

Pindar's Oath to Sogenes (*Nemean* 7.70–74)

EDWIN D. FLOYD

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

In lines 70–74 of *Nemean* 7, Pindar addresses the victor Sogenes as follows:¹

Εὐξένιδα πάτραθε Σώγεves, ἀπομύνω
 μὴ τέρμα προβαίς ἄκονθ' ὥτε χαλκοπάρρον ὄρσαι
 θοὰν γλῶσσαν, ὃς ἐξέπεμψεν παλαισμάτων
 αὐχένα καὶ σθένος ἀδιάντον,
 αἶθωνι πρὶν ἀλίῳ γυῖον ἐμπεισεῖν.
 εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλεόν πεδέρχεται.

These lines have been explained in many different ways. However, nearly every interpretation may be assigned to one or the other of two groups, according to the meaning which is given to the verb *προβαίνω* which appears in the aorist participle form *προβαίς* in line 71. (The form given in the manuscripts is *προβάς*; but the Aeolic form, printed by Turyn and Snell, is probably to be preferred.) One interpretation is that the verb here means “overshoot,” and the other is that it means “overstep.” Both of these meanings can be supported in the ancient tradition. The Scholiasts clearly take *προβαίνω* in the sense of “overshoot.” Hesychius, on the other hand, glosses the form *προβάς* as *ὑπερβάς*; since he gives the exact form which appears in this passage, his gloss may well refer specifically to this occurrence of the word.

The interpretation presented by the Scholiasts is that this passage refers to an athlete's throwing beyond (or beside) the target fixed for the javelin-throw. According to Scholia 103b, 103c, and 103d, the reference in *τέρμα προβαίς* is to a mistake. Contestants who threw wide of the mark were excluded from competition, and Pindar here avers that this is not the case with his own poetry; he does not go beyond what is proper, but instead says what is true. These three Scholia therefore indicate that

¹ Text and punctuation are from Snell's third Teubner edition (B. Snell, *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, pt. 1, Leipzig, 1959).

Pindar's statement is simply a metaphor, derived from the rules governing the javelin-throw. Scholia 106b and 106c, on the other hand, present a closer connection of this passage with Sogenes' own achievement in the pentathlon. These two Scholia do not regard the excessive javelin-throw as any sort of error. Rather, according to Scholion 106b, Sogenes' javelin-throw so impressed the other contestants that they declined to wrestle with him, and he was thereupon crowned as victor in the pentathlon without competing in the wrestling (cf. line 73). Scholion 106c, however, makes no mention of the attitude of Sogenes' competitors; according to this Scholion, the javelin-throw by itself was sufficient for absolute victory in the pentathlon, and it was for this reason that he did not have to wrestle.

The general line of interpretation indicated by the Scholiasts was followed by most scholars in the early nineteenth century. More recently, however, it has been generally neglected, except by Jüthner in an article published in 1932.²

Another explanation for the word *προβαίς* in this passage is clearly suggested by Hesychius' gloss of the word as *ὑπερβάς*. This interpretation is the one most generally held today, but it was first presented in detail (in modern times at least) just about 100 years ago.³ According to this view, the reference must be to a foul arising from someone's overstepping the line from which the javelin-throw should be made. Some modern scholars have taken the verb *ἐξέπεμψεν* in line 72 as a gnomic aorist, indicating what would naturally happen whenever any contestants violated the rules.⁴ Others, however, have taken the passage to refer to some specific occurrence in the pentathlon at Nemea in which

² For interpretations based on the Scholiasts' views, see A. Boeckh, *Pindari Opera*, vol. 1, pt. 2 (Leipzig 1811) 541-42; G. Hermann, "Notae ad Pindarum," in C. G. Heyne, *Pindari Carmina*, vol. 3, pt. 1 (Leipzig 1817) 382-84; L. Dissen, "Explicationes ad Nemea," in A. Boeckh, *Pindari Opera*, vol. 2, pt. 2 (Leipzig 1821 = Hildesheim 1963) 433-35; and finally, J. Jüthner, "Zu Pindar Nem. 7, 70 ff.," *WS* 50 (1932) 166-70.

³ Arthur Holmes, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar, with especial reference to Nem. VII, A Thesis* (Cambridge 1867) and E. Pinder, *Der Fünfkampf der Hellenen* (Berlin 1867). I have not seen either of these works, but for Holmes' work, cf. the mentions of it by C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge 1883) p. 67, note 2, and p. 80; and F. A. Paley, *The Odes of Pindar* (Cambridge 1868) p. 199, note 5; and for Pinder's work cf. P. Gardner, "The Pentathlon of the Greeks," *JHS* 1 (1880) 222.

⁴ So Pinder, one of the first to present this interpretation of *προβαίς* (according to Gardner's [above, note 3] account of Pinder's work); essentially the same interpretation is adopted by L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, vol. 2 (London 1932 = Amsterdam 1961) 298-300.

Sogenes was victorious.⁵ Finally, a third type of interpretation, also based on the translation of *προβαίνω* as "overstep," involves a different punctuation in lines 72 and 73 (see below, 148 and note 20).

Neither of the translations of *προβαίνω* mentioned above is, I believe, correct. According to the Scholiasts, the word here refers to the act of throwing a javelin. However, such a reference hardly seems possible for a compound of the verb *βαίνω*, which properly means "walk" or "step." The modern translation as "overstep" would, on the other hand, be natural enough for the compound. Yet, except for Hesychius' gloss, this meaning does not seem to be otherwise attested for *προβαίνω*. (The verb ordinarily means simply "step forward, advance, proceed.") Furthermore, an additional difficulty in the modern view of the passage is the use which it gives to the immediately following word *τέρμα*. In Homer, *τέρμα* is used of the turning-point in a race-course (e.g., *Il.* 23.309), or of the marker denoting how far a discus had been thrown (*Od.* 8.193). Both of these uses occur in later Greek as well, but after Homer the word is used more often in a metaphorical sense, denoting simply an end-point, either in space or time, in the sense of "terminus, boundary, end, limit." However, the sense of "starting-line" or "line from which one throws" does not seem to be otherwise attested.⁶ Consequently, the modern view of *Nem.* 7.71 means that in the phrase *τέρμα προβαίς* we are faced with not just one, but with two words in succession used in an unparalleled manner.

The interpretation which I should like to offer for these two words is that both of them here have essentially their regular meanings, *τέρμα* being used as an accusative of goal or motion toward. The phrase *τέρμα προβαίς* would therefore mean "having advanced to completion" or "having advanced to the goal."⁷ With such a translation, the meaning of lines 70-74

⁵ For example, T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, vol. 1 (Leipzig 1878) 291-92; Fennell (above, note 3) 80-81; J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London 1890) 139-140; A. Puech (who reads *ἐξέπεμψας* in line 72, with manuscript B), *Pindare*, vol. 3 (Paris 1952) 91-92; and R. Lattimore, "Pindar *Nemean* 7, 70-74," *CPh* 40 (1945) 121-22.

⁶ Cf. Jüthner (above, note 2) 168.

⁷ Paley (above, note 3) also takes *τέρμα προβαίς* here in the sense of "having advanced," with an accusative of goal or motion toward. However, Paley takes *τέρμα* in the sense of "starting-line," rather than "goal," and he paraphrases the passage as follows: "advancing the foot up, or on to it [the mark], in order to throw."

must be that although Sogenes finished the pentathlon early with his javelin-throw (as Scholia 106b and 106c indicate), Pindar has not yet reached his goal, i.e., has not yet come to a proper conclusion in this poem. More generally, the overall effect which this interpretation would have for the passage as a whole will, I believe, appear most clearly through the following translation of lines 70–73 (I here omit line 74, since it contains a particular problem with which I shall deal later):

“Euxenidas from your clan, O Sogenes, on oath I deny that, having advanced to completion, I urged on my swift tongue like the bronze-cheeked javelin, which sent forth from the wrestling both neck and strength unwetted, before any limb fell in the burning sun.”

This use of *προβαίνω* would be remarkably similar to the other Pindaric instance of the verb, viz., *Olym.* 8.63–64:

... τίς τρόπος ἄνδρα προβάσει
ἐξ ἱερῶν ἀέθλων μέλλοντα
ποθεινοτάταν δόξαν φέρειν.

Here, the reference is to an athlete's advancing from the games with glory. Similarly, in *Nemean* 7, one side of the comparison between Pindar and Sogenes is the manner in which the victor successfully reached his goal in the games. There is, of course, a difference in the way in which *προβαίνω* is used in these two passages. However, this difference is precisely that which we should expect from the two forms in question. In *Olym.* 8, the future active *προβάσει* is used, and this form is necessarily transitive. In *Nem.* 7, on the other hand, *προβαίς* is used intransitively, just as one would expect, since it is a second aorist form.

There does not seem to be any other instance in which an accusative of goal is used with *προβαίνω*. Such a usage must in fact be regarded as somewhat unusual, since the preposition *πρό* by itself never takes an accusative. However, a close parallel for this construction of *προβαίνω* may be found in Sophocles, *Electra* 1377–78, where the second aorist of *προῖστημι* is similarly used with an accusative of motion toward:

... ἧ σε πολλὰ δῆ
ἀφ' ὧν ἔχοιμι λιπαρεῖ προῖστην χερί.

The interpretation presented above for the phrase *τέρμα προβαίς* is, I believe, fully appropriate for the context in which these words appear. In particular, it would not reflect adversely on either Sogenes or Pindar, as do many other explanations which have been advanced for this passage. There is no idea of a foul, either as a hypothetical possibility or as a specific occurrence from which Sogenes was fortunate enough to profit. He did, to be sure, finish the pentathlon early, but this must have been by winning three victories in the first three or four individual events.⁸ Such a "premature" victory would not, however, be any reason for Pindar to cut short the poem written in Sogenes' honor. Rather, the three-fold victory would be all the more impressive and would therefore richly deserve a full-length epinikion poem. Furthermore, it would be especially appropriate at this point for Pindar to make clear that he has not already reached the end of the poem. The immediately preceding lines (64–69) deal with Pindar's proxeny with the Molossi (Neoptolemus' people) and with Pindar's straightforward, modest bearing among his own fellow-citizens. These lines thus form the conclusion to that section of the poem which is devoted to the Neoptolemus myth and to Pindar's statements concerning his handling of this story. The poet's manner of treating Neoptolemus is clearly an important theme in *Nem.* 7, and lines 64–69 might consequently appear as the conclusion to the entire poem. In view of this, Pindar's oath to Sogenes in lines 70–74 would have a definite function, for it would assure the victor that the preceding section was only a part of Pindar's concern, and that an important section, devoted to Sogenes himself and his achievement, remains to be sung.⁹

⁸ The idea that three victories in the individual events of the pentathlon were by themselves sufficient for victory in the pentathlon as a whole, although denied by some earlier scholars, is now generally accepted. See for example E. N. Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London 1910) 365–67; J. Jüthner, *RE* 37 (1937) 526–27, s.v. "Pentathlon"; and G. E. Bean, "Victory in the Pentathlon," *AJA* 60 (1956) 361.

⁹ In some respects, Jüthner's interpretation ([above, note 2] 169–70) is quite similar to that presented here. Jüthner holds that the reference in this passage is to Pindar's not yet having finished his poem, and he likewise holds that this reference is motivated especially by Pindar's extensive *apologia* to the Aiginetans concerning Neoptolemus. However, Jüthner does not take *τέρμα* as "conclusion," but instead interprets *τέρμα προβαίς* essentially as the Scholiasts do, viz., as referring to a javelin-throw beyond some particular mark. Also, he takes *ἐξέπειμυεν* as a gnomic aorist, rather than as referring specifically to Sogenes' victory in the pentathlon.

Although our interpretation of *Nem.* 7.70–74 thus seems attractive, mention must be made of four possible objections which have been raised by various scholars who have considered these lines. These objections (or unanswered questions) may be briefly stated as follows:

1. Is this explanation of the passage consistent with the order of events in the pentathlon?

2. Do not the words ἐξέπεμψεν παλαισμάτων in line 72 indicate that the wrestling contest was one *from which* the contestant *emerged* successfully, i.e., was a contest which was fought through to completion? Can this verb instead take the sense of “exempt” which our interpretation indicates for it?

3. Likewise, the words εἰ πόνος ἦν in line 74 seem to indicate that the wrestling—the last and most strenuous event in the pentathlon—actually took place.

4. Finally, our interpretation of the passage apparently necessitates an otherwise unparalleled sense, viz., “comes after,” for the verb πεδέρχεται in line 74. Should not this verb instead mean “goes in quest of”?

With regard to the first of these questions, our interpretation actually indicates only that the javelin-throw preceded the wrestling. However, the connection between Sogenes’ success in the one event and his exemption from the other strongly suggests that the wrestling was scheduled to follow immediately after the javelin-throw. It is clear from other sources that the wrestling was the last event,¹⁰ and our interpretation therefore suggests that the javelin-throw was the fourth event. This is in fact the position which Gardiner gives as the most likely. (For the pentathlon as a whole, he gives the following as the probable order: foot-race, jump, discus, javelin, wrestling.) Gardiner refers to our passage from *Nem.* 7 only in passing, and his study of the pentathlon is based almost entirely on other evidence.¹¹

¹⁰ See for example the sources given by Gardiner (above, note 8) 363, and Bean (above, note 8) 361.

¹¹ Gardiner (above, note 8) 363–65; see especially 364, note 1, where the various ancient sources are listed (actually, no one of these gives precisely the order which Gardiner adopts as most probable), and 364, note 2, where Gardiner states that little value can be attached to our Pindar passage in determining the order of events in the pentathlon.

Consequently, his conclusions would appear to be independent confirmation for the interpretation we have adopted for *Nem.* 7.

More recently, however, Bean has advanced the view that the events peculiar to the pentathlon—the jump, discus, and javelin—came first, followed by the foot-race as the fourth event, and then the wrestling as the fifth and final event. This conclusion rests principally on various inscriptions concerning the pentathlon, and, although it is not certain, it seems the most reasonable interpretation of them.¹² However, I believe that these inscriptions, which are relatively late, probably reflect a later change in the order of events in the pentathlon which did not hold true at the time of *Nem.* 7. Such a change may in fact have taken place in Pindar's own lifetime, not long after the date of this poem, which is probably to be placed in the 480's.¹³ According to Pausanias 5.9.3, the position of the pentathlon in the Olympic festival was somehow changed at the time of the seventy-seventh Olympiad (472 B.C.). This passage is difficult and probably corrupt,¹⁴ but Pausanias apparently indicates that the chariot-race and the pentathlon were moved from one day of the festival to another. Such a change in the organization of the entire festival may well have been accompanied by certain changes in the internal arrangement of the pentathlon. Consequently, it appears quite possible that, at the time of *Nem.* 7, the

¹² Bean (above, note 8) 363–64. Cf. J. Ebert, "Zum Pentathlon der Antike," *Abh. der Sächs. Ak. der Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 56, 1 (Berlin 1963) 18–20. The placing of the foot-race fourth is based on the phrase *νεικήσας πένταθλον πρώτην τρεῖς* in an inscription of the early third century A.D., published in *JHS* 37 (1917) 88 ff. (See L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni Agonistiche Greche* [Rome 1953] 239–41, for the date.) Bean holds that this reference should be to the three events peculiar to the pentathlon, which it would be reasonable to give a place of primacy in the holding of the pentathlon. In an addendum, p. 368, Bean refers also to an inscription from Rhodes, which may probably be assigned to the first century A.D. (see Ebert, p. 19, note 1). This inscription gives various regulations regarding the pentathlon, and although it is fragmentary, it appears probable from it that the foot-race immediately preceded the wrestling.

¹³ Wilamowitz' dating of *Pae.* 6 around 490, and hence of *Nem.* 7 in the 480's is, I believe, most likely to be correct. Cf. Snell (above, note 1) 144; A. Turyn, *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1952) 172; and especially A. Hoekstra, "The Absence of the Aiginetans," *Mnemosyne* 15 (1962) 13–14, who gives additional reasons for placing *Pae.* 6 in or near 490. However, for a considerably later date (467 for both *Pae.* 6 and *Nem.* 7), cf. C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964) 410–11, and the references given there.

¹⁴ See J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias's Description of Greece* (London 1913) 1.584 and 3.488–89.

javelin-throw rather than the foot-race may have come just before the wrestling. At least, there is no decisive evidence against this order, and I believe that it gives the most natural interpretation for *Nem.* 7.70–74.

The second question concerning our explanation of this passage has to do with the words ἐξέπεμψεν παλαισμάτων in line 72. The verb ἐκπέμπω regularly refers to being sent out of the place where one actually is, or out of the activity in which one is actually engaged, and its appearance here may therefore seem inconsistent with the view that Sogenes did not compete in the wrestling.¹⁵ However, I believe that the idea of Sogenes' being exempted from the wrestling, and thus being "sent from" it, is fully as appropriate for the verb as the idea of his fighting through the wrestling, and in that way being sent out of it. In fact, the former interpretation seems more natural in this passage, for the result described in lines 72–73 would thus follow immediately upon the javelin-throw (lines 71–72), rather than being postponed through the course of the wrestling-contest.

The view that ἐξέπεμψεν παλαισμάτων refers to Sogenes' being exempted from the wrestling is also indicated by the use of the word ἀδιάντων in the following line. This adjective must, I believe, be derived from the relatively frequent verb διαίνω, "wet," rather than from a hypothetical compound of διά and the very rare word αἰνώ.¹⁶ If we thus take ἀδιάντων in line 73 in the sense "unwetted," this line fully supports our interpretation of the passage as a whole. Its connotation may be slightly more general, but the principal meaning of ἀδιάντων here must be that Sogenes came from the wrestling without sweat (ἄνευ ἰδρωτός, as Scholion 106a states). In an actual wrestling contest Sogenes would have been required to throw his opponent three separate times in order to win, and, no matter how swift or easy it might

¹⁵ For this view that ἐξέπεμψεν παλαισμάτων must refer to a wrestling contest which actually took place, see Bury (above, note 5) 139–40.

¹⁶ For the interpretation of this word as ἀ-δι-άντων, see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Pindars siebentes nemeisches Gedicht," *Sitzungsb. K. preuss. Akad. Wiss.* (Berlin 1908) 339, note 2. Wilamowitz refers to the occurrence of ἀδιάντος in Bacchylides 17.122; here, the word is used to describe Theseus as he emerges from the sea. In the Bacchylides passage, the phrase ἀδιάντος ἐξ ἁλός is of course paradoxical, if the adjective means "unwetted," but I believe that this is no adequate reason for rejecting this sense for the word. Rather, precisely such an effect of paradox seems most appropriate as a conclusion to Theseus' wonderful adventures in the underwater palace of Poseidon.

have been for him, it does not seem plausible that he could do this *ἄνευ ἰδρωτός*. Rather, some considerable exertion would be required, and we may consequently conclude that Sogenes did not wrestle at all on this particular occasion.¹⁷

The third possible objection mentioned above is the reference to toil (*πόνος*) in line 74. When there is a specific connection with the games, Pindar otherwise uses *πόνος* only in connection with wrestling, the pancration, or the chariot-race. These three were all strenuous and even dangerous events, and it might therefore be thought inappropriate to have a reference to *πόνος* in connection with any of the first four events of the pentathlon, which were considerably less strenuous than the wrestling.¹⁸ However, I believe that this reference is quite in order, even though Sogenes brought the pentathlon to an end before the wrestling-contest. Pindar's limitation of *πόνος* elsewhere to the especially difficult events enumerated above may be to some degree fortuitous. At least, the word may certainly be used more generally. For example, in *Pyth.* 6.54, it is used to describe honey and the honeycomb (*μελισσᾶν . . . τρητὸν πόνον*); here, the force of the word is clearly to call attention to the careful, methodical work of the bees, rather than to any idea of danger or great exertion. Similarly, a reference to *πόνος* in connection with the pentathlon as a whole seems quite proper. Frequently (or usually) no contestant would be victorious in more than just one or two of the first four events, and the final victory would therefore be decided by the last scheduled event, the wrestling.¹⁹ Sogenes, however, must have won three of the first four events, and the word *πόνος* might well be used in connection with such an accomplishment. In fact, I do not believe that it is too fanciful to compare this passage directly with *Pyth.* 6.54, mentioned above. Just as *πόνος* is used there of the careful labor of the bees, so in *Nem.* 7 the word would appropriately refer to the careful attention

¹⁷ The words *αἰθωνι πρὶν ἅλιω γυῖον ἐμπεσεῖν* in the second half of line 73 also indicate that no wrestling took place. See for example the explanation given in Scholion 106b, where these words are paraphrased as follows: *πρὸ τοῦ ἐκλυθῆναι τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου διὰ τὴν πάλην*.

¹⁸ For this argument that Sogenes must have wrestled, see Fennell (above, note 3) 81, and Puech (above, note 5) 91-92.

¹⁹ For example, cf. the contest of Tisamenus and Hieronymus (Herodotus, 9.33; Pausanias, 3.11.6 and 6.14.13). Each of these contestants was victorious in two of the first four events; Hieronymus won in the wrestling, and hence was the victor in the pentathlon as a whole.

which Sogenes devoted to each of the individual events of the pentathlon, with the result that he was declared the victor before the last scheduled event could be held.

The last of the four possible objections to our interpretation of *τέρμα προβαίς*, enumerated above, has to do with the verb in line 74. On our interpretation (as on that of most scholars from the Scholiasts to the present day), lines 70–73 form a single sentence, with *ἄκων* as the antecedent of the relative *ὅς*; then, line 74 forms a separate sentence by itself. Wilamowitz, however, suggested a different punctuation for this passage, viz., a full stop before *ὅς* in line 72 and just a comma after *ἐμπεσεῖν* at the end of line 73.²⁰ With this punctuation, *πεδέρχεται* in line 74 thus becomes a transitive verb, having *ὅς* (used in an indefinite sense) as its subject, and *τὸ τερπνόν* as its object. Consequently, the sense of *πεδέρχεται*, on Wilamowitz' interpretation, is "goes in quest of" or "seeks after." This is a frequent meaning for the verb (Attic *μετέρχομαι*; other uses are "come or go among, go to another place, pursue," etc.). However, on our interpretation, *πεδέρχεται* must apparently be used intransitively (with *τὸ τερπνόν* as subject), and the prefix *πεδα-* will therefore have an essentially temporal sense, "after." The resulting meaning for *πεδέρχεται*, "comes after" or "follows after," is natural enough but does not seem to be otherwise attested. Thus, we are apparently brought to the distinctly embarrassing position that our interpretation of *τέρμα προβαίς* in line 71 gives to these two words their regular meanings, only at the cost of an unparalleled sense for the verb in line 74.

The problem presented by *πεδέρχεται* has not, I believe, been properly explained, either by the many scholars who interpret the verb in the sense "comes after," or by Wilamowitz' repunctuation of the passage. The sense "goes in quest of" might indeed be expected here, since it is a frequent meaning for the verb. However, Wilamowitz' punctuation produces a sentence which

²⁰ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 163. (Wilamowitz does not discuss this in any detail, but his translation of the passage makes it clear that he had this punctuation in mind.) This punctuation is followed by W. Schadewaldt, "Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion," *Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft*, 5, 3 (1928) 317–18, who translates *πεδέρχεται* as "geht sich zu holen"; and by Ebert (above, note 12) 8–10. Also, Snell prints this punctuation in his first and second Teubner editions (Leipzig, 1953 and 1955); however, in his third edition (above, note 1), Snell follows the punctuation indicated by the Scholiasts.

is both difficult and awkward; in particular, we should expect a subjunctive form in line 72 instead of the indicative ἐξέπεμψεν. (Cf. the subjunctive ἄρρηται in the similar sentence in *Isth.* 1.50–51). Also, there would seem to be something lacking in the way πεδέρχεται in line 74 is used in the particular context in which it appears. One might well expect a word such as ἔχει or δέχεται: "If there was toil, he receives the more joy."²¹ The verb πεδέρχεται, on the other hand, introduces a certain element of unfulfillment, as though the victor's accomplishment by itself was insufficient and some greater joy is required. Since Pindar elsewhere states that athletic achievement thirsts after song (*Nem.* 3.6–7), the additional reward which is here referred to as being sought after is undoubtedly the victory song itself. This interpretation of line 74 is also indicated by the following lines (75–76), which deal with Pindar's bringing favor to the victor:

ἔα με· νικῶντί γε χάριν, εἴ τι πέραν ἀερθεῖς
ἀνέκραγον, οὐ τραχὺς εἰμι καταθέμεν.

However, these two lines do not develop quite naturally enough from the preceding passage for them to be regarded as a fully adequate explanation of line 74. In particular, the shift from the third person πεδέρχεται to the second person imperative ἔα in line 75 produces an effect of discontinuity at this point, and makes difficult any close connection between lines 74 and 75.

The imperative phrase ἔα με, which occurs at the beginning of line 75, furnishes, I believe, the key to the problem presented by line 74. There are two possibilities of interpretation for this clipped imperative phrase.²² There may be an ellipsis here, with the infinitive omitted, as often, from the regular accusative and infinitive construction. Or the verb εἶω may here be used

²¹ In fact, Schadewaldt (above, note 20) 318, who here follows Wilamowitz' punctuation, paraphrases this line as if the verb were actually ἔχει: "der hat, war Mühe dabei, doppelte Freude."

²² Actually, there is no punctuation after ἔα με in the ancient tradition. Instead, the manuscripts and Scholia take this sentence as extending down through ἀνέκραγον in line 76. (For the punctuation of the manuscripts, see Tycho Mommsen, *Pindari Carmina* [Berlin 1864] 356.) However, the sentence which results from the ancient punctuation seems distinctly incomplete, and Hermann (above, note 2) 383–84, concluded that the phrase ἔα με should be taken by itself, followed by a period, with just a comma after ἀνέκραγον and a period after καταθέμεν. This punctuation (generally with a raised period after ἔα με, instead of a full stop) has been followed by most subsequent scholars, and may, I believe, be accepted as correct.

in the sense of "let alone, let be, leave alone," etc. The first of these explanations is suggested by Scholion 110. This Scholion paraphrases the passage as follows: "Permit me to bring favor to the victor"; thus, the sentence νικῶντι . . . καταθέμεν in lines 75–76 would serve to expand the idea contained in elliptical form at the beginning of line 75.²³ However, it seems decidedly awkward that this explanation should follow the imperative phrase. If ἔα με is indeed elliptical, we should rather expect it to allude to something which had already been mentioned, and which for this reason did not require to be mentioned here. (Cf. *Olym.* 7.61, where the words νιν οὐκ ἔϊασεν clearly refer to the preceding words ἄμπαλον . . . θέμεν.) Consequently, it might seem preferable to adopt an alternative translation for ἔα με, "leave me alone" or "let me be."²⁴ It is, however, difficult to understand just what this phrase could mean in the particular context in which it appears. If ἔα με is to be so translated, the most satisfactory interpretation would seem to be that suggested to me by the anonymous referee for this article, viz., to paraphrase ἔα με as "don't worry about my finishing properly." ἔα με would thus serve as a kind of transition to the final concluding section of the poem; although Pindar has clearly not yet finished (as he states in lines 70–71), he will do so correctly in his own good time. However, although this interpretation is attractive, it appears to me to be not quite possible. At least, there does not seem to be any close parallel for the particular connotation of ἐάω which it would require. Rather, other instances of ἐάω used without an infinitive (either expressed or understood) suggest the idea "leave behind, abandon" (e.g., *Il.* 8.125, 11.323; cf. 4.226); "heed not, pay no attention to" (e.g., *Il.* 9.701; *Pind. Pae.* 4.50–51); or, in a few special instances, "spare, let live" (e.g., *Il.* 24.569; *Od.* 4.744). None of these uses is appropriate as a parallel for *Nem.* 7.75.

The difficulties involved in interpreting ἔα με in *Nem.* 7.75 may be avoided by a change in the text in line 74, from the third singular form of the manuscripts to the second singular form πεδέρχειαι. Along with this change in the text, I believe that there

²³ See for example Disen (above, note 2) 435 (paraphrase: *sine me facere, quod meditator*); and F. Schwenn, *Der junge Pindar* (Berlin 1940) 124.

²⁴ So for example Bury (above, note 5) 140 (translation: "Let me be"); and J. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar* (London 1927) 389 (translation: "Forgive me").

should also be a minor change in punctuation, from a period to a raised period after *πεδέρχεαι*, so as to indicate a closer connection in thought between lines 74 and 75. With this emendation and change in punctuation, the translation of the imperative phrase *ἔα με* may then easily be expanded as follows: "Let me [bring to you the joy which you seek after]." ²⁵ Or, taking the passage as a whole, I believe that these lines (74–76) should be translated as follows: "If there was toil, you seek after joy the more; permit me: delight for one indeed victorious (if somehow aroused too much I cried out), I am not harsh to perform."

Of course, emendation is always somewhat risky, but I believe that the change to *πεδέρχεαι* in line 74 may be recommended on two separate counts. On the one hand, it well explains the second person form in line 75. If the preceding line contains a third person verb form (as the manuscripts indicate), the reference of this imperative seems quite uncertain; however, a second person form in line 74 would, in its context, clearly refer to Sogenes, and consequently the following imperative would also clearly be addressed to him. Secondly, this emendation permits the regular meaning "goes in quest of" for the verb in line 74; at the same time, it allows us to retain the interpretation of *τέρμα προβαίς* in terms of the ordinary meanings of these two words, and this is surely the most natural explanation for this phrase in line 71.

²⁵ Some such emendation was regarded as necessary by Wilamowitz in his 1908 study of the poem (above, note 16) 340, in which he follows the ancient punctuation. According to Wilamowitz, this entire passage refers to Pindar himself, and the athletic metaphors here refer to his struggle with his Aiginetan critics concerning his treatment of the Neoptolemus story. Consequently, Wilamowitz suggested the emendation of the verb in line 74 to the first person form *πεδέρχομαι*. (Later he rejected this emendation in favor of the change in punctuation already discussed.) Wilamowitz' 1908 emendation does not, however, seem satisfactory, for surely the athletic images here refer to Sogenes rather than to Pindar (cf. the discussion of this passage by Schadewaldt [above, note 20] 318–19).