

Pindar's Poetry and the Obligatory Crux: *Isthmian* 5.56–63, Text and Interpretation

M. S. Silk
King's College London

I

The end of Pindar's Fifth Isthmian (56–63) is a difficult passage, and commentators have said so. A sample of their comments gives a flavour of the difficulties: "the scholiasts had some trouble with...", "loci interpretatio virorum doctorum studiis non minus obscurata quam expedita," "the most obscure passage of all...", "von den vielen Interpretationen, welche diese Stelle gefunden hat...", "perhaps the most difficult phrase in Pindar, about which commentators have been somewhat too easy-minded," "the assumption...would not lighten the darkness," "testo corrotto: diversi gli emendamenti e più ancora le interpretazioni," "the most flagrant violation of...", "misconceived owing to the idea that...", "leges concinnae orationis prohibent...", "unica difficoltà...", "nothing but apparent necessity could reconcile..."—and early on in the passage, and foremost among its several difficulties, comes what one commentator has called "the obligatory crux" itself.¹

Commentators have identified some of the difficulties, but not all of them; and in any case they have failed to offer satisfactory solutions. The difficulties, once properly identified, are soluble, but their solution calls for not only patient and sensitive analysis of Pindar's words, but also some fairly sustained consideration of a wide variety of matters, cultural, linguistic, palaeographical, lexicographical² and literary—where "literary" takes in both epinician etiquette and the distinctive idiom and sensibility of a great poet. Elucidation of the passage, accordingly, invites an exemplary discussion, one that seeks both to establish and interpret a sequence of text and to help expose

¹Respectively: Hamilton 109 n. 13 (on the *celebrandi* of *I.* 5 and *I.* 6); Schroeder (on 56–58); Norwood 193 (on 56–58); Thummer (on 56–58); Farnell (on 57–58); Farnell (*ibid.*); Privitera (on 57–58); Fennell (on 59–61); Bury (on 59–61); Christ (on 59–61); Privitera (on 59–60); Fennell (on 62–63); Willcock 1978: 41 (on 57–58).

²Under which heading I subsume "literary lexicography," as defined by Silk 1983: 305.

the workings of Pindar's poetry. The discussion that follows, which is sometimes fuller than might have been expected, is offered in this spirit.

For *I. 5* we are effectively reliant on two manuscripts, both of which survive with scholia. The manuscripts are B (Vat.gr. 1312: late twelfth century) and D (Laur. 32, 52: early fourteenth), whose common source was a lost copy of, probably, around 1100.³ B's readings are commonly less corrupt, and form the basis of the text, or texts, to be found in all modern editions. In so far as there is such a thing as a modern vulgate, Turyn's text can pass for it. In Turyn, *I. 5.56–63* is printed as follows:⁴

56 οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρός
57 μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι
58 ἐλπίδων ἔκνισ' ὄπιν.
59 αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις
60 Φυλακίδα πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι,
61 χερσὶ δεξιόν, νόῳ ἀντίπαλον.
62 λάμβανέ οἱ στέφανον, φέρε δ' εὖμαλλον μίτραν,
63 καὶ πτερόεντα νέον σύμπεμψον ὕμνον.

This is essentially the version of B, except that in 58 B has ἔκνιξ', in 60 φυλακίδα, in 63 σύμπεμψον. The variations in D are largely trivial corruptions (ἐκπίδων ἔκνιζ' 58; γηοδάμαις 59; φυλακίδαν 60; νόων 61; νόον 63), except that in 63, where B has the obviously wrong σύμπεμψον, D has the obviously right σύμπεμψον.⁵ Of the putative corrections accepted by Turyn, ἔκνισ' (58) is a conjecture by Ceperinus and Φυλακίδα (60) another by Erasmus Schmid,⁶ the former *metri gratia*, the latter motivated by considerations of language and sense.

In Sandys' Loeb translation, no less representatively, the same sequence is rendered thus:⁷

³"...écrit entre 1075 et 1150," Irigoin 137. Full details, id., 137–39; cf. the summary in Snell-Maehler 1987: I.viii–ix.

⁴But with numeration as in Snell-Maehler *et al.*: 56–63 S-M = 63–70 T.

⁵Information in Christ. On codd. B and D, see Irigoin 157–65 and 321–30.

⁶Not acknowledged as such by Bowra (*OCT*: 1947), by any Teubner editor from Schroeder onwards, or by Turyn himself, all of whom imply that -ίδα is in B. Some editors (like Privitera and Thummer) even say so explicitly. Correct information (kindly now confirmed by Professor Herwig Maehler) in Gerber 1976: 136, and (among older editors) Bury, Christ, and Mommsen.

⁷My choice of "representative" translation is the Loeb translation by Sandys (1919), rather than the generally improved version by Race (1997), partly because the Sandys version is at

The long toil of the brave is not quenched in darkness, nor hath counting the cost fretted away the zeal of their hopes. I praise Pytheas also among pancratiasts, who, in guiding aright the course of Phylacidas' blows, was skilful with hands, and a match in mind. Take for him a crown and carry him a fillet of fine wool, and speed him on his way with this new-winged song.

The vulgate text, as indeed its basis in BD, is deeply problematic on several counts. Though suspiciously odd or opaque in places, the vulgate translation is not so much problematic, at least not *per se*, as irreconcilable with the Greek. In any case its sense is—on several counts—quite distinct (as I hope to show) from the sense of Pindar's original.

A few words on the context. The Fifth Isthmian has as its occasion a victory by Phylacidas of Aegina in the pankration. As *I.* 5 and two other odes, *N.* 5 and *I.* 6, make clear, Phylacidas was a member of a distinguished athletic family, distinguished not least for the recent successes of the new victor's elder brother, Pytheas. In broad terms the content of *I.* 5 is straightforward. After much celebration of human achievement in general, and the triumphs of Phylacidas, Pytheas, Aegina and the Aeacids in particular, the ode offers another tribute to the family's athletic achievement (54–56)

μαρνάσθω τις ἔρδων
ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν γεγενᾶν Κλεονίκου
ἐκμαθῶν

and, as unproblematic corollary, the reaffirmation that heroic effort *tout court* (μακρὸς μόχθος ἀνδρῶν) has indeed not been “blocked” nor are we “blinded” to it (οὔτοι τετύφλωται)⁸—and then the rest of the given sequence, οὐδ' ὁπόσαι κτλ., where all the problems are located. Within this final sequence the difficulties in, and with, the vulgates, ancient and modern, fall into two groups: first, the clause from οὐδ' ὁπόσαι to ὅπιν; then the

the time of writing much more familiar, but also because, on most of the main points at issue in the closing part of *I.* 5, Race broadly follows Sandys in any case.

⁸Not actually, or not simply, “quenched in darkness” (Sandys) or “hidden” (Race). The verb is used in a similar portmanteau metaphor at *O.* 12.9. For τυφλῶ = “block,” cf. *Aen. Tact.* 2.1, 2.5 (of roads) and *Thphr. CP* 5.15.7 (of plant growth); likewise τυφλός of body passages, *Arist. PA* 675b.7. Man's “long labour” has not been “blocked” like... (the vehicle is unspecified: *Silk* 1974: 127–29), and, as a result, that labour is not made “blind” (so Σ, *III.249* Drachmann), i.e., (metonymically) we, the world, are not blind to it, can still see it (in which sense cf. *Pi. fr.* 228 and *Race* 1990: 69).

remaining five verses from αἰνέω to ὕμνον at the end. Let us take the two sequences separately.

II

οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι | ἐλπίδων ἔκνιξ' ὅπιν: thus B, then Schroeder (1900, without comment), Bowra (but with a “vix sanum”), and Slater (with another “vix sanum” and daggers enclosing ἐλπίδων ἔκνιξ' ὅπιν). *Vix sanum* indeed. Whatever else it may be, the sequence is defective on metrical grounds. ἐλπίδων ἔκνιξ' ὅπιν = – ∪ – – – ∪ –, whereas it seems from the two other (cor)responding moments in the poem that what is required is – ∪ – – ∪ ∪ –.⁹ Given that, on the face of it, the fault lies in -ιξ' (– for ∪), then that D's ἔκνιζ' (though offering the same syllabic weight as B's ἔκνιξ', along with an unlikely imperfect, for good measure) nevertheless serves to prompt thoughts of conveniently available forms of the same verb, and also that, as we shall see, the forms ἔκνισα / ἔκνισαν crop up in the scholia on the passage, most modern editors have opted for convenient availability. Specifically, since 1526, when Ceporinus proposed the familiar Attic-*koine* aorist ἔκνισ' (– ∪) for B's “Doric” ἔκνιξ' (– –), the ξ- form has generally been discarded in favour of the σ-, and the metre thereby restored. The result is the modern vulgate, cited already from Turyn: οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι | ἐλπίδων ἔκνισ' ὅπιν. With or without minor variations of punctuation (a stop before οὐδ', a comma before ἐλπίδων), and with or without editorial misgivings, this bit of Greek was accepted, before Turyn, by Boeckh, Dissen, Bergk, Christ, Fennell, Bury, Sandys, Puech and Farnell and, after Turyn, by Willcock, Privitera and Race.

The irony is that the rejected ἔκνιξ' is surely right, and that it is almost the only right thing about the whole sequence. Not that ἔκνισ'- is in itself un-Pindaric: in itself it is as Pindaric (e.g., *P.* 11.23) as ἔκνιξ'- (e.g., *I.* 6.50). Rather that there are independent grounds for objecting to, pretty well, everything else, but none—despite the metrical impropriety—for objecting to ἔκνιξ': the metrical impropriety is merely the incidental consequence of a deeper and more extensive corruption. The fact is that οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι | ἐλπίδων ἔκνιξ' (or ἔκνισ') ὅπιν is gibberish, and for a number of reasons, three above all: (a) the overall construction is irredeemably bizarre; (b) ὅπιν (or any other part of ὅπις) is effectively unintelligible in this context; (c) the genitive ἐλπίδων is

⁹Despite the fact that the (cor)responding moments of text are themselves both the product of Triclinian emendation: 16 θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει (θνατοῖς BD), 37 Ἡρακλεῖ πρότερον (Ἡρακλεῖ BD).

close to unintelligible. And then again, less decisively, but still very damagingly: (d) the idiom with κνίζω is suspect; (e) the plural δαπάναι is a puzzle.

If so much is uncertain, it would be sensible to see what, if anything, can be said of the structure of the οὐδ' ὁπόσαι sequence in the light of the words that introduce it. One thing at least can be said. Unless Pindar's original bears no relation at all to the vulgate, we may assume that the aorist of ἔκνιξ' (*vel sim.*) is a gnomic aorist, as is implicit in the use of ἀνδρῶν in 57. The point here is that the sequence οὗτοι...ἀνδρῶν reads primarily as a "gnomic" comment on non-specific ἄνδρες, albeit there is, of course, a specific occasion for making the comment, namely the continuing triumphs of the γενεὰ Κλεονίκου (54–57):

μαρνάσθω τις ἔρδων
ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου
ἐκμαθῶν· οὗτοι τετύφλωται μακρός
μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ'...

The logic is: "look at this family and you will see that men's μακρὸς μόχθος—i.e., the μόχθος of generations of many *heroic* men—has not been blocked [τετύφλωται]." In poetry with Pindar's epinician presuppositions, the word ἄνδρες, unqualified in the plural, will be so taken unless there is some other phraseological directive to restrict its reference to (for instance) the ἄνδρες of *a* or *the* family. So it is with the unqualified "heroes" of (e.g.) *O.* 3.36–38, τοῖς γὰρ ἐπέτραπεν Οὐλυμπόνδ' ἰὼν θαητὸν ἀγῶνα νέμειν Ἰ ἀνδρῶν τ' ἀρετᾶς πέρι καὶ ῥιμφαρμάτου Ἰ διφρηλασίας. Or again, more simply, earlier in the present ode (*I.* 5.11): κρίνεται δ' ἄλκᾳ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν. In fact, if one excludes all qualified ἄνδρες phrases like ἀνδράσιν αἰχματᾶσι (*O.* 6.86), there seem to be about thirty instances in Pindar's extant epinicians where an unqualified plural ἄνδρες implies unspecific "man" or "men"¹⁰ and none at all where it turns out to refer exclusively to specific "men," i.e., to the γενεά, *unless* the immediate context provides programmatic specification. Consider, for instance, *P.* 10.5–6, where the "sons of Aleuas" are depicted as

¹⁰To the examples cited add: *O.* 1.17, 1.66, 6.10, 8.8, 8.58, 9.28, 9.88, 12.5, 13.7, 13.16; *P.* 2.43, 3.5, 3.105, 5.94, 5.123, 8.28, 8.76, 8.97, 12.4; *N.* 6.1, 6.10, 6.29, 7.24, 9.12, 11.38; *I.* 3.1, 8.14. "Qualified" ἄνδρες phrases are very various in form: see, e.g., those at *P.* 5.22 and 9.107.

Ἴπποκλέα θέλοντες
ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὄπα

and where the ἄνδρες, transparently, are the victor's particular celebrants. In such a case, Pindar's context provides an unambiguous particularizing directive.¹¹

At *I.* 5.57, by contrast, there is no such unambiguous directive; and, without one, the ἀνδρῶν are to be taken primarily as non-specific "heroes," "men," "the brave." If one were to attach a label to the perfect τετύφλωται, one might indeed hesitate as between an "ordinary" perfect and what Gildersleeve¹² called a "gnomic perfect," of which a clear example would be the κέρδει καὶ σοφία δέδετα of *P.* 3.54. There can be little doubt, nevertheless, that the spirit of the whole clause οὔτοι...ἀνδρῶν is "gnomic," and it surely follows that whatever comes after, linked by the simple coordinate οὐδέ, should be "gnomic" likewise; i.e., if what follows is ἐκνιξ', then ἐκνιξ' is a gnomic aorist. Like—though also, obviously, very unlike—Achilles' κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὃ τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ ὃ τε πολλὰ ἐοργῶς (*Il.* 9.320), Pindar's ἄνδρες (each one, very much, πολλὰ ἐοργῶς) impose a generalizing quality onto the whole sentence.¹³

At which point we may conveniently cite the evidence of the scholia (III.249 Drachmann):

οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι ἐλπίδων: Ἀρίσταρχος οὕτως· οὐδὲ ὁπόσαι δαπάναι αὐτοῖς ἐγενήθησαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκβεβηκυῶν ἐλπίδων τῶν περὶ τὴν νίκην, ἐκνισα τῇ φωνῇ, οὐδὲ ἐλυπήθη τῇ φωνῇ, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον ὕμνησα αὐτούς. ἔνιοι δὲ καταλληλότερον γράφουσι σὺν τῷ ν ἐκνιξ' ὅπιν, ἴν' ἢ Πινδαρικὸν σχῆμα· οὐκ ἐκνισαν αἱ δαπάναι οὐδὲ ὁ μόχθος αὐτῶν τετύφλωται, ἀλλὰ ὀξυδερκεῖ καὶ ἔχει καλὰ ἀποτελέσματα. ὥστε εἶναι· οὐδὲ ὁπόσαι δαπάναι τὴν τῶν ἐλπίδων ὅπιν, τουτέστι τὸ μέλλον ὀπίσω ἔσεσθαι, ἐκνισαν καὶ ἐλύπησαν.

¹¹So, e.g., *I.* 3.11–14 and *O.* 6.22–25.

¹²Gildersleeve 111.

¹³Privitera plausibly relates the tenses here to those at *O.* 12.7–8: "sul valore di τετύφλωται e per il suo abbinamento con un aoristo ved. *Ol.* 12.7 sgg. [σύμβολον δ'] οὐ πῶ τις ἐπιχθονίων | πιστὸν ἀμφὶ πράξιος ἐσσομένας εὖρεν θεόθεν, | τῶν δὲ μελλόντων τετύφλωνται φραδαί." This εὖρεν, like ἐκνιξ' in *I.* 5, exemplifies what Gildersleeve (112) calls an "empirical aorist," sc. "when the [gnomic] aorist has a temporal adverb or a negative or a numeral with it." For another Pindaric example, cf. ἐν σχερῶ δ' οὗτ' ὦν μέλαινα καρπὸν ἔδωκαν ἄρουραι, *N.* 11.39.

This remarkable paragraph contains a number of points which will need to be considered at a later stage in the argument. For the moment let us note that this scholium indicates: that the passage was already thought of as problematic in antiquity; that ὅπιν, along with the rest of B's clause, was a known reading in antiquity—though not necessarily the only known reading; and that Aristarchus thought Pindar wrote, not ὅπιν (σὺν τῷ ν), but ὀπί (“voice,” glossed φωνῇ).

To return now to the objections to the vulgate text: problem (a), the construction is bizarre. Two interpretations have been proposed, neither at all plausible. The first, picking up the scholia, involves the notorious σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν: plural subject (i.e., masculine/feminine plural subject), singular verb. For this purpose δαπάναι could be taken as parallel to μακρὸς μόχθος, with ὀπόσαι δαπάναι κτλ. a compressed relative clause equivalent to πᾶσαι δαπάναι ὅσαι κτλ.¹⁴ Thus, for instance, Nisetich's translation,

The great labors
Of their men have not been blotted out,
Nor has the expense that fed their hope...

where “expense” is parallel to “labors,” and where the plural δαπάναι (“expense”) is taken to govern the singular ἔκνιξ’ or ἔκνισ’ (“fed”).¹⁵ There is certainly no problem about the “reverse attraction” relative construction. At *S. Tr.* 1060–61, οὐθ’ ὄσην ἐγὼ ἰ γαῖαν καθαίρων ἰκόμεν... is equivalent to οὐτε πᾶσα γαῖα ὄσην...; at *E. Hipp.* 389–90, οὐκ ἔσθ’ ὀποίῳ φαρμάκῳ διαφθερεῖν ἰ ἔμελλον is again equivalent to οὐκ ἔστι φάρμακον ὀποίῳ...; at *Hdt.* 2.104.4, ὁκόσοι τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἐπιμίσγονται οὐκέτι Αἰγυπτίους μιμέονται, the ὁκόσοι is simply “those who”; while at *P.* 9.46 Pindar himself uses ὄσος and ὀπόσος as simple equivalents (ὄσσα τε...χῶπόσοι...).¹⁶ The problem is the relation between δαπάναι and ἔκνιξ’ / ἔκνισ’: “the long toil of the brave has not been blocked [τετύφλωται], nor <have [sc. τετύφλω[ν]ται]> all

¹⁴This is not, however, how Σ seems to construct the sentence; the presentation in Σ is closer to the interpretation offered by Farnell, p. 33 below.

¹⁵Note the misinterpretation of ἀνδρῶν as specific (“their men”: likewise Race 1997). After “fed their hope” Nisetich's version adds a redundant “come to nothing” (i.e., τετύφλω[ν]ται is translated twice), but the point is unaffected. Kurke (1991: 200) is among others who interpret the syntax the same way, though she attempts to avoid σχ. Π. by accepting, and reinterpreting, Wilamowitz's emendation (below, pp. 39–40).

¹⁶On the “*tractio inversa*,” see Schwyzler II: 641.

those (plural) δαπάναι ἐλπίδων which (singular) ἔκνιξ' / ἔκνισ' ὄπιν" (or "...all those δαπάναι which ἔκνιξ' / ἔκνισ' ἐλπίδων ὄπιν").¹⁷

This is simply not Greek idiom. The plural/singular idioms that are, or may be, grouped together under the unhelpful heading of the σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν are as follows:¹⁸

[i] The sense construction whereby a following verb retains the number of an initial singular subject (*vel sim.*), as *Il.* 23.380–81, μετὰφρενον εὐρέε τ' ὦμω | θέρμετ'.¹⁹

[ii] The sense construction whereby the number of a following verb is assimilated to an adjacent or intervening predicate or a singular item in a composite subject (*vel sim.*), as *Pi. O.* 11.4–6, ὕμνοι, | ὑστέρων ἀρχὰ λόγων, | τέλλεται and *P.* 10.41–42, ὕοσοι δ' οὔτε γῆρας οὐλόμενον κέκραται | ἱερᾷ γενεᾷ.²⁰

[iii] A sequence with a singular verb (usually ἔστι, ἦν or γίγνεται) preceding its plural subject, as *S. Tr.* 520, ἦν δ' ἀμφίπλεκτοι κλίμακες.²¹

[iv] A clause with a plurality of grammatical subjects which are "mentally unified"²² and seen as a single collective entity. Thus *Il.* 17.386–87, γούνατά τε κνῆμαί τε πόδες θ' ὑπένερθεν ἐκάστου | χεῖρές τ' ὀφθαλμοί τε παλάσσετο.²³

[v] An unexpected, but fairly well-attested, association of the plural noun/singular verb with the dithyramb and its Dionysiac qualities. Thus *Pi. fr.* 70b 12–13, στοναχαὶ | μανίαι τ' ἀλαλαί τ' ὀρίνεται.²⁴

Most of the quotable examples of the *schema* are in verse, though not all (especially in category [iii]); some can be explained in more than one way;

¹⁷See below, pp. 40–41.

¹⁸On the *schema Pindaricum* see in general: Kühner-Gerth II.1: 68–69 (and 79–81); Schwyzer II: 608; Haydon 182–92; Wilpert *passim*; Braswell on *P.* 4.57(a).

¹⁹On which see Richardson *ad loc.* and Chantraine II: 19.

²⁰Cf. Verdenius on *O.* 11.6.

²¹See further Kühner-Gerth and Schwyzer (n. 18 above), and compare and contrast Haydon (*ibid.*).

²²Dodds on *E. Ba.* 1350.

²³Differently explained by Edwards *ad loc.* as formulaic adaptation. Examples like *Pl. Lg.* 925e are not open to that explanation. Further instances in Dodds on *E. Ba.* 1350.

²⁴"In choral lyric the σχ.Π. seems to belong esp. to the dithyrambic style": Barrett (*Addenda*) on *E. Hipp.* 1255. Cf. Kannicht on *E. Hel.* 1358–59. The other Pindaric evidence is *fr.* 75.16–19 and *fr.* 78.2–3; cf. also *fr.* 239.

most—for whatever reason—involve either parts of the verb εἶναι or verbs with medio-passive forms. Outside the given five categories, examples are either textually corrupt or—as in quite a few cases—the result of a misunderstood (e.g., archaic) verb form.²⁵ In *I.* 5 the δαπάναι...ἔκνιξ' / ἔκνισ' construction bears no relation to any of the five categories; there is no question of a misunderstood verb form; the necessary conclusion is that the unidiomatic construction is no part of what Pindar wrote.²⁶

The alternative way of making something of the vulgate syntax is presented by Farnell: “there seems only one way of finding sense and a sort of syntax in the phrase, namely, to say that ὅπ. δαπ. is ‘short’ for a subordinate sentence [sc. noun phrase!] such as τὸ φροντίζειν ὅπόσαι εἰσὶν αἱ δαπάναι: ‘the thought of how great is the expense did not fret away, etc.’; this is, on the whole, the view of Schroeder and Sandys.” Sandys (to recall) translates, “the long toil of the brave is not quenched in darkness, nor hath counting the cost fretted away the zeal of their hopes.”²⁷ Schroeder (1900) first quotes Heimsoeth’s paraphrase: “nec quotquot sumptus, i.e. quotiens certaverunt, laesa iis est ἔλπ. ὅπ.” He then adds: “ὅπόσαι ita explicant, ut aut ‘quanti fuerint’ (Er. Schmid) aut ‘[nec] quotquot fuerunt, hoc attrivit eorum studium’ (Dissen) intellegant, alii rursus schema Pindaricum statuunt...” One may well doubt whether these explanations—Farnell’s own and those others he associates with his own—are all the same. One cannot doubt that they are all impossible. Farnell’s own portmanteau (“the thought of how great is...”) would presumably require at least a post-Pindaric τός²⁸ before the ὅπ. δαπ., which is in any case not there. Sandys’s “counting the cost” likewise cannot be got out of the Greek. As for the “quotquot” and the “quanti” indulged in by Schroeder: assuming that one allows the elliptical two-word clause (ὅπ. δαπ., “whatever the cost/costs”: not so much impossible Greek as implausible Pindar),²⁹ one is faced with a new

²⁵See Haydon. A good example of corruption is Hippon. 68.1 W (once read as ἡμέραι... ἔστιν, now shown by papyrus evidence to be ...εἰσιν: compare the app.crit. of Bergk *ad loc.* [*PLG*⁴ II: 472, fr. 29] with West); a good example of an archaic form is *Hom.h.Cer.* 279 (κόμαι κατενήνοθεν: Richardson *ad loc.*).

²⁶Hummel 57 claims *I.* 5.57–58 as one of several “presque sûres” examples of the σχ. Π., but without further discussion.

²⁷Simplified by Race (1997) to “nor have all their [cf. n. 15 above] costs vexed the zeal of their hopes.”

²⁸*LSJ* s.v. ὅ ἡ τό B.I.5: Kühner-Gerth II: 1.596–97. First attested in Euripides (*Hipp.* 265) and Herodotus (7.143.1; 8.79.3).

²⁹Not impossible Greek: rather, a very elliptical version of the type represented by Hdt. 6.12.3, τὴν μέλλουσαν δουλήτην ὑπομεῖναι ἥτις ἔσται (Kühner-Gerth II: 2.423), and less

problem. Irrespective of what the singular subject of ἔκνιξ' / ἔκνισ' might now be,³⁰ and irrespective, again, of the wrong (specifying) interpretation of the aorist, the sequence as interpreted is surely un-Pindaric because, with it, the value of δαπάναι would be negative. The logic would be something like: “μόχθος—thank heavens—has not disappeared off the face of the earth [μόχθος evidently having a positive value, then], and, *whatever* the δαπάναι / *despite* the δαπάναι, they keep on hoping”—where “hope,” like μόχθος, carries a positive value, but δαπάναι (like our “cost,” “expense”) does not. In Pindaric ideology, however, δαπάναι(ι) always—albeit paradoxically—has a positive value: δαπάναι(ι) opens the way to ἀρετά (*I.* 1.41–42, *O.* 5.15) and is accordingly rewarded by a κόμπος (*I.* 1.43) or μέλος (λυτήριον δαπανᾶν μέλος χαρίεν *P.* 5.106–7); above all, the victor is called upon to keep on spending (μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις, *P.* 1.90) and, with ἀρετά in view, can even be said to *enjoy* the costs (δαπάνῃ χαῖρον, *I.* 4.29; δαπάνῃ τε χαρεῖς...πράσσει...ἀρετάς, *I.* 6.10–11).³¹ This would be the only occurrence of the word in Pindar which unmistakably foregrounded its possible negative implication. The possibility indeed seems particularly remote here, given that one would expect μόχθος and δαπάναι(ι) to be a matching pair,³² so that if the one (μόχθος) is positive, the other should be positive as well. On several counts, then, the proposed construction is not credible.

Problem (*b*): ὅπιν (or any other part of ὅπις) is effectively unintelligible in this context. In its classical usage ὅπις is a not very common word, largely (though not entirely) restricted to verse, but—unlike many “verse words”—a word with a very precise scope. Most of the extant pre-Hellenistic occurrences are in *LSJ*,³³ but, contrary to the presentation in *LSJ* and elsewhere, the word has only two demonstrable senses, both of them firmly located within the sphere of religion.³⁴ The two senses are closely related: ὅπις is *either* the gods’

idiomatic than the elliptical type represented by Hdt. 2.126.1, πρήσσεσθαι ἀργύριον ὁκόσον δὴ τι.

³⁰The plural δαπάναι all over again? The μόχθος??

³¹Cf. Race 1990: 79, and Cingano (in Gentili *et al.*) on *P.* 1.90.

³²See pp. 42–43 below.

³³Add Tyrt. 10.12 (p. 35 below); there is also a very dubious reconstruction in a fifth-century Thessalian inscription, *CEG* I.120 (proposed by Maas, not accepted by Hansen). On later examples missing from *LSJ*, see n. 46 below.

³⁴Cf. Kaufmann-Bühler 285–86. Like ὅπις, the derivative ὀπίζομαι always points to religious awe/reverence in the archaic and classical periods, as a glance at *LSJ* s.v. indicates. The presentation in *LSJ* is defective, however, in not making clear that all three Pindaric uses share this implication (so, rightly, Willcock on *I.* 3.5 and Carey on *P.* 2.17; in *P.* 4.86 the

response to human behaviour, especially, though not only, a retributive response (“vengeance”: θεῶν ὅπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες, *Il.* 16.388; θεαὶ... ἀπὸ τῶ δῶσι κακὴν ὅπιν, *Hes. Th.* 221–22; θεῶν δ’ ὅπιν ἄφθονον αἰτέω, *Pi. P.* 8.71–72), or the religious “awe” felt by men in the light of, or the prospect of, the gods’ propensity to respond (οὔτε δαιμόνων οὔτε θεῶν ὅπιν ἔχοντας, *Hdt.* 9.76.2; οὔτ’ αἰδῶς οὔτ’ ὅπιν, *Tyrt.* 10.12³⁵). “Gods’ response,” “divine retribution,” “religious awe”: it is not remotely apparent how any one of these meanings could belong here.

Mindful of the complexities of Greek religious ideology, and bearing in mind that Pindaric gods can feel, or express, φθόνος, that this φθόνος may be aligned with ὅπιν (θεῶν δ’ ὅπιν ἄφθονον αἰτέω, *P.* 8.71–72), and that Pindar elsewhere associates *human* φθόνος with “hopes” in the notable phrase φθονεραὶ θνατῶν... ἐλπίδες (*I.* 2.43), one might wonder whether ἐλπίδων ὅπιν could somehow stand for ἐλπίδας φθονεράς. Without contextual support, however, this is surely out of the question, while, even if it were possible, the ἐλπίδες should still be those of the *gods*, which has nothing to do with the passage. Then again, even if the ἐλπίδες could be men’s ἐλπίδες, the sequence of thought would be quite illogical: the φθονεραὶ... ἐλπίδες of *I.* 2.43 “are felt by those who long to deprive the victor of praise” and belong to the world, not of “good” ἐλπίς (ἀγαθὰ: *I.* 8.15), but of “greedy” ἐλπίς (ἀναιδής: *N.* 11.45–46).³⁶ But in *I.* 5 the ἐλπίδες evidently belong with μόχθος and δαπάναι, which are *positive* elements associated with the victorious achievement and its celebration.³⁷

Commentators do not, as a matter of fact, try to convert ὅπιν to φθόνον. What they mostly do, however (and *LSJ*, representatively, with them), is no less implausible. They invoke a supposed secular sense of ὅπιν, “*pious care or zeal*” in *LSJ*’s version, whence Sandys’s translation: “nor hath counting the cost fretted away the zeal of their hopes.” *LSJ*’s presentation is instructive. After a main, and fairly unexceptionable, section “**I.** of the gods,” they add:

word, used of the response of the people of Iolcus to the sight of Jason, is explained at once by the question οὐ τί που οὗτος Ἀπόλλων κτλ.), as do, explicitly, those at *Thgn.* 734 and 1148.

³⁵Bergk’s conjecture, not adopted by West (q.v.), but very probable.

³⁶Bulman 22.

³⁷See p. 34 above. The arousal of φθόνος can be seen as a mark of achievement, of course (cf., e.g., *P.* 1.85 and Walcot 39–40), but that notion is too far from the present passage to be even possibly relevant.

II. of men, 1. *the awful regard* which men pay to the gods, *religious awe, veneration, obedience*, οὔτε δαιμόνων οὔτε θεῶν ὅπιν ἔχοντας, paying no *regard* to .. (cf. ὀπίζομαι), Hdt.9.76, cf. 8.143; so also ὅπι (v.l. ὅπιν) δίκαιον ξένων strict in his *reverence towards* strangers, i.e. in the duties of hospitality (al. ξένον), Pi.O.2.6; αἰδεσθεῖς ὀπιδα..πολιοῖο γενείου maintaining *due reverence* for the hoary beard, Mosch.4.117. 2. *pious care or zeal*, Pi.I.5(4).58.

This is bad lexicography.³⁸ A “trustworthy” classical prose usage (Herodotus) has been related to a whimsical trope from later poetry (Moschus)³⁹ and to—wonder of wonders—not one but *two* corrupt passages from Pindar. As *LSJ*’s entry indicates, besides the uncontroversial ὅπιν of *P.* 8.71 (discussed above) and the problematic ὅπιν of *I.* 5, there is also one other Pindaric *locus* to consider, *O.* 2.6. In Snell-Maehler the passage in question, with surrounding context, appears as follows (5–7):

Θήρωνα δὲ τετραορίας ἔνεκα νικαφόρου
γεγωνητέον, ὅπι [sic] δίκαιον ξένων, ἔρεισμι’ Ἀκράγαντος,
εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν.

ὅπι δίκαιον ξένων, “strict in his reverence towards strangers” (*LSJ*): this is indeed the nearest thing to any sort of parallel for secular ὅπις in classical Greek. Yet even this is not the same, because such “reverence” would actually devolve from Zeus *xenios* (πρὸς...Διὸς εἰσιν...ξεῖνοι, *Od.* 6.207–8). In any case this is only a conjectural text, rightly described by its most recent editor as quite “uncertain.”⁴⁰ All manuscripts (supported by *POxy.* 13.1614) point us to ΟΠΙ δίκαιον ξένον, and in the Byzantine era, at least, ΟΠΙ was in fact interpreted as ὀπί, “voice,” and associated with the preceding word γεγωνητέον (witness the scholiastic glosses ἐμμελεστάτῳ ᾄσματι / ἐν λόγοις / φωνῇ).⁴¹ On metrical grounds this ὀπί (~ ~) can hardly be right as it stands, since ~ – is required; but then again, the “uncertain” form ὅπι, which is

³⁸Cf. the fuller discussion of *LSJ*’s weakness in dealing with literary modes of language in Silk 1983. I take the opportunity to note here that the 1996 *Revised Supplement* to *LSJ* contains nothing that directly affects my discussion of ὅπις or any other lexical item discussed in this article.

³⁹On the principle and implications of this appeal to ‘trustworthy’ usage, see Silk 1974: 27–56, esp. 43–48; on the imperative need to resist interpreting classical (pre-Hellenistic) usage by reference to later (Hellenistic, etc.) usage, id. 38–39.

⁴⁰Willcock (1995: 143) *ad loc.*, adding, “this [is] the least uncomfortable reading.”

⁴¹Abel I.110: 8–9.

accepted by most modern editors for its supposed metrical value $\sim -$, is nowhere attested with this value; and a glance at the range of alternative conjectures⁴² is enough to dispel any cosy belief that ὄπι, or any part of ὄπις, has even commended itself to all modern authorities on Pindar's text.⁴³

Out of this unhappy *mélange* of conjecture, later usage and misrepresented earlier usage arises the alleged quasi-secular sense "reverence" (quite unjustified itself), and then (worse still) the separate category "pious care" or "zeal," invented to house the present passage from *I.* 5. One would say that here *LSJ* are committing the sin they commit too often elsewhere⁴⁴—mistaking what smells like a one-off poetic use for an established lexical meaning—except that here the smell is not even of a one-off poetic use, but of a one-off textual corruption.

As so often, *LSJ* have not invented their line of thought. Their "pious care" or "zeal" is common to most of the commentators over the last two centuries, and can be traced back to an earlier world of scholarship, namely the lexicographical lore of late antiquity. In Hesychius we find the gloss ὄπιν· ἐπιστροφὴν, in the *Suda* ὄπις· ἢ ἐπιστροφή, and elsewhere in the Pindaric scholia an extended version in the form of an unconvincing etymology, ὄπις... ἢ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐπιστροφή καὶ τοῦ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσομένου—in other words a derivation of ὄπις from ὀπίσω.⁴⁵ The form ὄπιν that is used as lemma in Hesychius is the commonest single form in our literary attestations of the word; but it is also the corrupt form transmitted at *I.* 5.58. I suggest that it may have been precisely this corruption that engendered the late lexicographical entries, and this corruption too that engendered the post-classical usage represented by Moschus (cited by *LSJ*).⁴⁶ For this to be possible, of course, the

⁴²See Gerber 32.

⁴³To the crux in *O.* 2.6 I have no solution, but note that, besides importing the *ad hoc* and otherwise unattested form ὄπι, the "uncertain" text (*coni.* Hermann) offers a sequence, δίκαιον..., ἐρεῖσιν'..., εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον, which is in effect a triadic structure, ABC τε. Such a structure is not common in any period ("rarely, τε couples the last two units of an otherwise asyndetic sequence": Denniston 501) and does not seem to occur elsewhere in Pindar (see Slater 488–89).

⁴⁴As, representatively, with the word πέμφιξ. See Silk 1983: 306–9.

⁴⁵On *I.* 3.5: III.223, 22–23 Drachmann. Cf. Σ on *I.* 5.58: III.249, 8–9 Drachmann.

⁴⁶Disguised only by the alternative epic formation ὀπιδα. For the record, no other later-antique uses of ὄπις seem to be attested, except for two other C.E. epic uses of θεῶν ὀπιν (Tryphiod. *Il.* 598 and epic adesp. ["ἐπίγραμμα"] ap. Philostr. *Her.*, II.214 Kayser). Besides this, there is only a very implausible conjecture at Timo Phl. 802.2 *Supp.Hell.* (see edd. *ad*

corruption must have been very early, Hellenistic or even pre-Hellenistic. And so indeed it was, as is indicated by the fact, noted earlier, that Aristarchus had already ascribed ὀπί to Pindar in preference (so one infers) to the ὀπιν (“σὺν τῷ ν”) read by unspecified ἔνιοι.⁴⁷ That is: ὀπιν was a reading known to, but rejected by, Aristarchus, meaning that the corruption had already entered the manuscript tradition by the third century B.C.E. The corruption thereafter prevailed *and* generated a gratuitous reinterpretation of ὀπις—witness both the later lexicographers and the usage in Moschus (*Meg.* 117), which, in full, is: αἰδεσθεῖς ὀπιδα προτέρην πολιοῖο γενείου, “maintaining a reverent *regard* for the hoary beard.” In this association of ὀπις and αἰδώς, together with the learned “extension” that presupposes, surely, scholarly discussion of Pindar’s supposed ὀπιν, one sees a Hellenistic poet’s characteristic allusion to a tradition of which he is not strictly a member but seeks to appropriate.⁴⁸ The spirit of such recreativity is aptly summed up by Bulloch on Callimachus’ use of Homer:

The poetic tone is that of the Homeric/poetic language, which is apparent in small details of form and phraseology which have no more exact significance except that they are “Homeric”....Rare words, usages, constructions etc. are picked out as special Homeric idiosyncrasies...and existing Homericisms are extended, or new ones created according to Homeric practice.... Occasionally an unusual feature is illuminated by what we know of editorial work which Hellenistic writers did on Homer...though discrepancies with Aristarchus’ later work are noticeable....⁴⁹

Under “Homericisms” now subsume “Pindaricisms,” and the whole statement can stand as a formula for Moschus’ recreative ὀπιδα, not least its evident “discrepancy” with Aristarchus.

After all of which, it seems almost superfluous to look back to the supposed Pindaric phrase ἔκνιξ’ / ἔκνισ’ ὀπιν and note how specific κνίζειν is,⁵⁰ and how anomalous it would be for a classical user of the language to suggest doing anything so specific to ὀπις. As a human being, one can “heed”

loc.) and what looks like an eccentric misunderstanding in Maiistas 58 (p. 71 *Coll. Alex.* Powell), where ὀπιν ἔκλεεν (*sic*) seems to imply a confusion of ὀπιν with ὀπα.

⁴⁷Above, pp. 30–31: cf. Wilamowitz 1922: 204 n. 1.

⁴⁸In Moschus’ phrase there is also learned allusion to canonical epic usage: ὀπιδα, *Od.* 14.82 *al.*, ὀπιν αἰδέσαστ’, *Od.* 21.28.

⁴⁹Bulloch 28.

⁵⁰See below, pp. 41–42.

or “not heed” ὅπῑς (θεῶν ὅπῑν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες, *Il.* 16.388); one can “have in mind” or “not have in mind” ὅπῑς (οὐκ ὅπῑδα φρονέοντες ἐνὶ φρεσίν, *Od.* 14.82), “be aware” or “not be aware” of ὅπῑς (οὐδὲ θεῶν ὅπῑν εἰδότες, *Hes. Op.* 187), “feel αἰδῶς” or “not feel αἰδῶς” in the face of ὅπῑς (οὐδὲ θεῶν ὅπῑν αἰδέσαστ’, *Od.* 21.28); or one can simply “keep” or “not keep” ὅπῑς (θεῶν ὅπῑν ἔχοντας, *Hdt.* 9.76.2). To have ὅπῑς as object of a verb like κνίξειν would be utterly out of line with attested usage, whatever meaning one attempted to foist onto either of these words.

One attempt has been made to salvage ὅπῑν in a way that would evade some, albeit only some, of the problems discussed:

οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρός
μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ’ ὁπόσαι δαπάναι
ἐλπιδ’ ἔκνιξαν ὅπῑν.

This is the text printed by Thummer (1968) and in successive Teubner editions from Schroeder (1914) up to and including the latest edition by Snell-Maehler (1987), whose apparatus laconically reports: “Wil. (ὅπῑν = ἐξοπίσω).”⁵¹ Farnell comments: “Wilamowitz’s treatment of the passage is original: he proposes ἐλπίδ’ ἔκνιξαν ὅπῑν, and explains the last word as adverbial accusative of a lost noun from which ὅπιθεν and ἔξοπῑν are derived in the sense of ‘afterwards’, ‘after the event’; and he makes the phrase dependent on τετύφλωνται [*sic*].” On the most positive interpretation, the supposed meaning would be: “the long toil of ἀνδρῶν has not been blocked [τετύφλωται], nor have all those expenses which did / which do habitually [gnomic aorist] κνίξειν hope for the future.” *Inter alia* Wilamowitz has not only eliminated the impossible ὅπῑς, but has also produced a Greek construction, and done justice to the positive force of δαπάναι and the tense of the verb⁵²—and this with a relatively modest emendation of reasonable palaeographical plausibility.

The cost of these improvements, however, is dire. Farnell remarks: “it is never helpful to emend a difficulty by an unknown word or a word of unproved meaning; and the whole phrase as [Wilamowitz] rewrites it is more obscure than what the MSS have given us.” It may be doubted whether Wilamowitz’s

⁵¹Wilamowitz proposed ἐλπίδ’ ἔκνισαν ὅπῑν in 1909: 825 n. 1. Schroeder printed ἔκνιξαν ὅπῑν in 1914 (2nd ed.). Wilamowitz emended his own emendation accordingly in 1922: 204 n. 1.

⁵²And also eliminated at least one more of the problems we have still to discuss in detail: the genitive, ἐλπίδων.

Greek is *more* obscure than the vulgate; but quite apart from the fact that the reference to the future, if not obscure, is certainly otiose (what else could the hope be, but “for the future”?), the postulation of a wholly unattested word is indefensible. A *hapax* may be peculiarly liable to engender scribal mystification and corruption, but to conjecture a new *hapax* (without any other supporting evidence) to explain a textual problem, and thereby to replace the problematic by the unknowable, is a breath-taking methodological impropriety. The pretext for Wilamowitz’s imaginative leap, presumably, is the scholiast’s phrase τὴν τῶν ἐλπίδων ὄπιν, τουτέστι τὸ μέλλον ὀπίσω ἔσεσθαι—but not only is this remark a mere variation on the dubious etymological theme pursued by the Pindaric scholia elsewhere, and not some specific key to the present passage; it in any case still presupposes the ἐλπίδων ὄπιν phrase that the putative adverb is supposed to eliminate.⁵³

After these—necessarily—lengthy discussions, the remaining problems posed by the vulgate text can be dealt with more summarily.

Problem (c): as Wilamowitz’s conjecture acknowledges, the genitive, ἐλπίδων, is hardly explicable. It must be dependent on either [i] δαπάναι or [ii] ὄπιν (so Σ). However, [i] δαπάναι ἐλπίδων is alien to fifth-century poetic Greek. What could this conjunction of abstractions possibly mean? “Expenditure(s) of hope(s)”? A glance at Pindar’s own attested usage of δαπάνα serves to suggest how remote such a phrase is from attested linguistic reality. In Slater’s lexicon the article on δαπάνα is as follows:

⁵³On ὄπιν / ὀπίσω see above, p. 37. Wilamowitz’s emendation also creates additional problems of its own, notably that in any kind of Greek ἐλπίδα is not much more plausible as a prospective object of κνίζειν than ὄπιν is (above, pp. 38–39, and below, pp. 41–42), especially in the singular, where ἐλπίδα is rarely the object of any remotely comparable verb: ἀποτρέπει ἐλπίδα (S. *Trach.* 124–25) is the closest available parallel. (In the plural, cf., e.g., ἀπὸ γὰρ κόρος ἀμβλύνει...ἐλπίδας, P. 1.82–83.) One should add that the meaning of ἐλπίδα κνίζειν would presumably be “provoke to hope” (below, p. 42), which in Pindar would be odd in the sense that ἐλπίς, even if *good* ἐλπίς (below, pp. 51–52), is hardly a τέλος. N.B. that a restored ἐλπίδ’ could only be ἐλπίδ(α), *pace* Thummer (on 56–58) and Kurke (1991: 200), who seem to suppose it could be ἐλπίδι: elision of dative singular -ι is not attested in melic poetry (West 1982: 10). Wilamowitz’s invention and the possible ὄπιν / ὀπίσω link are discussed learnedly and sympathetically by Burkert (198–204), who speculates that ὄπις may have originated as a pseudo-noun, generated by epic-poetic misunderstanding of the supposed adverb ὄπιν. In the end, however, Burkert (plausibly) rejects this interpretation of ὄπιν for Pindar, for lack of any supporting evidence that the adverb survived to his time, and (tamely) acquiesces in the vulgate, whose eccentricities are ascribed to Pindaric creativity (202–3).

expenditure (upon the training of athletes and horses) αἰεὶ δ' ἀμφ' ἀρεταῖσι πόνος δαπάνα τε μάρναται 0.5.15. μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις P.1.90. τὸ καλλίνικον λυτήριον δαπανᾶν μέλος χαρίεν P.5.106. εἰ δ' ἀρετᾶ κατὰκειται πᾶσαν ὀργάν, ἀμφοτέρων δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις I.1.42. οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρὸς μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι ἔλπίδων ἔκνιξ' ὅπιν I.5.57. εἰ γάρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάνᾳ τε χαρεῖς καὶ πόνῳ πράσσει θεοδμάτους ἀρετάς I.6.10. c.gen., δαπάνᾳ χαῖρον ἵππων *expenditure upon horses* I.4.29.

In Pindaric usage, evidently, δαπάνα(ι) is prospectively concrete and refers to literal expenditure.⁵⁴ One would therefore expect δαπάναι ἐλπίδων to have to mean something like “expenditure [of money resulting] from hope(s),” but the ellipse is as implausible as the opacity, in this context, is inconsequential: as the other δαπάναι passages quoted indicate, in such programmatic contexts Pindar is habitually lucid. Yet if, accordingly, δαπάναι ἐλπίδων is close to incredible, [ii] ἐλπίδων ὅπιν—the only available alternative—is out of the question. In the light of our discussion of ὅπιν—“gods’ response,” “divine retribution,” “religious awe”—there is simply nothing for the phrase to mean.

Problem (d): the idiom with κνίζω is suspect. The verb has two characteristic ranges of usage. First, there is a primary, physical usage, “scratch” or “scrape,” which is attested, though not often, with the uncompounded verb (as οὐδὲ κνιζόμενα αἰσθάνεται τὰ παιδιά, Arist. *HA* 587b.7; ἦν κνίσω τοῦτον, οὐκ ἔλκος ἔξει, Herod. *Mim.* 4.59–60 Cunningham) and compounds (ἔχοντες ὄνυχας σιδηροῦς ἐπικνίζουσιν, Thphr. *HP* 4.2.1), and which generates occasional metaphorical uses (like κνίσω τὸ ῥῆμ' ἕκαστον, Ar. *Ran.* 1198–99, plausibly explained⁵⁵ as equivalent to βασανίζειν, with allusion to the touchstone). In addition, the verb has a range of secondary and much commoner senses, from [i] “provoke (to action),” especially by “bothering” (rather like “bug” in late twentieth-century English slang), to [ii] “excite,” “tease,” especially sexually. Thus [i] Ζέρξην ἔκνιξε ἡ Ἀρταβάνου γνῶμη, Hdt. 7.12.1, ἐτερπόμην ὁμῶς δ' ἔκνιξέ μ' αἰεὶ τοῦθ', S. *OT* 785–86, Κλέων...με κακίσας ἔκνισε, Ar. *V.* 1286, νιν...ἰφίγένηι...σφαχθεῖσα... ἔκνισεν βαρυπάλαμον ὄρσαι χόλον, Pi. *P.* 11.22–23; and [ii] Ἀρίστωνα ἔκνιξε...τῆς γυναικὸς...ἔρω, Hdt. 6.62.1, κεκνισμένος ἔρωτι, Men. *Sam.*

⁵⁴As in early and classical usage in general (cf. *LSJ* s.v.), though instances like εἰς πλάσιν τοῦ ἐμβρύου...ἡ δαπάνη [sc. τῆς τροφῆς] (Arist. *GA* 776a.34, not in *LSJ*) are attested from the fourth century.

⁵⁵By Taillardat 456 n. 1.

330–31, κνίσειν τε Μίνωϊ κέαρ...Κύπριδος...δῶρα, B. 17.8–10, ἑτέροις ἑτέρων ἔρωτες ἔκνιξαν φρένας, Pi. P. 10.60. In these secondary usages, as the instances cited suggest, the object of the verb is always a person, albeit sometimes in metonymic disguise (as in Bacchylides' κνίσειν τε Μίνωϊ κέαρ and Pindar's ἔκνιξαν φρένας), sometimes, again, in ellipse (as in another Pindaric passage, P. 8.32, μὴ κόρος ἐλθῶν κνίση), and occasionally in the form of a proleptic compression (in Pindar again, N. 5.32, τοῦ δὲ ὀργὰν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι: "provoked his anger," i.e., "provoked *him* to anger").

In these attested ranges of usage there is nothing like κνίζειν ὄπιν. Given the non-physicality of the context, one would expect the verb to have to mean "excite" or "provoke." But "excite" or "provoke" ὄπιν—that is, "excite/provoke" <someone> to ὄπιν ("provoke the gods to retribution" or "provoke men to reverence" ??)—involves a prolepsis which is *per se* improbable (ὄπις is hardly a *mood* or *disposition* as ὀργή is) and in context baffling. The primary physical usage, on the other hand, would yield a weird metaphor, "scrape ὄπιν," which, if it meant anything, would presumably mean "test..." (like the Aristophanic κνίσω τὸ ῥῆμ', cited above); this again offers no prospect of sense here. And the notion that κνίζειν ὄπιν could somehow, unilaterally, mean "fret away (their zeal)"⁵⁶ is as gratuitous for κνίζειν as it is for ὄπιν itself. Wilamowitz's hypothetical κνίζειν ἐλπίδα at least has the merit of creating a phrase that is possibly Greek and a meaning that is possibly relevant ("provoke *to* hope," as ὀργὰν κνίζειν is "provoke *to* anger"). The vulgate offers a phrase that is barely Greek and a meaning that is simply irrelevant.

Problem (e): the plural δαπάναι, finally, is surprising—surprising, that is, in the context: οὗτοι τετύφλωται μακρός | μόχθος ἀνδρῶν, οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι.... Looking back to Pindar's δαπάναι(ι) passages, we find several instances where "expense" forms a pair with πόνος, "toil": πόνος δαπάναι τε in O. 5.15, δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις in I. 1.42, δαπάναι τε...καὶ πόνῳ in I. 6.10. In each of the three passages, the two words share the same number: we have a pair of singulars at O. 5.15 and I. 6.10, a pair of plurals at I. 1.42. The word μόχθος that appears at I. 5.57 is demonstrably a semantic collocate (synonym or close neighbour) of πόνος. Consider such sequences as: ἔχον πόνον, ...δῆριν ἔχον καὶ μόχθον, Hes. Sc. 305–6; ἦν δὲ διὰ μόχθων [ῥῶσι], τῶν πόνων [τὸν ἄρχοντα δεῖ πλεονεκτοῦντα φανερόν εἶναι], X.

⁵⁶Or, e.g., "vex the zeal" (Race 1997). Likewise the idea that κν. here could mean "scratch = hurt" (so in effect Σ: below, p. 44) is not credible.

Cyr. 1.6.25; ἀπάλαμον βίον τοῦτον ἐμπεδόμοχθον, ἢ μετὰ τριῶν τέταρτον πόνον, Pi. O. 1.59–60; or such Pindaric “equivalents” as μακρὸς μόχθος, I. 5.56–57: μακρῷ πόνῳ, P. 8.73.⁵⁷ The corollary is that μόχθος will be perceived as, in effect, a variant of πόνος and that in such a close sequence of “toil” and “expense” we would expect to find a true pair of parallel items. Accordingly, the singularity of this particular “toil” (here, μόχθος) makes the plural δαπάναι surprising, while the syntactic obstacles in the way of taking the latter as part of a true pair with μόχθος only serve to bring the whole sequence under renewed suspicion.

III

With or without the palliative ἔκνισ', the text given by manuscript tradition is indefensible; and no published attempt to emend it has succeeded in dealing with the problems involved—or if, like Wilamowitz, an emender has succeeded in dealing with some, he has left others and created more.⁵⁸ Let us start again. The best place to start is B's ἔκνιξ' (lightly corrupted to ἔκνιζ' in D) and the evidence of the scholia, the importance, and the detail, of which has been strangely downplayed. It will assist the discussion to cite the crucial passage again, this time with a relevant textual note and a part-translation of the Greek:

οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι ἐλπίδων: Aristarchus comments as follows: οὐδὲ ὁπόσαι δαπάναι αὐτοῖς ἐγενήθησαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκβεβηκυῶν ἐλπίδων τῶν περὶ τὴν νίκην, ἔκνισα τῇ φωνῇ, οὐδὲ ἔλυπηθην* τῇ φωνῇ, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ὕμνησα αὐτούς. More grammatically, some critics read ἔκνιξ' ὅπιν (with <final> ν), whereby there is a *schema Pindaricum* <which yields the following>: “οὐκ ἔκνισαν αἱ δαπάναι nor has their μόχθος been made blind (rather it is sharp-sighted and brings good results).” So <overall>: “nor do/did ὁπόσαι δαπάναι bother [?] and hurt the ὅπιν of hope(s)—i.e., expectations of the future [οὐδὲ ὁπόσαι δαπάναι τὴν τῶν ἐλπίδων ὅπιν, τουτέστι τὸ μέλλον ὁπίσω ἔσεσθαι, ἔκνισαν καὶ ἐλύπησαν].

*ἐλύπηθην B, ἐλυπήθη D: ἐλύπησα Bergk

Besides its evidence about ὅπιν / ὅπι the scholium indicates that ἔκνιξ' evidently was, but ἔκνισ' arguably was not, assumed by the ancient commentators who

⁵⁷Likewise, at O. 10.93 and N. 7.74 μόχθος and πόνος, respectively, are opposed to τὸ τερπνόν. On δαπάναι / πόνος cf. Cingano (in Gentili *et al.*) on P. 1.90.

⁵⁸Other proposals are listed by Gerber 1976: 136. See also Gerber 1990: 42, and Lasso de la Vega 45–47.

debated the ὅπι(ν) issue. The relatively outlandish “Doric” ἔκνιξ’ is explicit (σὺν τῷ ν ἔκνιξ’ ὅπιν: cf. ἔκνιξαν in the next sentence), whereas the ordinary Attic and *koinē* ἔκνισ’ appears only in the scholiast’s version of Aristarchus’ paraphrase (ἔκνισα τῇ φωνῇ) and the final paraphrase of the alternative text (ἔκνισαν), in both cases where one might well expect a normalized form to occur. ἔκνιξ’ is a much less familiar form than ἔκνισ’, and though both forms are indeed Pindaric, it is hard to see why ἔκνισ’ should ever have been corrupted to the *lectio difficilior*, ἔκνιξ’.⁵⁹ The scholiastic account of Aristarchus and the ἔνιοι seems to confirm that ἔκνιξ’ is *terra firma*. Let us assume that ἔκνιξ’ is right.

Aristarchus—and the ἔνιοι—evidently found the passage difficult. The ἔνιοι, with ὅπιν, made an attempt to interpret their text. So too did Aristarchus, with his ὀπί, and, notwithstanding some textual confusion in the scholium itself, we can infer that his explanation was as follows:

nor did I give pain [ἔκνιξ’ interpreted as ἔκνιξα and glossed ἐλύπησα (Bergk)] to them by saying [τῇ φωνῇ] how great were the costs that came their way in connection with their hopes of victory, which were now realized; on the contrary, I celebrated them.

Given its implausible switch of subject to an unsignalled first person, its less-than-Pindaric sentiment, and its bizarre linguistic deformations (notably κνίζω = “hurt”; ὀπόσαι...ὀπί = “by saying how great”), it is clear why the scholiast should see even the *schema Pindaricum* as “more grammatical” and hardly surprising that Aristarchus’ interpretation has commended itself to no one. Much more important than his interpretation, though, is his neglected witness to the state of the text in his own time. The Greek that prompted Aristarchus’ interpretation was (in quasi-Hellenistic majuscule orthography) ΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙ. Within this sequence there is no way of demonstrating whether the ΟΠΙ was a variant manuscript reading or a conjecture by Aristarchus or another. Either way, however, Aristarchus was presumably confronting a problem bequeathed to him by his predecessor, Aristophanes of Byzantium. We know that Aristophanes edited Pindar, and it seems likely that his edition consisted of a plain text to which Aristarchus added a commentary.⁶⁰ It is naive to assume of any ancient critic that he was either consistently “conservative” or else a habitual “emender,” and we

⁵⁹In the classical period the ξ- forms seem only to be attested in Pindar (*P.* 10.60, *I.* 6.50 and *I.* 5.58 itself); later instances are attested in compounds (περικνίξασθε *AP* 9.226: Zonas Epigr.); for σ- in Pindar cf. above, p. 28.

⁶⁰Pfeiffer 220–22; Irigoin 51ff.

know that both Aristarchus and his master Aristophanes on occasion emended texts.⁶¹ Nevertheless, Aristarchus certainly acquired a reputation as a conservative critic for his work on Homer,⁶² and one may reasonably suppose that the same conservative tendency would be operative in his work on Pindar and/or that, if he chose to follow Aristophanes' recension, it would be more likely than not that Aristophanes had shown the same tendency before him. It would therefore seem reasonable to conclude that Aristarchus' OPTI is more likely to be a variant (and a variant known to Aristophanes), not a conjecture; and one might argue that the very absurdity of his interpretation, on balance, supports this conclusion, i.e., that his interpretation is easier to explain as a desperate attempt to interpret a known text than as an independent conjecture (his own or Aristophanes').⁶³ Certainly the scholiast's phraseology ('Αρίσταρχος οὕτως...ἐνιοι δὲ καταλληλότερον γράφουσι...) is at least as suggestive of alternative variants as it is of rival corrections, or of one of each.⁶⁴

We may assume, then, that Aristarchus' exemplar read ΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙ , and since OPTIN (ὄπιν) is impossible and ΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙΝ leads nowhere, let us assume, further, that the sequence ΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙ was in Pindar's text. This is the assumption that breaks the logjam. If ΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙ is presumably right, the preceding ἐλπίδων is presumably wrong. The genitive is suspect, as we have noted, in any case. It is also now seen to be suspect on metrical grounds, because the sequence needed is $- \cup - - \cup \cup -$. The metrical requirement is not a problem for ΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙ ($- - \cup \cup$), but given ΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙ , ἐλπίδων is precluded: ΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙ fits, if preceded, not by $- \cup -$ (ἐλπίδων), but by $- \cup$, and if followed by an extra heavy syllable to close ($-$). In the light of this reasoning, we should regard the larger sequence (in majuscule) as

ΟΥΔΟΠΟCΑΙΔΑΠΑΝΑΙ
†ΕΛΠΙΔΩΝ†ΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙ<...>

without consideration yet of what OPTI might be doing here.

⁶¹Aristarchus: see, e.g., *N.* 10.62 with Σ ; cf. Porter 92–94. Aristophanes: Pfeiffer 189.

⁶²Pfeiffer 229; cf. Janko 26.

⁶³Despite the fact that Aristarchus seems to have proposed at least one undeniably absurd conjecture elsewhere (on *O.* 2.77; cf. Farnell *ad loc.*).

⁶⁴Note the similar phrasing in $\Sigma O.$ 3.26 (I.119 Drachmann) and cf. Irigoin 52–53 and Horn 72. For a somewhat different view of Aristarchus' (and Aristophanes') work on Pindar, see Gentili lxxv–lxxx.

Next question: if ἔκνιξ' is right, what is its object? In this context, the verb should surely carry its common secondary sense, “provoke” or “excite,” and, if so, it is likely to have the *human* object which this verb in this sense commonly has:⁶⁵ Κλέων...με κακίσας ἔκνισε (Ar. V. 1286), Ἀρίστωνά ἔκνιξε...τῆς γυναικὸς...ἔρωσ (Hdt. 6.62.1), τὰ...σμικρὰ οὐδέν μιν κνίζει (Hdt. 7.10e). The only available human object here would seem to be ἄνδρας, implied by the ἀνδρῶν of the preceding clause (...οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρὸς ἢ μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ'...), and the verb is indeed used idiomatically like that, with elliptical object, by Pindar himself (P. 8.29–32): εἰμὶ δ' ἄσυχολος ἢ ...μὴ κόρος ἔλθῶν κνίση.

And next: if the putative object of ἔκνιξ' is “men” (understood), and given that the verb is (*pace* Aristarchus) presumably third-person, ἔκνιξ(ε), used in its secondary sense, what is its putative subject? In its secondary usage, κνίζειν may have as subject a person (Κλέων...με...ἔκνισε), but here there is no sign of any person that could be such a subject. Alternatively, and indeed more commonly in the parallels available to us, κνίζειν in its secondary sense has as its subject an abstract noun or a quasi-abstraction—like ἔρωσ, like τὰ σμικρὰ, like κόρος, in the examples just quoted.⁶⁶ And *schemata Pindarica* apart, one would expect such a subject for ἔκνιξ' to be either a singular or a neuter plural. There are no possible neuter plurals in the vicinity. There are, however, four possible singular abstracts, or quasi-abstracts, that might be extracted from the vulgate. First, there is μόχθος, subject of the previous clause; but (quite apart from the problem of making anything of, or from, ὅπ. δαπ. ἔλπ., with μόχθος as subject) it defies ingenuity to see what sense there might be in the sequence, “men’s long toil has not been blocked, nor does it [the toil] provoke/excite them [the men]...” Secondly, there is of course ὅπισ, which—any part of which—we have considered and rejected. Then again, from ὁπόσαι δαπάναι (which we have likewise considered and likewise rejected) one might extract a singular subject for the verb, ὁπόσα δαπάνα. As a singular subject, ὁπόσα δαπάνα would certainly represent an improvement (interpreted, necessarily, not as objectionable two-word clause, but as compressed relative): “men’s long μόχθος has not been blocked nor has all that expenditure which provokes/excites <men>...<been blocked>....” The gain, both in general sense and in plausibility of construction, is clear; and there is now

⁶⁵Above, p. 42. The exceptions (cited *ibid.*) are passages like N. 5.32, τοῦ δὲ ὄργαν κνίζον, where the human object is metonymically disguised in an abstract noun. The only available abstract noun here, however, would now seem to be Wilamowitz’s ἐλπίδα, which is too implausible (above, n. 53) to consider further.

⁶⁶Likewise N. 5.32 (λόγοι), I. 6.50 (χάρις), B. 17.8–10 (Κύπριδος ἀγνὰ δῶρα), Hdt. 7.12.1 (γνώμη).

a further gain in terms of a normal pairing of singular μόχθος and singular δαπάνη. But this is no solution. One has now simply assumed a corruption of singular ὁπόσα... to plural ὁπόσαι... which still leaves †ἐλπίδων† unexplained and impenetrable: without meaning in the context and metrically impossible (†–υ – † for – υ).

We need a singular abstract subject for ἔκνιξ' that makes sense of †ἐλπίδων†. The only remaining candidate does just this. Concealed in †ἐλπίδων† itself is the nominative ἐλπίς, and ἐλπίς is an eminently suitable subject for ἔκνιξ'. However, if 58 begins with one singular nominative, ἐλπίς ἔκνιξ'..., it is obvious that in 57 ΟΠΟCΑΙΔΑΠΑΝΑΙ is not, indeed, an opaque plural nominative, ὁπόσαι δαπάναι. Though already misread as nominative plural (to judge from the scholia) in antiquity, it is evidently a dative singular, ὁπόσῃ δαπάνῃ.⁶⁷ The improvement—in general sense and plausibility of construction—promised by the failed expedient, ὁπόσα δαπάνη, is now properly realized. With ἐλπίς as subject, the compressed relative phrase now yields: “men's long μόχθος has not been blocked nor has *all that* δαπάνη (been blocked) *to which* hope ἔκνιξ' <them>...”

We now have the makings of a convincing Pindaric sequence. What remains is to account for: (a) the three letters' worth of extra unwanted syllable in ΕΛΠΙ<C>[ΔΩΝ]; (b) the heavy syllable missing (at the end of the verse) after ΟΠΙ; (c) some reasonable explanation of ΟΠΙ itself. The simple and plausible way of dealing with (a), (b) and (c) is to assume an early transposition in the text, with ΔΩΝ misplaced. In other words, ἔκνιξ' marks the end of a sentence; ΟΠΙ, as Aristarchus divined, is ὅπῃ, but going with αἰνέω; and ΔΩΝ is δ' ὧν, a proper connective for the next sentence, after ὅπῃ. The text, then, should be restored thus:

...οὐδ' ὁπόσῃ δαπάνῃ
ἐλπίς ἔκνιξ'. ὅπῃ δ' ὧν
αἰνέω...

Before we consider the full detail of this restored text, the palaeographical implications of the restoration call for comment. We have inferred from the evidence of manuscripts and scholia that two variant readings were available to the scholars of the Hellenistic age, Aristarchus (active in the first half of the

⁶⁷Mentioned as a possibility, but discarded, by Thummer *ad loc.*; accepted independently, as part of a sequence (still) based on ἐλπίδων ἔκνιξ' / ἔκνις ὄπιν by Pavese 430.

second century B.C.E.) and the ἔνιοι of the scholia. Bearing in mind the recent work on Pindar's text associated especially with Aristarchus' predecessor, Aristophanes (active in the late third century),⁶⁸ we have in effect made a further inference that the two rival readings were known from copies of the third century, both of these copies more or less corrupt, one of them offering the more corrupt sequence, ΕΛΠΙΔΩΝΕΚΝΙΞΟΤΙΝ, the other the less corrupt equivalent without the final N.⁶⁹ However, there are grounds for assuming that the two corrupt versions date back to an earlier period altogether—to the fourth century, when what came to be rounded ΕCΩ are written square (as ΕΣΩ, *vel sim.*), or even to the fifth, before the "Euclidian" change-over to the "Milesian" Ionic alphabet from the old Attic system, in which (*inter alia*) ου and ω are O.⁷⁰ As Reynolds and Wilson point out, "it is certain that some texts reaching the Alexandrian library were in the old script"—and one prime piece of evidence involves both Pindar and Aristarchus themselves: "we find Aristarchus explaining a difficulty in Pindar as due to misinterpretation of the old alphabet; he tells us that at *Nemeans* 1.24 an adjective which appears to be in the nominative singular (ἐκλός) is incorrect for metrical reasons and must be understood as the accusative plural (ἐκλόους)."⁷¹

If Aristarchus had access to fifth-century copies of Pindar, should we not, therefore, assume that the variants, and likewise the underlying corruption, are very early indeed, prospectively fifth-century themselves? If we assume this, certain orthographical consequences follow. Without venturing into the difficult territory of fifth-century local alphabets, and putting to one side the question of which alphabet Pindar's odes were originally written in or—a different

⁶⁸On the dating of Aristophanes and Aristarchus, see Pfeiffer 171–72, 210–11.

⁶⁹For the sake of convenience, the majuscule sequences cited here and elsewhere assume elision. Metrical inscriptions and papyri of the early-Hellenistic and earlier periods are in fact inconsistent and often show mixtures: see, e.g., (for inscriptions) Threatte I. 418–26, and (for papyri) Turner-Parsons 8; representatively, *scriptio plena* and elision are both features of the fourth-century Timotheus papyrus, as a glance at the transcriptions in Page (fr. 15 *PMG*) seems to show. However, one may infer that Aristarchus' ΟΠΙ exemplar, at least, elided after ἐκνιξ' from the fact that he interpreted ἐκνιξε as ἐκνιξα.

⁷⁰The change to the Ionic system begins in 403, and the switch from square to rounded forms about a century later, but orthographical change is seldom effected overnight. It is clear that in some quarters old-Attic practices survived after 400 (Threatte 19–27, 49–51), as equally that (e.g.) square E is still found in the mid-third century (cf. Turner-Parsons 92, on no. 52).

⁷¹Reynolds-Wilson 8–9; cf. Irigoin 25–26; see Σ on *N.* 1.24 (III.16 Drachmann).

question?—disseminated in, we are now positing a pre-Euclidian text which in an uncorrupted version included the sequence

ΕΛΠΙΣΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙΔΟΝ⁷²

which then emerged in the—more—corrupted version as

ΕΛΠΙΔΟΝΕΚΝΙΞΟΠΙΝ

with this latter text coexisting with a less corrupt—part-corrected?—version ending in ΟΠΙ. In palaeographical terms, the major transposition is easy enough to explain on the basis of a copyist's anticipation of the sequence ΠΙ-ΔΟΝ in place of the correct sequence ΠΙ-ΣΕΚ. It might also be that the copyist's ΕΛΠΙ-ΔΟΝ was influenced by ΑΝ-ΔΡΟΝ (ἄνδρῶν) a few words before; and it is at least conceivable that the eventual sequence ΟΠΙΝΑΙΝΕΟ (ὄπιν | αἰνέω) was influenced by a scribe's reminiscence of the similar-looking sequence in *P.* 8.71–72, ΟΠΙΝ...ΑΙΤΕΟ.⁷³

At all events, comparable transpositions are attested elsewhere in the copying procedures of antiquity, as they of course are in those of the Middle Ages. Take for instance the second-century C.E. papyrus of Hyperides, where—intricately—

ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥΤΟΥΕΞΟΙΟΥ (= 'Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ ἐξ Οἴου)

was miscopied as

ΑΛΕΑΝΔΡΟΥΕΞΟΙΕΟΥΟΥ.⁷⁴

Or take the sixth-century B.C.E. Attic inscription in which—simply—

ΠΑΙΔΟΙΝ-ΕΠΕΘΕΚΕ

⁷²On the fifth-century transmission of Pindar's text and the issues involved, see Irigoin 5–28 (and cf., more recently, Gentili lxx–lxxiv). As will be apparent, I am not concerned to reproduce plausible letter forms for (e.g.) ΠΣΞ for this period.

⁷³Especially conceivable if *P.* 8 was already as celebrated as it was to become in later centuries: cf. the high number of quotations from the poem in later sources cited by Snell-Maehler and Turyn. It is also conceivable that *I.* 5.56–57 μακρός | μόχθος might call to mind *P.* 8.73 μακρῶ πόνω.

⁷⁴Hyp. 3.12.4–5, p. 43 Jensen. On the date of the papyrus, cf. Jensen praef. x–xi.

is mis-cut as

ΠΑΙΔΟΙ-ΕΠΕΘΕΚΕΝ.⁷⁵

If one compares a typical instance from a later age in Pindar's *O.* 6.103, where

εὐθὺν δὲ πλόον καμάτων

is miswritten⁷⁶

εὐθυνε πλόον καμάτων δ'

it is obvious that the broad categories of scribal error remain fairly constant whatever the differences of physical medium and orthography. In all periods a copyist is capable of producing what Snell-Maehler (in the context of the second-century C.E. Bacchylides papyrus) call "rudem quandam congeriem litterarum similiium."⁷⁷ Nor, finally, should one exclude the possibility that the error in *I.* 5 was engendered by an omission of the final ΔΟΝ and a subsequent misinterpretation of an (? interlinear) correction, as happens in later ages: this might also explain the existence of a variant text with ΟΠΙ.⁷⁸

IV

οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρός
μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὅποσα δαπάνη
ἐλπίς ἐκνίξ'. ὅπῃ δ' ὦν
αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν...

Men's long toil has not been
Blocked, nor all the expense to which
Hope incites them. Well, Pytheas
Loudly I praise...

The restored sequence calls for a short (partly recapitulatory) commentary:

⁷⁵CEG I.32 Hansen.

⁷⁶In cod. A: see the app.crit. in Turyn and Snell-Maehler.

⁷⁷In the Teubner *Bacchylides* (Snell-Maehler 1970), praef. x.

⁷⁸On such corrections see, e.g., West 1973: 28. In the earliest literary papyri (IV–early III B.C.E.) the tendency seems to have been that letters omitted were added between the lines and more or less above the letters where the omission occurred, as at Tim. *Pers.* 133 and 173–74 (see the reproduction in Wilamowitz 1903) and in *PHib.* 6.1–2.

ὅποσα δαπάνα: idiomatic equivalent to πᾶσα δαπάνα ὅσα (cf. E. *Hipp.* 389–90, οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅποιώ φαρμάκῳ διαφθερεῖν | ἔμελλον and other passages cited above, p. 31). The dative, as often, is difficult to categorize: “the poet might well have been perplexed if asked about the classification of the dative” (Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1341f.). This one would seem to have elements of the instrumental, “with, because of” (cf., e.g., οἰκίαν...ὑπερβαλλούσῃ δαπάνῃ κεκαλλωπισμένην, X. *Hier.* 11.2, also, e.g., Pi. *I.* 1.41–42 εἰ δ' ἄρετᾱ κατὰκειται πᾶσαν ὀργάν, | ἀμφοτέρων δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις), but is also, and primarily, a “dative of purpose.” This latter use of the dative case, though ignored or misrepresented by various notable authorities, Kühner-Gerth among them, is a demonstrable reality in early and classical Greek: ξύλα καὶ ἄνθρακες τῷ μολύβδῳ (“wood and charcoal *for* [melting] lead”) *IG* I².371.14 (c. 420 B.C.E); ἔρισαν...γάμῳ (“contended *for* [= in pursuit of] marriage”) Pi. *I.* 8.27; τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος ἀπάσης ξυναγωνιουμένης, τὰ μὲν φόβῳ, τὰ δὲ ὠφελίᾳ (“some in fear, some *for* profit”) Th. 1.123.1. Especially close to the present use are instances like χάρμη προκαλέσσατο πάντας, *Il.* 7.285 and κρυφίαις γὰρ εὐναῖς πείσας ἄλοχον (“he persuaded her *to* have sex”), E. *El.* 719–20.⁷⁹ The expense of athletic preparation is, in a sense, a reason why the aspirant is hopeful but above all a target to which hope incites him.

μόχθος...δαπάνα: for the pairing and the positive tone of δαπάνα (as of μόχθος) in Pindar, cf. *I.* 6.10–11, ἀνθρώπων δαπάνᾳ τε χαρεῖς | καὶ πόνῳ, *P.* 1.90, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις, and other passages cited above (pp. 34, 42–43).

ἐλπίς: in early and classical poetry ἐλπίς is often subject of a verb: ἐλπίς δὲ πάντας...τρέφει, Semon. 1.6 W; γλυκεῖά οἱ καρδίαν | ἀτάλλοισα γηροτρόφος συναορεῖ | ἐλπίς, ἃ μάλιστα θνατῶν πολύστροφον γνῶμαν κυβερνᾷ, Pi. fr. 214; ἃ γὰρ δὴ πολυπλαγκτος ἐλπίς πολλοῖς μὲν ὄνησις ἀνδρῶν, | πολλοῖς δ' ἀπάτα κουφονόων ἐρώτων, S. *Ant.* 615–17.⁸⁰ In such cases the realities tend to be gnomic, with the victims “mankind” (πάντας, θνατῶν, ἀνδρῶν), as in *I.* 5. Again, as these examples remind us, “hope” in Greek poetry is notoriously equivocal (see, e.g., West on Hes. *Op.* 96, Griffith on [A.] *Pr.* 250, Collard on E. *Supp.* 479–80). In Pindar, in particular, hope is treacherous (*O.* 12.5–6, etc.) and a source of danger (associated with φθόνος, *I.* 2.43, or κόρος, *P.* 1.82–83); but also

⁷⁹On the “dative of purpose” see further Verdenius on *O.* 10.20 and Hoekstra 15–23.

⁸⁰Cf. Simon. 19.4–5 W, B. 9.18, S. fr. 948 Radt, E. *Hec.* 1032. It is irrelevant whether in any or all such configurations we see ἐλπίς as an abstraction, a personification or a deity, though in some instances (e.g., Hes. *Op.* 96–98, Thgn. 1143–46) ἐ. is personified at least: cf. van Groningen on Ἑλπίς at Thgn. 637–38.

a source of good (ἀγαθὸν ἐλπίδ', *I.* 8.15), in which sense it is "a particular kind of 'hope,' one that motivates a noble competitor bent on achieving some great feat of *aretê*. In epinician poetry, this is the *elpis* of athletic victors, warriors and heroes."⁸¹

ἐκνίξ': on the ξ- form see above (n. 59), and cf. Braswell on *P.* 4.159e. For the gnomic aorist in a relative clause, cf. *I.* 5. 7–9, ἐν...ἀέθλοισι...κλέος ἔπραξεν, ὄντιν'...στέφανοι...νικάσαντ' ἀνέδησαν ἔθειραν, *Il.* 13.300, *Od.* 23.13. For κνίζειν with abstract subject and human object understood, cf. *P.* 8.32, μὴ κόρος ἐλθὼν κνίση. The decisiveness of the idiom whereby a forceful *simplex* verb seems to enforce a general truth by putting a summary end to the clause is eminently Pindaric: *N.* 3.40, συγγενεῖ δέ τις εὐδοξία μέγα βρίθει; *N.* 8.34, ἃ [sc. πάρφασις] τὸ μὲν λαμπρὸν βιάται; *N.* 11.29–30, ἀλλὰ βροτῶν τὸν μὲν κενεόφρονες αὔχαι | ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἔβαλον; *I.* 3/4.23–24 ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλοις οὔρος | πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπαΐσσων ἐλαύνει; and cf. especially *P.* 2.35–36, εὐναὶ δὲ παράτροποι ἐς κακότητ' ἄθρόαν | ἔβαλον (on the sequence see Carey *ad loc.*), with gnomic aorist and ellipse of object as here. The elision at sentence-end before a programmatic switch of topic seems perhaps to make the summariness yet more marked; cf., e.g., *I.* 6.55–56, ὥς ἦρα εἰπὼν αὐτίκα | ἔζετ'. ἐμοὶ δέ.... As already noted (above, pp. 41–42), in its predominant secondary use the verb has a marked sexual connotation ("tease," "excite": ἐτέροις ἐτέρων ἔρωτες ἐκνίζαν φρένας, *P.* 10.60), which perhaps colours the use here. Compare again, then, the conception of ἐλπίς at *S. Ant.* 615–17, where hope is not only ὀνησις ἀνδρῶν ("by cheering them, and *inciting to worthy effort*" [Jebb *ad loc.*: my italics]), but also ἀπάτα κουφονόων ἐρώτων. Nothing ensures security in this life, and certainly not ἐλπίς, notwithstanding the fact that Pindar is in the process of acclaiming it: the nuancing in his choice of words here is apparent.

ὀπί: "with [my] voice," i.e., "out loud, loudly." One might well have expected an accompanying epithet (cf. Maehler on *B.* 1.77) on the lines of (e.g.) *N.* 7.82–84, βασιλῆα... | γαρυμένον ἄμερᾶ | ὀπί, and direct parallels to an unsupported ὀπί certainly look meagre: a plausible restoration in Philod. Scarph. (late IV B.C.E.), *Paeon in Dionysum* 61 (p. 167 *Coll. Alex. Powell*), σε...εὐκλέα τ' ὀπί κλέο]υσαι; a remote possibility in the lacunose *B.* 1.77, νιν | [– ~ –]σάινουσ' ὀπί; and an imponderable possibility in the corrupt sequence (discussed above, pp. 36–37) at *O.* 2.5–6, Θήρωνα... | γεγωνητέον ὀπί δίκαιον ξένον. However: [i] Pindar himself uses ὀπί elsewhere without epithet and with only the "support"

⁸¹Day 48.

of a possessive genitive which is structurally the equivalent of the first-person subject here: τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν | ὅπῃ νέων ἐπιχώριον χάρμα κελαδέων, *N.* 3.65–66. [ii] There is an established pattern of Homeric usage in which ὅπα and ὁπός are used unsupported, connoting “loudness”: Ἀτρεΐδευ ὁπός ἔκλυον αὐδήσαντος, *Il.* 16.76, alternating revealingly with μεγάλ' ἔκλυεν αὐδήσαντος, *Od.* 4.505; ἄκουσε θεοῦ ὅπα φωνήσαντος, *Il.* 20.380; and the odd-looking genitive absolute at *Od.* 24.535, θεῶς ὅπα φωνησάσης. [iii] Above all, ὅπῃ thus has strong analogical validation from the more ordinary φωνῇ, which, apart from its obvious use with supporting adjective (ἀδυμελεῖ δ' ἐξάρχετε φωνᾷ, *N.* 2.25), is used throughout Greek literature absolutely, with the sense “aloud”: Ἑλένην ἐκαλέσσατο φωνῇ, *Il.* 3.161; Χίρωνα προσήνεπε φωνᾷ, *Pi. P.* 9.29; γένος Ὀλυμπίων θεῶν | μέλπε καὶ γέραιρε φωνῇ, *Ar. Th.* 960–61; οὐδὲ φωνῇ, ἀλλὰ σιγῇ, *Pl. Tht.* 190a.⁸² [iv] Comparable one-off (*vel sim.*) usages are attested in comparable lexical sets in Pindar elsewhere. Like ὅπῃ, for instance, ποδί / ποσ(ο)ί usually comes with supporting epithet: ἀνά δ' ἔπαλτ' ὀρθῶ ποδί, *O.* 13.72; κούφοισιν ἔκνευσον ποσίν, *O.* 13.114; ἴσταμαι δὴ ποσσί κούφοις, *N.* 8.19; but then one also meets the simple ποσσί τρέχων, *O.* 10.65. [v] ὅπῃ...αἰνέω follows the pattern of the ordinary phrase λόγῳ (ἐπ)αινέω (see paragraph below), in which λόγῳ is similarly unqualified.

Like ποσσί at *O.* 10.65, ὅπῃ here adds a touch of simple concreteness to the verb (and perhaps a touch of Homeric-archaic dignity: cf. *Il.* 3.169, ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν; 3.171, μῦθοισιν ἀμείβετο, etc.). Unlike the impossible ὅπῃς, it also belongs to and evokes the celebratory sphere. In Pindar “the word ὅψ always has a positive connotation, usually indicating celebration” (Race 1990: 61 n. 5), whether used of the Muse (μελιγαρύων τέκτονες | κώμων νεανίαί, σέθεν ὅπα μαϊόμενοι, *N.* 3.4–5), the chorus (τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν | ὅπῃ νέων, *N.* 3. 65–66), or, as here, the poet mediated by the chorus (ὅπ'...γλυκεῖαν προχεόντων ἑμάν, *P.* 10.56). And by qualifying the “declaration of praise” (αἰνέω) as “loud,” the word brings this encomiastic moment into line with a well-established Pindaric pattern. In Pindar, quite simply, “praise” often *is* “loud”: γλυκὺς κρατὴρ ἀγαφθέγκτων ἀοιδᾶν, *O.* 6.91; εἰ δὲ Θεμιστίον ἴκεις ὥστ' αἰεῖδεν... δίδοι | φωνάν, *N.* 5.50–51; and ἔγειρ' ἐπέων σφιν οἶμον λιγύν, | αἶνει δέ..., *O.* 9.47–48⁸³, of which last instance ὅπῃ...αἰνέω is like a compressed miniature. *Unlike* that last instance in *O.* 9, however, αἰνέω here is used with ὅπῃ as simple

⁸²Likewise τῇ φωνῇ: *Ar. Ra.* 379, *Lys.* 6.51, *Pl. Prt.* 310b.

⁸³Likewise, e.g., *B.* 5.15–16, *Isoc.* 12.264.

qualifying noun, seemingly on the model of a phrase shaped like Aristophanes' γέραιρε φωνῇ (*Th.* 961: p. 53 above) or especially the more standardized λόγῳ (ἐπ)αινέω (*E. Cyc.* 155, *D.* 60.13), cf. λόγῳ τε καὶ ὄρκῳ ἐπήνεσαν, *Pl. Leg.* 691a; ἐπαινέσαιμι...λόγοις, *E. IA* 977; λόγοις καὶ ὥδαϊς ἐπαινεῖν, *Hyp. Epit.* 33–34 (reconstructed text)—all with simple noun or nouns. ἐπαινέω of course is a virtual synonym of αἰνέω, “for which it is regularly used in Attic” (*LSJ* s.v. ἐπαινέω, *s.init.*); the *simplex* and compound verbs, indeed, are used almost interchangeably outside Attic too (e.g., τίς ἄν σέ γε μωμήσαιτο, ἢ τίς δ' ἄν ἐπαινήσαι, *Thgn.* 875–76, versus οὐδένα... μωμήσομαι... ἢ οὐδὲ μὲν αἰνήσω, *id.* 1079–80; or cf. εἰ τύ γε Πausανίαν...αἰνεῖς ἰ..., ἐγὼ δ' Ἀριστείδαν ἐπαινέω, *Timocr.* 727.1–2 *PMG*).

Any reader of Pindar who has studied the end of *I.5* will incline to see the point of Bowra's judgement that the articulation of this ode, along with certain others, is characterized by a “stylish brevity”; and the phrasing of the restored sequence ὅτι δ' ὦν αἰνέω bears out the point.⁸⁴

⁸⁴Bowra 1964: 353. One less stylish alternative is worth a mention. For ὅτι read ἐπί: ἐπὶ δ' ὦν ἢ αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν... With ἐπί, the general sense is unaffected, but instead of the *recherché* collocation ὅτι : αἰνέω, one has the common compound ἐπαινέω in tmesis around δ' ὦν. Furthermore, the new sequence might seem to account better for our initial scribal misreading, with ΕΛΠΙ(ΣΕΚΝΙΞ)ΕΠΙΔΟΝ misread as ΕΛΠΙΔΟΝ... because of the resemblance of ΕΠΙ- to ΕΛΠΙ-. One may add that ἐπί in verbal tmesis is well attested in Pindar: ἐπὶ μὲν βαίνει, *O.* 7.45; ἐπὶ γὰρ...τίθησι, *P.* 2.9–10; ἐπὶ τε...πέμπετε, *fr.* 75.2. And that there is no shortage of parallels to such a cluster, with an unobtrusive word before the δ' ὦν: e.g., *Th.* 2.34.8, ἐπὶ δ' οὖν τοῖς πρώτοις; *Hdt.* 8.82.2, σὺν δὲ ὦν ταύτῃ τῇ νηί; [*A.*] *Pr.* 226, ὃ δ' οὖν ἐρωτᾷτ'; and in Pindar himself *O.* 3.38, ἐμὲ δ' ὦν and *P.* 9.103, ἐμὲ δ' οὖν [*sic* codd.]. (Not that it is hard to parallel the ὅτι kind of sequence, with a more obtrusive word before the δ' ὦν: e.g., *A. Th.* 810, βαρέα δ' οὖν; *S. Ant.* 890, μετοικίας δ' οὖν; *Hdt.* 3.46.2, βοηθείην δ' ὦν; *Ar. Av.* 499, ἰκτίνος δ' οὖν.) However, there are significant objections to ἐπί. [i] Both αἰνεῖν and ἐπαινεῖν occur often in Pindar in the sense “praise,” αἰνεῖν at least seventeen times, ἐπαινεῖν at least seven (see Slater s.vv.; I omit from the figures *I.* 5.59 itself and also *N.* 11.17, where codd. have αἰνεῖσθαι but some edd. print Schroeder's ἐπ-, but *P.* 5.107, where most edd. print Moschopoulos' ἐπ- for the αἰν- of codd., is counted under ἐπ-). However (discounting *I.* 5.59 again), there are five attestations of αἰνεῖν with direct object and first-person singular verb, but not one of ἐπαινεῖν. Pindar is happy to write νιν αἰνέω (*O.* 4.14), ἄνδρα...ἢ αἰνέσω (*O.* 7.15–16), παῖδ'...ἢ αἰνήσω (*O.* 10.99–100), φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων ἢ κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω (*N.* 7.62–63, with direct object—ἄνδρα—understood), σὲ δ' ἐγὼ παρά μιν ἢ αἰνέω (*fr.* 81 = *Dith.* 2), but seemingly avoids the ordinary expression, “you/him ἐπαινέω.” He has a single instance of ἐπαινέω in the first person, but in the plural and apparently without a direct object—this in the early *P.* 10 (69): ἀδελφεοῖσι τ' ἐπαινήσομεν ἐσλοῖς (text according to Wilamowitz, followed by most edd.). Here too, then, he seems to avoid the ordinary construction. [ii] It is not clear that ἐπὶ δ' ὦν αἰνέω would be idiomatic. In this hypothetical text δ' ὦν is connective-resumptive and

δ' ὦν: the usage is what Denniston (discussing δ' οὖν / δ' ὦν) labels "resumptive," adding, "leads back to the main topic, which has temporarily been lost sight of"; and Denniston's list includes several passages which make this connotation explicit, notably Isoc. 15.162, ὅτε δ' οὖν, ὥσπερ εἶπον, ἡρχόμεν and [A.] *Pr.* 226–27, ὃ δ' οὖν ἐρωτᾷτ'...I...τοῦτο δὲ σαφηνιῶ.⁸⁵ In *I.* 5 the "back to the main topic" means a return to the celebration which lies at the heart of the epinician programme. Pindar's other extant uses of δ' οὖν / δ' ὦν likewise signal just such a switch: ἐμὲ δ' ὦν πα θυμὸς ὀτρύνει φάμεν Ἑμμενιδαις | Θήρωνι τ' ἐλθεῖν κῦδος, *O.* 3.38–39; ἐμὲ δ' οὖν τις ἀοιδᾶν | δίδαν ἀκείόμενον πράσσει χρέος, *P.* 9.103–4.⁸⁶ In all three passages, furthermore, the

ἐπὶ...αἰνέω tmesis, but δ' ὦν does not seem to be one of the connectives that occurs in tmesis, even though it occurs between preposition and noun (σὺν δὲ ὦν ταύτῃ τῇ νηί, *Hdt.* 8.82.2, ἐπὶ δ' οὖν τοῖς πρῶτοις *Th.* 2.34.8) and even though there is indeed a well-established construction involving ὦν/οὖν in tmesis. That usage, however, is quite distinct. Largely attested in Ionic prose, it involves a verb in a gnomic tense and a non-connective ὦν/οὖν, on the pattern of *Hdt.* 2.47.1, καὶ τοῦτο μὲν...αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἱματίοις ἀπ' ὦν ἔβαψε ἐωυτόν or *Hp. Morb.* 1.30, ὅταν οὖν..., δι' οὖν ἐκίνησε: see Denniston 429–30 (with *Addendum* on 587); Powell 388; Kühner-Gerth II.1.537; Schwyzer II.283–84; Lloyd-Jones 74 (on *Semon.* 7.45). In *Hdt.* the tense is "always an aorist and [usually] gnomic"; in *Hp.*, likewise, "the verb denotes an habitual occurrence, the tense being indicative present or gnomic aorist" (Denniston 429). Schwyzer (II.283) plausibly includes *Il.* 19.94, κατὰ δ' οὖν ἑτερόν γε πέδησε (recurrent aorist, of ἄτη) with the *Hp./Hdt.* group: δ' οὖν here = connective δέ + ὦν ("wirklich," Schwyzer) and is certainly nothing like the unitary resumptive δ' ὦν of Pindar. Schwyzer (II.284 n. 2) also notes a few instances of ὦν/οὖν with non-gnomic aorist, but none of these involves δ' ὦν or is resumptive or connective (see further Denniston 460). The closest parallel to ἐπὶ δ' ὦν αἰνέω occurs in Euripidean lyric (*Andr.* 837), with the sentence-initial κατὰ μὲν οὖν...στένω. But μὲν οὖν is not δ' ὦν, and the plausibility of ἐπὶ δ' ὦν αἰνέω must remain in doubt. [iii] Above all, though, the problem with ἐπὶ δ' ὦν is that it makes it hard to explain Aristarchus' ὀπί. Much the easiest explanation of how ὀπί comes to be cited by Aristarchus is that it is the right reading. If it is not right, and ἐπὶ is, we have *either* a bizarre coincidence (Aristarchus [*vel sim.*] coincidentally conjectured -πί, albeit the strange ὀπί, not the easy ἐπί) *or* an extra stage of corruption, ἐπί > ὀπί (i.e., with Aristarchus' text) > ὀπιν (i.e., the vulgate). This is imaginable, but implies an uncomfortably tight timescale, given the presumption that the corruptions could go back to the fifth century. Moreover, if the corruptions do go back so far, they belong to the era of square capitals (Ε, etc.), in which a misreading of Ε as Ο, albeit in an already garbled text, is not as palaeographically simple as the misreading of Ε as Ο comes to be in later centuries.

⁸⁵Denniston 462–63.

⁸⁶Denniston's treatment of δ' οὖν / δ' ὦν in these other two Pindaric passages is defective. He does not in fact include either of them as "resumptive," but instead (461) rather mechanically characterizes the *P.* 9 instance as "breaking off and beginning a new story" and cites the *O.* 3 passage simply as an instance of "δ' οὖν without preceding μέν" (462). In the

switch involves a refocusing of, and onto, the poet's voice at the moment of praise (ὁπὶ...αἰνέω) towards the end of an ode: *I.* 5.58 > 63, *O.* 3.38 > 45, *P.* 9.103 > 125. If the case for ὁπὶ δ' ὦν in *I.* 5 needed any further strengthening, it is surely here.⁸⁷

V

We are now—albeit in mid-sentence—in a position to move on to the last part of the ode:

ὁπὶ δ' ὦν
αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμῃς,
Φυλακίδα, πλαγαῖν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι
χερσὶ δεξιόν, νόῳ ἀντίπαλον.
λαμβάνέ οἱ στέφανον, φέρε δ' εὖμαλλον μίτραν,
καὶ πτερόεντα νέον σύμπεμψον ὕμνον.

Well, Pytheas among vanquishers of limbs
Loudly I praise, O Phylacidas,
Smart-handed, like-witted:
A straight runner in the race of blows.
For him take up a crown, fetch a headband of fine wool,
And with them send a new song on the wing.

The text set out is essentially that of cod. B, unadulterated by well-meaning conjectures. This closing passage is not so densely fraught with textual conundrums as the half-dozen words preceding it, but several distinct problems of text and interpretation arise, associated, above all, with the received wisdom that Phylacidas is the object of the praise with which the passage begins and that his brother Pytheas was his trainer, or coach. On the contrary: though Phylacidas is naturally and properly part of the closing celebration, it is Pytheas who is the initial object of the praise, and he is praised, not as trainer, but for his own athletic prowess as a champion in his own right. For the main argument to this effect, see under καὶ Πυθέαν below. The points that need discussion can be taken in sequence.

αἰνέω: what is the construction of the verb? Is it accusative and infinitive, “I declare in praise of Pytheas that he...”? This interpretation worried many earlier

light of this, his remark that resumptive δ' οὖν is “rare in verse” (463–64) needs some qualification.

⁸⁷On δ' ὦν, finally, it is conceivable (no more) that a trace is preserved in Σ on αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν: ἐπαινῶ οὖν, φησί, καὶ τὸν ἀλείπτῃν αὐτοῦ (III.249, 12–13 Drachmann).

commentators, simply because (in Bury's words, *ad loc.*) "neither αἰνέω nor ἐπαινέω is constructed with the accusative and infinitive." More recently, the construction has been accepted by Willcock (1978: 44) and by Slater (s.v.), by Thummer (hesitantly), and by Hummel (275–76) who pronounces the usage "un hapax." Though no commentator seems ever to have cited a parallel, and though this use of αἰνέω/ἐπαινέω is certainly rare, it is no hapax: cf. τοὺς μὲν νόμους...πάντες ἄν ἐπαινέσειαν κάλλιστα νόμων κείσθαι καὶ ὀσιώτατα (Antiphon 6.2) and Ἀριστείδαν ἐπαινέω | ἄνδρ' ἱερᾶν ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν | ἐλθεῖν ἕνα λῶστον (Timocr. 727.2–4 *PMG*).⁸⁸ Notwithstanding these parallels, however, those earlier commentators who found the interpretation improbable were right, though not wholly for the right reason. Given the evident marginality of the construction *and* the way the vocative Φυλακίδα breaks up the sentence, any listener or reader is bound to feel αἰνέω as ordinary transitive verb with ordinary direct object, Πυθέαν, and then attach the infinitive εὐθυπορῆσαι to the words following, χερσὶ δεξιόν (see p. 73, below). This being a sequence of words in a living language and not a grammarians' exercise, it is no doubt possible that a fleeting impression of the accusative-and-infinitive construction is created as well—*apo koinou*, in effect—but any such impression must be secondary and subsidiary. And in case a pragmatic argument against the construction is needed, one should note that it would produce an aberrant type of praise. Were the construction, "I declare in praise of Pytheas that he...", the listener or reader would be faced with a sequence effectively meaning, "I declare in praise of Pytheas that he was a champion pankratiast." In context, though, the aorist tense of the infinitive would imply either that on *one* occasion Pytheas was a champion or that over his *whole* career (which is now a thing of the past?) he was.⁸⁹ However, it cannot be that Pytheas is praised here for any one thing he has *just* done, because it is only Phylacidas, the achiever on the immediate occasion, who has *just* done anything. And again, it cannot be that Pytheas is being praised for what he did, as athlete, over his whole career, whether on one or more earlier occasions, because Pindar only offers praises of athletes in this form with a further specification. That is, [i] the countless praises of athletes, when referring to past athletic achievement beyond the immediate occasion, always specify the place(s) or occasion(s) and/or add "once," "twice" etc. Thus: εἰ δὲ Θεμίστιον ἵκεῖς ὥστ'

⁸⁸For what it may be worth, the date of the Timocreon fragment must be very close to that of Pindar's *I. 5*, i.e., shortly after the battle of Salamis: cf. the full text of the fragment and the context in Plut. *Them.* 21.

⁸⁹"The aorist may refer even to a series of repetitions; but it takes them collectively as a whole": Goodwin 17.

αἶδιδεν... ἰ πύκταν τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίου φθέγξαι ἐλεῖν Ἐπιδαύρῳ διπλόαν ἰ νικῶντ' ἀρετάν, *N.* 5.50–53; ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου ἰ τρεῖς ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας, ἰ ἀγλαοὶ παῖδες τε καὶ μάρωας, *I.* 6.60–62; γεραίρετέ νιν, ἰ ὅς Ἴσθμιον ἂν νάπος ἰ Δωρίων ἔλαχεν σελίνων· ἐπεὶ περικτίονας ἰ ἐνίκασε δὴ ποτε καὶ κείνος ἄνδρας ἀφύκτα χερὶ κλονέων, *I.* 8.62–65. Of course, quite differently [ii], Pindar is happy to make athletic achievement (whether immediate or not) characteristic, by presenting it not as something the achiever *did*, but as part of what the achiever *was* or *is*, i.e., as an endowment, without reference to particular victories: ὄρθιον ὥρυσαι θαρσέων, ἰ τόνδ' ἀνέρα δαιμονία γεγάμεν ἰ εὐχειρα, δεξιόγυιον, ὀρῶντ' ἀλκάν, *O.* 9.109–11; ὦ Τιμόδημε, σὲ δ' ἀλκά ἰ παγκρατίου τλάθυμος ἀέξει, *N.* 2.14–15.⁹⁰ With the adjectival construction, εὐθυπορῆσαι...δεξιόν, we have an unexceptionable version of [ii]. With an accusative and infinitive, we would have a seemingly unique exception to [i].

καὶ Πυθέαν: not “I praise Pytheas *too* (as well as Phylacidas)...”⁹¹ καί = “in particular.” The idiom, very common in Pindar, is what Slater calls “emphatic” and Race “particularizing.”⁹² In Pindar it is often, as here, used to single out the *celebrandus*, whether an individual or not: ἐμὲ δ' οὖν τις ἀοιδᾶν ἰ δίψαν ἀκειόμενον πρᾶσσει χρέος αὐτίς ἐγεῖραι ἰ καὶ παλαιὰν δόξαν ἐῶν προγόνων, *P.* 9.103–5; κῶμας' ἔπειτεν ἀδυμελεῖ σὺν ὕμνῳ ἰ καὶ Στρεψιάδα (the victor to whom the κῶμος belongs), *I.* 7.20–21; σὺν δὲ τὴν [sc. Ἐλειθυίᾳ] ἰ καὶ παῖς ὁ Θεαρίωνος... ἰ...αἶδεται, *N.* 7.6–8 (a particularly unambiguous instance, in that this is the first mention in the ode of any “song” and the beneficiary of this song is the victor, the “son of Thearion,” Sogenes). In other words, καὶ focuses the switch of emphasis implicit in δ' ὦν and signals that Pytheas is its object.

Why Pytheas? Pytheas and Phylacidas were older and younger brother. Over the years, both won victories in the pankration, thereby adding to, and evoking, earlier athletic achievements by members of the family. So much is clear

⁹⁰So, variously, e.g., *O.* 4.14, *I.* 4.45–47.

⁹¹So, e.g., Fennell, Bury, Sandys (in the old Loeb, followed by Race in the new), Puech, Thummer, Privitera, Willcock (1978: 44) and presumably Σ (ἐπαινῶ...καὶ τὸν ἀλείπτῃν αὐτοῦ: III.249, 12–13 Drachmann).

⁹²Slater 258, col. 2; Race 1990: 97; cf. Verdenius on *I.* 2.19. The idiom is discussed by Denniston 317, with the gloss “actually” and under the label “precedes and emphasizes” (for parallels to Pindar’s substantival usage, see Denniston’s list on 320).

from two earlier odes, *N.* 5 and *I.* 6.⁹³ In *N.* 5, the earliest of the series, we hear of the boy Pytheas, how (4–6)

Λάμπωνος υἱὸς Πυθέας εὐρυσθενῆς
νίκη Νεμείοις παγκρατίου στέφανον,
οὐπῶ γέννυσι φαίνων τερείνας ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν

and also of an older kinsman, Euthymenes (41–43):

τὺ δ' Αἰγίναθε δῖς, Εὐθύμενες,
νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων.
ἦτοι μεταΐξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει
κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα⁹⁴

and of another, Themistius (50–53):

εἰ δὲ Θεμίστιον ἴκεις ὥστ' ἀείδειν...
πύκταν τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίου
φθέγξαι ἐλεῖν Ἐπιδαύρῳ διπλόαν
νικῶντ' ἀρετάν...

In *I.* 6 we hear more of the Λάμπωνος εὐαέθλου γενεᾶς (*I.* 6.3). The occasion for this ode is a victory by Phylacidas (5–7):

νῦν αὖτε Ἴσθμοῦ δεσπότη
Νηρείδεσσι τε πεντήκοντα παίδων ὀπλοτάτου
Φυλακίδα νικῶντος

but a whole series of earlier victories—by Euthymenes, by Pytheas, by Phylacidas himself—are celebrated along with it (57–62):

Φυλακίδα γὰρ ἦλθον, ὦ Μοῖσα, ταμίας
Πυθέα τε κώμων Εὐθυμένει τε...
ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου
τρῆς ἀπ' Ἴσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας,
ἀγλαοὶ παῖδές τε καὶ μάτρως.

⁹³Also from *B.* 13, which celebrates the same victory as *N.* 5. On the dating and external relationship of the four odes, see most recently Pfeijffer 1995: 318–32.

⁹⁴On the text of *N.* 5.43, see below, p. 68, with n. 123.

In *I. 5* itself praise of Phylacidas has already been conjoined to praise of his older brother (*I. 5.17–19*):

τὴν δ' ἐν Ἰσθμῷ διπλόα θάλλοις' ἀρετά,
Φυλακίδ', ἀγκεῖται, Νεμέα δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν
Πυθέα τε, παγκρατίου.

There is no doubt that Phylacidas is the source of the victory that is the immediate occasion of the ode, as the combination of apostrophe and order of items (with his Isthmian ἀρετά placed first)⁹⁵ imply, but it is equally clear that the celebration is to subsume the achievements of both brothers (21–22):

σὺν Χάρισιν δ' ἔμολον Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς
τὰνδ' ἐς εὐνομον πόλιν.

Why Pytheas then?—*because* Pytheas, along with his younger brother, is a beneficiary of the celebration which the ode represents.

But why is Pytheas singled out for praise again *now*? Following an unlucky guess recorded by a scholiast, interpreters have assumed, and continue to assume, that it is because he was Phylacidas' trainer or coach.⁹⁶ However, this cannot be so. The trainer theory rests partly on the ancient testimony, partly on a particular interpretation of Pindar's text associated with an admittedly simple emendation. In fact, though: [i] the ancient testimony is contradictory; [ii] the trainer theory is open to question on wider cultural grounds; [iii] it is not properly supported by parallels in Pindar elsewhere; and above all [iv], with or (especially) without the emendation, the phraseology of the actual passage in *I. 5* points in a different direction. Overall, then, the arguments against this *fable convenue* are as diverse and as strong as the case against ὄπιν, but there the task was to demonstrate the impossibility of an inherited text, while here it is a matter of upholding the text as given, and its straightforward implications, against a forced, albeit long-standing, interpretation.

⁹⁵For the principle, cf. Thummer I: 26–27. Apostrophe by itself is obviously no indication that the recipient is the new victor, as *N. 5.41* (above) and numerous other passages make clear.

⁹⁶So virtually all commentators except the independent-minded Bury. In recent work the assumption is repeated without argument by, e.g., Cole 40–41, Kyle 144 n. 119, and Pfeijffer 1995: 322. Hamilton 107–10 takes Pytheas as trainer, but in a “metaphorical” sense (“Pytheas showed the way,” 107).

[i] The ancient testimony about the role of Pytheas is contradictory. The claim that Pytheas coached his victorious brother is made in a scholium to *I.* 5.59 (III.249 Drachmann):

οὗτος ὁ Πυθέας ἐπεστάτησε τοῦ Φυλακίδα καὶ ἤλειπεν αὐτὸν...
ἐπαινῶ οὖν, φησί, καὶ τὸν ἀλείπτῃν αὐτοῦ...ποιήσαντα τὸν
τῶν πληγῶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι. παγκρατιαστής γάρ, διὸ
εὐθυπόρουν αἱ πληγαί.⁹⁷

This Pytheas was in charge of Phylacidas and “oiled” [sc. trained] him.... So, Pindar says, “I praise his trainer [oil-man]...because he made the course of [Phylacidas’?] blows run straight. The point is that he [Phylacidas?] was a pankratiast, so that his blows “ran straight.”

From the introductory section of the scholia on the ode, however, we learn that ancient scholars were uncertain about the rather more fundamental question of the identity of the *victor celebrandus* himself (III.240–41 Drachmann):

Inscr. *a* ταύτην τὴν ᾠδὴν Ἡφαιστίων...φησί...Πυθέα γεγράφθαι...

Inscr. *b* προκατασκευάζοντες ἔνιοι ὅτι Φυλακίδα μόνῳ γέγραπται, φασὶ τὸν Πυθέαν μὴ νενικηκέναι Ἴσθμια, ὥστε Ἰσθμιακὴν οὖσαν τὴν ᾠδὴν μὴ ἀναγεγράφθαι κάκείνῳ.... λανθάνει δὲ αὐτοῦς· ἐν γὰρ τῇ γεγραμμένῃ Μίδα [sc. Μειδίᾳ (corr. Wilamowitz)? = fr. 4 Snell-Maehler] ᾠδῇ...ιστορεῖ ὅτι καὶ ὁ Πυθέας Ἰσθμια ἐνίκησε....

Inscr. *c* ἄλλως. Καλλίστρατος Φυλακίδα μόνῳ γεγράφθαι φησί, συμπεριελήφθαι δὲ ἔξωθεν τὴν τοῦ Πυθέου νίκην, καθάπερ καὶ ἐν τῇ μετὰ ταύτῃ [sc. *I.* 6] τὴν Εὐθυμένους ὄντος αὐτῶν συγγενοῦς.

a Hephaestion says this ode was written for Pytheas....

b There are those who propose that it was written for Phylacidas alone, on the grounds that Pytheas won no Isthmian victories, and so, as this is an Isthmian ode, it was not dedicated to him as well....What they forget is that in the ode dedicated to [?] Meidias...it says that Pytheas too had won at the Isthmia....

c Alternatively: Callistratus says it was written for Phylacidas alone, and that Pytheas’ victory was brought in from another occasion, as with the victory of their kinsman Euthymenes in the following ode.

⁹⁷Between αὐτοῦ and ποιήσαντα, Σ has τοῖς πόνοις τοῖς γυιοδάμαις, which is surely corrupt. For the second τοῖς read ἐν (cf. Hartung, cited by Drachmann)?

In other words, at least one scholar, Hephaestion (II C.E.) ascribed the ode to Pytheas; unnamed ἔνιοι ascribed it to Phylacidas, on grounds identified by unnamed others as false; those unnamed others, by implication, regarded Pytheas and Phylacidas as joint honorands (“dedicated to him *as well*”); Callistratus (II B.C.E.), on different grounds, ascribed the ode to Phylacidas alone. In accordance with this scholarly uncertainty, our manuscripts BD have no heading; the heading ΦΥΛΑΚΙΔΑΙ ΑΙΓΙΝΗΤΗ ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΩΙ, found in all modern editions, was supplied by Triclinius. Not all his predecessors were so sure, and given *their* doubts about the status of Phylacidas, it is obvious that the arguments about the honorand were based, not on any external knowledge,⁹⁸ but on inference from the text. The supposition that Pytheas was his brother’s trainer must have belonged to this debate; it would presumably be precluded by Hephaestion’s ascription; and certainly, if there was no external evidence about honorands, there was none about trainers. The idea that Pytheas was Phylacidas’ trainer, whatever its antiquity, was a guess.

[ii] The trainer theory may be queried on wider cultural grounds. Phylacidas, Pytheas and their family, the γενεὰ Κλεονίκου (*I.* 5.55), were presumably aristocrats. There is plenty of evidence, from Pindar and others, about the use of trainer-coaches in the fifth century and later, but the indications are that they were paid ex-athletes who were, at best, “respectable men of means.”⁹⁹ Such a figure was the Athenian Menander, hired once for the young Pytheas, as we learn from *N.* 5, where Pindar proclaims that one who shapes athletes like a “carpenter” (τέκτον’ ἀεθληταῖσιν) *should* come from Athens (*N.* 5.48–49)—and from Bacchylides (13.190–98), who celebrates the same victory and refers to the “countless” (μυρίων) athletes who have benefited from Menander’s handiwork. The idea that an athlete might offer tips on a one-off basis to a younger brother is perfectly plausible in itself, albeit unattested, in any such Greek family, in fact. But this is not what is claimed for Pytheas by the scholiast. Pytheas “was in charge of him” (ἐπεστάτησε) and “gave him his oil” (ἤλειψε): he was the expert, he looked after Phylacidas and supervised

⁹⁸Must one infer that if there was a list of Isthmian victors available to ancient scholars (cf. *Σ I.* 1.11: III.199 Drachmann), it was somehow defective?

⁹⁹Kyle 145, who offers a largely plausible discussion (141–45). Pleket 64 sees coaches as lower-class professionals. Pleket’s position, along with others, is criticized by Young 147, on the grounds that “no ancient source...associates athletic coaches with a social class or any social movement” (but Young himself equally argues against the counter-position that coaches might be aristocrats: see n. 102 below).

his exercises¹⁰⁰—and indeed something on this systematic scale would seem to be called for, if Pytheas were actually to be praised, as expansively as he is, *for helping his brother*. However, there is no evidence to speak of that any aristocrat, like Pytheas, ever did provide such thorough-going help, whether for a member of his own family or not. There is a late-antique story that the philosopher Plato was trained by a wrestler who had the same name as (therefore, might be the same person as?) Plato's own nobly born father.¹⁰¹ Then there is a twentieth-century hypothesis that one or more of the Athenian trainers praised by Pindar was in fact of noble family.¹⁰² These are modest supports for the idea that one young aristocrat should have systematically coached another; and, given the limited evidence available, we may at least agree that aristocratic attitudes do not make the trainer theory seem especially plausible.

[iii] The theory is not properly supported by parallels in Pindar elsewhere. In Pindar's epinicians "trainer praise is confined to [boxing, wrestling and the pankration] and to boy victors in these events";¹⁰³ and where trainers are acknowledged, it is near the end of an ode,¹⁰⁴ as the Athenian Menander's service to Pytheas is acknowledged near the end of *N.* 5 (vv. 48–49, out of 54 vv. in all). In *I.* 5 two of these conditions are satisfied: the event(s) celebrated is/are the pankration; and Pytheas is indeed acknowledged near the end of the ode. The third condition, however, is not fulfilled: in the earlier *I.* 6, Phylacidas and Pytheas too are called παῖδες (62), but however short the lapse of time between *I.* 6 and *I.* 5, there is no reason to suppose—nor is it generally

¹⁰⁰For ἀλείπτῃς / ἀλείφω see Harris 171 and Poliakoff 109–10.

¹⁰¹D.L. 1.4, ἐγυμνάσατο δὲ παρὰ Ἀρίστωνι τῷ Ἀργεῖῳ παλαιστῇ: "Ariston" was also the name of Plato's father (*not* an Argive); cf. Riginos 244, index, s.vv. "Ariston, father of Plato" and "Ariston of Argos."

¹⁰²In particular, Wade-Gery 208–11 speculated that Melesias (see *O.* 8, *N.* 4, *N.* 6) was the same Melesias as the father of the Athenian politician Thucydides. His arguments are accepted by, e.g., Kyle 143–44, 207; *contra*, see, e.g., Young 148–49 n. 45.

¹⁰³Hamilton 108, listing *O.* 8, *O.* 10, *N.* 4, *N.* 5, *N.* 6. Hamilton adds (107): "other than *I.* 4 and *I.* 5, a trainer is found only in odes for boys and his presence in those two can be explained." He duly (107–8) explains the praise of Orseas in *I.* 4 ("assuming that Orseas is not a charioteer") as in fact part-celebration of Melissus' victory as a boy, and *I.* 5 as "metaphoric use of trainer praise," stressing (110) that "men in these [three] events do not demand trainer praise (*O.* 7, *O.* 9; *P.* 8; *N.* 2, *N.* 3, *N.* 10...)." Pfeijffer (1996: 533) queries the restriction of "trainer praise" to boy victors, but only on the counter-evidence of *I.* 4 and the present passage in *I.* 5 ("supported" by a misinterpretation of *I.* 5.17–19). Kyle 142 misrepresents the evidence more comprehensively by the loose assertion that "by the fifth century it seems to have become normal for every aspiring athlete to have a trainer."

¹⁰⁴Cf. Schadewaldt 285–87, and Maehler on B. 13.191–92.

supposed—that in *I.* 5 Phylacidas is, in the technical sense, a “boy.”¹⁰⁵ Even if he were, actually, there are other extant odes for a boy victor in the three “heavy events” which have no “trainer praise.” *O.* 11, which celebrates a boy victor in a boxing match, has none;¹⁰⁶ and, in particular, the parallel earlier ode, *I.* 6, which (as all commentators agree) celebrates the pankratiast Phylacidas as boy victor, also contains no reference to a trainer at the end. At the end of *I.* 6, instead, we have a praise of the boy’s father, Lampon, for what Hamilton reasonably calls his “munificence” (66–73).¹⁰⁷

[iv] The phraseology in *I.* 5 does not support the trainer theory. When trainers in Pindar—and likewise in Bacchylides—are referred to, we generally find a clear acknowledgement that the trainer helped the young athlete to win or else a clear phraseological indication that the trainer was in charge. Thus in Bacchylides 13.191–92 we hear of Menander’s μέλεταν...βροτωφελέα for Pytheas. In Pindar: at *O.* 8.59 Melesias is praised for his “instruction” (τὸ διδάσθαι); at *O.* 10.16–17 the victorious Hagesidamus is to “show his gratitude” to his trainer (νικῶν ἰλᾶ φερέτω χάριν); at *N.* 5.48–49 Pytheas is assured that he won because of the contribution of Menander (Μενάνδρου σὺν τύχῃ), the master craftsman (τέκτον’ ἀεθληταῖσιν); at *N.* 6.66 Melesias, again, is the “charioteer” of his protégé’s physical might (χειρῶν τε καὶ ἰσχύος ἀνίοχον); while at *I.* 4.71–72 the victor won “by heeding his helmsman’s good advice” (κυβερνατῆρος οἰακοστρόφου ἰγνώμα πεπιθῶν πολυβούλῳ).¹⁰⁸ In *I.* 5 there is no such indication. Furthermore, the

¹⁰⁵Hamilton 106–8. On the chronology of *I.* 6 and *I.* 5, see Pfeijffer 1995; on the technical sense of παῖς, see Kyle 37 and 183–84, and Harris 154–55 with n. 6.

¹⁰⁶Odes for boy-victors in other events likewise lack “trainer-praise”: *O.* 14, *P.* 10, *P.* 11, *N.* 7 (Hamilton 107).

¹⁰⁷Hamilton 110. Jebb’s comment on the passage (on B. 13 [= his 12].191–92) is worth quoting: “Lampon, the victor’s father, is described by Pindar [*I.* 6. 66–67] as μέλεταν ἰ ἔργοις ὀπάζων, ‘bestowing care on feats of prowess’ (i.e. on athletics), and recommending it to his sons...Pindar’s meaning (or a part of it) must be that Lampon, a rich man [cf. B. 13.224–25], procured the best training for his sons.” That “procurement” is consistent with Pindar’s words, but not spelled out in them. (Meanwhile, the modern scholarly anxiety to find trainers for Pindar’s younger athletes engendered an audacious conjecture by Mommsen at *I.* 6.72: for νιν ἄνδρ’ ἐν ἀθληταῖσιν [BD] read Μένανδρον ἐν ἀεθληταῖσιν...).

¹⁰⁸Only at the end of *N.* 4, which is arguably corrupt and certainly difficult, is such an indication lacking. οἶον αἰνέων κε Μελησίαν ἔριδα στρέφοι κτλ. (93 ff.): the connection of these words with what precedes is baffling, as is αἰνέων (which, *pace* Bury and Willcock, cannot *mean*, though it might *connote*, “emulate”), and ἔριδα, and/or the logic of 93 ff. itself. There are acknowledged corruptions in 90 and 91 (cf. edd.); Aristarchus (again!) was one who

indications that there are point in a quite different direction: ἐν γυιοδάμῃ tends to imply that the subject is an athlete, not a trainer; εὐθυπορῆσαι (grievously misinterpreted by the scholarly tradition) definitely indicates an athlete who achieves something, not a minister to someone else's needs; the call for a στέφανος points the same way; and the emendation of Φυλακίδα to -δα, supposedly in support of the trainer theory, does not help, any more than it convinces. Certainly it would need a more drastic change of text to get a trainer in here. The detail of all these points will be considered (s.vv.) below.

In rejecting the trainer theory, we propose instead the natural and necessary interpretation of Pindar's words. Earlier on in the ode, he has pinpointed Phylacidas' latest Isthmian victory as the present occasion for poetic celebration, but in the same breath as his own and his brother's past achievements (17–19). Now he is praising Pytheas again, not for anything he has just done, but as an athletic achiever in general. Why Pytheas again *now*? Because Pytheas, though young himself, is Phylacidas' elder, an *earlier* achiever from the γενεᾶ Κλεονίκου (55);¹⁰⁹ and it is one of Pindar's established practices to close an ode with praise of a distinguished older relative, as indeed is the case with the family's other odes, *N.* 5 and *I.* 6: *N.* 5 ends with praise of Themistius (50–54), *I.* 6 with praise of Lampon (66–75).¹¹⁰ In this connection, we may note Hamilton's conclusions that, just as "inscriptions for victory dedications are almost always for the victor's whole career," some odes "were written for more than one victory"; that "one should probably admit the possibility of an ode celebrating all the victories of an individual or his family as well"; and that, in particular, "*I.* 5 is for both Isthmian and Nemean victories of both brothers."¹¹¹ Our argument does not commit us to these positions: it all rather depends on what "written for" and "celebrate" are taken to mean, in literary-theoretical or institutional terms, or both.¹¹² But Hamilton's conclusions and our argument are quite compatible and

read/proposed a different text from ours in 93. Significant corruption in 93 itself cannot be excluded, and it is probably unsafe to draw any conclusions from the passage.

¹⁰⁹For a hint in these lines of another, still earlier, achiever from the same γενεά, namely Euthymenes, see p. 80 below.

¹¹⁰The final two verses of *I.* 6, 74–75, are in honour of σφε, i.e., the whole family—of which Lampon is a key member.

¹¹¹Hamilton 104, 106.

¹¹²On "celebrate": the interpreter of Pindar needs to remain vigilant against the unremitting oversimplifications of concept and terminology engendered by Bundy, for whom Pindar's odes are (simply) "enkonomia," which are (simply) "devoted to praise," which is (simply) centred on "the" *laudandus* (Bundy 1962, e.g., I. 3–5). Despite a series of productive studies

certainly stand together against all the implausibilities which an obstinate insistence on the trainer theory has forced interpreters into over the years.

VI

At which point we can resume our commentary:

ἐν γυιοδάμαις: γυιοδάμας (a first-declension adjective used as noun) is an exotic formation, presumably coined *ad hoc* on the analogy of forms like χρυσοκόμας (epithet of male deities, *O.* 6.41, etc.).¹¹³ The compound means “limb-” or “body-overcomers,” in line with: [i] the predominant use of δαμ-, which tends to imply the successful application of hostile force (βίη καὶ χερσὶ δαμάσσης, *Hes. Th.* 490; πόλεμός τε δαμᾶ καὶ λοιμὸς Ἀχαιοῦς, *Il.* 1.61; Γίγαντας ὃς ἐδάμασας [sc. Heracles], *Pi. N.* 7.90); and [ii] the predominant use of γυῖον and compounds from epic onwards, in which (despite epic phrases like φαίδιμα γυῖα or Bacchylides’ γυιαλκέα μουνοπάλαν [12.8]) γυι- connotes the body of a victim or a body in pain: λύντο δὲ γυῖα, *Il.* 7.16; ὑπὸ δ’ ἔτρεμε γυῖα, *Il.* 10.390 (cf. the range of usage in Ebeling, s.v.); γυιοβόρους μελεδώνας, *Hes. Op.* 66 (cf. West *ad loc.*); σῶμα...γυιοδόνητον τείρει,

in recent years which make a properly measured use of Bundy’s categories (studies as various as those by Most, Steiner, Hubbard and Kurke), it is still necessary to insist on some basic truths: that there may be more than one *laudandus*; that *laudatio*, however prominent and even primary, is rarely “the meaning” of an ode; that *laudandus*, therefore, is not necessarily a helpful word because it begs the question about “meaning”; that this “meaning” is a matter of an aristocratic aesthetic and ideology for which the celebration of the aristocratic individual within his community has a special significance; above all, that, in the wake of Bundy, interpreters tend to conflate occasion, praise and celebration. Pindaric odes—if one has to offer a general formula—may be said (a) to assume a particular occasion of an athletic victory, (b) to include praise, especially but not necessarily only of the victor in question, (c) to offer a celebration associated with and arising from the occasion. What is praised is also celebrated, but not necessarily *vice versa*. The occasion is also celebrated, but what is celebrated is not necessarily occasional. In *I.* 5 the occasion is Phylacidas’ new Isthmian victory. The poem subsumes praises—of the Aeginetan effort at Salamis and especially of the family of Cleonicus, to which Phylacidas belongs. The poem *as a whole*, like most of Pindar’s other odes, is celebration: of a victory and a victor (yes), but also of beauty, of achievement, of a value-system, of a communal tradition, of celebration itself. It is because the poetry *as a whole* has a wider interest than the occasion, or a deeper interest *in* the occasion, that (e.g.) myths, with all their outward-lookingness and multiple connotations, bulk so large in Pindar’s odes and that (e.g.) odes like *N.* 5, *I.* 6 and *I.* 5 end the way they do.

¹¹³First in *Hes. Th.* 947: cf. Silk 1974: 159–60. λεοντοδάμας (of a dog) is used in [?] *Pi.* fr. 74, and ἀνδροδάμας at *N.* 3.39, but the latter appears to be an -αντ- stem on the evidence of *N.* 9.16 and fr. 166.1. Hermann and various other nineteenth-century commentators took γ. as an adjective with χερσὶ, “giving the most flagrant violation of usual order to be found in Pindar” (Fennell).

Phryn. Trag. 2; παλαίσματα...γυιοβαρῆ, A. Ag. 63; ἀφύκτοισι γυιοπέδαις, Pi. P. 2.41; νωδυνίας...γυιαρκέος, Pi. P. 3.3–6 (where the positive -αρκ- is counterpointed against the pain and sickness of γυι-).¹¹⁴ The formation is (appropriately?) harsh inasmuch as one would not, phraseologically, δαμάζειν an opponent's γυῖα, but would δαμάζειν *him* (φῶτας...!...δαμάσσαις, O. 9.91–92) by physical pressure to his γυῖα. Nevertheless, the referent of the compound is clear enough: victorious pankratiasts.

The pankration was a combination of boxing and wrestling which, in later antiquity, tends to be described as a kind of wrestling that allowed (among other things) the use of fists: thus οἱ παγκρατιάζοντες...κεκινδυνευμένη προσχρῶνται τῇ πάλῃ...καὶ σφυρῶ προσπαλαίουσι καὶ τὴν χεῖρα στρεβλοῦσι προσόντος τοῦ παίειν καὶ ἐνάλλεσθαι, Philostr. Jun. *Im.* 2.6. In earlier sources, however, boxing and wrestling are put on a par. Thus Arist. *Rh.* 1.5.14: ὁ δὲ [δυνάμενος] θλίβειν καὶ κατέχειν παλαιστικός, ὁ δὲ ὥσαι τῇ πληγῇ πυκτικός, ὁ δ' ἀμφοτέροις τούτοις παγκρατιαστικός.¹¹⁵ In Pindar's usage elsewhere it is a wrestler who wins νίκαν...θρασύγυιον (P. 8.37) by pressing down on his opponent's (or opponents') γυίοις (O. 8.68), thereby φῶτας...δαμάσσαις (O. 9.91–92);¹¹⁶ but here the -δαμ- of γυιοδάμαις is not physically specific enough to point to the wrestling component of the sport, any more than to the boxing.¹¹⁷ Even so, the compound, with its “overcoming,” is specific enough to point to victorious athletes, not successful trainers;¹¹⁸ and in contrast the prepositional phrase as a whole suggests that the subject, Pytheas, is himself seen as an athlete too. In itself, the phrase leaves it open whether Pytheas (who was, or had been, a pankratiast) is here counted among the γυιοδάμαις or not: i.e., it could be *either* a phrase like ἐν παισὶ νέοις παῖς, ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἀνὴρ, N. 3.72, or ἄριστος ἐνὶ Θρήκεσσι, Il. 6.7, or one like ἐν παισὶ μὲν γέρων, ἐν δὲ γέρουσι παῖς, prov. ap. Apostol. *Cent.* 7.29, or

¹¹⁴Cf. also (whatever the etymological relationship) γυιός / γυιόω: see Frisk, s.v. γυῖα.

¹¹⁵Boxing may even be foregrounded, as at Ar. *Pax* 897–98 (παγκράτιον...πύξ).

¹¹⁶Cf. A. Ag. 63, παλαίσματα...γυιοβαρῆ, where the adjective indicates the “pressing and holding down of one wrestler by the other” (Wecklein, paraphrased by Fraenkel *ad loc.*; Rose *ad loc.* gratuitously takes παλ. γυι. to refer to the pankration itself). Cf. also B. 12.8, γυιαλκία μουνοπάλαν, cf. 9.36–38.

¹¹⁷δαμάζειν (etc.) almost never has a physical thing as its grammatical object: Il. 20.265–66 (of Achilles' shield) is a rare exception.

¹¹⁸There is of course a less hostile use of δαμ- associated with “taming” horses and similar animals (δαμάσσειν thus at Il. 23.655, δαμάζειν likewise at X. *Mem.* 4.3.10; cf. ἵπποδαμος), but this is only evoked when such an animal is alluded to—and in any case it is not as if trainers would expect to have *wild* pupils who would need to be *broken in*.

ἔλεγον ἐν τοῖς τριάκοντα, Lys. 12.6. In context, however, the plural suggests that he is indeed himself counted here as a pankratiast. It is much more natural to say, “among pankratiasts I praise Pytheas as an exponent of the pankration,” than “among pankratiasts I praise Pytheas as a trainer.” It would no doubt be possible to take ἐν γυμ. as excluding Pytheas, with the sense, “among the pankratiasts he was a wonderful instructor,” but then only, presumably, if he were a *regular* trainer for Phylacidas *and others*. Understandably enough, no interpreter has raised this possibility.¹¹⁹

Φυλακίδα: vocative. No modern editor has retained -α, which is the reading of cod. B (D has φ-αν).¹²⁰ Following Schmid, editors emend to -α, supposedly a dative of interest required for the trainer theory. The emendation is neither necessary nor satisfactory. The sentiment is addressed to Phylacidas, because he is the immediate victor and Pytheas’ achievements are linked by family to his own and reflect on his own. That is, Phylacidas is not forgotten, but, on the contrary, gains stature by association with his senior, as Pytheas himself does at the end of *N.* 5 (50–54) by association with his grandfather¹²¹ Themistius. There too praise of the older relative seems to displace consideration of the “actual” subject. In fact, there is no displacement, but enhancement, by an aesthetic-ideological principle akin to “double determination” in Homer: “a man will achieve ‘when his heart bids him and a god rouses him’ (*Il.* 9.702–3). So achievement is not diminished by its divine associations; rather they serve to symbolize its special authority and distinction.”¹²² In an earlier passage from *N.* 5 (40–43), despite corruption and textual uncertainty,¹²³ the associative principle is presented more clearly:

πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενῆς ἔργων πέρι
πάντων. τὺ δ’ Αἰγίναθε δῖς, Εὐθύμενες,
νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων.
ἦτοι μεταίξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει
κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα.

¹¹⁹Contrast the closing passage in the sister ode *I.* 6, where Lampon, father of Pytheas and Phylacidas, is described as ἄνδρ’ ἐν ἀεθληταῖσιν...| Ναξίαν πέτραις ἐν ἄλλαις χαλκοδάμαντ’ ἀκόναν (72–73)—i.e., among the athletes (his two sons) he (who never was, or at least is not here counted as, an athlete) is a source of encouragement (cf. n. 107 above).

¹²⁰See p. 26 above. -α figures only as part of a composite conjecture by Herwerden (τὴν γυιοδαμᾶν, Φ.), cited by Gerber 1976: 136.

¹²¹Grandfather, according to Σ on *N.* 5.50 (III.99 Drachmann): cf. *I.* 6.65.

¹²²Silk 1987: 82.

¹²³See Turyn’s apparatus and Farnell’s commentary *ad loc.*

Pytheas' uncle, Euthymenes, by *his* former achievements, "brings glory to *you*, Pytheas." In the present passage, in any case, Phylacidas is gloriously *there* in the action by virtue of the word-position which puts his name literally in the midst of the pankratiasts and their blows.

In *I.* 5 the vocative is not explicitly attached to a reference to the addressee in the same sentence. With a human addressee, generally, there is such a reference in Pindar, as twice in the passage just cited from *N.* 5, τὸ δ'...Εὐθύμενες (41), σὲ...τεὸς...Πυθέα (43), or as earlier in *I.* 5, τὴν δ'...Φυλακίδ' (17–18), or in *O.* 6.22, ὦ Φίντις...ζευξον (with imperative). However, [i] there are instances where there is no visible reference and instead a more or less remote implicit connection: οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε, φῶτες...!...ἐτόξευον...ῥμους, *I.* 2.1–3 (where Thrasybulus is the living son of the late victor to whom *this* ῥμους is in effect dedicated); καὶ κε μυθήσαιο ὅποιαν, Ἀρκεσίλα, ἰεῦρε παγὰν ἀμβροσίων ἐπέων, *P.* 4.298–99 (where Arcesilaus is king of Cyrene, and the subject of the verb is the exile whom a king could, if he chose, bring home); Σώγερες, ἀπομύω ἰ μὴ τέρμα προβαῖς ἄκονθ' ὥτε..., *N.* 7.70–71 (on which Carey *ad loc.* pertinently remarks, "after an apostrophe to Sogenes...one would expect the relative clause to refer to Sogenes, [but] attempts to secure such a reference have been unsuccessful"—and then conjectures a loose connection on the lines of "I swear that I have not/will not [any more than *you*]..."). [ii] Among the many instances of the motif, "O..., your family has won victories," most are straightforward (as οὐκ ἀγνώτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι ἰ οὔτε κώμων, ὦ Θρασύβουλ', *I.* 2.30–31). There are some, however, where the explicit connection is delayed or elided, as εἰ δ' ἐτύμως..., Ἀγησία, μάτρως ἄνδρες, *O.* 6.77 (i.e., "Hagesias, *your* maternal relations"). The referentiality of the vocative in *I.* 5.60 is less marginal than the instances in [i], closer in spirit to the *O.* 6 instance in [ii], but a shade less explicit: "O Phylacidas, it is <your brother> Pytheas that I praise." It is noteworthy that with the restoration of the vocative in *I.* 5.60, the ode is seen to fall into a Pindaric pattern. It is one of only four odes in which the same addressee is addressed in the vocative twice, and in each of these four at least one of the instances (usually the second) is not straightforwardly attached. Thus: *I.* 5.17–18, τὴν δ'...Φυλακίδ', and 60 (not straightforward); *O.* 6.12, Ἀγησία, τὴν δ', and 77 (not straightforward, above); *P.* 4. 250–55, ὦ Ἀρκεσίλα...ὑμετέρας ἀκτῖνος (connection real, though delayed), and 298 (not straightforward, above); *I.* 2.1 (not straightforward, above), and 30–31, ὑμῖν... ὦ Θρασύβουλ' (above).

If the vocative accords with Pindaric logic and Pindaric usage, the conjectural dative is quite problematic. The pretext for the conjecture is the scholiast's guess (discussed above) that Pytheas was Phylacidas' trainer and a common misinterpretation of εὐθυπορῆσαι as causal, "direct (straight)," for which there is also a modest support in the scholia (see s.v. below). Hence a series of translations from commentators and others assuring us that Pytheas "showed Phylacidas the way" or "directed his blows," where Φυλακίδᾱ is taken as dative of interest. Thus Farnell ("to cause the swift path of blows to be straight for Phylacidas"), Dissen ("Pytheas...certamina praeundo fratrem vincere docuerat"), Privitera ("nel guidare a Filacida il corso dei colpi"), Puech ("a montré à Phylacidas le droit chemin que doivent suivre les coups"), Sandys ("guiding aright the course of Phylacidas' blows"). Once one accepts that a causal force cannot be ascribed to εὐθυπορῆσαι, which is "go (straight)," not "direct (straight)," it is hard to see what force might be given to the dative, though Thummer, for instance, apparently supposes that it means something to say, "ich lobe auch Pytheas..., dass er dem Phylakidas den richtigen Weg der Schläge beschritten hat." It is true that the dative of interest is fairly common in Pindar and is often used quite freely, especially with proper names: thus Φυλακίδᾱ γὰρ ἦλθον...ταμίας, *I.* 6.57, Διὸς...τὸν...κωμάξατε Τιμοδήμῳ, *N.* 2.24, and ἔμολον Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς, *I.* 5.21, earlier in our ode. But in all these "parallels" the basis of the "interest" is quite clear, which in our passage is not the case. One is simply not entitled to say that Pytheas "went *before*" Phylacidas (though he did) or "*showed him* the way" (though, no doubt, he may have done), because there is no "before" and no "showed" in the Greek, just as, without the conjectural dative, there is no "him" either. As it stands, with the dative the Greek would yield only "I praise Pytheas as an achiever *for Phylacidas*," which, no doubt, is physically impossible. But there is clearly no profit in scratching about for conceivable meanings of a conjectural text, when a satisfactory text is offered within the manuscript tradition.¹²⁴ One need only add that, with the dative, οἱ in 62 is ambiguous, which would be bizarre (see s.v. below).

¹²⁴The only other discussible defence of the conjectural dative is by Bury, who makes Φυλακίδᾱ dependent on ἀντίπαλον. This does make sense ("I praise P. as peer of Ph."), but involves an unidiomatic and wildly un-Pindaric conjunction of elements across two other intervening datives (χερσὶ and νόῳ). It is, incidentally, a matter of regret that, in a substantial discussion of the dative in Pindar, Hummel (123–34) neither discusses nor even cites this instance, despite following the Teubner (Hummel 17) and therefore presumably reading -ᾱ here.

VII

At which point we can resume our commentary again:

πλαγᾶν: “blows” are part of what the pankratiast aims to inflict, or defend himself with (ᾤσαι τῇ πληγῇ, Arist. *Rh.* 1.5.14: see p. 67 above), or if necessary endure (καματωδέων...πλαγᾶν, *N.* 3.17).

δρόμον: a novel metaphor, seemingly, but not a transparent one. δρ. in itself could be “racecourse” (e.g., *Il.* 23.321, *Pi. P.* 1.32, *Hdt.* 6.126, *E. Andr.* 599) or “(foot) race” (e.g., *Il.* 23.758, *Pi. I.* 1.23, *X. Lac.* 1.4, *E. IA* 211). Elsewhere, Pindar himself uses the phrase ὕβριος ἐχθρὰν ὁδὸν | εὐθυπορεῖ (*O.* 7.90–91), which might incline one towards “course.” But there seems to have been an established expression, δρόμον (as cognate accusative) + verb, where δρ. = “race,” in the proverb attested at *Hdt.* 8.74.1, περὶ τοῦ παντὸς ἤδη δρόμον θέοντες, and *Ar. V.* 376, τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς δρόμον δραμεῖν (cf. also λαγῶς τὸν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν τρέχων, *prov. ap. Zenob.* 4.85, where, as Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad loc.* suggest, δρόμον is presumably the noun implied). And certainly “race” makes better sense: the competing athletes each strive to get their punches in *first*. For the mixture of physical activities in the image, πλαγᾶν (boxing, pankration) δρόμον (running), cf. *N.* 3.17, παγκρατίου στόλῳ and *N.* 6.14, ἀμφὶ πάλα κυναγέτας.

εὐθυπορεῖσαι: governs δρόμον as cognate accusative, as with ὁδὸν εὐθ. at *O.* 7.90–91 (see under δρόμον above). The verb εὐθυπορεῖν, and its Ionic equivalent ἰθυπορεῖν, is attested only as “travel straight,” whether of physical items (ἰθυπόρηκε [sc. ἡ φλέψ], *Hp. Oss.* 15; τὰ ὀλόπτερα...οὐκ εὐθυποροῦσιν, Arist. *IA* 710a7),¹²⁵ or in secondary usage of abstractions (αἱ δ' ἀποδείξεις...εὐθυποροῦσιν, Arist. *de An.* 407a.29 [logical demonstrations “proceed in a straight line”], ἐωμένης τῆς γενέσεως εὐθυπορεῖν, Arist. *EE* 1224b.33 [development is “allowed to proceed”]), or again in metaphorical usages, as at *A. Ag.* 1005, πότμος εὐθυπορῶν, at *Pi. O.* 7.90–91 (above), and as here.¹²⁶ Other -πορέω compounds, when “travel” words, follow the same rule, notably ποντοπορεῖν, *Od.* 11.11; μεσοπορεῖν, *Thphr. Char.* 25.2; and ὁδοπορεῖν and διοδοπορεῖν, both used by Herodotus with cognate accusative: ὁδοιπόρεον...ὁδόν, 4.116.1, and τὰς δύο...μοίρας διοδοιπορήκεσαν,

¹²⁵Likewise *Thphr. HP* 1.5.5, *CP* 1.8.4 and 5.3.4.

¹²⁶In one other Pindaric instance, fr. 52n (b) 10, there is insufficient context to determine the use, though it seems likely to be metaphorical.

8.129.2.¹²⁷ The notion that εὐθυπορεῖν could be used causally, “make someone/something travel = direct,” was engendered by the scholiast’s paraphrase (III.249 Drachmann): ἐπαινῶ οὖν, φησί, καὶ τὸν ἀλείπτῃν αὐτοῦ...ποιήσαντα τὸν τῶν πληγῶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι. The scholion merely adds a gratuitous ποιήσαντα, citing no evidence for a causal use, and indeed there seems to be no relevant evidence to cite.¹²⁸ A verb like εὐθύνω would yield a causal sense (ἐς τὰ μαλθακὰ ἰ γαίης...εὐθύνοι δρόμον, E. *Hipp.* 1226–27); εὐθυπορεῖν, on all the evidence, neither would nor could.

In terms of the δρόμος metaphor, εὐθ. points to the obvious value of running in a straight line—ἔθει δρόμῳ τὴν ὁδὸν ταύτῃν εὐθεῖαν (Th. 5.10.6)—on a track without lanes. In the “race” conducted primarily with the hands, Pytheas “ran straight”—ἰθὺς δράμεν (*Od.* 23.207), εὐθὺν τόνον ἢ ποσσὶ τρέχων (Pi. *O.* 10.64–65)—which means “ran well” (cf. Verdenius on *O.* 7.33). Likewise, in the use of his hands, he literally went “straight” for his opponents, like the Homeric warriors who μένος χειρῶν ἰθὺς φέρον (*Il.* 5.506). In Pindar’s image, then, εὐθυ- is interactive, belonging as it does to the terminologies of both vehicle and tenor.¹²⁹ It is also presumably to be assumed that Pytheas fought openly, *fairly*, as a εὐθυμάχας (used of a boxer, *O.* 7.15) in the face-to-face engagement to which Homer applies the phrase ἰθὺς μαχέσασθαι (*Il.* 17.168) and Herodotus the compound ἰθυμαχίη (4.102.1, 4.120.1); but any fleeting suggestion of a *moral* εὐθυ- (for which see *LSJ* s.v. εὐθύς A.2 etc.) is diverted by δεξιόν, which points to skill, rather than propriety. Regarding the connotations of Pindar’s εὐθυπορῆσαι, there are no grounds for detecting a maritime image here (notwithstanding translations like *LSJ*’s “hold a straight course,” s.v.). -πορεῖν can be nautical (as ποντοπορεῖν); πόρος is of course originally a sea (or river) word; εὐθυπορεῖν itself is used in a nautical image at A. *Ag.* 1005; and δρόμος likewise, metaphorically, at S. *Aj.* 889 and, seemingly, Pi. fr. 1a.5. However, the normal and predominant uses of δρόμος point to running, and that fact in turn determines the sense of εὐθυπορῆσαι. A maritime image is available, but not activated. Nor is it apparent that there is any allusion to speed in the fighting (as

¹²⁷Hdt. also uses ὁδοιπορεῖν absolutely at 4.110.2.

¹²⁸Privitera irrelevantly cites the usage of εὐπορεῖν, as at D. 33.7, εὐπορήσειν αὐτῷ δέκα μνᾶς (i.e., as in *LSJ* s.v. II, “supply or furnish”). However, here as elsewhere, there is no sign that εὐπορεῖν, formed directly from εὐπορος (like ἀπορεῖν from ἀπορος), has retained any sense of an etymological connection with “travel.”

¹²⁹As “support” (Silk 1974: 134–37, where the present instance, along with various other subdued instances, is not cited).

opposed to speed in the metaphorical running). Outside Pindar, speed is not much cited as an asset in descriptions of the pankration, nor is it alluded to in any of Pindar's praises of pankratiasts (though a wrestling-trainer is once praised for his τάχος: *N.* 6.64).

χερσὶ δεξιόν: with these words, the hitherto unexplained syntax of the sentence suddenly (in Gerard Manley Hopkins' phrase) "explodes." εὐθυπορῆσαι is seen to be exegetic infinitive with δεξιόν (and, more loosely, with νόω ἀντ. following). Cf. such expressions as ἀγαθὸν... μάρνασθαι, *O.* 6.17; ἵππεύεσθαι ἀγαθοί, *Hdt.* 1.79.3; ἐπινοῆσαι ὀξεῖς, *Th.* 1.70.2; δεινὸς γὰρ εὐρεῖν κᾶξ ἀμηχάνων πόρον, [*A.*] *Prom.* 59. The collocation χ.δ. itself is oddly arresting, in that the familiar phrase δεξιὰ χεῖρ (*E. Med.* 496: likewise *Pi.* fr.146.2, *A. Ag.* 1405, *Hdt.* 2.106.3, *Ar. Nub.* 81; cf. *Il.* 7.108 etc. with δεξιτερός) is half evoked, but its elements are reoriented. In line with such standard usages as the epic χειρῶν γεύσασθαι, *Od.* 20.181, and the prosaic ἦρχε χειρῶν ἀδίκων, *Lysias* 4.11 (*LSJ* s.v. χεῖρ IV), χερσὶ in the context of the pankration primarily connotes might: ἄνδρας ἀφύκτα χερὶ κλονέων, *I.* 8.65 (cf. σὺν ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικῶντι σθένει, *N.* 10.48, of wrestling, and κρατέοντα χερὸς ἀλκᾶ, *O.* 10.100, and μάχας θρασύχειρος, *B.* 2.4, both of boxing). At the same time, hands can be skilful, hence the praise of a warrior as εὐχειρα, δεξιόγυιον (*O.* 9.111). δεξιός as "smart, quick," with an implication, then often a specification, of quick wits, is not common until the late fifth century (by which time it is established as a distinctive term of praise: see, e.g., Dover on *Ar. Nub.* 148). Along with the present instance, *Anacr.* 72.6 *PMG* and *Epich.* 99.2 *Kaibel* seem to be the earliest attested examples. (There is also an occurrence in the epigram *Simon.* 111 D, but the poem is doubtless Hellenistic: Page 244.) In Anacreon, as here, the point is physical dexterity: δεξιὸν... ἐπαμβάτην (*codd.* and *edd.* ἐπεμ-: on the text, see Silk 1974: 124, 126).

νόω: Pytheas' physical prowess and skill are matched by his mental abilities. How these would have impinged on (let alone off) the field of combat, we are not told. Praise of *mens* and *corpus* together is common in Pindar in a variety of contexts. The ideal king is χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς ἄριστος (*N.* 8.8, of Aeacus); the pankration, however, calls for the θυμός of the lion but, in particular, the μῆτις of the fox (*I.* 4.45–47; cf. *O.* 11.19–20, of boxing), and the natural implication of νόω here is that Pytheas commanded that subtlety by which a master of the heavy events was likely to overcome any opponent (φῶτας... δόλω l... δαμάσσαις, *O.* 9.91–92, of wrestling). The ultimate model for this combination of talents is no doubt Homer's Odysseus, as at *Od.* 22.60–70, both

πολύμητις and possessor of χεῖρας ἀάπτους (for other pairings of aristocratic-heroic qualities, see Privitera *ad loc.*).

ἀντίπαλον: in effect, “as good with his νόω *as with* his χερσί.” In this abstract sense, “equivalent, corresponding,” ἀντίπαλος is reasonably common by the later fifth century, especially in Thucydides (see Bétant s.v. and *LSJ* s.v. I.2 [but mistakenly limiting the category to “of things”]): cf., e.g., ἀντίπαλοι...τῇ παρασκευῇ καὶ δυνάμει (of former allies, Th. 3.9.2). The present instance and another at *O.* 8.71 are the earliest attested in this sense. Given the association between the pankration and wrestling, the etymology of the word (ἀντί + πάλη) is evoked in the background: cf. the sequence πάλα καὶ μεγαυχεῖ παγκρατίῳ...ἀντιπάλων at *N.* 11.21–26 (where ἀντίπαλοι is fully re-etymologized as “wrestling-rivals”). Given the present context, furthermore, the open-endedness of the phrase νόω ἀντ. allows a subsidiary suggestion of “as good *as you*, Phylacidas” (which indeed is how Bury interpreted ἀντ. with dative Φυλακίδᾳ: see n. 124 above). Together, the two hints serve to enforce the impression that this praise of Pytheas, as equal but senior, is indeed relevant to “you,” Phylacidas. Once again, then, Phylacidas is seen to gain from the celebration of his brother’s glory; as Aristarchus put it in his paraphrase of Pindar (wrong in the first instance, but right ultimately)—ὕμνησα αὐτούς.¹³⁰

With ἀντίπαλον, it becomes clear that this intricate and, in several respects, strange sentence is calculated to do two things: to place the two brothers and their achievements against one another and also to conduct this verbal operation in a way that enacts the full scope of the athletic event that has engendered the celebration. Under this second heading, the sentence contrives to evoke pretty well all the familiar elements of the pankration in a new combination: a classic piece of defamiliarizing.¹³¹ We have the skill and the strength; the guile; the wrestling (-παλον) and the boxing (πλαγᾶν); the victor (-δάμναις) and the vanquished (γνιο-); with the whole, in Pindaric fashion, elevated to the ideal, yet still in touch with the physicality of the event.

λάμβανε...ὕμνον: this is what Willcock (1995: 13) calls the “quiet close” on which Pindar’s epinicians so often come to rest. Quiet as it is, it still raises issues of interpretation. It is convenient to take the larger issues first.

¹³⁰Above, pp. 43–44.

¹³¹Contrast the banal comments by Farnell (on 59–61): “the obscure style is maintained nearly to the end.... The phrase is strained and unnatural; for Pindar is least happy when he deals with athletic technicalities.” On defamiliarization, see (briefly) Silk 1995: 119–20.

[i] Who is οἱ (62), the beneficiary of the στέφανος and the μίτρα? With Pytheas the focus of attention in the previous sentence, οἱ is inevitably Pytheas again. This would indeed be the natural interpretation, even if the text had Φυλακίδᾱ, as many commentators in the past have been uncomfortably aware: "nothing but apparent necessity could reconcile Dissen and others to referring the last two verses of the ode to Pytheas" (Fennell). Of recent commentators, Thummer assigns οἱ to Pytheas (despite believing the "trainer" story and reading Φυλακίδᾱ).¹³² Of all commentators, only Bury (though also reading Φυλακίδᾱ) has seen the overriding logic that makes this interpretation inevitable: "I praise Pytheas...as peer of Phylacidas....Take a crown for him [sc. Pytheas]...." Despite the efforts of some to refer οἱ to Phylacidas on grounds of natural justice ("him' is of course Phylacidas; it is, after all, his victory," Willcock 1978: 45), the fact is that, whatever the case of Φ., the run of the Greek and the foregrounding of Pytheas make him the referent, *but* with Phylacidas as the addressee of the sentence preceding, there is no alternative and no possible ambiguity.¹³³ It is not the new victor, but the older relative Pytheas, who is to have "the crown" (στέφανος and μίτρα), like the older relative Themistius at the end of *N.* 5 (50–54) where Pytheas himself was the new victor:

εἰ δὲ Θεμίστιον ἵκεις ὥστ' αἰδεῖν...
 πύκταν τέ νιν καὶ παγκρατίου φθέγγαι ἐλεῖν Ἐπιδάυρῳ διπλόαν
 νικῶντ' ἀρετάν, προθύροισιν δ' Αἰακοῦ
 ἀνθέων ποιάεντα φέρε στεφανώματα σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισιν.

Once again it is apparent that the Pytheas of *I.* 5 is no trainer, but (like Themistius in *N.* 5) himself an athlete. Trainers are praised in a number of odes; in none of them is a trainer ever offered a στέφανος, literal or metaphorical.¹³⁴

¹³²So, too, Slater 143 col. 2 and Hummel 198, who, bizarrely enough, without any discussion, remarks, "le référent de οἱ est en général clair, ainsi...*Isth.* 5.62 [Pythéas]."

¹³³It is hard to find an instance of οἱ in Pindar which *is* ambiguous (the nearest is perhaps *P.* 4.287, on which see Burton 171, and Duchemin and Braswell *ad loc.*). This consideration is in effect another argument against the conjectural Φυλακίδᾱ, which would, at least notionally, build ambiguity in. Kurke 1991 suggests that Pindar's syntax sometimes "seems deliberately to blur" close kin (father/son, grandfather/grandson, 288) in the interests of glorifying "the entire family rather than just the individual victor" (289). I suppose a brave spirit might be tempted to hypothesize an instance here (brother/brother)—but not with my text.

¹³⁴Trainers are praised in *O.* 8, *O.* 10, *N.* 4, *N.* 5, *N.* 6, *I.* 4 and also *B.* 13 (191–98). In *O.* 8 the trainer is rewarded with κύδος (54), in *O.* 10 with χάρις (17), in *I.* 4 with χάρις and a

[ii] Who or what is the subject of the imperatives λάμβανε, φέρε, σύμπεμψον? “The poet bids himself...” (Fennell). “The imperative [sc. λάμβανε] is addressed to the Muse (or the poet)” (Bury). “Incerto se degli imperativi sia soggetto Pindaro...oppure Pitea...: meno probabile che sia la Musa o il coro” (Privitera). Other candidates would be the victor’s city, Aegina (suggested by Σ III.249 Drachmann), Theia (who is *not* the Muse, but the elusive divinity invoked at the beginning of *I.* 5), and Phylacidas, who is—as we now know—addressed by name in the previous sentence. Pytheas, obviously, can be excluded: he is the οἱ, not the unspecified σύ. All the others are possible, and we cannot assume that there is a single “right” answer. If we look at parallel usage in Pindar elsewhere, we will find that directives to confer a “crown” are of five main kinds:

- (a) prayers to a deity to accept a crown on behalf of a new or present triumph (thus δέξαι στεφανῶμα τόδ’...Μίδα, *P.* 12.5);
- (b) prayers to a deity to give a crown to the victor (i.e., grant him a victory) on a future occasion (thus πόρε...καὶ Πυθόϊ στέφανον, *I.* 7.49–51);
- (c) injunctions to “himself” to crown the victor for his new triumph (thus ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι κείνον...μολπῇ χρῆ, *O.* 1.100–103);
- (d) instructions to a specified addressee (e.g., a friend) to crown the victor for his new triumph (thus ἀλίκων...τις...πλεκέτω...στέφανον, *I.* 8.66–67);
- (e) instructions to an unspecified addressee to crown a senior member of the victor’s family for his earlier triumphs (thus the example cited above from *N.* 5.50–54, φέρε στεφανώματα).

Of the five types, our passage is clearly closest to (e), and the parallel from *N.* 5 is worth a closer look. In the latter part of that ode the victor, Pytheas, is addressed directly (σὲ...Πυθέα, 43) and is the grammatical subject a few verses later (ἴσθι...μόχθων ἀμοιβάν ἰ ἐπαύρεο, 48–49), shortly before the string of imperatives that celebrate the older relative Themistius: εἰ δὲ Θεμίστιον ἵκεις ὥστ’ ἀεῖδειν, μηκέτι ῥίγει· δίδοι ἰ φωνάν, ἀνὰ δ’ ἰστία τείνον...ἰ πύκταν τέ νιν...φθέγξαι...ἰ...προθύροισιν δ’ Αἰακοῦ ἰ...φέρε στεφανώματα... (50–54). In *N.* 5, then, an evident address to the victor is followed by a call to an unnamed addressee to acknowledge the achievement of an older relative,¹³⁵ so that the

share in the κῶμος (72). In the other cases no “reward” is mentioned. There are, on the other hand, dozens of στέφανοι, στεφανώματα, and allusions thereto in Pindar’s odes.

¹³⁵Such sequences also figure less prominently in the course of, rather than at the ends of, Pindar’s odes: see, e.g., *N.* 4.78ff. At *N.* 5.54 the imperative φέρε is Wilamowitz’s

parallel with *I.* 5 (where the—now—evident address to the victor Phylacidas is followed by a call to acknowledge the achievement of his own elder brother) is seen to be a close one. In each case, however, the call still remains unassigned. In each case (let us suggest) the call to celebrate the older and earlier achiever is to be heard by the inspiring Muse (ὦ Μοῖσ', *O.* 10.3), the performing chorus (ὦ νέοι, *I.* 8.1), and the creating poet (φίλον ἦτορ, voc., *O.* 1.4), all of whom co-operate in the collaborative moment, and all of whom are the representative subjects of assigned imperatives elsewhere; but the victor *too* is associated with them all, to his older kinsman's, and his own, glory.

[iii] What *are* the στέφανος and the μίτρα here? That is, is this a real or a figurative “crown”? A crown for a victor invites interpretation—in principle at least—as a literal crown: ἀλίκων τῷ τις ἄβρόν | ἀμφὶ παγκρατίου Κλεάνδρῳ πλεκέτω | μυρσίνας στέφανον (*I.* 8.66–67). Some crowns, however, even crowns for victors, are clearly figurative: ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι | κείνον... | Αἰοληίδι μολπᾷ | χρή (*O.* 1.100–103), Λυδῖαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεπτοικιλμέναν (*N.* 8.15). A new crown for a past achiever asks to be interpreted in some such figurative way. Like Themistius in *N.* 5, Pytheas now is offered a “crown” of Pindar's own words, and Phylacidas himself, as enacted in the previous sentence, is to be associated with the offering.¹³⁶

[iv] If the στέφανος and the μίτρα are for Pytheas, what of the ὕμνος? The οἱ is attached only to the command that involves the στέφανος, but the second command is sufficiently parallel to the first (λάμβανε—φέρε, στέφανον—μίτραν) to share its οἱ by association. This is not the case, however, with the third. The first two, furthermore, are attached by the connective δέ, whereas the third is attached to the first two by a καί. This mechanism inevitably creates an impression that the first two belong more closely together than the second does (or the first and second do) to the third.¹³⁷ At the same time, the three

emendation for the φέρειν of codd.; φέρε (which is entirely plausible in its own right) gains support from the parallel text in *I.* 5.62 (cf. pp. 81–85 below).

¹³⁶In *N.* 5 Themistius is presumably already dead. It is not inconceivable that the same is true of Pytheas in *I.* 5: cf. Σ Pi. III.241, 15 Drachmann and Turyn on fr. 3 (= fr. 4 Snell-Maehler). However, the presence of humour in this sequence (below, pp. 79–80) is—presumably, again—an argument against it.

¹³⁷This notwithstanding the fact that Greek lists *can* be structured, e.g., δέ...δέ...δέ...καὶ...δέ (like Pl. *Leg.* 925d, cited by Denniston 289) or δέ...τέ...δέ (as with the imperative clauses in *N.* 5.50–54 cited above). One might ponder the point made by Denniston on anaphoric lists (584, *Addendum* to 291): “where καί is used in anaphora, there is always a fairly marked contrast between the two ideas, whereas δέ in anaphora regularly conveys the emphasis of accumulation.” There is no anaphora here in *I.* 5, yet perhaps some such contrast is operative.

clauses (as Thummer points out) are structured as a triad, according to the law of “increasing members”: the first offers noun without adjective; the second, noun with one adjective; the third, noun with two. These simple mechanisms, in combination, do just enough to create a climax on the ὕμνον clause, while isolating it, however slightly, from the two clauses preceding. The upshot, surely, is a sense that Pytheas, who is the οἱ of the στέφανον clause, is likewise the beneficiary of the μίτρα, but that the ὕμνον clause is left open—open for Phylacidas, the new victor, as well as for Pytheas, who was celebrated just now. This makes perfect sense. Phylacidas can—figuratively, even literally—join in the taking-up of a στέφανον and the fetching of a μίτραν, whereas it is the Muse, the chorus, the poet, and the whole poetic community, who represent the natural joint subject of σύμπεμψον ὕμνον—but hardly Phylacidas. He, like Pytheas and *with* Pytheas, is the recipient of the ὕμνον. The two brothers are named and coupled together in the closing passage, as they were earlier in the ode (17–19),

τὴν δ' ἐν Ἴσθμῳ διπλόα θάλλοις ἀρετά,
Φυλακίδ', ἄγκειται, Νεμέα δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν
Πυθέα τε, παγκρατίου

shortly after which Pindar proclaims the two as joint objects of his poetic “visit” (21): σύν Χάρισιν δ' ἔμολον Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς. The proclamation made then is now finally realized, and Phylacidas (who, a moment before, was honouring his brother) is now, tacitly but effectively, made co-recipient of due honour himself.¹³⁸

VIII

The remaining, more local, points that need making can be made briefly in ordinary sequence:

οἱ: on the form and use of (f)οἱ, see Braswell on *P.* 4.23(d).

στέφανον...μίτραν: almost a hendiadys. στ. = the leaves of the crown, μ. = the woollen fillet on which the leaves were strung: see further Maehler on *B.* 13.196. Here the στ. and μ. are (detroped) the “foregoing words of praise” (Bury).

¹³⁸Compare and contrast the responses of earlier commentators to the three rewards in the final couplet. Most try and make Phylacidas the beneficiary of all three; Thummer does the same for Pytheas. Bury's response (1892: 103), though not quite fully attuned to the pointing of the closing passage, is immeasurably more sensitive: “the Muse, who bears the new hymn to Phylacidas, is to bear too, figuratively, a wreath and band for Pytheas; that is, without metaphor, the foregoing words of praise.”

εὔμαλλον: a hapax. The noun μαλλός (“flock of wool”: first in Hes. *Op.* 234) is not a common word, and the somewhat eccentric range of compound adjectives formed from it themselves occur only rarely in early literature: πηγεσίμαλλος, *Il.* 3.197; δασύμαλλος, *Od.* 9.425; χρυσόμαλλος, Pherecydes 105 J. Pindar uses βαθύμαλλος at *P.* 4.161.

πτερόεντα νέον: the first epithet, deftly recalling Homer's ἔπεα πτερόεντα, sums up “how far abroad this song...will be able to transport its subject's [or rather, subjects'] fame” (Mullen 30); they above all will be ἀνθρώποισι... αἰοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοι (Il. 6.358). As Privitera notes, Pindar's poetry is on the move, the opposite of a sculpture (*N.* 5.1ff.). Theognis (237) claimed to have given his Cynus “wings”; Pindar's song, νεώτατον καλῶν, is itself ἐμᾶ ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾶ (*P.* 8.33–34). In Pindar, as in Aristophanes (αἰεὶ καινὰς ιδέας εἰσφέρων σοφίζομαι, *Nub.* 547), as in Ezra Pound (“make it new”), “new” is a term of value when applied to poetry: αἶνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων | νεωτέρων (*O.* 9.48–49).

σύμπεμψον ὕμνον: not “speed him on his way [*where to ??*] with this...song” (Sandys), but “send the song on *its* way, complete with its tribute to Pytheas, as well as its commemoration of Phylacidas.”¹³⁹ On the uses of πέμψω in Pindar, cf. Mullen 29–31 (thought-provoking, if not always accurate). After πτερόεντα and νέον, which point to the song's value and its potential for promulgation, the implication of σύμπεμψον is seen to be that, now the performance—with this final phrase—is complete, Pindar's work is ready to be sent out to a wider community, is ready for its *mission*, is “ready to fly forth to the world with its annunciations” (Mullen 31): καὶ ἀγάνορος ἵππου | θᾶσσον καὶ ναὸς ὑποπτέρου παντᾶ | ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν (*O.* 9.23–25), with the emphasis on παντᾶ.

IX

There remains one substantial set of points to be made. A convenient start is the ὅπῃ δ' ὦν sentence and, in particular, its tone. The sentence is clearly exuberant and, as always, “grand,” in the sense that Pindar's idiom is through and through high-style, yet in place of the wholly majestic delineation of achievement that might have been expected, we are confronted by a certain humour. After the solemnities of Salamis and the affirmations about γενεὰν Κλεονίκου, about μακρὸς μόχθος ἀνδρῶν, and about δαπάνα and ἐλπίς, we encounter a series of almost whimsical turns of phrase, none of them remarkable by itself, but

¹³⁹Cf. Race 1997: “send along this winged new hymn.”

collectively tending to activate the quirkiness of each other. Under this heading belong the use of racing terminology for the boxing component of the pankration (πλαγᾶν δρόμον), the bland collocation χερσὶ δεξιόν, and the re-etymological gesture in ἀντίπαλον, all of them dealt with in the commentary above. Above all, though, there is an additional hint of word-play in the same sequence: ὁπὶ δ' ὦν ἰ αἰνέω...Πυθέαν...ἰ Φυλακίδα...εὐθυπορῆσαι.... In the immediate context of Πυθέαν and Φυλακίδα, the compound εὐθυ-πορῆσαι recalls the roll-call of modern heroes in the earlier ode *I.* 6 (57–58):

Φυλακίδα γὰρ ἦλθον, ὦ Μοῖσα, ταμίης
Πυθέα τε κώμων Εὐθυμένει τε...

where Phylacidas and Pytheas are accompanied by their fellow-athlete uncle, *Euthymenes*, who was already celebrated, along with Pytheas, in the still earlier *N.* 5 (41–3):

τὸ δ' Αἰγίναθε δῖς, Εὐθύμενες,
νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων.
ἦτοι μεταίξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει
κείνου ὁμόςπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα.

“Play” seems the *mot juste* for this evocation—“I praise Pytheas, associating his name with our new victor, Phylacidas, and in some as yet unexplained way with Euthy-...”—which then evaporates no sooner than conjured up.¹⁴⁰ The evocation reads almost like an in-joke between poet and patron, between members of a close, even closed, community. On a literary-critical level, beyond all the cultural sub-systems we have grown used to keying into, it serves to remind us of that irreducible private aspect of the Pindaric ode (summed up by the interpreter’s need to say that, unlike *us*, Pindar’s original audience “knew *all* the facts”)¹⁴¹ which no doubt constitutes the major limitation on the achievement of this improbably profound and thrilling form of poetry as *universal* art. The poetic “mission” is, in part, held fast to its own day, and the poetic “wings” cannot always carry beyond their own horizon. To be rooted in occasion and context is a strength; to be unable to transcend them threatens to negate the poetic immortality that the odes aspire to.

¹⁴⁰On comparable word-play in Pindar (well-attested with proper names), cf., e.g., Willcock on ἄκραντα in *O.* 2.87, Carey on *N.* 7.1, Bury on *N.* 5.49, Braswell on *P.* 4.174–75(b), Stanford 129–30.

¹⁴¹Carey 1989: 291 (my italics).

For scholarly purposes, at all events, the presence of private allusion offers a modest compensation. It will have become evident in the course of our discussion that the three Pytheas-Phylacidas pankration odes, *N. 5*, *I. 6* and *I. 5*, are in some sense parallel works, such that our ode, the latest of the three, seems to contain echoes of the others. This relationship between the three odes was noted decades ago, with the enthusiasm of the code-breaker, by Bury above all,¹⁴² in the same spirit as others who have thought to reveal supposed secret meanings and hidden codes in Pindar, from Mezger to Norwood and, more recently, Newman and Newman. Such quests have been treated with great scepticism by fellow-Pindarists and, in general, deservedly so. The secret meanings and the hidden codes are, broadly speaking, unrealized and perhaps unrealizable; they tend to be imperceptible to the intelligent reader of (or listener to) poetry and, if perceptible, not open to the significance attached to them. In the present instance, the correspondences seem, likewise, hardly perceptible and certainly not conducive to any "meaning" that should concern the critic. And yet they do appear to exist, operating on some private compositional level; and—the oddity of the situation—they serve to confirm, at several crucial points, the text and (to a degree) the interpretation proposed above.

The Euthymenes allusion in effect retraces the verbal steps taken at a certain moment in one of the earlier odes. This happens on a much more extensive scale elsewhere in *I. 5*. As Bury noted, certain turns of phrase and, especially, certain striking items of vocabulary recur, or have clear counterparts, within the three odes to a degree without parallel elsewhere in Pindar, for all that conventional expressions or *Lieblingswörter* do "constantly recur" in his epinician odes.¹⁴³ In more recent years, Race has rightly stressed that "in constructing a particular poem, Pindar is also keenly aware of his other poems."¹⁴⁴ It may indeed be thought natural that, in "constructing" *I. 5*, Pindar would be "keenly aware" of the other victory odes he had composed for the same family, but, natural or not, the degree of phraseological correspondence between these poems is altogether special. One point worth particular emphasis, beyond Bury's presentation of the evidence, is that phraseological *sequences* in *I. 5* have their counterparts in the earlier odes and, within those sequences, certain distinctive words or clusters. Thus *I. 5. 4–21*,

¹⁴²On *I. 5* and *I. 6* (= his *I. 4* and *I. 5*) in Bury 1892: 79–89. Bury also discusses the relation of *I. 6* to *N. 5*, which is not my concern.

¹⁴³Bury 1892: 89.

¹⁴⁴Race 1990: 187.

καὶ...ἐριζόμεναι...ἄθλοισι...στέφανοι...κρίνεται...εὐανθεῖ...τὴν δ'...
διπλόα θάλλοισ' ἄρετά...Νεμέα...Πυθέα...παγκρατίου... σὺν Χάρισιν,

has the imprint of *N.* 5.39–54,

καὶ...ἐρίζοντι...κρίνει...τὴν δ'...Πυθέα...Νεμέα...ἄεθληταῖσιν...παγ-
κρατίου...διπλόαν νικῶντ' ἄρετάν...ἀνθέων...στεφανώματα...
σὺν...Χάρισιν,

where the phrase διπλόα(ν) – – ἄρετά(ν) is, as it were, the distinctive epicentre of the sequence.¹⁴⁵ The question whether such a sequence could be perceptible to an audience (which I doubt) and the further question whether, as a matter of artistic communication, a composer of poetry has any right to expect such a sequence to be perceived (to which my answer is firmly, *no*) are both irrelevant. And it is no objection to note that some of these items (Pytheas, Nemea, pankration) recur because of the *real* relationship between the occasions that engendered the odes; that real relationship is the spring of the compositional correspondence in the first place. It is sufficient to surmise that the one ode was indeed composed with the other in mind.

Correspondences of the given kind between *I.* 5 and *I.* 6 are yet more substantial. In particular, we have the following sequence, within a relatively short passage, at *I.* 5. 35–41,

Αἰακοῦ παίδων...συμμάχοις¹⁴⁶...πόλιν Τρώων...σὺν...πέφνον...
χαλκοάραν

corresponding to this from *I.* 6.27–35,

χαλκοχάρμαν...σὺν...σύμμαχον ἐς Τροίαν...πέφνεν δὲ σὺν...Αἰακίδαν

where the χαλκο- compounds and the noun σύμμαχος (not otherwise attested in Pindar) are distinctive. Then again, the same *I.* 5 passage is implicated in a longer

¹⁴⁵διπλόος only twice else in Pindar: οὐ γνῶμα διπλόαν θέτο βουλάν, *N.* 10.89, and ὅδ' ἀνὴρ διπλόαν...νίκαν ἀνεφάνατο, *I.* 4.70–71.

¹⁴⁶συμμάχοις (ignored by recent edd.) is Bury's own plausible correction for codd. σὺν μάχαις (cf. Σ III. 245, 20–21 Drachmann: οἵτινες ταῖς ἑαυτῶν συμμαχίαις τὴν τῶν Τρώων ἐπόρθησαν πόλιν). *Inter alia* the repetition, with σὺν μάχαις (“in battle”) at the start of the clause and σὺν Ἀτρεΐδαις (“with the sons of Atreus”) at the end, seems unpindarically gratuitous and more likely to be the product of “unconscious repetition by the copyist” than “unconscious repetition by the poet” (cf. Jackson 220–27). Having said which, one may add that the correspondence with *I.* 6.27–35 would not be significantly lessened if the true *I.* 5 reading were σὺν μάχαις after all.

sequence which has a quite different set of correspondences elsewhere in *I. 6*. At *I. 5*. 30–48 we find

ἐν μὲν...κρατεροί...αἰχμὰ...παίδων...ἐσπόμενοι...στράταρχον...πόλις
Αἴαντος ὀρθωθεῖσα

and at *I. 6*. 37–66

τὸν μὲν ἐν...καρτεραίχμαν...παῖδα...ἐπέσθω...ἄρχόν...Αἴαντα...
ὀρθώσαντες...πόλιν

within which κρατεροί...αἰχμὰ / καρτεραίχμαν and στράταρχον / ἄρχόν represent the special features. *I. 5*, clearly, was composed with *I. 6* in its composer's mind, alongside *N. 5*.

From the existence of these, and other lesser, correspondences between the three odes,¹⁴⁷ what follows in the first instance is a measure of confirmation for several of the textual proposals made above, in so far as each of them serves to bring the phraseology of *I. 5* closer to that of one or other of the two earlier poems. The difference such “confirmations” make may be hard to estimate, but on any reckoning they must count for something. The points to note are the following:

[i] In the new sequence

οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρός
μόχθος ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ὀπόσα δαπάνα

the plausibility of δαπάνα as dative singular, over the supposed nominative plural, is enhanced by the closer resemblance thereby effected to *I. 6*. 10–11

δαπάνα τε χαρεῖς
καὶ πόνω.

[ii] The new continuation, ἐλπὶς ἔκνιξ', is remarkably close to a usage in *I. 6*. 50, ἔκνιξεν χάρις, with the restored *I. 5* text now seen to echo the phraseology of the earlier ode down to the -ις abstract-noun subject, the positive force of the verb, the ξ- form, and (for good measure) an articulation of both phrases before a syntactical pause.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷See further Bury's evidence (above, n. 142).

¹⁴⁸It is worth adding that κνίζειν also occurs at *N. 5*. 32. The verb is only attested four times besides in Pindar: *O. 6*. 44, *P. 8*. 32, *P. 10*. 60, *P. 11*. 23.

[iii] The restoration of the plain vocative Φυλακίδα, in the context of praise for Phylacidas' senior, Pytheas, recalls the address to Pytheas within the praise of *his* senior, Euthymenes, at *N.* 5. 43,

ἦτοι μεταίξαις, σὲ καὶ νῦν τεδὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει
κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα.

As with Phylacidas in our ode, Pytheas there is called, in effect, to glory in, and thus gain glory from, the achievement of his predecessor, as he is a second time in *N.* 5, with the praise of Themistius (50–51):

εἰ δὲ Θεμίστιον ἴκεις, ὥστ' αἰδεῖν, μηκέτι ῥίγει· δίδοι
φωνάν....

[iv] Given the restoration of ὀπί and the suggestion that ὀπί is engendered by analogy with φωνῇ, it is worth noting the more remote connection between the “loud” praise of Themistius just cited and that of Pytheas in *I.* 5. In the sentence-initial δίδοι | φωνάν... might we, in fact, have the compositional seed of the (likewise sentence-initial) ὀπὶ δ' ὦν... that we have reconstructed?¹⁴⁹

On the interpretative, rather than the purely textual level, we may add that [v], though there is indeed praise of a trainer in one of these odes,¹⁵⁰ all three are now shown to close without reference to trainers,¹⁵¹ and again without any exclusive concentration on the latest victory, but with due acclamation of the family as a whole. In *N.* 5 after praise of Euthymenes we have the unspecified call—to Pytheas or otherwise—to φέρε στεφανώματα for Pytheas' senior, Themistius (54). In *I.* 6 the declaration (57–58)

Φυλακίδα γὰρ ἦλθον, ὦ Μοῖσα, ταμίας
Πυθέα τε κώμων Εὐθυμένει τε

is followed by praise of the grandfather (Themistius, 65) and the father (Lampon, 66–73), and finally the “promise” (74), πίσω σφε Δίρκας ἀγνὸν ὕδωρ..., “I shall give *them*...”: that is, this song and these words constitute that gift, for the

¹⁴⁹Likewise, it might be argued that ἐν ἀεθληταῖσιν at *I.* 6.72 has engendered ἐν γυιοδάμῃς at *I.* 5.59 (in both cases, *facilior* to *difficilior*: cf. n. 151 below).

¹⁵⁰Menander, in *N.* 5.48–49; cf. the discussion of *I.* 6.72 in n. 107 above.

¹⁵¹One could add that the interpretation of ἐν γυιοδάμῃς (*I.* 5.59) as “among athletes” (of the older relative Pytheas) is in line with the use of ἐν ἀεθληταῖσιν (of the older relative Lampon) in *I.* 6.72.

whole family. In *I.* 5, likewise, Pindar declares, ἔμολον Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς (21), while the final celebration begins with an acknowledgement of the whole γενεὰν Κλεονίκου (55). Phylacidas, the immediate victor, is now to join in the acclamation for *his* senior, Pytheas himself; and like Pytheas in *N.* 5 he is associated with an unspecified call (62), λάμβανέ οἱ στέφανον, φέρε δ' εὖμαλλον μίτραν, till, last of all, the honour of the πτερόεντα νέον...ῥυμνον is felt to embrace the two Λάμπωνος υἱοί, latest representatives of the achievement of their aristocratic house, together.

All in all, then, the three odes are seen to tell the same, mutually corroborative story, and Pindar's habits of compositional self-reference may be said to provide cumulative support for our reading and our readings, *tout court*.¹⁵²

¹⁵²I wish to thank Professors C. Carey and P.E. Easterling for kindly commenting on an earlier version of this article and for a number of particular suggestions which I have gratefully accepted. My thanks also to the anonymous referees of *TAPA* for some further helpful observations.

Works Cited

- Abel, E. 1890–91. *Scholia Recentia in Pindari Epinicia*. Budapest.
- Bergk, T. 1878. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (4th ed.). Leipzig.
- Bétant, E.-A. 1843. *Lexicon Thucydideum*. Geneva.
- Boeckh, A. 1825. *Pindari Carmina* (2nd ed.). Leipzig.
- Bowra, C. M. 1947. *Pindari Carmina* (2nd ed.). Oxford.
- . 1964. *Pindar*. Oxford.
- Braswell, B. K. 1988. *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin.
- Bulloch, A. W. 1985. *Callimachus, The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge.
- Bulman, P. 1992. *Phthonos in Pindar*. Berkeley.
- Bundy, E. L. 1962. *Studia Pindarica*. 2 vols. Berkeley.
- Burkert, W. 1981. “θεῶν ὄπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες: Götterfurcht und Leumannsches Missverständnis.” *MH* 38: 198–204.
- Burton, R. W. B. 1962. *Pindar's Pythian Odes*. Oxford.
- Bury, J. B. 1890. *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*. London.
- . 1892. *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar*. London.
- Carey, C. 1981. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*. Salem, NH.
- . 1989. “Two transitions in Pindar.” *CQ* 39: 287–95.
- Chantraine, P. 1963. *Grammaire homérique*. Vol. II. Paris.
- Christ, W. 1896. *Pindari Carmina*. Leipzig.
- Cole, T. 1992. *Pindar's Feasts or the Music of Power*. Rome.
- Day, J. W. 1991. “The poet's *Elpis* and the opening of Isthmian 8.” *TAPA* 121: 47–61.
- Denniston, J. D. 1959. *The Greek Particles* (2nd ed., corr.). Oxford.
- Dissen, L. 1830. *Pindari Carmina*. Gotha.
- Drachmann, A. B. 1903–27. *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*. Leipzig.
- Duchemin, J. 1967. *Pindare: Pythiques III, IX, IV, V*. Paris.
- Ebeling, H. 1885. *Lexicon Homericum*. Leipzig.
- Farnell, L. R. 1932. *The Works of Pindar. Vol. II: Critical Commentary*. London.
- Fennell, C. A. M. 1899. *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (2nd ed.). Cambridge.
- Frisk, H. 1954–73. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
- Gentili, B. (et. al.) 1995. *Pindaro, le Pitiche*. Milan.
- Gerber, D. E. 1976. *Emendations in Pindar 1513–1972*. Amsterdam.
- . 1989. “Pindar and Bacchylides 1934–1987.” *Lustrum* 31: 97–269.
- . 1990. “Pindar and Bacchylides 1934–1987.” *Lustrum* 32: 7–67.
- Gildersleeve, B. L. 1900. *Syntax of Classical Greek*. New York.
- Goodwin, W. W. 1929. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (rev. ed.). London.
- Hamilton, R. 1974. *Epinikion*. The Hague.
- Harris, H. A. 1964. *Greek Athletes and Athletics*. London.
- Haydon, R. S. 1890. “Σχημα Πινδαρικών.” *AJP* 11: 182–92.
- Hoekstra, A. 1962. “A note on the dative of purpose (*dativus finalis*) in Greek.” *Mnemosyne* 15: 15–23.
- Horn, E. 1883. *De Aristarchi Studiis Pindaricis*. Diss. Greifswald.
- Hubbard, T. K. 1985. *The Pindaric Mind*. Leiden.
- Hummel, P. 1993. *La Syntaxe de Pindare*. Louvain.
- Irigoin, J. 1952. *Histoire du texte de Pindare*. Paris.
- Jackson, J. 1955. *Marginalia Scaenica*. Oxford.
- Janko, R. 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. IV: Books 13–16*. Cambridge.

- Jebb, R. C. 1905. *Bacchylides, The Poems and Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Jensen, C. 1917. *Hyperidius Orationes*. Leipzig.
- Kaufmann-Bühler, D. 1956. "Hesiod und die Tisis in der Odyssee." *Hermes* 84: 267–95.
- Kühner, R.-Gerth, B. 1898–1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Vol. II, i–ii* (3rd ed.). Hanover.
- Kurke, L. 1991(a). *The Traffic in Praise*. Ithaca, NY.
- . 1991(b). "Fathers and sons: a note on Pindaric ambiguity." *AJP* 112: 288–300.
- Kyle, D. G. 1987. *Athletics in Ancient Athens*. Leiden.
- Lasso de la Vega, J. 1992. "Nuevas notas críticas a Pindaro." *Myrtia* 7: 41–47.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1975. *Females of the Species*. London.
- Maehler, H. 1982. *Die Lieder des Bakchylides. Vol. I: Die Siegeslieder, ii (Kommentar)*. Leiden.
- Mezger, F. 1880. *Pindars Siegeslieder*. Leipzig.
- Mommsen, C. J. T. 1864. *Pindari Carmina*. Berlin.
- Most, G. W. 1985. *The Measures of Praise*. Göttingen.
- Mullen, W. 1982. *Choreia: Pindar and Dance*. Princeton.
- Newman, J. K., and F. S. Newman. 1984. *Pindar's Art*. Hildesheim.
- Nisetich, F. J. 1980. *Pindar's Victory Songs*. Baltimore.
- Norwood, G. 1945. *Pindar*. Berkeley.
- Page, D. L. 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge.
- Pavese, C. O. 1968. "Semantematica della poesia corale greca." *Belfagor* 23: 389–431.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship*. Oxford.
- Pfeijffer, I. L. 1995. "The date of Pindar's fifth Nemean and Bacchylides' thirteenth ode." *CQ* 45: 318–32.
- . 1996. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean 5, Nemean 3 and Pythian 8*. Diss. Leiden.
- Pleket, H. W. 1974. "Zur Soziologie des antiken Sports." *Med. Ned. Inst. Rom.* 36: 56–87.
- Poliakoff, M. 1982. *Studies in the Terminology of the Greek Combat Sports*. Königstein.
- Porter, J. I. 1992. "Hermeneutic lines and circles: Aristarchus and Crates on the exegesis of Homer." In R. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney, eds., *Homer's Ancient Readers*. Princeton. 67–114.
- Powell, J. E. 1938. *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. Cambridge.
- Privitera, G. A. 1982. *Pindaro, le Istmiche*. Milan.
- Puech, A. 1961. *Pindare. Vol. IV: Isthmiques et Fragments*. (3rd ed.). Paris.
- Race, W. H. 1990. *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*. Atlanta.
- . 1997. *Pindar. Vol. II: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments*. Loeb. Cambridge, MA.
- Reynolds, L. D., and N. G. Wilson. 1974. *Scribes and Scholars* (2nd ed.). Oxford.
- Riginos, A. S. 1976. *Platonica*. Leiden.
- Sandys, J. E. 1919. *The Odes of Pindar* (2nd ed.). Loeb. Cambridge, MA.
- Schadewaldt, W. 1928. *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*. Halle.
- Schroeder, O. 1900. *Pindari Carmina*. Leipzig.
- . 1914. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis Selectis* (2nd ed.). Leipzig.
- Schwyzler, E. 1939–71. *Griechische Grammatik*. Munich.
- Silk, M. S. 1974. *Interaction in Poetic Imagery*. Cambridge.
- . 1983. "LSJ and the problem of poetic archaism: from meanings to iconyms." *CQ* 33: 303–30.
- . 1987. *Homer, The Iliad*. Cambridge.
- . 1995. "Language, poetry and enactment." *Dialogos* 2: 109–32.
- Slater, W. J. 1969. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.
- Snell, B.-Maehler, H. 1970. *Bacchylidis Carmina cum Fragmentis* (10th ed.). Leipzig.

- . 1987–89. *Pindarus* (8th ed.). Leipzig.
- Stanford, W. B. 1939. *Ambiguity in Greek Literature*. Oxford.
- Steiner, D. 1986. *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar*. London.
- Taillardat, J. 1965. *Les Images d'Aristophane*. Paris.
- Threatte, L. 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*. Vol. I. Berlin.
- Thummer, E. 1968–69. *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte*. Heidelberg.
- Turner, E. G., and P. J. Parsons. 1987. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (2nd ed.). London.
- Turyn, A. 1952. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (2nd ed.). Oxford.
- Wade-Gery, H. T. 1932. "Thucydides the son of Melesias." *JHS* 52: 205–27.
- Walcot, P. 1978. *Envy and the Greeks*. Warminster.
- West, M. L. 1973. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*. Stuttgart.
- . 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1903. *Der Timotheos-Papyrus*. Leipzig.
- . 1909. "Erklärungen pindarischer Gedichte." *SPAW* 32: 806–35.
- . 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin.
- Willcock, M. M. 1978. "On first reading Pindar: the Fifth Isthmian." *G&R* 25: 37–45.
- . 1995. *Pindar: Victory Odes*. Cambridge.
- Wilpert, O. 1900. *Das Schema Pindaricum und ähnliche grammatische Konstruktionen*. Oppeln.
- Young, D. C. 1984. *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics*. Chicago.