

THE PREMIÈRE OF PINDAR'S THIRD AND NINTH PYTHIAN ODES

EDWIN D. FLOYD

University of Pittsburgh

Some uncertainty attaches to the date of both *Pyth.* 3 and *Pyth.* 9, but they are clearly from the same general period of Pindar's career and they may well be from the same year, 474 B.C.¹ One other point

¹ A preliminary version of the first part of this paper was read at the University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference in April 1968.

The texts which I have followed are B. Snell's Teubner text, *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Leipzig 1964) and, for the Scholia, A. B. Drachmann's edition, *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig 1903-1927). The following works are cited by author's last name: H. C. **Bennett**, Jr., "On the Systemization of Scholia Dates for Pindar's *Pythian Odes*," *HSCP* 62 (1957) 61-78; A. **Boeckh**, *Pindari Opera* (Leipzig 1811-21); C. M. **Bowra**, *Pindar* (Oxford 1964); R. W. B. **Burton**, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford 1962); W. **Christ**, *Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig 1896); L. R. **Farnell**, *The Works of Pindar* (London 1930-32); H. **Fränkel**, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (Munich 1962); E. **Gaspar**, *Essai de chronologie pindarique* (Brussels 1900); B. L. **Gildersleeve**, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1885); A. **Puech**, *Pindare, Pythiques* (Paris 1961); O. **Schroeder**, *Pindars Pythien* (Leipzig and Berlin 1922); U. von **Wilamowitz-Moellendorff**, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922).

For *Pyth.* 9, the Scholiasts (inscr. a and b) give us a specific date, viz., the 28th Pythiad. This would be 474, according to the scheme of dating the Pythian odes which has been generally followed in modern times; however Boeckh 2.2.206-8 proposed a different system, by which the 28th Pythiad would be four years earlier, or 478. Boeckh's dating was accepted by many (though not all) Pindarists in the remainder of the nineteenth century, e.g. by J. W. Donaldson, *Pindar's Epinician or Triumphal Odes* (London 1841) xxi-xxii; Tycho Mommsen, *Pindaros: Zur Geschichte des Dichters und der Parteikämpfe seiner Zeit* (Kiel 1845) 34 and 62-63; Gildersleeve 240, 335; and Christ lxxxvi; while the currently accepted dating, followed also before Boeckh's time, was supported by, e.g. T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (Leipzig 1878) 1.6-8 and 12-13, and Gaspar 2-10; Gaspar gives a detailed history of the scholarship on the problem. This dating, strongly supported by Gaspar, has been very generally followed in this century; however, the question is not fully settled, since a return to Boeckh's dating has fairly recently been urged by Bennett. Cf. also below, notes 9 and 23.

For *Pyth.* 3, the Scholia give us no specific date, since this ode does not celebrate any one particular victory. However, the references to Hieron as king (line 70) and as the

also suggests that these two poems may be most profitably studied in conjunction with each other. Only three of Pindar's extant *Epinicia* open with an extended mythical account, with scarcely any introductory section concerning the victor for whom the poem was written. These are *Pyth.* 3, 4, and 9. *Pyth.* 4, however, is a far longer poem, and in it the story of the Argonauts runs into the twelfth of its thirteen triads, while *Pyth.* 3 and *Pyth.* 9 both contain five triads, with the principal myth in each covering somewhat less than the first three of these. Furthermore, the account of Cyrene in *Pyth.* 9 resembles, both in structure and content, the way in which Pindar tells the story of Coronis and her son Asclepius in *Pyth.* 3.² In fact, I believe that the similarities are great enough to indicate that *Pyth.* 3 and *Pyth.* 9 must in some sense have been intended by Pindar as a unit. It is the purpose of this paper to develop this idea in detail, and to try to explain why Pindar wished to connect the two poems.

The first word in both *Pyth.* 3 and 9 is a first person singular form of ἐθέλω. Though this is a small point, it may yet be significant, since none other of Pindar's *Epinicia* begins with this verb, and only two (*Olym.* 12 and *Pyth.* 12) open with a first person singular form. (A relatively close parallel is, however, furnished by βούλομαι in *Fr.* 118; according to Scholia 39a and 70f to *Olym.* 2, this was the first word of the poem.) Then, after the expression of the wish, Pindar proceeds quickly to the myth in both *Pyth.* 3 and *Pyth.* 9. The second word in *Pyth.* 3, *Χίρωνα*, already names Asclepius' teacher, but the detailed account of how he brought him up is postponed until line 5 (οἶος ἐὼν θρέψεν, κτλ.); the intervening lines deal in general terms with Chiron and his relevance to the present situation. In *Pyth.* 9,

founder of Aetna (line 69), the mention of his illness (lines 1-5, 63-76), and the probability that the poem was written after Pindar's visit to Sicily, along with its similarities with *Pyth.* 9, have resulted in a fair consensus for either 474 or 473. The former date is advanced by J. E. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar* (London and New York 1915) 182; Schroeder 24; Fränkel 501; Snell, *op. cit.* 1.71; and Bowra 408; while 473 is supported by Wilamowitz 283; F. Schwenn, s. v. "Pindaros," *RE* 40 (1950) 1653; and Puech 52-53; Burton (p. 80) regards either date as plausible. On the other hand, a date early in 476 (based on the fact that no mention is made of Hieron's Olympic victory of 476) is suggested by Gaspar 79, Farnell 2.135-36, and A. Turyn, *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Cambridge, Mass. 1952) 86.

² The similarity has often been noted, e.g. by Gildersleeve 338, Wilamowitz 281, and Burton 81; in fact, it forms part of Wilamowitz' argument for placing the composition of *Pyth.* 3 near that of *Pyth.* 9.

the partitioning into introduction and myth is sharper, since the first four lines deal just with the victor Telesicrates; then, the mention of Cyrene at the end of line 4 leads directly into the story which begins in line 5 (τὰν ὁ χαιτάεις, κτλ.). From line 5, the overall development of the myth is roughly similar in both poems: it opens with a summary account (*Pyth.* 3.5–11, 9.5–13), followed by a fuller treatment of certain details (3.11–40, 9.14–67), after which Pindar returns to the material emphasized in the initial summary (3.40–62, 9.68–70), finally concluding the third triad with a recapitulation of the introductory four or five lines (3.63–67, 9.71–75). The two myths also show numerous similarities in content. Probably the most obvious connections are that both deal at length with the relationship of Apollo with a mortal woman, and that the Centaur Chiron plays an important role in both accounts. Pindar's source would also appear to have been the same for both stories, viz. the Hesiodic catalogue of women.³ Another, curious feature is that towards the beginning of both poems Pindar sets the scene on Mount Pelion (3.4, 9.5), and emphasizes the wilderness which this setting involves; the form ἀγρότερον is used in 3.4 to refer to Chiron, and the corresponding feminine form ἀγροτέραν appears in 9.6, referring there to Cyrene.

The points of contact between *Pyth.* 3 and 9 appear particularly clearly in terms of a series of sharp contrasts. Throughout *Pyth.* 9, the tone is joyous and light-hearted: the brief references to Telesicrates, the description of the huntress Cyrene, the conversation between Apollo and Chiron, Chiron's prophecy concerning Aristaeus, etc. In *Pyth.* 3, on the other hand, everything is presented in a graver and more serious way, from the introductory animadversions concerning Hieron's illness, through the story of the sinful love of Coronis and Ischys, and Apollo's reaction to it, to the account of the great, but overweening healer Asclepius.

The keynote for this contrast in mood between *Pyth.* 3 and *Pyth.* 9 is clearly struck by their opening words. In 3.1 the imperfect ἥθελον forms the apodosis of a hopeless, contrary-to-fact wish: if it were proper for him to do so, Pindar would wish that Chiron were still alive. In 9.1, on the other hand, the form is ἐθέλω: Pindar states simply that he

³ *Pyth.* 3, Scholia 14 and 52b (cf. Scholia 38c and 46a), and *Pyth.* 9, Scholion 6a. Cf. Wilamowitz 281.

wishes to sing of the Pythian victor Telesicrates. A number of other contrasting ideas are likewise placed in a similar metrical position in the two poems. (Of course, in dealing with two different metrical schemes, one cannot speak of any exact metrical correspondence, but only in terms of the major metrical divisions of strophe, antistrophe, and epode; so, for example, the references to Mount Pelion, along with the words ἀγρότερον and ἀγροτέρων, occur in roughly the same position in both, viz. toward the middle of the first strophe.) In both poems, the first antistrophes deal with some association of a goddess with the mortal woman who is loved by Apollo: in *Pyth.* 3.9-11 Artemis, at her brother's request, punishes Coronis, while in 9.9-11 Aphrodite welcomes Cyrene and Apollo in Libya. Then, at the beginning of the following epodes, the emphasis is on the relationship of the two mortal women with their girl-companions. The huntress Cyrene rejected their pursuits (9.18-19), since she preferred an out-of-doors life. Coronis too found herself separated from her companions, but for quite different reasons: in her hastiness, she did not wait for the sort of songs which her age-mates would have sung at her wedding (3.16-19). The grammatical form in which the epodes are cast is also very similar in the two poems, viz. a two-fold negative statement (οὐκ . . . οὐδέ . . . in *Pyth.* 3; οὔθ' . . . οὔτε . . . in *Pyth.* 9), followed by a clause, beginning with ἀλλά, which displays the real character of each girl: Coronis' vain love for what was not proper for her (3.19-20) and Cyrene's worth, caring for her father's flocks (9.20-23).

The second strophes continue the parallel development of the stories of Coronis and Cyrene, for it is at this point that Apollo discovers the true nature of each: in 3.25-27 he learns of Coronis' sinful union with Ischys, and in 9.26-28 he observes Cyrene boldly wrestling with a lion. However, the manner in which this contrast is presented is important primarily in connection with Pindar's treatment of Apollo, rather than for presenting the different characters of the two mortal women. In *Pyth.* 3, Apollo is a sternly punitive god, who relents in his anger against Coronis only enough to save their child Asclepius by taking him from his mother's body as she lay on her funeral pyre. In *Pyth.* 9, though, he is throughout a genial figure, who appears gentle with Cyrene and talks pleasantly, if not indeed jestingly, with

Chiron. The contrast between 3.27-32 and 9.30-37 (conclusion of the second strophe and beginning of the following antistrophe in both poems) is particularly striking. In this section of *Pyth.* 3, Pindar quietly but strongly insists upon Apollo's all-seeing knowledge: by his own mind, which knows all, he learned of Coronis' association with Ischys. In *Pyth.* 9, though, Pindar's picture of Apollo is far less serious, and the god's words to Chiron must certainly be facetious, since he appears to be actually ignorant of his own omniscience: he asks Chiron who Cyrene is, and whether it is right for him to lay his hand upon her. To be sure, Chiron promptly reminds Apollo that he in fact knows even how many leaves there are in the spring, etc. (lines 42-49), but this scarcely effaces the earlier presumption of ignorance which appears from the god's own words in the poem.

Pindar's presentation of Asclepius and Aristaeus in the third triads continues the contrast between the two myths. Both these sons of Apollo were benefactors of mankind. Asclepius, however, was tainted with his mother's restless temperament, and eventually sought what was beyond his proper grasp. After a long career of healing the sick, he finally brought back to life a man already dead; for thus trying to make man in effect immortal, he, and the man whom he had revived, were both struck down by Zeus (3.55-58, toward the middle of the third antistrophe). With Cyrene's son Aristaeus, Pindar deals in less detail, but there is clearly no hint of this sort of character in him. Though he was destined to be made immortal, this boon was granted in his infancy (9.62-63, again toward the middle of the third antistrophe);⁴ it must surely have been a free gift of the gods, not the result

⁴ The passage is generally punctuated as I have taken it, with a comma after ἀθάνατον (line 63), but Wilamowitz 267-68, note 4, punctuates before ἀθάνατον, thus taking the adjective with Ζῆνα. If this is correct, any explicit indication that Aristaeus is to be made immortal disappears from *Pyth.* 9 (even though he would still be called "an immortal Zeus"); however, this punctuation necessitates taking θήσονται in line 63 as the future of θήσθαι, "suckle" (cf. θρέψουσι, the paraphrase given in Scholion 113a). This future form appears to be otherwise unattested, and it would also be a bit unusual after the mention of Aristaeus' diet of nectar and ambrosia—a point which Wilamowitz acknowledges, referring (in English) to Gaea and the Horae as being "dry nurses." Consequently, θήσονται would seem to be best taken as the future of τήθημι, with ἀθάνατον as its complement (so Scholion 107 and also most modern scholars).

There is also one other, rather puzzling point to be noted in connection with this passage. The reference to Zeus and Apollo in 9.64 (third antistrophe) would seem

of any conscious endeavor on his part to disrupt the established order of life.

There are, I think, only two ways in which these numerous metrically corresponding points of connection between *Pyth.* 3 and *Pyth.* 9 can reasonably be explained. One possibility is that Pindar first wrote one of the two poems, with no thought of the other, and then later modeled the second poem on it; the other is that he wrote the two together, with the aim of making them mirror each other. Between these alternatives it is hard to choose (cf. note 9 below). But, whatever the particular circumstances were, it would appear that Pindar at some time intended a deliberate contrast between *Pyth.* 3 and 9.

Probably the most likely explanation is that *Pyth.* 3 and 9 were originally parts of one single day's or evening's performance. Although this idea appears not to have been previously suggested, it would nevertheless well explain certain unusual features about them which have long been recognized. First, it is the view of many scholars that *Pyth.* 9 was intended for a celebration at Thebes rather than for Telesicrates' return home to Cyrene. The mention of Theban heroes in lines 79–88, and in particular the reference to some vow to them in 89–89a, would seem to indicate that πόλιν τάνδ' in 91 is Thebes. Also, the future δέξεται in line 73 suggests that Telesicrates had not yet returned home when the poem was performed.⁵ It is of course easy to conjecture that Telesicrates remained in mainland Greece for a considerable length of time after his victory in the hoplite-race at Delphi in July or August of 474. For one thing, he may have wished

to be mirrored in 3.67 (third epode), where Pindar wishes that Chiron were able to provide some healer ἢ τινα Λατοῖδα κεκλημένον ἢ πατέρος, i.e. a son of Apollo or Zeus. However, the two passages do not correspond metrically, and it therefore seems better not to try to include them in our list of parallels. Possibly, if *Pyth.* 3 and *Pyth.* 9 were composed at roughly the same time, Pindar might unconsciously have produced a certain repetition in his phraseology, such as this, without any specific intent of doing so.

⁵ It has been fairly generally accepted that the poem was performed at Thebes. So it is suggested by Boeckh 2.2.321 and stated by Gaspar 110–12, Wilamowitz 265, Farnell 2.201, Bowra 143, and others. However, some scholars, e.g. Fränkel 505 and Burton 50–55, regard the poem as having been written for a performance at Cyrene. See also E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* = *Univ. of Cal. Publ. in Classical Philology* 18 (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1962) 1.18 and 21.

to compete in other, minor contests (such as the Iolacia at Thebes and the games at Megara and Aegina, which are mentioned in *Pyth.* 9.90-91);⁶ on an athletic tour of this sort, he would undoubtedly not have returned home to Cyrene between the various contests, if they were held within a month or so of each other. Yet, despite the plausibility of this, no parallel instance can readily be cited for Pindar's having written for a non-Theban victor a poem which was intended for presentation at Thebes.⁷ The other poem, *Pyth.* 3, is in a sense even more unusual. It does not celebrate any specific victory, but is instead a letter of consolation addressed to Hieron during some serious illness. In fact, it would seem to be an unsolicited letter, not a poem actually commissioned by Hieron. (He may, however, have sent word to Pindar at Thebes, asking him to return to Sicily and informing him of his illness; *Pyth.* 3 might then be considered Pindar's answer.) But, even if the poem was to some extent "commissioned," we may still ask ourselves what sort of performance it was meant for: Pindar could easily send the text of the poem to Hieron, but he could scarcely know whether or how the poem would be performed at Syracuse.⁸

⁶ So H. J. Rose, "Iolaos and the *Ninth Pythian Ode*," *CQ* 25 (1931) 158: "Telesicrates had come to Greece to take part in several athletic festivals." (However, Rose 159 takes the reference to Megara and Aegina as having to do with Pindar, and not Telesicrates.)

⁷ Burton 50-51.

⁸ The unusual nature of *Pyth.* 3 is recognized by the Scholiasts (inscr. a and b), who appear to assume that the poem was written quite some time after the victories which it mentions; cf. Bennett 64-65. Various theories have been advanced to explain just how the poem came to be written; perhaps the most attractive is that of Wilamowitz 280-85, according to whom *Pyth.* 3 is a kind of *recusatio* ("Absagebrief," p. 282); cf. Wilamowitz' "Isyllos von Epidauros," *Philologische Untersuchungen* 9 (Berlin 1886) 61-62 and his "Hieron und Pindaros," *SPAW* (Berlin 1901) 1298. However, F. Klingner, *Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Zürich and Stuttgart 1964) 80-85 rejects this idea, stating that Pindar knew simply of Hieron's illness and his suffering and hopes—no more. In any event, I cannot agree with Wilamowitz' notion that *Pyth.* 3 was not intended for performance (suggested, if not stated, by him in *Pindaros*, 280). To be sure, there is no mention in *Pyth.* 3 of the musical accompaniment, but its meter is far more appropriate to choral performance than as a work merely to be read. Cf. Christ xcvi: "nullum, ne epistolari quidem carmine P. III excepto, ad legendum solum destinaret," and W. Schmid and O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Munich 1929) 1.1.576: "Die Versmasse zeigen, dass alle Gedichte zum Chorvortrag bestimmt waren" (emphasis in original). But cf. also Schmid-Stählin's note 6 to this statement just quoted, along with their p. 456, note 2.

These two unusual poems are, I should like to suggest, complementary to each other: the occasion for the performance of *Pyth.* 3 was originally provided by the celebration at Thebes of Telesicrates' Pythian victory. During his extended stay in Greece, Telesicrates may himself have asked Pindar to write for him a poem which could be performed at Thebes, or the whole thing may have been organized on Pindar's own initiative, so as to provide a suitable occasion for the presentation of *Pyth.* 3. In either event, there would be at least one reason readily at hand for combining Hieron's poem with Telesicrates': both had been Pythian victors.

Besides justifying the various resemblances between *Pyth.* 3 and 9, this reconstruction of their première performance also provides an answer for a problem which has long puzzled commentators. This is the fact that *Pyth.* 3 mentions Hieron's long-past victories at Delphi which took place in 482 and 478, but makes no reference to his more recent, and more notable, Olympic victory of 476. Indeed, Pindar's silence in this matter is sufficiently noteworthy that some scholars have concluded that the poem must date from before the Olympic competition in 476. However, all the other evidence suggests a later date (cf. note 1 above). This is of course quite reasonable if we regard *Pyth.* 3 as having formed part of a celebration primarily honoring Telesicrates: under such circumstances it would be inappropriate to mention Hieron's victory at Olympia, since Telesicrates had never won there.⁹

⁹ It might appear that (1) if *Pyth.* 3 dates from after the founding of Aetna in 476 (cf. above, note 1) and (2) if it was intended to be performed with *Pyth.* 9, then both poems can be securely dated in 474. We would thus have here one small additional point in favor of the system of dating the Pythian odes which is now generally followed. Both in the title of this paper and throughout its text I have accepted this conclusion and all the chronological particulars implied by it. However, if Boeckh's date of 478 for the 28th Pythiad should after all prove to be correct (cf. above, note 1 and also below, note 23), the theory of a joint performance of *Pyth.* 9 and *Pyth.* 3 does not necessarily fall. This earlier date for 9 would of course mean that it was written long before 3, and that the similarities in the two poems are entirely due to Pindar's having later modeled 3 on 9. It would also mean that *Pyth.* 9 must have been presented at least twice at Thebes, once in 478, and again when *Pyth.* 3 was performed. Such a repetition may seem implausible, but it is nonetheless suggested by one curious point in the Scholia. According to inscr. a to *Pyth.* 9, Telesicrates won in the 28th Pythiad, and again in the stadion-race in the 30th Pythiad, "but Pindar does not appear to mention this victory, perhaps because he had previously written for the 28th Pythiad" (οὐ

Their first performance at Thebes need not of course have been the only one for either poem. *Pyth.* 9 at least was probably presented again when Telesicrates returned home to Cyrene; for a fairly close parallel, cf. *Olym.* 6, which was performed first at Stymphalus, and then a second time at Syracuse.¹⁰ For this poem, Pindar seems to have directed his attention primarily to its presentation at Stymphalus; in particular, the optative *δέξαιτο* in line 98, referring to the reception of Hagesias' festive celebration upon its arrival in Syracuse, would be more suitable from the point of view of its first performance.¹¹ Likewise, the future *δέξεται* in *Pyth.* 9.73 and the references to Thebes in lines 79–92 would both be more specifically appropriate to the poem's première than to a performance at Cyrene.

Pyth. 3, on the other hand, may never have been sung except at Thebes; at least, Pindar cannot very well have known whether or not Hieron would arrange for its performance at Syracuse. In fact, the notably single-minded development of Pindar's theme in this poem—everything in it is turned toward the consolation of Hieron in his illness¹²—may well be due to the fact that it was written more for presentation before Telesicrates and an audience gathered to honor him than for Hieron. For such a group, Pindar may have felt that the theme of *Pyth.* 3 should be stated more plainly and more clearly

φαίνεται δὲ ὁ Πίνδαρος ταύτης τῆς νίκης μνημονεύων, ἴσως ὅτι φθάσας τῆς ἐικοστῆς ὀγδόης ἔγραψε.) Although this statement has been generally disregarded, there may yet be something to it; in any event, it appears that the Scholiast thought that *Pyth.* 9 was performed after the *second* of Telesicrates' victories, even though the poem makes no mention of this. Possibly it was originally presented in 478 and later revived in 470, at which time *Pyth.* 3 (but, it would seem, no new poem for Telesicrates) was also performed. This later date may in fact be preferable for *Pyth.* 3, if the seriousness which this poem assigns to Hieron's illness is inappropriate for 474. Cf. R. Lattimore, *The Odes of Pindar* (Chicago 1947) 154: "the illness spoken of in *Pythia I* . . . has become hopeless." (*Pyth.* 1 dates from the 29th Pythiad, i.e. four years after the victory for which *Pyth.* 9 was written, four years before Telesicrates' second victory at Delphi.)

¹⁰ *Olym.* 6.97–100. For the two different performances of the poem, cf. Gildersleeve 171; G. Norwood, *Pindar* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1945) 127; and A. Puech, *Pindare, Olympiques* (Paris 1958) 76.

¹¹ In fact, some commentators speak only of this first performance of *Olym.* 6, and not of its projected repetition at Syracuse (even though Pindar's words *δέξαιτο κῶμον* make this quite clear). So Gaspar 137–38, Wilamowitz 307, and Farnell 2.40.

¹² Cf. Burton 78: "It is not often in his poems that Pindar reveals so clearly a single unifying line of thought."

than in the usual epinician ode, for which the audience would be well acquainted with the victor.

If *Pyth.* 3 and 9 were presented as part of the same program, one of them must have been sung before the other. The first poem was, I believe, *Pyth.* 9. It would be appropriate to give Telesicrates' poem the more important place on the program, since the celebration at Thebes must have been primarily in his honor. Under such circumstances, the modern tendency might well be to place *Pyth.* 9 last, but Pindar's feeling (and that of his audience) would probably have been that it belonged first; cf. the great importance which he attaches to the prooemium in his individual poems as being the point of highest interest (as in *Olym.* 6.1 ff.). The way in which Chiron is dealt with in the introductory section of *Pyth.* 3 also indicates this order. For one thing, any mention at all of Chiron in *Pyth.* 3 seems somewhat contrived. If Pindar wants a healer for Hieron, it would surely be more direct for him to wish for Asclepius than for Asclepius' teacher; the indirect form of expression in *Pyth.* 3.1-5 therefore seems a purposeful link with the other poem, in which the Centaur is an important figure. The connection with *Pyth.* 9 would, however, scarcely be viable for the audience unless this poem came first. With this order, the two words *Ἡθελον Χίρωνα* with which *Pyth.* 3 opens would clearly recall *Pyth.* 9, but if *Pyth.* 9 had not yet been performed, this would of course not be the case. Furthermore, the lively presentation of Chiron in *Pyth.* 9 makes more poignant the aura of resignation, which is so clear in *Pyth.* 3, that he belongs to some era long past; if he had not previously been treated in detail, the audience would not feel so strongly the immediacy of Pindar's wish that Chiron were still alive.

Additional parallels between *Pyth.* 9 and 3 appear at the end of the third triads. Besides the fact that Pindar at this point returns to the theme of the beginning of the poem (*Pyth.* 9: mention of Telesicrates in lines 71 ff. as in lines 1-4; *Pyth.* 3: wish that Chiron were alive in lines 63 ff. as in lines 1-5), there is also one other rather curious point which I have not yet mentioned. In 9.73-75 Pindar states that Cyrene will joyously receive Telesicrates when he brings glory home from Delphi. In the metrically corresponding section of *Pyth.* 3 (lines 68-69), there is again the idea of a voyage to distant parts—in this instance to Syracuse. If these two passages formed an isolated example, one

would scarcely imagine any connection between them; however, in view of the close association of the two poems, this parallel may also be intentional.

The connection between *Pyth.* 9 and 3 is also continued in their fourth triads, in one quite striking correlation. In 9.79–83 (conclusion of the fourth strophe), we learn how Iolaus once did not neglect *καῖρός*; nay, when his youthful vigor was briefly restored to him, he used the time given to him to kill Eurystheus (and thus save Heracles' children).¹³ In *Pyth.* 3, the metrically corresponding section (lines 72–76) forms the only fully explicit expression in the poem of Pindar's wish that he could restore health to Hieron. The audience hearing this passage could not, I think, fail to recall the corresponding lines in *Pyth.* 9, if they had heard these lines just a half hour or so before. First of all, if Pindar were able to bring health to Hieron, this would certainly be a kind of rejuvenation, like Iolaus' brief return to his youthful vigor. The reference in 3.73–74 to Hieron's past victories would also recall the other story, both because Iolaus had been victorious over Eurystheus, and because the presence of this story in *Pyth.* 9 is

¹³ Pindar does not say just how Iolaus came to kill Eurystheus, but I believe that he has in mind the same story as appears in Euripides, *Heracleidae* 849–53. Scholion 137a, however, first presents another version, according to which Iolaus was already dead and was briefly restored to life; the Scholiast then goes on to say that it is more plausible that Iolaus, though aged, was still living. Cf. Puech 127, note 2, who also opts for this account.

Another doubtful point is the reference of *νῦν* in line 80. I have taken the pronoun in the same way as did the Scholiasts (137b and 138) and most modern scholars up to and including Wilamowitz in *Pindaros* 264, viz. with *καῖρός* in line 78 as its antecedent (*νῦν* may be either the subject or the object of ἀνυπόσπαρα). Recently, though, the feeling has grown that we should take *νῦν* as referring to Telesicrates, mentioned in lines 71–75. So, in fact, Wilamowitz in his article in *SPAW* 1901 (above, note 8) 1291, along with Schroeder 85–86, Fränkel 505, Rose (above, note 6) 158, and Bundy (above, note 5) 1.17, note 42. That Telesicrates won in the Iolaia is undoubtedly correct (so Scholion 156a, commenting on lines 89–89a; cf. below, p. 196); however, *καῖρός* is far closer to *νῦν* than is any reference to Telesicrates. Furthermore, this interpretation of *Pyth.* 9.78–80 finds a close parallel in *Pyth.* 4.286–87; cf. L. R. Farnell in an addendum to his "Note" on Rose's article, *CQ* 25 (1931) 164: "here again a general aphorism about *καῖρός* is followed by a special statement about it containing *νῦν* = *καῖρόν*, and the later passage [*Pyth.* 4.286–87] sounds like an echo of the earlier." To be sure, the sense of "fitting moment" for *καῖρός* may be un-Pindaric (so Fränkel 509–10, note 14, and Bundy [above, note 5] 1.18, note 44), but the sense of "fitting or proper amount" will work just as well, if not better, in *Pyth.* 9.78–80: only a brief time was granted to Iolaus, but it was sufficient to enable him to kill Eurystheus.

probably motivated by Telesicrates' victory in the Iolacia.¹⁴ Actually, the restoration of Iolaus' youth is not explicitly mentioned in *Pyth.* 9 (Pindar speaks only of his slaying Eurystheus and his subsequent burial), but this is no argument against connecting the corresponding section of *Pyth.* 3 with this account. In fact, the allusive nature of Pindar's words in *Pyth.* 9 may well be deliberate. Since the story is incompletely told here, the audience would be left with an uneasy feeling concerning it: what exactly did Pindar mean, and why should its most striking point, viz. Iolaus' rejuvenation, be omitted? With such a feeling, the audience would, I submit, subconsciously expect some explanation, and, when *Pyth.* 3 was performed, would therefore all the more readily connect the metrically corresponding passages in the two poems.

Their fourth strophes appear to form the culmination of the parallelism between metrically corresponding sections in *Pyth.* 9 and 3. At least, I have been unable to find any similarly close correlation in the remainders of the poems. This therefore seems an appropriate point to summarize our results in tabular form; so as to emphasize the metrical correlation between the two poems, I have cited (p. 193) the various passages in terms of their position within individual metrical units, e.g. 1.2.3 = first triad, second section (antistrophe), third line.

It is clear from this chart that the connections between *Pyth.* 9 and *Pyth.* 3 appear in two clusters, one running from the beginning of each poem into the second antistrophe (9.1-37 and 3.1-32), and the other from the middle of the third antistrophe through the fourth strophe (9.62-83 and 3.55-76). The greater degree of connection between the two initial sections is of course natural: in their actual performance, the similarities of the two poems would thus be established from the very beginning of the second poem, *Pyth.* 3. The other set of contrasts would also seem to have a specific motivation: they are primarily connected with the idea that Pindar cannot get a healer for Hieron. This

¹⁴ The appearance of *ποτέ* in 3.74 may also be significant—not indeed as a direct echo of 9.79, for although *ποτέ* is used there too, it is a relatively colorless word, and would probably not attract the audience's attention. This adverb is of course appropriate in 3.74, since Pindar is here referring to victories which were won considerably before the present poem, but it is generally used of the mythic past by Pindar (cf. Burton 49), and its use in *Pyth.* 3 may therefore be a means of placing Hieron's accomplishments in the same general sphere of reference as the story of Iolaus in *Pyth.* 9.

Pythian 9

- 1.1.1. 'Εθέλω, simple statement that Pindar wishes to celebrate Telesicrates.
 1.1.5. Mount Pelion.
 1.1.6. ἀγοτέραν.
 1.2.1-3. Aphrodite welcomes Cyrene.
 1.3.2-3. Cyrene rejects the pursuits of her age-mates.
 1.3.4-7. Instead, she cared for her father's flocks.
 2.1.5.-2.2.4. Apollo asks Chiron who Cyrene is.
 3.2.4-5. Aristaeus is to be granted immortality.
 3.3.5-6. Mention again of Telesicrates.
 3.3.7-9. Cyrene will receive Telesicrates.
 4.1.4-9. Story of Iolaus.

Pythian 3

- 1.1.1. "Ηθέλον, contrary-to-fact wish that Chiron were alive.
 1.1.4. Mount Pelion.
 1.1.4. ἀγοτέρον.
 1.2.2-4. Artemis punishes Coronis.
 1.3.2-5. Coronis did not wait for her age-mates to sing at her marriage.
 1.3.5-6. Instead, she sought what she should not.
 2.1.4.-2.2.2. Omniscient Apollo discovers Coronis' sin.
 3.2.2-5. Asclepius attempts to revive a dead man.
 3.3.3-7. Return to the wish that Chiron were still alive.
 3.3.8-9. Pindar would travel to Syracuse.
 4.1.3-7. Pindar wishes to bring both health and a victory-song.

idea is at least latent in the contrasting stories of Aristaeus and Asclepius, and it appears also in the contrast between the two projected voyages from Thebes. Its most compelling statement, however, is undoubtedly in the fourth strophes. Just as Pindar absolutely cannot come to Syracuse with health for Hieron, so also Iolaus' rejuvenation was most impermanent: after his success in battle against Eurystheus, he died and was buried beside the tomb of his grandfather Amphytrion (9.81-83). With this mythic parallel before them, the audience which heard *Pyth.* 3 would realize that any relief for Hieron from his sickness would undoubtedly be similarly evanescent; this of course makes very natural Pindar's change at this point to a new theme, viz. the prayer to the Mother of the Gods in lines 77-79.

For the remainders of *Pyth.* 9 and 3, one can indeed note some vague similarity in the topics which they treat, but the parallelism is in no way as detailed as that which we have thus far considered. For example, a cursory glance through the fourth triads reveals that both

contain references to some vow or prayer (9.89–89a, 3.77–78) and to the wisdom of the past (9.93–96, 3.80–82). However, both prayers and gnomic advice are common enough in Pindar, and neither of these in the one poem bears much resemblance to its “counterpart” in the other. Furthermore, the metrical correlation here is not nearly as close as it is for all of the previously considered examples.¹⁵ The concluding sections are similarly unencouraging to the searcher after parallels, for although both deal with marriage (9.103–25, in connection with Telesicrates’ ancestor Alexibiades; 3.86–95, in connection with the heroes Peleus and Cadmus), there is again no particular metrical correlation between these two passages. Consequently, it appears that Pindar chose not to extend the close correlation of *Pyth.* 9 and *Pyth.* 3 beyond their fourth strophes. Probably he wished only to emphasize certain points (such as the Iolaus story and its implications) through a particular comparison between the two poems, and he may well have felt that any more extensive metrical corresponsion would connect them in too mechanical a fashion.¹⁶

On page 186 above, I assumed that the words πόλιν τάνδ’ in 9.91 refer to Thebes, and that the way in which this city was honored (εὐκλεΐξαι) at Megara and Aegina was through Telesicrates’ victories. These assumptions require further comment. I should like to begin by mentioning a notable passage in Boeckh’s introduction to his commentary on Pindar, in which he briefly mentions *Pyth.* 9.76–103, indicating that he may have been wrong in the conclusions which appeared in print in this volume. His second thoughts on the matter

¹⁵ The reference to prayer in *Pyth.* 9 comes toward the end of the fourth antistrophe (4.2.6–7), while in *Pyth.* 3 it is right at the beginning (4.2.1–2); the gnomic references are not even in the same major metrical division (epode in *Pyth.* 9, antistrophe in *Pyth.* 3).

¹⁶ However, there may be other, more subtle connections, involving not individual passages in the two poems, but rather their overall patterns. I have in mind particularly an observation made by Fränkel 511, note 20. He points out that the beginning or middle of each antistrophe in *Pyth.* 9 has to do with love or marriage (1.2.4–5, 2.2.3–4, 3.2.1–5, 4.2.1–3, and 5.2.1–3). The corresponding sections of *Pyth.* 3 are likewise connected among themselves, for they all deal with either the gods’ punishment or, more generally, their treatment of mortals (1.2.1–4 and 2.2.2–4, punishment of Coronis; 3.2.4–5 punishment of Asclepius; 4.2.4–6, the gods give to mortals two griefs for every joy; and 5.2.4–5, one must live as the gods allow). Perhaps the similarity of these two patterns would have been clearer to the original audience than to us, for these patterns may have been reflected in the now lost music or choreography; they may therefore have formed an additional connection between *Pyth.* 9 and 3.

arose from a perusal of Thiersch's edition of Pindar (which had then just appeared), wherein *Pyth.* 9.97–103 was explained as a section sung in the chorus' own person, rather than in Pindar's. This interpretation is indicated by Scholion 172, and Boeckh too, following the Scholiasts, had originally considered the possibility that various different *personae* are represented in 9.76–103; although he had rejected this interpretation in the form which his commentary eventually took, he states that he may have been wrong in doing so, in view of Thiersch's espousal of the same sort of thing.¹⁷ To be sure, neither Boeckh nor anyone else appears to have subsequently followed up this idea in any detail.¹⁸

¹⁷ Boeckh 2.2.10–11 (the commentary is dated 1821) and F. Thiersch, *Pindarus Werke* (Leipzig 1820) 1.1.147–49; cf. Thiersch's discussion of this passage in his commentary, 1.2.309–10. Boeckh's comments, which are in the form of an address to his colleague, are, I believe worth quoting in some detail (p. 11): "Quippe quum me in Pindaricis nexus sententiarum haud uno loco torqueret, in Pythio carmine nono versanti mihi oblata est suspicio, non omnia ex eadem persona dicta esse, idque in vs. 79 [= 76] sqq. qui a Thebano videbantur cantati esse, atque iterum vs. 107 [= 103]. Deinde coepi etiam alia considerare, partim eadem, de quibus tu dixisti; mox quum mihi res impedita videretur, hanc suspicionem pressi prope invitatus, et contrariam rationem amplexus omnia a poeta dicta iudicavi, sive per chorum sive per singulos, idque subinde significavi. . . . Nec tuam hac de re sententiam falsam pronuncio, quod similem opinionem reliquisse me profiteor; quis enim nescit, quoties in rebus difficilibus huc illuc animum appellentes, quae vera sint, etiamsi menti obversata fuerint, omittamus? Immo siquis alius tale quid dixerit, minus id repudiare audeo, quam ubi solus repererim." Besides *Pyth.* 9.97–103, Thiersch also discusses (1.1.143–51) five other passages in terms of a division between different speakers or manners of performance, viz. *Pyth.* 1.1–5, 5.72ff., 11 (entire poem); *Nem.* 1.19–24, and 7.85. It is interesting to note that *Pyth.* 11, the only poem for the entirety of which he presents a (quite conjectural) reconstruction of its original *personae*, was also performed at Thebes, possibly in the same year as *Pyth.* 9. (A very likely date for *Pyth.* 11 is the 28th Pythiad.) Although Thiersch's analysis of this poem (1.1.144–46) is not fully convincing, his choice of it may not be completely coincidental: perhaps for a hometown audience, such as that which heard *Pyth.* 11 and *Pyth.* 9, Pindar would have allowed himself a greater freedom than usual in presenting clearly distinct *personae* within an individual poem.

¹⁸ In general, modern scholars have held that the *Epinicia* were throughout sung in Pindar's person. See e.g. Boeckh 2.2.314, Mommsen 10–12, and Christ xcvi, along with M. R. Lefkowitz, "*Τῶ καὶ ἐγώ*: The First Person in Pindar," *HSCP* 67 (1963) 225–37. In fact, in some of the standard works on Pindar, the impossibility of any dialogue between different *personae* is such a deep-seated assumption that the question is either not considered at all, or is dismissed without discussion. So e.g. Wilamowitz 7: "Thiersch verirrt sich so weit, eine Verteilung der Lieder auf Chor und Chorführer vorzunehmen"; cf. his treatment of *Pyth.* 9 (pp. 263–70), where not a word is said about the possibility of such an interpretation of this poem. On the other hand, some shift between different speakers is admitted or implied by, besides Thiersch, F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (Berlin 1921) 81–85, E. Thummer, *Die Religiosität Pindars* (Innsbruck 1957) 32, Fränkel 485, note 2, and 543, note 12, Bundy (above, note 5) 1.18, note 43, and

Nevertheless, it seems to me to be worthy of further consideration. In lines 89–89a, someone says that because of a vow he will celebrate the ancient heroes of Thebes. According to Scholion 156b, these lines are spoken by the victor: *ὁ λόγος παρὰ τοῦ ὑμνουμένου πρὸς τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ Ἰφικλέα*; nor does any specifically contrary opinion regarding these lines appear in the Scholia (although such may be implied by the third-person reference to the victor in Scholion 156a: *τὰ Ἰολαεῖα ἐνίκησεν ὁ νικηφόρος*). Next, lines 89a–90 in Pindar's text express the wish that the Charites may not forsake the speaker. The only Scholion on this passage is 158, which refers to "my" writing (*γένειτό μοι χαρίεντα γράφειν*); presumably the Scholiast means that the speaker here is Pindar. Then, in lines 90–92, we learn that at Aegina and Megara the speaker has honored this city thrice. According to Scholion 161, this passage is in Telesicrates' person; however, the preceding comment, Scholion 160, fairly clearly suggests that someone other than the victor is the speaker here.¹⁹ The next section (93–96) then states that, in view of this accomplishment, one should be sure to praise even one's enemies; the Scholiasts make no explicit comment regarding the speaker here, though Scholion 164 perhaps suggests that Telesicrates is *not* the speaker.²⁰ Lastly, 97–103 give us a listing of various of Telesicrates' victories; according to Scholion 172, the passage is spoken by the chorus to the victor (*ὁ δὲ λόγος ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ πρὸς τὸν νικήσαντα*).

Even aside from their probable disagreement concerning lines 90–92, the Scholiasts' various explanations of *Pyth.* 9.89–103 are not in

2.69–70, and A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern and Munich 1963) 217. See also my article, "The Performance of Pindar, *Pythian* 8.55–70," *GRBS* 6 (1965) 187–200. One might also mention Gildersleeve 255–56 and 265–67, and Farnell 2.131–32, who interpret *Pyth.* 2.72–96 in terms of more than one speaker; however, Farnell 132 explicitly regards this passage as an isolated example, "such as is found nowhere else in Pindar."

¹⁹ Scholion 161 is fully explicit (*ὁ δὲ λόγος ἀπὸ τοῦ νικηφόρου*), while Scholion 160 begins thus: *διορίζομαι γὰρ τὸν νικηφόρον... ταύτην τὴν πόλιν εὐκλεῖα καταστήσαι*; however, the situation with regard to Scholion 160 is complicated by the fact that this comment goes on to include a nominative form *ἐκφυγών*, which must refer to Telesicrates. Apparently the Scholiast here had in mind a construction like that of Homer, *Iliad* 2.350 ff. (So Boeckh 1.498 and 2.2.327 interprets both Pindar's text and the Scholiast.)

²⁰ This Scholion refers to the victor in the third person, as follows: *εἴτε τις αὐτῷ τῷ νικηφόρῳ φίλος... ἐστι, κτλ.*

themselves fully convincing, since they give no indication of how these rapid changes of speaker between one passage and another could be made clear to the audience. Nevertheless, some definite method may well underlie their apparently random comments; I would suggest that the following, relatively complex, pattern of speakers is the most probable:

87(?)–89a (<i>κωφός</i> . . . <i>ἑσλόν</i>)	victor (so Scholion 156b)
89a–90 (<i>Χαρίτων</i> . . . <i>φέγγος</i>)	poet (so Scholion 158)
90–94 (<i>Αἰγίνα</i> . . . <i>κρυπτέτω</i>)	victor (so Scholion 161)
95–96 (<i>κεῖνος</i> . . . <i>ἔννεπεν</i>)	poet
97–103 (<i>πλεῖστα</i> . . . <i>ἐπιχωρίοις</i>)	chorus (so Scholion 172)
103–105(?) (<i>ἐμέ</i> . . . <i>προγόνων</i>)	poet

What justification, if any, does Pindar's text offer for this scheme? In particular, what justification does it offer for the idea that some half-dozen or so lines are sung in Telesicrates' person? That at least lines 90–92 refer to his victories is certainly reasonable, for the statement that someone has given a city good fame at Aegina and Megara would be more appropriate to an athletic context than to anything else.²¹ If the infinitive *εὐκλείξει* of the manuscript text (91) is correct, the Scholiast's interpretation then appears necessary: the subject of this infinitive must be the same as the subject of the first person verb *φάμι*.²² But how could Telesicrates be said to honor Thebes? The answer, I believe, is that he had made this city his base of operations in mainland Greece in 474, going from there to compete at Delphi

²¹ Cf. Schroeder 86–87, Fränkel 510, and Burton 52–53.

²² Of course the Scholiast need not have had any independent evidence regarding the performance of this section, but may instead have drawn his conclusion exactly as I have from Pindar's text. Perhaps as a result of this possibility, coupled with the different interpretation which we find in Scholion 160, his view has been generally disregarded, except by Bundy (above, note 5) 1.18, note 43, who states that in lines 89–89a we have the "language, here quoted, of Telesikrates' prayer." For example, Boeckh, following Scholion 160 (see above, note 19) concluded, albeit with some hesitation, that the nominative form *φυγών* in line 92 stands, by a harsh enallage, for *φυγόντα*; he is thereby relieved of the necessity of taking Telesicrates himself as the speaker here. This interpretation has not, however, been generally followed. Another way out is by emendation, either to *εὐκλείξει* (Pauw) or to *εὐκλείξας* (Hermann); the latter is followed by Schroeder 86, Fränkel 505 and 510, and Burton 54. Still others have kept the manuscript text, but refer it to Pindar's having praised Thebes in poems performed at Aegina and Megara, e.g. Wilamowitz 265–66 and 269, Farnell 2.208, and Bowra 143–44.

and in various other contests. Since the Thebans at this time must still have been held in ill repute for their Medism of a few years back, a foreign athlete's choice of their city over others might therefore be considered a particular honor—especially so if he proved victorious at Aegina, which had greatly distinguished itself in the war.²³ Yet, however much Telesicrates' accomplishments might honor Thebes, Pindar would probably be unwilling to state openly that Thebes thus stood in need of a foreigner to honor her. Telesicrates himself, though, could very well be represented as stating his friendship for Thebes in these terms.²⁴ It would of course not be necessary for him actually to sing in the performance. Instead, the chorus could pretend that they were he, or just a part of the chorus or one individual member could do so. Any such proceeding would undoubtedly be unusual, but the half-jesting tone which such a mimesis of the victor would give to this section would be fully in keeping with the light-hearted nature of the poem as a whole.

Both from Scholion 156b and from their content, lines 89–89a would also appear to have been sung in Telesicrates' person; however, it is difficult to say just where this section begins. Probably it is either in line 84 (where Alcmena's twin sons are first mentioned) or in line 87 (where their special prominence is referred to). On the other hand, lines 89a–90, with their mention of the Charites, are surely in Pindar's person (so Scholion 158), while Telesicrates resumes as the speaker in lines 90 ff. The simple mechanics of the performance seem clear enough. Lines 89a–90 must have been sung by a different member of the chorus from the singer or singers who sang the preceding and following sections: probably the chorus-leader sang this passage, since it seems a plausible and easily understood convention that he should represent the poet. (It is of course possible, though perhaps unlikely, that Pindar himself appeared in the performance

²³ The argument would be neater if Telesicrates' own city Cyrene had fought against the Persians; however, any philo-Theban foreigner could be said to honor Thebes by victories at Aegina and Megara. My argument might also appear stronger if fewer than five years had passed since the siege of Thebes. The point is not, however, a major one, and we cannot press it as an indication of a date in 478 for *Pyth.* 9.

²⁴ Likewise Pindar's feelings as a Theban probably explain the fact that in *Pyth.* 8.56–60 the joyful reference to Alcmaeon (who sacked Thebes) is expressed, not as a statement by the poet himself, but rather in the person of the Aeginetan victor Aristomenes. Cf. my article (above, note 18) 198–99.

and sang this and certain other passages.) The meaning of the two sections sung in Telesicrates' person would also seem to be sufficiently clear. He is now celebrating certain Theban heroes, in fulfilment of a vow that he would do so if they granted him victory in the games at Thebes.²⁵ This vow (89–89a) he then goes on to justify by explaining that he had previously honored Thebes at Megara and Aegina (90–92), i.e. he was not really an outside “intruder” from Cyrene, but rather a kind of Theban himself: it was therefore fully appropriate for him to pray to the local heroes to grant him a victory at Thebes. But what then is the function of Pindar's one-line wish, *Χαρίτων . . . φέγγος*, which stands between the mention of the vow and its explanation? For one thing, it clearly puts Pindar's own approval on Telesicrates' vow to praise Heracles and the other heroes: he wishes to help him fulfill it, and hopes that the inspiration of the Charites will not fail him in this task. Also, this section serves to make it clear that Telesicrates is the speaker in the immediately preceding and following lines. Both of these sections must, in view of their content, have an individual reference, but whether they were sung by the entire chorus, by a few members of it, or by one individual, one might ordinarily assume (as have nearly all modern scholars) that the first person in them refers to the poet. However, if this part of the poem also contained a quite distinct solo passage, clearly referring to Pindar, it would immediately be clear that the speaker in lines 89–89a and 90 ff. is not he, but someone else, i.e. Telesicrates.

²⁵ Scholion 156a refers this vow to the Iolaia, while Scholion 156b calls these games the Heracleia; their particular nomenclature does not, perhaps, make much difference. Wilamowitz 265, however, feels that the reference in lines 89–89a may be to Telesicrates' Pythian victory (he regards the speaker here as being Pindar), while Schroeder 85–86, Rose (above, note 6) 158–59, and Burton 49–50, though agreeing that Telesicrates was indeed victorious in the Iolaia, regard lines 79–80 as the only explicit reference to this in the poem, and take 89–89a as referring to Pindar.

In any event, the future form *κωμάσομαι* most probably refers to the present celebration; it is thus quite different from the actually future reference of *δέξεται* in line 73. For a similar use of the future in connection with a celebration, so as to express the eagerness of the subject to praise someone, cf. *Olym.* 2.92, 6.21, 7.16 and 20; and *Nem.* 9.1—all of them first-person forms, unlike *δέξεται*. (Several of these examples, along with a number of others, are cited by Bundy [above, note 5] 1.21–22 in support, partly, of a present sense for *δέξεται* in *Pyth.* 9.73; however, the only other non-first-person form which he mentions is *μαρτυρήσει* in *Olym.* 13.108, which I believe is really future in reference: “[if you wish to learn how many victories they won in Arcadia], to this the lord of Lykaion will bear witness.”)

No definite indication appears in the Scholia concerning the speaker in lines 93–96, which deal with the advice of the Old Man of the Sea. However, this section fits into its context far better if divided between two individuals than if considered as a single unit. Despite a possible contrary indication in Scholion 164 (above, note 20), lines 93–94 seem most likely to form a continuation of the section sung in the victor's person: because (*οὔνεκεν*) he has brought good fame to their city, the citizens of Thebes, whether friend or foe, should honor him for what he has done in their behalf. Such a request, so stated, would be fully appropriate for a foreigner, whose position in the city would of necessity be somewhat unsure. Also, though the possibility is suggested that the speaker may have enemies at Thebes, the word which is used is the relatively mild term *ἀντράεις*. In 95–96, however, the word *ἐχθρόν*, which must connote hatred, is used instead. If we take this passage directly with 93–94, the suggestion is then inevitable that Telesicrates had *ἐχθροί* at Thebes. This seems most inappropriate in a poem whose object is his praise. On the other hand, if there are here two different speakers, 95–96 would be felt simply as an alternative statement of the general idea of 93–94, and there would be no suggestion that what is said here applies specifically to Telesicrates' case. Furthermore, these two lines would also serve as a kind of "buffer" passage to ease the relatively sharp transition from 90–94, in which the chorus, or some part of it, speaks in Telesicrates' person, to 97 ff., in which the chorus addresses him.²⁶

Lines 89–98 constitute the only section in *Pyth.* 9 for which the Scholiasts give any clear indication of any changes from one speaker to another.

²⁶ Cf. my article (above, note 18) 196 for a discussion of *Pyth.* 8.67–69, another short solo passage with a similar transitional function. The change in person between *Pyth.* 9.90–94 and 97 ff. would of course be even easier if (as is quite likely) just a part of the chorus imitates the victor, while the entire chorus sings lines 97 ff.

According to Thiersch (above, note 17) 1.1.148, line 98 contains in the word *εἶδον* a specific first-person statement by the Cyrenaean chorus. However, there is no need to take Scholion 172 thus (it states simply *ὁ δὲ λόγος ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ πρὸς τὸν νικήσαντα*), and it is far more likely that Pindar intended *εἶδον* as a third person plural (as is implied by the plural participle *ὀρώσαι* in Scholion 173); the construction would be somewhat unbalanced if both the participle *νικάσαντα* and a clause introduced by *ὥς* depend on *εἶδον*, while it is quite natural to translate *εἶδον ἄφωνοί θ' ὥς ἕκασται* as "they saw you and speechless they, each in her own way, . . . prayed, etc."; for *ὥς ἕκασται*, cf. Burton 57, who translates these two words as follows: "according to their individual wishes or condition."

This is also probably the only part of the poem for which such changes are important for our understanding of the bare meaning of Pindar's text. However, if these lines were in fact divided between different speakers, it is extremely likely that an analogous, non-significant alternation between different types of performance extended through the entire poem. One can in fact make some fairly plausible conjectures concerning it. Thiersch, for example, concluded that the choral section which begins in line 97 extends through 103, and that a solo voice, representing Pindar, picks up there with the statement that someone (Telesicrates) wishes him to sing of his ancestors.²⁷ This analysis of the passage, though perhaps unprovable, does certainly seem likely, for it would be most appropriate for Pindar himself to speak thus concerning the theme with which his poem should here deal.

An extensive treatment of the performance of *Pyth.* 9 (and of *Pyth.* 3 also) might well be worthwhile, but it cannot be attempted here. In particular, any determination of the most probable manner of presentation for each point in the stories of Cyrene and Alexibiades, which take up most of the poem, would appear to be most difficult, since in these narrative sections the performer or performers cannot be said to speak in any specific role at all, whether their own or that of the poet or the victor.²⁸

Instead of attempting an analysis of the performance of *Pyth.* 9 as a whole, I should like to conclude by considering again lines 89 ff., so as to see what relationship the performance of this section may have with that of the corresponding part of *Pyth.* 3. There would certainly appear to be no correspondingly dramatic presentation in the fourth triad of the poem for Hieron. Neither the Scholia nor Pindar's text suggest that any section of *Pyth.* 3 is sung in the victor's person, nor does this triad in particular seem suitable for any extensive alternation between different speakers. In fact, about two-thirds of it, lines 72–86, must be quite specifically in Pindar's own person. Both the idea that the speaker might go to Syracuse and the alternative to this,

²⁷ Thiersch (above, note 17) I.I.I.149.

²⁸ Of course the main myth of *Pyth.* 9 has a distinctly dramatic treatment, since both Apollo's and Chiron's speeches (lines 30–37 and 39–65) are quoted directly (so also is Apollo's brief speech in *Pyth.* 3.40–42); however, the words *προσῆνεπε* and *ἀμείβετο* introduce these speeches, and they are therefore quite different from the dramatic dialogue in lines 89 ff.

viz. the prayer to the Mother of the Gods, would, as stated in lines 72–79, be far more appropriate to Pindar than to any other individual or group. The tone of the advice to Hieron, which begins in line 80, is likewise more appropriate to Pindar's person than it would be to anyone else's. On the other hand, two sections in this triad, viz. the lines immediately preceding line 72 (to πατήρ) and those following line 86 (αἰὼν δ' ἀσφαλής, κτλ.), might well be sung by the whole chorus.²⁹ Even so, the presentation of this part of the poem must have been very different from that of the corresponding part of *Pyth.* 9. This very difference in the two performances would, however, continue the overall contrast between the two poems, since in *Pyth.* 9 the repartee between various individual performers in lines 89 ff. indicates a friendly and easy relationship of the victor with those who are singing his praises, while in *Pyth.* 3 the tone of Pindar's advice to Hieron is both more careful and also more reserved, quite in harmony with the more serious nature of this poem.

²⁹ For this section of *Pyth.* 3, I should like to suggest the following divisions between Pindar's *persona* and that of the chorus:

61(?)–62	poet
63–71	chorus
72–86	poet
86–	chorus

With the example of Asclepius' punishment (55–58) before him, the speaker in 61–62 explicitly eschews striving for immortality. This statement seems fully appropriate to the wisdom of the poet. Then, in the next few lines (63–67) we hear that if Chiron were still alive, the speaker would persuade him to provide some healer for good men. There is here a slight, but distinct, shift in attitude from lines 61–62—especially in the wish that Chiron, though dead, were still alive. Consequently, it would be more appropriate to present these words as being spoken by someone else, i.e. the chorus. The praise of Hieron in lines 70–71 is also quite conventional, and it too could well be sung in the chorus' person. It would then be natural for Pindar (or the chorus-leader singing for him) to resume in 72 ff., recapitulating what the chorus has said; the form of statement here does not actually wish for Chiron to be restored to life, but rather states what would happen if the speaker could bring health to Hieron. After a relatively long solo section, the chorus could then appropriately resume in lines 86 ff., with the stories of Peleus and Cadmus, mythic parallels to Hieron, who like him were supremely blessed by fortune, and also endured misfortune.