening.

It is not possible, then, to make sure inferences concerning the ζόφον by a comparison with the sleep of the ancient renown. On the other hand, the νιφάς and the ζόφον, although symbolically not dissimilar, obviously have very different objects of reference. It would be insipid to say that the bright flowers had bloomed after the darkness of a single day. But the juxtaposition of ζόφον and μηνῶν cannot be haphazard; Pindar is clearly suggesting an interval of time under ζόφον just as he does under the sleep of the ancient renown. The flowering of the ground clearly suggests the coming of spring; the only thing that can provide a satisfactory contrast to it is the long, drab winter.⁸

⁷ This may be inferred from παλαιὰν (24) and ἐν ὕπνῳ γὰρ πέσεν (25).

⁸ The storm in Solon's "Hymn to the Muses," fr. 1.18–24 (Diehl²), is simply a sudden spring storm, and is not properly compared with the Pindaric passage, as is done by H. Fränkel, "Eine Stilleigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur" *NGG* (1924)

This conclusion is borne out by a further consideration. The word *χειμέριος* means, in the first place, 'stormy,' and therefore might appear to be in itself poor evidence for the season. However, the word and its congeners recall associations with the winter's storms; it is clear that when used of a period of time the word normally must refer to the winter-season. So the *ὥρη χειμερίη* of Hom. *Od.* 5.485, *χειμέρι'* . . . *ἤματα* in Hes. *Op.* 565, *τοὺς χειμεριωτάτους μῆνας τέσσερας* in Herodotus 2.68.1, and *χειμέριον* . . . *μῆνα* in Simonides fr. 20 (Diehl). But if we have rightly analysed the beginning of the *Fourth Isthmian*, then there is a reference in line 19 to a considerable period of time. When such a period is called *χειμέριος*, there can be only one season that is meant.

But if this is so, there is trouble with *ποικίλων μηνῶν*. *Ποικίλος* best suits the spring. It is the season of flowers: cf. *P.* 4.64: *φοινικανθέμου ἥρος ἀκμῆ*; *H. Hom.* 19.17: *ἔαρος πολυανθέος*; Alc. fr. 98 (Diehl²): *ἥρος ἀνθεμόεντος*; so spring is *πολιόν*: cf. Eustath. *ad Hom. Il.* 2.88 (178.41 f.). Cf. also *Anth. Pal.* 9.564.1 f.: *αἰόλον ἱμεροθαλὲς ἔαρ φαίνουσα, μέλισσα ξουθά, ἐφ' ὥραις ἀνθεσι μαινομένα*. The word is easily taken as referring to the colours of the spring. It is this explanation that the scholiast prefers: *ἡ ποικίλων τῶν καρπῶν, καθ' οὓς ὅλη ἡ γῆ ποικίλη γίνεται τῇ τῶν φυτῶν ἐξανθήσει*. Of the figure of *I.* 4.20 he says: *ὥσπερ ἐαρίζουσα γῆ ἐκ χειμῶνος ἐκδίδωσι τὰ ρόδα*. Schmid's explanation that the reference is to the changing weather of winter is therefore to be rejected on this ground, even if one were unable to reject it because it obscures the essential contrast between *ζόφον* and the flowering earth.

Farnell attempts to meet this difficulty by declaring that *ποικίλων* is a fixed epithet, that is, not necessarily appropriate to the occasion at all — "the changeful months," whether in winter or summer. This is, in essence, the alternative explanation of the scholiast: *τὸ γὰρ ποικίλων μηνῶν, ἦτοι καθὸ ποικίλα καὶ πολλὰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ γίνεται*. The objection to this is twofold. The epithet, if fixed, should appear elsewhere in the same conventional use; but it does not. Furthermore, Pindar gains no corresponding advantage for this heavy sacrifice. What does *ποικίλων μηνῶν* add to the phrase, if the words are taken in this sense? In Homer the fixed epithet is admittedly

96 note 1. Simonides fr. 20 (Diehl) is also not comparable, as it refers to the calm of the winter solstice. There is, of course, in all three passages the contrast, made more or less explicit, between the storm and the calm that follows it.

common; it is a mark of the oral technique. But what of such epithets in Pindar in the fifth century? Could they serve any other purpose than to add an archaic flavour? In line 45 (καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον) we have in πάγκαρπον an epithet that seems irrelevant in its context. However, it has pictorial value, and suggests the contrast between the fertile land and the unharvested sea, and we can find delight in this picture of contrasts, apart from any thought of its significance or appropriateness in the context. But what is added by ποικίλων in line 19 seems instead only to obscure the contrast that Pindar is most eager to make.

Bury, in a somewhat similar fashion, thinks the months are regarded as "many-coloured; they bring both winter's darkness and spring's roses." The genitive, he thinks, depends on ζόφον as well as on ῥόδοις. The grammatical construction seems impossible, and the clarity of Pindar's image is again confused.

If, however, it be agreed that ποικίλος must refer to the spring, it is necessary to grant that it cannot then modify μηνῶν. As has been seen, ζόφον refers to the winter, which is contrasted with the flowering of spring. But if ποικίλων μηνῶν refers to spring, then its position was rightly described by Jebb⁹ as "one for which it would be hard to find a parallel." Is there in Pindar another example of such a use of an enclosed genitive? Boeckh suggests that this is an example of the genitive of time, like ἔαρος, and with the same meaning. But, as Farnell also observes, the order is unexampled.

If ποικίλος cannot modify μηνῶν, what can it do? Hartung's ποικίλα would refer it to χθών¹⁰ — the many-coloured earth of spring. Cf. (Bergk⁴) fr. adesp. 104a: ποικίλλεται μὲν γαῖα πολυστέφανος. For a similar adjective similarly placed, cf. Pindar, fr. 63.15 f. (Bowra): φοινικοεάνων ὁπότε οἰχθέντος Ὠρεῶν θαλάμου εὐδομον ἐπάγοισιν ἔαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεια. As a result of this one change¹¹ the text appears to be

⁹ R. C. Jebb, "Pindar" in *Essays and Addresses* (Cambridge, 1907) 87.

¹⁰ For the use of an epithet with χθών, cf. fr. 207.2 (Bowra): ἀγλαὰ χθών; P. 9.6 f.: πολυμήλου καὶ πολυκαρποτάτας . . . χθονός; N. 1.14: εὐκάρπου χθονός. Cf. also Lucr. 1.7: daedala tellus.

¹¹ Hartung altered χειμέριον into χειμερίων and the change has been accepted by Rauchenstein, Christ, and by H. Fränkel in *NGG* (1924) 96 note 1. But the change is needless. Of course, either χειμέριον ζόφον (cf. P. 5.10: χειμέριον δμβρον; 6.10) or χειμερίων μηνῶν (cf. p. 371 supra) in isolation would be satisfactory. However, in a complex prepositional phrase (except when anastrophe occurs) Pindar usually has following the preposition a word governed by it. Exceptions, of course, occur, most notably in N. 10.48: καὶ Λύκαιον παρ Διὸς θῆκε δρόμω, σὺν ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικᾶσαι σθένει.

healed, and the emendation has been generally accepted by Continental editors (except Turyn), despite the preference for the reading of the mss shown by the English editors (except Bowra).

It may be objected that the order thus created is no less improbable than the old. However, it is quite in Pindar's manner to insert inside a prepositional phrase a word that obviously belongs outside of it, and is grammatically connected with something outside of it. For example, there is the position of the verb in *P.* 6.7–9: ἐτοῖμος ὕμνων θησαυρὸς ἐν πολυχρύσῳ Ἀπολλωνίᾳ τετείχισται νάπα; of the adverb in *O.* 1.65 f.: τούνεκα προῆκαν νιδὸν ἀθάνατοὶ οἱ πάλιν μετὰ τὸ ταχύποτμον αὖτις ἀνέρων ἔθνος; of an appositional nominative in *I.* 5.48 f.: καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἀρεῖ μαρτυρήσαι κεν πόλις Αἴαντος ὀρθωθείσα ναῦταις ἐν πολυφθόρῳ Σαλαμῖς Διὸς ὄμβρῳ; of an adjective preceding its noun (and hence most like ποικίλα) in *P.* 4.42 f.: καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇδ' ἄφθιτον νάσῳ κέχυται Λιβύας εὐρυχόρου σπέρμα πρὶν ὥρας.¹² For an example in a complex prepositional phrase, cf. fr. 1.1–4 (Bowra): σὺν θεῶν δέ νιν αἴσα Ὕλλου τε καὶ Αἰγυμίου Δωριεὺς ἐλθὼν στρατὸς ἐκτίσσατο.¹³ It is to be further observed that this displacement is not always casual; nor is it always imposed *metri gratia*. For example, in *O.* 1.66 αὖτις gains new meaning from its juxtaposition with ταχύποτμον: not only was Pelops sent back again, but he became mortal again. Similarly, in the passage from the *Fourth Isthmian*, ποικίλα by its position emphasises the contrast which it is Pindar's main poetic purpose

But it is not possible, I think, to cite from Pindar a parallel to μετὰ χειμερίων ποικίλα μνηῶν ζόφον, whereas there is a striking parallel to μετὰ χειμέριον ποικίλα μνηῶν ζόφον in *N.* 3.16 f.: ἐν περισθενεὶ μαλαχθεὶς παγκρατίου στόλῳ. It should be added that Pindar has a habit of leaving a dependent genitive unqualified, while adding epithets to the noun upon which the genitive depends: cf. *P.* 9.8: ῥίξαν ἀπείρου τρίταν εὐήρατον θάλλουσιν; *N.* 3.38 f.: καὶ ποτε χαλκότοξον Ἀμαζόνων μετ' ἄλκῃν ἑπετό οἱ; 3.59: θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι. Altogether, it would appear that there is insufficient reason for changing the reading of the mss.

¹² For more examples of such intruded words or phrases within prepositional phrases, cf. *P.* 4.239 f.: πρὸς δ' ἐταῖροι καρτερόν ἄνδρα φίλας ὥρεγον χεῖρας; 4.254–256: καὶ ἐν ἀλλοδαπαῖς σπέρμ' αἰούραις τουτάκις ὑμετέρας ἀκτίνος ὄλβου δέξατο μοιρίδιον ἄμαρ ἢ νύκτες; *N.* 6.34–37: καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἀγαθῇ χεῖρας ἱμάντι δεθεὶς Πιθῶνι κράτησεν ἀπὸ ταύτας αἶμα πάτρας χροσσοπολάμου ποτὲ Καλλίας ἀδὼν ἔρνεσι Λατοῦς; 10.48: σὺν ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικᾶσαι σθένει; 11.24–26: ναὶ μὰ γὰρ ὄρκον, ἐμὴν δόξαν παρὰ Κασταλία καὶ παρ' εὐδένδρῳ μολῶν δχθῶ Κρόνου κάλλιον ἂν δηριόντων ἐνόστησ' ἀντιπάλων; *I.* 7.44–47: ὃ τοι πτερόεις ἔρριψε Πάγασος δεσπότην ἐθέλοντ' ἐς οὐρανοῦ σταθμοὺς ἐλθεῖν μεθ' ὀμάγυριν Βελλεροφόνταν Ζηνός.

¹³ For more examples, cf. *P.* 9.105 f.: οἷοι Λιβύσσης ἀμφὶ γυναικὸς ἔβαν Ἴρασα πρὸς πόλιν, Ἀνταίου μετὰ καλλίκομον μναστήρης ἀγακλῆα κούραν; 10.15 f.: ἔθηκε καὶ βαθυλείμων ὑπὸ Κίρρας ἀγῶν πετρᾶν κρατησίποδα Φρικίαν; fr. 83.4 f. (Bowra): παντὶ δ' ἐπὶ φθόνος ἀνδρὶ κείται ἀρετᾶς; also *O.* 1.65 f. and *I.* 5.48 f., cited in the text above.

to make.¹⁴ Furthermore, there is no possibility of ambiguity or confusion, as there is in the version given by the MSS.

The manner of the corruption is easy to guess: *ποικίλα* became attracted into the case of the following *μηνῶν*, since *ποικίλα* seemed too difficult.

There is a strikingly similar passage in the *Seventh Isthmian*, where Pindar celebrates the victory that has come after the death in battle of the victor's uncle.

ἀλλὰ νῦν μοι
Γαῖάοχος εὐδὶαν ὄπασσεν
ἐκ χειμῶνος. (37–39)

But here the image is the simple contrast of fair weather after foul. The same image¹⁵ is to be found in the *Fifth Pythian* (10 f.):

εὐδὶαν ὅς μετὰ χειμέριον ὄμβρον τεᾶν
καταιθύσσει μάκαιραν ἑστίαν.

Here there is the additional point that the contrast is also sharpened by the order of the words,¹⁶ although the dislocation is not so striking as in the *Fourth Isthmian*. The image in these passages¹⁷ is obviously similar in purpose and effect to the image of the *Fourth Isthmian*, and it is evident at once that in all these the contrast between the earlier and the present state is quite unmediated. On Pindar's canvas the black is set against the white without the interposition of intermediate shades, and so it must be in the *Fourth Isthmian*.

The moral theme of the ode, it may be said, is that the vagaries of fortune are not to be foreseen — *ἔστιν ἀφάνεια τύχας*. This is the idea that underlies all Pindar's reflections on Melissus, his victory,

¹⁴ Cf. note 16 infra.

¹⁵ Again, in *O.* 1.97–99, *εὐδία* is said to follow after the strife of the games.

¹⁶ A very similar contrast is to be found in the very similar phrase in *N.* 3.16 f.: *ἐν περισθενεῖ μαλαχθεὶς παγκρατίου στόλῳ*.

¹⁷ Other examples of contrast might be cited: there is the contrast between past misfortune and present happiness in *O.* 12.13–19; *P.* 2 *passim*, esp. 19 f.; *I.* 1.35–40; the contrast between the toil of the games and the victor's glory: *O.* 5.15; 6.75 f.; 10.23; the contrast between light and darkness: *P.* 1.22–24; 8.95–97; *I.* 4.71; fr. 98b; 114.1–3 and *passim* (Bowra). The passage with which we are concerned contains a contrast between past misfortunes and present happiness; it does not contain an explicit contrast of light and darkness, but one that is similar, as in the familiar *O.* 1.1 f.: *ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ ἄτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μέγανoros ἔξοχα πλούτου*.

and his family.¹⁸ Foresight is impossible, not only because man's judgment is weak but also because of the marked vicissitudes that characterise his life, and make of it a succession of stages, linked in time but in nature contrasted. There is no link to be discovered between successive stages except the will of the gods. It thus appears that, in this passage at least, Pindar's manner supports his matter, for his *σοφία* includes both poetic artistry and ethical reflection.

¹⁸ It is not proper, I think, to maintain that *ποικίλων μηνῶν* would have the effect of emphasising the mutability of fortune, as in *I.* 3.19: *αἰῶν δὲ κυλινομένης ἀμέρας*. Apart from the matter of the construction, there is the fact that such sentiments are properly found in the gnomes and that it is not Pindar's custom to pass judgment upon his contrast in the moment of describing it.