NEGATIVE EXPRESSIONS
AND PINDARIC ΠΟΙΚΙΛΙΑ

WILLIAM H. RACE
Vanderbilt University

Every reader of Pindar soon discovers that no small part of the poet's art consists in expressing negatively ideas that in more straightforward speech would be expressed positively. A number of scholars have called attention to this phenomenon in passing. For example, Bury notes that μὴ κρύπτειν φάος ὀμμάτων (N. 10.40–41) is expressed positively at N. 7.66: ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν,[1] and H. Fränkel has shown that σιγαλὸν ἀμαχα-νίαν . . . φυγών (P. 9.92) is equivalent to εὐμαχανίαν . . . ἔφανας . . . ὕμνῳ διώκειν (I. 4.2–3).[2] Most recently, A. Köhnken demonstrates that οὐκ ἀποδαμεῖ (P. 10.37) is litotes for "ganz zu Hause" and discusses other instances in Pindar.[3] But these and other scholars have only scratched the surface of what constitutes one of the most important (and potentially confusing) stylistic and rhetorical techniques in Pindar's verse. There is not a single ode without at least one such negative expression, and most contain several examples. More important than mere number, however, is the fact that considerable misunderstanding of particular passages has resulted from inadequate appreciation of Pindar's procedure. The purpose of this article is to survey the form, function, and vocabulary of negative expressions and to discuss a number of passages of importance; at the end I shall

[2] H. Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, M. Hadas and J. Willis, trans., (Oxford 1975) 448, note 18. He goes on to say, "The negative manner of expression here, as often elsewhere, can be explained by the fact that the polar habit of thought always has the opposite in mind." This alleged "polar habit of thought" really "explains" nothing and is a useless concept for analysis. In this essay we shall treat the form and function of negative expressions, without trying to discover any underlying mental habits—all good poets, it seems to me, are capable of "keeping the opposite in mind."

[3] A. Köhnken, "Gebrauch und Funktion der Litotes bei Pindar," *Glotta* 54 (1976) 62–67. Cf. also W. Slater, "Futures in Pindar," *CQ* 19 (1969) 93–94, and G. Cerri, "A proposito del futuro e della litote in Pindaro: *Nem.* 7.102 sgg.," *QUCC* 22 (1976) 83–90.

examine in detail a longer passage (P. 9.79–96) to show how effectively Pindar employs this stylistic device.

I. The Stylistic and Rhetorical Nature
of Negative Expressions

The primary purpose of negative expressions in Pindar is to give *variety* (ποικιλία) to the vocabulary and discourse. Since the basic thought behind every epinician ode is the rather simple "ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν,"[4] the poet must either repeat himself endlessly or find new ways of expressing the same thought. In much the same way that the oral epic poet can vary his use of formulae, so the written poetry of Pindar has at its disposal a large metaphorical vocabulary of positive and negative words and phrases that can be adapted to the meter and also express subtle nuances of sense and feeling. On the level of discourse, negative expressions often serve to give variety in larger developments (particularly in catalogues and prayers) and to highlight a climactic, positive restatement.[5] Finally, in a number of cases, negative expressions have the additional effect of underscoring the ethical effort involved in success and its celebration by depicting the adverse qualities that have to be overcome.[6]

---

[4] N. 3.29. Cf. the variations, the one positive, the other negative: τὸν αἰνεῖν ἀγαθῷ παρέχει (I. 8.69) and οὔτε . . . χρή μ[ε] λαθεῖν ἀοιδὰν πρόσφορον (*Parth.* 2.36–37).

[5] Among many examples, one might cite P. 1.90: μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις followed by ἐξίει δ' ὥσπερ κυβερνάτας ἀνήρ / ἱστίον ἀνεμόεν (91–92); N. 5.50: μηκέτι ῥίγει followed by δίδοι / φωνάν (50–51); and N. 7.61: σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον followed by ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων / κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω (62–63). At the end of this article we shall examine a more complex alternation of negative and positive. E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* I & II (Berkeley 1962) 1–92, to whose pioneering work the present article owes more than it can possibly acknowledge, discusses this relationship in terms of "foil" and "climax" and "decrescendo" and "crescendo."

[6] Although it is beyond the scope of this article to illustrate this aspect in detail, a good example is at P. 3.71, where Pindar praises Hieron for "not begrudging the good (their due)" (οὐ φθονέων ἀγαθοῖς), meaning that Hieron is "generous" to men of merit, but by casting it in the negative, the poet calls attention to Hieron's overcoming a natural fault of tyrants (cf. Hdt. 3.80.4; φθονέει . . . τοῖσι ἀρίστοισι). Aristotle labels this source of praise as παρὰ τὸ προσῆκον "beyond expectations" at *Rhet.* 1.1367в14 and 1368а13 and adds the example of Simonides' praise of Archedice, who, *in spite of* being wife, sister, and mother of tyrants, οὐκ ἤρθη νοῦν ἐς ἀτασθαλίην. Likewise, the word ἀμώμητον at P. 2.74 has its full ethical force, coming as it does after the ψόγος of Ixion (who "chased a sweet lie," ψεῦδος γλυκὺ μεθέπων, 37) to describe the fruit of Rhadamanthys' judgment, who, in contrast, "takes no delight" in the all-too-common deceptions of whisperers (οἷα . . . ἔπετ' αἰεὶ βροτῷ, 75). In general, by keeping before our eyes the contrasting terms of "failure," "oblivion," "blame," "selfishness," and "evil," Pindar never lets us forget that human existence is constantly poised between right and wrong choices, and that "success," "fame," "praise," "generosity," and "probity" are all the more remarkable and valuable for the many obstacles they must overcome.

Perhaps the most succinct discussion of the stylistic and rhetorical background for the poetic use of negative expressions is in Aristotle's treatment of "impressiveness" in style at *Rhet.* 3.1408Alff.:

> Antimachus' advice is also useful, namely to describe an object by the qualities it does not possess (ἐξ ὧν μὴ ἔχει), as he does in his description of Teumessus which begins: "There is a little wind-swept hill. . . ." This kind of description can be prolonged indefinitely. This method of describing things negatively (ὅπως οὐκ ἔχει) can be used of good qualities or bad, whichever is useful at the time. Poets coin expressions of this kind, such as "stringless" and "lyreless" music, and they add epithets to describe qualities that are lacking (ἐκ τῶν στερήσεων). This is attractive in metaphors of proportion, as to say that the trumpet utters "a lyreless song." (G. M. A. Grube, trans.)

This procedure of describing things by the qualities which they do not have (ἐξ ὧν μὴ ἔχει, ὅπως οὐκ ἔχει) involves not only simple negatives, but also a-privatives, and metaphors of proportion, all of which abound in Pindar's verse.[7] They can be used to deny a bad subject good qualities (e.g. ὅσσα δὲ μὴ πεφίληκε Ζεύς, P. 1.13; cf. fr. 81.2–3 and P. 2.42–43) or a good subject bad qualities (e.g. ἄδικον οὔθ᾽ ὑπέροπλον ἥβαν δρέπων, P. 6.48 and γλῶσσα δ᾽ οὐκ ἔξω φρενῶν, I. 6.72). Let us take an example from Pindar, Pa. 6.127–31:

> οὕνεκεν οὔ σε παιηόνων
> ἄδορπον εὐνάξομεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀοιδᾶν
> ῥόθια δεκομένα κατερεῖς,
>   πόθεν ἔλαβες ναυπρύτανιν
> δαίμονα καὶ τὰν θεμίξενον ἀρετ[άν.

"For we shall not put you to bed without a supper of paeans, but rather receiving waves of songs you shall recount where you came by the ship-ruling daimon and that hospitable excellence." The first thing to note is

---

[7] A quick survey of a lexicon reveals over a hundred different a-privatives in Pindar. For the metaphor of "proportion" or "analogy," cf. Aristotle, *Poetics* 1457β22, where he gives the example of old age as "the evening of life." To take but one example of Pindar's metaphorical language, at P. 4.283 he praises Demophilus with the statement: ὀρφανίζει μὲν κακὰν γλῶσσαν φαεννᾶς ὀπός. In straightforward (κυρίως) speech this means, approximately, "he suppresses backbiting." But Pindar has borrowed two metaphorical terms to give variety, subtlety, and depth to this statement. The first is the verb ὀρφανίζω, "to bereave," one of a number of metaphorical terms expressing disapproval and avoidance (cf. κελαδεννᾶς τ᾽ ὀρφανοί / ὕβριος at I. 4.8–9). The second term is φαεννός, which means "bright," and always (along with numerous other terms involving light discussed below) indicates *conspicuousness*. Likewise, the word ὄψ always has a good connotation, usually indicating *celebration*. Thus, when Demophilus "deprives" slander of its "shiny" "voice," he (positively) puts it into *obscurity* (cf. Pindar's use of σκότος and *silence* (cf. terms involving σιγά). To say, with Slater, that in this one instance the word φαεννός is "of the voice, *clear*" is to miss the bold metaphorical transfer from the visual realm to the auditory. In other words, Demophilus does not allow slander to possess the positive qualities of achievement and its celebration.

that the οὐ (127) negates the verb εὐνάξομεν "we shall not put you to bed," and the concomitant idea is that of ἄδορπον "without supper." As a general rule in Pindar, an οὐ/μή is best taken primarily with the verb, although its force also applies to other α-privatives and rejected words in the sentence.[8] S. L. Radt's comment is to the point: "Ein merkwürdiger Ausdruck für 'wir werden dich nicht unbesungen lassen.'"[9] As we shall see, εὐνάξομεν is one of a complex of metaphors describing the state of being without song in terms of sleep, death, forgetfulness, and silence.[10] There is also the notion of "dismissing" (as with χαῖρε in hymns). In other words, the hymnist assures Aegina that she will not be abandoned in silence, nor will she be without share of celebration. Here παιηόνων ἄδορπον nicely combines the ideas of feasting with song, the two components of a proper *theoxenia* (cf. the positive σὺν εὐφώνοις θαλίαις at P. 1.38). That this is the intended meaning is clear from what follows, for Pindar subsequently expresses himself positively (note the ἀλλ' "but rather").[11] This climactic assertion, carefully prepared by the negative statements, moves from στέρησις[12] (ἄδορπον) to ἕξις (δεκομένα), from deprivation (ἄδορπον) to abundance (ῥόθια), from silence (εὐνάξομεν) to speech (κατερεῖς).[13] By stating the negative first, Pindar not only produces striking metaphors, but by depicting what it is like *not* to have songs, he can contrast in climactic statement his real intention all along,

---

[8] Sandys' translation "For we shall lay thee to rest, Aegina, not without banquet of paeans" slightly skews the meaning. The chorus wishes to assure Aegina that they *do not intend to put her to bed* without her fill of song. Granted, the difference may seem slight, but important misunderstandings have resulted from overlooking this rule at N. 7.102ff. Cf. Slater (above, note 3) 93 with the objections of Cerri (above, note 3) 83–88.

[9] S. L. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Amsterdam 1958) 175.

[10] Cf. below, pp. 104–5. The positive verb is (ἀν)εγείρω, and always is associated with song.

[11] Cf. ἀλλά at Od. 6.44. Bundy (above, note 5) 22, note 50 and 36, note 3 points out the use of ἀλλά to reject "foil" and signal the "climax," a very common phenomenon in Pindar, especially when shifting from negative to positive assertions, as here. Often there is also a shift of metaphorical terminology from the negative statement to the positive.

[12] The term στέρησις comes from Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1408A7 (quoted above), on which see the good discussion by E. M. Cope, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, vol. 3, ed. J. E. Sandys (Cambridge 1877) 68–70. Much of Pindar's alleged obscurity disappears when this technique of στέρησις–ἕξις is kept in mind.

[13] The word ῥόθια "breakers" gains its precise meaning from the negative terms in the "foil." In contrast to ἄδορπον it designates "fullness, abundance"; in contrast to εὐνάζειν it designates "activity" and "noise." At N. 7.62 the ῥοάς are in contrast to the phrase σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον (61) and represent "free-flowing" praise, perhaps with a hint of "bright." At I. 7.19 the κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν are opposed to metaphors of sleep (εὕδει, 17) and forgetfulness (ἀμνάμονες, 17) and represent the "activity" and "sound" (cf. κλυταῖς ἐπέων) of song. In the passage from Pa. 6, note the urbane switch to the second person with κατερεῖς, indicating that not only will Aegina "stay awake," but she herself will declare her glories.

namely to celebrate Aegina's seamanship and hospitality (both reserved for effect until the end of the sentence and the verse).

II. Achievement and Its Celebration

If all the positive metaphorical terms associated with victory (and by extension with its concomitant celebration) were categorized according to the senses and perception, they would be: *visual,* "bright"; *spatial,* "high, large, far reaching"; and *auditory,* "loud."[14] Victory—and its celebration—must be *conspicuous*: bright and bold so that it can be seen from afar, and loud enough for all to hear. The individual vocabulary is large.

A. Visual Display[15]

Light (χρονιώτατον φάος εὐρυσθενέων ἀρετᾶν, O. 4.10), radiance (ὑπέρτατον ... φέγγος, Pa. 2.68), splendor (νικαφόρον ἀγλαΐαν, O. 13.14), illustrious (ἀγλααὶ νῖκαι, N. 11.20), shine (λάμπει δὲ σαφὴς ἀρετά, I. 1.22), blaze (φλέγεται δ᾽ ἀρεταῖς μυρίαις, N. 10.2), evident (ἐπιφανέστερον, P. 7.7), bright (λιπαρὸν κόσμον, O. 8.82–83), clear (ἐς φανερὰν ὁδόν, O. 6.73; σαφὴς ἀρετά, I. 1.22; φάει ... ἐν καθαρῷ, P. 6.14), apparent (πέφανται, N. 6.13b; πρόφαινεν, I. 8.55; πρόφατον, O. 8.16; ἀνέφανε, P. 9.73; ἐπέδειξεν βίαν, N. 11.14).[16]

B. Spatial Display[17]

High, exalted (κλέος ... ὑψηλόν, P. 3.111; στέφανον ὕψιστον, P. 1.100; ὑψοῦ ... πατεῖν, O. 1.115; πτερύγεσσιν ἀερθέντ᾽ ἀγλααῖς, I. 1.64; πᾶσαν ὀρθώσαις ἀρετάν, I. 4.38; μοῖρα πέμπῃ ἀνεκὰς ὄλβον ὑψηλόν, O. 2.22); distant (τηλαυγέσιν ... στεφάνοις, P. 2.6; τηλέφαντον ὄρσαι γέρας, fr. 5.2; περαίνει πρὸς ἔσχατον πλόον, P. 10.28–29; τὸ δὲ κλέος τηλόθεν δέδορκε, O. 1.94); big, abundant (μέγα ... κλέος,

---

[14] One could also include *taste,* "sweet" (cf. ἀδύς, γλυκύς, and μέλι) and *touch,* "soft" (cf. μαλ(θ)ακός, ἁβρός, and ἀγανός), but with the exception of τραχύς and one clear instance of πικρός there is no corresponding negative vocabulary.

[15] Cf. the excellent chapter "Areta und Ruhm als 'Licht'" in H. Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Tübingen 1935) 11–19. Opposing terms (which will be illustrated shortly) include σκότος, σκοτεινός, καλύπτω, κρύπτω, κρυφαῖος, and ἐπίκρυφος.

[16] Cf. ἐπιδείκνυμι at Bacch. 2.9, 3.93, Pindar P. 4.253 and fr. 32. It is this term which ultimately came to designate the literary genre as "display," ἐπιδεικτικός.

[17] Opposing terms include: χαμαί, πίτνω, ἔνδον, ἐν μεγάρῳ, (κατα)φθίνω, ἐλινύω, κάθημαι, and various κατά-compounds. All these designate downward motion, diminution, or confinement. For the nexus of ideas involving "increasing" and "flourishing" and their relationship to the epinician occasion, cf. F. J. Nisetich, *The Poetry of Victory: A Study in the Occasional Nature of Pindar's Odes* (Diss. Harvard 1973) 118ff. and his "Olympian 1.8–11: An Epinician Metaphor," *HSCP* 79 (1975) 62–65.

O. 8.10; ὁ πολύφατος ὕμνος, O. 1.8; εὐμαχανίαν . . . ἔφανας, I. 4.2);
increase, flourish (ὕμνων ἄεξ᾽ . . . ἄνθος, O. 6.105; θάλλοισ᾽ ἀρετά,
I. 5.17; εὐανθὴς ἅπας τέθαλεν ὄλβος, Thren. 7.7); movement, activity
(ἀλλ᾽ . . . στεῖχ᾽, N. 5.2–3; ἀνάγει, I. 4.22).

C. Auditory Display[18]

Sing out, celebrate (τίνα θεόν . . . κελαδήσομεν, O. 2.2; εἰ δ᾽ ἄεθλα γαρύεν
ἔλδεαι, O. 1.3; Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει, P. 2.19); announce (κάρυξ ἀνέειπέ
νιν ἀγγέλλων, P. 1.32; κλυτὰν φέροισ᾽ ἀγγελίαν, O. 14.21; νίκαν . . .
ἀπαγγελεῖ, P. 6.18); proclaim (Θήρωνα . . . γεγωνητέον, O. 2.5–6;
αὐτὸν . . . ὕπατον παίδων ἀνέειπεν, P. 10.8–9; κάρυξε Θήβαν, I. 3.12);
loud-sounding (ἀγαφθέγκτων ἀοιδᾶν, O. 6.91); boasting (κόμπον ἰείς,
N. 8.49); ἐπέων καύχας ἀοιδά, N. 9.7); shouting (ὄρθιον ὤρυσαι, O. 9.109).

The list could easily be extended, but it is representative of the *posi-
tive* vocabulary of achievement and praise and must be kept in mind in
order to understand Pindar's complex use of negative and antithetical
expressions. In general, the successful athlete makes an open, public
display of his excellence, he is proclaimed officially by the herald at the
games, he brings glory to his city, he himself is distinguished (in both
senses); and then the poet must cause that brightness, exaltation, and
fame to be openly displayed in his poem. Thus, the same positive terms
which apply to the victory also apply to the poet's attempt to match
them in song.

At the end of *Isthmian* 1, Pindar expresses the wish that his celebra-
tion of Herodotus might inspire the athlete to bring honor to Thebes
with further victories at the Pythian and Olympic games. He describes
Herodotus as "lifted up on the bright wings of the tuneful Pieridae"
(εὐφώνων πτερύγεσσιν ἀερθέντ᾽ ἀγλααῖς Πιερίδων, 64–65), which com-
bines the positive qualities of sound, height, and brightness, all aspects of
conspicuousness. By contrast, Pindar then portrays (as a slight warning)
the opposite of what he hopes Herodotus to be: a miser who guards his
"hidden" (κρυφαῖον, 67) wealth "inside" (ἔνδον, 67), who instead of hon-
oring his fellow men (cf. τιμὰν . . . τεύχοντ᾽, 66–67) mocks them,[19] who
disregards the fact that he will die "without fame" (δόξας ἄνευθεν, 68).
The contrasting terms are ἀγλααῖς—κρυφαῖον, πτερύγεσσιν ἀερθέντ᾽—
ἔνδον, and εὐφώνων—δόξας ἄνευθεν.[20]

---

[18] Opposing terms include: σιγάω, σιγά, σιγαλός, σωπάω, σιωπά, ἀκλεής, ἀγρυξία,
λάθα, and ἀμνάμων. ·

[19] This derisive laughter which "attacks" (ἐμπίπτων, 68) others contrasts with the sweet
laughter of victory which inspires *charis* as described at P. 8.85–86: γέλως γλυκύς /
ὦρσεν χάριν.

[20] Cf. N. 1.31–32, where ἐν μεγάρῳ . . . ἔχειν = ἔνδον νέμει; πλοῦτον κατακρύψαις =
πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον and φίλοις ἐξαρκέων contrasts with ἄλλοισι δ᾽ ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ, while

A similar contrast is developed in *Olympian* 12, where Ergoteles' racing fame would have "shed its leaves" (κατεφυλλορόησεν, 15)[21] and been "without fame" (ἀκλεής, 15), like a rooster that "fights within" (ἐνδομάχας, 14);[22] instead (νῦν δέ, 17) he has been crowned at the great Panhellenic festivals, lives in companionship (ὁμιλέων, 19 contrasts with the στάσις of 16), and "exalts" (βαστάζεις, 19; cf. schol. 27a: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπαίρεις καὶ αὔξεις) his new homeland.

At N. 9.6–7 Pindar combines three important negative terms: ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, τετελεσμένον ἐσλόν / μὴ χαμαὶ σιγᾷ καλύψαι. Here is an elaborate negative periphrasis of "ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν" that contains our three aspects: spatial (χαμαί, "on the ground"), auditory (σιγᾷ, "silence"), and visual (καλύψαι, "hidden"). This is then contrasted (δέ, 7) with the "fitting" (πρόσφορος, 7) song of "loud acclaim" (καύχας, 7) and the upward movement of ἀνὰ . . . ἀνὰ . . . ὄρσομεν (8). A close parallel is P. 9.93–94 (discussed below, pp. 121–22), where λόγον . . . ἀλίοιο γέροντος (94) = λόγος ἀνθρώπων; πεπΟναμένον εὖ (93) = τετελεσμένον ἐσλόν; and μὴ . . . κρυπτέτω (94) = μὴ . . . καλύψαι. Both are followed by vigorous affirmations of the need for praise.

There are two very similar passages in which Pindar highlights the joy, congratulations, and display of victory by portraying the opposite effect on the losers. The first is at O. 8.67–71:

> ἐν τέτρασιν παίδων ἀπεθήκατο γυίοις
> νόστον ἔχθιστον καὶ ἀτιμοτέραν γλῶσσαν καὶ
>   ἐπίκρυφον οἶμον,
> πατρὶ δὲ πατρὸς ἐνέπνευσεν μένος
> γήραος ἀντίπαλον.

εὖ . . . ἀκοῦσαι contrasts with δόξας ἄνευθεν. At I. 8.70 the expression ὑπὸ χειᾷ, if correct (cf. D. C. Young, "The Text of Pindar Isthmian 8.70," *AJP* 94 [1973] 319–26), combines the ideas of concealment, confinement, and depth.

[21] This bold metaphor combines the idea of downward motion (κατα-) (cf. πίτνει χαμαί at P. 8.93 and χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν at N. 4.41), with the notion of withering (cf. φθινοπωρὶς . . . πνοά at P. 5.120) and dying (cf. φθίνει at P. 1.94). For examples of ἀρετά, κλέος, πλοῦτος, and ὕμνος with the idea of "flowering" and "flourishing," cf. W. J. Verdenius, "Pindar's Twelfth Olympian Ode: A Commentary," *Festschrift E. De Struycker* (Antwerp 1973) 339–40 and Slater, s.v. ἀνθέω and ἄνθος. F. J. Nisetich, "The Leaves of Triumph and Mortality: Transformation of a Traditional Image in Pindar's *Olympian* 12," *TAPA* 107 (1977) 258–64 suggests that there is a further allusion to *Il.* 6.146ff., but κατεφυλλορόησεν can certainly be understood on its own terms within the context of Pindar's language.

[22] ἐνδο- (reinforced by συγγόνῳ παρ᾿ ἑστίᾳ) is equivalent to ἔνδον and ἐν μεγάρῳ (discussed above, note 20), and refers to the "*obscurum*" of the private realm, on which cf. H. Arendt, "The Public and the Private Realm," in *The Human Condition* (Chicago 1958) 22–78, and esp. 71, note 78, where she notes that "the Greek and Latin words for the interior of the house, *megaron* and *atrium*, have a strong connotation of darkness and blackness." Κλέος can only be acquired in the public realm, while failure is consigned to the private. Cf. fr. 42, esp. προφαίνειν (1), ἐς μέσον χρὴ παντὶ λαῷ / δεικνύναι (4–5), and σκότει κρύπτειν (6).

Alcimedon "put away from himself" (ἀπεθήκατο, a rejection-word similar to [ἀπο]φεύγω) a "very unpleasant homecoming," "speech without as much honor" and an "obscure path."[23] Instead (δέ, 70), his victory inspired his grandfather with the courage to "wrestle against" old age. At P. 8.81–87, with more elaboration, Pindar mentions the same elements.

> τέτρασι δ' ἔμπετες ὑψόθεν
> σωμάτεσσι κακὰ φρονέων,
> τοῖς οὔτε νόστος ὁμῶς
> ἔπαλπνος ἐν Πυθιάδι κρίθη,
> οὐδὲ μολόντων πὰρ ματέρ' ἀμφὶ γέλως γλυκύς
> ὦρσεν χάριν· κατὰ λαύρας δ' ἐχθρῶν ἀπάοροι
> πτώσσοντι, συμφορᾷ δεδαγμένοι.

Aristomenes' opponents had a "homecoming" (νόστος) that was not "as cheerful" (οὔτε . . . ὁμῶς ἔπαλπνος, litotes for unpleasant[24] and parallel to νόστον ἔχθιστον at O. 8.69), nor upon their return to their mother (parallel to grandfather at O. 8.70) did sweet laughter "arouse χάρις all around" (parallel to ἀτιμοτέραν γλῶσσαν at O. 8.69), but they "shrink down alleyways to avoid hostility" (κατὰ λαύρας is parallel to the ἐπίκρυφον οἶμον at O. 8.69). This negative portrayal is then contrasted (δέ, 88) with the victor, who is "flying" (πέταται, 90) on his "winged" (ὑποπτέροις, 91) manliness.[25] These two passages are also very similar rhetorically. Both celebrate the "manliness" (cf. ἀνορέας at O. 8.67 and ἀνορέαις at P. 8.91) of boy wrestlers who have won in the most difficult fashion, by having to defeat four successive opponents, a feat sufficiently noteworthy to be found on inscriptions.[26] Having called attention to the large number of defeated boys, the poet can then dwell on details of their disappointed return to their families, not in order to sound a note

[23] The opposite of the νόστος ἔχθιστος is the νόστος γλυκερός/γλυκύς (cf. P. 4.32 and N. 9.23). Ἀτιμοτέραν corresponds to ἀκλεής (τιμά) at O. 12.15 and the opposite is Timodemus' glorious homecoming (σὺν εὐκλέι νόστῳ) at N. 2.24. The opposite of the ἐπίκρυφος οἶμος is the φανερὰ ὁδός (O. 6.73) and καθαρὰ κέλευθος (I. 5.23).

[24] For another example of litotes with οὐχ ὁμῶς, cf. I. 3.6, where it should be taken with θάλλων, not with πάντα χρόνον as it regularly is.

[25] The following lines in the poem present one of Pindar's most impressive alternations of negative and positive observations, and in the midst is the famous expression τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὔ τις; It might be observed that very subject of this article is "what a man is, and what a man isn't."

[26] The schol. at P. 8.81 (117 Dr.) gives the technical term for this achievement: ἄνευ κλήρου . . . νικήσαντος (= ἀνέφεδρος). For discussions, cf. L. Moretti, Iscrizioni Agonistiche Greche (Rome 1953) 171–73 and J. Ebert, Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen (Berlin 1972) 228–29. For individual inscriptions, cf. Ebert 32 (= Moretti 20), Ebert 55 (= Moretti 33), and Ebert 76 (= Moretti 64).

of "savagely boyish exultation,"[27] but to emphasize by purposely exag-
gerated contrast[28] the joys of hard-earned victory.[29]

In his paradigmatic choice at *Il.* 9.412–16, Achilles wavers between a
long, safe life at home without glory and an early, glorious death fight-
ing about Troy. The heroic life requires risk (κίνδυνος) in the public
realm of competition, for which the reward is fame. We have already
seen at I. 1.64–68 the contrast between the miser who guards his hidden
wealth inside and who dies without fame and the athlete who brings his
city honor. At O. 6.9–11, Pindar contrasts deeds without risk with those
entailing effort: ἀκίνδυνοι δ᾽ ἀρεταί / οὔτε παρ᾽ ἀνδράσιν οὔτ᾽ ἐν ναυσὶ
κοίλαις / τίμιαι· πολλοὶ δὲ μέμνανται, καλὸν εἴ τι πονᾱθῇ. Here the neg-
ative expression is quite brief and simple; at O. 1.81–84 occurs a re-
markable series of negative ideas portraying the antithesis of heroic risk:

> ὁ μέγας δὲ κίν-
> δυνος ἄναλκιν οὐ φῶτα λαμβάνει.
> θανεῖν δ᾽ οἷσιν ἀνάγκα, τά κέ τις ἀνώνυμον
> γῆρας ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος ἕψοι μάταν,
> ἁπάντων καλῶν ἄμμορος;

The position of οὐ creates a purposeful ambiguity. Although it may be
taken with ἄναλκιν φῶτα ("Great danger / Calls to no coward's heart,"
Conway), it is more natural to take it with λαμβάνει as equivalent to
φεύγει. As so often (and cf. above at O. 6.9–11), Pindar employs a nega-
tive along with an a-privative. Although the next sentence contains no
overt negative, a rhetorical question with a τίς is equivalent to οὐδείς:
"why would anyone" means "no one would." Every word is carefully
chosen. The prominent ἀνώνυμον (note the privative) corresponds to

---

[27] B. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1885) 199.

[28] Pindar's portrayal is indeed vivid, especially in comparison with N. 11.26, where he
predicts that Aristagoras would have enjoyed a better homecoming than his rivals:
κάλλιον ἂν δηριώντων ἐνόστησ᾽ ἀντιπάλων (since this is a hypothetical case, there is no
point in elaborating the contrast), but it is not realistic (in the modern sense). We are not
meant to linger too long on the details, or to think that all those defeated in the great
games had to sneak into town, nor say with Gildersleeve (above, note 27) of ἀτιμοτέραν
γλῶσσαν that it "refers to the jibes and jeers of enemies in the gate." We are meant to
experience (metaphorically) the deprivation of defeat, so as to appreciate the glow of
victory.

[29] Pindar has already prepared the reader for Aristomenes' hard work with the negative
expression μὴ σὺν μακρῷ πόνῳ at P. 8.73 and the positive δάμασσας ἔργῳ at 80. The prin-
ciple of going the extra mile to win making the victory more enjoyable is enunciated at
N. 7.70–73, where Pindar (as eulogist/athlete) says that he has gone "all the way" in the
pentathlon (significantly ending with wrestling), and as a result: εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν
πλέον πεδέρχεται (74). At P. 5.45ff. Carrhotus enjoys the fortune of being remembered
with highest praise (λόγων φερτάτων μναμήϊ᾽, 48–49) after his "great toil" (πεδὰ μέγαν
κάματον, 47), because he won out of a field of forty contestants.

δόξας ἄνευθεν at I. 1.68 and ἀκλεής at O. 12.15. Ἐν σκότῳ adds the
visual dimension and contrasts with the extensive vocabulary of light and
visibility that characterizes successful action in the public view, while
καθήμενος portrays the stationary, spatially restricted life of the stay-
at-home (cf. ἐνδομάχας at O. 12.14 and ἔνδον at I. 1.67). The verb ἕψοι
corresponds to νέμει at I. 1.67 (and, as we shall see, with πέσσοντ᾽ at
P. 4.186) and depicts an obsessive preoccupation with wealth and life
that is ultimately "in vain" (μάταν), for it is deprived of (ἄμμορος) all the
noble aspects of human existence (ἁπάντων καλῶν). Not surprisingly,
this extended negative characterization is immediately followed by an
impressive positive description of the success of Pelops and his descen-
dants: ἀλλ᾽ ἐμοὶ μὲν οὗτος ἄεθλος / ὑποκείσεται (84–85), from whose
games τὸ δὲ κλέος / τηλόθεν δέδορκε (93–94), an expression that com-
presses the auditory, spatial, and visual aspects under consideration.

At P. 4.185–87, Hera inspires the heroes with a desire for sailing on
the Argo:

> μή τινα λειπόμενον
> τὰν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν αἰ-
> ῶνα πέσσοντ᾽, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ καὶ θανάτῳ
> φάρμακον κάλλιστον ἑᾶς ἀρετᾶς ἅ-
> λιξιν εὑρέσθαι σὺν ἄλλοις.

Here, as the context demands, the emphasis is on going forth from the
security of home to a life of risk in the public realm. λειπόμενον "left
behind" indicates the privation of οὐ . . . λαμβάνει at O. 1.81, while
ἀκίνδυνον corresponds to κίνδυνος at O. 1.81; παρὰ ματρὶ μένειν denotes
the "stay-at-home" which at O. 1.83 is portrayed by ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος.[30]
Αἰῶνα corresponds to γῆρας at O. 1.83, the article τάν (which Gildersleeve
ad loc. correctly calls "contemptuous") reinforces the rejection made ex-
plicit by μάταν at O. 1.83, while πέσσοντ᾽, like ἕψοι at O. 1.83, is a bold
metaphor stressing solicitous preoccupation. In both cases, the positive is
forcefully introduced mid-line with ἀλλά.

Before concluding this section on achievement and its celebration, it
may be worthwhile to consider a few more examples of the negative
side, namely of failure (or lack of participation) and its concomitant
obscurity. Fr. 228 describes the state of excusing oneself from participa-
tion: τιθεμένων ἀγώνων πρόφασις / . . . ἀρετὰν ἐς αἰπὺν ἔβαλε σκότον,
while fr. 229 describes the fate of failure: νικώμενοι γὰρ ἄνδρες ἀγρυξίᾳ

---

[30] It also parallels συγγόνῳ παρ᾽ ἑστίᾳ at O. 12.14 and ἐν μεγάρῳ at N. 1.31. If all these
passages are kept in mind, the meaning of φάρμακον κάλλιστον, badly confused by Gun-
dert (above, note 15) 25, followed by R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford
1962) 163 and W. Slater, s.v. φάρμακον, readily becomes apparent. It is just what the
scholia say: εὐδοξίαν (330b Dr.) and εὔκλεια (332a Dr.). Extended arguments are in my
"Pindar's Heroic Ideal at *Pyth.* 4.186–187" (forthcoming).

δέδενται, and both aspects are combined (in the figure of synaesthesia) at *Parth.* 1.9–10: ὁ δὲ μηδὲν ἔχων ὑπὸ σι- / γᾷ μελαίνᾳ κάρα κέκρυπται. At I. 8.70–71 Cleandrus deserves praise "because he did not repress his youth in a hole": ἥβαν γὰρ οὐκ ... ὑπὸ χειᾷ ... δάμασεν, that is, he "displayed it."[31] On the other hand, a successful deed may be described as "dead" if it is kept in silence: θνᾴσκει δὲ σιγαθὲν καλὸν ἔργον (fr. 121), or "asleep" if it is old (παλαιός): ἐκ λεχέων ἀνάγει φάμαν παλαιάν / εὐκλέων ἔργων· ἐν ὕπνῳ γὰρ πέσεν· ἀλλ' ἀνεγειρομένα χρῶτα λάμπει (I. 4.22–23), or can be "forgotten" as at N. 6.20–21, where the victorious Praxidamas "stopped the forgetting of Socleides" (ἔπαυσε λάθαν / Σωκλείδα'), that is, "caused him to be remembered." Both ideas of "sleeping" and "forgetting" are combined at I. 7.16: ἀλλὰ παλαιὰ γάρ / εὕδει χάρις, ἀμνάμονες δὲ βροτοί before the climactic assertion of song's celebratory role at the beginning of the next triad (18ff.).[32]

Finally, at N. 7.12–16 Pindar discusses the relationship of song to deed as one of "reflection": ταὶ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαί / σκότον πολὺν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι. "Those great deeds of courage" (cf. μέγας ... ἄναλκιν at O. 1.81) "have great obscurity when they lack songs." Once the deed itself is manifest, its brilliance must be matched in song, here the positive image of the mirror (ἔσοπτρον, 14), but not a literal mirror; rather the brightness (cf. λιπαράμπυκος, 15) of memory results from a fitting discovery of resounding songs with words to match the toils. The σκότος πολύς is the obscurity of oblivion, and by mentioning it Pindar emphasizes the *preciousness* of song's celebratory function.

III. Praise and Blame

Like the pairs of terms "light-dark," "sound-silence," "high-low," "moving-stationary" that we have been examining, where the one can be expressed as the negative of the other, so too praise is often defined as the negative of blame. Slater calls attention to two examples.[33] At N. 7.64 Pindar protests that if an Achaean is present "he will not blame me" (οὐ μέμψεταί μ'), and at I. 2.20 Xenocrates "did not blame" (οὐκ

---

[31] Cf. above, note 20.

[32] Cf. P. 9.104–5: χρέος, αὖτις ἐγεῖραι / καὶ παλαιὰν δόξαν and O. 8.74: χρὴ μναμοσύναν ἀνεγείροντα φράσαι. In two places, Pindar stresses the fact that his songs possess *sound* and *activity* by contrasting his art with that of the sculptor. The one occurs at the end of I. 2 (cf. οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας, 46), while the other opens N. 5: οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμι ... ἀλλ' ... στεῖχ' ... διαγγέλλοισ'. A delightful example of pseudo-biographical invention results from misunderstanding Pindar's use of the figure ὅπως οὐκ ἔχει here. One scholium (1a Dr.) reports: "Some say that Pytheas' relatives requested Pindar to write an encomium for him, but when Pindar demanded 3,000 drachmas, they said that for the same price it was better to have a statue made than a poem. But later they changed their minds and paid the price. He begain his poem with these words by way of reproach."

[33] Slater (above, note 3) 93.

ἐμέμφθη) the driving of his charioteer. Both of these clearly indicate (in litotes) *approval* for successful effort.

There are a number of less obvious examples. When Pindar prays to bequeath to his sons "fame without that (i.e. Odysseus') dishonor" (κλέος / μὴ τὸ δύσφαμον, N. 8.36–37), he is expressing negatively what elsewhere he puts in positive form (e.g. κλέος ἐτήτυμον at N. 7.63), while reminding us that "infamy" is a form of κλέος, too. When, at O. 6.89–90, the poet hopes to "escape the ancient reproach" (ἀρχαῖον ὄνειδος . . . εἰ φεύγομεν), he means that he expects approval for his tactful praise (with the urbane suggestion, "beyond what one would expect of a Boeotian"). At O. 1.37 the poet says that observing the propriety of saying good things about the gods entails "less blame" (μείων . . . αἰτία), by which he means that it is *more laudable*. Similarly, at P. 1.82 he says that if one is brief, then "less blame comes from men" (μείων ἕπεται μῶμος ἀνθρώπων), meaning "more approval."[34]

At N. 7.61 Pindar declares that he is Thearion's guest (ξεῖνός εἰμι), and says:

> σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον,
> ὕδατος ὧτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ᾽ ἄγων
> κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω.

Since praise "mirrors" the brightness of achievement (cf. N. 7.14), it is not surprising to find that blame should be described as "dark." Here "keeping away dark blame" reinforces the following affirmation, "I intend to praise (αἰνέσω) fully and truthfully." In a similar context at N. 1.24, after praising Chromius' hospitality (cf. also N. 9.2–3) he makes the point: λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἐσλοὺς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν / ἀντίον. Although the particular details of these lines have been subject to much disagreement,[35] the force of the statement is clear: fault-finders are discomfited by the ἐσλοί. As in the case of σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον above, we are not meant to conjure up any specific individuals. The point is that great munificence such as Chromius' extinguishes criticism, which— put positively—means that he is completely praiseworthy (cf. εὖ . . . ἀκοῦσαι φίλοις ἐξαρκέων, 32).

[34] In very similar passages (where silence or abbreviation is recommended), I. 1.63 gives the positive εὐθυμίαν μείζω φέρει, while at O. 9.104 οὐ σκαιότερον is litotes for "more appropriate," "better." Cf. schol. 156d: οὐ σκαιότερον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων, βέλτιον. Other scholl. gloss it as σοφώτερον (cf. σοφώτατον at N. 5.18 and ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς at P. 9.78). Slater's "ill-omened" is wide of the mark. At N. 5.16 οὐ . . . κερδίων means "inappropriate," "worse." Behind all of these passages is the thought "it is impossible to please every kind of listener" (cf. Thuc. 2.35.2–3), and the negative expressions emphasize the difficulty of the decision.

[35] Cf. S. L. Radt, "Pindars erste nemeische Ode," *Mnemosyne* 19 (1966) 154–64 and R. Stoneman, "The Niceties of Praise: Notes on Pindar's *Nemeans*," *QUCC* 31 (1979) 65–70.

To close this discussion of praise and blame, it is worthwhile to examine two longer passages in detail, because the one from *Pythian* 2 has caused considerable misunderstanding, and because a comparison helps to illuminate their similar vocabulary and function. The first is at O. 1.52–53, where Pindar recoils from the spiteful tale to the effect that the gods cut up Pelops' flesh *and ate it* (καὶ φάγον, 51: note the prominent position at the end of the antistrophe).[36] Pindar then says (52–53):

> ἐμοὶ δ᾽ ἄπορα γαστρίμαρ-
>   γον μακάρων τιν᾽ εἰπεῖν· ἀφίσταμαι·
> ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρους.

"I find it impossible to say that any one of the blessed gods is a glutton: I recoil! Lack of gain frequently befalls slanderers." As we know from line 35 (ἔστι δ᾽ ἀνδρὶ φάμεν ἐοικὸς ἀμφὶ δαιμόνων καλά· μείων γὰρ αἰτία), Pindar intends to reject the "slanderous" old tale of criticism of the gods and convert it into one of praise for them and for Pelops. To emphasize this shift, he resorts to negative expressions: he tells what he is *not* going to do; not only is he unable to tell this particular story, but, as a general observation, impoverishment frequently results from defamation. As always, we must keep in mind the positive: namely, that praise is motivated by kindness expressed towards a friend and results in mutual χάρις. On the other hand, one is reluctant to blame, for it is motivated by hatred and results in enmity. Its justified use is in conjunction with praise (cf. N. 8.37–42), but fault-finding for its own sake can become an alienating obsession (cf. Theophrastus' depiction of κακολογία). By eschewing the dangers of excessive blame, Pindar highlights *his* version of the myth, the love of Poseidon for Pelops.[37]

At P. 2.52–56, Pindar effects a transition from his long ψόγος of Ixion (21–48) to the praise of Hieron:

> ἐμὲ δὲ χρεών
> φεύγειν δάκος ἀδινὸν κακαγοριᾶν.
> εἶδον γὰρ ἑκὰς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ᾽ ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ
> ψογερὸν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν
> πιαινόμενον.

This passage is more elaborate than the one from *Olympian* 1, but it shares many common features, not least of which is the function of switching from blame (one form of epideictic poetry) to praise (the other). In effect, the poet is saying, "I am finished presenting the negative side of life and

---

[36] Bundy (above, note 5) 74 calls attention to the prominent φόνῳ at I. 5.50 (cf. ἐν φοναῖς at P. 11.37) which "prompts the recoil" of the succeeding lines. He gives more examples, ibid., note 100, to which add P. 1.80: καμόντων, P. 3.58: μόρον, and P. 10.48: λίθινον θάνατον φέρων (the last two suggested by the anonymous referee).

[37] Cf. O. 9.37–38 for a variation: τό γε λοιδορῆσαι θεούς / ἐχθρὰ σοφία.

intend to praise true accomplishment." At O. 1.52, he finds it "impossible"
to speak bad things; at P. 2.52 he "must flee repeated biting of reproach."[38]
At O. 1.52 he "stands away" from what the envious man ($\tau\iota\varsigma$ . . . $\phi\theta o\nu\epsilon\rho\hat{\omega}\nu$,
47) had said of the gods; at P. 2.54 he is "far away" from Archilochus (the
paradigmatic critic). At O. 1.53, Pindar expresses the poverty of slander in
a gnome; at P. 2.54, he uses the concrete example of Archilochus, who was
"frequently in poverty." The following table will make clearer the close
relationship of vocabulary in these two passages.

O. 1.52–53	P. 2.52–56
$\dot{\epsilon}\mu o\grave{\iota}$ δ' (52)	$\dot{\epsilon}\mu\dot{\epsilon}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (52)
$\ddot{a}\pi o\rho a$ . . . $\epsilon\grave{\iota}\pi\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ (52)	$\chi\rho\epsilon\grave{\omega}\nu$ $\phi\epsilon\acute{\nu}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\delta\acute{a}\kappa o\varsigma$ (52–53)
$\dot{a}\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau a\mu a\iota$ (52)	$\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\dot{a}\varsigma$ $\dot{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\nu$ (54)
$\kappa a\kappa a\gamma\acute{o}\rho o\upsilon\varsigma$ (53)	$\kappa a\kappa a\gamma o\rho\iota\hat{a}\nu$ (53)
$\theta a\mu\iota\nu\acute{a}$ (53)	$\tau\grave{a}$ $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\lambda$' (54)
$\dot{a}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\delta\epsilon\iota a$ (53)	$\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\dot{a}\mu a\chi a\nu\acute{\iota}a$ (54)

By this elaborate eschewing of blame, the poet not only prepares his
audience for the coming praise of Hieron (perhaps the most lavish in all
the odes), but also helps to define the positive aspects of praise by show-
ing what it is not.

IV. Kindness and Envy

Pindar uses a number of words to express the feelings of goodwill
toward someone who has achieved success. The most important are
$\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ($\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda o\varsigma$, $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota o\varsigma$) and $\chi a\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$ ($\chi\acute{a}\rho\iota\varsigma$, $\chi\acute{a}\rho\mu a$), and they represent
freely given, uninhibited joy, respect, and praise. Their most important
contrasting term is $\phi\theta o\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ($\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu o\varsigma$, $\phi\theta o\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$), which indicates feelings
of ill-will expressing itself in a *withholding* of approval, a *niggardliness*,
a *resistance*. The $\phi\theta o\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ is the *stinter* who *begrudges* others their fair
share of joy, and is therefore *illiberal*; he expresses his meanness in criti-
cism, disbelief, and refusal to participate in the spirit of the occasion.
For example, at the beginning of his "Funeral Oration," Pericles portrays
the great difference between the $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\nu o\upsilon\varsigma$ $\dot{a}\kappa\rho o a\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ who wants to hear
lavish (cf. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\varsigma$) praise, and the listeners whose $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu o\varsigma$ is aroused
at any exaggeration and who consequently withhold belief ($\dot{a}\pi\iota\sigma\tau o\hat{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\nu$)
(Thuc. 2.35.2).
In order to express the concept of whole-hearted, generous recogni-
tion of the *laudandus'* worth (characteristic of one who is $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\nu o\upsilon\varsigma$),

[38] Cf. A. M. Miller, "Pindar, Archilochus and Hieron in *P*. 2.52–56," *TAPA* 111 (1981)
138, note 13: "Since $\dot{a}\delta\iota\nu\acute{o}\nu$ means 'close,' 'thick,' 'crowded,' 'frequent,' (not 'strong,'
'violent,' as Slater and others take it), Pindar may be implying that it is persistent ('relent-
less' G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* [Baltimore 1979] 225) censure, not censure *per
se*, that must be avoided." This important article clears up many mistaken interpretations.

Pindar frequently employs negative expressions involving φθόνος. For example, at I. 5.22ff. he says "If someone has turned onto a clear road of god-given deeds,"[39]

> μὴ φθόνει κόμπον τὸν ἐοικότ᾽ ἀοιδᾷ
> κιρνάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων. (24–25)

At I. 1.41ff. occurs a very similar passage: "If someone devotes himself completely to excellence with expenses and hard work,"

> χρή νιν [sc. ἀρετὰν] εὑρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον
> μὴ φθονεραῖσι φέρειν
> γνώμαις. (43–45)

At O. 6.6–7 the poet asks (rhetorically): "What song (τίνα . . . ὕμνον; = οὐδένα . . . ὕμνον) would a man like that avoid," ἐπικύρσαις ἀφθόνων ἀστῶν ἐν ἱμερταῖς ἀοιδαῖς. The ἄφθονοι ἀστοί are those who, in positive terms, generously bestow praise out of delight (cf. ἱμερταῖς). In all three cases, negation of φθόνος expresses granting of high praise (as it does at Bacch. 3.67–68, 5.187–90, and 13.199–202).

The idea of generosity or bounty is also present in several other negative expressions. For example, at P. 3.71 Hieron "does not begrudge the good (their due)" (οὐ φθονέων ἀγαθοῖς), clearly litotes for "munificent to,"[40] as in the case of Theron: no one more generous (ἀφθονέστερον, O. 2.94) has appeared in a century. The sense of bounty is evident at N. 3.9, where Pindar prays to the Muse to grant him "abundance" (ἀφθονίαν) of song. Likewise at O. 11.7, he declares: "without stint" (ἀφθόνητος) is such praise as this dedicated to Olympic victors; ungrudged praise is lavish praise.

With the previous passages in mind we can better understand two more difficult ones involving φθόνος. The first is at O. 6.74–76:

> μῶμος ἐξ ἄλ-
> λων κρέμαται φθονεόντων
> τοῖς, οἷς ποτε πρώτοις περὶ δωδέκατον δρόμον
> ἐλαυνόντεσσι αἰδοία ποτιστά-
> ξῃ Χάρις εὐκλέα μορφάν.

The clear purpose of this statement is to lead up to the high praise of Hagesias' achievement in the games in lines 77–81: εἰ δ᾽ ἐτύμως . . . ᾽Αγησία . . . κεῖνος, ὦ παῖ Σωστράτου . . . εὐτυχίαν. The problem is that there is no explicit negative; the meaning must be that praise and congratulations are due when "respect-commanding Grace" sheds "glorious stature"

---

[39] For a thorough discussion of this passage, cf. Bundy (above, note 5) 56–57. A good positive parallel is N. 8.48–49: χαίρω δὲ πρόσφορον / . . . κόμπον ἱείς; note that μὴ φθόνει is the counterpart of χαίρω.

[40] Cf. above, note 6 for further implications of this expression.

on victorious racers (the positive being reserved for climactic effect). The solution lies in the words ἐξ ἄλλων. These "others" are (like the unspecified τις in the examples from Bacchylides) φθονεροί who are alien to the spirit of victory and give blame (μῶμος) when what is called for is respect and praise (cf. εὐκλέα). The φθονεραὶ . . . ἐλπίδες at I. 2.43 are of the same stamp, and the ἄλλος ἀνήρ with stinting designs (φθονερὰ . . . βλέπων) at N. 4.39 provides a good parallel for ἐξ ἄλλων.[41] In all these instances, Pindar draws attention to the existence of φθόνος not only to show that it is inappropriate in the given circumstances, but also to remind us that generosity (whether with wealth or praise) entails suppressing natural tendencies of niggardliness.

The second occurs at O. 8.53–55. Pindar has just finished the "myth" with Aeacus' return home (δεῦρ᾽, 51) on Poseidon's chariot, and he begins his transition to the victory at hand with the observation that "no one thing will be equally pleasant for men. But if I praise Melesias' fame in youths' events,[42] may φθόνος not strike me with a rough stone." Historical interpreters have found in this statement proof that Pindar is embarrassed about praising an Athenian in front of an Aeginetan audience.[43] But no such reference is even noted in the scholia, nor can it possibly be inferred from the text. When Bacchylides "fends off φθόνος with both hands" at 5.188–89 we are not meant to suspect that he and Hieron are surrounded by hostile enemies; he means that he intends to praise his subject fully and without reserve. Likewise, here μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος means in positive form "I trust that no one would harshly[44] begrudge me praise of Melesias," and then he goes on to say, in effect, "after all, at Nemea, I can report that he too won this honor." And after this, he briefly describes the career of this athlete/trainer, which now (νῦν, 65) has culminated in Alcimedon's victory, his trainer's thirtieth. If there is any hesitancy to be detected in Pindar's reference to φθόνος, it is (as the scholia say) because he is giving the trainer pride of place before the victor, but even this serves to underscore the exceptional praise of Melesias.

V. Various Expressions Denoting Association

One of the most remarkable manifestations of variety occurs in statements that concern association (or the lack of it). For example, to say that

---

[41] For an excellent discussion of this difficult passage, cf. A. M. Miller, "N. 4.33–43 and the Defense of Digressive Leisure," CJ 78 (1983) 210–11.

[42] The ambiguity of ἐξ ἀγενείων (54)—whether it refers to honors Melesias won "as a boy" or from "training boys"—is exploited in the following lines (56–66): it means both.

[43] Cf. H. T. Wade-Gery, "Thucydides the Son of Melesias," in Essays in Greek History (Oxford 1958) 247–48 and M. Woloch, "Athenian Trainers in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides," CW 56 (1963) 103–4, among many.

[44] The adjective τραχύς reinforces the notion of φθόνος and implies harsh opposition. Cf. the litotes οὐ τραχύς εἰμι at N. 7.76, "I am delighted."

someone has won crowns (cf. Bacch. 1.158: στεφάν[ων] ἐπίμοιρον) can be expressed by οὐ νέοντ᾽ ἄνευ στεφάνων (N. 4.77) or, as an injunction: μήτ᾽ ἐν ὀρφανίᾳ πέσωμεν στεφάνων (I. 8.6a). With the same metaphor, the Cleonymidae are said to be ὀρφανοὶ ὕβριος (I. 4.8–9), while Diagoras keeps straight down a path ὕβριος ἐχθράν (O. 7.90), and Demophilus has learned ὑβρίζοντα μισεῖν (P. 4.284); cf. Pa. 6.8–9: ψόφον . . . ὀρφανὸν ἀνδρῶν.

The attendance or help of a god (cf. σὺν θεῷ, I. 4.5) is subject to a number of negative variations such as οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ (P. 5.76), οὐδὲ . . . Χαρίτων ἄτερ (O. 14.8) (cf. the positive expressions σὺν . . . Χάρισσιν at N. 5.54 and εὖ λαχὼν Χαρίτων at Bacch. 1.151), ἃς [sc. Artemis] οὐκ ἄτερ (P. 2.7), ἄνευ σέθεν [sc. Eleithyia] οὐ . . . (N. 7.2–3), and οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν (I. 5.20).[45] At N. 2.12 Orion is "near" (μὴ τηλόθεν) the Pleiades, while Aegina is "near" the Graces (οὐ Χαρίτων ἑκάς, P. 8.21); at P. 4.5 Apollo is "on hand" (οὐκ ἀποδάμου ᾽Απόλλωνος), and at P. 10.37 the Muse is "present" (Μοῖσα δ᾽ οὐκ ἀποδαμεῖ).[46] At O. 1.108 and P. 9.90, the continued presence of the god is solicited with the expression μὴ λίποι, while at N. 3.76 Aristocleides "has his share" of aretai (τῶν οὐκ ἄπεσσι). Three times Pindar stresses the fact that something is "one's own" with negative expressions: χάρμα δ᾽ οὐκ ἀλλότριον, (P. 1.59), οὐ ξείναν . . . γαῖαν ἄλλων, (P. 4.118), and ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσί (I. 1.15).

A number of expressions involve "acquaintance." At O. 6.96–97 there is the positive statement that "music and song recognize Hieron" (ἀδύλογοι δέ νιν λύραι μολπαί τε γινώσκοντι). At I. 2.30 the halls of Thrasybulus' family are "not unfamiliar with (οὐκ ἀγνῶτες) revels and songs," while at N. 1.23 Chromius' halls are "not unacquainted with (οὐκ ἀπείρατοι) frequent foreign guests," and at I. 8.70 Cleandrus' youth is "not without experience (οὐκ ἄπειρον) of success." At O. 11.18 the Epizephyrian Locrians are "not inexperienced in beautiful things" (μήτ᾽ ἀπείρατον καλῶν), and at fr. 198a2 the poet describes himself as "not ignorant of the Muses" (οὐδ᾽ ἀδαήμονα Μοισᾶν), while at P. 9.58 Libya is "not unfamiliar with hunting" (οὔτ᾽ ἀγνῶτα θηρῶν). All these instances of negation of an a-privative are examples of litotes in vaunting statements.

Finally, it should be noted that words such as φεύγω and λύω can serve as virtual negatives. For example, at O. 6.6 a man like Hagesias "could not avoid" praise and at O. 11.17 the Epizephyrian Locrians are described as "not fleeing hospitality" (φυγόξεινον). Frequently, these verbs are used to "negate" undesirable words. At P. 9.92, the victor "has escaped the poverty of silence" (σιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν . . . φυγών), and at O. 6.89–90 the poet hopes to "escape the ancient reproach of 'Boeotian Swine'" (ὄνειδος . . . εἰ φεύγομεν)—that is, to be praised for his poetic

---

[45] Cf. P. 12.28–29, ἄνευ καμάτου / οὐ; O. 9.77–78, μή ποτε / . . . ἄτερθε (= "always beside"); and the frequent οὐκ ἄτερ (O. 8.45, P. 2.32).

[46] Cf. Köhnken (above, note 3) 66–67.

ability. At O. 4.21 the victory of Erginus "released him from the blame
of the Lemnian women" (ἔλυσεν ἐξ ἀτιμίας), that is, brought him their
praise,[47] and at O. 2.51–52 "success in the trial of the games releases
(one) from (the charge of) folly" (ἀφροσυνᾶν παραλύει), that is, gives
one a name for intelligence.[48]

VI. Litotes in Vaunts

Many examples (especially those with *a*-privatives) which we have
cited occur in sections of direct praise and may be called *litotes* (under-
statement which denies negative qualities). The phenomenon is too fre-
quent to treat in detail, but a few observations are pertinent. There are
two basic functions of such litotes; first, it attests to the ethical seriousness
of the poet, who is careful to guard against exaggeration, and, secondly,
it provides variation and a sense of climax in what might otherwise be a
mere shopping-list of virtues. One example is the vaunt at O. 11.16–19:

> ἔνθα συγκωμάξατ'· ἐγγυάσομαι
> ὔμμιν, ὦ Μοῖσαι, φυγόξεινον στρατόν
> μήτ' ἀπείρατον καλῶν
> ἀκρόσοφόν τε καὶ αἰχματὰν ἀφίξεσθαι.

Here the praise of the Epizephyrian Locrians is made convincing and
interesting by the artful use of litotes and positive praise. The praise of
Thrasybulus at P. 6.47–49 also exhibits this alternation:

> νόῳ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει
> ἄδικον οὔθ' ὑπέροπλον ἥβαν δρέπων,
> σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων.

Thrasybulus makes intelligent use of his wealth, he enjoys a youth of
justice and moderation, and appreciates poetry. The litotes relieves the
catalogue and gives a slight emphasis to σοφίαν.

Litotes is also evident (to the point of conventionality) in vaunts where
the superlative preeminence of the subject is expressed. Instead of the posi-
tive statement "Hieron is the greatest," Pindar resorts to the formula "no
one is better than Hieron." At N. 6.25 "no other house (ἔτερον οὔ τινα
οἶκον) possesses more boxing crowns"; at O. 13.30–31 Xenophon's double
victory achieved "what no mortal ever yet did before" (ἀνὴρ θνατὸς οὔπω
τις πρότερον). At O. 1.104 the poet is confident that there is no host "more

---

[47] Cf. οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντα at P. 9.80. Here again is the figure παρὰ τὸ προσῆκον, for the
negative expression implies that Erginus gained their praise contrary to the women's ear-
lier expectations.

[48] Cf. the positive statement at O. 5.16: εὖ δὲ τυχόντες [v.l. ἔχοντες] σοφοὶ καὶ πολίταις
ἔδοξαν ἔμμεν. The negative expression also implies that this esteem is gained *despite* the
commonsense view that it is simple folly to make great outlays of effort and expense when
the results are so uncertain (cf. O. 5.15–16).

knowledgeable or powerful" (μή τιν' . . . κυριώτερον) than Hieron; at
O. 2.93–94 he swears that "no city has in a century given birth to a more
generous man" (τεκεῖν μή τιν' . . . πόλιν . . . ἄνδρα μᾶλλον εὐεργέταν . . .
ἀφθονέστερόν τε) than Theron; at P. 1.49 he asserts that the Deinomenids
have won such honor "as no other Greek" (οἵαν οὔτις Ἑλλάνων δρέπει);
and in the most comprehensive terms of all, at P. 2.60 he declares that any-
one who claims any previous Greek king to be wealthier or more honored
than Hieron (ἕτερόν τιν' . . . ὑπέρτερον) "wrestles with an empty mind."

    Another variation of superlative praise is the well-known "ne plus
ultra." It is an aspect of the vocabulary of "distance" associated with
achievement, and the positive is expressed in such statements as: περαίνει
πρὸς ἔσχατον πλόον (P. 10.28–29; cf. N. 3.20 and I. 6.12–13). But more
often, the poet combines superlative praise with ethical caution by admon-
ishing the subject to "go no further." At I. 4.11–13, the two types are
combined:[49]

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀνορέαις δ' ἐσχάταισιν
οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἅπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις·
καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν.

</div>

Variations include μὴ ματεύσῃ θεὸς γενέσθαι (O. 5.24) and οὐκ ἔστι
πρόσωθεν θνατὸν ἔτι σκοπιᾶς ἄλλας ἐφάψασθαι ποδοῖν (N. 9.47).

    Finally, there is a group of passages in which litotes is employed to
express the idea that the victor's performance has measured up to the
expectations imposed by his heritage and/or physical stature. The model
is at Od. 24.112, where Telemachus assures his father that he will "not
disgrace" his race (οὔ τι καταισχύνοντα τεὸν γένος). Likewise, at
P. 8.35–37, the victor who is following in the footsteps of his uncles
"measures up to" (οὐ κατελέγχεις) their Olympic and Isthmian successes.
As a variation, at N. 3.15–16, Aristocleides "has lived up to" (οὐκ ἐλεγ-
χέεσσιν . . . ἐμίανε) his island's long-standing fame. At I. 3.13–14
Melissus "enhances the glory of" his inherited excellence (ἀνδρῶν δ'
ἀρετὰν σύμφυτον οὐ κατελέγχει), and at I. 8.66 Cleandrus "matches" his
cousin's performance (οὐ κατελέγχει). In Olympian 8 are two further
variations of this topic. The first is at O. 8.67 where Alcimedon enjoyed
divine favor (μέν), but (δέ) "didn't fall short of his manhood" (ἀνορέας δ'
οὐκ ἀμπλακών). The second is at O. 8.19:

<div style="text-align:center">

ἦν δ' ἐσορᾶν καλός, ἔργῳ τ' οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἐλέγχων.

</div>

The meaning is "he performed as well as he looked," as comparisons
show. Positive parallels include O. 9.94; ὡραῖος ἐὼν καὶ καλὸς κάλλιστά

---

[49] Note the alternation of negative and positive at P. 10.27–30 and N. 3.20–23 (in the
latter case ἐσχάτας is reserved for the description of the Pillars of Heracles). At
O. 1.113–14 we have τὸ δ' ἔσχατον . . . / μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον, and at O. 3.43–45
we have πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν . . . / τὸ πόρσω δ' ἐστὶ . . . ἄβατον.

τε ῥέξαις and N. 3.19: ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων τ' ἐοικότα μορφᾷ, while litotes is employed at I. 7.22: σθένει τ' ἔκπαγλος ἰδεῖν τε μορφάεις, ἄγει τ' ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἴσχιον φυᾶς and at A.P. 16.2 (for Theognetus of Aegina): κάλλιστον μὲν ἰδεῖν, ἀθλεῖν δ' οὐ χείρονα μορφῆς.[50]

VII. Negative Expressions in Assertions

Very frequently the poet asserts that he is *not* doing something in order to emphasize the positive intention. This procedure has caused considerable misunderstanding in certain passages. We have already seen how the assertion at O. 8.55, μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος (= "I know I can count on your goodwill"), has been understood to conceal real embarrassment. When the poet assures us that he is telling the truth (οὐ ψεύδει τέγξω λόγον, O. 4.17–18; οὐ ψεύσομ' ἀμφὶ Κορίνθῳ, O. 13.52; πολλῶν ἐπέβαν καιρὸν οὐ ψεύδει βαλών, N. 1.18; οὐ ψεῦδις ὁ μάρτυς, N. 7.49), that he is not hostile (οὔτε δύσηρις ἐὼν οὔτ' ὢν φιλόνικος ἄγαν, O. 6.19; σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον, N. 7.61; οὐ τραχύς εἰμι, N. 7.76), that others might begrudge the success (μή νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες, . . . σιγάτω, I. 2.43–44; μῶμος ἐξ ἄλλων κρέμαται φθονεόντων, O. 6.74), we are not meant to supply names and facts to construct a "historical" account, but to appreciate the difficulties that must be overcome for the poet to fulfill his generic responsibility "ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν."

This brings us to the notorious "envoi" of N. 7.102–5, where the poet assures his audience from the depths of his being (τὸ δ' ἐμὸν . . . κέαρ) that he "will never admit" (= "will always affirm") that he has "forced Neoptolemus with harsh words" (= "treated Neoptolemus with kindly words"). The form is perfectly regular; the negative οὐ goes immediately with ποτε to negate the verb φάσει, but its force continues throughout the entire sentence to negate the a-privative ἀτρόποισι.[51] Two passages will help to bring out the force of this statement. The first comes from the same poem (lines 65–67), where the poet assures his audience that he trusts in the hospitality of Thearion (προξενίᾳ πέποιθ'), that he can look Thearion's fellow citizens straight in the eye (ἔν τε δαμόταις ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν) because he has not overshot the mark (= been hyperbolic in his praise) (οὐχ ὑπερβαλών), and has dragged everything constrained from his path (βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσαις), which is to say that he has eschewed

---

[50] There is an interesting reversal of this *topos* at I. 4.49ff., where Melissus' poor appearance is belied by his performance: ἀλλ' ὀνοτὸς μὲν ἰδέσθαι, / συμπεσεῖν δ' ἀκμᾷ βαρύς. A similar topic underlies the story of Erginus at O. 4.18–27. The model is at *Il.* 5.801: Τυδεύς τοι μικρὸς μὲν ἔην δέμας, ἀλλὰ μαχητής.

[51] Cf. above, note 8. For other examples of negative expressions with ἔπος, involving οὐ with an a-privative (or its equivalent), cf. O. 1.86: οὐδ' ἀκράντοις ἐφάψατο ἔπεσι, P. 4.105: οὔτ' ἔπος ἐντράπελον . . . εἰπών, and P. 6.37: χαμαιπετὲς δ' ἄρ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπέριψεν. For other implications of the negative language, cf. also M. R. Lefkowitz, "Autobiographical Fiction in Pindar," *HSCP* 84 (1980) 44–45.

forced praise.[52] Whether or not the wrestling metaphor is present here as well,[53] ἐρύω is a synonym for ἕλκω (cf. schol. *ad loc.* who glosses it as ἐφελκύσας), and βίαια adds the notion of compulsion (cf. Slater, s.v. ἕλκω). If Pindar can use such vivid terms to vouch for his praise of Thearion, surely he can do the same for his praise of Neoptolemus. The second passage occurs at the end of *Nemean* 4.93–96:

> οἷον αἰνέων κε Μελησίαν ἔριδα στρέφοι,
> ῥήματα πλέκων, ἀπάλαιστος ἐν λόγῳ ἕλκειν,
> μαλακὰ μὲν φρονέων ἐσλοῖς,
> τραχὺς δὲ παλιγκότοις ἔφεδρος.

Here the wrestling metaphor is explicitly concerned with praise (αἰνέων). The main difference between this passage and that at N. 7.102ff. is that this one concerns *potential* praise, whereas that one is a justification of praise already given. The poet would be unbeatable when wrestling with words in praise of Melesias, treating good men in kindly fashion, but a rough competitor against bitter foes. Although the poet is here talking about his competition against other poets vying to praise Melesias, the words ἀπάλαιστος ἐν λόγῳ ἕλκειν and τραχύς depict the rough, unconquerable treatment which underlies the meaning of ἀτρόποισι . . . ἑλκύσαι ἔπεσι "wrestle with someone by using inflexible, unrelenting words."[54] The point is clear: the poet has treated Neoptolemus (in the poem) with amicable praise. This "envoi" at the end of the encomium descends from the χαῖρε at the end of rhapsodic hymns and expresses concern for the future reception of the poem. For example, Bacchylides confidently asserts at the end of his third ode that men will sing (τις ὑμνήσει) his poem. At the end of his encomium of Ptolemy, Theocritus bids farewell to his subject and predicts (in litotes) that his verse will not be rejected by future generations (δοκέω δ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπόβλητον / φθέγξομαι ἐσσομένοις, 17.136–37). To reinforce the earnestness of his assertion (οὔ ποτε φάσει),[55] Pindar then concludes the poem by saying that there is no point to repeating what is obvious to all.[56]

---

[52] For the interpretation of this passage, cf. E. L. Bundy, "The 'Quarrel Between Kallimachos and Apollonius' Part I: The Epilogue of Kallimachos's *Hymn to Apollo*," *CSCA* 5 (1972) 81–82, note 99.

[53] The presence of metaphors from wrestling is very likely, given 70ff. (cf. παλαισμάτων, 72).

[54] For the meaning of ἄτροπος, cf. E. Tugendhat, "Zum Rechtfertigungsproblem in Pindars 7. nemeischen Gedicht," *Hermes* 88 (1960) 404–5. The goddess Ἄτροπος is "inflexible," "relentless."

[55] Contrary to Slater's arguments (above, note 3) 92, φάσει is not a "conventional" future in the sense that he defines it, but assertive (like Theocritus' φθέγξομαι; cf. φάσω at Bacch. 1.159), and concerns the future reception of his poetry. Cf. Bundy (above, note 5) 22, note 49.

[56] Bundy (above, note 5) 28–29 says of N. 7.104–5, "its declaration of impatience with

When the poet wishes to make a strong assertion as at O. 8.55 and N.
7.102–5, he frequently makes it more forceful by choosing vivid meta-
phors. It is precisely such forceful language that has invited commentators
(ancient and modern) to read more into the text than is there. Thus we
have a Pindar supposedly cringing before his Aeginetan audience in
Olympian 8 because he is praising an Athenian trainer and in *Nemean* 7
because of another poem's version of Neoptolemus' death.[57] Another
example is at I. 5.51, when the poet ends his description of Aeginetan
success at the battle of Salamis with ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως καύχαμα κατάβρεχε σιγᾷ.
Because of the forceful language and the following reference to Zeus,
commentators have amplified on the scholiastic gloss διὰ τὸν ἔξοθεν
φθόνον and have read into this statement a fear on Pindar's part lest his
boasting call down the φθόνος τῶν θεῶν.[58] But, as Bundy has pointed
out,[59] there is nothing here about φθόνος, whatever its supposed source.
An analysis of the context reveals the intended meaning. At 46–48 the
poet announces that he has a great deal (πολλά) to say in celebration of
Aegina's prowess in the past and recently (καὶ νῦν) at Salamis (note the
auxetic elaboration in lines 49–50, as the poet's enthusiasm begins to wax).
But (ἀλλ᾽), *nevertheless* (ὅμως) (i.e., in spite of such a splendid theme),
he abruptly stops himself with "drench your vaunt[60] in silence," and the
fervor of his refusal (indicating that a theme as promising—especially
before Aeginetans!—as the battle of Salamis really takes some suppression
to keep it down) matches the grandness of the martial theme. The point of
the following asyndetic gnome is that Zeus dispenses a *variety* of things
(not specifically good and bad) and is master of all things: Ζεὺς τά τε καὶ

---

further elaboration adds force to the laudator's confident assertion that N. 7, his 'hymn to
Neoptolemos,' has done justice to this hero and to the other laudandi of the ode."

[57] Just as modern commentators invented the "problem" of Pindar's praising an
Athenian before an Aeginetan audience, I suspect that ancient interpreters like Aristo-
demus were troubled here (as so often elsewhere) by the strong language of 102–5, and
since there was nothing in the poem itself that could possibly be construed to offend
anyone—indeed, the portrayal of Neoptolemus is extraordinarily flattering—one of them
looked to see what Pindar might have said elsewhere about Neoptolemus. Coming across
Pa. 6, he "discovered" what must have been bothering Pindar. And then, the recovery of
the Paean (which contained just what Aristodemus said it did!) lent a specious plausibility
to his account.

[58] Cf. A. Boeckh, *Pindari Opera* 2.2 (Leipzig 1821) 520, who gives as Pindar's reason for
stopping: ne insolentius gloriando etiam deorum invidiam excitem. He is followed by a
number of critics, including Dissen and most recently M. M. Willcock, "On First Reading
Pindar: *The Fifth Isthmian*," *G&R* 25 (1978) 37–45.

[59] Cf. Bundy (above, note 5) 74, note 100.

[60] καύχαμα (like κομπέω) can mark a theme as "too grand" or "too imposing." Cf.
P. 10.1–4, where Pindar abruptly stops his "grand" themes with τί κομπέω παρὰ καιρόν;
and proceeds to his less elevated subject. Likewise, at O. 9.38–39, he rejects the "grand"
theme of Heracles' battles with the gods with τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρόν / μανίαισιν
ὑποκρέκει and proceeds to the more suitable story of Pyrrha and Deucalion.

τὰ νέμει, / Ζεὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος (52–53).[61] Having cited Zeus as the guarantor of variety in life, the poet can then say that such honors (as those won in games) also welcome the joy of victory celebration.[62] Thus the entire passage serves as a transition from Aegina's glory in war to her athletic successes, and the first word of the following sentence, μαρνάσθω (54), nicely links the two spheres of activity (cf. ἐν ⟨Ἄρει, 48 and ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν, 55). A pious Pindar recoiling before the "jealousy of the gods" disappears, and in his place is a poet giving high praise for Aegina's martial prowess, while recognizing her athletic prominence.

VIII. Negative Expressions in Prayers

Since the language of prayers is naturally cautious and to a great extent apotropaic, negative expressions abound. Although a detailed examination of this phenomenon is beyond the scope of this article, what has already been said applies equally here: negatives provide abundant nuances of vocabulary and avoid the tedium of a list of positive requests. As a gross generalization, requests in prayers have two underlying hopes: (1) that the god be pleasantly disposed, and (2) that he give good things.[63] It is obvious that the one follows from the other and that either can just as easily be expressed in negative terms: (1) may the god not be displeased, and (2) may he not withhold (curtail, disrupt) good things. These two are expressed positively at O. 2.12–15 (ἰανθεὶς ἀοιδαῖς / εὔφρων, 13–14; κόμισον, 14), while at O. 13.24–29, the first is negative (ἀφθόνητος ἔπεσσιν / γένοιο, 25–26) and the second is positive (νέμων . . . εὔθυνε . . . δέξαι, 27–29). At P. 8.67–72 the first (that the god be pleased at the song) is positive: ἑκόντι . . . νόῳ / κατά τιν' ἁρμονίαν βλέπειν (67–68); the second is negative: θεῶν δ' ὄπιν / ἄφθονον αἰτέω . . . ὑμετέραις τύχαις (71–72). In both cases the privation of φθόνος is meant to convey generous approval.

At P. 10.17–22 occurs an interesting variation:

> ἕποιτο μοῖρα καὶ ὑστέραισιν
> ἐν ἁμέραις ἀγάνορα πλοῦτον ἀνθεῖν σφίσιν·
> τῶν δ' ἐν Ἑλλάδι τερπνῶν
> λαχόντες οὐκ ὀλίγαν δόσιν, μὴ φθονεραῖς ἐκ θεῶν
> μετατροπίαις ἐπικύρσαιεν. θεὸς εἴη
> ἀπήμων κέαρ.

---

[61] Note the elements of a summary priamel (τά τε καὶ τά, πάντων). For analyses of this passage in broader contexts, cf. Bundy (above, note 52) 80–81 and W. H. Race, "The End of Olympia 2: Pindar and the Vulgus," CSCA 12 (1979) 257.

[62] Fr. 141 provides a good parallel: θεὸς ὁ πάντα τεύχων βροτοῖς / καὶ χάριν ἀοιδᾷ φυτεύει, as does Pa. 6.132–34.

[63] Cf. W. H. Race, "Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns," GRBS 23 (1982) 8–14.

First the request for continued benefits is put positively (ἔποιτο μοῖρα . . .
ἀνθεῖν, 17–18); then, after mentioning their "not small portion" of success,
it is put negatively (μὴ φθονεραῖς ἐκ θεῶν / μετατροπίαις ἐπικύρσαιεν,
20–21), that is, may the gods not cease their largesse. And, finally, concern
for the god's good disposition comes last in litotes: ἀπήμων κέαρ = καρδία
γελανεῖ at O. 5.2 (of a goddess) and means "with a glad heart."[64] The last
request then leads to extended praise of the victorious father and son. In
these examples from O. 13, P. 8, and P. 10, φθόνος has the same meaning
when used of divinity as it does when referring to a human audience and
means *withholding* of pleasure or generosity.

There are numerous variations on the request that the gods not cease
giving benefactions. After praising Hieron at O. 6.92–97, Pindar prays
that his prosperity may continue for a long time: μὴ θράσσοι χρόνος
ὄλβον ἐφέρπων (97); more figuratively at P. 5.120–21 he prays: μὴ
φθινοπωρὶς ἀνέμων / χειμερία κατὰ πνοὰ δαμαλίζοι χρόνον. At O. 8.28–
29 he prays: ὁ δ᾽ ἐπαντέλλων χρόνος / τοῦτο πράσσων μὴ κάμοι; cf.
Bacch. 5.36: εὖ ἔρδων δὲ μὴ κάμοι θεός.[65] And, finally, Pindar ends
Olympian 8 with a series of positive and negative variations of the kind
under discussion (84–88):

> ἐσλὰ δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἐσλοῖς
> ἔργα θέλοι [sc. Ζεὺς] δόμεν, ὀξείας δὲ νόσους ἀπαλάλκοι.
> εὔχομαι ἀμφὶ καλῶν
>   μοίρᾳ νέμεσιν διχόβουλον μὴ θέμεν·
> ἀλλ᾽ ἀπήμαντον ἄγων βίοτον
> αὐτούς τ᾽ ἀέξοι καὶ πόλιν.

IX. *Pythian* 9.70–103

Perhaps the most fitting way to end this article is with an examina-
tion of a longer passage in which Pindar displays his artistic ποικιλία
with respect to negative expressions in a very impressive fashion.[66] At
P. 9.70 the poet ends his account of Cyrene's past by mentioning its
fame in athletics: κλεινάν τ᾽ [sc. πόλιν] ἀέθλοις. The last word (reserved
for climactic effect) provides an easy transition to Telesicrates' Pythian
victory (καί νυν, 71), which is amplified in positive terms in the follow-
ing lines (71–75). Then, before beginning the rest of the catalogue of
Telesicrates' victories, he pauses to explain how he will proceed (76–79):

[64] The full arguments for this interpretation are in my "Two Pindaric Passages: *Pyth.*
5.55 and *Pyth.* 10.21–22," *AJP* 104 (1983) 182–88.

[65] Similarly, at P. 1.90, Pindar's advice to Hieron, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις, means "keep
on spending." For positive statements expressing the "joy" of spending, cf. O. 4.15: χαί-
ροντά τε ξενίαις πανδόκοις, I. 4.29: δαπάνᾳ χαῖρον ἵππων, and I. 6.10.

[66] There are many other possible choices, including P. 1.85–100, P. 2.73–96, and
N. 7.54–82.

ἀρεταὶ δ' αἰεὶ μεγάλαι πολύμυθοι·
βαιὰ δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν
ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς· ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως
παντὸς ἔχει κορυφάν.

"There is always a great deal to say about success, but wise men like to hear a varied elaboration (ποικίλλειν) of a few themes among longer ones, for this deft selection (καιρός) conveys the gist just as well."[67] There is a great deal that could be said about Pindar's literary theory as presented in these lines, but the most important word for this study is ποι-κίλλειν, for it suggests the *variatio* that is so apparent in the ensuing catalogue of verses 79–103. And one of the ways in which this variety is apparent is through the use of negative expressions, of which there are five examples in a mere fifteen lines. The first occurs immediately in lines 79–80:

ἔγγνον ποτὲ καὶ Ἰόλαον
οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντά νιν ἑπτάπυλοι Θῆβαι.

Until Bundy (and more recently A. Köhnken),[68] these lines were badly misunderstood because the almost formulaic nature of the expression οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντά νιν was not recognized. When the poet says that Iolaus—a personified, active force inherent in the games named in his honor—"did not dishonor him," he means "(the games of) Iolaus conferred honor on Telesicrates," i.e., Telesicrates won τιμή at the Iolaia.[69] It is all the more remarkable that this negative expression has caused so much difficulty, when a clear parallel in positive form can be found just nine lines above (71–72):

καί νυν ἐν Πυθῶνί νιν ἀγαθέᾳ Καρνειάδα
υἱὸς εὐθαλεῖ συνέμειξε τύχᾳ.

Here ἐν Πυθῶνι= Θῆβαι; Καρνειάδα υἱός = Ἰόλαον; νιν = νιν; and εὐθαλεῖ συνέμειξε τύχᾳ is a positive variation of οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντα. Even the καί νυν corresponds to ποτέ! The main difference is that in the one Iolaus "honored" Telesicrates, while in the other Telesicrates "honored" his city Cyrene.

After brief mention of the highlights of Iolaus' career, the poet

---

[67] Cf. Bundy (above, note 5) 17–18, who gives an excellent survey of the entire passage under discussion and concludes, "Here is a catalogue relieved of tedium by brevity (βαιά, line 80) and variety (ποικίλλειν, line 80)." See also the important analysis of verses 76–79 by D. C. Young, "Pindar, Aristotle, and Homer: A Study in Ancient Criticism," *CA* 2 (1983) 156–70.

[68] Cf. A. Köhnken (above, note 3) 63–66.

[69] Cf. the negative expressions (all in victory catalogues) at O. 13.34: Νέμεά τ' οὐκ ἀντιξοεῖ, O. 7.86–87: ἐν Μεγάροισίν τ' οὐχ ἕτερον λιθίνα / ψᾶφος ἔχει λόγον, and N. 4.21: Καδμεῖοί νιν οὐκ ἀέκοντες ἄνθεσι μείγνυον.

traces his lineage back to Amphitryon and tells of Alcmena's giving birth
to two sons: διδύμων κρατησίμαχον σθένος υἱῶν (86). Here again, the last
word is the link with what follows. Pindar has purposely withheld the
proper names of these twins in order to assert them climactically. But
since he has already recounted the deeds of Iolaus, a flat account of their
deeds might seem repetitious, however splendid they are. So, he resorts
to *praeteritio* (87–88):

> κωφὸς ἀνήρ τις, ὃς 'Ηρακλεῖ στόμα μὴ περιβάλλει,
> μηδὲ Διρκαίων ὑδάτων ἀὲ μέ-
> μναται, τά νιν θρέψαντο καὶ 'Ιφικλέα.

Whether κωφός is a "deaf-mute" and the sentence means "everyone talks
about Heracles . . ." (= "objective" in Bundy's terms),[70] or κωφός means
"dullard" and refers to poets "who are stupid not to talk about Heracles,
etc." (= "subjective"), the rhetorical effect is the same: the subject is set
beyond the need to praise, for Heracles, Thebes, and Iphicles are treated
fully (cf. στόμα περιβάλλει) and continually (ἀὲ μέμναται). By thus
relieving himself of the need to say more about their exploits—the mere
mention of their name being sufficient for everyone—he can conclude
with "thanks" to them (a variation of the hymnal χαίρετε) for Tele-
sicrates' victory: τοῖσι τέλειον ἐπ᾽ εὐχᾷ κωμάσομαί τι παθών / ἐσλόν
(89–89a).[71]

    Now that the poet has completed his account of Telesicrates' Theban
victories (in the Iolaia and the Heracleia), the poet pauses before passing
on to others with a brief prayer cast in negative terms for continued
inspiration, thus making a clean break between the Theban victories and
those at Aegina and at Megara, closer to the victor's homeland (89a–90):

> Χαρίτων κελαδεννᾶν
> μή με λίποι καθαρὸν φέγγος.

A positive form of this prayer is found at O. 9.82–83: τόλμα δὲ καὶ
ἀμφιλαφὴς δύναμις / ἕσποιτο (also introducing extended praise). Μὴ
λίποι is clearly equivalent to ἕσποιτο and the καθαρὸν φέγγος is the
clear light of praise (cf. κελαδεννᾶν) which illumines success and makes

---

[70] D. C. Young, "Pindar's Style at *Pythian* 9.87f.," *GRBS* 20 (1979) 133–43 argues that
the reference is "objective," but it could equally (given ἀὲ μέμναται) refer to poets.

[71] Bundy (above, note 5) 70, note 86 shows how close the language of this "thank-you" is
to Theogn. 341–42. The verb κωμάσομαι is almost certainly an "encomiastic" future,
which is fulfilled with its very utterance, (i.e., "I will (now) celebrate"). The τι παθὼν
ἐσλόν is a nice variation (from the recipient's point of view) of the οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντα (from
the point of view of the games). Cf. also Bacch. 8.27–30: τελέσ[αις . . . εὐχάς . . .
ὀ]πά[σσαι]ς . . . ἄνθημ᾽ ἐλαίας.

it apparent, "illustrious." And, finally, the Χαρίτων κελαδενναῖ represent the beauty and χάρις (pleasure, goodwill) of the celebratory occasion.

The asseveration (cf. φαμί, 91) which follows avers that *three* (δή, 91) times at Aegina and Megara Telesicrates has glorified "this city" (= Cyrene):[72]

σιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν ἔργῳ φυγών (92)

"by avoiding silent helplessness," that is by providing a ready subject for praise.[73] This is a variation of the positive declaration of his Pythian victory above at 73–75, where νικάσαις (73) = ἔργῳ (92), ἀνέφανε Κυράναν (73) = πόλιν τάνδ᾽ εὐκλέϊξας (91), and δόξαν ἱμερτὰν ἀγαγόντ᾽ (75) = σιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν . . . φυγών (92). It is important to note that in reporting these victories at Aegina and Megara, Pindar has reversed the usual order of negative followed by a positive climax, which we have noted so frequently. Here he does it in order to emphasize the public theme (the city of Cyrene), while at the same time passing on to the victor, whose full praises he intends to sing, but not yet. In Bundy's terms, the negative expression provides a kind of decrescendo before the final praise of the victor.

But before launching into the final catalogue of local victories (and here the words πόλιν τάνδ᾽ at 91 have neatly led us back geographically to Cyrene), he prepares with an extended injunction to praise, this time to the local citizens of Cyrene (ἀστοί always refers to local, fellow citizens) (93–96):

οὔνεκεν, εἰ φίλος ἀστῶν, εἴ τις ἀντά-
    εις, τό γ᾽ ἐν ξυνῷ πεποναμένον εὖ
μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἁλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω·
κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν
παντὶ θυμῷ σύν τε δίκᾳ καλὰ ῥέζοντ᾽ ἔννεπεν.

At line 73 the poet had said that Cyrene would receive Telesicrates graciously, νιν εὔφρων δέξεται. That promise is now fulfilled, Telesicrates has "returned" to his homeland, and the poet is now, as it were, defining more precisely the word εὔφρων: every fellow townsman in Cyrene—even some

---

[72] I am accepting Hermann's εὐκλέϊξας at 91. I find Burton's arguments compelling (above, note 30) 52–54. It can be stated as a law of convention that ἥδε πόλις always refers to the home of the victor, and it is inconceivable that Pindar would have written three other odes for Telesicrates' victories at minor games. Finally, it is awkward for the poet to introduce himself before the οὔνεκεν (93), which says "for that reason" everyone should praise Telesicrates. Οὔνεκεν must mean "because of his victories," not "because of my celebrations." See also G. M. Kirkwood, "Pythian 5.72–76, 9.90–92, and the Voice of Pindar," *ICS* 6 (1981) 19–21.

[73] Cf. Pa. 6.9–11; ἦλθον / ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἀ[λ]έξων / τεοῖσιν ἐμαῖς τε τιμαῖς, the last part of which means "to maintain my honor."

τις who may be hostile[74]—should openly proclaim (μὴ . . . κρυπτέτω) *this achievement* (at least! γ') in which all share (τό γ' ἐν ξυνῷ πεπονaμένον εὖ). And, by so doing, he will "not do harm to" (i.e., "heed") the command of the old man of the sea. After these negative expressions, the poet can then assert the positive declaration: "he enjoined (everyone) to give whole-hearted and just praise even to an enemy when he performs well."

Having ended on this climactic note with "let us all praise the victor," Pindar can boldly sum up the concluding items in the catalogue of successes, Telesicrates' local victories. Note the force of πλεῖστα νικάσαντά σε (97, in asyndeton), the silent (but heartfelt) testimony of the maidens (98–100), the climactic address, ὦ Τελεσίκρατες (100), and the open-ended ἔν τε καὶ πᾶσιν ἐπιχωρίοις (102–3), reemphasizing that we have arrived "home." It is not by accident that the remarkable account which then finishes the ode (103–25) is about a "local" ancestor of the victor.

In this catalogue we have seen an amazing display of ποικιλία, of alternation between positive and negative statements, all carefully calculated to lead up to the next item. This is just one of the more obvious examples of Pindar's genius for craftsmanship that can be seen again and again in all the odes. It is hoped that this article will encourage readers to watch more carefully Pindar's use of negatives and thereby gain greater precision of meaning and greater appreciation for Pindar's art, for he is just as likely to describe what things aren't (πῶς οὐκ ἔχει) as what they are.

---

[74] It is unnecessary to speculate, as does Burton (above, note 30) 55, following H. J. Rose, "The only assumption necessary is that Telesicrates had enemies in Cyrene who were loath to acclaim his successes." On the contary, the implication of this conventional "omnibus celebrandus est" is that his success is shared by all (ἐν ξυνῷ, 93) and no one would be so mean as to deny him his praise (αἰνεῖν, 95).