

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/113966>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2017-12-06 and may be subject to change.



M.J.H. VAN DER WEIDEN

THE DITHYRAMBS OF PINDAR

INTRODUCTION, TEXT AND
COMMENTARY

GIEBEN



THE DITHYRAMBS OF PINDAR

THE DITHYRAMBS OF PINDAR

INTRODUCTION, TEXT AND COMMENTARY

een wetenschappelijke proeve op het gebied der Letteren

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Katholieke Universiteit te Nijmegen,
volgens besluit van het college van decanen
in het openbaar te verdedigen op donderdag 27 juni 1991
des namiddags te 1.30 uur precies

door

MARIA JOHANNA HELENA VAN DER WEIDEN

geboren op 18 maart 1954 te Rotterdam

J. C. GIEBEN, PUBLISHER
AMSTERDAM 1991

Promotor: Prof. Dr. A.H.M. Kessels

Co-promotor: Dr. M.A. Harder (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)

CIP-DATA KONINKLIJKE BIBLIOTHEEK, DEN HAAG

Weiden, M.J.H. van der

**The Dithyrambs of Pindar. Introduction, text and
commentary / M.J.H. van der Weiden. - Amsterdam : Gieben
Thesis Nijmegen. - With ref. - With summary in Dutch.**

ISBN 90-5063-067-7

Subject headings: Pindar / Greek poetry.

CONTENTS

Preface	iii
Introduction	1
1. Characteristics of the dithyramb	1
1.1. Name	1
1.2. Contents	2
1.3. Musical aspects	5
1.4. Rhythm and dance	9
1.5. Style and vocabulary	11
1.6. Performance	14
1.7. Remains of the dithyrambs	16
1.8. Conclusion	19
2. The dithyrambs of Pindar	20
2.1. Contents	20
2.2. Metre	20
2.3. Style	21
2.4. Performance	26
2.5. Text of the dithyrambs	28
Commentary	
70a	34
70b	52
Related fragments	84
249a	86
249c	88
81	89
346	94
70c	108
70d	120
P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 3	165
P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 6	165
70d(g)	166
70d(a)	167
70d(b)	168
70d(c)	169
70d(f)	170
70d(e)	170

70d(h)	171
71	173
72	175
73	179
74	181
74a	182
75	183
76-77	206
78	216
80	221
82	223
83	224
84	226
85-85a	227
86	229
86a	230
335	231
List of abbreviations	234
Bibliography	235
Indexes	240
Samenvatting	243
Curriculum vitae	247

PREFACE

The goal of this study is to offer a better understanding of Pindar's dithyrambs. In the first chapter I will give an overview of the dithyrambic genre and try to define Pindar's position within it. Conclusions cannot be drawn with certainty because no complete dithyramb of Pindar is known to us, and because the tradition of the genre as a whole is also full of gaps. Then follow the text and the commentary. The text presented includes both genuine and doubtful fragments from Pindar's dithyrambs. I have followed Maehler's order as much as possible.

The text of the papyrus fragments is based on personal inspection of the *Oxyrhynchus papyri* in Oxford and of *P. Berol. 9571* in Berlin. In the critical apparatus I have tried to describe what I saw as exactly as possible.

Because of the fragmentary state of the text the commentary is mainly philological, focusing on grammar, vocabulary and style. In order to explain the supposed reception by the original audience, I also pay attention to the religious, historical and cultural context, including the generic conventions. Much of this, however, must inevitably remain in the realms of speculation.

Authors and works are cited according to LSJ. Editions are indicated when necessary by the addition of the editors' names. In the bibliography only those books and articles are listed that are cited more than once. In the text they are referred to by author's name and year of publication. Abbreviations are explained in a section preceding the bibliography.

An index of subjects discussed and a summary in Dutch follow at the end.

This book could not have been written without the support of many people whom I would like to mention by name.

Dr. Annette Harder was the first to set me on the track of Greek literary papyri and always guided and encouraged me. Professor A.H.M. Kessels gave me the chance to develop my interest into a dissertation and Professor S.L. Radt helped me with his critical suggestions.

Financial support from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) from 1987 until 1991 made it possible to finish this dissertation in a reasonable time, especially through the research they enabled me to carry out in 1990 during several visits to Oxford, where Dr. R.A. Coles and Dr. J. Rea were always willing to show me the *Oxyrhynchus papyri* in the Ashmolean Museum. Dr. Poethke received me kindly when I asked to see the Berlin Papyrus.

I wish to thank Professor H. Maehler for the copy he sent me of the latest edition of Pindar's fragments and Professor B. Zimmermann for the copy of his *Habilitationsschrift*, which has not yet been published elsewhere.

Dr. Anne-Marie Palmer corrected my English.

Hans, Mathilde and Peter were always there to remind me of other duties and pleasures, which made for a healthy balance between my various activities.

INTRODUCTION

The history of the dithyramb is not easy to sketch. Its beginnings go back to the seventh century. Little certain information exists and there are no remaining poems, only a few random words. Of Pindar and Bacchylides we have substantial fragments and even complete poems, but after them the tradition is once more full of gaps. In the first section I have tried to describe the characteristics of the dithyramb in a chronological perspective. The second section deals with the dithyrambs of Pindar: their contents, metre, style and performance, and is followed by a final section on the textual tradition of the papyri.

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DITHYRAMB

1.1. Name

Archilochus is the first poet to use the word διθύραμβος: fr. 120 West ὡς Διωνύ-
κου ἀνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος / οἶδα διθύραμβον οἴνωι συγκεραυνωθεὶς
φρένας, 'I know how to lead the fair song of Lord Dionysus, the dithyramb, when
my wits are fused with wine' (transl. Pickard-Cambridge).

Although it is certain that the dithyramb is a song of Dionysus, the etymology of the name διθύραμβος has not yet been satisfactorily explained. Three derivations current in antiquity are mentioned by Proclus (*Chr.* 42 [320a25]): ὁ δὲ διθύραμβος γράφεται μὲν εἰς Διόνυσον, προσαγορεύετο δὲ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἦτοι διὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν Νύσαν ἐπ' ἀντρῶι διθύρῳι τραφῆναι τὸν Διόνυσον, ἢ διὰ τὸ λυθέντων τῶν ραμμάτων τοῦ Διὸς εὐρεθῆναι αὐτόν, ἢ διότι δις δοκεῖ γενέσθαι, ἅπαξ μὲν ἐκ τῆς Σεμέλης, δεύτερον δὲ ἐκ τοῦ μηροῦ, 'The dithyramb is written for Dionysus, and receives its name from him, either because Dionysus was raised on Mt. Nysa in a two-doored cave, or because he was found after the stitches of Zeus were opened, or because he seems to have been born twice, once from Semele and the second time from the thigh of Zeus'. Cf. also *Et. M.* 274, 44. The first derivation (ἐν διθύρῳι ἀντρῶιι τραφεῖς) is impossible because the first syllable ought to be δι-. The second explanation probably goes back to *Pi.* fr. 85 Πίνδαρος δὲ φησι λυθίραμβον· καὶ γὰρ Ζεὺς τικτομένου αὐτοῦ ἐπεβόα· 'λυθι ράμμα, λυθι ράμμα' and has no other authority. The third etymology is restored by A. Severyns (*Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus. II*, Liège 1938, 133) as δις θύραν βεβηκῶς = δις γενόμενος, but is also impossible because of the length of the first

syllable. Modern attempts to explain the word διθύραμβος have not led to positive results. A comparison of the syllable -αμβ- with the same syllable in θρίαμβος, ἕαμβος suggests that -αμβ- means 'step' or 'movement', because these words are apparently associated with song and dance (see Pickard-Cambridge 1962², 7-8; Chantraine 1968, 282).

1.2. Contents

Since the dithyramb is a hymn of Dionysus (cf. Archil. fr. 120 West; Procl. *Chr.* 42 [320a25]; Gal. X p. 12 Kühn), it is to be expected that the god and his history form a substantial part of the contents. In Pindar's dithyrambs Dionysus does indeed play a considerable role (see 2.1) and some of the surviving fragments of the poets of the New Dithyramb (the second half of the fifth century) also contain references to the attributes of the dionysiac festival, such as wine (cf. Melanippides *PMG* 760, 761, Timotheus *PMG* 780), descriptions of dionysiac music and also aetiological parts about e.g. musical instruments (cf. Telestes *PMG* 805, 806, 808, 810; Melanippides *PMG* 758) and related deities (Telestes *PMG* 810 *Magna Mater*). See 1.6 for a discussion whether these fragments can be ascribed to dithyrambs.

An early dithyramb with a mythical narrative is ascribed to Ibycus, *PMG* 296 (= Σ E. *Andr.* 631) προδοῖσιν αἰκάλλων κύνα· ἤτηθεις τοῖς ἀφροδιείοις. ἄμεινον ὠκονόμηται τοῖς περὶ Ἴβυκον· εἰς γὰρ Ἀφροδίτης ναὸν καταφεύγει ἡ Ἑλένη κάκειθεν διαλέγεται τῷ Μευελάωι, ὃ δ' ὑπ' ἔρωτος ἀφίησι τὸ ξίφος. τὰ παραπλήγια <τούτοις καὶ Ἴβυκος ὃ suppl. Schwartz> Ῥηγίλος ἐν διθυράμβωι φησὶν, 'fawning upon the treacherous dog: defeated by Aphrodite's doing. This is treated better by Ibycus: for Helen flees into the temple of Aphrodite and from there she speaks with him, and he, (conquered) by love, throws away his sword. Ibycus of Rhegium says something similar to this in a dithyramb'. Usually innovations of such importance are connected with a specific poet (e.g. Lasus or Arion with the introduction of the circular dance-form, Philoxenus with the first attempt to try a different musical mode), but we have no certain source for the introduction of the mythical narrative into the dithyramb. We do find a mention of Arion in Herodotus, which is not unequivocal but which may be interpreted to fill this gap: *Hdt.* 1, 23 καὶ διθύραμβον πρῶτον ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν ποιήσαντά τε καὶ ὀνομάσαντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἐν Κορίνθωι, '(Arion) the first of men whom we know to have composed the dithyramb and named it and produced it in Corinth' (transl. Pickard-Cambridge). If Herodotus meant that Arion was the first to have given the name of διθύραμβος to such a song, this is obviously false: Archilochus used

the name a century earlier. Herodotus may have ignored this on purpose because he wanted to ascribe certain innovations to Arion in order to give him a historical basis after the really incredible story of his arrival on the mainland on the back of a dolphin ('Αρίονα τὸν Μηθύμναϊον ἐπὶ δελφῖνος ἐξεμειχθέντα ἐπὶ Ταΐναρον) (Privitera 1957, 102-103). In that case, ὀνομάσαντα means 'gave the name διθύραμβος to a song'. 'Ονομάζω, however, may refer to a later innovation, which involved the introduction of mythical subject-matter and individual dithyrambs acquiring titles referring to these myths. In that case ὀνομάσαντα must be interpreted as 'gave titles to the individual dithyrambs' (cf. Suda s.v. 'Αρίων ... λέγεται ... πρῶτος ... διθύραμβον ἄσαι καὶ ὀνομάσαι τὸ ἀιδόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ, 'It is said that Arion ... first ... sang a dithyramb and named what the chorus sang', transl. Pickard-Cambridge). Interpreting ὀνομάζω as 'giving titles to the dithyrambs' would fill the gap in the tradition. See also H. Patzer, *Die Anfänge der griechischen Tragödie*, Wiesbaden 1962, 96.

Originally the myths were probably closely connected with the god Dionysus. Cf. Σ Lond. Dion. Thrax p. 451, 21 Hilgard Διθύραμβός ἐστι ποίημα πρὸς Διόνυσον ἀιδόμενον ἢ πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνα, παραπλοκάς ἱστοριῶν οἰκείων <περιέχον>, 'the dithyramb is a poem directed at Dionysus or at Apollo, <containing> interwoven proper (suitable) narratives'. (The reference to Apollo must be a mistake. The source of the scholiast was probably Proclus' *Chrestomathia*, where the dithyramb of Dionysus is compared with the *nomos* of Apollo. The scholiast must have confused some sections of this treatise. See H. Färber, *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*, München 1936, 53). It is possible that in time the contents of the narrated myth became more important than the references to Dionysus, at least with some poets. This would explain the fact that some of the dithyrambs of Bacchylides completely lack a reference to Dionysus or a dionysiac mood. The only poem where Dionysus and his parentage are mentioned is the fifth Dithyramb (B. 19, 46-51). The label of *P. Oxy.* 1091 (see 1.7) reveals that the Alexandrians classified these poems of Bacchylides as dithyrambs, but the almost complete absence of references to Dionysus or a dionysiac festival has raised the question whether or not this classification was correct. In fact, controversies existed even in antiquity: *P. Oxy.* 2368, a *scholium* on *carmina* 22-23, sets out the arguments for classifying 23 either as a dithyramb (its mythical contents) or as a paeon (the word λή). A similar discussion is mentioned in Plu. *de Mus.* 1134e περὶ δὲ Ξενοκρίτου ... ἀμφισβητεῖται εἰ παλαιῶν ποιητῆς γέγονεν ἠρωϊκῶν γὰρ ὑποθέσεων πράγματα ἔχουσῶν ποιητὴν γεγονέναι φαεῖν αὐτόν· διὸ καὶ τινας διθυράμβους καλεῖν αὐτοῦ τὰς ὑποθέσεις, 'with regard to Xenocritus ... it is disputed whether he composed paeans, for it is said that he composed on heroic themes involving action. Hence some call his pieces dithyrambs' (transl. Loeb).

The classification of 17 is still controversial too, see Schmidt 1990, 18-31. Originally there must have been formal criteria to distinguish the various genres, cf. Pl. *Lg.* 700a Διηρητημένη γὰρ δὴ τότε ἦν ἡμῖν ἡ μουσικὴ κατὰ εἶδη τε ἐαυτῆς ἄττα καὶ σχήματα, 'For at that time music was distinguished, each according to its own genre and form'. Later, after the Persian wars, the distinctions disappeared or were ignored: 700d μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, προϊόντος τοῦ χρόνου, ... ποιηταὶ ἐμίγνοντο ... κεραυνύντες δὲ θρήνους τε ὕμνους καὶ παιῶνας διθυράμβοις, καὶ ἀύλωδιαις δὴ ταῖς κιθαρωδιαῖς μιμούμενοι, καὶ πάντα εἰς πάντα συνάγοντες, 'but afterwards, when time went on, ... poets came ... mixing dirges with hymns and paeans with dithyrambs, imitating flute-music on the lyre, and mixing everything together'. Therefore it would not be strange if some centuries later the Alexandrians became confused and made mistakes (on the inadequacy of Alexandrian classification see A.E. Harvey, *The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry*, *CQ* 49 [1955], 157-175), especially since there may have been different kinds of dithyrambs. Our knowledge of the dithyramb is too small to challenge the Alexandrian classification effectively, especially since they had many more extant poems on which to base their judgment, so that it is best to consider B. 15-20 as dithyrambs (see also Zimmermann 1988b, 48-109 who tries to show for each poem that the textual information about the performance supports the classification as a dithyramb).

The existence of non-dionysiac dithyrambs seems to be mentioned in a treatise on the dithyramb which is found in *P. Berol.* 9571v (see the *editio princeps* by Schubart 1941, 24-29 and Del Corno 1974, 99-110). The text is badly mutilated, but some quotations are recognizable, e.g. *E. Hyps.* fr. 752; *Pi.* fr. 70b, 8-18 and a reference to fr. 72. The text of 61-66 ... οἱ μ(ὲν) π[/ οὐδὲν ἔξουσι διθυραμβικ[ὸν / ὀνόματα διθυραμβικὰ [/ ἐκλείπεται ἐν γοῶν [διθυρ- / ράμβω[ι] αὐτοῦ οὔτε ἐν ἀρ[χ- ὄνομα] / τοῦ θεοῦ [...] εὔρε οὐ[τ' ἐν] τέ[λει], suggests that there existed a kind of dithyramb in which Dionysus was neither named nor invoked, at the beginning or end of the poem. Bacchylides might be a representative of this type. F. Longoni, *Nota sulla storia del ditirambo*, *Acme* 29 (1976), 305-308, notes an opposition between 36-38 ρι ἦ [ἐν ἀρ]χῆι τοῦ ποιήμ[ατος] / ἦ κ(αὶ) [ἐν τέ]λει, ὄθεν κ(αὶ) τὸ π[/ Διόνυσόν φη(κι) κ(αὶ) τὴν τρα[γωιδίαν] and 61-66, and suggests that 36-38 refer to the dionysiac type of the dithyramb. It is more likely, however, that these lines belong to an argument about a specific poem (perhaps *Pi.* fr. 71-74, Del Corno 1974, 107) in the context of a discussion about the development to satyr play. That there were dionysiac dithyrambs did not need to be mentioned.

1.3. Musical aspects

Of the music of the dithyrambs nothing can be traced. We only know that the dithyramb was accompanied by the αὐλός and written in the Phrygian mode. Both were considered to be particularly suited to the enthusiasm of the dithyramb. Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 8, 1342b4 πᾶσα γὰρ βακχεία καὶ πᾶσα ἡ τοιαύτη κίνησις μάλιστα τῶν ὀργάνων ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς αὐλοῖς, ‘Dionysiac frenzy, and all such agitations of the mind, are more naturally expressed [when depicted in poetry] by an accompaniment of the flute than by one on any other instrument’ (transl. Barker); Procl. *Chr.* 50 (320b19) οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ἀρμονίαις οἰκείαις ἐκάτερος χρῆται· ὁ μὲν (sc. διθύραμβος) τὸν φρύγιον καὶ ὑποφρύγιον ἀρμόζεται, ‘besides, each uses its own appropriate mode; for the dithyramb the Phrygian and Hypophrygian mode are suitable’; Stesich. *PMG* 212 τοιάδε χρῆ Χαρίτων δαμώματα καλλικόμων / ὕμνεϊν Φρύγιον μέλος ἐξευρόντας ἀβρῶς / ἦρος ἐπερχομένου, ‘such songs as these, song of the lovely-haired Graces, it is right to sing gracefully to the people, having found the Phrygian song, when spring arrives’. The Phrygian mode is the scale where a semi-tone interval follows the second and the sixth note: T T S T T T S T. Starting on C this gives C D Dis F G a ais c (see *OCD* s.v. Music 6).

Lasus is mentioned as an innovator, cf. Plu. *de Mus.* 1141c Λᾶσος ὁ Ἐρμιονεὺς εἰς τὴν διθύραμβικὴν ἀγωγὴν μεταστήσας τοὺς ῥυθμούς, καὶ τῆι τῶν αὐλῶν πολυφωνίαι κατακολουθήσας, πλείοσι τε φθόγγοις καὶ διερριμμένοις χρησάμενος, εἰς μετάθεσιν τὴν προῖνπάρχουσαν ἤγαγε μουσικὴν, ‘Lasus of Hermione, by altering the rhythms to the tempo of the dithyramb, and by taking the extensive range of the auloi as his guides and thus using a greater number of scattered notes, transformed the music that had heretofore prevailed’ (transl. Loeb). Since we know neither the Greeks’ flute music nor their dances, it is difficult to imagine what exactly Lasus did. We do know that Pindar’s poems are mentioned as representative of the traditional dithyramb (see 2.3) and that the New Dithyramb is known for its experiments in music and style. Finally we have the *hyporchema* of Pratinas (*PMG* 708). It is not easy to combine these facts chronologically and logically. There are two options. Either Lasus was truly an innovator, changing the pre-existing music (Pickard-Cambridge 1962², 14; Privitera 1965, 74). In that case a reaction from contemporary poets would not be unexpected. Perhaps this reaction is found in Pratinas, *PMG* 708, cited and introduced by Ath. 14, 617b-f Πρατίνας δὲ ὁ Φλειάσιος αὐλητῶν καὶ χορευτῶν μισθοφόρων κατεχόντων τὰς ὀρχήστρας ἀγανακτείνῃ τινας ἐπὶ τῶι τοὺς αὐλητὰς μὴ συναυλεῖν τοῖς χοροῖς καθάπερ ἦν πάτριον ἀλλὰ τοὺς χοροὺς συναίδειν τοῖς αὐληταῖς· ὃν οὖν εἶχευ κατὰ τῶν ταῦτα ποιούντων θυμὸν ὁ Πρατίνας ἐμφανίζει διὰ τοῦδε τοῦ ὑπορχήματος·

τίς ὁ θόρυβος ὄδε; τί τάδε τὰ χορεύματα;
 τίς ὕβρις ἔμολεν ἐπὶ Διονυσιάδα πολυπάταγα θυμέλαν;
 ἔμὸς ἔμὸς ὁ Βρόμιος, ἐμὲ δεῖ κελαδεῖν, ἐμὲ δεῖ παταγεῖν
 ἀν' ὄρεα σύμενον μετὰ Ναϊάδων

5 οἷά τε κύκνον ἄγοντα ποικιλόπτερον μέλος.
 τὰν αἰοιδὰν κατέστασε Πιερίε βασίλειαν· ὁ δ' ἀγύλλο
 ὕστερον χορευέτω· καὶ γὰρ ἐσθ' ὑπηρέτας.
 κῶμῳ μόνον θυραμάχοις τε πυγμαχίαισι νέων θέλοι παροῖνων
 ἔμμεναι στρατηλάτας.

10 παῖε τὸν φρυνεοῦ ποικίλαν πνοὰν ἔχοντα,
 φλέγε τὸν ὀλεσισιαλοκάλαμον
 λαλοβαρύοπα παραμελορυθμοβάταν
 ὑπαὶ τρυπάνῳ δέμας πεπλάσμενον.
 ἦν ἰδοῦ· ἄδε σοι δεξιᾶς καὶ ποδὸς διαρριφά·

15 θρίαμβε διθύραμβε κισσόχαιτ' ἀνάξ,
 <ἄκου'> ἄκουε τὰν ἐμὰν Δώριον χορείαν.

'Pratinas of Phlius, when hired flute-players and dancers dominated the orchestra, being angry because the flute-players did not accompany the choruses in the traditional manner but the choruses accompanied the flute-players, displayed his anger against those responsible by this *hyporcheme*: "What is this noise? What are these dances: What is this madness at the resounding altar of Dionysus? Bromios is mine, mine. It is for me to cry, for me to make the noise, ranging the mountains with Naiads, like a swan leading the many-feathered song. The song is the queen appointed by the Muse, let the flute dance afterwards. For it is the servant. It can only lead the revel and the street battles of young drunkards. Beat the man with the voice of the spotted toad, burn the slave with the drilled body, the spittle-wasting reed, the heavy chatter, the slow discordant measure. See here I fling my right hand and my foot, Thriambodithyrambos, ivy-wreathed lord. Listen to my Dorian dance' (transl. Pickard-Cambridge).

The information about Pratinas and his plays places him at the end of the sixth and the beginning of the fifth century (cf. Suda s.v. Πρατίνω; *hypoth.* I A. Th.; *P. Oxy.* 2256, fr. 2), the time of Lasus' innovations. Pratinas perhaps composed *PMG* 708 as a protest. It may have been part of a satyr play, parodying the new dithyrambic style (Garrod 1920, 129-136; Seaford 1977/78, 81-94) or a dithyramb (U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Sappho und Simonides*, Berlin/Zürich/Dublin 1913, 1966, 133; Pickard-Cambridge 1962², 20). We must perhaps assume that following the innovations of Lasus and the resulting protests (cf. Pratin. *PMG* 708?) there followed a period in which the poets adhered to the generic conventions and traditions. Within this framework poets can, of course, be original (as

Pindar repeatedly claims, see my note on fr. 70b, 1-3). After this a new period of innovation may have started, represented by Melanippides and his contemporaries.

Another possibility is that Lasus' innovations consisted in unifying the various musical practices of his time: at the end of the sixth century there were many different musical instruments, all with their own tunings and teachers. Lasus is said to have written a book *Περὶ Μουσικῆς* (Suda s.v. Λᾶκος), probably to bring some order here. One of his subjects was the division in different modes, their relationship with songs from different countries, and their mutual relationship. The polyphony of the flutes and the greater range of the notes (Plu. *de Mus.* 1141c) may refer to this. In this case Lasus consolidated rather than revolutionized the music of his time (F. Lasserre, *Plutarque De la Musique*, Olten/Lausanne 1954, 34-44). Pindar, who is a pupil of Lasus according to some scholia, continued along his line, and the first profound changes do not occur until the time of the New Dithyramb. That means that the *hyporchema* of Pratinas does not belong in the time of Lasus, but should be dated much later. In fact, Zimmermann 1986, 145-154 supposes that the fragment is a dithyramb, falsely ascribed to Pratinas, and proposes a much later date for it. Zimmermann argues that the metre with its changes of rhythm and its tendency to imitate the action of the chorus, the vocabulary with its many neologisms, and the fact that the criticized predominance of the flute is especially prominent in the period of the New Dithyramb (cf. Plu. *de Mus.* 1141d τὸ γὰρ παλαιόν, ἕως εἰς Μελανιππίδην τὸν τῶν διθυράμβων ποιητῆν, συμβεβήκει τοὺς ἀλλήλας παρὰ τῶν ποιητῶν λαμβάνειν τοὺς μισθοὺς, πρωταγωνιστοῦς τῆς δηλονότι τῆς ποιήσεως, τῶν δ' ἀλλήτων ὑπηρετούντων τοῖς διδασκάλοις. ὕστερον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο διεφθάρη, 'for formerly, up to the time of the dithyrambic poet Melanippides, it had been the custom for the auletes to receive their pay from the poets, the words evidently playing the major role, and the auletes subordinating themselves to the authors of them; but later this practice also was lost' [transl. Loeb]), are more consistent with the second half of the fifth century. This may be right because there are indeed many newly formed compounds, a feature of the New Dithyramb, frequently parodied in comedy, and the style is reminiscent of the dialogues in Aristophanes. However, we do not know enough of the satyr play and the dithyramb around 500 B.C. to decide that the Pratinas fragment was incongruous with the early period.

If we assume that Lasus was not a predecessor of the New Dithyramb, and accept the later date of *PMG* 708, we assume the development of the dithyramb to be from an informal song (seventh and sixth centuries) to a formalized poem (Lasus, Pindar) and then to the experiments of the second half of the fifth century. If Lasus' reforms were indeed revolutionary, we must assume a chrono-

logical development with alternating periods of innovation and restoration, or, rather admit with Plu. *de Mus.* 'che anche nel V e nel IV sec. vi furono buoni musicisti e che anche gli antichi musicisti furono novatori' (Privitera 1965, 80).

The poets of the New Dithyramb not only changed (again?) the relative importance of lyrics and musical instruments (see Plu. *de Mus.* 1141d quoted above), but also began to experiment with the lyrical parts. It appears that they composed astrophic parts which became ever longer (cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1409b24 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ αἱ περίοδοι αἱ μακραὶ οὐσαὶ λόγος γίνεται καὶ ἀναβολῆι ὁμοίον. ὥστε γίνεται ὁ ἔσκωψε Δημόκριτος ὁ Χίος εἰς Μελαννιπίδην ποιήσαντα ἀντὶ τῶν ἀντιστροφῶν ἀναβολάς, 'οἷ τ' αὐτῶι κακὰ τεύχει ἀνήρ ἄλλωι κακὰ τεύχων, ἡ δὲ μακρὰ ἀναβολὴ τῶν ποιήσαντι κακίστη', 'similarly long periods assume the proportions of a speech and resemble dithyrambic preludes. This gives rise to what Democritus of Chios jokingly rebuked in Melanippides, who composed instead of antistrophes dithyrambic preludes: "a man does harm to himself in doing harm to another, and a long prelude is most deadly for the one who composes it" [transl. Loeb]). It is clear that this would ask too much of a chorus of citizens and that the ἀναβολαὶ required solo performers (see also Arist. *Probl.* 19, 918b18).

The music of the New Dithyramb is described as 'full of twists': cf. Ar. *Nu.* 970-971 εἰ δὲ τις αὐτῶν βωμολοχεύσαιτ' ἢ κάμψειέν τινα καμπήν, / οὔσασι οἱ νῦν τὰς κατὰ Φρύνην ταύτας τὰς δυσκολοκάμπτους, / ἐπετρίβετο τυπτόμενος πολλὰς ὡς τὰς Μούσας ἀφανίζων, 'and if any of them played the clown or introduced some convolution such as the moderns use, those annoying twists in the style of Phrynis, he was thrashed hard and often for disfiguring the music' (transl. Sommerstein); Pher. fr. 155, 8-15 K.-A. Cf. also D.H. *Comp.* 19 (2, 86 U.-R.) who adds that Philoxenus and his contemporaries also ignored the old rules about melodies and rhythms: καὶ τὰς μελωδίας ἐξήλαττον, τοτὲ μὲν ἐναρμονίους ποιοῦντες, τοτὲ δὲ χρωματικάς, τοτὲ δὲ διατόνους, καὶ τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς κατὰ πολλὴν ἄδειαν ἐνεξουσιάζοντες διετέλουν, οἳ γε δὴ κατὰ Φιλόξενον καὶ Τιμόθεον καὶ Τελέστην, ἐπεὶ παρά γε τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τεταγμένους ἦν καὶ ὁ διθύραμβος, 'and they varied the melodies, making them now enharmonic, now chromatic, now diatonic; and in the rhythms they continually showed the boldest independence, - I mean Philoxenus, Timotheus, Telestes, and men of that stamp, - since among the ancients even the dithyramb had been subject to strict metrical laws' (transl. W. Rhys Roberts). This probably means that the melodies were very difficult to sing, with quavers and trillers. This is another development making (parts of) the dithyramb more suitable for professional singers than for an amateur chorus.

Philoxenus is the first poet who tried to write a dithyramb in a mode other than the Phrygian, which was considered to be the only suitable mode, cf. Arist.

Pol. 8, 1342b4 τῶν δ' ἀρμονιῶν ἐν τοῖς φρυγικῇ μέλεσι λαμβάνει ταῦτα τὸ πρέπον, οἷον ὁ διθύραμβος ὁμολογουμένως εἶναι δοκεῖ Φρύγιον, καὶ τούτου πολλὰ παραδείγματα λέγουσιν οἱ περὶ τὴν σύνεσιν αὐτήν ἄλλα τε, καὶ διότι Φιλόξενος ἐγχειρήσας ἐν τῇ δωρικῇ ποιῆσαι διθύραμβον τοὺς Μύσους οὐχ οἷός τ' ἦν, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως αὐτῆς ἐξέπεσεν εἰς τὴν φρυγικὴν τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀρμονίαν πάλιν, 'similarly, in the matter of modes, we find that melodies which are in the Phrygian mode are the vehicle suitable for such states of mind. The dithyramb, which is generally agreed to be Phrygian in character, will serve as an example. Many instances attesting the character of the dithyramb are cited by experts in the art of music. The case of Philoxenus is one. He attempted, but failed, to compose a dithyramb, entitled 'The Mysians', in the Dorian mode; and he was driven by the very nature of his theme to fall back on the Phrygian mode as the more appropriate.' (transl. Barker); *Plu. de Mus.* 1142f, cf. also *D.H. Comp.* 19 (2, 86 U.-R.).

1.4. *Rhythm and dance*

The circular dance was characteristic of the dithyramb. Cf. *Σ Ar. Av.* 1403 κυκλιο-διδάσκαλον ἤγουν τὸν διθυραμβοποιόν, 'the teacher of the cyclic chorus: they tried to carry off the dithyrambic poet'; *Plu. decem oratorum vitae* p. 835b καὶ αὐτὸς (sc. Andocides) δ' ἐχορήγησε κυκλίῳ χορῶ τῇ αὐτοῦ φυλῇ ἀγωνιζομένη διθυράμβῳ, 'and he himself was choregos of the circular chorus when his own tribe entered the dithyrambic contest'; *AP* 13, 28, 9; *Σ Aeschin. in Tim.* 10. See Pickard-Cambridge 1968², 74; Th. Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* II, Berlin 1883, 507-508. Arion is mentioned as the one who introduced the circular dance by *Procl. Chr.* 43 (320a32) τὸν δὲ ἀρξάμενον τῆς ᾠδῆς Ἀριστοτέλης Ἀριονά φησιν εἶναι, ὃς πρῶτος τὸν κύκλιον ἤγαγε χορόν, 'Aristotle says that the one who introduced this song, was Arion, who first led the circular dance'; *Σ Pi. O.* 13, 26b. However, other sources say that Lasus introduced the circular dance form (*Suda s.v.* κυκλιοδιδάσκαλος) or mention a controversy on this point (*Σ Ar. Av.* 1403 Ἀντίπατρος καὶ Εὐφρόνιος ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι φασι τοὺς κυκλίους χορούς εἴησθαι πρῶτον Λᾶσον τὸν Ἑρμιονέα, οἱ δὲ ἀρχαιότεροι, Ἑλλάνικος καὶ Δικαίραρχος, Ἀριονα τὸν Μηθυμναῖον, Δικαίραρχος μὲν ἐν τῶι περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγῶνων, Ἑλλάνικος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Καρνεονικαῖς, 'Antipatros and Euphronios in their commentaries name Lasos of Hermione as the first to compose stationary songs for circular choruses. Older authorities, Hellanicus and Dicaearchus, name Arion of Methymna, Dicaearchus in his book *On Dionysiac contests*, Hellanicus in the *Karneonikai*' (transl. Pickard-Cambridge). The true course of events cannot be

traced now, but the introduction of the circular dance would not be incompatible with the picture of Lasus as it emerges from other sources. On Lasus' musical innovations see also *I.3*.

The dance of the dithyramb is called τυρβασία by Pollux 4, 105 τυρβασίαν δ' ἐκάλουν τὸ ὄρχημα τὸ διθυραμβικόν, 'they called the tyrbasia the dance of the dithyramb'. Cf. Hesch. s.v. τυρβασία: ἀγωγή τις τῶν διθυραμβικῶν, 'tyrbasia: one of the dithyrambic *tempî*', which suggests that there were other ἀγωγαί. Another one was perhaps the πυρρίχη which developed from a Spartan war-dance into a dionysiac dance, cf. Ath. 631a-b ἡ δὲ καθ' ἡμᾶς πυρρίχη Διονυσιακὴ τις εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἐπιεικεστέρα οὐσα τῆς ἀρχαίας (...) ὀρχοῦνται τε τὰ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τοὺς Ἴνδουσι ἔτι τε τὰ περὶ τὸν Πειθέα, 'The pyrriche of our times is rather Dionysiac in character and is more respectable than the ancient kind. (...) dance the story of Dionysus and India, or again the story of Pentheus' (transl. Loeb); it may have been a dithyrambic dance because it is associated with the dithyrambic poet Cinesias, cf. Ar. *Ra.* 152-153 νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐχρῆν γε πρὸς τοῦτοις κελ / τὴν πυρρίχην τις ἔμαθε τὴν Κινησίου, 'There too, by the gods, should he be plunged (i.e. the dung of the Underworld), whoever has danced the sword-dance of Cinesias'; Suda s.v. πυρρίχη· πυρρίχην ἔμαθε τὴν Κινησίου. οὗτος δὲ Κινησίας διθυραμβοποιὸς ἦν, ἐποίησε δὲ πύρριχον, '(whoever) danced the sword-dance of Cinesias. He was Cinesias the dithyrambic poet, and he composed a sword-dance'. Of course Cinesias may have written an accompaniment for a dance outside the dithyrambic genre.

A lively rhythm is considered suitable for the dionysiac atmosphere of the dithyramb: cf. Procl. *Chr.* 48 (320b12) ἔστι δὲ ὁ μὲν διθύραμβος κεκινημένος καὶ πολὺ τὸ ἐνθουσιῶδες μετὰ χορείας ἐμφαίνων, εἰς πάθη κατασκευαζόμενος τὰ μάλιστα οἰκεία τῷ θεῷ καὶ σεοβήται μὲν καὶ τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς καὶ ἀπλουστερώς κέχρηται ταῖς λέξεσιν, 'the dithyramb is full of movement, and shows, also in its dance, the ecstatic mood to a high degree; it is suitable for the moods which belong specifically to the god. It is agitated in its rhythms and it chooses its words simply'. Proclus does not explain which metres are especially suitable, but elsewhere the baccheus is mentioned, cf. Σ Hephaestion (p. 301, 24 Consbruch) ἕβδομος ὁ βακχείος, ἐκ βραχείας καὶ δύο μακρῶν. ἐκλήθη δὲ οὕτως, ἐπειδὴ οἱ τῶν διθυραμβοποιῶν πρὸς Διόνυσον ὕμνοι ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐκ τούτου τοῦ μέτρου ἦσαν· ὁ καὶ ὑποβάκχειος, 'the seventh is the baccheus, consisting of a short and two longs. It has this name because the songs of Dionysus, written by the dithyrambic poets, consisted mainly of this metre. There is also the hypobaccheus'.

Although Lasus of Hermione is said to have changed both the rhythms and the music (see *I.3*), later authors regarded the old dithyramb, of which Pindar was also a representative, as 'orderly' (D.H. *Comp.* 19 [2, 86 U.-R.]) παρά γε τοῖς

ἀρχαίοις τεταγμένους τῆν καὶ ὁ διθύραμβος, ‘among the ancients even the dithyramb had been subject to strict metrical laws’ (transl. W. Rhys Roberts). So long as the chorus consisted of citizens without a musical education the metres had to be fairly simple, or at least regular. With the introduction of the solo parts, probably executed by professional artists (see 1.3.), the strophic structure could be dismissed (cf. Arist. *Probl.* 19, 918b18). This development supposedly began with Melanippides. The longer dithyramb fragments of Pindar and Bacchylides all seem to be strophic.

1.5. Style and vocabulary

In its original form the dithyramb was sung at bacchic festivals, cf. Archil. fr. 120 West ὡς Διωνύσου ἀνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος / οἶδα διθύραμβον οἴνωι κυγερωνωθεὶς φρένας, ‘I know how to lead the fair song of Lord Dionysus, the dithyramb, when my wits are fused with wine’ (transl. Pickard-Cambridge); Epich. fr. 132 Kaibel οὐκ ἔστι διθύραμβος ὄκχ’ ὕδωρ πίητις, ‘there is no dithyramb when you drink water’; Procl. *Chr.* 51 (320b21) ἔοικε δὲ ὁ μὲν διθύραμβος ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τοὺς ἀγροὺς παιδιᾶς καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς πότοις εὐφροσύνης εὐρεθῆναι. ... ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ μέθαι καὶ παιδιαί, ‘the dithyramb seems to originate from rustic amusement and festivities at drinking-parties; ... for there (i.e. in the dithyramb) you find drunkenness and amusement’; Plu. *de e ap. Delph.* 9, p. 389a. The use of ἐξάρξαι in Archil. fr. 120 West implies the presence of an ἐξάρχων, who started a song, perhaps an improvisation, and of a chorus, a group of fellow-revellers, who joined in a refrain (see Pickard-Cambridge 1962², 9). For this use of ἐξάρχω cf. Archil. fr. 121 West; *Il.* 18, 606; 24, 720-722; *h. Hom.* 27, 18 and see M. Fordeker, *Der Sanger in der homerischen Schildbeschreibung*, in *Synusia*, Festschrift W. Schade-waldt, Pfullingen 1965, 25. In such circumstances the vocabulary must have been simple (cf. Procl. *Chr.* 47 [320b15] ... ἀπλουτέρως κέχρηται ταῖς λέξεσιν). *PMG* 871, a song of Elean women addressed to Dionysus, may have been like the original form of the dithyramb. The god is requested to come to the temple, on the occasion of a festival, and the form makes it plausible to assume that the last two lines were a refrain sung by a chorus, while the first lines were sung by a soloist.

The mythical narrative, probably introduced by Arion (see 1.2), presumably made the dithyramb a more formal poem. The verbs ποιήσαντα and διδάξαντα used by Herodotus imply that the dithyramb of Arion was rehearsed with the chorus and was a much more formalized and structured poem than the dithyramb of Archilochus. Pindar belongs in this more formal phase of the dithyramb. Cf.

Gal. X p. 12 Kühn ἢ τίνας μελοποιού (εὐπορήσομεν) κατὰ Πίνδαρον αἰκοντος ὑψηλῶς ἐν διθυράμβοις ὡς πάλαι τὸν Διόνυσον, οὕτως νῦν τὸν Θεσσαλόν;, 'or which poet, singing in an elevated style as Pindar sang of Dionysus in his dithyrambs, can we use now to sing of Thessalos?' Most of the dithyrambs of Bacchylides are almost completely concerned with myth, and present the material in a novel way: there is quite a lot of direct speech (B. 15, 50-63; 17, 20-46; 52-66; 74-80; the whole of B. 18); except for B. 19 and 20 there are no smooth introductions or endings, but the story begins *in mediis rebus* (B. 15; 17) and/or ends abruptly (B. 15; 16; 17; 18). Zimmermann 1988b, 106 suggests that Bacchylides' style was influenced by contemporary Attic tragedy: the introduction of direct speech, the dialogue form of B. 18, and the unity of time and place which he pursues by just presenting an episode instead of narrating the whole story. It is possible that such innovations prepared the way for the New Dithyramb poets (see Zimmermann 1988b, 109), where mimesis plays a large role.

The mimetic character of the New Dithyramb is mentioned by Arist. *Probl.* 19, 918b18 διὸ καὶ οἱ διθυράμβοι, ἐπειδὴ μιμητικοὶ ἐγένοντο, οὐκέτι ἔχουσιν ἀντιστρόφους, πρότερον δὲ εἶχον, 'for the same reason the dithyrambs, once they had become imitative, were no longer antistrophic, as they had previously been' (transl. Loeb). Mimesis in Aristotle refers to parts where the poet speaks either as a narrator or as a character (see I. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers*, Amsterdam 1987), but here its meaning seems more restricted, indicating that in the New Dithyramb characters were impersonated. Some descriptions of dithyrambic performances refer to such mimetic tendencies: cf. e.g. Tim. *PMG* 792 (= Ath. 8, 352a) ἐπακούσας δὲ τῆς Ὠδύσεως τῆς Τιμοθέου, εἰ δ' ἐργολάβου, ἔφη (sc. ὁ Στρατόνικος), ἔπικτεν καὶ μὴ θεόν, ποίᾳς ἄν ἤφιει φωνάς;, 'listening to *The Birth-pangs of Semele* by Timotheus, he (Stratonicus) remarked: "If she were bearing a theatrical manager instead of a god, what screeches she would be letting forth!"' (transl. Loeb); D. Chr. 78, 32 (2, 271 de Budé); *API.* 16, 7. Another example may be Philoxenus' *Cyclops* or *Galatea* (*PMG* 815-824). It is uncertain whether or not this was a dithyramb. A part of it is parodied in *Ar. Pl.* 290-315 where one of the actors, representing Polyphemus, executes a wild dance with the chorus who are supposed to be the flock of sheep and goats. That this is indeed aimed at the poem of Philoxenus is explained by the scholiast on *Pl.* 290: Φιλόξενον τὸν διθυραμβοποιὸν ἢ τραγωδοδιδάσκαλον διασύρει, 'he ridicules Philoxenus the dithyrambic or tragic poet' (Philoxenus is also described as a τραγικός in the same scholium, but usually he is identified as a διθυραμβοποιός [*PMG* 814, 826, 828, 830]). Arist. *Poet.* 1448a14 discusses the fact that artists can depict people as better or worse than they actually are and gives as one of the examples: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τοὺς διθυράμβους καὶ περὶ τοὺς νόμους, ὥσπερ τῆσ' Ἰκύκλωπας

Τιμόθεος καὶ Φιλόξενος, μιμήσαιτο ἄν τις, '(these divergences can arise) likewise in dithyrambs and nomos: for just as Timotheus and Philoxenus (represented) Cyclopes, (so) one may represent (people in different ways)' (transl. Janko). Since both Timotheus and Philoxenus wrote nomos as well as dithyrambs, this does not help to define the genre of the Κύκλωψ. The expression θρεπτανελό (*Ar. Pl.* 290, 296) imitates the sound of the lyre (clumsily) played by the Cyclops. This θρεπτανελό comes from the original poem of Philoxenus (*Σ Ar. Pl.* 290; *Suda s.v.* θρεπτανελώ). If the actor really played the instrument, this must have been quite an innovation. The poem is called a δράμα by Zenob. V, 45 (1, 139 Leutsch-Schneidewin = *PMG* 824) and by the scholiast on *Ar. Pl.* 290. Philoxenus is said to 'bring the Cyclops on stage' (εἰσάγειν). The surviving texts in *PMG* 821, 823 and 824 are direct speech and may be evidence of solo parts. All such features are more in accordance with the dithyramb than with any other genre of choral lyric, because of the mimetic tendencies of the New Dithyramb (cf. *Arist. Probl.* 19, 918b18; *Poet.* 1461b30-32 = *Tim. PMG* 793; see also Th. Gomperz, *Skylla in der aristotelischen Poetik und die Kunstform des Dithyrambos*, *Hellenika I*, Leipzig 1912, 85-92). D.F. Sutton, *Dithyramb as Δράμα: Philoxenus of Cythera's Cyclops or Galatea*, *QUCC* n.s. 13 (1983), 37-43 comes to the conclusion that the poem was an experiment, a hybrid form somewhere between dithyramb and δράμα. This is another way to describe the mimetic tendencies and seems the best solution for the conflicting testimonies. Such an experimental form would be the expected consequence of the 'dramatic' B. 18. Philoxenus must still have been a 'real' dithyrambic poet, because Philodemus maintains that despite the innovations the style of a dithyramb remains recognizable: κ[αὶ τοὺς] δειθυραμβι- / κοὺς δὲ τρόπ[ο]υς εἶ τις κυγ- / κρίναι, τὸν τε κατὰ Πίνδα- / ρον καὶ τὸν κατὰ Φιλόξε- / νον, μεγάλην εὐρεθήσεσθαι / τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν ἐπιφαι- / νομένων ἤθῶν, τὸν δ' αὐ- / τὸν εἶναι τ[ρ]όπον, 'and when someone should want to compare the styles of the dithyrambs, of Pindar and of Philoxenus, the resulting differences in character would be found to be large, but it would also be clear that the style is the same' (*de Mus.* 1 fr. 18, 6 p. 9 Kemke).

Compound words were considered typical of the dithyramb (cf. *Arist. Poet.* 22, 1459a8 τῶν δ' ὀνομάτων τὰ μὲν διπλᾶ μάλιστα ἀρμόττει τοῖς διθυράμβοις, 'among names, double ones are most appropriate for dithyrambs' (transl. Janko); *Rhet.* III, 1406b1; *Pl. Cra.* 409c). Both Pindar and Bacchylides use words that are found seldom or not at all in the extant literature, but their vocabulary is not empty and hollow. The ridicule of Aristophanes (e.g. *Nu.* 332-339; *Pax* 827-831; *Σ Av.* 1393 πλείετῃ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἢ λέξις τοιαύτη, ὁ δὲ νοῦς ἐλάχιστος, ὡς ἡ παροιμία· 'καὶ διθυράμβων νοῦν ἔχεις ἐλάττονα', 'for their words are very large, but their sense is very small, as the saying goes: "you have even less sense than the

dithyrambs") and the criticism of Demetrius (*de eloc.* 91, p. 24,3 Radermacher λιπτέον δὲ καὶ σύνθετα ὀνόματα, οὐ τὰ διθυραμβικῶς συγκείμενα, οἷον 'θεοτεράτους πλάνας', οὐδὲ 'ἄστρων δορύπυρον στρατόν', ἀλλ' εὐκότα τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς συνηθείας συγκειμένοις, 'compound words should also be used. They should not, however, be formed after the manner of the dithyrambic poets, e.g. "heaven-prodigied wandering" or "the fiery-speared battalions of the stars". They should resemble the compounds made in ordinary speech' [transl. W. Rhys Roberts]) are aimed at the poets of the New Dithyramb. The compound words of the New Dithyramb poets apparently did not convey any real meaning, and were considered ridiculous. Examples are found in Philoxenus (*PMG* 821 ὦ καλλιπρόσωπε χρυσεοβόστρυχε [[Γαλάτεια]] / χαριτόφωνε θάλας Ἐρώτων) and Timotheus (*PMG* 778b, 780 and many lines and words in the Persians *PMG* 791). The style of Cinesias is described as 'crooked' in Erotian. p. 75, 10-12 Nachmanson (p. 113 Klein) *s.v.* ῥαιβοειδέστατον· καμπυλώτατον. (...) †πλασίων <δ'> ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ τι μὲν κοίλου, κατὰ τι δὲ καμπύλου, ὡς Κινησίας τάσσει τὴν λέξιν, 'most crooked-looking: very curved (...) of conformations (?), hollow on one side and curved on the other, as Cinesias forms his diction'. Perhaps this refers to the above mentioned criticisms of the dithyrambic vocabulary: long words with no contents.

1.6. Performance

It is recorded that Lasus introduced the dithyramb to the contest (Suda *s.v.* Λᾶσος· πρῶτος δὲ οὗτος περὶ μουσικῆς λόγον ἔγραψε καὶ διθυράμβον εἰς ἀγῶνα εἰσήγαγε καὶ τοὺς ἐριστικοὺς εἰσηγήσατο λόγους, 'he was the first who wrote a book On Music, who introduced the dithyramb to the contest and who introduced sophisms'). Garrod has tried to harmonize the testimonies of the Suda and of Plutarch (*de Mus.* 1141c Λᾶσος ὁ Ἐρμιονεὺς εἰς τὴν διθυραμβικὴν ἀγωγὴν μεταστήσας τοὺς ῥυθμούς ..., 'Lasus of Hermione, by altering the rhythms to the tempo of the dithyramb ...' [transl. Loeb]) and suggests reading διθυραμβώδεις ἀγωγὰς εἰσήγαγεν in the Suda (1920, 136). This is a suggestion worth considering, which would imply that Lasus had nothing to do with the introduction of the dithyramb to the contest. However, a reference by Aristophanes (*V.* 1409-1410 Λᾶσός ποτ' ἀντεδίδασκε καὶ Σιμωνίδης· ἔπειθ' ὁ Λᾶσος εἶπεν· 'ὄλιγον μοι μέλει', 'Lasos once was a rival producer and Simonides. Then Lasos said "I do not care"' [transl. Pickard-Cambridge]) reveals that there were dithyrambic contests in Lasus' time, and their introduction cannot have been much earlier (see Pickard-Cambridge 1962², 15). The exact role of Lasus in this development remains obscure, because the introduction of the dithyrambic contest would seem to be a matter

for the tyrannos rather than for a poet. Perhaps Lasus was the very first to secure a victory in such a contest, or perhaps there was information, now lost, about Lasus' role or influence with the tyrannos.

At the City Dionysia of Athens competitions were organized for dithyrambic choruses of boys and of men, for comedy and tragedy. The victories are recorded in this order (*JG* II², 2318). For the dithyrambic contest each of the ten tribes provided a chorus of fifty men and of fifty boys: Σ Aeschin. *in Tim.* 10 ἐξ ἔθουσι Ἀθηναῖοι κατὰ φυλάσις ἵστασαν πεντήκοντα παίδων χορὸν ἢ ἀνδρῶν, ὥστε γενέσθαι δέκα χορούς, ἐπειδὴ καὶ δέκα φυλαί, 'habitually the Athenians organized choruses of fifty boys or men by tribe, so that there were ten choruses, because there were ten tribes', and chose a χορηγός: D. 21 *hypoth.* II, 2 ἐν οἷσι (City Dionysia) προὔβαλλετο χορηγός ἀφ' ἑκάστης φυλῆς πρὸς τὸ τρέφειν χορούς παίδων τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν ... παυομένης δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ μηνὶ προὔβαλλοντο οἱ χορηγοὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἑορτῆς, 'at the City Dionysia a choregos was put forward from each tribe to provide for the choruses of boys and men ... and after the festival, in the first month thereafter, the *choregoi* for the next festival were put forward'. The χορηγοὶ chose the poets (cf. Ar. *Av.* 1403-1404 ταυτὶ πεποιήκας τὸν κυκλιο-διδάσκαλον, / ὅς ταῖσι φυλαῖσι περιμάχητός εἰμι' αἰεὶ, 'Is that how you treat me, a dithyrambic poet, who is always fought for by the tribes?'; X. *Mem.* 3, 4, 4 οὐδὲ ᾧδε γε ὁ Ἀντισθένης οὐδὲ χορῶν διδασκαλίᾳ ἐμπειροσ ὧν ὄμωσι ἐγένετο ἱκανὸς εὐρεῖν τοὺς κρατίστους ταῦτα, 'although Antisthenes knows nothing about music or the training of a chorus, he showed himself capable of finding the best experts for this') after drawing lots for the order of choice (cf. Antiph. 6, 11 ἐπειδὴ χορηγός καταστάθην εἰς Θαργήλια καὶ ἔλαχον Παιντακλέα διδάσκαλον ..., 'when I was appointed *choregos* for the Thargelia and had obtained by lot Pantakles as poet ...'; the practice was probably the same for the Dionysia). In Demosthenes' time the order in which the flute-players were to be chosen, was also decided by lots: D. 21, 13 παρούσης δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν ἧι τὸν ἄρχοντ' ἐπικληροῦν ὁ νόμος τοῖς χοροῖς τοὺς ἀύλητάς κελεύει (...) καὶ κληρουμένων πρώτος αἰρεῖσθαι τὸν ἀύλητὴν ἔλαχον, 'when the Assembly met at which the law directs the Archons to assign the flute-players by lot to the choruses (...) at the drawing of the lots I was fortunate enough to get first choice of a flute-player' (transl. Loeb). Until Melanippides the choice of the flute-player was the poet's responsibility, cf. Plu. *de Mus.* 1141c-d (see also 1.3). The χορηγός further assembled the chorus (Antiph. 6, 11) and appointed a χοροδιδάσκαλος, whose role was of course very important for a successful performance (cf. D. 21, 17; 58-60).

The prize for the victorious tribe and its χορηγός was a tripod (Simon. fr. 77; 79 Diehl; D. 21, 5; *AP* 13, 28, 6). There were wreaths (D. 21, 63), probably for the poet (*AP* 13, 28, 3-4), and a bull is recorded as the first prize for the poet

(Simon. fr. 79 Diehl; Pi. O. 13, 19; Σ Pl. R. II, 394c τῶν δὲ ποιητῶν τῶι μὲν α' βοῦς ἔπαθλον ἦν, τῶι δὲ β' ἀμφορεύς, τῶι δὲ γ' τράγος, ὃν τρυγὶ κεχρισμένον ἀπῆγεν, 'for the first of the poets the prize was a bull, for the second an amphoreus of wine, and for the third a goat which was led away smeared with wine-lees' [transl. Pickard-Cambridge]). In the official records only the tribe and the χορηγός were mentioned (*IG* II², 2318).

Dithyrambs were also performed at other Athenian festivals, at the Thargelia (Lys. 21, 1 (ἀνήλωσα) Θαργελίους νικήσας ἀνδρῶν χορῶν (δισχιλίας δραχμάς), '(I spent 2000 drachmas) for the Thargelia, where I secured a victory with a chorus of men'; Ps. Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 3, 4; Dittenberger 3, 1091, 16 ἀνδράσι and παισί), at the (Lesser) Panathenaea (Lys. 21, 2 ἀνήλωσα ... Παναθηναίους τοῖς μικροῖς κυκλίω χορῶν τριακοσίαις, 'I spent 300 (drachmas) for a cyclic chorus at the Lesser Panathenaea'; Ps. Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 3, 4; *IG* I² 673 [see D. Peppas-Delmousson, *Das Akropolis-epigramm IG I² 673, MDAI(A) 86* (1971), 55-66]) and probably also at the Promethia and Hephaestia (cf. Ps. Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 3, 4; Dittenberger 3, 1091, 11).

For more details see Pickard-Cambridge 1968², 74-79; Pickard-Cambridge 1962², 31-38.

1.7. Remains of the dithyrambs

Archil. fr. 120 (West) is probably not a dithyramb because the way in which the first person speaks about himself is not compatible with a cult song (see also Privitera 1957, 98). Perhaps the small remains of an Archilochean poem in the inscriptional life of Archilochus (N. Kontoleon, Νέαι ἐπιγραφαὶ περὶ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου ἐκ Πάρου, *Arch. Eph.* 1952; A.G. Woodhead (ed.), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 15, Leiden 1958, nr. 517, A III 31-35 ὁ Διόνυκος [/ οὐλάς τυαζ[/ ὄμφακες α[/ κύκα μελ[ιχρὰ / οἰφολίω ἐρ[) belonged to a dithyramb (see G.A. Privitera, *Tradizione diretta e indiretta della melica ditirambica*, *Sileno* 12 [1987], 222).

No fragments of the dithyrambs of Lasus have survived, except for the mention of the word κύμνος (Ael. *NA.* 7, 47 = *PMG* 703).

Although Simonides of Ceos must have been very famous, as is testified by the fifty-six victories mentioned in fr. 79 Diehl (= *AP* 6, 213); fr. 77 Diehl, none of his poems is left to us. We only have the title of one of them, Str. 15, 3, 2 ταφήναι δὲ λέγεται Μέμνονι περὶ Πάλτου τῆς Συρίας παρὰ Βαδᾶν ποταμόν, ὡς εἶρηκε Σιμωνίδης ἐν Μέμνονι διθυράμβω τῶν Δηλιακῶν, 'Memnon is said to have been buried in the neighbourhood of Paltus in Syria, by the river Badas, as

Simonides states in his dithyramb entitled *Memnon*, one of his Delian poems' (transl. Loeb).

The first poet from whose dithyrambs we have substantial fragments is Pindar. They show, as far as we can judge, no traces of the revolutionary tendencies set in motion by Lasus. Indeed, Pindar is sometimes explicitly mentioned as an example of 'the good old days' by later theoreticians (cf. Phil. *de Mus.* 1 fr. 18, 6; Gal. X p. 12 Kühn). He will be treated in detail in chapter 2.

Remains of six dithyrambs of Bacchylides were found on papyri in 1896 and published in 1897 by Kenyon as B. 15-20. These belonged to one roll. Kenyon suggested that 15 and 18 might be hymns, 16 and 17 paeans (although 17 seems to be referred to as a dithyramb by Servius), and 19 and 20 dithyrambs. In 1911 Hunt published *P. Oxy.* 1091 containing remains of one column of B. 17. To this papyrus the original label, a palimpsest *sillybos* was still affixed, bearing the title Βακχυλίδου Διθύραμβοι. Beneath these words remnants of some lines were visible, later identified by Edmonds as the title of 15 'Αντηνορίδαι ἢ Ἐλένης ἀπαίτησις, 'doubtless written here by mistake for the title of the book' (*CR* 36 [1922], 160). This implies that B. 15-20 form the beginning of a roll of dithyrambs: because the poems were placed in the alphabetical order of their titles, it is certain that 15 was not preceded by other dithyrambs (Snell, *praefatio* to Snell-Maehler, *Bacchylides. Carmina*, Leipzig 1970, IX). The title of the last extant dithyramb, "Ἰδακ, suggests that the original collection must have been larger. Remains of some of them are published by Snell-Maehler as dithyrambs 21-29.

Other poets of this period who wrote dithyrambs, are Ion (*PMG* 740-741), Praxilla (*PMG* 748) and Licymnius (*PMG* 768), but almost everything of their poems is lost.

Not much of the New Dithyramb is left to us. Our knowledge is mainly second-hand: judgments, often negative, from theoreticians such as Plato, Aristotle and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and parodies in comedy. For the New Dithyramb and the reactions it evoked, see H. Schönewolf, *Der jungattische Dithyrambos. Wesen, Wirkung, Gegenwirkung*, Diss. Giessen 1938.

The first representative of this later dithyramb is Melanippides of Melos (cf. Pher. fr. 155, 3 K.-A. ἐμοὶ (sc. Musae) γὰρ ἤρξε τῶν κακῶν Μελανιππίδης, 'for the first to begin these evils, was Melanippides'). None of the extant fragments (*PMG* 757-766) can be called a dithyramb with certainty, although the subject-matter of *PMG* 758 (Athena and the flute) and 760-761 (wine) would suit the genre.

Cinesias of Athens is mainly known from comedy (*Ar. Av.* 1373-1409; *Ra.* 1437; *Eccl.* 330; fr. 149-150; *Nu.* 333 and Σ *a ad loc.* εἰς τοὺς περὶ Κινησίαν καὶ Φιλόξενου καὶ Κλεομένην, 'referring to Cinesias, Philoxenus and Cleomenes'; Strattis frs.

14-22 K.-A.; cf. also Plu. *glor. Athen.* 5, p. 348b). (See also L.B. Lawler, 'Lime-wood' Cinesias and the Dithyrambic Dance, *TAPA* 81 [1950], 78-88.) Only one word of his dithyrambs remains, *PMG* 775 Φθιῶτα.

On Philoxenus' most famous poem, *Cyclops or Galatea* and its genre, see 1.5. Some other small fragments of Philoxenus have survived but their genres are unknown.

Telestes of Selinus, another dithyrambic poet, is also reported to have written δράματα (Suda s.v. Τελέστης). These, too, may have been dithyrambs: the few surviving contents of the Ἀργώ are compatible with the genre, describing Athena and the flute (*PMG* 805a-c) including praise of the art of the flute (805c ἀν κυνεριθοτάταν Βρομίῳ παρέδωκε σεμνάς / δαίμονος ἀερόεν πνεῦμ' αἰολοπτέρυγον / σὺν ἀγλαᾶν ὠκύτατι χειρῶν, 'which the uplifted breath of the august goddess, joined with the swiftness of her flashing fingers that quivered like wings, gave over to Bromius to be his most faithful handmaid' [transl. Loeb]); of the Ἀσκληπιός a fragment about the playing of the αὐλός remains (*PMG* 806) and a short notice about a mythical event (*PMG* 807 τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν δ' ὑπὸ Διὸς κε[ραυνῶ]θῆναι γεγ[άφασιν ...] καὶ ὁ τ[ᾶ] Ναυ[πάκτια ποι[ήσας] καὶ Τελέστης Ἀσκληπιῶν, 'they wrote that Asclepius was hit by lightning by Zeus ... both the author of the *Naupactia* and Telestes in his *Asclepius*'). *PMG* 808 is identified as a dithyramb by Ath. 14, 637a and describes the μάγαδις, a string instrument. *PMG* 810 may have been from a dithyramb because of its contents: πρῶτοι παρὰ κρατῆρας Ἑλλάνων ἐν αὐλοῖς / κυνοπαδοὶ Πέλοπος Μαιτρὸς ὀρείας / Φρύγιον ἄεισαν νόμον / τοῖ δ' ὄξυφώνοις πηκτίδων ψαλμοῖς κρέκον / Λύδιον ὕμνον, 'the first to sing the Phrygian strains in honour of the Mountain Mother, amid the flutes beside the mixing-bowls of the Greeks, were they who came in the company of Pelops; and the Greeks struck up the Lydian hymn with the high-pitched twanging of the lyre' (transl. Loeb).

Timotheus wrote a dithyramb entitled Ἑλπήνωρ (*PMG* 779). His Σκύλλα was probably also a dithyramb, but only one corrupt line of it has survived (cf. *PMG* 794 τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν διθυράμβων ὅμοια τοῖς ἐπίδεικτικοῖς· διὰ δὲ καὶ τεὰ δῶρα φεῖτατ Σκύλλα', 'for those of dithyrambs resemble epideictic exordia: "for thee and thy presents or (?) Skylla"' [transl. Loeb]). His nomos are reported to have had a dithyrambic style (Plu. *de Mus.* 1132d-e τοὺς γοῦν πρώτους νόμους ἐν ἔπεισι διαμιγνύων διθυραμβικὴν λέξιν ἦιδεν, ὅπως μὴ εὐθύς φανῆι παρανομῶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν μουσικὴν, '(Timotheus) sang his first nomos in heroic hexameters, with a mixture of the diction of the dithyramb, in order not to display at the start any violation of the laws of ancient music' [transl. Loeb]). This category includes the Persians (*PMG* 788-791, see T.H. Janssen, *Timotheus. Persae. A Commentary*, Amsterdam 1984) and perhaps also the Artemis (*PMG* 778 θυιάδα φοιβάδα

μαινάδα λυccάδα) and the Cyclops (e.g. *PMG* 780 ἔγχευε δ' ἔν μὲν δέπας κίccι-
νον μελαίνας / σταγόνοc ἀμβρόταc ἀφρῶι βρυάζον / εἴκοcιν δὲ μέτρ' ἐνέχευ',
ἀνέμιcγε / δ' αἶμα Βακχίουc νεορρῦτοιcιν / δακρῦοιcιν Νυμφᾶν, 'into it he poured
one ivy-wood cup of red drops ambrosial, bubbling with foam; then he poured
in twenty measures, and mingled together the blood of the Bacchic god with fresh-
flowing tears of the Nymphs' [transl. Loeb]).

For more extensive collections of dithyrambs and their poets see C. Del Grande, *Ditirambografi: Testimonianze e Frammenti*, Napoli 1947; D.F. Sutton, *Dithyrambographi Graeci*, Hildesheim/München/Zürich 1989.

1.8. Conclusion

The available evidence for the development of the dithyramb is meagre. There are hardly any actual poems left, neither of the early nor of the New Dithyramb, so that the dithyrambs of Pindar can only be compared with those of Bacchylides. The testimonies we have, seem to indicate that the dithyramb developed from an informal revel-song to a more formalized poem which was rehearsed and performed at official festivals. Between this early dithyramb and the New Dithyramb which is described as overstepping the boundaries of the genre, Pindar can be considered the supreme representative of the formal dithyramb, adhering closely to the traditional subject-matter and employing an elevated style. Bacchylides let himself be less strictly influenced by the rules of the genre and already marks the beginning of the New Dithyramb. The position of Lasus in this historical sketch, however, is uncertain. Innovations in musical accompaniment and rhythm are not only ascribed to Melanippides and other poets of the New Dithyramb, but also to Lasus. Whether Lasus created order in an anarchical situation or was an innovator along the lines of the New Dithyramb, is unknown (see 1.3), because we know too little of the music and rhythm of the period. It is possible that innovations of Lasus evoked reactions (perhaps reflected in Pratin. *PMG* 708) which caused a return to a more formal stage of the genre, but it is equally reasonable to suggest that a unification of the musical practices and theories offered a basis for the elevated dithyrambs of Pindar.

2. THE DITHYRAMBS OF PINDAR

2.1. *Contents*

The fragments of Pindar's Dithyrambs deal for a large part with Dionysus (as the god of the dithyramb) and his history (fr. 85; 85a), descriptions of his worship (fr. 70b, 6-23), related deities (Cybele fr. 70b, 9; fr. 80) and rites (Eleusis fr. 346). Worth individual mention are hymnic features such as invocations (fr. 70b, 31?; fr. 70c, 9?), genealogical information (fr. 70b, 27-32; fr. 75, 11-12), and the epithets (fr. 75, 9-10). These hymnic features are also transferred to other gods: the Olympians (fr. 75, 1-9), Ἀλαλά (fr. 78) and probably to Cybele (fr. 80). Here we must also count the references to the actual situation of performance (fr. 70a, 11; fr. 70b, 7 καί; fr. 70c, 16-17; fr. 75, 16-19) and the mention of spring time (fr. 70c, 19; fr. 70d[c], 2-3?; fr. 75, 6; 13-15).

Mythical narratives form an integral part of this genre of choral lyric (see 1.1): cf. fr. 70a, 15ff; fr. 70b (as the title suggests); fr. 249a; fr. 346; fr. 70c, 22 (according to Bury); fr. 70d, 13-17; 31-43; fr. 70d(a); fr. 70d(b)?; fr. 70d(f); fr. 70d(g); fr. 70d(h)?; frs. 72-74. It is likely that the myth was in some way connected with the city, thereby giving the poet a chance to make the citizens feel themselves proud of their city.

Praise of the city for which the poem is made is frequent. This may be done by means of favourable descriptions or epithets (fr. 70a, 7 μεγάλῳ; 11 εὐ]δαιμόνω; fr. 70b, 26; fr. 70c, 9-10; fr. 70d[c], 6-9; fr. 70d[h], 4-5?; fr. 75, 4-5; fr. 76; fr. 77) or by reference to their history (fr. 70a, 1-10; fr. 70b, 27-30). The latter may overlap with the category of mythical narrative if it is related extensively.

The art of poetry and the poet himself are mentioned in fr. 70a, 11-15; fr. 70b, 1-5; 23-26; fr. 75, 7-9; fr. 86a.

In the extant fragments there are no certain gnomic sentences. We may think of fr. 70d, 45 and/or 46 and perhaps of fr. 70d, 18ff. The text is, however, too fragmentary to be sure. Perhaps we must count fr. 81 here too.

2.2. *Metre*

The fragmentary state of most of Pindar's dithyrambs makes it difficult to draw any conclusions about their metre. Fr. 70b consists of fairly regular dactylo-epitrites. Fr. 75 consists of a combination of iambic and other metres, and similar cola can be recognized in fr. 70a and fr. 70d, although the fact that we do not

always have the beginning or the end of a line must be reason for caution. The lack of a corresponding (anti)strophe in particular makes it impossible to make a satisfactory metrical analysis of fr. 75. As it is, we have a mixture of different metres (see on fr. 75 *Metre*). This may have been so bewildering that it led Horace to say that Pindar in his dithyrambs 'numeris ... fertur lege solutis' (*Od.* 4, 2, 11-12). Cf. also Ps. *Censorinus De musica* 9 (Pindarus) *qui liberos etiam numeros modis edidit*. The interpretation of the unbound 'numeri' is hindered by our lack of knowledge concerning the extent of Horace's and his contemporaries' understanding of Pindar's metrics. We must assume that strophic responson was recognizable, so that it cannot refer to astrophic poems, because strophic responson is found in at least two of Pindar's dithyrambs (fr. 70a and fr. 70b). If we assume that Horace understood the metrical structure of Pindar's poetry, the unbound 'numeri' must refer to the metrical liberties which Pindar allowed himself within the different metres. This is consistent with the opinion of the scholiast: 'ergo in hoc lex pedum non quaeritur et syllabarum, sed quali sono vocis dityrambi et quali rithmo cantentur. aut lege solutos dixit, quia in hoc metro licet variare, et non in eodem metro perdurare' (Σ *Hor. Od.* 4, 2, 11 [1, p. 329 Keller]). It also fits with the much simpler and more polished rhythm of Horace's poetry, which is more like the monodic poems of Sappho and Alcaeus. See P. Steinmetz, *Horaz und Pindar. Hor. carm. IV 2, Gymnasium* 71 (1964), 1-17.

2.3. Style

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Comp.* 22) quotes fr. 75, the only decent-sized dithyrambic fragment known until the papyri with dithyramb fragments were found, as an example of the austere style. Characteristic of the austere style are

- a. long words with long syllables, suggesting a majestic pace (*Comp.* 22, 148 $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma \tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \delta\iota\alpha\beta\epsilon\beta\eta\kappa\omicron\varsigma\iota\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\varsigma\iota\upsilon\varsigma \omega\varsigma \tau\acute{\alpha} \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \mu\eta\kappa\upsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \phi\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota$: τὸ γὰρ εἰς βραχείας συλλαβὰς συνάγεσθαι πολέμιον αὐτῆι, πλὴν εἴ ποτε ἀνάγκη βιάζοιτο, 'it is prone for the most part to expansion by means of great spacious words. It objects to being confined to short syllables, except under occasional stress of necessity' [transl. W. Rhys Roberts]);
- b. an arrangement of the words which makes each word stand apart by itself (*Comp.* 22, 148 $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \tau\acute{\alpha} \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \acute{\alpha}\sigma\phi\alpha\lambda\omega\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma \lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu \iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma, (...) \acute{\alpha}\iota\sigma\theta\eta\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma \delta\iota\epsilon\iota\rho\gamma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha'$ τραχείαις τε χρῆσθαι πολλαχῆι καὶ ἀντιτύποις ταῖς συμβολαῖς οὐδὲν αὐτῆι διαφέρει, 'it requires that the words should be like columns firmly planted and placed in strong positions (...) being separated by perceptible intervals. It does not in the least shrink from using

frequently harsh sound-clashings which jar on the ear' [transl. W. Rhys Roberts]); c. majestic rhythms without artful symmetry and smoothness (*Comp.* 22, 148-149 ἐπιτηδεύει καὶ τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς τοὺς ἀξιωματικοὺς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεῖς, ... φύσει τ' εὐοκῆναι μᾶλλον αὐτὰ βούλεται ἢ τέχνη, 'it pursues ... also impressive and stately rhythms, ... It wishes them to suggest nature rather than art' [transl. W. Rhys Roberts]);

d. syntactical irregularities (*Comp.* 22, 150 ἀγχιέτροφός (v.l. ἀντίρροπός) ἔστι περὶ τὰς πτώσεις, ποικίλη περὶ τοὺς σχηματισμούς, ὀλιγοσύνδεσμος, ἀναρθρος, ἐν πολλοῖς ὑπεροπτική τῆς ἀκολουθίας, 'the arrangement in question is marked by flexibility in its use of the cases, variety in the employment of figures, few connectives; it lacks articles, it often disregards natural sequence' [transl. W. Rhys Roberts]).

For an extensive résumé of *Comp.* 22, see Pohl 1968, 50-56.

Dionysius discusses *b* only, but it is interesting to look into all the characteristics of the austere style.

a. If Dionysius wants great and spacious words he may think of the eight rather long compound words of fr. 75 (3 πολύβατος, 5 πανδαίδαλος, 6 ἰόδετος, ἑαρίδροπος, 9 κισσοδάης, 10 ἐριβάας, 14 φοινικοέανος, 19 ἐλικάμπυξ). The problem is that for the most part these words have short syllables, which is uncharacteristic of the austere style.

b. Dionysius discusses the word arrangement of fr. 75, 1-8 in detail (*Comp.* 22, 155-162). His main argument is that the difficulty of pronunciation makes the words stand apart: combinations of letters that are produced in different parts of the mouth (ἐν χορόν), hiatus ('Ολύμπιοι, ἐπί, θυόεντα ἐν, ἀγλαΐαι ἴδετε) and combinations of consonants (κλυτάν) which are difficult to pronounce and which, moreover, make the syllable longer than an ordinary short (such as λυτάν) Cf. also at l. 5 πανδαίδαλόν τ' εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν and at l. 6 στεφάνων τᾶν τ' ἑαριδρόπων, where τ' εὐ-, -ων and τᾶν are considerably longer than the average. It is unclear whether these observations are purely theoretical, or that the audience indeed noticed such peculiarities of arrangement.

c. The rhythm of fr. 75 is iambic with much variation. The iambus is considered οὐκ ἀγενής (cf. D.H. *Comp.* 17, 106), although not so majestic as e.g. the spondaeus or the dactyl. The frequency of resolution into $\text{—} \sim \text{—}$ makes the rhythm even less stately. The uneven length of the periods (see Zimmermann 1988b, 40-43) conforms to the goal of the austere style to avoid artful symmetry and so seem unstudied.

d. The flexibility in the use of cases is difficult to judge, because the standard usage is unknown. With variety in the employment of figures is meant 'der eigentümliche Gebrauch der Wortformen und außergewöhnlicher Satzkonstruk-

tionen' (Pohl 1968, 188). We find *ἐν* with the accusative at l. 1, the position of *οἱ τ'* at l. 3, repetition of *τὸν* and *τότε* at ll. 10 and 16 respectively, the majestic plural at ll. 11-12, a neuter plural noun with a plural verb at l. 15, *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν* at ll. 16, 18 and 19, and *οἰχνέω* is constructed twice with an accusative instead of a preposition. The use of conjunctions is remarkable: we only find *τε* (ll. 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19). The article is also used quite sparingly (4, 6, 9). Finally, the disregard of the natural sequence can be seen in the separation of noun and adjective (2 *κλυτὰν ... χάριν*, 3 *πολύβατον ... ὄμφαλόν* etc.), the tmesis of 2 *ἐπί ... πέμπετε*, the late position of 8 *ἴδετε*, the subject-object reversal at l. 17. See also the examples of *ποικιλία περὶ τοὺς σχηματισμούς* mentioned above. Applying Dornseiff's remarks and examples about asymmetry (1921, 103-109) to fr. 75 we note at ll. 3-5 the use of a circumscription (*ἄστεος ὄμφαλόν*) beside a concrete name (*ἀγοράν*), at l. 6 *στεφάνων* without an article and *δοιδᾶν* with an article, at ll. 11-12 *πατέρων - γυναικῶν* (where *ματέρων* would have provided the exact symmetry) and the chiasmic position of *ὑπάτων* and *Καδμείᾶν*. See also J.W. Poultney, Non-concinnity in Pindar, *AJPh* 108 (1987), 1-8.

Without being native speakers of ancient Greek, it is difficult for us to judge Dionysius' views for ourselves. We can only compare his examples with other poets and poems. Taking e.g. Bacchylides we notice:

a. The number of compound words does not seem to be typical of fr. 75 and we must assume that Bacchylides also wrote in the austere style, since the vocabulary of e.g. B. 15 (= dith. 1) also has long words (43 *δεξιέτρατος*, 48 *Πλεισθεΐδας*, *θελεΐετής*, 49 *εὔπεπλος*, 50 *ἀρτίφιλος* etc.). Bacchylides shows an even greater tendency than Pindar to use compound words, cf. B. 3, 1 *Ἀριστόκαρπος*, 2 *Ἰοστέφανος*, 3 *γλυκύδαρος*, *Ὀλυμπιοδρόμος*, 6 *εὐρυδίνας* etc.

b. For difficult consonant combinations in Bacchylides cf. B. 15, 42 *ἀόλλιζον*, 43 *δεξιέτρατον*, 45 *ἀνίχχοντες χέρας*, etc.; B. 3, 1. *Σικελίας κρέουσαν*, 2 *Δ[ά]ματρον Ἰοστέφανον*, etc. The smooth style avoids hiatus within its periods, but not between them. Hiatus between the lines is, therefore, distinctive of neither the austere nor the smooth style (*Comp.* 23, 179-180).

c. The rhythms of B. 3 and B. 15 also conform to Dionysius' preference for stately, but seemingly unpolished and natural rhythms.

d. B. 15 has one article, and is generally similar to the Pindaric fragment: adjectives separated from their nouns, asyndeton in 47 and 48, no predicate in 51-52, etc. Note the repetition in B. 3, 15-16, 21.

On the one hand Simonides is called one of the representatives of the smooth style (*Comp.* 23, 173), but on the other hand Simon. *PMG* 543 is quoted as an example of how verse can resemble prose (*Comp.* 26, 221-223). At *Comp.* 22, 148-149 Dionysius expounded about the austere style: *οὔτε πάρισα βούλεται τὰ κῶλα*

ἀλλήλοισ εἶναι οὔτε παρόμοια οὔτε ἀναγκαῖαι δουλεύοντα ἀκολουθίαι, ἀλλ' εὐγενῆ καὶ λαμπρὰ καὶ ἐλεύθερα, φύσει τ' εὐοικέναι μᾶλλον αὐτὰ βούλεται ἢ τέχνη, καὶ κατὰ πάθος λέγεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ κατ' ἦθος. περιόδους δὲ συντιθέναι συναπαρτιζούσας ἑαυταῖς τὸν νοῦν τὰ πολλὰ μὲν οὐδὲ βούλεται, 'it tries to make its clauses not parallel in structure or sound, nor slaves to a rigid sequence, but noble, brilliant, free. It wishes them to suggest nature rather than art, and to stir emotion rather than to reflect character. And as to periods, it does not, as a rule, even attempt to compose them in such a way that the sense of each is complete in itself' (transl. W. Rhys Roberts). It seems that such objectives are similar to those of verse which strives to resemble prose, so that Simonides seems to fit with the austere style, too:

a. For compound words in Simon. *PMG* 543 cf. e.g. 5 ἀδιάντος, 10 χαλκεόγομος, 11 νυκτιλαμπής.

b. The same fragment of Simonides illustrates quite well the use of 'difficult' letter combinations (e.g. 8 ἄωτεις, γαλαθηνῶν, 9 κροῶσεις, 12 δνόφων).

c. Simon. *PMG* 543 is explicitly praised for its rhythm (*Comp.* 26, 221-223).

d. Simon. *PMG* 543 is syntactically fairly regular: nouns and adjectives mostly together, more particles and connectives than in Pi. fr. 75, no irregularities in σχηματισμός. It has, however, no articles at all.

Taking Sapph. fr. 1 Voigt, Dionysius' example of the smooth style, we do notice the differences:

Ποικιλόθρον' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφρόδιτα,
 παῖ Δίῳς δολιόπλοκε, λίσσομαί σε,
 μή μ' ἄσαισι μηδ' οὔναισι δάμνα,
 πόνυια, θῦμιμον,
 5 ἀλλὰ τυῖδ, ἔλιθ', αἶ ποτα κάτέρωπα
 τὰς ἔμας ἀύδας αἰοῖσα πῆλοι
 ἔκλυες, πάτροις δὲ δόμον λίποισα
 χιρύσιον ἤλθιες
 ἄρμ' ὑπαδεῖξαισα· κάλοι δέ σ' ἄγον
 10 ὤκεες στροῦιθοι περὶ γᾶς μελαίνας
 πύκνα δίνυνεντες πτέρ' ἀπ' ὠράνω αἴθε-
 ροις διὰ μέσσω·
 αἶψα δ' ἐξέκοιντο· σὺ δ', ὦ μάκαιρα,
 μειδιαίριαις ἀθανάτωι προσώπωι
 15 ἦρθε' ὅττι δηῦτε πέποιθα κῶπτι
 δηῦτε κιάλγημιμι
 κῶπτι μοι μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι
 μαινόλαι ἰθύμωι· τίνα δηῦτε πείθω

- 20 .ι. ράγην ἔς ἄν φιλότατα; τίς ε' ὦ
 Ψα,πφ' ἰάδικησι;
 καὶ γὰρ αἰ φεύγει, ταχέως διώξει,
 αἰ δὲ δῶρα μὴ δέκετ', ἀλλὰ δώσει,
 αἰ δὲ μὴ φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει
 κοῦκ ἐθέλοισα.
- 25 ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, χαλέπαν δὲ λῦσον
 ἐκ μερίμναν, ὄσσα δέ μοι τέλεσσαι
 θῦμος ἰμέρρει, τέλεσον, σὺ δ' αὐτά
 σύμμαχος ἔσσο.

a. Except for the hymnic address using long words at ll. 1-2 we find no compounds (ἀθανάτω at l. 14 is so common that I do not count it).

b. In comparison there are fewer consonant combinations. The many cases where vowels stood together, are almost all resolved by crasis and elision.

c. The rhythm is very clearly polished: seven short strophes, all with the same metre: cr. ^hipp. | cr. ^hipp. | cr. ^gl ^pher.

d. The syntax is regular, most nouns and adjectives are closely together. We find more different conjunctions than in the choral lyrics: ἀλλά (l. 5); αἶ ποτα (l. 5); δέ (ll. 3 [μῆδ'], 7, 9, 13 [twice], 22, 23, 26, 27), καὶ (ll. 15, 17); καὶ γάρ (l. 21).

This means that even for us the distinct styles of composition of Pi. fr. 75 and Sapph. fr. 1 are recognizable.

According to Dionysius the austere style is typical of Pindar in general, without dividing his poems into genres. It has also been argued that dithyrambs have a style of their own. Some of the peculiarities of fr. 75 are seen as typical of the 'dithyrambic style' by Seaford 1977/78, 81-94, esp. 88: the cases of *σχημα Πινδαρικόν*, the many elaborately compound epithets, the frequency and aggregation of the epithets and the cases of repetition. Considering our earlier discussion of the characteristics of the austere style and the comparison with Simonides and Bacchylides, it seems that only the *σχημα Πινδαρικόν* and other syntactical peculiarities are typical of Pindar's dithyrambs. All other features are also found in Bacchylides and Simonides.

This implies that Horace exaggerates when he says (*Pindarus*) *seu per audaces nova dithyrambos / verba devolvit numerisque fertur / lege solutis* (*Od.* 4, 2): Pindar is like a torrent (*devolvit, fertur*, cf. also l. 5-8 *monte decurrens velut amnis, imbres / quem super notas aluere ripas, / fervet immensusque ruit profundo / Pindarus ore*), composing audacious dithyrambs, with new words and a metre without any laws. Cf. also Quint. *Inst. Orat.* 10, 1, 61 *Novem vero lyricorum longe Pindarus princeps spiritu, magnificentia, sententiis, figuris, beatissima rerum verborumque copia et velut quodam eloquentiae flumine: propter quae Horatius eum merito nemini credit*

imitabilem. In interpreting Horace's judgment about Pindar's dithyrambs and his emphasis on the new words and the unbound '*numeri*', we must keep in mind that in this ode Horace stresses the difference between Pindar and himself (4, 2, 25-32). Poetic exaggeration is likely, see E. Fraenkel, *Horace*, Oxford 1957, 435. There are new words in the Dithyramb fragments, e.g. εὐάμπυξ (fr. 70a, 13), ῥιψαύχην (fr. 70b, 13), but their number must not be taken as the only criterium: some of those words may also have occurred in the lost poems of Pindar or other poets; and some are rather simple variations on known words (e.g. fr. 75, 5 πανδαίδαλος from πολυδαίδαλος). Cf. the remark of the scholiast on Horace: '*nova: aut admiranda, aut ab eo inventa*'.

The elevated tone of Pindar's dithyrambs (Gal. X p. 12 Kühn ἢ τίνος μελοποιού (εὐπορήσομεν) κατὰ Πίνδαρον ἄικοντος ὑψηλῶς ἐν διθυράμβοις ὡς πάλαι τὸν Διόνυσον, οὕτως νῦν τὸν Θεσσαλόν;, 'or which poet, singing in an elevated style as Pindar sang of Dionysus in his dithyrambs, can we use now to sing of Thessalos?' cf. also Prop. 3, 17, 39-40 *haec ego non humili referam memoranda coturno, / qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat*) is unmistakable. It is an effect of the new words (see above), of the unusual combinations (e.g. fr. 70b, 12 ἐρίγδουποι στοναχαί; fr. 78, 2 ἐγγέων προοίμιον) and of the hymnic elements (see 2.1). These features are, however, more typical of *all* Pindar's poetry than particularly of his dithyrambs. Therefore Galenus' ὑψηλῶς probably implies a contrast with later dithyramb poets, not with Pindar's other poems: Pindar is mentioned specifically as a counterpart of the New Dithyrambic poets, as a representative of the 'good old days' (Plu. *de Mus.* 1142b-c = Aristox. fr. 76 Wehrli; Phil. *de Mus.* 1, fr. 18,6 p. 9 Kemke).

2.4. Performance

We may assume that the dithyrambs of Pindar were performed at dionysiac festivals, because the references to dithyrambs in festivals for other deities, notably at the Apolline Thargelia, are all from classical times and therefore not applicable to Pindar: Antiph. 6, 11 (ca. 412); Lysias 21, 1-2 (403-402); *IG* 1138-1139 (403-402); Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 56, 3 (328-325).

If we suppose that fr. 70a is part of a dithyramb composed for Argos, the most likely festival would be the Agr(i)ania, because it is the only Dionysiac festival in Argos of which we know. It is mentioned as 'Αγράνια or as 'Αγριάνια. Cf. Hesch. *s.v.* 'Αγριάνια: νεκύκια παρὰ 'Αργείοις. καὶ ἀγῶνες ἐν Θήβαις, 'death festival in Argos, also contests in Thebes'; *s.v.* 'Αγράνια: εορτὴ ἐν 'Αργεὶ ἐπὶ μιᾷ τῶν Προΐτου θυγατέρων, 'festival in Argos for one of the daughters of Proetus'.

It is commonly assumed that these two entries refer to one festival. The connection of this Argive festival with Dionysus is based on the combination of the two Hesychian descriptions: Dionysus punished the Proetids with insanity for their resistance to his cult, and the death festival is the counterpart of the Athenian Anthesteria, where Dionysus is the main deity. Moreover, the Agr(i)ania are considered to be the same festival as the Agrionia, a Dionysiac festival in several Greek places, especially in Boeotia (see W. Burkert, *Homo necans*, Berlin/New York 1972, 189-200, esp. 194; see also Nilsson 1906 (r1957), 271-274; Burkert 1977, 254-257, 341, 433).

Of the two Dionysiac festivals known in Thebes either one may have been the scene of fr. 70b. We know of the Agr(i)ania: Hesch. s.v. Ἀγριάνια ... καὶ ἀγῶνες ἐν Θήβαις. It is not known what these ἀγῶνες were, but they may have been musical contests including dithyrambic choruses. For the dionysiac character of the Agr(i)ania, see above. The other festival is the Λύκιοι τελεταί· αἱ Διονύσου: Photius, Suda s.v. Λύκιοι τελεταί. According to Paus. 9, 16, 6 this festival was held once every year in remembrance of Dionysus' help in setting free some Theban soldiers from Thracian captors. On the day of the festival the sanctuary of Dionysus was opened and two statues could be seen, one of which represented Semele, as Pausanias reports the Thebans as saying. There may, however, have been another festival in Thebes which may have provided the scene for the performance of our Dithyramb, in a setting similar to that of the annual night festival of Dionysus Βακχεῖος and Λύκος in Sicyon. Here the statues of both deities were carried to the temple, accompanied by burning torches and singing (Paus. 2, 7, 5). For a further explanation of this festival, see Nilsson 1906 [r 1957], 300-302. The proceedings of this festival sound quite similar to the Bacchic scene in fr. 70b.

Dithyrambs in Athens were usually performed at the City Dionysia, although circular choruses are also attested for other festivals (see I.6). We have, however, no literary references to dithyrambic performances at the Anthesteria. It is, therefore, virtually certain that the dithyramb of which fr. 75 is the beginning, was sung at the City Dionysia, since the other festivals where dithyrambs were performed, are not in the spring (see Zimmermann 1988b, 168 n. 20). This must be explicitly stated, because there has been some discussion about a possible performance at the Anthesteria. K. Friis Johansen, *Eine Dithyrambosaufführung. Arkeol.-Kunsthist. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selskap* 42 (1959), 3-42 discusses a Copenhagen bell crater of the Cleophon Painter (c. 425 B.C.) and identifies the scene as a dithyrambic chorus consisting of five singers and a flute player. These characters are grouped around an object which Friis Johansen thinks is a Maypole. A similar object is seen on a New York *chous* (dated in c. 450 B.C. by G. van Hoorn, *Choes*

and *Anthesteria*, Leiden 1951, 159, or in c. 400 B.C. by L. Deubner, *Dionysos und die Anthesterien*, *JDAI* 42 [1927], 179). The scene on this *chous* has been interpreted as a parody of the Wedding of Dionysus and the Basilinna, a ceremony at the Anthesteria. Connecting these two vase paintings because of the Maypole depicted on both, Friis Johansen concludes that there were dithyrambic performances at the Anthesteria, and further maintains that Pi. fr. 75 was one of the dithyrambs composed for and performed at this festival. This interpretation is followed by T.B.L. Webster in *Pickard-Cambridge* 1962², 37-38, by E. Simon, *Ein Anthesterien-Skyphos des Polygnotos*, *AK* 6 (1963), 20 and by H.W. Parke, *Festivals of Athens*, London 1977, plate 44.

It is, however, unlikely that the scene of the New York *chous* is a wedding procession, since the necessary attributes (torches and veil) are missing and since the bride was not accompanied by the bridegroom himself, as would be the case if the characters on the *chous* are identified as Dionysus and the Basilinna (A. Rumpf, *Attische Feste - Attische Vasen*, *BJ* 161 [1961], 210-211). It is probably a representation of the escorting back to the theatre of the statue of Dionysus Eleuthereus, in which the *epheboi* took a leading part (E. Buschor, *Ein choregisches Denkmal*, *MDAI[A]* 53 [1928], 98 n. 1; see also *Pickard-Cambridge* 1962², 59-61). The fact that the New York *chous* does not refer to the Anthesteria, makes the interpretation of the Copenhagen bell crater as a representation of the Anthesteria doubtful too, because it depended on the picture of the Maypole which they had in common. It is certainly better to interpret the Copenhagen crater too as representing a dithyrambic chorus at the City Dionysia (see A. Greifenhagen, *Ein Satyrspiel des Aischylos?* Berlin [Winckelmannsprogramm 118], 1963, 5; M. Schmidt, *Dionysien*, *AK* 10 [1967], 80; H. Froning, *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen*, Würzburg 1971, 27-28; E. Simon, *Festivals of Athens*, Madison, Wisconsin 1983, 98-99).

The poem itself suggests the Dionysia rather than the Anthesteria because 15 εὐόδμων and 17 ῥόδα are more appropriate for the end of March than of February: there may be some spring flowers in February, but not enough to make the air fragrant and probably not yet any roses (see also Puech 1923, 151 n. 1). At l. 6, λοδέτων ... στεφάνων also point to the Dionysia (see my note *ad loc.*).

2.5. The text of the dithyrambs

The Alexandrine scholars collected Pindar's dithyrambs in two books (*Vit. Ambr.* I, 3, 6 Dr.). Of those two books only one large fragment was known (fr. 75) until the editions of *P. Oxy.* 1604 in 1919 and *P. Oxy.* 2445 in 1961 added frs. 70a-c and

fr. 70d (and 31 smaller fragments) respectively. Other smaller fragments and testimonies were known from citations by other authors, but our main body of knowledge comes from the papyri.

2.5.1. *P. Oxy. 1604*

B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XIII*, London 1919, 27-45, Plate I (editio princeps).

J. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar, including the Principal Fragments*, Cambridge, Mass. 1919² (r 1968), 558-561 (fr. 1, col. II).

K.F.W. Schmidt, *GGA* 184 (1922), 87-99, esp. 90-92 (fr. 1, col. II).

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922, 341-345.

O. Schroeder, *Pindari Carmina*, Leipzig 1923², frs. 70b, a, c.

A. Puech, *Pindare. Tome IV. Isthmiques et Fragments*, Paris 1923, 142-150 (dith. 1-3).

A. Körte, *Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen*, *APF* 7 (1924), 114-160, esp. 134-136 (fr. 1 col. II, 1-18).

C.M. Bowra, *Pindari Carmina*, Oxford 1947² (r 1968), frs. 60-62.

A. Turyn, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Oxford 1952, frs. 89, 86, 70.

H. Maehler, *Pindarus. Pars II. Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1989, frs. 70a-c (revised edition of B. Snell-H. Maehler, 1975⁴).

The papyrus is kept in the Papyrology Rooms of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.

P. Oxy. 1604 was published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1919. They describe the first hand as 'a medium-sized, rather square and sloping uncial' (p. 29) and assign the papyrus to a period before 200 A.D. The title was apparently added by a later hand, in cursive writing. The marginal readings in fr. 1, col. II, 8, 18, 19 are probably by a third hand, not cursive. The alterations in 27, a strangely formed α in very thick ink, and in fr. 2, 9 are different again. Most reading signs seem to be due to the original hand. Especially fr. 2 has been considerably corrected, but a few mistakes have been left in the text: fr. 1 col. II, 9 τυμπάνων, 13 τε όρίνεται, ύψαύχει, 21 βακχείαις, 22 χορευούσαις must all be corrected, for metrical reasons or because the form is not Pindaric (χορευούσαις).

Col. I contains fragments of 39 lines and does not show the beginning nor the end of the column. The scholium in 20 refers to έάν wrongly inserted from the antistrophe, almost certainly from 34. The endings of the few words that we can read in lines 25-38 correspond to 11-24, which would make 11-24 the strophe and 25-38 the antistrophe. Long columns seem to vary in length from 35 to 50 lines (see E.G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Oxford 1971, reprinted as *BICS Supplement* 46, 1987, e.g. Plates 14 [*Iliad*], 23 [Pindar, *Olympian Odes*], 31 [Euripides, *Hypsipyle*]). Assuming that 38 is near the end of the poem,

we conclude that 1-10 are then of the penultimate epode and that the final epode is lost. This means that the epode is at least 10 lines long, which makes the column at least 48 lines.

On the other hand we must not exclude the possibility that fr. 70a was continued in col. II, since fr. 70b does not seem to begin at the top of the column: what is left of col. II begins three lines below the first line of col. I. Col. II contains (fragments of) 34 lines and shows the beginning of a dithyramb: indicated in the margin by a coronis, the title and the name of the city for which it was composed, and by the remains of the text itself which is known from citations (see further *ad loc.*).

Fragment 2 has parts of 26 lines. None of these is complete.

2.5.2. *P. Berol. 9571v*

W. Schubart, Über den Dithyrambus, *APF* 14 (1941), 24-29 (editio princeps).

D. Del Corno, *P. Berol. 9571 verso über den Dithyrambos. Akten XIII. Intern. Papyrologenkongr. Marburg/Lahn 1971*, München 1974, 99-110.

The papyrus is kept in the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin.

P. Berol. 9571 verso was published in 1941 by Schubart. The recto contains two columns of a document, and between and below those columns a treatise about the days of the Odyssey. The handwriting of this literary text is the same as that of the text on the verso side, described by Schubart as a 'persönliche Hand' (p. 24). The papyrus is assigned to the beginning of the third century A.D. The verso text contains a treatise about the dithyramb, including quotations. The quotations begin two or three letters more to the left than the rest of the text.

Personal inspection of the papyrus showed that in 49 a small piece of the papyrus had disappeared which Schubart apparently had read. That small piece, containing the letters $\gamma\chi$, is visible on the photograph that I received before my visit to Berlin, but is there placed two lines higher, before $\tau\epsilon\ \delta\rho\phi$. It also shows the letters ρ above $\gamma\chi$. They must have belonged to $\pi\alpha\gamma\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$ (the traces of the first letter are compatible with the right-hand half of κ), but Schubart did not include them in his transcription. It seems then that Schubart had the small piece at the right place (although it is unclear why he only transcribed the lower half), that afterwards, when the photograph was taken, the piece was mislaid two lines higher, and that later again the piece was removed.

2.5.3. *P. Oxy. 2622*

E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XXXII*, London 1967, 63-65 (editio princeps).

H. Lloyd-Jones, Heracles at Eleusis: *P. Oxy. 2622* and P.S.I. 1391, *Maia* 19 (1967), 206-229.

H. Maehler, *Pindarus. Pars II. Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1989, fr. 346 (revised edition of B. Snell-H. Maehler, 1975⁴).

The papyrus is in the Papyrology Rooms of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.

The hand of *P. Oxy. 2622* is 'an unskilled upright uncial of medium size, which may be dated in the first century'. In a few cases (fr. 1, 3; 5; 10) tremas have been added to a ι, but they 'are oddly made, the dots being formed as dashes and placed beside, not above, the tip of ι to which they impart the appearance of τ' (Lobel 63). Iota adscript is sometimes written (ll. 1, 13) and apparently sometimes omitted (l. 3 and perhaps l. 9).

The *editio princeps* of *PSI 1391* was published by V. Bartoletti, *Papiri Greci e Latini. Vol. XIV*, Firenze 1957, 62-67 (Plate V). The commentary on *P. Oxy. 2622* is found in fr. B col. I, 5-32. *PSI 1391* is reviewed by H. Lloyd-Jones in *Gnomon* 31 (1959), 111-112.

2.5.4. *P. Oxy. 2445*

E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XXVI*, London 1961, 86-101 (editio princeps).

H. Maehler, *Pindarus. Pars II. Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1989, frs. 70d-70d(h) (revised edition of B. Snell-H. Maehler, 1975⁴).

The papyrus is in the Papyrology Rooms of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.

The hand of this papyrus is probably the same as that of *P. Oxy. 1604* (see 2.5.1) and 1788 (Grenfell and Hunt 1922, 47). The contents seem to support this identification (Lobel 1961, 86, see also on fr. 70d *Tradition*). The papyrus is broken off both at the top and at the bottom, so that the length of the columns cannot be determined. They may have been considerably longer than the remains we have, if they were similar to the columns of frs. 70a-b.

Maehler has published the larger fragments only: fr. 1 = fr. 70d, fr. 8 = fr. 70d(g), fr. 15 = fr. 70d(a), fr. 19 = fr. 70d(b), fr. 21c = fr. 70d(c), fr. 23 = fr. 70d(d), fr. 24 = fr. 70d(f), fr. 25 = fr. 70d(e), fr. 27 = fr. 70d(h).

2.5.5. *P. Herc. 247 VI a 17-21*

Herculanensium voluminum quae supersunt collectio altera II, Napoli 1863, 47.

Th. Gomperz, *Philodem über Frommigkeit*, Leipzig 1866, 19.

Th. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci I*, Leipzig 1878⁴, 399.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922, 271 n. 3.

O. Schroeder, *Pindari Carmina*, Leipzig 1923², fr. 80.

A. Puech, *Pindare. Tome IV. Isthmiques et Fragments*, Paris 1923, 208, fr. 15.

C.M. Bowra, *Pindari Carmina*, Oxford 1947² (1968), fr. 77.

A. Turyn, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Oxford 1952, fr. 148.

A. Henrichs, *Toward a New Edition of Philodemus' Treatise On Piety*, *GRBS* 13 (1972), 84-86.

A. Schober, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 18 (1988), 77.

H. Maehler, *Pindarus. Pars II. Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1989, fr. 80 (revised edition of B. Snell- H. Maehler 1975⁴).

The remains of the papyri and the Neapolitan *disegni* are now in the Officina dei Papiri of the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples. The Oxford *disegni* are in the Bodleian Library in Oxford.

The carbonized Herculaneum papyri, containing among others the treatise Περὶ εὐσεβείας of Philodemus, were found in 1752 and cut open because they could not be unrolled. This meant that the order of the columns was lost. Most of the papyri were destroyed in the process of transcription, because every sheet that had been copied had to be removed before the next sheet could be read. In the early nineteenth century *disegnatori* of the Naples Academy made copies (*disegni*) of the papyri. These copies were later engraved in copper plates and published in 1863 in the *Herculanensium Voluminum quae supersunt Collectio Altera, vol. II*. Approximately 800 lines (Pap. 1077 and 1428) were also copied from the original papyrus by John Hayter in 1802 and published in Drummond, *Herculanensia*, London 1810.

Before the *editio princeps* of the whole Περὶ εὐσεβείας by Gomperz in 1866 several scholars had directed their attention to parts of it (see F. Bücheler, *Philodemos Περὶ Εὐσεβείας, Jahrb. f. Phil.* 91 [1865], 513 = *Kleine Schriften* I, 580-581, who discusses the previous suggestions and his own in a commentary on the whole text [513-541 = 580-612]). The edition of Gomperz 'is hardly satisfactory according to modern standards and often almost useless because of its technical shortcomings. In this edition all the passages which did not make sense to Gomperz are printed, as if they were hieroglyphics, in *scriptura continua* and majuscules; whole lines of text are frequently, and one might even say unscrupulously, relegated to the critical apparatus' (Henrichs 1972, 68).

R. Philippon tried to reconstruct the text of the different fragments and to establish which fragments treated the same subjects (*Zu Philodemos Schrift über die Frommigkeit, Hermes* 55 [1920], 225-278; 364-372). This was done more

thoroughly by A. Schober in his dissertation *Philodemi De Pietate. Pars prior*, defended orally on March 1, 1923 (Henrichs 1972, 69 n. 8), but never published until 1988 (*Cronache Ercolanesi* 18 [1988], 67-125). At the moment Albert Henrichs prepares a new edition of the first part of the treatise (see *GRBS* 13 [1972], 67-98). The second part will be edited by Wolfgang Schmid (Henrichs 1972, 69).

The title of the book can be inferred from the words of 1428 col. 15 ὡς τε καὶ τοῦ μέρ[ου]ς τούτου τ[ῆ]ς δ[ι]αι[ρέ]σεως τῆς κατ' ἀ[ρχ]ὰς ἐκτ[ε]θείσης ἀπ[ο]χρώ-
τω[ς] ἐξέ<ι>ργα[ς]μένου κα[ὶ] ἄν εἴ[η] τὸν περ[ὶ] τῆ[ς] εἰ[ς] βεβείας λόγου
τῆς κατ' Ἐπίκουρον αὐτοῦ παραγράφου. This implies that the first part ends here, and that it will be followed by a second part, in which a summary will be given of Epicurean theology. The first part 'deals with the Epicurean criticism of statements about the gods by poets and philosophers' (Henrichs 1972, 68). The Pindaric fragment belongs in this first part.

That Philodemus is the author is corroborated by the avoidance of hiatus and the vocabulary (see Schober 1988, 70).

The papyri contain orthographical mistakes, e.g. the substitution of εἰ for ἰ and vice versa, and assimilation of consonants between words (ἐμ παντί, 247 VII). The division of words is not always consistent. The scribe used several signs to fill up the lines and to indicate the beginning of a new subject. Some blank spaces cannot be explained on grounds of content, so that it must be assumed that the papyrus was at that spot unsuitable for writing (see Schober 1988, 67-69).

2.5.6. *PSI 2, 146*

T. Lodi, *Papiri Greci e Latini. Vol. II*, Firenze 1913, 72-73 (editio princeps).

U. von Wilamowitz-Moelendorff, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922, 134-135 n. 3.

A. Körte, *Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen*, *APF* 7 (1924), 138.

A. Turyn, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, Oxford 1952, fr. 194.

H. Maehler, *Pindarus. Pars II. Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1989, fr. 335 (revised edition of B. Snell- H. Maehler, 1975⁴).

The fragment is described as a 'frammento lirico' from the third century by Lodi. They are 'schmaler Streifen aus einer Buchrolle mit geringen Resten von 10 Versen' (Körte).

P. Oxy. 1604, fr. 1 col. I

]αποδανα[
]νλεγουτων[
]_ουανακτα[
]λειβομενουδ[
 5]_σεπατεραγοργου[
]_κλώπων'πτολιςα[]...τητοσιδιβολδισαυται
]ηνσησαντεςδε...σσαλακαςμ°
]νεναργειμεγαλω[]ηντοςμεταγ'...αι
]ποιζυγεντεσερατ'αιδο...
]υτάβαντος
 10]_εεν']τα εξεισθησανουκυκλωτεςδιονυσιακον
]δαιμωνωνβρομιαδιθιοιναπρεπει
]_ορυφαν
]θέμει'εναμπυκες
]ξετετιμοιςαιθαλοςοιδαν
 15]_αρευχομαι'λεγοντιδεβροτοι
 αι ερκος
]αφυγοντανινκεμελαναλμας
]φορκοιο'συγγονουπατερων' κοράν
]_
]ποντ'εμολον'
 20]_ιανθαν απ[]οσανπερις
]_ωμενοι
]_ιον
] λεγοσπεινμαχον
]

3]. lower tip of vertical stroke, possibly ι, ρ, τ | 4 δ could also be λ | .[the end of α? | 5]. the tip of a stroke coming from below right, probably υ | 6]. upper tip of a horizontal or diagonal stroke, compatible with υ | 7 ..[traces of ink on the top of the line | 8 ... [faint traces of ink | 10]. λ or δ | 12]. upper tip of diagonal or vertical stroke | 15]. end of horizontal stroke | 18]. upper tip of stroke as of ν | 20]. upper tip of vertical stroke | 21]. a corner, like right side of ζ, ρ? | 22 ι might be ρ

Fr. 70a

]απὸ Δανα[
]ν λεγόντων [
]ον ἄνακτα [
]λειβόμενον δ[
 5]υσε πατέρα γοργον[
 Κ]υκλώπων· πτόλις α[
]ν ἐν Ἄργει μεγάλα .. [
]ποὶ ζυγέντες ἐραταὶ δόμον
]ντ' Ἄβαιτος,
 10 —]λεεν.
]δαιμόνων βρομιάδι θοίνοι πρέπει
]κορυφάν
]θέμεν· εὐάμπυκες
]ξετ' ἔτι, Μοῖσαι, θάλος αἰοιδᾶν
 15] γὰρ εὐχομαι. λέγοντι δὲ βροτοὶ
]α φυγόντα νιν καὶ μέλαν ἔρκος ἄλμας
] Φόρκοιο, κύγγουον πατέρων,
]ν
]ποιτ' ἔμολον
 20] .ιαν {ἐάν}
] .ωμενον'
]ιον
]
 —]

Scholia 6 .] ... ἦν τὰ οἰ δι' ὀ οὐ· δι' ὀ αὐτῶν. {ἀ}γνοσήσαντες δὲ το(ῦτο) ὥς καλοικικμοῦ διτος μεταγρ(άφουσι) εἰς οὐ || 10 .τα. ἐξενίσθησαν οἱ Κύκλωπες διονυσιακόν || 17 κορᾶν || 20 απ[.] ο() ἐάν περιε[ῶς] προ(σπεθὲν) ἐξ ἀντιτρο(φου) || 23 λεγόμενον) ἐπ' ἐπίμαχον

1 Δανά[α]ς vel Δανα[α]ῶν vel Δανα[ῶ]ν Grenfell-Hunt 1919 | 2 ἄλλων ? | 5 Γοργόν[ων] Grenfell-Hunt; vel potius γοργόν ? | 8 κόμ]ποὶ Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt | 10 φι]λέεν ? | 11 εὐ]δαιμόνων ? | 12 [ὑμνων] κορυφάν Snell 1975⁴; [λόγων] κορυφάν Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt; utrumque longius spatio, [με] vel [μοι] κορυφάν lacunam expleret | 13 λόγων] potius quam ὑμνων] θέμεν || 14 ἀέ]ξετ' Grenfell-Hunt; ἐπαέ]ξετ' ? | 15 ὑμμι] Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt; τούτο] Snell | 16 Περρέ]α ?

36

FRAGMENT 70A

25

]εραν

]

]

]

]ις

30

]ις

]ασιως

]

]τελειαις

]αν

ΟΚΕΝ ΠΕΡΙΣΣΟΣ

35

] ναιατο

]μανθανατον[

]

] αις

28 traces of ink | 38]. tip, end of diagonal stroke, compatible with λ

25

]εραν

(desunt vv. 3)

30

]ιϛ

]ιϛ

]αϛιωϛ

]

] τελεταῖϛ'

ἐ]άν

35

] . ναῖατο

]μαν θάνατον [

]

]λαιϛ

—

Scholia 34 ὁ κεν περιϛϛός

31 ἀπ]αϛίωϛ Grenfell-Hunt | 34 ἐ]άν cf Σ v. 20

Tradition

The text of *P. Oxy.* 1604 fr. 1, col. I (fr. 70a) is not known from other sources. The *editores principes* felt certain that this text was part of a dithyramb of Pindar, because of the indubitable identification of the adjacent fr. 1, col. II (fr. 70b) (Grenfell-Hunt 1919, 27): Strabo 10, 3, 13 introduces ll. 1-2 with ὁ Πίνδαρος ἐν τῶν διθυράμβων, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή.

Characteristic of Pindar's dithyrambs is the poet's reference to Dionysus or the Dionysiac festival at which the dithyramb was performed, cf. fr. 70b, 6 Βρομίου [τελε]ῖται; 20-21 ὄργαις Βακχίαις; fr. 75, 9-10 τὸν κισσοδαῆ θεόν, / τὸν Βρόμιον, τὸν Ἐριβόαν. Similarly in fr. 70a, 10 Σ we find Διονυσιακόν (although it is not certain to which festival this refers); and at 11, βρομιάδι θοίναι. Βρόμιος occurs three times in Pindar's extant work, once in an epinicion (*N.* 9, 8) and twice, as an epithet of Dionysus, in a dithyramb (fr. 70b, 6; fr. 75, 10); βρομιάς is found only once, at fr. 70a, 11, and is the feminine form of the adjective 'of Bromios', 'Dionysiac'. Although the rate of occurrence is very low, it seems that the adjectives βρόμιος and βρομιάς occur mainly in dithyrambs.

The conclusion must be that there is no real evidence that fr. 70a is a dithyramb fragment, but some of the words and its proximity to fr. 70b (which is certainly a dithyramb) make it very likely that it is.

Contents

In fr. 70a, the mention of a dionysiac gathering and an invocation of the Muses occurs between two parts with mythical contents. The first of these refers to a father, somebody or something of the Cyclopes, a city in Argos and the house of Abas; the second to an escape from the sea and to (the daughters of?) Phorcus. These references seem to point to the legends of Perseus and his forefathers as the subject of this fragment.

This does not necessarily imply (as the *editores principes* suppose, followed by Maehler) that this dithyramb was composed for the Argives. In the epinicia the myth is related to either the games (*O.* 1; 3; 10; *P.* 12; *N.* 9), the victor (*O.* 4; *P.* 1; 2; 3; 6; 8; 10; *I.* 1), his family or ancestry (*O.* 2; 6; 9; *N.* 1), or his city or country (*O.* 7; 8; 13; *P.* 4; 5; 9; *N.* 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 10; *I.* 1; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8). This means that knowing the myth of an epinicion does not necessarily give us a clue as to the identity of the city for which it was composed. In this case there would be more justification for connecting fr. 70a with Argos, because on first thought it seems plausible that in the poems for gods (hymns, paeans, dithyrambs or

prosodia) the myths are more intimately linked with the city for which the song was composed than in the epinicia: in the poems for gods the myth can only be related with the god or the city. It is logical to assume that the myth of a dithyramb will be connected either with the god Dionysus or with the city where it is to be performed.

This argument, though difficult to check because the extant poems are so fragmentary, does not seem quite strong enough. The only poems with titles are *Pae.* 6, 7, 15, 18, 22h and fr. 70b, and they show that the myth does not always fit the city: *Pae.* 18, for Argos, contains a myth about the Tyndarids. *Pae.* 6, for Delphi, contains mythical parts about Achilles, who was protected by Apollo in Troy, and about Neoptolemus. It is easy to see a relationship between Delphi and these mythical characters, but they would also fit in a poem for Aegina.

Therefore, although it is easily imaginable that fr. 70a was composed for Argos, this is impossible to prove.

Metre

The remains of fr. 70a are much too scanty to enable us to make a definite metrical scheme, because it is too often impossible to determine the relationship between longa and brevia. We can, however, recognize iambic and aeolic metres as in fr. 75. For the added syllables and their lengths see notes *ad loc.*

Strophe/Antistrophe:

11/25	-] _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	ia ia cr
	~] ~ ~	cr (ba)
	~ -] ~ _ _ _ _ x	? cho cr (io ia)
	- (·) -] ~ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	ia ia - -
	~ -] ~ _ _ _ _ _ x ~ ~	cho ia ia
16/30	~ -] ~ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	da ia cho ba
] _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	... ia ~ ~ -
]	
] _ _ _ x	
] ~ x	
21/35] _ _ x	
] _ _ _ x	
]	
] -	

Epode:

(some lines lost?)

] - - - - [
 -] - - - [
] - - - = [
] - - - - [
 5] ? - - - - - ? [
 -] - - - - ? [
] - - - - - [
] - - - - - - - - - =
 -] - - - =
 10] - =

Commentary

1-6 The only certain words in these first lines are λεγόντων, ἀνακτα, λειβόμενον, πατέρα and Κηκλώπων. The restoration Γοργόν[ων is too rash, since other possibilities can also be thought of, such as γοργόν as an adjective qualifying πατέρα, or Γοργόνη as the subject of ἴψα.

On the basis of l. 1 δαναί, l. 7 Ἄργει and l. 9 Ἄβαντος it may be assumed that the myth belongs to the body of Argive legendary material, which revolves around Danaus and his descendants. In an attempt to find a relationship between the Cyclopes, these Argive myths and the text of our fragment there are three possibilities:

a. The Cyclop Polyphemus is the grandson of Phorcus (cf. *Od.* 1, 71-72), who is possibly mentioned here as πατέρα Γοργόν[ων.

b. Poseidon is the father of Polyphemus, cf. *Od.* 1, 73. His epithets, e.g. Ἐννοκίδας, κεικίχθων, suggest that he is an awe-inspiring divinity, who could perhaps be described as γοργόν.

c. Proetus reclaims his heritage from Acrisius with the help of the Cyclopes from Lycia (*Str.* 8, 6, 11; *Apollod.* 2, 2, 1). Acrisius could then, because of his cruelty against Danae and Perseus, be described as πατέρα γοργόν[Δανάας.

The objection against a and b is that the Cyclopes of the *Odyssey* must be differentiated from the mythical builders of the Cyclopean walls in, for example, Tiryns or Argos (see also Roscher, *Lex. s.v.* Kyklopen). It is this last category of

Cyclopes which is clearly meant here, cf. *Il.* 6-7. Another objection against *a* is that building activities for the relatives of Perseus, the man who deprived Phorcus of his daughter Medusa, cannot be expected from Phorcus' Cyclopean grandson.

The strongest objection against *b* is in the first place the fact that Poseidon has no role in the Argive myths, so that such an elaborate mention of him here would be strange. Secondly, the fact that he is the father of one Cyclops, sc. Polyphemus, does not necessarily mean that he can be called the father of the Cyclopes in general.

If we assume that *c* is the most probable solution in the context, *Il.* 1-4 may contain the story of the discord between Acrisius and Proetus.

There are rival versions for two parts of the myth, the cause of the discord between the two brothers, and the identity of the father of Perseus. Acrisius and Proetus are said to have quarrelled about the kingdom (*Apollod.* 2, 2, 1 οὔτοι καὶ κατὰ γαστρὸς μὲν ἔτι ὄντες ἑστακίαζον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ὡς δὲ ἀνετράφησαν, περὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐπολέμουν), but we also have the scholium on *Il.* 14, 319 Dindorf 2, 50, 1-15 Δανάη Ἰακρυίου θυγάτηρ, ἣ Διὶ κυκοιμηθεῖσα Περσεῖα ἐγέννησε. Χρωμένωι γὰρ, φασι, τῶν Ἰακρυίωι περὶ γενέσεωσ ἀρρένων παιδῶν ὁ θεὸς ἔφη γενέσθαι παῖδα ἐκ τῆσ θυγατρὸσ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν κτείνειν· δείσασ δὲ ὁ Ἰακρυίωσ τοῦτο, κατὰ γῆσ θάλαμον χαλκοῦν κατασκευάσασ τὴν Δανάην ἔφρουρει. αὐτὴ δὲ, ὡσ φησι Πίνδαροσ καὶ ἕτεροὶ τινὲσ ἐφθάρη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατραδέλφου αὐτῆσ Προίτου ὄθεν αὐτοῖσ καὶ στάσισ ἐκινήθη. ἔνιοι δὲ φασι ὅτι Ζεὺσ μεταμορφωθεὶσ εἰσ χρυσοῦν καὶ διὰ τῆσ ὀροφῆσ εἰσπεσῶν ἔφθειρε ταύτην· διὸ καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα μετὰ τοῦ παιδοσ εἰσ λάρνακα ἐμβάλων ἐν τῆι θαλάσσει ἔρριψε. διασωθέντων δὲ τούτων εἰσ Σέριφον τὴν νῆσον, συνέβη ἀνατραφῆναι τὸν παῖδα παρὰ Πολυδέκτηι ἣ, ὡσ ἔνιοι φασι, ὑπὸ Δίκτυοσ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Πολυδέκτου. φυγόντοσ δὲ ὕστερον Ἰακρυίου τὴν Ἀργείων βασιλείαν παρέλαβε Περσεύσ (Pi. fr. 284). This scholium already indicates that it is not certain who fathered Perseus. Cf. also *Apollod.* 2, 4, 1.

The discord between the two brothers is also found in *B.* 11, 59-81, but the reason is there only indicated by *l.* 65 βληχρᾶσ ... ἀπ' ἀρχᾶσ. Maehler 1982, 228 argues that Bacchylides hinted at Proetus' assault of Danae because there is no other known cause of war. But *Apollod.* 2, 2, 1 suggests that the war was caused by greed and envy. The only way to explain *Apollod.* 2, 2, 1 away would be by supposing that Apollodorus misunderstood *B.* 11, 65 and interpreted βληχρᾶσ ἀπ' ἀρχᾶσ too literally: 'from childhood'; this would invalidate greed as the cause of the feud. It seems, however, too far-fetched to suppose that Apollodorus would have made such a mistake, so that either reason for the quarrel may have been mentioned.

It is possible that l. 2,]ν λεγόντων, indicates that in ll. 3-4 a different reason is mentioned which is set in contrast with the version of l. 1. If this contrast is between the causes of the feud, l. 1 may mention the fact that Acrisius banned Proetus]ἀπὸ Δανα[οῦ / Δανα[ῶν γὰρ because of the heritage, while ll. 3-4 give the alternative reason that Proetus (Τιρύνθ[ι]ον or Προῖ[τον] ἀνακτα) inserted (λειβόμενον) his seed into Danae. If the contrast concerns about the fatherhood of Perseus, l. 1 may have told that Perseus was born]ἀπο Δανά[α and Proetus, while ll. 3-4 said that Zeus (Ὀλύμπ[ι]ον ἀνακτα) inserted (λειβόμενον) his seed into Danae. If ll. 5-6 are about the return of Proetus who checked Acrisius (πατέρα γοργόν[ι] Δανάα) with the help of the Cyclopes (Κυκλώπων), the first suggestion seems more attractive, because the mention of the Cyclopes and of the fortification of a city in Argos makes it almost certain that the quarrel between Acrisius and Proetus was mentioned. If l. 1 did not yet mention the actual quarrel, ll. 5-6 must have contained both the banishment of Proetus and his triumphant return, which seems unlikely.

1]ἀπὸ Δανα[: for the fact that the Argives were called Danaei cf. E. fr. 228, 6-7 (Δαναός) Πελαγιάτας δ' ὠνομαζμένους τὸ πρὶν / Δαναοὺς καλεῖσθαι νόμον ἔθηκ' ἄν' Ἑλλάδα. For]ἀπὸ Δανά[α, where ἀπό is used in the sense of 'begotten from', cf. E. *Hel.* 391 Ἄερόπησ λέκτρων ἄπο; *HF.* 826 Ζητὸς Ἀλκμήτης τ' ἄπο.

2]ν λεγόντων [: perhaps to be connected with a possible Δανα[ῶν, but the distance between the words in that case seems a bit long. It is therefore more likely to be a (rather prosaic?) genitive absolute (e.g. ἄλλω]ν λεγόντων), followed by the contents of what 'they say' in ll. 3ff. The genitive absolute would indicate that there are two conflicting versions of 'what people say', otherwise we would have ὡς λέγουσι *sim.* The genitive absolute is not very frequent in Pindar, but does occur, see Braswell 1988 on *P.* 4, 85 and *P.* 4, 69.

Conflicting versions of myths are also mentioned in *O.* 1, 36, ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι. Cf. *Call. H.* 1, 59-66 where there are two different versions of the way Zeus became lord of Olympus. For references to implicit or explicit sources of mythical material, see my note on l. 15, λέγουσι δὲ βροτοί.

4]λειβόμενον δ[: for λείβομαι in connection with human seed, cf. Dioscorides *AP* 5, 55, 5 μέχρις ἀπεσπείσθη λευκὸν μένος.

5]υε πατέρα γοργόν[: since it is difficult to think of a meaningful role for Phorcus in connection with the Cyclopes (see above on ll. 1-6) it is unlikely that we should read Γοργόν[ω here. The same applies to a nominative Γοργόν[η which, if connected with πατέρα, has the same disadvantage. We should therefore perhaps accept the adjective γοργός, even though this does not occur elsewhere in Pindar.

The adjective, meaning 'grim, fierce, terrible' (usually applied to the eyes or to the impression which someone makes on others, see Leumann 1950, 154-155), seems applicable to a person as Acrisius, imprisoning his daughter, ousting his brother and finally throwing his daughter and grandson into the sea, especially if the disagreement between the brothers was only about the heritage.

The adjective would also be suitable for Proetus if he assaulted Danae and so begot Perseus: πατέρα γοργόν[Περσέος. The text might have been e.g. 'The Lycian king supported Proetus (πατέρα γοργόν[Περσέος) with the help of the Cyclopes (Κ]υκλώπων)'.
 6-7 πτόλις α[/]ν ἐν Ἄργει μεγάλῳ .. [: with l. 6 goes a marginal remark which is difficult to read, let alone understand:] ... ημτοοιδιδοιδιοαντωι / .]γνοσαντεσδε...εσολοικισμῶ / οητοςμεταγρ...οι. The second οι in l. 1 is not certain, Grenfell and Hunt (1919, 32-33) read οῦ > οὔτως, but that leaves a tall upright (as ι) unexplained. I prefer to read it as οι with a rather large spiritus. That gives the following text:] ἦν τὸ οι δι' ὃ οι δι' ὃ αὐτῶι, [ἀ]γνόσαντες δὲ τῶ(ῦ) ὡς σολοικισμο(ῦ) ὄητος μεταγρ(άφουσι)ν) ἐς οἷ, 'There was οι for οἷ for αὐτῶι; but by mistake, (because) it is an incorrectness in the use of language, they altered (to) οἷ'. So it seems that the text read οἷ, to be interpreted as αὐτῶι, which was mistakenly 'corrected' to what is probably οἷ = εἰατῶι.

On the basis of this marginal remark and my suggestion that Proetus is the subject of the preceding clause, we may add to something as 'a city was built for him (Proetus) by them (the Cyclopes) in great Argos'. Cf. Str. 8, 6, 11 τῆι μὲν οὖν Τίρυνθι ὀρητηγίῳ χρήσασθαι δοκεῖ Προῖτος καὶ τειχίσαι διὰ Κυκλώπων; Apollod. 2, 2, 1 (Προῖτος) καταλαμβάνει Τίρυνθα, ταύτην αὐτῶι Κυκλώπων τειχίσαντων; B. 11, 59-81; Paus. 2, 16, 5.

7 Ἄργει : Argos for the country Argolis, instead of for the city of Argos, is common in poetry. See Jebb 1924 on S. *El.* 4; Denniston 1939 on E. *El.* 1. Cf. e.g. E. *Archel.* fr. 2a (=P. *Hamb.* 118a), 13-14 Ἄργουσι πόλιν / ... Μυκήνας. Whether Pindar means the city of Argos or Argolis is often unclear: e.g. in O. 7, 83 Argos is mentioned as the hometown of games, while other games are mentioned both in cities (Athens and Pellana) and in countries (Nemea, Arcadia, Boeotia).

μεγάλῳ : if this dithyramb was indeed composed for the Argives, the adjective may be interpreted as a compliment, even if Argos means the Argive plain. Μέγας is seldom used by Pindar in a neutral descriptive way, but is in most cases meant as a laudatory adjective. See Bissinger 1966, 139-141, 311-313. Cf. P. 4, 48-49 μεγάλας / ἐξανίστανται Λακεδαίμονος Ἄργεῖου τε κόλπου καὶ Μυκηναῶν; N. 2, 8 ταῖς μεγάλας ... Ἀθῆναις.

8-10 It is unclear how much is missing on the left-hand side of col. I. A very rough method (sc. comparing the widths of col. I and II), suggests that before $\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\nu$ in l. 10 (where the papyrus curves a little outward to the left) there is room for two or three letters. This would mean that ll. 8-10 are almost complete.

That means the predicate is represented by $\lambda\upsilon\tau'$ in l. 9. The subject must be $\lambda\pi\omicron\iota$ in l. 8, and the object is supposed to be $\delta\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$, although the reading of $\delta\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$ is very uncertain. With $\delta\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$ goes $\alpha\beta\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in l. 9. $\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\nu$ in l. 10 must then be an infinitive with $\lambda\upsilon\tau'$: a third person singular indicative imperfect is impossible, because there is no room for a change of subject. This leaves us with $\zeta\upsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$ without the necessary female noun. I therefore assume that the clause began in l. 7, where the papyrus has a lacuna after $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\iota$. This seems a better solution than to assume that more letters are to be supplied at the beginning of the lines, because in ll. 11-15, too, short supplements provide an adequate sense.

Because the Cyclopes are mentioned both in l. 6 and in the marginal note on l. 10, it seems probable that they were also referred to in ll. 8-9, and that these lines continue the story of the first part of the fragment.

8 $\lambda\pi\omicron\iota$ $\zeta\upsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$: in the context suggested above it is difficult to see how the first word that comes to mind (especially in connection with $\zeta\upsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$) sc. $\lambda\pi\lambda\pi\omicron\iota$, would fit into the story. The most attractive possibility is $\kappa\acute{o}\mu\lambda\pi\omicron\iota$ (Bury, see Grenfell-Hunt 1919, 38): songs in connection with a delightful feast or musical instrument. For $\zeta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\upsilon\mu\iota$ in a musical context cf. *N.* 1, 7 $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ $\nu\iota\kappa\alpha\phi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\acute{\omega}\mu\iota\omicron\nu$ $\zeta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\alpha\iota$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. The reference may be to a feast on the occasion of the twin brothers' reconciliation and the new walls for Tiryns.

8-9 $\delta\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$ / $\lambda\upsilon\tau'$ $\alpha\beta\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$: if the suggestions about the contents of ll. 1-8 have been right, Abas must have been dead for a long time, so that 'the house of Abas' must either mean his family (cf. *O.* 2, 45) or be a circumscription of Argos (on Argos as the dwelling place of Abas cf. *P.* 8, 55 $\alpha\beta\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\upsilon\chi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\upsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$).

It is most likely that $\lambda\upsilon\tau'$ represents the ending of the predicate. It must be a verb like $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau'$, for example, so that it can be connected with an infinitive (see above on ll. 8-10). In a musical context we could expect something like 'Songs, joined to a delightful lyre/connected with a delightful feast, (came to entertain) the family of Abas'.

10 $\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\nu$: the scholium cannot be read with certainty: $\tau\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\nu\iota\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\upsilon\kappa\lambda\omega\pi\epsilon\delta\iota\omicron\nu\nu\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$. A small letter may have stood before τ . The fourth letter looks like π . This would give $\acute{\omicron}\tau'$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\xi\epsilon\nu\iota\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma\alpha\nu$ $\omicron\iota$ $\text{Κύκλωπες διονυσιακόν}$, meaning 'when the Cyclopes lived away from their homes, in a dionysiac way'. $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\xi\epsilon\nu\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, however, always has the negative sense of banishment, cf. *S. El.* 777 $\phi\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$; *E. Hec.* 1221. This is not the meaning we expect here, in

the first place because of the joyful context, secondly because of *διονυσιακόν*. All we can say is that a form of *ξενίζομαι* was probably meant. Since one of the meanings of *φιλέω* is synonymous with *ξενίζω*, 'entertain', it is likely that the text contained *φι]λέεν*.

The infinitive ending in *-έεν* is analogous to *O. 3, 25 πορεύεν; P. 4, 56 άγαγέν; N. 11, 18 μελίζεν (coni. Pauw)*. For infinitives ending in *-εν* see Schwyzer 1, 806-807; Radt 1958, 149-150.

φι]λέεν by itself does not justify the marginal *διονυσιακόν*. There is hardly room for an adverb if we assume that only a few letters on the left-hand side are missing. Perhaps the missing noun with *έρατᾶι* warrants the use of *διονυσιακόν*. It is improbable that it is a comment on l. 11, *βρομιάδι θοίνοι*, because in that case *διονυσιακόν* should have been written either a line lower, or at least with some extra spacing to indicate that it was a note on a different line. Moreover, l. 11 seems to be about the present festival (see note on ll. 11-13).

11-13 Here begins a new strophe and we may ask whether this marks the end of the myth of Abas' family. Preceding an invocation to the Muses (ll. 13-15) we have a clause about a dionysiac feast to which it is fitting to bring the very best. The crucial word for the interpretation is *ἴδαιμόνων*.

It is unlikely that the banqueters of l. 10 are referred to as *δαίμονες*, because none of the Argive persons mentioned can be called divine, while the Cyclopes as mythical city-builders are not directly comparable to Cyclopes such as Polyphemus, who claim Poseidon as their father. Besides if the divinity of the Cyclopes (and perhaps the mythical Argives) were mentioned, a better word would be e.g. *ἡμίθεος* (cf. *P. 4, 12; 184; 211* of the Argonauts): *δαίμων* is not the word we would expect here (see also Schmidt *Syn. 4, 2*). Since the text does not show that gods have been mentioned elsewhere, the most likely completion is *εὐ]δαιμόνων*, but that still leaves the problem of determining to whom this word refers: the ancient Argives, reconciled again and therefore fortunate and happy, or the present Argives (or the inhabitants of whichever city this dithyramb was composed for).

The entertainment referred to in l. 10 cannot have been too quiet a feast, judging by the marginal *διονυσιακόν*. Perhaps the description of the feast is continued in ll. 11-13. But *βρομιάς* makes a reference to the festival-at-hand also possible. This adjective is suitable for a dionysiac festival for which dithyrambs are composed, especially since *Βρόμιος* is an epithet of Dionysus, cf. e.g. fr. 75, 10; *A. Eu. 24; E. Ph. 649; Ar. Th. 991*. Cf. also fr. 70b, 6 *Βρομίου [τελε]τάν*. If this is the case, there is probably a direct comparison with the feast in l. 10, with *βρομιάδι θοίνοι* echoing a word with the meaning of *διονυσιακόν*.

The second interpretation seems preferable because of the present form of *πρέπει*: 'it is fitting (that I) put (on show) the very best for a dionysiac feast of fortunate people'. In that case the adjective must be understood as a compliment, because *εὐδαίμων* is used of people whose life and success provide visible proof of their enjoyment of divine favour (De Heer 1969, 40-44). Cf. *P.* 4, 276 τὰς εὐδαίμονος ... Κυράνας where the fact that 'Cyrene is a rich, well-watered, fertile land (...) is the visible manifestation of divine favour' (De Heer 1969, 44; see also Braswell 1988 *ad loc.*). If Pindar made this poem for the Argives the epithet is an addition to *l.* 7 *μέγᾳλω* and is even more complimentary.

Πρέπει can be construed with a dative or an accusative. Theoretically *βρομιάδι* *θόιναι* may be construed with *πρέπει* (so Slater *Lex. s.v. πρέπει*). However, it is more likely that *πρέπει* refers to the poet's task than to an activity required from the banqueters, because in ll. 13-15 the poet invokes the Muses for assistance in this task. For *πρέπει* referring to the task of the poet cf. *O.* 2, 46-47 *πρέπει τὸν Αἰνιχιδάμον / ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε τυγχανέμεν*; fr. 94b, 33-35 *ἐμὲ δὲ πρέπει / παρθενήμα μὲν φρονεῖν / γλώσσαι τε λέγεσθαι*; fr. 121 *πρέπει δ' ἐκλοῖσιν ὑμνεῖσθαι*. See Verdenius 1983, 54.

11 βρομιάδι : for the formation of such feminine adjectives with *-άς* see P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris 1933, 354-355. Cf. fr. 70b, 19 *οἰοπολάς*; *N.* 4, 36 *ποντιάς*; *I.* 4, 20; Pratin. *PMG* 708, 2 *Διονυσιάς*. For the meaning of *βρομιάς*/*βρόμιος*, see my note on fr. 70b, 6, *Βρομίου*.

12 ἰορυφάν : Pindar uses *κορυφά* mainly metaphorically, in the sense of 'chief point, purport', cf. *O.* 7, 68 *λόγων κορυφαί*; *P.* 3, 80; *Pae.* 8a, 13-14; or 'the best, the top', cf. *O.* 7, 4 *κορυφᾶν κτεάνων*, etc. Which meaning our text contained cannot be ascertained. By restoring the text to *ὑμνων] ἰορυφάν* (proposed by Snell 1975⁴, 72) emphasis is laid on the outstanding quality of Pindar's poetry, quite fitting for a festival. Alternatively the text may have been *λόγων] ἰορυφάν* (proposed by Bury, see Grenfell-Hunt 1919, 39). This would point to Pindar's typical treatment of myths (see also K. Fehr, *Die Mythen bei Pindar*, Diss. Zürich 1936, 121; Bowra 1964, 287-288; cf. *P.* 9, 77-79 *βαῖά δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν / ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς· ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως / παντὸς ἔχει κορυφᾶν*): he selects only those points of the myth that are relevant to the point he wants to make, although, as he says himself, *μακρὰ μὲν τὰ Περσέος ἀμφὶ Μεδοΐσας Γοργόνας* (*N.* 10, 4).

If *φι]λέεν* in *l.* 10 is correct, there is no room for either *λόγων* or *ὑμνων* before *κορυφᾶν*. Before *κορυφᾶν* I suggest *με* or *μοι*, to be connected with *l.* 11 *πρέπει*. *Λόγων* or *ὑμνων* would fit before *θέμεν* in *l.* 13. Considering the size of the letters I think *λόγων* would fit more easily than *ὑμνων*. If every line represents a colon, one drawback is that neither *με* nor *μοι* is found at the beginning of a colon.

Perhaps l. 12 is not an independent colon, but the continuation of l. 11. In that case $\mu\epsilon/\mu\omicron\iota$ is permissible, cf. the position of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in the colometry of *O.* 9, 28 and of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ in *O.* 13, 52.

Although $\kappa\omicron\rho\upsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}$ is never explicitly used with reference to vegetation, in the context we often find images of growth or fertility (Gerber 1982, 35), cf. *N.* 1, 14-15 $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\acute{\kappa}\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\theta\omicron\nu\delta\varsigma\ / \Sigma\iota\kappa\epsilon\lambda\iota\alpha\nu\ \pi\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\rho\theta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu\ \kappa\omicron\rho\upsilon\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\lambda\iota\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\phi\nu\epsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$; *O.* 1, 13 $\delta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega\nu$; 7, 2-8 $\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \dots\ \delta\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\omega\iota\ / \dots\ \kappa\alpha\rho\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \phi\rho\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. The same role is performed here by l. 14, $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\omicron\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu$.

13-15 In his extant works Pindar addresses the Muses more often in the course of a poem than at the beginning. This seems to be in agreement with R. Harriott, *Poetry and Criticism before Plato*, London 1969, 53 who observes that Bacchylides mentions 'the Muses at, or near, the beginning and end of the poem, while Pindar, beginning often with a maxim or an apostrophe to a city or divinity connected with the occasion of the poem, is particularly likely to address them or refer to them before or after the central myth.' But an inventory of all the places where Pindar mentions or addresses the Muse(s) ($\text{Μοῦσα, Μοῦσαι, Μοῦσαῖος, Πιερίδες, Ἐλικωνιάς, Ἐλικώνιος, κόραι Μναμοσύνας}$), shows that the three categories in which almost all of them can be classed are the beginning of the poem (*O.* 3, 4; 9, 5; 10, 3; *P.* 1, 2; 4, 3; *N.* 3, 1; 4, 3; 9, 1; *I.* 2, 2; 6, 2; 8, 6; *Pae.* 6, 6) or a(n anti)strophe (*O.* 7, 7; *P.* 1, 14; 10, 37; *I.* 2, 6; 7, 23; 8, 61); the end of the poem (*O.* 1, 112; 10, 96; 11, 17; *P.* 6, 49; 10, 65; *N.* 8, 47; 9, 55; *I.* 1, 65; 6, 75; *Pae.* 6, 181) or of a(n anti)strophe (*P.* 1, 12) or a point of transition in the contents (*O.* 6, 21; 6, 91; 9, 81; 13, 22; 13, 96; *P.* 1, 58; 3, 90; 4, 67; 4, 279; 11, 41; *N.* 1, 12; 3, 28; 5, 23; 6, 28; 6, 32; 7, 12; 7, 77; *I.* 2, 34; 3/4, 61; 6, 57; 8, 57; *Pae.* 6, 54; fr. 70a, 14; fr. 70b, 25). Many transitions are from the myth to the laudatory part or vice versa, or to finish a digression. The texts of *I.* 9; *Pae.* 7b and *Pae.* 12 are too fragmentary to determine the place or function of the mention of the Muse(s). The shorter fragments where the Muses are mentioned cannot be used either.

It appears then that the only cases which do not fit in the three categories are *P.* 5, 65 (the Muse/music as a gift of Apollo); 5, 114 (idem); 10, 26 (in a catalogue of victories), so that the conclusion is justified that mentioning the Muse(s) virtually always signifies something new: either in the structure of the poem (beginning, end, strophe) or in the contents. In our fragment l. 15 $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \beta\rho\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\iota$ shows that the Muses introduce a myth.

13-14 $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\varsigma\ \dots\ \text{Μοῦσαι}$: when we find hyperbaton of an invocation the interposition of the imperative is the most frequent. Cf. *Il.* 21, 379 $\text{Ἥφαιστε, c\acute{\chi}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron, \acute{\tau}\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\varsigma}$; *Pi.* *N.* 7, 1-2; *I.* 7, 49. See Kambylis 1964, 95-199, esp. 176.

The adjective is a new word, analogous to *P.* 3, 89-90 χρυσαμπύκων / ... Μοιᾶν; *I.* 2, 1-2; Hes. *Th.* 916. Similar adjectives with the ending -άμπυξ are used of other goddesses, cf. e.g. *N.* 7, 15 λιπαράμπυξ (*Mnemosyne*).

14]ξερ' ἔπι : Bury and Stuart Jones propose ἀέ]ξερ' comparing it with *O.* 6, 105 ἐμῶν δ' ὕμνων ἄεξ' εὐτερπέεσσι ἄνθος. 'Αέξω is the more poetic form and the only one used by Homer (LSJ *s.v.* ἀύξω/αύξω, ἀέξω), but Pindar uses αὐξω (15 or 16 times) rather than ἀέξω (5 times). Because of the fragmentary state of the papyrus the metre cannot be determined, so that there is no rational argument to decide which form Pindar used here. The drawback of both words is that they are too short for the lacuna. ἀναέ]ξερ' (cf. Coluth. 245 ἄνθος ἀνηέξησε), ἐπαέ]ξερ' (cf. *Od.* 14, 65 θεὸς δ' ἐπὶ ἔργον ἀέξημι), *sim* would therefore be better.

The imperative here must be seen as an example of a 'hortative' or 'inceptive' present imperative, where the poet apparently expects that the Muses will comply (see note on fr. 75, 2 ἐπί τε ... πέμπετε).

θάλος αἰοιδᾶν : LSJ *s.v.* θάλος only recognize the metaphorical sense of 'scion', 'child', but this is not appropriate here, nor in *I.* 7, 24. In these places θάλος is best interpreted as 'flowering garland, crown', one of the meanings of θαλλός. See Farnell 1932 († 1961) on Pi. *I.* 7, 24 κοινὸν θάλος, "a share in his wreath of fame". Wilamowitz, p. 411, n. 1, comments on this use of θάλος as unique; elsewhere it only = "scion" of the human family: the word used for "shoot" or "bough" is θαλλός, very frequently in association with κτέφανος. If θάλος was a variant for θαλλός, it is strange that the metaphorical use of a word should be expressed by such a difference of form. This passage suggests that this distinction between the two forms was not rigidly observed'. See also R.F. Renehan, *Conscious Ambiguities in Pindar and Bacchylides*, *GRBS* 10 (1969), 221-223; 1975, 102-103.

15] γάρ εὐχομαι : the use of γάρ is characteristic in invocations (see also Norden 1912, 152-153; 157). It is used either to explain why a certain epithet is fitting or justified, cf. e.g. Orph. *H.* 14, 9-11 (Rhea) μήτηρ μὲν τε θεῶν ἡδὲ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων / ἐκ κοῦ γάρ καὶ γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρύς ὑπερθεῖν / καὶ πόσιος πνοιαί τε; 16, 4-7 (Hera); or to explain why the poet is right to ask for this divinity's help, cf. e.g. Pi. *O.* 4, 1; 14, 5-6 σὺν γάρ ὕμῖν τὰ <τε> τερπνὰ καὶ / τὰ γλυκὲ' ἀνεταί πάντα βροτοῖς; 8-9; *Pae.* 6, 54-58; *N.* 6, 29. This use of γάρ applies to the suitability of the prayer in relationship to the god(dess). Γάρ is also used to mark this suitability with regard to the poet and his situation. Cf. Pi. *O.* 10, 7; 14, 17; *N.* 3, 3-5; 9, 4; *I.* 3/4, 63. See Bremer 1981, 196 on such 'arguments' as a structural part of hymns. The first person εὐχομαι shows that the second use of γάρ is applicable here. It may have been preceded by ὕμμι (Bury); τοῦτο (Snell) seems too long.

The first person refers to the poet's persona, because he is the one in contact with the inspiring divinities (Tsagarakis 1977, 130). Since first personal statements are often transitional (as observed by Lefkowitz 1963, 177-253), this εὐχομαι has the same function as the invocation of the Muses itself (see note on ll. 13-15). Both mark here the transition from the poet's task (ll. 11-15) to a myth, while the part about the poet's task itself forms the transition between the part about the city's mythical history (ll. 1-10) and the mythical part of ll. 15 ff. See also Hamilton 1974, 16-17; Zimmermann 1988b, 45.

λέγοντι δὲ βροτοί : the function of λέγοντι *sim.* is structural. Such verbs are often used to introduce a myth (cf. e.g. *O.* 2, 28 λέγοντι; *O.* 6, 29 λέγεται; *P.* 7, 54 φαντί; 12, 17 φάμεν; fr. 70b, 27 φάμα; *B.* 5, 57 λέγουσιν; 5, 155 φασίν). For this use of λέγουσιν *sim.* to mark the beginning of a myth in Bacchylides, see B. Gentili, *Bacchilide. Studi*, Urbino 1958, 31; Bernardini 1967, 86 n. 14.

Perhaps it is Pindar's concern for truth and credibility (cf. fr. 205; *O.* 1, 28ff.; 2, 92; 13, 98;) which leads him to refer to his sources implicitly (cf. *Σ O.* 2, 28 λέγοντι referring to *Od.* 5, 333-334), or explicitly (cf. *O.* 7, 54-55 φάντι δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιὰ / ῥήσιες; *N.* 3, 52-53; 6, 53-54). See Van Leeuwen 1964, 104 and n. 166; Richardson 1985, 383-401, esp. 395. Cf. also Call. *H.* 5, 56 μῦθος οὐκ ἔμός, ἀλλ' ἐτέρων; fr. 92, 2-3 Pf.; 178, 27-29 Pf.; fr. 384, 47-49 Pf. On the other hand we must not overemphasize this legitimizing use of λέγοντι *sim.* when the myth is well-known and Pindar does not deviate from the accepted version.

16-17 The mention of (the daughters of?) Phorcus makes it likely that this part contains the legend of Perseus and Medusa.

16 **ἴα φυγόντα υἱ καὶ μέλαν ἔρκος ἄλμας** : if Perseus is the subject matter of λέγοντι δὲ βροτοί we may suspect that he is the subject of φυγόντα. Then either ἴα is the end of Περσέῃα, or υἱ represents Perseus. The first possibility is more likely because (as far as we know) Perseus has not yet been mentioned by name and it would be too difficult for the audience if they were left guessing. Περσέῃα would fit in the lacuna (see on ll. 8-10).

Φυγόντα seems to have two objects, connected by καί, although it is also possible that καὶ μέλαν ἔρκος ἄλμας is governed by another participle. Because this is the first clause of the myth after the invocation, υἱ must refer back to the beginning of the fragment. If Perseus is mentioned by name, υἱ might be e.g. Acrisius, referring back to l. 5 πατέρα γοργόν, while μέλαν ἔρκος ἄλμας might be the sea in which Danae and Perseus were thrown.

υἱ : in this case there is no doubt about the orthography of υἱ, because there is no variant recorded. Even if there was, υἱ had the stronger case, because the Doric υἱ is better attested than the Ionic μῦ (see Slater *Lex. s.v. μῦ*; Braswell

1988 on *P.* 4, 79; W.S. Barrett, *The Oligaithidai and their Victories, Dionysiaca*, Cambridge 1978, 1-20, esp. 19 n. 29). When only *μιν* is recorded (as in fr. 81), it seems best to adhere to that orthography, even though it is not consistent with Pindar's generally Doric usage, because the occasional use of other dialects is found more often. About the uncertainty on the orthography, see Radt 1958 on *Pae.* 6, 115; Des Places 1947, 24.

μέλαν ἕρκος ἄλμας : the connotation of *μέλας* is usually negative (Fogelmark 1972, 29); *μέλας* is considered a neutral colour word by Platnauer 1921, 153; E. Irwin, *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry*, Toronto 1974, 196-198, but here a negative interpretation is favoured because *ἕρκος ἄλμας* is (probably) part of the object of *φυγόντα*, because in *P.* 2, 80 *ἕρκος ἄλμας* is used to express the slander to which Pindar has been exposed, and because the sea always inspired awe. For 'black sea', cf. e.g. *Il.* 23, 693; 24, 79; *Od.* 4, 359.

The reference is to the forced sea-journey of Danae and Perseus. Parallel to *P.* 2, 80 (and on the basis of its marginal remark *τῆι τῆς θαλάσσης ἐπιφανείαι*) *ἕρκος ἄλμας* is usually interpreted as 'the surface of the sea'. Yet the more literal meaning of *ἕρκος*, 'confines', gives essentially the same meaning, cf. *N.* 10, 36 where *ἐν ἀγγέων ἕρκεσιν* = *ἐν ἄγγεσιν*. The genitive with *ἕρκος* is probably a *genitivus possessivus* rather than a *genitivus explicativus*.

17] *Φόρκοιο* : the text of these lines is too fragmentary to allow any conclusions. Before *Φόρκοιο* there is probably room for five letters. If *Φόρκοιο* depends on a third accusative with *φυγόντα*, there must have been a connective, such as *καί* or *τε*. In that case it is more likely that the noun stood in l. 18, than that it was a two- or three-letter word in l. 17. The article may have stood in l. 17. Another possibility is that l. 18 contained an infinitive, probably aorist, governing an accusative in l. 17: 'People say that Perseus, having escaped him and the black sea, reached ... of Phorcus (killed ... of Phorcus)' or something similar. In that case the noun was probably masculine or neutral, and it is with this that *κύγγονον* is to be connected. Perhaps e.g. *γένος* (cf. *P.* 12, 13 *θεσπέσιον Φόρκοι' ... γένος*, Hes. *Th.* 270-277), *μένος*?

The marginal *κορᾶν*, almost certainly to be connected with *Φόρκοιο*, either explains a word that (according to the traditional myth) goes with the Gorgons, gives an alternative reading or is a correction of the text.

κύγγονον πατέρων : the stops before and after these words make it an apposition. It is not clear, however, in relation to what it stands in apposition.

Σύγγονον refers to a relative (e.g. a brother) or to something hereditary or inborn. If we are correct in our supposition that Perseus is the subject, *πατέρων* may refer to Zeus, of whom a pluralis majestaticus would be fitting. On the plural

see Kühner-Gerth 1, 18-19 Anm. 2 and Schwyzer 2, 44-47. Cf. fr. 75, 11-12 γόνον ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων ... / γυναικῶν τε Καδμειᾶν (Zeus and Semele). But perhaps πατέρων refers to the father of Phorcus, Nereus. In that case κορᾶν may indicate the Nereids.

.[...].{
 ...{
 ηρακλη.[
 ηκερβερος ..[
 θηβαιως δι..[
 καιτος.[
 διαπεπ[.] .[.....].....[
 5 κλοιεινεα.[.....]ιδότες

Marginalla 1 two dots on the bottom of the line | 2 o or α, probably α | right half of a large circle | δ or α, probably δ | 3 last letter probably the upper part of c, because o is usually very small | 3-5 between the ends of the last lines of the inscription and the first two lines of the text a coronis

Text 1 ..[vertical stroke followed by part of a vertical stroke below the line | 2 . lower left half of a circle | .[dot below the line | 3 .[traces compatible with α | 4 of π[only the left half |] .[two specks of ink on the bottom of the line, above the right speck the meeting-point of two converging strokes, which makes the traces compatible with α |].....[the left half of a stroke going diagonally to the right from below left, a vertical stroke, the top of a circle, a dot below the line, two ends of diagonal strokes coming from above left | 5 .[beginning of a rising stroke, probably ν, because thicker and higher than most υ's

Fr. 70b

Ἰ Ηρακλῆς ἦ Κέρβερος. Θηβαίοις.

Πρὶν μὲν εἴρπε σχοινοτένειά τ' αἰοῖδᾶ
 διθυράμβων
 καὶ τὸ ζᾶν κίβδηλον ἀνθρώποισιν ἀπὸ στομάτων,
 διαπεπ[.]α[.....].....[.....] κύ-
 5 κλοισινεα [.....] εἰδότες

Test. 1-33 P. Oxy. 1604, fr. 1, col. II | 1-2 Str. 10, 3, 13 p. 469 ὁ Πίνδαρος ἐν τῷ διθυράμβῳ, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή: 'Πρὶν μὲν - διθυράμβων', μνησθεὶς τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ὕμνων τῶν τε παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν ὕστερον, μεταβάς ἀπὸ τούτων φησι 'κοὶ μὲν - πεύκαις', τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἀποδειχθέντων νομίμων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι καὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς Φρυγῶσι περὶ τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν κυνοικειῶν ἀλλήλοισι | 1-3 Ath. 10, 82 (455 b-c) Πίνδαρος δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀειγμοποιηθεῖσαν ᾠδὴν, ὡς ὁ αὐτός φησι Κλέαρχος, οἰολεὶ γρίφου τινὸς ἐν μελοποιίᾳ προβληθέντος, ὡς πολλῶν τούτωι προσκρουόντων διὰ τὸ ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἀποσχέσθαι τοῦ εἴγματος καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ δοκιμάζειν, ἐποίησε: 'Πρὶν μὲν - ἀνθρώποις' | Ath. 11, 30 (467 a-b) τὸ δὲ εἶναι ἀντὶ τοῦ εἴγματος Δωρικῶς εἰρηκάσιν. οἱ γὰρ μουσικοὶ, καθάπερ πολλάκις Ἀριστοξένος φησι, τὸ εἴγμα λέγειν παρηγοῦντο διὰ τὸ σκληρόστομον εἶναι καὶ ἀνεπιτήδειον αὐτῶν (...) καὶ Πίνδαρος δὲ φησι: 'Πρὶν μὲν - στομάτων' || D.H. *Compr.* 14 (p. 55 U.-R.) ἄχαρι δὲ καὶ ἀηδὲς τὸ ε καὶ πλεονάσκειν ἐφόδρα λυπεῖ θηριώδους γὰρ καὶ ἀλόγου μάλλον ἢ λογικῆς ἐφάπτεσθαι δοκεῖ φωνῆς ὁ κυριγμός: τῶν γούν παλαιῶν τινες σπανίως ἐχρῶντο αὐτῶν καὶ πεφυλαγμένως, εἰς δ' οἱ καὶ ἀείγμονε ἔλας ᾠδὰς ἐποίησαν: δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ Πίνδαρος ἐν οἷς φησι: 'Πρὶν μὲν - ἀνθρώποις' || 8-18 P. Berol. 9571v, 44-50 || 8-11 Str. 10, 3, 13 p. 469 vide supra | 13-14 Plu. *qm. con.* 1, 5, 2 p. 623b αἱ τε εφοδραὶ περιχάρεται τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν μὲν ἐλαφροτέρων τῶν ἦθει καὶ τὸ σῶμα συνεπαίρουσιν καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν εἰς ἔνρυθμον κίνησιν, ἐξ-αλλομένων καὶ κροτούων εἴπερ ὀρχεῖσθαι μὴ δύνανται: 'μανίαί - κλόνοι' κατὰ Πίνδαρον || Plu. *qm. con.* 7, 5, 4 p. 706 ὡς περ γὰρ οἱ μάγοι τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους κελεύουσι τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλέγειν καὶ νομάζειν, οὕτως ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις τερετίσμασι καὶ σκιρτήμασι 'μανίαί - κλόνοι' τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ σεμνῶν ἐκείνων γραμμάτων ἀναμνησκόμενοι καὶ παραβάλλοντες ᾠδὰς καὶ ποιήματα καὶ λόγους γενναίους οὐκ ἐκπλαγῆσόμεθα παντάσῃν ὑπὸ τούτων οὐδὲ πлагίον παραδώσομεν ἑαυτοὺς ὡς περ ὑπὸ βέουματος λείου φέρεσθαι || Plu. *def. or.* 14 p. 417c παλλαχοῦ δὲ πάλιν αἰσχρολογίαὶ πρὸς ἱεροῖς 'μανίαί - κλόνοι' θεῶν μὲν οὐδενὶ δαιμόνων δὲ φαύλων ἀποτροπῆς ἕνεκα φήκαμεν ἂν τελεῖσθαι μελίχια καὶ παραμύθια || 26 ad v. 26 respicit Σ Pi. *inscr. P.* 2 τὸν Πίνδαρον ... προσαγορεύειν ... τὰς Θήβας βρισκαρμάτους (χρυσκαρμάτους codd., corr. Snell)

1 εἴρπε Str.; Ath. 10, 82; D.H. edd.: ἦρπε Ath. 11, 30; D.H. cod. F; ἦρχε D.H. codd. M, V; ἦριπε D.H. codd. E, P, s; ἔρπε Schroeder 1900 | σχοινοτένεια Ath. 11, 30; D.H.: σχοινοτενία Ath. 10, 82 cod. A; σχοινοτονίας Str. | αἰοῖδᾶ: αἰοῖδαί Str. codd. B, k, l, n, o, x | 2 διθυράμβων Str. cod. x, D.H. codd. E, P, M, V, s; διθυράμβωι Str.; διθυράμβων D.H. cod. F; om. Ath. | 3 κίβδηλον Ath.; D.H. codd. E, F; κίβδαλον D.H. codd. P, M, V, s | ἀνθρώποισιν Hermann 1824; ἀνθρώποις Ath. 10, 82; D.H. codd. E, F, M; ἀνθρώποι D.H. codd. P, V, s; om. Ath. 11, 30 | ἀπὸ στομάτων Ath. 11, 30; om. Ath. 10, 82; D.H. | 4 διαπέπ[τ]α[ι]νται δὲ νῦν ἰσοῖς πύλαι Grenfell-Hunt 1919 | 5 [κοφοὶ οἱ εἰδότες Grenfell-Hunt; [λαχεῖτ' εἰδότες Maas apud Schroeder 1923²

διανβρομιο [.....] αν
 και παρασκα [..] ονδισουρανίδαι
 ενμεγαροις [..] ντι·σεμναῖμενκαταρχει ἵστάντι
 ματεριπαρμ [..] ἀλιρομβοιτυμπανων·
 10 ενδεκέχλαδ [..] κρόταλ' αιθομένατε
 δαῖς ὑποξαν [..] .σιπευκαίς·
 ενδεναιδω .. ρίγδουποις τοναχαι·
 μανίαι τ' αλα [.] .[[α]] τεορίνεται ιψαύχενι
 συνκλονωι·
 15 ενδ' ὀπάγκρά ['] ρκερανυ .. αμπνέων
 πυρκεκίν [.....] ενυαλ .ου
 εγχος· αλκαεσσα [.] επαλλάδο [.] αιγις
 θ
 — μυριωνφογαζεται κλαγγαῖς δρακοντων· οφ[
 ριμφαδ' εἰσινάρτεμι δὸσπόλας δούπαλος
 20 ζεύξαις· ενοργαῖς
 βακχειαις φυλονλεοντωνα[
 οδε κηλεῖται χορευούσαις κικα[
 ρῶνα γελαις· εμεδ' εξαίρετο[
 καρυκασοφωπεων
 25 μοῖς· ανέστᾱς· ελλάδικα [.] . [.]
 ευχομενον βρισαρματοις θ[

6 [the lower tip of a vertical stroke, quite low, therefore probably υ |]. right half of a horizontal stroke, a little too high for ε, more probably τ or γ | 7 last α marked short, corrected from a marking as long | 11]. upper half of a vertical stroke | 12 [lower part of a vertical stroke |]. dot, probably end of middle stroke of ε | 13 [small dot |]. vertical stroke | 15 of]ς only the upper tip | following traces compatible with upper parts of ο and ε | 16 .. [a vertical stroke followed by a horizontal stroke at medium height (compatible with η), followed by a dot on the line | of first υ after the lacuna only the tail | λ.ο only a dot | 25]. [upper part of diagonal stroke coming from below left

οἶαν Βρομίου [τελε]τάν
 καὶ παρὰ κᾶ[πτ]ον Διὸς Οὐρανίδαι
 ἐν μεγάρους ἴς<τ>α, γι. σεμναῖ μὲν κατάρχει
 10 Ματέρι πᾶρ μεγάλαι ρόμβοι τυπάνων,
 ἐν δὲ κέχλαδ[εν] κρόταλ' αἰθομένα τε
 δαῖς ὑπὸ ξαυθα, γι, πεύκαις·
 ἐν δὲ Ναῖδω ἐρίγδουποι στοναχαί
 μανίαι τ' ἀλαλαί, τ' ὀρίνεται ριψαύχενι
 ξὺν κλόνωι.
 15 ἐν δ' ὁ παγκρα[τῆ]ς κεραυνὸς ἀμπνέων
 πῦρ κέκινη[ται τό τ'] Ἐνυαλίου
 ἔγχος, ἀλκάεσσά [τ]ε Παλλάδο[ς] αἰγίς
 — μυρίων φθογγάζεται κλαγγαῖς δρακόντων.
 ῥίμφα δ' εἴειν Ἄρτεμις οἰοπολάς ζεύ-
 20 ξαῖς ἐν ὄργαῖς
 Βακχίαις φῦλον λεόντων α[- - - - -]
 ὁ δὲ κηλείται χορευοῖσαις κα[-]
 ρῶν ἀγέλαις. ἐμὲ δ' ἐξαίρετο[ν]
 κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων
 25 Μοῖς' ἀνέστας Ἑλλάδι κα[.] [- - -]
 εὐχόμενον βρισαρμάτοις Θ[ή]βαις - - -

Scholia 8 ἴσταντι || 18 δφ[εων] || 19 οἰοπόλος

6 [τελε]τάν Grenfell-Hunt | 8 σεμναῖ P. Oxy. 1604; P. Berol. 9571v: κοὶ Str. | κατάρχει P. Oxy. 1604: κατάρχεν Str. | 9 ματέρι πᾶρ μ[εγ]άλαι P. Oxy. 1604: μάτερ πάρα μεγάλοι Str. | τυπάνων Grenfell-Hunt: τυμπάνων P. Oxy. 1604; κυμβάλων Str. || 10 κέχλαδ[εν] Schroeder 1919: κέχλαδ[ον] Grenfell-Hunt; καχλάδων Str. || 11 δαῖς Str.: δαῖς P. Oxy. 1604; δαῖς Snell 1975⁴ || 13 μανίαι τ' ἀλαλαί P. Oxy. 1604; Plu. 623b; 417c: μανίαις τ' ἀλαλαῖς Plu. 706e | τ' Grenfell-Hunt: τε P. Oxy. 1604 | ὀρίνεται P. Oxy. 1604: ὀρινομένων Plu. 623b; 417c; ὀρινόμενοι Plu. 706e | ριψαύχενι Plu. 706e; 417c: ἐριαύχενι Plu. 623b; ἰψαύχενι P. Oxy. 1604 || 15 δ' ὁ P. Oxy. 1604: δε ὁ P. Berol. 9571v || 18 κλαγγαῖς P. Oxy. 1604: φθ[ογγα]ῖς P. Berol. 9571v || 19 οἰοπόλας Snell: οἰοπόλας P. Oxy. 1604; οἰοπόλος Bowra 1947² || 21 Βακχίαις Grenfell-Hunt: Βακχίαις P. Oxy. 1604 | ἀ[γροτέρων] Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt; ἀ[γρότερον] Schroeder | Βρομίω Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt || 22 χορευοῖσαις Grenfell-Hunt: χορευοῖσαις P. Oxy. 1604 | κα[ὶ] θη- Housman apud Grenfell-Hunt || 25 κα[λ]λιχόρω Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt; κα[ὶ] γ[ε]νεάν Sandys apud Grenfell-Hunt || 26 βρισαρμάτοις Snell: χρυσαρμάτους Σ Pi. inscr. P. 2 | Θ[ή]βαις γεγάκειν Wilamowitz 1922; Θ[ή]βαις γενέθει Schmidt 1922

α

ενθάποθαρμονιαν . ἄμ[εν] ..[
 καδμονυψ [...]πραπιδε [.
 νανδ[..]δ' ακ[.....]μφαν[
 30 καιτέξυδοξ [.....] νθρωπο[
 διονυ [..] θ [.....] .. [.] [.
 ματε[
 πει [.
] .. [

27 second θ corrected from τ | . right end of horizontal stroke, which makes φ possible | .[right half of high horizontal stroke, followed by the left half of a sharply pointed triangle, probably of α || 28 .[upper tip of a vertical stroke | .[dot on the line || 30 of ε only the middle stroke | ξ with parts joined instead of unconnected | .[left half of triangular letter |]. dot at medium height | .[left upper part of ο || 31 .[part of vertical stroke | θ.[dot |].[.][upper parts of three letters, all horizontal strokes || 33 .[upper part of a thin vertical stroke || 34].[two upper tips of strokes going from upper left to lower right

P. Berol. 9571v, 44-50

44]εμνᾶιμε [.
 δ
 ρομβο[.....]νωεντε [.
 υποξα[.....]υκαικ [.. [.
 μανια[.....]τερο[...]τ[
 ..]δεο[....]ρα[.]ησκε[..]υ [.
 ..]να[.....]γχοα[.]καε[.]κα[
 50 . αζετ[...] ογγα[.]δρα[.]ον [.

44 .[the lower part of a vertical stroke || 45 .[upper part of a vertical stroke || 46 . vertical stroke which curves to the right at the bottom | .[vague traces of ink || 47 of α[only the left part | ...[upper part of ε | vague traces of ο | ρ without tail || 48 .[lower part of a vertical rising stroke || 50 . lower part of a vertical stroke |]. end of a horizontal stroke at medium height | .[left part of a high horizontal stroke and lower part of a vertical stroke

ἔνθα ποθ' Ἀρμονίαν [φ]άμα γα[] -
 Κάδμον ὑψη[λαῖ]ς πραπίδες[] - - =
 νάν· Δ[ιὸ]ς δ' ἄκ[ουσεν ὀ]μφᾶν,
 30 καὶ τέκ' εὐδοξο[]ν παρ' ἄνθρωπο[]ς - - -
 Διόνυς[] ἔθ[] [.....] ἔτ[] [] γ[]
 ματέ[]ρ -
 πει[] [] - - - - - - - -

27 φ]άμα γα[μετάν Housman apud Grenfell-Hunt; φ]άμα μ[ε]γά[λαν Wilamowitz; φ]άμα γα[ρ]ύει Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt | 28 ὑψη[λαῖ]ς πραπίδες[] λαχεῖν κεδ- Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt; ἄγειν σεμ- Housman apud Grenfell-Hunt; ποι- Wilamowitz | 29 Δ[ιὸ]ς δ' ἄ[κουσεν ὀ]μφᾶν Grenfell-Hunt; ὀμφᾶν West *Philologus* 1966, 155 | 30 παρ' ἄνθρωπο[]ς γενεάν Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt | 31 Διόνυς[] ἔθ[] Snell | 31-32 Διόνυς[] ὀ[] θ[] εἰων ἄναξ[]] εφ[] γ[]άμας cān θέτο] / ματέ[]ρα Werner 1967, 537

Translation

- Earlier it went in a straight line, the song
 of dithyrambs
 and the s came falsely from the people's mouth,
 (but)
- 5 the circle dances knowing
 what sort of ritual festival of the Roarer
 even beside the sceptre of Zeus the heavenly gods
 celebrate (or: establish) in his palace. Beside the revered
 great Mother begins the whirling motion of the drums,
- 10 and in addition the castanets' noise swells and the burning
 torch under the golden green firs;
 and in addition the Naiads' loud sounding groans
 and their fits of madness and their cries are roused with
 the neck-throwing confusion.
- 15 And besides the almighty lightning, blazing
 fire is set in motion, and Enyalios'
 spear, and the valiant aegis of Pallas
 sounds loudly with the hissing sound of ten thousand snakes.
 Swiftly comes solitary Artemis, having
- 20 yoked in bacchic frenzy
 the (wild) race of lions (for the Roarer).
 And he is enchanted by the dancing herds ...
 ... But me as an outstanding
 herald of wise and skillful poetry
- 25 the Muse has appointed for Hellas
 me, boasting that (for Thebes) mighty because of its chariots ...
 where once, as rumour says, Harmonia ...
 Cadmus, with a high temperament, ...
 ...; and (s)he obeyed the voice of Zeus,
- 30 and bore/begot (a child) famous among men.
 Dionysus
 ... mother
 ...

Contents

The title at the top of the column cannot be exactly established but it is clear that it mentions Heracles and Cerberus. The text of the fragment itself does not refer to Heracles at all. It begins with a (probably negative) statement about the earlier dithyramb and the sound of the *san* (1-3). L. 5 $\nu\epsilon\alpha$ [seems to imply that Pindar then proceeded to his own poetry, but the text of ll. 4-5 is too fragmentary to be certain. In ll. 6-23 the Olympian gods are described as celebrating a Bacchic revel in the presence of the Great Mother. Ll. 23-26 are about Pindar himself and his role as herald of the Muses and constitute the transition to a mythical part about Cadmus and Harmonia, leading via Semele to Dionysus, the deity of the dithyramb.

Here the papyrus breaks off. How or how soon the transition to the Heracles story was effected, cannot be known. Since Pindar mentions both Heracles and Dionysus as names Thebes can be proud of (*I.* 7, 5-7; cf. Hes. *Th.* 530 Ἡρακλῆος Θηβαγενέος), it should not have been too difficult to make the transition from Dionysus (l. 31) to Heracles' adventure in Hades.

Metre

Fr. 70b is written in dactylo-epitrites and is divided into strophes. The papyrus breaks off before the end of the second strophe, so that it cannot be determined whether it was followed by an epode or another strophe. The metrical scheme is as follows:

	---x-----	e x D - e -

	---x-----	E - D
	-----x-----	d ² - E x D e
5/23	-----	
	-----	- D
	-----	e - D
	-----	d ¹ - E -
	-----	D - d ¹
10/28	---x-----x	e x D x E -

	---x-----	E - d ¹

	d ² d ² = E
	- - -	e
15/33	E = e
	e - D
	e - D -
	E - e -

Commentary

The first period of the strophe (ll. 1-5) contains the introduction of the dithyramb, followed in ll. 6-7 (period 2) by the general outline of the ensuing scene. The third period (ll. 8-13) pictures the ecstatic festival, comparable with the revels of the mortals (music, torches, frenzy). It is questionable if l. 14 is to be taken as a separate period: the contents do not warrant such an emphasis. It is perhaps better to assume that Pindar wrote the essentially Attic ξύν, so that the third period includes l. 14. The next periods (ll. 15-16 and ll. 17-18) show the effect of Dionysiac ecstasy on Zeus and Ares and on Pallas Athena respectively.

The first period of the antistrophe (or second strophe?) (ll. 19-23) introduces Artemis and Dionysus himself and rounds off the Bacchic scene. In the second period (ll. 24-25) the subject is the poet himself and in the third period (ll. 26-31/32) it is the city of Thebes, for which the dithyramb is composed. Although l. 32 is not complete, it does not seem to warrant the emphasis of being a period in itself (as did l. 14 not either). The last two periods of this (anti)strophe have been lost.

The two sequences of three double shorts (ll. 3-4 [D | d²] and 12-13 [d¹ | d² d²]) are broken by the end of the line. For D | d² cf. *O.* 7, strophe 5-6, epode 5-6; *O.* 13 epode 5-6; for D | d² cf. e.g. *N.* 1, epode 2; *I.* 5, epode 8. For d¹ | d² d² cf. *O.* 6, epode 2.

In l. 15 both linking ancipitia are short. Such long sequences of alternating long and short syllables also occur in *O.* 11, epode 4, and in slightly different forms in *I.* 3/4, 19 (e - e - E -) and *I.* 5, 2 and 5, 8 (~e - e - d¹). On such short ancipitia in Bacchylides and Pindar see W.S. Barrett, *Dactylo-epitrites in Bacchylides*, *Hermes* 84 (1956), 248-253.

Ll. 1-2 and ll. 19-20 correspond metrically, but the scribe has not divided both cola in the same way, apparently to avoid the division within a word. It seems best to assume that this was an error and to divide both cola consistently. The London Bacchylides papyrus shows similar inconsistencies, cf. e.g. B. 5, 35, 75

and 115 versus 155 and 195; l. 13 versus 53 and l. 28 versus 68. These are not corrected by Snell-Maehler. Since in other places division within a word is not avoided, and since the inconsistent colometry does not even solve the problem (cf. l. 75 ἀναπτύ-/ξασ), the metrical analysis should prevail over the scribe's choice. See also W.J.W. Koster, *Traité de métrique grecque*, Leiden 1953², 295-296 and n. 3. Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 41 divide ἀουδὰ / διθυράμβων because the traces of ink do not allow the reading -δὰ διθυράμβων in l. 2, which would be expected from the division οιοπόλας / ζεύξαις' in ll. 19-20. Consequently they divide ζεύ-/ξαις' there.

Title The beginning of the title is lost. The last three lines are almost certainly Ἡρακλῆς ἢ Κέρβερος. Θηβαίους. Above this can be seen traces of two lines which cannot be read. It is also not clear what sort of text we could expect to find there. An adjective with Ἡρακλῆς is not likely, since this would be more appropriate after it than before (see also Wilamowitz 1922, 345 n. 2); a noun such as the proposed κ]ατά[βρασις or κάθ]οδο[ς (Snell) is unlikely because Ἡρακλέους cannot be read: η is certain, followed by the upper half of a round letter like o or c, but almost certainly c, because the o is written much smaller by this scribe. This makes the epic form Ἡρακλῆος an unlikely conjecture, which is made even more implausible because the title was added by a grammarian who supposedly wrote in the Attic dialect. In the last three lines the title and the city are mentioned. No other information seems necessary. A noun such as δι-θύραμβος or Πινδάρου would be appropriate in an anthology, but the style of frs. 70a and 70c is consistent enough with that of fr. 70b to be considered Pindaric dithyrambs too. Perhaps a reference to the festival where the song was performed? The traces of ink are too small to check this suggestion. Pindar's Paeans, transmitted on papyri, are identified by the city and the god of the Paeon's occasion, cf. *Pae.* 6 Δελφοῖς εἰς Πυθῶ; 15 Α[ι]γυνῆταις εἰ[ς] Αἰακόν; 18 Ἀ]ργείοις ..[..]ς Ἡλεκτρώω[ν]...

Extant dithyrambs with titles besides Pindar's fragment 70b are Simonides' *Memnon* (Σιμωνίδης ἐν Μέμνονι διθυράμβωι τῶν Δηλιακῶν *PMG* 539), and most of Bacchylides' dithyrambs: 15 Ἀντηγορίδαι ἢ Ἐλένης ἀπαίτησις, 17 Ἡίθειοι ἢ Θησεύς, 18 Θησεύς, 19 Ἴώ, 20 Ἴδα, 23 Κακκάνδρα; Praxilla *PMG* 748 Ἀχιλλεύς; Telestes *PMG* 808 Ὑμέναιος. Dithyrambs, tragedies and comedies had titles because they were entered in contests and people needed some means of discriminating between them (Snell 1965, 125; but see E. Schmalzriedt, *Περὶ φύσεως. Zur Frühgeschichte der Buchtitel*, München 1970, 26-27 n. 10, who feels certain that the titles were added later, by the Alexandrine scholars).

Double titles are known from Bacchylides' Dithyrambs (B. 15; 17) and many tragedies (cf. Sophocles' Ἄτρεὺς ἢ Μυκηναῖαι, Μάντις ἢ Πολύδης, Ναυκικά ἢ Πλυτρίαι, Πανδώρα ἢ Σφυροκόποι and for Aeschylus *TrGF* T 78). At least seven of Menander's comedies have alternative titles. Cf. also Pratin. *PMG* 711 Δύσμαινοι ἢ Καρύτιδες. Originally the poems and plays had only one name, enough to differentiate between the contributions of the various contestants. Since the poets all drew their material from the same mythical background and since they generally used the same method of choosing a title by naming the play after the chief protagonist or the chorus, this led inevitably to confusion when grammarians wanted to compile catalogues. In such cases they either appended an alternative title (e.g. Ναυκικά ἢ Πλυτρίαι), they changed the original title (e.g. Αἴαντος θάνατος instead of Αἴας) or they added a specifying epithet (e.g. for Aeschylus' three plays about Prometheus and Sophocles' two plays about Oedipus). See A.E. Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, Oxford 1896, 395-402.

1-3 The text begins with a description of the older dithyramb. The words Πρὶν μὲν ... suggest a contrasting background, probably for ll. 4-5 where νεα [may refer to the newer poetry. An example of the newer poetry seems then to be shown in the scene of ll. 6-23, while in ll. 24-26 the poet presents himself as the prime representative of this newer poetry. Such an opening is a well-known motif: the poetry of the poet's predecessors is presented as the antithesis of his own poetry. For the antithetical construction and the same theme cf. *I. 2*, 1-11 οἱ μὲν πάλαι ... φῶτες, ... νῦν δέ etc.

It seems to have been a common practice among lyric poets from the fifth century on to comment on each other's poetry, e.g. Corinna's reported criticism of Pindar's way of handling mythical material, cf. *Plu. glor. Ath.* 5, 348c δεῖ χειρὶ σπείρειν, οὐχ ὄλω τῶι θυλάκω. Simon. *PMG* 602 ἐξελέγχει νέος οἶνος οὐπω <τὸ> πέρυσι δῶρον ἀμπέλου, is answered by *Pi. O.* 9, 48-49 αἶνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων / νεωτέρων. In *O.* 2, 86-88 σοφός ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυαῖ· μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι / παγγλωσσίαι κόρακες ὡς ἄκραντα γαρύετον / Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιθα θεῖον, the eagle is Pindar himself and the crows are two (unidentified) lesser contemporary poets (the scholiasts' interpretation that this refers to Simonides and Bacchylides is not generally accepted, see B.L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar. The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, New York 1890 [Amsterdam 1965], 152; Farnell 1932, 22; G.M. Kirkwood, *Pindar's Ravens*, *CQ* 31 [1981], 240-243). *B. fr.* 5 ἔτερος ἐξ ἑτέρου σοφός / τό τε πάλαι τό τε νῦν. / οὐδὲ γὰρ ῥαῖστον ἀρρήτων ἑπέων πύλας / ἐξευρεῖν may be either a reaction to *Pi. O.* 2, 86-88 or to Pindar's frequent emphasis on his originality in general.

Poets also used their poetry to talk about the rules of their trade and their own view of it, cf. *P.* 9, 76-79 ἀρεταὶ δ' αἰεὶ μεγάλαι πολύμυθοι / βαιὰ δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν / ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς· ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως / παντὸς ἔχει κορυφάν; *O.* 6, 1-4; Thgn. 769-772, and poems were the place to promote oneself and one's style. Pindar often used this method to emphasize his own originality, cf. *O.* 3, 4 μοι νεοσίγαλον εὐρόντι τρόπον; *O.* 9, 48-49; *N.* 8, 20; *I.* 5, 63, *Paе.* 7b, 11-17. It is uncertain whether Bacchylides did this too, cf. 19, 8-10 ὑφαίνε νυν ἐν / ταῖς πολυηράτοις τι καινὸν (ν.λ. τι κλεινὸν) / ὀλβίαις Ἀθάναις. Cf. also Tim. *PMG* 796 οὐκ αἰεὶδὼ τὰ παλαιά, καινὰ γὰρ ἀμὰ κρείσσω· νέος ὁ Ζεὺς βασιλεύει, τὸ πάλαι δ' ἦν Κρόνος ἄρχων· ἀπίτω Μοῦσα παλαιά; 791, 202-205 ἀλλ' ὧ χρυσεοκίθαριν ἀε- / ξων μοῦσαν νεοτευχῆ, / ἔμοις ἔλθ' ἐπικούρος ὕμ- / νοις ἰήε Παιάν. For a more detailed discussion of these topics see L.E. Rossi, *I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche*, *BICS* 18 (1971), 69-94, esp. 75-77; S. Gzella, *Self-publicity and Polemics in Greek Choral Lyrics*, *Eos* 58 (1969-1970), 171-179; G. Lanata, *Poetica pre-platonica. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Firenze 1963; Maehler 1963; Bowra 1964, 1-41 and 192-238; Radt 1966, esp. 64-68.

It is possible that πρίν refers to a specific poet or period. It has been argued that the mention of the *san* alludes to Lasus and the elimination of c in his Κένταυροι (C.M. Bowra, *Early Lyric and Elegiac Poetry*, in: J.U. Powell [ed.], *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, Oxford 1933, 49; 1964, 195). If that were true, Pindar would consider Lasus as another representative of the 'new generation'. This agrees with our knowledge about Lasus who is described as an innovator (see Introduction 1.2, 1.5). However, the effect of the comparison is stronger if Pindar sees himself as a unique poet. Especially in view of the emphatic ἐμὲ δ' in l. 23, it is likely that Pindar is contrasted with *all* his predecessors. This pleads for a non-specific interpretation of πρίν. It is not clear, however, in what way this second Dithyramb is an innovation because hardly any earlier or roughly contemporary dithyrambs have been preserved. Perhaps the contents, i.e. the Dionysiac scene on Mt. Olympus, are a novelty, just as the vividness of the scene, as expressed both by the style and the language.

1 εἴρπε χοινοτένειά τ' αἰοιδά : literally χοινοτένεια means 'stretched as a χοῖνος'. This may refer to the χοῖνος as a land-measure (cf. Hdt. 2, 6 ὁ δὲ χοῖνος ἕκαστος, μέτρον ἐὼν Αἰγύπτῳ, ἐξήκοντα στάδια) or to χοῖνος = rush, reed (cf. Hdt. 1, 189; 199; 7, 23 where χοινοτενής means 'in a straight line'). In both cases the interpretation is 'monotonous'. For χοινοτένεια based on χοῖνος as a land-measure cf. Call. fr. 1, 18 Pf. ...αὐτὸ δὲ τέχνη / [κρίνετε,] ἰμῆ χοῖνωι Περσίδι τῆλυι σοφίην; and the use of the term in later (rhetorical)

writings: Philostr. *Her.* 55, 4 καὶ ἄλλως σοφὸν ἐν τοῖς αἵμασι τὸ μὴ ἀποτείνειν αὐτά, μηδὲ χουνοτενῆ ἐργάζεσθαι; Eust. 946, 8 *σχ. ἔννοιαι*; Hermog. *Inn.* 1, 5; 4, 4 of rhetorical κῶλα exceeding a certain length (LSJ s.v. I.2). It is conceivable that these were based on Pindar's text, just as e.g. Callimachus more often derives expressions and imagery from Pindar. Cf. *Pae.* 7b, 11-14 Ὀμήρου [δὲ μὴ τριπτόν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν / ἴοντες, ἀ[λλ' ἀλ]λοτρίαια ἀν' ἵπποις, / ἐπεὶ αὐ[πι]τανὸν ἄρμα / Μοισα[]μεν with Call. fr. 1, 25-28 Pf. πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἀμαξα / τὰ στείβειν, ἐτέρων ἴχθια καθ' ὁμά / δίφρον ἐλ[ῆ]ν μῆδ' οἶμον ἀνά πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους / ἀτρίπο[υ]ς, εἰ καὶ στεῖνοτέρην ἐλάσει. See M.T. Smiley, Callimachus' debt to Pindar and others, *Hermathena* 18 (1914), 46-72; M. Poliakoff, Nectar, Springs and the Sea: Critical Terminology in Pindar and Callimachus, *ZPE* 39 (1980), 41-47; Richardson 1985, 383-401; J.K. Newman, Pindar and Callimachus, *ICS* 19 (1985), 169-189; Th. Fuhrer, A Pindaric Feature in the Poems of Callimachus, *AJPh* 109 (1988), 53-68.

ἔρπεε : Schroeder 1923², 415 changed the augmented reading of most MSS into the unaugmented ἔρπε, but there is no need for this. Metrically both forms are equivalent and Pindar would have written E both for ε and ει, and perhaps also for η. See also Braswell 1988 on *P.* 4, 243 where Schroeder did the same, changing ἔλπετο into ἔλπετο.

χοινοτένεια : the form of the feminine adjective is irregular, we would expect χοινοτενής. The only other similar forms in Pindar are female names such as Κυπρογένεια (*P.* 4, 216), Ἀκυδάμεια (*O.* 7, 24), Ἴπποδάμεια (*O.* 1, 70; 9, 10). See Kühner-Blass 1, 544 Anm. 8.

3 τὸ σὰν κίβδηλον : *san* is the Doric equivalent of Ionian *sigma*. Apparently the s-sound was considered disagreeable, and not suitable to the music of the flute, cf. Ath. 11, 30 (467a). Dionysius of Halicarnassus had a particular aversion to it and called it even θηριώδης (*Comp.* 14, 80 p. 54ff. U.-R.). It must have been very unpleasant to listen to, so that some ancient authors used it σπανίως ... καὶ πεφυλαγμένως (D.H. *Comp.* 14, 80), and other poets even went so far as to avoid the c altogether: Lasus' Κένταυροι; *TrGF* fr. adesp. 655 Ἄτλας.

Pindar does not avoid the c. The Greek language does not easily lend itself to this and a poet's energy can be better used (Puech 1923, 145-146). Yet κίβδηλον indicates that Pindar is not happy with the sound either, so that Wilamowitz' may be correct when he suggests that τὸ σὰν κίβδηλον refers to a bad pronunciation of the s-sound, and that Pindar teaches a better pronunciation to the members of his chorus (Wilamowitz 1922, 342; Privitera 1965, 29-32). Cf. Eust. *Orusc.* 133, 30 Tafel κίβδηλοῖς γλώσσαις καὶ ὑποχάλκοις, δι' ὧν ἐξηχοῦμεν ὡς κύμβαλα.

A playful illustration of the defensive position into which *c* was forced by linguistic developments, is given in *Luc. Lud. Voc.*

ἀπὸ στομάτων : for the interpretation of the clause 'εἶρπε... ἀπὸ στομάτων' see Braswell's observation (*Zaμηνής: A lexicographical Note on Pindar, Glotta* 57 [1979], 182-190, esp. 187) about 'mannerisms of a more formal poetic style', where 'the organ of speech from which the sound comes is mentioned together with a verb of motion or articulation.' Cf. Simon. *PMG* 585 πορφυρέου ἀπὸ στόματος λεία φωνᾶν παρθένος; *Pi. P.* 4, 10-11; *Pae.* 12, 16-17; *Il.* 1, 249 τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδῆ; *Pi. O.* 6, 12-14 αἴνος ... ὄν ... / ἀπὸ γλώσσης Ἄδρατος ... / φθέγγατ'.

4-5 νεα [in l. 5 suggests that ll. 4-5 are the answering clause to l. 1 πρὶν. This is a recurrent motif in poetry, see note on ll. 1-3.

Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 42 propose διαπέπ[τ]α[νται δὲ νῦν ἱροῖς] πύλαι [κύ-] / κλοις νεα, combining suggestions from different scholars. The metaphor is found elsewhere in Pindar: *O.* 6, 27 πύλας ὕμνων ἀναπιτυνάμεν. Cf. also B. fr. 5, 2 οὐδὲ γὰρ ῥαϊστον ἀρρήτων ἐπέων πύλας ἐξευρεῖν. For the rest of the lacuna (- - -) Maas' assumption (see Schroeder 1923², 546) ἰαχεῖτ' εἰδότες is widely accepted. This has more letters than the 5 or 6 which the lacuna allows, but because it contains two ι's it might fit. At least equally attractive is [κοφοὶ οἱ εἰδότες (Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 42), cf. *O.* 2, 86 κοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυαῖ.

The proposed δὲ νῦν is, however, doubtful because Pindar always uses the regular combination of νῦν δέ (cf. *O.* 1, 90; 3, 43; 12, 17; 13, 104; *P.* 9, 55; *I.* 2, 9; 4, 58). Where δὲ νῦν is found in other authors (cf. B. 6, 10; *Sapph.* 62, 9 Voigt; *A. Ch.* 763) δέ belongs semantically not with νῦν but with the preceding word. Even in *S. OC.* 932 εἶπον μὲν οὖν καὶ πρόσθεν, ἐννέπω δὲ νῦν, νῦν is not in opposition to πρόσθεν, but shows the continuation of the act of speaking, so that δέ is continuative rather than contrasting.

If we are convinced that the contrast with ll. 1-3 must be found in ll. 4-5, we may think of e.g. a simple δέ, or of δὲ οἱ νῦν (cf. *Pi. O.* 1, 105; B. 5, 4), *sim.* In this latter case νεα [could be the object of διαπεπ[.] [. In the lacuna between νεα [and εἰδότες there is space for 5 or 6 letters, depending on their width and on that of the last letter of νεα [. The text may have contained νεάν [ιδέαν, [ιαχάν *sim.* In the lacuna of l. 4 stood perhaps a noun such as χορῶν, μελέων (with *synizesis*) to be connected with this.

But of course it is possible that the text contained nothing like νῦν or νεα [at all. Perhaps we must divide κύκλοις νεα [, and think of e.g. ἔαρ[- (although the tail of the ρ should have been farther below the line than the traces on the papyrus allow). The removal of νῦν and νεα [from our line of reasoning opens

the way for quite different hypotheses. It is possible that ll. 4-5 are not opposed in meaning to ll. 1-3, but are a digression on the same theme. The Olympic scene in ll. 6-23 may then be preceded by e.g. οὐκ ἐβλόστες, at the same time a criticism of his predecessors and an illustration of his own craftsmanship. This would lay an even greater emphasis on l. 23 ἐμὲ δ'. That we have in l. 23 a turning point in the poem is confirmed by the emphatic position of the pronoun.

[κί-] / κλοι(ν) : κύκλοις refers to the κύκλιοι χοροί of the dithyramb, because the dithyramb was performed, at least in the Athenian contests, as a circular dance (see Introduction 1.3).

6-23 We are presented with a description of a Dionysiac festival on Mt. Olympus. All the characteristics of Bacchic rituals on earth are present.

The torches mentioned in l. 11 show that the festival is a παννυχίς, cf. E. *Ion* 716-718 (Parnassus) ἵνα Βάκχιος ἀμφιπύρους ἀνέχων πεύκας / λαίψηρὰ πηδαί νυκτιπόλοις ἅμα σὺν Βάκχαϊς; fr. 472, 13 μητρί τ' ὀρείῳ δαΐδας ἀνασχών; *Ion* 1077; Nonn. *D.* 12, 391 where the torch lit for Dionysus is called νυκτιχόρευτος.

The musical instruments (l. 9 τύπανα, l. 10 κρόταλα) are typical of the orgiastic orchestra, cf. *h. Hom.* 14, 3 ἦι κροτάλων τυπάνων τ' ἰαχὴ σὺν τε βρόμος αὐλῶν; E. *Cyc.* 205 κρόταλα χαλκοῦ τυπάνων τ' ἀράγματα; *Ba.* 120-134 about the origin of the τύπανον.

The main celebrants are women, usually the Maenads, here the Naiads (l. 12). The throwing backwards of the head (l. 13 ῥιψαύχεν) is a sure sign of bacchic frenzy, cf. E. *Ba.* 864 δέραν εἰς αἰθέρα δροσερὸν ῥίπτουσ'; 150 (ὁ Βακχεύς) τρυφερὸν <τε> πλόκαμον εἰς αἰθέρα ῥίπτων.

These parallels with Bacchic revelry show that there is no ground for Hardie's distinction (1976, 135) between ll. 8-18 (the Phrygian arousing influence of Cybele) and 19-23 (the taming effect of the Greek Dionysus). On the contrary there is a climax from joyful music (ll. 8-10), via the firebrands (ll. 10-11) to the Oreibasia (ll. 12-14), followed by the awe-inspiring attributes of Zeus and Ares (ll. 15-17) and finally the wild animals (ll. 18-21) (so also Zimmermann 1988b, 34).

L.R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar. Vol. I*, London 1930, 330 remarks that imagining deities as worshipping each other is quite exceptional in Greek religious literature. This is true; a somewhat similar scene, however, is described in an Epidaurian Hymn, probably of the fourth century B.C., fr. adesp. *PMG* 935, 9-12 ὁ Ζεὺς δ' ἐσιδὼν ἄναξ / τὰν Ματέρα τῶν θεῶν / κεραυνὸν ἔβαλλε, καὶ / τὰ τύπαν' ἐλάμβανε.

6 Βρομίου : Βρόμιος is Dionysus, 'the Roarer', see also Dodds 1960², 74 on E. *Ba.* 87. Cf. E. *Ba.* 66; *h. Hom.* 7, 56; 26, 1 ἐρίβρομος; 49, 3 ἐριβρεμέτης; *Pi.*

fr. 75, 10 ἐριβόας, and E. *Ba.* 156 βαρυβρόμων ὑπὸ τυμπάνων for his roaring kettledrums. For the ambivalent use of the adjective βρόμιος as both 'loud-sounding' and 'dionysiac', see Kannicht 1969 on E. *Hel.* 1308.

[τελε]τάν : cf. fr. 70c, 6 τεᾶν τε[λε]τάν, also referring to a Bacchic festival. The specific meaning became the regular use: 'from the later fifth century onwards (τελετή was) used chiefly of the rites practised in the mystery cults' (Dodds 1960², 75-76). This does not necessarily mean that Pindar refers to an initiation (for the view that 'Bacchic τελεταί are initiations' see R. Seaford, *Euripides. Cyclops*, Oxford 1984, 8 n. 24), because Pindar uses τελετά in the more general sense of 'ceremony', cf. *N.* 10, 34 (Panathenaea, see also C. Zijderveld, *Τελετή. Bijdrage tot de kennis der religieuze terminologie in het Grieksch*, Putmerend 1934, 7-9). If the verb ἵσταντι must be understood as 'establish' (cf. *O.* 2, 3 'Ολυμπιάδα ἕστανεν; 10, 58) the scene perhaps refers to the introduction of Dionysus and his festival to Mt. Olympus. Although the sources which mention Dionysus as one of the Twelve Gods are late (*Σ O.* 5, 10; Boethius *AP* 9, 248, 1 *Εἰ τοῖος Διόνυσος ἐς ἱερὸν ἦλθεν Ὀλυμπον*; cf. also Nonn. *D.* 8, 97; 13, 223; 256-258; 268-269) Pindar may well have known this tradition and used it in his material. On the other hand the Great Mother is not usually part of the Olympian household. The other meaning of ἵσταντι which might be suitable with τελετά, 'arrange', is therefore more relevant. Cf. *B.* 11, 112 χοροὺς ἵσταν γυναικῶν.

7 καὶ παρὰ κᾶπτον Διός : καὶ indicates that Pindar sees a parallel between the human festival and that of the Olympian gods. For such a parallel cf. also *P.* 1. For the sceptre of Zeus cf. *P.* 1, 6.

Οὐρανίδαι : originally used as 'descendants of Uranus', and so in Hes. *Th.* 502 the Titans, in Pindar Cronus (*P.* 3, 4). But Pindar, followed by later poets, also used the word in the general sense of 'the gods' (cf. the Homeric Οὐρανίω-νες, except for *Il.* 5, 898 where the Titans are meant), in which case the reference is to οὐρανός, 'vault of heaven', instead of to the deity; see Chantraine 1968, 838. Cf. *P.* 4, 194 πατέρ' Οὐρανιδᾶν ἐγχεικέραννον Ζῆνα; Call. *H.* 1, 3 Ζῆνα ... δικασπόλον Οὐρανίδησι. See Braswell 1988 on *P.* 4, 194 for more examples.

8 ἐν μεγάροις : this implies that the festival was held indoors. *L.* 7 παρὰ κᾶπτον Διός supports this, suggesting a royal throne and a palace. This would not only be contrary to the normal (human) practice, but also be incompatible with *l.* 11 ὑπὸ ξανθαῖσι πεύκαις (see note *ad loc.*). We must either assume that the palace included the surrounding terrain, or that the 'house of Zeus' is Mt. Olympus or heaven itself.

ἴσταμνι : too long for the lacuna, but the word is given in the margin, probably as a correction for the text's **ἰσάντι**, Doric for **ἴσασι**. The mistake may have been caused by l. 5 **εἰδότες**. A similar error was made and corrected in l. 18 **φ<θ>ογγάζεται**.

For the interpretation of **[τελε]τάν ... ἴσταμνι** see above on **[τελε]τάν**.

8-9 σεμνάι ... Ματῆρι ... μεγάλαι : cf. Pi. P. 3, 78-79 **Ματρί, τὰν κοῦραι ... μέλπονται ... / σεμνὰν θεὸν**; A. fr. 57 **σεμνάς Κοτυτοῦς ὄργι' ἔχοντες**; Ag. Av. 746 **σεμνά τε μητρί χορεύματ' ὄρειαι**.

That the Great Mother is the Phrygian mother-goddess is made evident by the explanation in Str. 10, 3, 13 **τὴν κοινωϊαν τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἀποδειχθέντων νομίμων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι καὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς Φρυγί περὶ τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν συνοικειῶν** (sc. Πίνδαρος) **ἀλλήλοισ** (after the quotation of 70b, 8-11), and also by the **τύπανα** and **κρόταλα**, attributes of Cybele. Cybele was known in Greece at this time, cf. *h. Hom.* 14; Pi. fr. 80; Paus. 1, 3, 5 **ὠκοδόμηται δὲ καὶ Μητρὸς θεῶν ἱερόν, ἣν Φειδίας εἰργάσατο**; the Northern frieze of the Siphnian treasury in Delphi (c. 525 B.C.) where Cybele is shown in a chariot drawn by a lion. See also Lehnus 1979, 120-121.

Other places showing the connection between Cybele and Dionysus are A. fr. 57 (introducing **τοὺς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον** as **σεμνάς Κοτυτοῦς ὄργι' ἔχοντας**; cited by Strabo 10, 3, 16 in his discussion of the similarity of the Greek, Phrygian and Thracian rites); E. Ba. 72-82 **ὦ μάκαρ, ὅστις ... / τὰ τε ματρὸς μεγάλας ὄρ- / γιὰ Κυβέλας θεμιτεύων, / ἀνὰ θύρον τε τινάσσων, / κισσῶν τε στεφανώθεις / Διόνυσον θεραπεύει**; Diogenes Ath. TrGF 45 F 1 in his *Semele* (and therefore probably containing mythical material about Dionysus): **καίτοι κλύω μὲν Ἀσιάδος μιτρηφόρους / Κυβέλας γυναῖκας ... / τυπάνοις καὶ ρόμβοις καὶ χαλκοκτύπων βόμβοις βρεμούσας ἀντίχερσι κυμβάλων**.

κατάρχει : **κατάρχεσθαι** in a religious sense means 'to begin the sacrificial ceremonies', but is almost never used in the active form. Three places are known: E. Andr. 1198 **θανόντα δεσπότην γούσι νόμωι τῶν νερτέρων κατάρξω**; an Attic funeral inscription of about 530 B.C., probably to be completed to read **[Α]ντιλόχο: ποτὶ σὲμ' ἀγαθὸ / καὶ σόφρονος ἀνδρὸς, / [δάκρυ κ]ἀτάρ[χ]σον, ἐπεὶ καὶ / σὲ μένει θάνατος** (CEG I, 34) and this line. P. Stengel, *Opferbräuche der Griechen*, Leipzig/Berlin 1910, 42 n. 1, wants to translate the active voice with 'honour': the active expresses that the ceremony is on behalf of the deity, in her honour, while the middle voice would express that it is on behalf of the sacrificing person, e.g. to ask a favour. This distinction would, according to Stengel, be analogous for **θύειν/θύεσθαι**. But cf. E. IT. 40 **κατάρχομαι μὲν, σφάγια δ' ἄλλοισιν μέλει** where there is no personal involvement to account for the middle

voice. Perhaps the interpretation 'honour' can be used for E. *Andr.* 1198, but for the funeral inscription (where the object is probably δάκρυ *sim.*) and fr. 70b, 8 (where there is no object with κατάρχειν) it is better to translate with 'begin'. This is also in agreement with the more profane use of κατάρχω, which cannot be excluded here, because it is not clear to what degree the scene is to be interpreted as religious and sacrificial (see above on [τελε]τάιν).

It is remarkable that in the Epinicia the *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν* occurs only rarely, but that in the Dithyrambs we find relatively many cases of this construction, in fr. 70b (ll. 8-9, 12-13), fr. 75 (ll. 16, 18, 19) and fr. 78, 2-3. Cf. also frs. 239 and 246a-b. It is the general view that in the *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν* the singular verb precedes the plural subject (Gildersleeve 1900, 53; Jebb 1908 on S. *Tr.* 520; W. Havers, *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax*, Heidelberg 1931, 20, 214 and W.J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar. Vol. II*, Leiden 1988, 88-89). Except for 70b, 12-13 all cases of *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν* in the fragments of Pindar follow this rule. The construction has the effect of dividing the clause into parts, thereby emphasizing both the predicate and the subject. Ll. 12-13 are an exception. It is remarkable that the subject consists here of three separate plural nouns. The other two places quoted by Gildersleeve where the subjects precede the predicate, also have a subject consisting of more than one noun: cf. *Il.* 17, 386-387 γούνατά τε κνήμαί τε πόδες θ' ὑπένερθεν ἐκάστου / χεῖρες τ' ὄφθαλμοί τε παλάσσετε; Pl. *Smp.* 188b καὶ γὰρ πάχνηαι καὶ χάλαζαι καὶ ἐρυσίβαι ... γίγνεται. How this must be explained is unclear. Perhaps the number of subjects in such cases evoked a sense of τὰ πάντα, 'everything', accounting for the singular verb.

Grammatically speaking ll. 8-9 κατάρχει ... ῥόμβοι and ll. 12-13 στοναχαί / μανίαι τ' ἀλαλαί τ' ὀρίνεται are cases of *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν*, but l. 10 κέχλαδεν and l. 16 κекίνηται are not. See also Kühner-Gerth 1, 68; Schwyzer 2, 608; Barrett 1964 on E. *Hipp.* 1255 + pp. 436-437. It is, however, clear that Pindar was aiming at a certain effect, when within ten verses there are four singular verbs, connected with eight subject nouns (four of which are masculine or feminine plural nouns): he is aiming, perhaps, at an effect of looseness and liberty, the grammatical liberties echoing the looseness of the bacchic scene.

ῥόμβοι τυπάνων : ῥόμβος is used for any circling motion, e.g. of an eagle (Pi. *I.* 3/4, 65), of javelins (*O.* 13, 94). It can also mean the kettledrum itself, cf. Ar. fr. 315 K.-A. ἴθι δὴ λαβῶν τὸν ῥόμβον ἀνακωδώνιον.

The word ῥόμβοι indicates that the τύπανα were moved in the air, so that we should not think of our sort of drums. The τύπανον/τύπανον is a hoop with a sheet of hide stretched over it (cf. E. *Hel.* 1346 τύπανα βυρσοτενή; *Ba.* 124 βυρσότονον κύκλωμα), a drum to echo the rhythm of the ecstatic dance and to

imitate the rumbling of the earth, cf. A. fr. 57 τυπάνου δ' εἰκῶν, ὡςθ' ὑπογαίου βροντῆς, φέρεται βαρυταρβῆς. We should probably imagine the τύπανα looking like tambourines, but without the small cymbals (*pace* Dodds 1960², 70). The combination of the original τύπανον and small κύμβαλα seems to be an innovation of the Hellenistic and Roman period (see F. Behn, *Musikleben im Altertum und frühen Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1954, 120). For illustrations, see the list in Wegner 1949, 228-229.

Strabo's κυμβάλων is a mistake; both the Oxyrhynchus papyrus (τυμπάνων) and the Berlin papyrus (Ἰων) show that the text is about τύ(μ)πανα. The τύ(μ)πανα are more regularly connected with Cybele than the κύμβαλα, cf. *h. Hom.* 14, 3 ἦι κροτάλων τυπάνων τ' ἰαχῆ σὺν τε βρόμος αὐλῶν; E. *Cyc.* 205 κρόταλα χαλκοῦ τυμπάνων τ' ἀράγματα. The form must be τυπάνων because τυμπάνων is metrically impossible.

10 ἐν δέ : anaphora in ll. 10, 12, 15, preceded by ἐν in l. 8, provides a good way of drawing attention by balancing the clauses (Bowra 1964, 206-207). An example of repetition, not to be interpreted as a characteristic of excited dithyrambic style (*pace* Seaford 1977/78, 88 n. 58) because a similar repetition is found in the description of Achilles' shield (*Il.* 18, 483-485 etc.) and also in Sapph. fr. 2 Voigt. Here ἐν δέ is repeated in l. 5 and l. 9, also in a description of a scene, but in connection with very soft sounds. For this and other figures of style, see Stockert 1969, 19-22). In Homer and Sappho ἐν δέ has a local meaning, 'thereon', 'therein' respectively. Because ἐν δέ in our fragment is the sequel to Ματέρει παρ μεγάλαι, the interpretation must be temporal, 'besides, in addition'. Cf. *N.* 7, 77-78 Μοῖρᾶ τοι / κολλᾶι χρυσὸν ἐν τε λευκὸν ἐλέφανθ' ἀμᾶ.

κέχλαδ[εν] : this is not an instance of *εχῆμα* Πινδαρικόν, but rather a question of how concord is reached between the verb and two or more subjects (see Kühner-Gerth 1, 77-82).

Κέχλαδεν is found only in Pindar, only in the perfect tense, and means 'swell', 'well up' or 'sing, ring out' (Chantraine 1968, 1261 'bouillonner' resp. 'bruire, retentir'). Its accompanying present is the hypothetical *χλάζω, analogous with καχλάζω 'bruire en bouillonnant' (Chantraine *l.c.*). Cf. Eust. 153, 34 χλάζω κέχλαδα παρὰ Πινδάρωι (723, 49 *idem*). It is used of sounds, *P. O.* 9, 1-2 τὸ μὲν... μέλος / ... καλλίνικος ... κεχλαδῶς; and of the exuberance of youth, *P.* 4, 179 κεχλάδοντας ἦβαι. The scholiast on *P.* 4, 179 paraphrases πληθύνοντας τῆι ἦβηι. The best interpretation here is 'swell' or 'well up': this meaning gives no problem when connected with (the sound of) κρόταλ', since it is similar to the use in *O.* 9, 2; neither is it difficult to imagine the word 'swell' said of burning torches: the flame makes it look longer and larger.

The ν is not really necessary for position building, cf. *P.* 5, 92 ἰππόκ'ροτον; *P.* 4, 232 κ'ρόκεον.

κρόταλ' : another instrument belonging to the orgiastic orchestra which consisted of drums, flute and κρόταλα, cf. *h. Hom.* 14, 3.

They are described either as clappers or castanets, or as cymbals. For clappers or castanets cf. *Σ Ar. Nu.* 260 κρόταλος (...) ὁ ἐχιζόμενος κάλαμος ἢ ξύλον πρὸς τὸ ἦχον ἀποτελεῖν, εἴ τις αὐτὸν δοιοίη ταῖς χερσίν. Note also the onomatopoeic sound of κρόταλα, like rattles, and the alliteration of the k-sounds in κέχλαδεν κρόταλ' (on alliteration, see Stockert 1969, 5-6). Cymbals would seem likely because of the regular adjective 'bronze': cf. *E. Cycl.* 205 κρόταλα χαλκοῦ τυμπάνων τ' ἀράγματα; *Pi. I.* 7, 3-4 χαλκοκρότου Δαμάτερος. Cf. also *E. Hel.* - 1308-1309 κρόταλα δὲ βρόμια διαπρύσιον / ἴεντα κέλαδον ἀνεβόα, where διαπρύσιον 'piercing', 'shrill' is more aptly said of cymbals than of castanets. A decisive argument in favour of the clappers is that there are no specimens left. If κρόταλα were made of bronze, we would expect to have found some of them preserved. For a list of illustrations of κρόταλα see Wegner 1949, 212-214.

αἰθόμενα : αἰθόμενος is an Homeric epithet used mainly with πῦρ (in Homer always in the genitive), but also three times with δαῖς (acc. pl.; cf. *Od.* 1, 428; 434; 7, 101) and a few times with other nouns. For use of the epic formula in Pindar cf. *O.* 1, 1 αἰθόμενον πῦρ; *Pae.* 6, 97-98.

10 δάις : the metre requires a long syllable (cf. l. 29). The scribe's δαῖς ought to be corrected into δάις, because δαῖς is not found elsewhere. Another accentuation error is found in the marginal ἔσταντι (l. 8). Snell has changed the scribe's δαῖς in his edition to δαῖς, with two shorts, convinced by J. Wackernagel, *Miszellen zur griechischen Grammatik, ZVS 27* (1885), 277 = *Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen 1953, 588. Even though δάις is the Homeric form, it seems to me questionable to change the long syllable into two shorts, when both the metre and the scribe demand otherwise.

For the torches in Bacchic revels cf. *E. Ion* 716 Βάκχιος ἀμφιπύρουσ ἀνέχων πεύκας; *Ba.* 144-150; 307-308.

ὑπὸ ξανθαῖσι πεύκαις : ξανθαὶ πεύκαι cannot refer to the burning torches although ξανθός can be explained as the colour of fire (cf. *B. fr.* 4, 65 ξανθαῖ φλογί; *Arist. Col.* 791a4 τὸ δὲ πῦρ καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ξανθά). We must follow Kirkwood who maintains that ξανθαὶ πεύκαι are the pines with light barks, 'glowing in the light of the torch. The festival is divine, but the locale is that of the pine groves of terrestrial Greek uplands' (1982, 326). The meaning 'under golden pinetrees' may seem at first sight more far-fetched, but in the first explanation δάις cannot be accounted for, especially because in that case both the δάις and the πεύκα

would be burning. The use of ὑπὸ makes it also more likely that the location of the scene was meant, cf. *Il.* 2, 307 καλήμ ὑπὸ πλατανίστω. This implies that *l.* 8 ἐν μεγάροισι cannot be taken literally.

12 Ναϊδῶν : the mortal Maenads are for this divine festival replaced by the Naiads. Nymphs are usually counted among the goddesses (*Il.* 24, 615-616 θεῶων ... Νυμφάων; Hes. *Th.* 129-130; S. *OC.* 680), although there is also another view that they are mortal, be it very long-lived. This second opinion seems to be connected mainly with tree-nymphs, the idea being that the Nymph died when the tree died, cf. Call. *H.* 4, 82-85 ἐμαὶ θεαί, εὔπατε Μοῦσαι, / ἧ ῥ' ἔτεδον ἐγένοντο τότε δρῦες ἠρίκα Νύμφαι; / Νύμφαι μὲν χαίρουσιν, ὅτε δρῦας ὄμβρος ἀέξει, / Νύμφαι δ' αὖ κλαίουσιν, ὅτε δρῦσιν οὐκέτι φύλλα; Ov. *Met.* 8, 771 'nymphā sub hoc ego sum Cereri gratissima ligno.' With their male counterparts, the Satyrs and Sileni, they came to belong to Dionysus' retinue, where they counterbalance the Maenads (Heichelheim *RE* 17, 1531).

Cf. Pratin. *PMG* 708, 4 (ἐμὲ) ἀν' ὄρεα κύμενον μετὰ Ναϊάδων; S. *Ant.* 1126-1129 cē δ' ὑπὲρ διλόφου πέτρας στέροψ ὄπωπε λιγνύς, ἔνθα Κωρύκiai νύμφαι στείχουσι Βακχίδες, where nymphs also take the place of mortal women, and the poet also 'alludes, not to the human festival, but to supernatural revels' (Jebb 1928, 201 *ad loc.*).

ἐρίγδονποι στοναχαί : the adjective is epic, in Homer almost exclusively connected with Zeus, cf. *Il.* 5, 672 Διὸς υἱὸν ἐριγδούποιο; *Od.* 15, 112 ἐρίγδουπος πόσις Ἥρης. It is used once of horses, *Il.* 11, 152 ἐρίγδονποι πόδες ἵππων. That Pindar connects it with στοναχαί is very unconventional, intended to convey the stamping of the dancing feet. The related ἐρίδουπος is not used in this sense either, although its accompanying nouns cover a wider range of things and places (*Il.* 20, 50 ἐπ' ἀκτάων ἐριδούπων; *Od.* 10, 515 ποταμῶν ἐριδούπων; *Il.* 24, 323 ἐκ ... αἰθούσης ἐριδούπων).

Στοναχαί here not of distress, but of ecstasy (Kirkwood 1982, 326).

12-13 Note the rhythm and rhyme of στοναχαί μανίαι τ' ἀλαλαί τ'.

13 μανίαι : the plural of this abstract noun makes the sense concrete (Gildersleeve 1900, 22; Kühner-Gerth 1, 16): 'attacks of madness'. Cf. A. *Pr.* 878-879 φρενοπληγεῖς / μανίαι (με) θάλπουσι; E. *HF.* 878 μανίαισιν Λύσσαις / ... ἐναύλοισι. For μανίαι cf. also fr. adesp. *PMG* 1003 εὖιον ὀρσιγύναικα μαινομέναις Διόνυσον ἀνθέντα τιμαῖς.

ἀλαλαίαι₁ : cf. E. *Ba.* 592-593 Βρόμιος <ὄδ'> ἀλαλάζεται; 1133; *Hel.* 1343-1344 Δηοῖ θυμωσαμέναι / λύπαν ἐξαλλάξατ' ἀλαλαῖ; Σ *Pi.* *O.* 7, 68 ἡ γὰρ ἀλαλαγή... λέγεται καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκβακχευμάτων. For its use with the orgiastic musical instruments, cf. E. *Cyc.* 65 τυμπάνων ἀλαλαγμοί; *Hel.* 1352; A. fr. 57

ψαλμὸς δ' ἀλαλάξει; *AP* 6, 51, 5-6 ἀλαλητὸν / ἀυλῶν. See also on l. 14. For this Dionysiac connotation see Deubner 1941, 1-28, esp. 25.

δρίνεται : a clear case of *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν*, see on l. 8 *κατάρχει*.

ῥιψαύχειν : the choice between *ὑψαυχέιν*, *ἐριαυχέιν* and *ῥιψαυχέιν* is clear-cut because only the latter is metrically possible. Moreover, the other words can be explained as scribal errors stemming from the unusual *ῥιψαυχέιν*.

Cf. E. *Ba.* 864 *δέραν εἰς αἰθέρα δροσερὸν ῥίπτουσι*; *On. Met.* 3, 726 *ululavit Agave, collaque iactavit, movitque per aera crinem*. By throwing their heads backwards the Naiads expose their throats to the air. When we visualize the scene we understand it is unnecessary to follow Powell (Τράχηλος 'Head', *CR* 53 [1939], 58), who maintains that the head is often indicated by words denoting the neck. See also Harder 1985, 75-76 on E. fr. 66A, 42. The movement of throwing the head backwards 'is not simply a convention of Greek poetry and art; at all times and everywhere it characterizes this particular type of religious hysteria' (Dodds 1951, 274).

14 ξύν : metrical analysis shows that l. 14 forms a period all by itself if we read *κύν*. This is unlikely, not only because such a short period would be unprecedented in Pindar, but also because the contents do not warrant such an emphasis. The solution would be to assume that Pindar wrote *ξύν*, thereby linking l. 14 without pause with the preceding *ῥιψαύχειν*. It is readily conceivable that in the tradition this was simplified to *κύν*. Pindar does not seem to use *ξύν* elsewhere, and the form is essentially Attic, but the consequences of keeping *κύν* seem more serious than of assuming the unusual *ξύν*.

κλόωναι : *κλόνος* usually refers to war scenes, cf. e.g. *Il.* 16, 331 *κατὰ κλόνον*; *A. Ag.* 403-404 *ἀσπίστορας κλόνοισι*. This makes the word remarkable in a festive scene, and draws attention to the fact that some other words in the preceding lines are also more readily associated with fighting and war than with festivals: this goes especially for l. 12 *στοναχαί*, but also for l. 13 *ἀλαλαί*, because *ἀλαλά*, 'loud cry', is used frequently in the sense of 'war-cry', cf. *N.* 3, 60; *I.* 7, 10; fr. 78.

15-17 The Dionysiac music rouses Zeus' lightning and the war-god, while the Apollonian music quietens them (*P.* 1, 5-6; 10-12). See also Schroeder 1922, 117.

15-16 ὁ παγκρα[τῆ]ς κεραυνὸς ἀμπνέων / πῦρ : for the fire of the lightning cf. *P.* 1, 5-6 *τὸν αἰχματᾶν κεραυνὸν ... / αἰενάου πυρός*; fr. 146 *πῦρ πνέοντος ... κεραυνοῦ*; *A. Pr.* 359 *κεραυνὸς ἐκπνέων φλόγα*.

It is theoretically possible that the lightning is here deployed by Dionysus: cf. E. *Ba.* 594 *ἄπτε κεραύνιον αἶθοπα λαμπάδα*; 1082-3 *καὶ ταῦθ' ἄμ' (Dionysos) ἤγρορευε καὶ πρὸς οὐρανὸν / καὶ γαῖαν ἐστήριξε φῶς σεμνοῦ πυρός*; *Opp. Cyn.* 4, 301-3 (see Dodds 1960², 151). Dodds also adduces *Pi.* fr. 70b, 15-16 as an

example, because this is a description of the god's thiasos. But in Pi. fr. 146 and in Aeschylus the context makes it clear that Zeus himself is meant, and in *P.* 1, 5-6 it is logical to assume the same, since this is the regular arrangement and Dionysus is not mentioned at all in *P.* 1. The parallels between *P.* 1 and fr. 70b make it natural to expect the lightning in fr. 70b to be handled by Zeus as well, and this interpretation is confirmed by *παγκρατής*, a regular epithet of Zeus, cf. *A. Th.* 255 ὁ παγκρατὲς Ζεῦ; *Eu.* 918; *E.* fr. 431, 4. Moreover, Dionysus would not fit in at this place in the catalogue of deities that is presented. He comes at the end.

16 κεκίνη[ται] : for the singular verb see my note on l. 8 *κατάρχει*. The perfect tense indicates the state of affairs and conveys a stronger meaning than the present: the lightning and the spear *are* in constant motion. Cf. *Hes. Th.* 791 (Oceanus) εἰλιγμένος εἰς ἄλα πίπτει. See Kühner-Gerth 1, 146-148; Schwyzer 2, 263-264.

16-17 τὸ τ'] Ἐνυαλίου / ἔγχος : Ἐνυάλιος is the most common epithet of Ares (cf. F.H. Bruchmann, *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas Graecos leguntur*, Lipsiae 1893, ↑ Hildesheim 1965, s.v. Ἄρης). Jessen *RE* 5, 2653 mentions Ἐνυάλιος also as an epithet of a 'kriegerischen' Dionysus, cf. fr. adesp. *PMG* 1027 Βρόμει δορατοφόρ' ἐνυάλιε πολεμοκέλαδε πάτερ Ἄρη. The capitalization of Βρόμει is strange, since it is not conceivable that Dionysus is meant here. It is certain, considering all the other adjectives, that Βρόμει should be read as another epithet of Ares: 'loud sounding, noisy'. Another place where Dionysus is called ἐνυάλιος is *Macrob. Sat.* 1, 19, 1 *Bacchus ἐνυάλιος cognominatur*. Macrobius' source is probably the fragment cited above, since there is no other passage where Bacchus and Ares/Enyalius are considered as one god; on the contrary, they are more often seen as completely incompatible (see below). For this fragment it is certain that Pindar refers to Ares: note l. 17 ἔγχος and as its counterpart the scene in *P.* 1, 10-12 καὶ γὰρ βιατὰς Ἄρης, τραχεῖαν ἀνευθε λιπῶν / ἔγχέων ἀκμάν, λαίνει καρδίαν / κόματι. For the ἔγχος as Ares' attribute cf. *Il.* 15, 605 Ἄρης ἐγχέεπαλος; *Pi. N.* 10, 84 κελαινεγχεῖ τ' Ἄρει, *Hes. Sc.* 453.

That even Ares comes under the influence of Dionysiac music is quite an accomplishment and says something of its power: cf. the antithesis between Dionysus and Ares in *E. Ph.* 784-785 ὁ πολύμοχος Ἄρης, τί ποθ' αἵματι / καὶ θανάτῳ κατέχη Βρομίον παράμουκος ἑορταῖς; and the description of Ares in *A. Supp.* 681-682 ἄχορον ἀκίθαριν δακρυογόνον Ἄρη.

17-18 ἀλκᾶεσσά [τ]ε Παλλάδο[ς] αἰγίς / μυρίων φοβογγάζεται κλαγγαῖς δρακόντων : Athena is here presented mainly as a martial goddess, her war-like character being given tangible expression by her ἀλκᾶεσσα αἰγίς. Cf. *h. Hom.* -

28, 1-3 Ἀθηναίην ... ἀλκήεσσαν; S. *Aj.* 401-2 ἃ Διὸς / ἀλκίμα θεός; *AP* 6, 124, 2 Παλλάδος ἀλκιμάχας. The snakes are to be understood as the θύκανοι around the edge, being shaken against the shield by Athena's movements.

18 μυρίων ... δρακόντων : the scholium explains ὄφ[ρων, but it is not clear why this is necessary. 'Strictly speaking, though poetry does not always observe the distinction, ὄφις is the genus of which δράκων is a species (Σ Ε. *Or.* 479)...' (Dodds 1960², 206). This can indeed be inferred from Hes. *Th.* 321-322 τῆς δ' ἦν τρεῖς κεφαλαί· μία μὲν χαροποῖο λέοντος, / ἥ δὲ χιμαίρης, ἥ δ' ὄφιός, κρατεροῖο δράκοντος; 825 ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαί ὄφιός, δεινοῖο δράκοντος. But the distinction is absent in *Il.* 12, 202-208 and Hes. *Sc.* 161-166. It seems best to assume that for poetical purposes ὄφις and δράκων were interchangeable, see LSJ; *Lfgre s.v.* δράκων.

φθογγάζεται : a rare verb, synonym of φθέγγομαι. To be interpreted as a verbum intensivum, see Kühner-Blass 2, 261. Similarly ριπτάζω vs. ρίπτω; στενάζω vs. στένω etc. For another occurrence of the verb cf. *Ion Trag. TrGF* 19 F 53.

κλαγγαῖς : κλαγγή indicates a sharp sound, often the sounds made by animals, cf. *Il.* 3, 3 κλαγγῆ γεράνων; *Od.* 14, 412 κλαγγῆ ... κυῶν; *h. Hom.* 14, 3 λύκων κλαγγῆ χαροπῶν τε λέοντων. For the hissing of live serpents, cf. *A. Th.* 381 κλαγγαῖσιν ὡς δράκων βοᾶν. Live snakes are impossible here, but entranced participants of the ritual may have had the illusion that the snakes were alive through the movements of the aegis. For κλάζω of lifeless things cf. *Il.* 1, 46 ἔκλαγξαν δ' ἄρ' οἰστοί. Φθ]ογγαῖ[ς in the Berlin papyrus must be a mistake, influenced by φθογγάζεται.

19-23 For wild animals in Dionysiac cult, see for example the illustration of a Maenad and a Silenus accompanied by a lion (W. Klein, *Die griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen*, Wien 1887, 59 [Nikosthenes]) and by a lion and a panther (id. 61). On the Siphnian frieze in Delphi Rhea/Cybele drives Dionysus' chariot drawn by lions. For another early illustration see Robinson 1949, 315, no. 17: a gold ring from Attica representing Cybele driving a chariot drawn by two lions. For illustrations of Artemis with lions see the list in Wernicke *RE* 2, 1437-1438.

19 ῥίμφα δ' εἶσιν Ἄρτεμις : while the gods so far mentioned were present on Mt. Olympus, Artemis comes from the distance (οἰσπολάς), quickly answering the call of the music. Cf. *h. Hom.* 9, 4 (Artemis) ῥίμφα ... ἄρμα διώκει.

Ἄρτεμις : here portrayed as the πότνια θηρῶν; cf. *Il.* 21, 470-471 πότνια θηρῶν, / Ἄρτεμις ἀγροτέρη; Anacr. fr. 1 Bergk ἀγρίων δέσποινα Ἄρτεμι θηρῶν. Cf. also *A. Ag.* 140-144.

Relevant aspects are Artemis' special relationship with spring, dance and song (cf. *h. Hom.* 5, 18-19 καὶ γὰρ τῆν (Artemis) ἄδε τόξα καὶ οὔρεσι θῆρασ ἐναίρειν, / φόρμιγγές τε χοροὶ τε διαπρύσιοί τ' ὄλολυγαί; 32, 18 ἐξάρχουσα χορούς; *Call. H.* 3, 3), and her connection with the worshippers of the Great Goddess, cf. Diogenes Ath. *TrGF* 1, 45 F 1, 6-8 κλύω δὲ Λυδάσ Βακτρίας τε παρθένουσ / ... Τρωλῖαν θεὸν / ... "Ἄρτεμιν ἐβείν. For a more detailed discussion see Burkert 1977, 233-237. For the relationship between Artemis and Dionysus see F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte*, Roma 1985, 242-243.

οἰσπολάς : it is difficult to see on the papyrus whether we should read οἰσπολος or οἰσπολας: the letter ο/α falls in the lacuna, but it is most likely α; the word in the margin is οἰόπολος, probably meant as an explanation. It is best to take οἰσπολάς as a feminine adjective, comparable to βρομιάς as the feminine of βρόμιος (cf. fr. 70a, 11), and ποντιάς (*N.* 4, 36; *I.* 3/4, 38) indicated as 'poet. fem. of πόντιος' by LSJ. The meaning is 'solitary, unaccompanied', cf. *P.* 4, 28 and Braswell 1988 *ad loc.*; see also Burkert 1977, 235. Artemis has nothing to do with sheep, which disqualifies LSJ *s.v.* οἰσπόλος II.

19-20 ζεύξαις : on the colometry see above on *Metre*.

The meaning of ζεύξαις ἐν ὄργαις Βακχίαισ φῦλον λεόντων is probably that Artemis makes the lions frenzied, binds them into a frenzy (see also Fränkel 1962², 521 who translates 'Artemis [...] der Löwen Geschlecht in bakchische Ekstasen schirrend').

20 ὄργαις : for the original meaning of ὄργή, sc. 'disposition, mood, temperament', and its emotional connotation, see Chantraine 1968, 815; W. Marg, *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Würzburg 1938, 13-14; H. Diller, *Gnomon* 15 (1939), 597-598; P. Huart, *Le vocabulaire de l'analyse psychologique dans l'oeuvre de Thucydide*, Paris 1968, 156-162. The meaning 'wrath, anger' is a later development. Pindar uses ὄργή in the original sense, see Illig 1932, 38 n. 1. Here the adjective Βακχίαισ gives it a more emotional force: 'in Bacchic frenzy' (Bowra 1964, 63; see also Renehan 1975, 152).

For ὄργή of animals cf. Hes. *Op.* 304 κηφήνεσσι κοθούροισ εἴκελοσ ὄργῆν; *Thgn.* 215 πολυτύπου ὄργῆν ἔσχε πολυπλόκου; *Semon.* 7, 11 West ὄργῆν δ' ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοίτην ἔχει; *A. Supp.* 762-763 κνωδάλων / ἔχοντοσ ὄργάσ; *Pi. P.* 2, 77 ὄργαισ ... ἀλωπέκων ἔκελοσ.

21 Βακχίαισ : the papyrus reads Βακχίαισ, but the metre requires Βακχίαισ, a normal variant.

φῦλον λεόντων ἀγρότερον : because φῦλον is regularly used in clauses with hypallage (cf. *Il.* 19, 30-31 ἀγρια φῦλα, μυίασ; *Ar. Av.* 777 φῦλά τε ποικίλα θηρῶν) both ἀγρότερον and ἀγροτέρων are possible.

For the adjective cf. Pi. *N.* 3, 46 λεόντεσσιν ἀγροτέροισι. Note that Ἄγροτέρα is a cult epithet of Artemis, the Huntress: *Il.* 21, 470-471 πότνια θηρῶν, / Ἄρτεμις ἀγροτέρη; *Ar. Eq.* 660; *Th.* 116; *Lys.* 1262; *Nonn. D.* 48, 840.

[Βρομίωι] : because the metre requires - - - and the sense requires an antecedent to l. 22 ὁ δέ, a case of Βρόμοιο is almost certain. The dative would be best, indicating that Artemis caused the lions' frenzy for Dionysus, as an expression of reverence.

22 ὁ δέ : Pindar's use of ὁ δέ as a demonstrative pronoun (this pronoun following a direct or indirect object in the preceding clause) is more like the strictly regulated use found later in Attic prose than the looser Homeric practice (see Des Places 1947, 45-47).

κηλεῖται : κηλέω and θέλω are used to express the enchanting influence of music: cf. Pl. *Ly.* 206b καὶ μὲν δὴ λόγοισι τε καὶ ᾠδαῖσι μὴ κηλεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔξαργαίειν πολλὰ ἀμουσίᾳ; *Archil.* 253 West; Pi. *P.* 1, 12 tells about the effect of Apollonian music: κῆλα δὲ καὶ δαμῶνων θέλωι φρένας; *N.* 4, 2-3 αἰ δὲ σοφαί / Μοικᾶν θύγατρει ἀοιδαὶ θέλωσαν νιν ἀπτόμεναι.

Dionysus 'in the midst of his thiasos, in the same hypnotic trance as his worshippers' (Kirkwood 1982, 326) is a well-known motif in vase-painting. See e.g. C. Houser, *Dionysos and his circle*, Harvard College 1979 and *LIMC* III, 1, pp. 463-464, nrs. 465-473. On the other hand there are many representations of Dionysus sitting quietly in the midst of a thiasos of Satyrs and Maenads. See *LIMC* III, 1, pp. 453-454, nrs. 325-342. Cf. *E. Ba.* 134 (τριετηρίδων) αἷς χαίρει Διόνυσος, where χαίρει does not make clear whether Dionysus is a participant or an observer, although the lines which follow make it likely that he participates, either in person or through the person of his ἔξαρχος Βρόμοιο.

χορευοῖσθαι : *P. Oxy.* 1604 is the only papyrus where an Ionic participle (χορευοῖσθαι) was used. Since the other papyri and the manuscript tradition in general used for the most part Aeolic forms, χορευοῖσθαι is the better text. See also Verdier 1972, 37-52. Verdier's explanation that the scribe of *P. Oxy.* 1604 may have erred because χορεύω is a technical verb from drama and therefore more readily written in Attic-Ionian, does not seem particularly strong, because χορεύω is also found elsewhere in Pindar (*I.* 1, 7; fr. 94c, 1) and in other lyric poets (cf. Pratin. *PMG* 708, 7; fr. adesp. *PMG* 939, 5; 1024, 4).

22-23 χορευοῖσθαι κα[] / ῥῶν ἀγέλαισθαι : the metre demands a long syllable and an anceps at the end of the line; κα[] ῥων must be either a participle with ὁ δέ, or a genitive plural with ἀγέλαισθαι. A verb with a suitable metre is καρκαίρω 'quake (of the earth)', cf. *Il.* 20, 157-158 κάρκαρει δὲ γαῖα πόδεσσιν / ὀρνευμένων. This verb is also found in Hesychius in the sense of πληθῦω and ψόφον τινα

ἀποτελέω. None of this sounds applicable to Dionysus. For a genitive plural noun I have not found an alternative to Housman's κα[ῖ θη]ρῶν (see Grenfell-Hunt 1919, 44), which in my opinion cannot be right. Καί has no function here. Χορευοίαιαι must be taken with ἀγέλαιαι since there is no mention of a group of female dancers. The Naiads (ll. 12-14) occur too early in the poem to be referred to here, although ἀγέλαι can be used with girls, cf. Pi. fr. 112 Λάκαινα μὲν παρθένων ἀγέλαι; fr. 122, 18 κορᾶν ἀγέλαν. The ἀγέλαι probably refer to the lions in l. 21 φῦλον λεόντων. Cf. Pi. fr. 239 ἰαχεῖ βαρυφθεγκτᾶν ἀγέλαι λεόντων.

23-25 ἐμὲ δ' ... : the sudden transition starting with a personal pronoun is a conventional usage, cf. Alcman *PMG* 1, 39 ἐγὼν δ' αἰείδω; it occurs frequently in Pindar, cf. e.g. *O.* 10, 97 ἐγὼ δέ; *P.* 2, 52 ἐμὲ δὲ χρεῶν. See Schadewaldt 1928, 300 n. 6; Des Places 1947, 10-11, 48; Lefkowitz 1963, 182.

The mention of Bromios rounds off the Olympic scene. The attention is now drawn back to the earth and the poet's role and mission. The parallel between the heavenly scene and the setting on earth is underlined by the parallelism of l. 8, ἴσταμνι, and l. 23, ἀνέστα'. The fragmentary state of ll. 4-5 makes it impossible to determine how strong the relationship is between l. 1 Πρὶν μὲν and l. 23 ἐμὲ δ'. Even if l. 1 πρὶν μὲν... is answered by ll. 4-5 νεα [(which cannot be verified, see my note *ad loc.*) the intention of ἐμὲ δ' must be seen against the background of old vs. new poetry. The 'I' is either the only one who is capable of new poetry (when ll. 4-5 are not in opposition to ll. 1-3, and when ll. 6-23 are therefore preceded by οὐκ εἰδότες *sim.*), or the 'I' is the representative (and a very special and outstanding one, ἐξάίρετο[ν!]) of the new poetry, which he taught to his chorus (whose members are then εἰδότες) and an example of which is given in ll. 6-23 (Hardie 1976, 116-117). See E. Thummer, *Die Isthmischen Gedichte. Band I*, Heidelberg 1968, 82-102, who devotes a chapter to 'Lob für den Dichter und seine Kunst'.

The announcement of the poet's mission (a conventional theme in archaic lyric poetry, called 'ars' by Pavese 1968, 424, the poet's task by Hamilton 1974, 16-17) marks the transition to the Theban myths (Kirkwood 1982, 323; Zimmermann 1988b, 45; see also my note on fr. 70a, 15, γὰρ εὐχομαι).

23 ἐμὲ : the first person pronoun can refer to the actual performer(s), instead of to the poet. This is indeed the case in the Partheneia (fr. 94a, 5-6; fr. 94b, 11-12; 33-35; 66-72; fr. 94c), in *Pae.* 2 (3-4; 24-30; 39-40; 102-103) and in *Pae.* 4 (21-27). However, the fact that a chorus performs the song does not mean that the first person always refers to that chorus, just as the second person does not always refer to the audience. In this case it is made clear by the context that the

first person indicates the poet's persona, since the chorus could never claim divine inspiration (see Tsagarakis 1977, 130-131). Cf. also *Pae.* 6, 5-11; 58-61; 7b, 15-22; 8, 1-4, where ἐγώ is clearly the poet's persona. See also Lefkowitz 1963, 177-253.

Self-identification and self-promotion are also found in the Epinicia (cf. *O.* 1, 115b-116 ἐμὲ ... / πρόφαντον σοφία; *P.* 4, 248 πολλοῦσι δ' ἄγῃμαί σοφίας ἐτέροισι), but are necessary in songs such as dithyrambs which were performed in competition (Maehler 1963, 71ff.; Lefkowitz 1963, 251 n. 108).

ἐξαιρέτο[ν] : for ἐξαιρέτος and poetry cf. *O.* 9, 26 ἐξαιρέτον Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον.

24 κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων : it is common for poets to call themselves heralds, prophets and servants of the Muses. For heralds cf. *Pi. N.* 4, 74 κάρυξ ἐτοιμός ἔβαν; *B.* 13, 230-231 αἰοδαὶ ... καρύξονται. See too Becker 1937, 80-82. For other terms cf. e.g. *Hes. Th.* 99-100 αἰοδός / Μουσάων θεράπων; *Pi. Pae.* 6, 6 Πιερίδων προφάταν; *N.* 6, 57b ἄγγελος; *Theoc.* 16, 29 Μουσάων ὑποφῆται; *Pl. Ion* 534e οἱ δὲ ποιηταὶ ... ἐρμηνῆς ... τῶν θεῶν. It may be significant that Pindar himself does not use the word θεράπων, perhaps because the term does not give enough credit to the poet's active role. A herald is under divine protection and therefore has a higher status than a mere θεράπων. From the beginning of Greek literature both heralds and bards are considered θεῖος, because they have a similar relationship with the gods: cf. *Il.* 4, 192 θεῖον κήρυκα; *Od.* 4, 17 θεῖος αἰοδός. See also Bona 1988, 119-120. Both προφάτας and κάρυξ relate messages from their superiors, a προφάτας from a god, a κάρυξ from a king usually. In this case κάρυξ is therefore not used literally, since the Muse is divine.

σοφῶν : in Pindar the meaning of σοφός oscillates between the earlier meaning of skilful and the later meaning of wise. In the many cases where σοφός is applied to songs, Muses or poets it retains at least part of the original meaning of ability, with its technical connotation. See B. Gladigow, *Sophia und Kosmos*, Hildesheim 1965, 39ff.; F. Maier, *Der σοφός-Begriff*, Augsburg 1970, 77-81; Gianotti 1975, 85-109; W.J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar. Vol. I*, Leiden 1987, 72, 111. Gianotti includes fr. 70b, 24, translating 'araldo di abili versi'. He adduces *P.* 4, 138 (Ίάκων) βάλλετο κρηπίδα σοφῶν ἐπέων, where Jason's ability to persuade is stressed; cf. also *P.* 4, 217 σοφὸν Αἰκονίδαν; 3, 113-114; *Call.* fr. 1, 17-18 Pf. For the Muses as the source of σοφία cf. *Solon* 1, 51-52 West ἄλλος Ὀλυμπιάδων Μουσέων πάρα δῶρα διδαχθεῖς / ἡμερτῆς σοφίης μέτρον ἐπιστάμενος; *Pi. P.* 6, 49 (δρέπων) σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων; *Pae.* 7b, 18-20 τυφλα[ῖ γὰρ] ἀνδρῶν φρένες, / ὄστις ἀνευθ' Ἐλικωνιάδων / βαθεῖαν ε.. [..] ὦν ἐρευνᾷ σοφίας ὁδόν.

ἐπέων : ἔπη is not merely used in the sense of 'words', but should be interpreted as 'words of song', 'poetry'. Cf. Pi. *O.* 3, 8 φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοῶν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε θέειν; *N.* 9, 3 ἀλλ' ἐπέων γλυκὺν ἕμνον πράσσετε; *O.* 9, 47; *N.* 6, 28-29.

25 Μοῖς' ἀνέστας' : the concepts of poetic inspiration and poetic genius must be differentiated (see Murray 1981, 87-100). Here ἀνέστας' points to the permanent state of poetic genius, and is therefore not quite comparable to fr. 151 Μοῖς' ἀνέηκέ με (an echo of *Od.* 8, 73 Μοῦς' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν) where the verb seems to point more to temporary inspiration.

It is uncertain whether the aorist means that Pindar refers to a specific act in the past or whether the aorist is meant to refer to a permanent state. Cf. *h. Hom.* 5, 2-3 (Αφροδίτη) ἧ τε θεοῖσιν ἐπὶ γλυκὺν ἕμερον ὄρσε / καὶ τ' ἑδαμάσσατο φῦλα καταθηγῶν ἀνθρώπων and 39 συνέμιξε. See N. van der Ben, Hymn to Aphrodite 36-291, *Mnem.* 39 (1986), 4-5 and n. 5: 'on the one hand, the aorists are historical in so far as they refer to a mythical past in which Aphrodite introduced sexual desire into the world; on the other, the expression implies a permanent fact (as is usual in phrases with epic τε), the goddess having devoted herself to love ever since.' The fact that in fr. 70b, 25 there is no epic τε suggests that the aorist ought to be taken as historic.

The relationship between the artist and the god is one of co-operation because while expressing self-confidence Pindar steadfastly acknowledges the role of the Muse. Cf. e.g. *O.* 3, 4 Μοῖσα δ' οὔτω ποι παρέστα μοι νεοσίγαλον εὐρόντι τρόπον; 10, 95-97 τρέφονται δ' εὐρὺ κλέος, / κόραι Πιερίδες Διός. / ἐγὼ δὲ συνεφ-απτόμενος ...; *N.* 3, 1^τ Ω πότνια Μοῖσα, μᾶτερ ἀμετέρα, λίσσομαι; 9 τᾶς (ἀοιδᾶς) ἀφθονίαν ὄπαζε μήτιος ἀμαῖς ἄπο.

Much has been published on Pindar's conception of poetry, see e.g. O. Falter, *Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern*, Würzburg 1934; H. Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf*, Utrecht 1935 (' 1978); Maehler 1963; Snell 1965; Bernardini 1967, 80-97; Tigerstedt 1970, 163-178; R. Häussler, *Der Tod der Musen*, *A&A* 19 (1973), 117-145; Gianotti 1975; Murray 1981; Verdenius 1983, 1-59, esp. 37-46.

Ἑλλάδι : Ἑλλάδι should be taken with ἀνέστας', and not with εὐχόμενον.

Cf. *O.* 1, 116 (εἴη ἐμέ) ὀμιλεῖν πρόφαντον σοφίαι καθ' Ἑλληνας ἕοντα παντᾶι. A survey of the victors for whom Pindar composed Epinicia and of the cities for which he composed Hymns, Paeans etc., shows that Pindar was indeed a panhellenic poet, successful all over the Greek world: in centrally located Greek πόλεις such as Thebes (e.g. *P.* 11; *I.* 1; fr. 29ff.; *Pae.* 1; fr. 70b), Athens (*P.* 7; frs. 75-77), Argos (*N.* 10), Corinth (*O.* 13) and Aegina (e.g. *O.* 8; *P.* 8; *N.*

3), but also in many Sicilian cities (*O.* 1; 2; 3 etc.); Cyrana (e.g. *P.* 4), Rhodes (*O.* 7), Tenedos (*N.* 11), Western Locri (*O.* 10; 11), Abdera (*Pae.* 2) and Ceos (*Pae.* 4).

κα[] : the papyrus shows only traces of ink of the fourth letter: α, δ, κ, λ, ρ or υ could be read. The metre requires _ _ _ _ . Κα[ι] followed by a word complementary with 'Ελλάδι: 'herald for Greece and the rest of the world' is unlikely, because Hellas represents the whole Greek-speaking world and a Greek poet would not be understood elsewhere. A second verb after κα[ι] is not necessary and a meaningful one is hardly possible before εὐχόμενον. Another adjective or participle with ἐμέ, (e.g. καινοτόμον, καινόγραφον, but υ cannot be read) would give too many adjuncts without connectives (ἐξάϊρετον, κάρυκα, κα[] [, εὐχόμενον), so that an adjective with 'Ελλάδι, e.g. κα[λ]λ[ι]χόρω (proposed by Bury and accepted by Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 44) is the best alternative. For καλλιχόρος said of cities cf. *Od.* 11, 581 διὰ καλλιχόρον Πανοπῆος; *h. Hom.* 15, 2 Θῆβης ἐνι καλλιχόροιςιν.

26 εὐχόμενον : this must mean something permanent here because of ἀνέστας'. Therefore εὔχομαι in the sense of 'praying for' is not likely, although praying for the city, the family or the person asking for a poem, is a conventional theme.

It is better to interpret εὐχόμενον as 'boasting', 'professing loudly', and to complete to e.g. Θ[ή]βαις γεγάκειν (Wilamowitz 1922, 343 n. 2) or Θ[ή]βαις γενέσθαι (Schmidt 1922, 92); cf. fr. 198a οὔτοι με ξένον οὐδ' ἀδατήμονα Μοικᾶν ἐπαίδευσαν κλυταὶ Θῆβαι. Boasting about one's descent or place of birth is already found in Homer, cf. *Od.* 15, 425; 17, 373; 20, 192; *h. Hom.* 3, 470. See H. Reynen, *Eὔχεσθαι und seine Derivate bei Homer*, Bonn 1983, 80-101. Also possible, and more apt for the occasion, would be αἰδεῖν, μελίζειν *sim.* For other such reasons to boast in Homer, see Reynen 1983, 112-129, cf. e.g. *Il.* 2, 597-598.

βρισαρμάτοις : a quite unusual adjective, used elsewhere only as an epithet for Ares, cf. Hes. Sc. 441 and *h. Hom.* 8, 1. The meaning here might be 'powerful through the weight or might of chariots' (Kirkwood 1982, 327). The Theban chariots must have been famous, cf. fr. 106 (ἐξοχώτατον) ἄρμα Θηβαίων. Hence the many epithets for Thebes referring to chariots, cf. Pi. fr. 195 εὐάρματε ... Θῆβα; S. *Ant.* 845; Pi. *I.* 8, 20 φιλαρμάτου πόλιος; fr. 323 codd. χρυσαρμάτους; S. *Ant.* 149 πολυαρμάτωι Θῆβαι.

Other examples where an epithet of a god is transferred to something else are *P.* 2, 4 τετραορίας ἐλελίχθονος and *N.* 2, 19 ὑψιμέδοντι Παρνασσῶι. 'Doubtless the audience witnessed this process (of brushing the cobwebs from formulaic

adjectives by using them in a novel situation) with immense enjoyment' (Carey 1981, 25).

Θήβαις ... : it is certain that Thebes was mentioned in this verse. Metrically it is possible both immediately after βριγαρμάτοιο and as the last word, but because εὐχομαι is here taken in the sense of 'profess loudly', 'boast' we need an infinitive in the lacuna. Θήβαις must therefore come first because an infinitive can only metrically fit - - -, but cannot be - - -.

The city for which the poem is composed, is usually mentioned earlier in a poem. The only exception to this is *P. 3*, where the name of Syracuse does not appear until l. 70. This, however, is not a regular Epinicion, but a *consolatio*, so that praise of the city is not really called for (see also D.C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar*, Leiden 1968, 27-68). In *P. 8* we read the name of Aegina for the first time in l. 98, but in ll. 23-24 (also fairly late in the poem) Αλακιδᾶν / ... νᾶκος supplies the same information.

27-32 The name of the city triggers the transition to a mythical story connected with its past and with its inhabitants. The first story is about the birth of Dionysus, a suitable and conventional subject in a dithyramb. It must have been followed, either immediately or perhaps after a run-through of Theban stories (cf. *I. 7*, 1-15; fr. 29), by Heracles' descent to Hades.

27-30 Cf. *P. 3*, 91 ... Θήβαις, ὀπόθ' Ἀρμονίαν γάμεν βοῶπιν; fr. 29, 6 γάμον λευκῶλένου Ἀρμονίας; Hes. *Th.* 937 Ἀρμονίην θ', ἦν Κάδμος ὑπέρθυμος θέτ' ἄκουιν; for the subsequent births of Semele and Dionysus cf. *B. 19*, 46-51. The marriage of Cadmus and Harmonia is a favourite topic for poets, cf. also *Thgn.* 15-18; *E. Ph.* 822; *Honestus AP* 9, 216. A picture of the wedding can be seen on the François-vase; see also F. Brommer, *Vasenliste zur griechischen Heldensage*, Marburg 1973³, 479.

The text leaves room for different interpretations. Combining suggestions of different scholars Grenfell and Hunt proposed ἔνθα ποθ' Ἀρμονίαν [φ]άμα γα[μετάν] / Κάδμον ὑψη[λαῖ]ς πραπίδες[ci λαχεῖν κεδ-] / νάν' Δ[ιὸ]ς δ' ἄκ[ουεν ὀ]μφάν, / καὶ τέκ' εὐδοξο[ν παρ'] ἀνθρωπο[ic γενεάν], and suggest that Cadmus in ll. 27-28 and Harmonia in ll. 29-30 are to be considered the subject (1919, 44). They argue that the subject of l. 30 τέκ' is more likely the mother than the father, and that she is also the subject of l. 29 ἄκ[ουεν]. Even though 'the change of subject (...) is eased by the position of κεδνάν' (Kirkwood 1982, 327), a text where one person is the subject throughout would be preferable.

It is grammatically possible to retain this text and take Cadmus as the subject of the whole passage. Pindar uses τίκτω more frequently in the sense of 'give birth to', but 'beget' is also found, cf. *O. 7*, 71; 74; *P. 9*, 33. The distinction has

already become blurred in Homer, see A. Hoekstra, *Epic Verse before Homer*, Amsterdam/Oxford/New York 1981, 72-81.

If Harmonia is the subject of ll. 27-30 the text must be different. One of the versions of the story is that Harmonia is rather reluctant to marry Cadmus: Nonn. *D.* 4, 28-31 παρθενική δ' αίουσα πολυπλάγκτους ὑμεναίους / καὶ πόειν ἀστήρικτον, ἰπυρόφιον μετανάστην / ξείνον ἔχειν ἀπέειπε, καὶ ἐκ Διὸς ὄσσα τοκῆος / ξεινοδόκος Κάδμοιο βοοσσός ἔννεπεν Ἐρμῆς; Σ *E. Ph.* 7 where Cadmus is said to ἀρπάσαι Ἄρμονίαν. This would suggest e.g. 'where once, as rumour goes, (...) Harmonia (refused) Cadmus as her husband (γα[μέταν] in her haughtiness. But Zeus' voice she obeyed and she gave birth to ...' Since the sources of this version of the story are late, it seems better to adopt the former suggestion, and to take Cadmus as the subject in ll. 27-30.

27 ἔνθα ποθ' : the introduction of the myth by a relative with ποτε is a regular procedure in Pindar; see Des Places 1947, 48; Illig 1932, 32-33. For ποτε 'légendaire' cf. *O.* 3, 13; *P.* 1, 16; 4, 10; 4, 20; 4, 53; etc.

28 ὑψη[λαῖ]ς πραπίδε[ς]αι : if the subject of the clause is Cadmus, ὑψη[λαῖ]ς πραπίδε[ς]αι has probably a positive connotation; Cadmus receives Harmonia as his wife 'through his lofty spirit, because of his stately mind'. For this positive interpretation of ὑψηλός cf. Pi. *O.* 5, 1 ὑψηλῶν ἀρετῶν; *P.* 3, 111 κλέος ... ὑψηλόν. If Harmonia is taken as the subject, the connotation of ὑψη[λαῖ]ς πραπίδε[ς]αι must be one of haughtiness, arrogance. Cf. Pi. *P.* 2, 51 (θεός) ὑψιφρόνων τιν' ἔκαμψε βροτῶν.

29 Δ[ιὸ]ς δ' ἄκουσεν ὄμφαν : ἀκούω in the sense of 'obey' needs a genitive, cf. *Il.* 19, 256 ἀκούοντες βασιλῆος; *Od.* 7, 11 θεοῦ δ' ὡς δῆμος ἄκουεν; Pi. *P.* 1, 2 τᾶς (φόρμιγγος) ἀκούει βᾶσις. Therefore ὄμφαν should be accented ὄμφᾶν (M.L. West, Conjectures on 46 Greek Poets, *Philologus* 110 [1966], 155).

Pindar uses ὄμφά here in the Homeric sense of 'voice of a god' (cf. *Il.* 20, 129; *Od.* 3, 215). For the plural cf. S. *OC.* 102 κατ' ὄμφὰς τὰς Ἀπόλλωνος.

30 καὶ τέκ' εὔδοξο[ν παρ'] ἀνθρώπο[ι]ς : the line may be completed with γενεάν οἱ Σεμέλαν, cf. ll. 31-32.

31 Διόνυ[ς]. : this must be a vocative, if an accent is to be read before]θ, because other cases of Διόνυκος would fill the whole lacuna and leave no room for the vowel with the accent. Snell's Διόνυ[ς]ε cé] θ[is too long. Perhaps something like Διόνυ[ς] ἐύ]θ]υρος? For the adjective cf. Nonn. *D.* 13, 53; for ἐύ- cf. *P.* 12, 3 ἐύδματον.

Διόνυκος is more frequent than Διώνυκος. The latter form occurs for metrical reasons in *O.* 13, 18; *Pae.* 4, 25; fr. 29, 5; fr. 124, 3; fr. 153 (Van Groningen 1960, 89).

Related fragments

There are a number of fragments that may be part of the same dithyramb as fr. 70b. The arguments for their inclusion are based mainly on grounds of contents. Their relative order cannot be established.

Fr. 249a is a scholium on *Il.* 21, 194 about Heracles' visit to Hades, his meeting with Meleager, Deianeira's brother, and his struggle with Acheloo. According to the scholium, this is a story *παρὰ Πινδάρῳ*. The title of fr. 70b and the first words of the scholium: 'Ηρακλῆς εἰς Ἄιδου κατελθὼν ἐπὶ τὸν Κέρβερον, seem to justify the suggestion (also made by Wilamowitz 1922, 342) that fr. 249a should be included in this dithyramb which begins with fr. 70b, although there is no further evidence. Another scholium on *Il.* 21, 195, referring to Acheloo, quotes Pi. fr. 249b *πρόσθα μὲν ἔς Ἀχελῷου τὸν αἰοιδότατον / Εὐρωπία κράνα Μέλ[α]ν[ό]ς τε {ποταμοῦ} ῥοαί / τρέφον κάλαμον*. There is no metrical correspondence between fr. 249b and fr. 70b, nor with fr. 81. It is possible that the Theban dithyramb was triadic, and that fr. 249b was part of an epode, but it seems better to follow Snell-Maehler and to place fr. 249b among the Paeans on the basis of fr. 70 (= *Σ P.* 12, 44): *ἐν γὰρ τῷ Κηφισσῷ οἱ αὐλτρικοὶ κάλαμοι φύονται· εἶρηται δὲ καὶ ἐν παιᾶσι περὶ αὐλτρικῆς*. See also Bona 1988, 320.

Fr. 249c = *Σ Il.* 8, 368 *Πίνδαρος δὲ ἑκατόν, Ἑκίοδος δὲ πεντήκοντα ἔχειν αὐτὸν* (sc. Cerberus) *κεφαλὰς* possibly belongs here too. There is no real evidence, but Cerberus does not figure in any of the extant works of Pindar, and since this dithyramb mentions Cerberus in its title, it seems not far-fetched to include the testimonium here.

It is practically certain that fr. 81 belongs with fr. 70b, because the fragment is preceded by the words *μνησθένος ... ἐν διθυράμβῳ τινί* and because the metre of fr. 81 corresponds with that of fr. 70b. M. Davies, Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* and its folk-tale origins, *CQ* 38 (1988), 277-290 argues that Heracles' mission to catch the cattle of Geryon is a 'Jenseitsfahrt' and that the quest for Cerberus is its doublet, added to Heracles' labours at a later stage, when the references of the Geryon story to the Underworld were no longer understood. It is not likely that Pindar was conscious of such parallels because Pindar's praise of Geryon is not consistent with the ultimately positive effect of Heracles' quest (in Davies' view), i.e. conquering Death.

In fr. 346 Heracles is apparently initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries before descending into Hades and meets with Meleager in the Underworld. This fits the story of fr. 249a, so that it is defensible to place fr. 346 with fr. 70b, even though the metres do not fit. Fr. 346 may have come from the epode. It is not likely that

this fragment came from a hymn to Persephone, either of Pindar (fr. 37) or Bacchylides (frs. 2-3), as was suggested by Bartoletti in his edition of *PSI* 14, 1391. The mention in the fragment of the establishment of the Mysteries does not seem prominent enough for that.

Σ Α Δ Gen. Hom. II. 21, 194 (5, 165, 71 Erbse) ad τῶι (Διί) οὐδὲ κρείων Ἄχελώϊος ἰσοφαρίζει·

Ἡρακλῆς εἰς Ἄιδου κατελθὼν ἐπὶ τὸν Κέρβερον συνέτυχε Μελεάγρῳ τῳ Οἰνέως, οὗ καὶ δευθέντος γῆμαι τὴν ἀδελφὴν Δηϊάνειραν, ἐπανελθὼν εἰς φῶς ἔσπευσε εἰς Αἰτωλίαν πρὸς Οἰνέα· καταλαβὼν δὲ μνηστευομένην τὴν κόρην Ἄχελῳ τῳ πλησίον ποταμῳ διεπάλασε αὐτῳ ταύρου μορφὴν ἔχοντι· οὗ καὶ ἀποσπᾶσας τὸ ἕτερον τῶν κεράτων ἔλαβε τὴν παρθένον. φασι δὲ αὐτὸν Ἄχελῳ παρὰ Ἀμαλθείας τῆς Ὠκεανοῦ κέρας λαβόντα δοῦναι τῳ Ἡρακλεῖ καὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἀπολαβεῖν. δοκεῖ δὲ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ποταμῶν μέγιστος εἶναι ὁ Ἄχελῳς· διὸ καὶ πᾶν ὕδωρ τῆι τούτου προσηγοῖται καλεῖται. ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Πινδάρῳ.

3 μνηστευομένην δὲ καταλαβὼν Ge; καταλαβὼν δὲ μνηστευόμενον Bergk | 4 Ἄχελῳ τὸν πλησίον ποταμὸν A D | 4 οὗ οἱ. Ge | 5-6 αὐτὸν τὸν Ἄχελῳ D Ge | 6 παρ' D (edd.) | κέρας: γέρας Ge | 8-9 ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Πινδάρῳ: ἱστορεῖ Πινδαρος D

Heracles descending into Hades to get Cerberus, met Oineus' son Meleager, and because Meleager asked him to marry his sister Deianeira, he hurried to Aetolia to Oineus after he came back into the light; and having found on arrival that the girl was courted by Achelous, the nearby river, he wrestled with Achelous who had the shape of a bull; having torn from him one of his horns Herakles took the girl. And they say that Achelous himself obtained a horn from Amaltheia, the daughter of Oceanus, and gave it to Heracles, and took back his own. The Achelous seems to be the largest of the rivers in Greece; therefore all water is called by that name. (This is) the story in Pindar.

The meeting of Heracles with Meleager in Hades (fr. 249a) is also related by Bacchylides (B. 5, 94-154) and mentioned by Apollod. 2, 5, 12 ὁππῆρκα δὲ εἶδον αὐτὸν αἱ ψυχαί, χωρὶς Μελεάγρου καὶ Μεδοῦσης τῆς Γοργόνοσ ἐφυγον. It is also found in Pi. fr. 346 (see below).

The story is treated very differently by Pindar and Bacchylides. As far as can be concluded from the scholium, Pindar did not relate how Meleager died, but let Meleager ask Heracles to marry his sister Deianeira, to save her from Achelous. Fr. 346 tells us only that Heracles and Meleager meet, and that they talked

privately (? fr. 346c, 3 ἀτρεθῆ[]). Bacchylides lets Meleager tell the story of the Calydonian boar hunt and how he accidentally killed his uncles. Therefore his mother wanted revenge and brought about his death. Heracles is so full of admiration for Meleager that he asks if Meleager perhaps has a sister whom he can marry, and the mythical part ends with the answer that Deianeira is his sister. In the Homeric version (*Il.* 9, 571), it is not specified how Meleager met his end, but Phrynichus tells how Meleager's mother burned the log which sustained his life (*TrGF* 1, 3 F 6). The version of Bacchylides is that of Phrynichus and is also followed by A. *Ch.* 604-612; D.S. 4, 34, 5-7. In another version of the story (in the lost *Minyas* [Paus. 10, 31, 3]; Hes. fr. 25, 12 M-W.; fr. 280, 2 M-W.) Meleager is killed in battle by Apollo. For the view that the death of Meleager caused by the firebrand is a post-Homeric innovation, see J.R. March, *The Creative Poet, BICS Supplement* 49 (1987), 29-46; J. Bremmer, La plasticité du mythe: Méléagre dans la poésie homérique, in C. Calame (ed.), *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique*, Genève 1988, 37-56.

Maehler in his commentary on B. 5 (1982, 80-82) suggests that Pindar did not need the story about Meleager himself, because the emphasis is on Deianeira and Achelous: when Heracles descends into Hades the shade of Meleager does not flee from him (cf. Apollod. 2, 5, 12), because he wants to ask Heracles to rescue his sister from Achelous. The combination of this meeting with Meleager's story may be an innovation of Bacchylides. This interpretation cannot be more than a suggestion (as Maehler admits, p. 82) but is in accordance with the text of frs. 249a and 346.

For the story of Deianeira cf. also Archil. fr. 286-287 West; S. *Tr.* 6-26; 503-530.

The fight with Achelous is an example of other struggles of Heracles with the 'Old Man of the Sea'; see W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Sather Classical Lectures vol. 47, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1979, 95-96 and nn. 13-14. An illustration of the fight is shown on an Attic red-figure vase of c. 510 (*ARV*² 54, 5 Oltos). Achelous has here a human body with a bull horn above and a fish shape below (the fins show that the intended animal is a fish and not a snake or a creature of the sea with a dragon's tail, as H.P. Isler, *Achelous*, Bern 1970, 16 writes and as S. *Tr.* 12 δράκων demands). Other illustrations show Achelous predominantly as a bull with a human torso, whereas this illustration emphasizes Achelous' role of river god; see Isler 1970, 16.

Σ Α b (BCE^{3E4}) T Hom. *Il.* 8, 367-368 (2, 366, 29 Erbse) ad εὔτε μιν εἰς Ἄϊδαο
 πυλάρταο προὔπεμψεν / ἐξ ἐρέβευς ἄξοντα κύνα στυγεροῦ Ἄϊδαο·

ἀπὸ τοῦ μείζονος ἄθλου πάντας δηλοῖ. οἶδε δὲ τὸν κύνα καὶ τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ.
 Πίνδαρος δὲ ἑκατόν, Ἡσίοδος δὲ πεντήκοντα ἔχειν αὐτὸν κεφαλὰς φασι

1 οἶδεν Α | καὶ b: ἦ T | 2 δὲ T: μὲν οὖν b; γοῦν Α | κεφαλὰς αὐτὸν ἔχειν φησὶν b

He clarifies all deeds by the largest one. He knows the dog and its nature.
 Pindar says that he has a hundred, Hesiod that he has fifty heads.

In Maehler's edition of Pindar (following the numbering of Snell) this scholium is given after fr. 249a and indicated as id.b. This cannot be interpreted as fr. 249b, because there is already a fragment of that number after fr. 70. Professor Maehler agrees with me that the scholium needs a separate number. I think it is most convenient to identify it henceforth as fr. 249c.

A reference to the poem of which fr. 249c is a part may be seen in Tertull. *de corona* 7 (1, 432 Oehler): *Hercules nunc populum capite praefert, nunc oleastrum nunc apium. habes tragoediam Cerberi, habes Pindarum atque Callimachum* (fr. 89 Pf.) *qui et Apollinem numerat interfecto Delphyne dracone lauream induisse qua supplicem.*

The mention of Cerberus in *Il.* 8, 368 κύνα στυγεροῦ Ἄϊδαο and in *Od.* 11, 623 κύ(α) occurs both times in the context of Heracles' mission to bring up the Hell-dog. The actual name is found for the first time in Hes. *Th.* 311-312 Κέρβερον ὠμηστήν, Ἄϊδεω κύνα χαλκεόφωνον, / πεντηκοντακέφαλον, ἀναιδέα τε κρατερόν τε. This last place is mentioned by the scholiast on *Il.* 8, 368, who adds that Pindar gave a hundred heads to Cerberus. Cf. Hor. *Od.* 2, 13, 34 *belua centiceps*. But the number of heads must probably be understood οὐκ ἀριθμητικῶς, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τοῦ πολυκέφαλος (Σ Pi. P. 1, 31 about the hundred heads of Typhon). See also *LfggE* s.v. ἑκατόμβη, ἑκατόμπολις, ἑκατόμπυλος and Van Groningen 1960, 41 on fr. 122, 24 (122, 19 M.) ἑκατόγγυλον. In the visual arts, Cerberus most often has two heads in the sixth century (see e.g. a gem of c. 500 B.C. described by Robinson 1949, 312-314), or only one. Three heads become common on red-figure vases and also in tragedy (cf. S. *Tr.* 1098; E. *HF.* 611; 1277).

The actual word may have been ἑκατογκεφάλας (cf. Pi. *O.* 4, 8; Ar. *Nu.* 336); ἑκατογκεφάλος (cf. Ar. *Ra.* 473; E. *HF.* 883); ἑκατογκάρανος (cf. A. *Pr.* 353); ἑκατόγκρανος (cf. Pi. P. 8, 16); ἑκατοιντακάρανος (cf. Pi. P. 1, 16).

Fr. 81

- - - - - cè δ' ἐγὼ παρά μιν
 αἰνέω μέν, Γηρυόνα, τὸ δὲ μὴ Δί
 φίλτερον σιγῶμι πάμπαν' - - - -

Aristid. 2, 229 (I, 209, 11-17 Lenz-Behr) δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ Πίνδαρος, εἴ τι δεῖ περὶ τοῦ αἵματος (fr. 169a) εἰπεῖν, οὐκ εἰσηγούμενος οὐδὲ συμβουλευόν σπουδῆ ταῦτα λέγειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλ' ὡς περὶ σκεπτικῶν. τεκμαίρομαι ἔργουιν' Ἡρακλέος αὐτοῖς τούτοις, ὅτι καὶ ἐτέρωθι μεμνημένος περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν διθυράμβῳ τινί, 'Σὲ δ' ἐγὼ παρ' ἀμῖν' φησὶν αἰνέω μέν Γηρυόνη, τὸ δὲ μὴ Διὶ φίλτερον σιγῶμι πάμπαν.' οὐ γὰρ εἰκόσ, φησὶν, ἀρπαζομένων τῶν ὄντων καθῆσθαι παρ' ἑστῆαι καὶ κακὸν εἶναι. | *Scholía* Σ Aristid. 3, 409 Dind. cè δέ, ὡ Γηρυόνη, ἐπαυῶ παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν Ἡρακλέα· ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὰ σὺκ ὄντα ἀφείλετο ἐν βιαίαι χειρί, εὐ δέ, ὡς ἀδικούμενος, μάχην πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤραε, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἀποδεκτός. ἵνα δὲ μὴ τις αὐτῶι εἴπη ὡς Διὸς βουλῆι τοῦτο γέγνε, πῶς οὖν αὐτὸς πρὸς Ἡρακλέα δυσχεραίνει, ἐπάγει· ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς οὐκ ἀποδέχεται, καὶ αὐτὸς σιγῶ.

1 παρά μιν Hermann 1834: παρ' ἀμῖν Aristid. edd.; παρ' ἀμῖν Aristid. codd. T, Q, R, rec.; παράμιν Aristid. codd. E, U; παρ' αμῖν Aristid. cod. A; παρ αμῖν Aristid. cod. V | 2 Γηρυόνα Boeckh 1821: Γηρυόνη Aristid. edd.; Γηρυόνι Aristid. codd. A, E, a; Γαρύονα Schroeder 1900 | Διὶ Hermann: Διὶ Aristid. edd. | 3 σιγῶμι Aristid. edd.; σιγῶμι Aristid. codd. T, Q, V; σιγῶ μὴ Aristid. codd. A, E, U, R, rec.a | οὐ γὰρ εἰκόσ Snell 1975⁴

You, as well as him (Heracles), I
 praise, Geryoneus, but of what is
 not pleasing to Zeus, I would not speak at all.

Contents

The fragment is clearly divided into two antithetical parts, underlined by μέν ... δέ expressing 'an idea of strong contrast' (see Denniston 1954², 370 s.v. μέν III, 1, ii). In the first part Pindar praises Geryon. The context of the fragment in Aristid. 2, 226-230 (L.-B.) is a discussion of the opening of Pi. fr. 169a, Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς, where Pindar seems to justify violence. This discussion makes it clear that the laudable fact is that Geryon defended his cattle against the attack of Heracles, 'because it is wrong to sit still at home and be a coward when one's goods are being stolen'. For Heracles' attack on Geryon's cattle cf. fr. 169a, 6-

8 ἔπει Γηρυόνα, βόας / Κυκλώπειον ἐπὶ πρόθυρον, Ἐΐϋρυς, θεός / ἀνατεί τε] καὶ ἀπριάτας ἔλασεν; *I.* 1, 12-13 Ἀλκμήνα τέκεν / παῖδα, θρασεῖαι τόν ποτε Γηρυόνα φρίξαν κύνας.

That Pindar here seems to favour Geryon above Heracles is suggested by a similar description of Heracles' attack on Diomedes in fr. 169a, 9-17: Diomedes is explicitly described as king of the Cicones (ll. 10-11) and as son of Ares (ll. 12-13). These are good enough reasons for him to have a claim to ἀρετά, while he also fights to defend his property, οὐ κό]ρωι ἄλλ' ἀρεταῖ (l. 15): καλὸν γ]ὰρ ἀρπαζομένων τεθνάμεν / πρὸ χρη]μάτων ἧ κακὸν ἔμμεναι (ll. 16-17). Note the similarity between these last two lines and the words in Aristid. 2, 229 after fr. 81. For the same sentiment cf. *O.* 1, 81-84 ὁ μέγας δὲ κίνδυνος ἀναλκιν οὐ φῶτα λαμβάνει

...

The sympathy with Geryon seems contrary to the regular views of both Pindar and his contemporaries. Geryon is usually pictured as a monster; violence against him is therefore justified. For Geryon as a monster cf. Hes. *Th.* 287 τρικέφαλον Γηρυονῆα; Stesich. *PMG* 186 (=Σ Hes. *Th.* 287) Στηρίχορος δὲ καὶ ἔξ χειρας ἔχειν φησὶ καὶ ἔξ πόδας καὶ ὑπόπτερον εἶναι; A. fr. 74 βοτῆρας τ' ἀδίκους κτεῖνας δεσπόταν τε ἱτριύτατον† τρία δόρη πάλλοντα χεροῖν.

Pindar's view of Geryon was perhaps prepared by the treatment of the same story by Stesichorus, who transformed Geryon from an inhuman monster into a Homeric hero (despite his strange appearance): cf. Stesich. *SLG* 10-13, the discussion between Geryon, Menoites and his mother about the decision whether or not to face Heracles. See Brize 1980, 32-40; Bornmann 1978, 33-35.

The second part of the fragment shows that Pindar wants to be silent about something that is displeasing to Zeus. The use of μὲν ... δέ suggests that it is in contrast with the first part of the fragment, and the context, including the comparison with fr. 169a, seems to suggest that the displeasing fact is the praise of Geryon, because it implies criticism of Heracles. Heracles is always portrayed positively by Pindar, who even says: κωφὸς ἀνήρ τις, ὃς Ἡρακλεῖ στόμα μὴ περιβάλλει (*P.* 9, 87) and τὸ πάντολμον θένος Ἡρακλέος / ... ὑμνήσομεν (fr. 29, 4-5). Heracles' fight with Poseidon, Apollo and Hades (*O.* 9, 29-35) provides such a contrast that Pindar neither wants to believe nor mention it (*O.* 9, 35-39).

The supposed contrast between these two standpoints, i.e. the praise of Geryon and the unwillingness to offend Zeus, has led to many discussions, mostly in the framework of a discussion of the famous fr. 169a, 1-8 Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς / θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων / ἄγει δικαῶν τὸ βιαιότατον / ὑπερτάται χειρὶ. τεκμαίρομαι / ἔργοισιν Ἡρακλέος, followed by the story of Heracles' attacks on Geryon and Diomedes.

In fr. 169a it also seems that Heracles' violent actions are contrasted with the legitimate defence of his victims. The violence is justified by Νόμος. It has troubled commentators that Pindar seems to offer such a negative picture of one of his favourite heroes and they sought a solution in the interpretation of Νόμος. For a short overview of the different views, see H. Lloyd-Jones, *Pindar Fr. 169, HSPh 76* (1972), 55. The conclusion is that Heracles did not act unjustly because he carried out the will of Zeus, helping to enforce the order of the universe against unlawful beings (1972, 55-56).

It is to be expected that Zeus favours Heracles more than e.g. Geryon. Not only is Heracles his son, but he has also decreed, albeit unknowingly and unwillingly, that Heracles shall obey Eurystheus and complete the labours ordered by him, cf. *O. 3*, 28-29 εὐτέ νιν ἀγγελίαις Εὐρυκθέος ἔντυ' ἀνάγκα πατρόθεν / χρυσόκερων ἔλαφον θήλειαν ἄξιοιθ'. The fact itself of Heracles' victory proves the presence of the divine will, because success is the result of the gods' favour.

The presentation of Heracles in a positive light in fr. 169a suggests that we should also beware of reading a negative comment on Heracles into fr. 81. The text of the fragment gives even less reason to see something negative than fr. 169a (where l. 3 δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον has misled so many, including Plato). There need be no opposition implied in παρά μιν, because παρά can mean 'side by side with' (cf. *P. 3*, 81-82 ἐν παρ' ἑκλὸν πῆματα σύνδυο δαίονται βροτοῖς / ἀθάνατοι). Geryon was probably praised for his courage in challenging Heracles' strength. Courage is something laudable, even in Pavese's negative view of Geryon (Pavese 1967, 68). Bornmann is more positive and concludes 'beiden Gedichten ist übrigens die Anerkennung der Tapferkeit des Gegners gemeinsam, der keineswegs als brutales Ungeheuer auftritt, sondern sein eigenes Ethos aufweist' (1978, 35).

Metre

As Schroeder 1922, 118 has already remarked, the metrical scheme of fr. 81 corresponds with the last three cola of the strophe of fr. 70b:

$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \parallel$	$\begin{array}{l} (\text{e } -) \text{ D } \parallel \\ \text{e } - \text{ D } - \\ \text{E } - (\text{e } -) \parallel \end{array}$
---	---	--

Commentary

1 ἔγώ : a first person, and especially the emphatic form of the pronoun, usually indicates a transition, cf. e.g. fr. 70a, 15; 70b, 23; and notes. This is probably the case here too because τὸ δὲ μὴ Δί φίλτερον εὐγῶμι πάμπαν is an 'Abbruchformel', 'a praeteritio, serving the purpose of taking the poet back to the main stream of his song' (Pavese 1967, 68).

παρά μιν : since the context is unknown the exact interpretation remains open, but in the light of the discussion of the contents, παρά may be interpreted in the sense of 'side by side', 'as well as', not as 'compared with, contrary to' which is the regular interpretation of παρά, esp. with καιρόν and δίκαν. For the use of παρά as 'side by side' cf. *P.* 3, 81. Of course the local 'side by side with' is frequent, cf. e.g. *O.* 6, 28; 9, 17; 10, 101.

μιν : see my note on fr. 70a, 16.

2 μέν : for the late position of μέν in the clause, see I. Hajdú, *Über die Stellung der Enklitika und Quasi-Enklitika bei Pindar und Bakchylides*, Lund 1989, 96-97: the fragment is an anacoluth. The period end after μιν and the late μέν raise the expectation that ἐδ' ἐγὼ παρά μιν also belongs with the δέ-clause, but after μιν the clause breaks off and begins again with αἰνέω μέν, so that μέν has its regular position after all.

Γηρυόνα : the form with -η is defended by Forssman 1966, 119-120, even though the form Γαρυφόνες is found on a Chalcidian vase of the sixth century (see E. Schwyzer [ed.], *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora*, Leipzig 1923³, nr. 797[2]). The name is found three times in Pindar, always with η, probably an echo of Hesiod, esp. *Th.* 291-292.

The meeting of Geryon and Heracles was a popular myth in antiquity. The early literary tradition consists of Hes. *Th.* 287-294, the *Geryoneis* of Stesichorus (*SLG* 7-87), and some brief references in Pindar (*I.* 1, 15; fr. 81; fr. 169a) and the tragedians (*A.* fr. 74; *Ag.* 870; *E. HF.* 423). Cf. also the *Heraclea* of Pisander (*EGF* fr. 5, p. 251), Panyassis (*EGF* fr. 7, p. 256) and Pherecydes of Athens (*FGH* 3 F 18) which probably related the meeting with Geryon (see Jacoby on *FGH* 3 F 18). For the many representations in the visual arts see Brize 1980, 41-51, 133-144 (catalogue).

2-3 Such 'Abbruchformel' are used more than once by Pindar to break off an offensive myth after mentioning it. Cf. *O.* 1, 35 ἔστι δ' ἀνδρὶ φάμεν εὐκὸς ἀμφὶ δαιμόνων καλὰ· μείων γὰρ αἰτία; 52 ἐμοὶ δ' ἄπορα γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν' εἰπέιν· ἀφίσταμαι; 9, 35-39; 13, 91; *N.* 5, 16-18; *I.* 5, 51. Cf. also fr. 180; *Ibyc. PMG* 310 δέδοικα μὴ τι πᾶρ θεοῖς ἀμβλακῶν τιμᾶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ἀμείψω. *Be-*

cause such a stylistic device draws the attention of the audience to the suppressed subject it is rather contradictory. If the hushed-up version is followed by a new Pindaric version which is less offensive to the pious, the device serves to arouse the audience's interest (see Gerber 1982, 69-70 on *O.* 1, 35), but this is not always the case (cf. e.g. *O.* 9, 35-39; 13, 91). The technique serves the same purpose when it is followed by a selection priamel, as in *Call. H.* 6, 17-23. See E.L. Bundy, Quarrel between Kallimachos and Apollonios, *CSCA* 5 (1972), 70-71.

Φίλτερον must be seen as a contrasting comparative, see Kühner-Gerth 2, 306; Schwyzer 2, 183; Stanford 1958², 203 on *Od.* 13, 111 θεώτεροι. The effect is enhanced by the use of litotes, as another rhetorical expression: μή ... φίλτερον, expressing not merely 'not so pleasing', but 'very displeasing'. See A. Köhnken, Gebrauch und Funktion der Litotes bei Pindar, *Glotta* 54 (1976), 62-67.

P. Oxy. 2622 fr. 1a

]ρωκτεαν[
]αμοσυνας[
]ϊαλατερπειφ λο .[
]φερσεφουαιματ ..[
 5]ντελευτανινεσει[
]διδυμαισειδουενυμο[
] ραι [
]πορευνηρακλειπρωτω[
]ντικελευθονεπιςπησει .[
 10] νιαδασαλοχος [
]αλλεγεμαν [
]τικαμινφθιμενων [
 ο ε
] ρεφεταικαικουποντωι[
]μενος[] [
 15]αμ[...] διοσυιον [

3 . lower end of a vertical stroke | .[dot, probably foot of a vertical stroke ¶ 4 ..[foot of a stroke hooked to right on the line, followed by the foot of an upright ¶ 5 υ later inserted | ι almost impossible to discern from τ ¶ 6 ι between ε and δ later inserted, a little above the line and smaller ¶ 7]. a dot on the line ¶ 9 .[foot of an upright turning to right ¶ 10]. right-hand arc of ο or ω ¶ 12 κ written across an original c ¶ 13]. right-hand end of a cross-stroke above the line | ο and ε inserted above the line, nothing deleted ¶ 15]. upper part of an upright

P. Oxy. 2622 fr. 1b

]...[
]μιναντια .[
]λεαγρονατερθ .[
]να(λεν . [

1 lower part of a stroke descending from left, lower part of a circle, lower part of an upright descending below the line ¶ 2 .[lower left-hand arc of a circle ¶ 3 .[left-hand arc of a circle ¶ 4 c too close to λ | . a period?

Fr. 346a

κ]ρέσσονα
 σο]φὸν ἀγη[τ]ήρα

Fr. 346b

]ρῶι κτεάν[ων
]αμοσύνας [
]ία λατερπέι φ . λο . [
] Ἐλευσίνοθε| Φερσεφόνοι ματρί| τε χρυσοθρόνωι
 5 θῆ[κεν ἀστ]οῖσι|ν τελετάν, ἕν' ἔς ἓν[
]διδύμαις εἶδον Εὐμο[λπ
] , ραι
]πορεν Ἑρακλεί πρώτω[ι
]ντι κέλευθον ἐπισπήσει . [
 10 Ἐμφιτρυ]ωνιάδας ἄλοχος
]αλλε γε μάν
 ἀύ]τίκα μιν φθιμένων
]τρέφεται καὶ ὄς' ἐν πόιντωι [
]μενος
 15]α μ[έγα]ν Διὸς υἰόν

Fr. 346c

] ... [
]μιν ἀντιάζ[
 Με]λέαγρον ἄτερθε[
]νας λευ

(b) 1 ἐν και]ρῶι Lobel 1967 | κρέσσον' νεὶ κρέσσονα τ' ἐν και]ρῶι Lloyd-Jones 1967 | 2 σοφὸν ἀγητήρα [Μν]αμοσύνας [τε κόρασι φίλων Lloyd-Jones | 3 εὐνομ]ία <ι> Lloyd-Jones | φιλο.[Lobel; φιλο.[Lloyd-Jones | 4 Ἐλευσινόθε Lloyd-Jones ex *PSI* 1391 | ματρί [τε χρυσοθρόνωι Lobel ex *PSI* 1391 | 5 θῆ[κέν τε λαοῖσι]ν Lobel ex *PSI* 1391; θῆκεν ἀστῶσι]ν Lloyd-Jones | τελεταν P. Oxy. 2622; τελετάν Lobel; τέλος Lloyd-Jones ex *PSI* 1391 | 6 Εὐμο[λπ- Lloyd-Jones | 8 πρώτω[ι ξένων Lloyd-Jones | 10 Ἐμφιτρυ]ωνιάδας Lobel | c' ἄλοχος Machler 1989 | 12 ἀύ]τίκα Lobel | φθιμένων [ψυχαῖ Lobel; [ἀγέλαι sim. Lloyd-Jones | 15 μ[έγα]ν Lobel | (c) 3 Με]λέαγρον Lobel

PSI 1391 fr. B col. I, 5-32

- 5 κ]ρέσσονα [κ]τ[εάνων καί
 σο]φόν ἀγη[τ]ήρα λ[έγει τὸν
 κατ]ὰ καιρὸν .[.]ε[ς .[
 μενον τῶν κτ[ημάτων,
 ἐν καιρῶι δὲ καὶ [
 10 κρείσσονα δὲ κατα[
 οντα καὶ ὑπεράνω τοῦ δι-
 αφόρου διντα, πιθα[νω[ς δὲ τῆν
 εὔνο<μ>ίαν κατὰ σύν[θεσιν
 εἴρηκεν λατερπ[έα διὰ
 15 τὸ τοὺς λαοὺς τέρπ[ειν δηλον-
 ότι. ὀπη[ν]ίκα εὔνομ[ία κα-
 θεστήκη κρείσσονα [καὶ
 ὑπερ]άνω τῶν χρημ[άτων
 διν]τα καὶ τοῦτ' ἐν καιρ[ῶι
 20 πρᾶ]πτοντα, οὐκ εἰκῆ[ι
 ..] ν .. ἐστὶ προσεκτικόν
 ..] Ἐλευσινόθε Φερσεφόνα
 ματρί τε χρυσοθρόνω θῆ-
 κεν ἀστοῖς]ν τέλος. φησὶν
 25] ... τῶν κρατίστω[ν
 ἀν]άκ[των τ]ῆς ἐν τῆν Ἄτ-
 τι]κῆι Ἐλευσίνος τοῖς αὐ-
 το]ῦ ἀστοῖς τελετῆν κατέ-
 στη]σε τ[ῆ]ι τε Φερσεφό-
 30 νηι καὶ τ[ῆ]ι Δήμητρει, τού-
 τεστ]ι κατέστηεν αὐτοῖς
]τα[ς τῶν θεῶν

5 κ]ρέσσονα [χ]ρ[ημάτων Bartoletti 1957: [κ]τ[εάνων καί Maehler 1989 | 6 σο]φόν ἀγη[τ]ήρα λ[ι
 Bartoletti | λ[έγει τὸν / κατὰ Merkelbach apud Bartoletti; λ[ατερπέα Snell 1975⁴ | 7-8 γενό]μενον
 Merkelbach apud Bartoletti; οὐκ ἠπτώ]μενον Snell | 8 κτ[ημάτων Merkelbach apud Bartoletti | 9
 [δόντα] Merkelbach apud Bartoletti; [εὔνοου] Snell | 10 [φύσει] Bartoletti | 11-12 suppl. Bartoletti
 | 12 suppl. Lloyd-Jones 1959: om. δὲ Snell, Maehler | 13 εὔνο<μ>ίαν Lloyd-Jones: εὔνοϊαν Snell,
 Maehler | σύν[θεσιν] Bartoletti | 14-15 suppl. Bartoletti | 16 ὀπη[ν]ίκα Bartoletti: οἱ [δ' ἠν]ίκα
 ᾄ<ν> Lloyd-Jones | 16-17 εὔνομ[ία κα-] / θεστήκη Lloyd-Jones: εὔνο<ι>α [έγκα-] / θεστήκη
 Snell, Maehler | 17-20 suppl. Bartoletti | 21 legit Barns apud Lloyd-Jones | 22 Ἐλευσινόθε Barns
 apud Lloyd-Jones: Ἐλευσ[ε]νος Bartoletti | 23-24 θῆ / [κέν τε λα]οῖς Bartoletti; θῆ- / [κέν
 ἀστοῖς]ν Lloyd-Jones | 25 [ὅτι ὁ βασι]λεῦων Bartoletti | 25-26 ... ἐν κρατίστωι | [χωρίωι] ? Lloyd-
 Jones; .. τῶν κρατίστω[ν] | ἀν]άκ[των] Maehler | 26-30 suppl. Bartoletti | 30-31 τού- / [των δ]ῆ
 Bartoletti; τού- / τεστ]ι Lloyd-Jones | 32 ἔορτάς μεγίς]τα[ς Bartoletti

P. Oxy. 2622 fr. 2 (= fr. 346d)

εϋ[
 θα[
 ..[
 ..[
 5 φρ[
 νυ[
 εϋ[

3 right-hand arc of a circle and a dot on the middle to the left of it, so probably θ | left-hand arc of a circle | 4 two horizontal strokes connected by a vertical stroke, ζ ? | ο or ω

P. Oxy. 32, 2622 fr. 3 (= fr. 346e)

] [
] εϋ ..υ[
] [
] υμνο[
 5] ιερε[
] [

5 second ε corrected from υ

Contents

P. Oxy. 2622 is only a small fragment, but its interest lies in the possibility that it is part of Pindar's second Dithyramb. Its interpretation was helped along by the discovery that *PSI* 14, 1391 contains a commentary on just this fragment. The text of *PSI* 14, 1391 contains individual words and complete verses of the original poem, which are commented upon. The comments are mostly paraphrases with a great deal of repetition.

Combining the text of the fragment and the commentary in *PSI* 14, 1391 we can deduce that a wise leader is mentioned who is above wealth, and who rules with Eunomia, which is called 'delightful to the people' (l. 3). Then the Eleusinian mysteries (ll. 4-5) are connected with Heracles (l. 8) on the occasion of his descent into Hades (l. 12), where he meets Meleager (fr. 346c, 3).

It is certain that Pindar treated this scene in one of his poems (cf. fr. 249a) but this fragment is not necessarily part of it since it is possible that he made it the subject of more than one poem. It is even possible that fr. 346 is by another author.

Metre

The metre consists of dactylo-epitrites:

b] --- [-
] ---- [
	--] ----- ?? [
	----- ? --
5	- [--] ----- ? [
] ----- ? [
] ??
] ----- [
	-] ----- [
10	----] -----
] ----
	-] -----
] -----
] - =
15] ? ----- =

c 2] - - - - [
 -] - - - - - [-
] - -

If fr. 346 and fr. 70b come from the same poem, fr. 346 must be (part of) the epode because there is no metrical resposion between the two fragments. If all fifteen lines belong to the epode, it was unusually long.

Commentary

Fr. 346a

The commentator in *PSI* 1391, 5-12 explains κ]ρέσσονα [κ]τ[εάνων καὶ / σο]φόν ἀγη[τ]ῆρα λ[έγει τὸν / κατ]ὰ καιρὸν . [.] ες . [] / μενον τῶν κτ[ημάτων,] / ἐν καιρῶι δὲ καὶ [] / κρείσσονα δὲ κατα[] / οἴτα καὶ ὑπεράν[ω τοῦ δι-] / αφόρου δυντα. Since the next comment is about fr. 346b, 3 λατερπέι, this must be about 346b, 1-2, which is made almost certain because of 346b, 1 κτεαν[. *PSI* 1391, 17-20 repeat: κρείσσονα [καὶ / ὑπερ]άνω τῶν χρημ[άτων / ὄντ]α καὶ τοῦτ' ἐν καιρῶι / πρ[ά]ττοντα, οὐκ εἰκῆ. However, since the exact relationship with fr. 346b cannot be determined, it is safer to print it as a separate fragment.

Fr. 346b

1 Κρέσσονα κτεάν[ων and σο]φόν ἀγη[τ]ῆρα both seem to refer to a leader, probably a king. The commentator uses the accusative in his explanation, but the text may have contained a different case. Perhaps this leader was the subject of l. 5 θῆκε, or the object of an unknown verb.

Combining these words about a leader with the contents of ll. 4-5 and l. 8 makes the following reconstruction possible: 'Heracles went to visit Eumolpus, the wise leader who is above wealth (...), who rules his nation with delightful concord, and who established in Eleusis the mysteries, where / in order that into ...'

The wording of the commentary does not make it necessary for ἐν καιρῶι to be part of the text, but it is difficult to find a useful alternative dative. Perhaps πτολιέθ]ρωι is possible, cf. fr. 76, 3 (Athens).

For the expression κρέσσων κτεάνων *sim.* cf. Pi. *N.* 9, 32 κτεάνων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κρέσσονας; *P.* 8, 92 κρέσσονα πλοῦτου μέριμναν; *Th.* 2, 60, 5 φιλόπολις τε καὶ χρημάτων κρείσων.

Ἄγητήρ is the Pindaric form of the Homeric ἡγήτωρ (e.g. *Il.* 2, 79; 3, 153; 10, 181; *h. Hom.* 2, 475; 4, 14), and is used to indicate Hiero in *P.* 1, 69-70. In *h. Hom.* 2, 475 Eumolpus' fellow-king Celeus is described as ἡγήτωρ λαῶν.

2]αμοcυνας[: if the king referred to is a σοφὸς ἄγητήρ he may further be described as Μυ]αμοcύνας [τε κόραισι φίλον (Lloyd-Jones 1967, 216), cf. *Hes. Th.* 80-90. Also possible would be a description of the leader as 'keeping τλ]αμοcύνας away from his people'. For τλημοcύνη (pl.) 'distress, sufferings' cf. *h. Hom.* 3, 190-191 ἀνθρώπων / τλημοcύνας, ὅς' ἔχοντες ὑπ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.

3]ια λατερπηῖ : although the text suggests a nominative, the comment in the Florence papyrus makes it very likely that]ια is the end of the quoted εὐνοία/εὐνομία, so that we must correct to]ια<ι>.

The comment in *PSI* 1391, 12-16 reads πιθα[νῶς δὲ τήν] / εὐνοίαν κατὰ σύν[θεσιν] / εἶρηκεν λατερπη[έα διὰ] / τὸ τοὺς λαοὺς τέρπη[ειν δηλον-] / ὅτι. This l. 16 ends with εὐνο], where the last letter is certainly not ι.

There are two ways to reconcile ll. 13 and 16. Bartoletti (1957, 65) read l. 16 εὐνοα[without further comment. Since εὐνοα does not exist and since in l. 13 we have εὐνοίαν he presumably supposed that εὐνοα[= ευνο<ι>α[. Lloyd-Jones (1967, 210) thinks that l. 16 εὐνομ[ία is as likely, and that l. 13 εὐνο<μ>ία gives a better meaning than εὐνοία. In either case a scribal error must be assumed. The two alternatives must be weighed up in the light of their respective appropriateness to Pindar.

Although both 'goodwill, favour' and 'concord' can be described as λατερπήs, εὐνομία seems better than εὐνοία because the latter is found predominantly in prose writers and much less in poetry (cf. *A. Supp.* 450; 489; 940; *Th.* 1012; *S. Ph.* 1322; *Tr.* 708), while εὐνομία is found four times in Pindar's extant works, always with a connotation similar to λατερπήs. Cf. *O.* 9, 15-16 Θέμις θυγάτηρ τέ οἱ κάτειρα λέλογχεν / μεγαλόδοξος Εὐνομία; 13, 6-8 ἐν ταῖ γὰρ Εὐνομία ναίει κακιγίητα τε, βάθρον πολιῶν ἀσφαλές, / Δίκαι καὶ ὁμότροφος Εἰρήνη, τάμ' ἀνδράσι πλοῦτου, / χρύσειαι παῖδες εὐβούλου Θέμιτος; *P.* 5, 67-68 ἀπόλεμον / εὐνομίαν; *Pae.* 1, 10. Cf. also *Hes. Th.* 80-90; *Tim. PMG* 791, 240.

For adjectives ending with -τερπήs cf. *Poll.* 4, 31; 96 ὀχλοτερπήs; *Pl. Min.* 321a; *D.H. Rh.* 1, 8 δημοτερπήs.

φ_λο[: because after the two shorts of -πέι a long syllable is necessary φ_λο[is impossible and φῦλο[must be assumed (Lloyd-Jones 1967, 210). The papyrus does not rule out either one.

Since φύλοπς is an almost exclusively epic word (elsewhere only found in S. *El.* 1072; Ar. *Pax* 1076; Theoc. 16, 50), φύλον or one of its cases is likely: the leader ruling his nation with all-delighting concord. For this meaning of φύλον cf. *Il.* 2, 840 φύλα Πελασγῶν; A. *Pr.* 808; *Supp.* 544; E. *IT.* 887.

Φῦλον must be qualified either by an adjective or by a genitive plural. It is not Ἐλευσινίων because with l. 4 Ἐλευσίνοθε it would be too repetitive, but that is all we can say.

4-5] Ἐλευσίνοθε, Φερσεφόνοι ματρί τε χρυσοθρόνω / θῆ[κεν ἀκτ]οῖσι, τελετάν : this refers to the establishment of the Eleusinian mysteries, probably by Eumolpus (cf. l. 6 εὐμο[]), who is almost certainly also the leader mentioned in the first lines. Perhaps we must add e.g. ὅς τ' before Ἐλευσίνοθε (see also Maehler 1989 *ad loc.*). Eumolpus is mentioned as the founder of the mysteries by Istrus *FGH* 334 F 22; Plu. *Exil.* 17, p. 607b); Lucian. *Demonax* 34.

4] Ἐλευσίνοθε, : the context suggests that we must translate 'in Eleusis' and not 'from Eleusis'. In Pindar words with the suffixes -θε and -θεν are found side by side and with the same meaning, e.g. ματρόθε and ματρόθεν, τηλόθε and τηλόθεν. See M. Lejeune, *Adverbes grecs en -θεν*, Diss. Paris 1939, 404.

χρυσοθρόνω : 'It is normal for gods to have golden things' (Richardson 1974 on *h. Hom.* 2, 19), which is also shown by the many epithets of gods with χρυσο- and χρυσεo-. The attractiveness of gold lay not only in its gleam and beautiful appearance, but also in the knowledge that it was the most valuable of possessions. It is not necessary to assume that the epithets refer to the statues and their golden decorations, as H.L. Lorimer suggests (*Gold and Ivory in Greek Mythology*, in: *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays presented to Gilbert Murray*, Oxford 1936, 14-33). Both the poet and the sculptor probably tried to adorn the gods in the most beautiful way, for which gold seemed to be the most appropriate (see Duchemin 1955, 209).

Χρυσόθρονος is an epithet of goddesses, e.g. Hera (cf. *Il.* 1, 611; *h. Hom.* 12, 1; *Pi. N.* 1, 37), Artemis (cf. *Il.* 9, 533), Eos (cf. *Od.* 10, 541; *h. Hom.* 4, 326), Cyrene (cf. *Pi. P.* 4, 260), Muse (cf. fr. adesp. *PMG* 953, 1). The second part of the adjective refers to a throne (θρόνος) and not to 'flowers embroidered on cloth' (θρόνα), see Braswell 1988 on *P.* 4, 260-261.

5 θῆ[κεν ἀκτ]οῖσι, : probably to be completed to θῆ[κεν ἀκτ]οῖσι, (Lloyd-Jones 1967, 211). The addition θῆ[κε λα]οῖσι, seems too short. Bartoletti's θῆ[κεν τε λα]οῖσι, in *PSI* 1391, 23-24, accepted by Lobel for the text of fr. 346b, 5 (1967, 65), does not seem right: τε is unnecessary and makes the text too long for the lacuna. An additional argument in favour of ἀκτ]οῖσι, is the mention of ἀκτοῖς in the paraphrase of ll. 5-6 in *PSI* 1391, 24-30 Φησὶν / [] ... τῶν κρατίστων /

ἀν]ακ[των τ]ῆς ἐν τῇ 'Ατ- / [τι]κῆι 'Ελευσίνοσ τοῖσ ἀν- / [το]ῦ ἀστοῖσ τελετῆν κατέ-/ [στη]σε τ[ῆ]ι τε Φερσεφό- / [νη καὶ τ]ῆι Δήμητρι.

τελετάν : the papyrus has τελευταν, but *PSI* 1391, 24 τέλος and 28 τελετῆν make clear that the text must be corrected. The same error is found in *Pi. fr.* 131a, ὄλβιοι δ' ἅπαντες αἴσαι λυσιπόνων τελετᾶν (*v.l.* τελευτάν). *PSI* 1391 has τέλος in the quotation and τελετῆν in the paraphrase, and Lloyd-Jones rightly remarks (1967, 211) that the use of τέλος for τελετῆ is so specific that it is likely that the paraphrase had τελετῆ as an explanation of τέλος (cf. *S. OC.* 1050 πότνια [Demeter and Persephone] σεμνά τιθνοῦνται τέλη; *fr.* 837; *A. fr.* 387; *E. Hipp.* 25; *Pl. R.* 560e). However, the metre requires τελετάν and since this is the original reading of the papyrus, we should keep it. Τελετά is a common Pindaric word (*O.* 3, 41; 10, 51; *P.* 9, 97; *N.* 10, 34; *fr.* 70a, 33; *fr.* 70b, 6; *fr.* 70c, 6; *fr.* 131a).

Ἦν' ἐσ ἐν] : the most probable division is Ἦν' ἐσ ἐν], because Ἦνεσ would be irrelevant here. The local Ἦνα would be logical after the mention of 'Ελευσίνοθε in l. 4, but the final use, 'in order that', would also fit well. Pindar does not use the final meaning in his extant works, but this must be a coincidence, because other poets do (as did Homer), cf. e.g. *Il.* 3, 252; *A. Pr.* 61; *S. Ph.* 880.

The meaning 'in order that' would ask for a completion like 'he could enter Hades': ἐσ ἐν[νυχίου 'Αἶδα ἵκηται (cf. *S. Tr.* 501) or 'he could be introduced to the mysteries': ἐσ ἐν[ύχιον τέλος δέχεται (cf. *IG* 3, 713, epitaph of a Hierophant: ὁσ τελετὰσ ἀνέφηνε καὶ ὄργια πάννυχα μύσταισ, Εὐμόλπου προχέων ἱμερόεσσαν ὄσα; *PRIM* 20 col. I, 23 νυκ]τὸσ ἱερᾶσ). The latter completion is also possible with 'where': 'where he was introduced to the mysteries', or e.g. 'where he was invited into the city, the palace': e.g. ἐσ ἐν[ναλίαν πόλιν (cf. *O.* 9, 99).

That Heracles was initiated in Eleusis is known from *Apollod.* 2, 5, 12: Δωδέκατον ἄθλον ἐπετάγη Κέρβερον ἐξ' Αἶδου κομίζειν. (...) μέλλων οὖν ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἀπέλναι ἦλθε πρὸσ Εὐμόλπον εἰσ' Ἐλευσίνα, βουλόμενοσ μνηθῆναι [τῆν δὲ οὐκ ἐξὸν ξένοισ τότε μυεῖσθαι, ἐπειδῆπερ θετὸσ Πυλίου παῖσ γενόμενοσ ἐμνεῖτο]. μῆ δυνάμενοσ δὲ ἰδεῖν τὰ μυστήρια ἐπέπερ οὐκ τῆν ἡγγικέμενοσ τὸν Κενταύρων φόνον, ἀγνισθεῖσ ὑπὸ Εὐμόλπου τότε ἐμνήθη. The same story is found in *X. H.G.* 6, 3, 6 and in *D.S.* 4, 25, 1, although Eumolpus is there replaced by Triptolemos and Musaeus respectively. Another variation in the story is that the solution for Heracles being a foreigner, is not sought in his adoption by Pylius (*Apollod.* 2, 5, 12; *Plu. Thes.* 33, 2), but in the establishment of the Lesser Mysteries (*D.S.* 4, 14, 3; *Σ Ar. Pl.* 845).

The goal of the initiation seems to have been to gain courage (*Axiochus* 371e [*Ps. Plato*] τὸ θάρροσ τῆσ ἐκεῖσε πορείασ παρὰ τῆσ 'Ελευσινιασ ἐναύσασθαι) or

strength (cf. E. *HF* 613 μάχη· τὰ μυκτῶν δ' ὄργη· εὐτύχη· ἰδῶν), or to have more influence with Persephone (D.S. 4, 25, 1 πρὸς δὲ τοῦτον τὸν ἄθλον ὑπολαβῶν συνοίσειν αὐτῶι, παρῆλθεν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ μετέσχε τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσίῃ μυστηρίων; 26, 1 οὗτος γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς παραδεδομένους μύθους καταβάς εἰς τοὺς καθ' αἵδου τόπους, καὶ προσδεχθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς Φερσεφόνης ὡς ἂν ἀδελφός ...). For the indebtedness of Pindar, Bacchylides and later authors to a common source, an epic poem of archaic date, see F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung*, Berlin/New York 1974, 142-150; Robertson 1980, 274-300.

Fr. 346b seems to convey that Eumolpus was the king who initiated Heracles (cf. l. 6) and that Heracles was the first foreigner to be thus accepted (cf. l. 8), probably after being adopted, since the alternative of the Lesser Mysteries is not mentioned.

The reason why Heracles wanted to be an initiate is not made explicit, unless l. 9 ἐπισπῆσει [is meant to do this.

6]διδύμαϊ· εἶδον Εὐμόλπυ : continuing the contents of ll. 1-5 it is reasonable to suppose that the citizens saw Eumolpus (l. 6) do something (l. 7?), and that then he gave something to Heracles, to the first (of strangers?) (l. 8).

Διδύμαϊς may have indicated the two goddesses, τῶ θεῶ, for whom some sacred act was performed in the course of the rituals, or the two hands of the hierophant. But Pindar uses διδυμος not only in the sense of 'twin', but also more freely in the sense of 'two' (cf. e.g. *I.* 3, 9 of two victories; *P.* 3, 72; *N.* 6, 57), so that many more possibilities remain open.

7]_ραι : this may have been a nominative plural, indicating the subject of εἶδον in l. 6.

8]πόρεν Ἑρακλεῖ πρώτῳι : if the object of πόρεν is the initiation, the subject is probably the hierophant, here Eumolpus. A possible supplement for πρώτῳι would be ξένων (Lloyd-Jones 1967, 214; see also Robertson 1980, 274-300, esp. 292-300). Cf. X. *H.G.* 6, 3, 6 λέγεται μὲν Τριπτόλεμος ὁ ἡμέτερος πρόγονος τὰ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης ἄρρητα ἱερὰ πρώτοις ξένοις δεῖξαι Ἑρακλεῖ τε τῶι ἡμετέρῳ ἀρχηγέτῃ καὶ Διοσκούροιν τοῖν ἡμετέροιν πολίταιν.

An illustration of this scene is found on a black-figure amphora of c. 540 B.C. (*ABV* 147, 6; see F.T. van Straten, Heracles and the Uninitiated, *Festoen. Scripta Archaeologica Groningana* 6 [1976], 563-572; Robertson 1980, 275-276 and n. 4; see also the catalogue of Heracles as an initiate and with Eleusinian deities in *LIMC* IV.1, 806-808). For the markedly greater number and different iconography of the Athenian representations of Heracles and Cerberus between 530 and 500, instigated by Athens' control of the Eleusinian Mysteries, see J. Boardman, Herakles, Peisistratos and Eleusis, *JHS* 95 (1975), 1-12, esp. 6-10.

9-10]ντι κέλευθον ἐπίσπῃσει . [/]ωνιάδας ἄλοχος : since none of the words ending with]ωνιάς fits in the context, it seems best to follow Lobel's suggestion (1967, 64) and read (a case of) 'Ἀμφιτρυ]ωνιάδας (cf. *O.* 3, 14; *I.* 6, 38; *B.* 5, 85; 25, 25).

It seems best to take ll. 9-10 together and to read]ντι κέλευθον ἐπίσπη<ι> ε εἰς [/ 'Ἀμφιτρυ]ωνιάδα, ε' ἄλοχος, 'in order that you, son of Amphitryon, could face your journey into (Hades), the wife ...'. We assume that iota adscript was not written, as in l. 3 εὐνομ]ια<ι>. The subjunctive would ask for a final conjunction. For κέλευθον ἐπίσπη cf. expressions such as *Od.* 14, 195 ἄλλοι δ' ἐπὶ ἔργον ἔποιεν; *Pi. P.* 4, 294 συμποσίας ἐφέπων.

Other interpretations of ἐπίσπῃσει [are less satisfactory. Lobel (1967, 65) suggested ἐπίσπῃσει [, a future of ἐφέπω (cf. *P. Oxy.* 2519 fr. 1, II, 6 σπῃσεται and Lobel *ad loc.*) but it is difficult to see how the future can be explained.

A division into ἐπίσπη<ι> σεῖ [is possible. In that case l. 10 is the beginning of a new clause, where Heracles is addressed personally, as opposed to l. 9, where he is mentioned in the third person; or a new clause begins with ἄλοχος, while 'Ἀμφιτρυ]ωνιάδας is the subject of ἐπίσπη<ι>. The difficulty, however, is to find a suitable word for σεῖ [. I have thought of σεῖς[ων, 'going to disturb (Hades)', cf. *P.* 4, 272 πόλιν σεῖσαι; *S. Ant.* 163, but it is doubtful whether σεῖω can be used with Hades and whether in any case it correctly describes Heracles' way of acting.

9]ντι : if this is not the end of an adjective or participle going with 'Ἡρακλέι in l. 8, it is difficult to find another dative that would be necessary or functional in the clause. Perhaps it is to be completed to ὡς λέγο]ντι, but that would not be much more than a stopgap. The best suggestion seems]ν τι, where]ν? is the end of an adverbially used adjective, qualified by τι.

ἄλοχος : in ll. 12ff. Heracles has descended into Hades and meets the shades, so that ll. 10-11 must relate the descent itself. Persephone does not play a role until later in the story so that ἄλοχος probably does not refer to her, but it is difficult to think of anybody else who could be meant here.

11]αλλε γε μάν : γε μάν is adversative, cf. e.g. *O.* 13, 104; *P.* 1, 17, and perhaps indicates that although Heracles received help from Eumolpus and although he went on his way into (Hades?), he was still hindered by somebody or something. Ll. 10-11 could be interpreted as '(Hades') wife (was willing to welcome him, because he was one of her initiates) but yet (Charon only reluctantly) carried him across (?)'.]αλλε comes perhaps from a compound of βάλλω or ἰάλλω. For Charon's reluctance cf. *Verg. Aen.* 6, 342-343 *nec vero Alciden me sum laetatus euntem / accepisse lacu*; *Sen. Herc. Fur.* 770-775.

12 ἀύ]τίκα μιν φθιμένων : the lost part must have contained words equivalent to 'immediately when the shades (or the flocks, Lloyd-Jones 1967, 215 n. 15) of the deceased saw him they fled away', cf. *Apollod.* 2, 5, 12 ὀπηνίκα δὲ εἶδον αὐτὸν αἱ ψυχαί, χωρὶς Μελεάγρου καὶ Μεδούσης τῆς Γοργόνης ἔφυγον. Cf. also *B.* 5, 83 ψυχαῖσιν ἐπι φθιμένων.

13 ἴτρέφεται καὶ ὄσ' ἐν πόντωι [: expressions such as these are used to indicate a large quantity: everything on earth (suggested by τρέφεται) and in the sea. Here said of the number of ghosts. Their large number is emphasized also in *B.* 5, 65-67 and in *Verg. Aen.* 6, 309-312, where the ghosts are compared with rustling leaves and with leaves and birds respectively.

Τρέφεται suggests that Pindar mentioned plants (cf. *Il.* 11, 741 ἢ τόσα φάρμακα ἦλδη ὄσα τρέφει εὐρέϊα χθών; *A. Ag.* 1407 χθοιοτρεφὲς ἔδανόν) or animals (cf. *h. Hom.* 5, 4-5 οἰωνούς τε διυπετέας καὶ θηρία πάντα, / ἤμην ὄσ' ἤπειρος πολλὰ τρέφει ἠδ' ὄσα πόντος; *Hes. Th.* 582; *Alcm. PMG* 89; *E. Hipp.* 1277-1280). Leaves may also be intended, cf. *Pi. P.* 9, 46 ὄσκα τε χθών ἠρινὰ φύλλ' ἀναπέμπει, especially because they convey an image of multitude (cf. *Il.* 2, 800 λίην γὰρ φύλλοισιν ἐοικότες ἢ ψαμάθοισιν; *A.R.* 4, 216) and because they may suggest the ephemerality of life (cf. *Il.* 6, 146-148; *Mimn. fr.* 2, 1 West; *Verg. Aen.* 6, 308-309).

Ὅσ' ἐν πόντωι may refer to animals (cf. *h. Hom.* 5, 4-5 mentioned above; *Hes. Th.* 582; *Alcm. PMG* 89; *A. Ch.* 585-589; and also *S. Ant.* 343ff; *E. Hec.* 1181-1182) or waves or grains of sand. For waves cf. *A.R.* 4, 214-215 ὄσκα δὲ πόντου / κύματα χειμερίοιο κορύσσεται ἐξ ἀνέμοιο; *Phryn. Trag. TrGF* 1, 3 T 13 (= *Plu. Qu. conv.* 8, 9, p. 732f) ὄσ' ἐνὶ πόντωι / κύματα ποιεῖται χεῖματι νυξ ὀλοή. For sand cf. *Il.* 9, 385 οὐδ' εἴ μοι τόσα δοίη ὄσα ψάμαθός τε κόνις τε; *Pi. P.* 4, 46-48 χώποσαι / ἐν θαλάσσαι καὶ ποταμοῖς ψάμαθοι / κύμασιν ῥιπαῖς τ' ἀνέμων κλονέονται.

The text may have referred to animals, because these are found in both atmospheres (for this combination, see also *Pi. fr.* 220 [τῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς τραπέζαις] οὔτε τι μεμπτόν οὔτ' ὦν μεταλλακτόν, <...?> ὄσ' ἀγλαὰ χθών πόντου τε ῥιπαὶ φέροισιν; *S. fr.* 941, 9-11; *Clem. Alex. Paed.* 2, 1 [1, 155, 15-17 St.] ὄσα τε χθών πόντου τε βένθη καὶ ἀέρος ἀμέτρητον εὖρος ἐκτρέφει), but a combination of growing entities on earth with lifeless things on/in the sea is also possible (cf. *Pi. P.* 9, 46-48) because ὄσ' ἐν πόντωι is not necessarily a subject of τρέφεται.

14]μενος[] : if this line belongs grammatically to the preceding lines,]μενος[is better taken as the noun μένος than as the end of a nominative participle, because there seems to be no singular male subject. It is perhaps the μένος of the wind or storm, cf. *Emp.* 111, 3 ἀκαμάτων ἀνέμων μένος; *E. Heracl.* 428

χειμῶνος ... ἄγριον μένος. Wind or storm are explicitly mentioned as causes of countless waves or stirrings of sand by A.R. 4, 215; Phryn. Trag. *TrGF* 1, 3 T 13; Pi. *P.* 4, 48.

15]α μ[έγα]ν Διὸς υἱόν : 'the great son of Zeus' is the third mention of Heracles. Cf. l. 8 Ἡρακλεί and l. 10 Ἀμφιτρυφονιάδα(ς). For μέγας as an adjective of Heracles and other heroes, see Bissinger 1966, 33-34; cf. E. *HF.* 443-444 τοῦ μεγάλου / ... Ἡρακλέους; Lucilius *AP* 11, 116, 2. For the usually positive connotation of the adjective μέγας in Pindar, see my note on fr. 70a, 7 μεγάλωι.

Fr. 346c

2]μιν ἀντιας[: the number of lines lost between fr. 346b and c cannot be ascertained, but if the text continued the mythical narrative the lacuna cannot have been very long because Heracles meets Meleager almost immediately after his arrival in Hades. Apollod. 2, 5, 12 first mentions a meeting with Medusa, but B. 5, 68ff. and Pi. fr. 249a only refer to the encounter with Meleager.

Μιν is probably best understood as αὐτόν because ἄμμιν, ὕμμιν, θέ]μιν or δύνα]μιν do not fit the context. It must refer to somebody already mentioned, possibly Heracles, because ἀντιας[and l. 3 Με]λέαγρον strongly suggest that this is about the encounter between the two heroes. The subject of ἀντιας[is then Meleager and we must translate either 'encounter, meet' (cf. B. 5, 76-77 τῶι δ' ἐναντία / ψυχὰ προφάνη Μελεάγρου; Pi. fr. 249a Ἡρακλῆς ... συνέτυχε Μελεάγρωι), or 'entreat' (cf. Pi. fr. 249a οὔ καὶ δεηθέντος).

A red-figure calyx crater of c. 440 B.C. (*ARV*² 1086, 1) shows, among others, Heracles and Meleager in the Underworld (see Robertson 1980, 293).

3 Με]λέαγρον ἄτερθε[: the accusative indicates that this is a new clause. If ἄτερθε[is to be taken as one word, it can be a preposition with genitive (cf. *O.* 9, 78; *Pae.* 8, 77) or an adverb (cf. *P.* 5, 96). It seems to imply that Heracles talked with Meleager in private, which is not strange if all the other shades fled away (fr. 346b, 13-15?).

]να . [
] [
] . ιτομ . νστασις·
] . οδα

χ

5] . ατε . [.....] ογκυανο[[κ]]ιτων
] τεαντε[...] . υμελιζοι

ν

] πλοκονς[.....] νωνκικςκινων απ . [
] . ροταφον []

αν

 ελ ε [[ως]] α .
] εων[[φ]]θ[[ου]]φιλ . δτηπολε[[ω]]
 10] ιοιτεςκοπελουγειτοναπρυτανι . [

α

] . μ . . καιστρατια[[ις]]
] . ακναμπτικρεμασον
] στεχαρμας τασειδορατιδας

υ

15] . [...] ντοσα[[ρ]]χηρνυοιτοπα[
] . υπελοι·
] . ανπον . ιχορων[
] εεστ' αιδάι·
] οιοφυ[[λ]]λον . [
] επεταλοιςτηρ[

1 . [λ or left half of ν | 3] . speck of ink at medium height | . top of curve to the right, probably ε | 4 .] very small part of right-hand corner, as of π | 5 .] the right hand tips of three strokes, the highest stroke being horizontal, the two lower strokes rising upwards to the right, perhaps ξ | . [lower part of a vertical stroke, below the line | 6] . the right hand tip of a stroke coming from the (top) left | 7 .] a dot on the line | 8 the right hand tips of two slightly diverging strokes | 9 first φ may have been ορ | . a short upright, perhaps ι | 10 .] [lower part of a vertical stroke | 11] . diagonal stroke coming from upper left | . upper tip of diagonal stroke coming from upper right and diagonal stroke coming from upper left, not quite connected | 12 left half of δ | 14] . [high horizontal stroke connected on the left with the upper tip of a vertical stroke | 15] . right part of a curved stroke going to upper right, as of ω | 16 .] right hand tip of a diagonal stroke coming from upper left | . upper part of a small circle | 18 .] left part of a stroke curving to upper right, perhaps ω, c or ε

Fr. 70c

-]ναλ[
]
] ,ιτο μὲν στάσις·
]πόδα
 5] ,ατε , [....]ον κυανοχίτων
]τεάν τε[λετ]άν μελίζοι
]πλόκον σ[τεφά]νων κισσίων
]κρόταφον []
]εων ἔλθῃ φίλαν δὴ πόλε ..
 10]ιόν τε σκόπελον γείτονα πρύτανι , [
]αμα· καὶ στρατιά
]τ' ἀκναμπτεὶ κρέμασον
]σ τε χάρμας
]π[....]ντος ἀύχην ῥύοιτο πα[
 15]ων πέλοι·
]λαν πόνοι χορῶν [
]εες τ' αἰοδαί,
]οιο φῦλον φ[
 19]ε πετάλοισ ἦρ[ινοῖς

Scholia 7 ἀν(τὶ τοῦ) πλ[εκτῶν Grenfell-Hunt | 13 τὰς ἐπιδορατίδας

3 παύσα]ιτο Schroeder 1923²; μὴ γένο]ιτο Zimmermann 1988; καταλύο]ιτο sim. ? | 5 κατε[ναντί]ον Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt 1919 | 6-7 suppl. Grenfell-Hunt | 9 πόλεα 'valde dubium' Snell 1975⁴ | 12 ἀκαμπτεὶ Schroeder; ἀκναμπτί LSJ Suppl. | 14 π[ιπτο]ντος Puech 1923 | 17 εὐμελ]έες Snell; πολυγαθ]έες Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt | 19 suppl. Grenfell-Hunt

20] .
]
] μιον[[ε]]ιπ[
] , ιταμιας[
] υστ ..[
 25] λθε[
] ..[

20] . lower part of a curved stroke or a circle | **23**] . right tip of high horizontal stroke | **24** . upper part of a small circle | . [upper part of λ, α or δ | **26** .. upper parts of two diagonal strokes, one very small, probably going to lower left, the other going to lower right

2 vv. desunt

25]μιον ιπ[
]τι ταμίαια[
]ν στολ[
]λθε[
]..[

22 [στό]μιον ἕπ[πειον Bury apud Grenfell-Hunt

Tradition

Grenfell and Hunt applied the same reasoning to *P. Oxy.* 1604, fr. 2 (fr. 70c) as to fr. 1, col. I (1919, 27, see on fr. 70a *Tradition*). In fr. 70c typically dithyrambic references are 6 τεάν τε[λετ]άν (almost certainly referring to Dionysus, see comm. *ad loc.*); 7 c[τεφά]νων κικκίνων. Dithyramps were generally performed at spring festivals: cf. fr. 75, 13-19. Fr. 70c, 19 also seems to mention the spring season: πετάλοισ ἡρ[ινοῖς].

Contents

As far as can be made out, the fragment contains some traditionally dithyrambic references: the wish is expressed that somebody sings of Dionysus' (= your?) ritual (l. 6), followed by the mention of ivy wreaths about somebody's head (l. 7) and an invitation to come to a city, probably the city for which the dithyramb is composed (l. 9). It seems to be a festival in spring time (l. 19?).

The text shows a certain parallel with fr. 70b, 6-23: in both cases the god attends (70b, 22-23), or is invited to attend (70c, 9), a festival in honour of himself (70b, 6-8; 70c, 6); the music (70b, 8-14; 70c, 6; 70c, 16-17) and dance (70c, 4?) are described, and stress is laid on the fact that even warlike deities with their attributes (70b, 15-18) and armed people (70c, 11-13) participate in the celebration.

Metre

3]? - - - -
] -
 5]-[? ...]- - - - -
]- - [-]- - - -
]- [-]- - - -
] - -
]- - - - - - - - -
 10]? - - - - - - - - - - - - - - [
]? ? - - - -
]- - - - -
 -]- - -

15][...]~ - - - ~ - - ?[
]- ~ -
]- ~ - - - - [
]- ~ - - - -
]- ~ - - - - [
 19]- ~ - - - - [~ -

Snell 1975⁴, 76 remarks that there is perhaps metrical correspondence between ll. 1-6 and 12-17 and he may be right, but the remains of ll. 1-2 and 4 are so scanty that this cannot be proved. Moreover, the intervening lines must then be either another (anti)strophe or an epode. It cannot be an (anti)strophe because it is one line shorter, but if we assume ll. 7-11 are an epode, we run into problems with ll. 18-19. These should then correspond to ll. 1/12 and 2/13, but they do not fit. Ll. 7-8 do not correspond with 18-19 either, which means that the strophe cannot be continued with l. 7/18. There seems to be no solution for this, so that it is better not to force ll. 1-6 and 12-17 into correspondence.

Commentary

3]ιτο μὲν στάσις : since most poets, including Pindar, use *στάσις* almost exclusively in the sense of ‘sedition’, it probably has the same meaning here.

This word is in strong contrast with the dance (?) and song of ll. 4-8, probably underlined by *μὲν*. This contrast led Schroeder (1923², 548) to suggest *παύσα]ιτο*, and Zimmermann (1988, 22) to propose *μὴ γένο]ιτο μὲν στάσις*. The speck of ink before *ι* is too small to be helpful and the metre cannot be sufficiently determined to make a choice, but the context may offer some help to choose between ‘may it stop’ and ‘may it not happen’. L. 12 *κρέμασων* suggests that weapons have been used, or at least, that weapons were carried, and since that seems to indicate that even if there has been no actual fighting, there was enough discord to arm oneself, this pleads for *παύσ]αιτο* (cf. *X. Mem.* 4, 6, 14), *καταλύ]οιτο* (cf. *Ar. Ra.* 359), *sim.*

For the antithesis between civil strife and joyful song and dance cf. E. fr. 453 *Ειρήνα ... / δέδοικα δὲ μὴ πόνοις / ὑπερβάλῃ με γῆρας, / πρὶν ἂν προσιδεῖν χαρίεσσαν ὥραν / καὶ καλλιχόρους ἀοιδὰς / φιλοστεφάνους τε κώμονός / ἴθι μοι, πότνα, πόλις, / τὰν δ’ ἐχθρὰν Στάσις ἐργ’ ἀπ’ οἶ- / κων τὰν μαινομένην τ’ Ἔριν / θηκτῶι τερπομένην κιδάρωι*. Cf. also the places quoted below on l. 12 *κρέμασων*.

4-6 Although much is missing in these lines a few things are certain, so that they can be used as a starting-point. The verb μελίζοι and the accusative τεὰν τε[λετ]ᾶν belong together, 'may (somebody) celebrate in song your ritual'. We need a subject, and a better indication of who the addressee is. L. 5 κυανοχίτων may be either a nominative, the subject of μελίζοι, or a vocative, to be understood as the 'you' of τεὰν.

If κυανοχίτων is a nominative, there may have been a noun or a name to go with it. The verb μελίζοι might point to the chorus as the subject, but κυανοχίτων is usually connected with gods (see below on l. 5). The subject may also be a god(dess) who is called κυανοχίτων. If the chorus is the subject (and κυανοχίτων is a vocative) l. 4 πόδα could be part of an expression of 'dancing', either depending on another verb or a participle. L. 5] , ατε[.....]ου may contain the end of an adjective with πόδα, but it is impossible to determine how long it was or what it was. If κυανοχίτων is a nominative we still need a vocative, although perhaps not necessarily in these three lines. The person concerned may have been addressed before. The fact that this fragment probably belongs to a dithyramb, the mention of τε[λετ]ᾶν in l. 6 and of the ivy-wreaths of l. 7 make it certain that Dionysus is addressed here. The beginning of l. 5] , ατε[may be part of a vocative, with or without elision. The first letter is strange, but looks most like a ξ; there is, however, no suitable word ending on -ξατος.

If κυανοχίτων is a vocative it almost certainly refers to Dionysus (see above). Cf. also *Ar. Av.* 1389, where the dithyramb is called κυαναυγήc.

A third possibility is that the antithesis with στάσις may have been explicitly stated by mentioning e.g. Ειρήνη (cf. *E. fr.* 453 quoted above): 'may civil strife stop; may then Peace set foot in our city and may the chorus (or the people) celebrate with song your (Dionysus') ritual'. In such a text κυανοχίτων could refer to Peace.

4] πόδα : for πόδα associated with dancing (see Zimmermann 1988, 22), cf. *Pae.* 6, 18 ποδι κροτέο[ντι γᾶν θο]ῶι; *fr.* 107b, 1 ἔλαφρον ὄρχημ' ... ποδῶν; *Od.* 8, 264; *Pratin. PMG* 708, 14; *Call. H.* 4, 306; *fr.* 67, 14 Pf.

5 κυανοχίτων : the papyrus read originally κυανοκίτων. This is the Doric form, cf. *Sophr.* 35; *P. Oxy.* 1269, 30.

West 1966 on *Hes. Th.* 406 Λητώ κυανόπεπλον remarks: 'black clothing is elsewhere associated with mourning (μέλας for mortals, κῶνεος for gods) (...), or with deities such as Night (...), Death (...) the Erinyes (...). Leto has ordinarily nothing to do with any of this, but we may recall the cult of Leto Μυχία or Νυχία ...' This fragment has nothing to do with mourning either. In Pindar κῶνεος(-compounds) are associated with the divine. For the essentially positive connotation

of κύανεος see Fogelmark 1972, 24; H. Kriegler, *Untersuchungen zu den optischen und akustischen Daten der bacchylideischen Dichtung*, Diss. Wien 1969, 51-52. Cf. *O.* 6, 40-41 λόχμας ὑπὸ κυανέας / τίκτε θεόφρονα κοῦρον; 13, 70-71 κυάναιγις παρθένος (Athena); fr. 29, 3 κυανάμπυκα Θήβαν; fr. 33c, 5-6 μάκαρες δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ / (sc. κικλήσκουσιν) τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον (Delos); *Pae.* 6, 83-84 κυανοπλόκοιο ... ποιτίας / Θέτιος. Κύανεος is dark-blue rather than black since the blue colour of κύανος is certain, and a dark blue shade is imaginable in the adjectives Pindar made of it.

The adjective is a ἄπαξ. Seaford argues that such new words are characteristic of the dithyrambic style (1977/78, 88 n. 59), but the compound is a rather simple variation of κυανόπεπλος (*h. Hom.* 2, 319; 360; 374; 442).

6] τεάν τε[λετ]άν : that τελετά refers here to the ritual festival of Dionysus is indicated by the mention of ivy wreaths in l. 7 (see also note *ad loc.*). Τεάν must then be equivalent to Διονύσου or Βρομίου, cf. fr. 70b, 6 and note.

μελίζοι : 'celebrate in or with song', cf. *N.* 11, 18 (Ἀρισταγόραν) μελιγδοῦποισι ... μελίζεν αἰοιδαῖς.

Pindar uses μελίζω and especially μέλος frequently (Slater *Lex. s.v.* μέλος cites 18 places for 'song' and two more for 'music'), probably because these words suggest the sweetness of songs: Dornseiff 1921, 61 already drew attention to the similarity in sound of μέλος/μέλη and μέλι. *N.* 11, 18 (cited above) is very illustrative in this respect; cf. also Theoc. 20, 26-28 ἐκ στομάτων δέ / ἔρρεέ μοι φωνά γλυκερωτέρα ἢ μέλι κτηρῶ. / ἀδὺ δέ μοι τὸ μέλισμα, καὶ ἦν κύριγγι μελίδω. See also J.H. Waszink, *Biene und Honig als Symbol des Dichters und der Dichtung in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Opladen 1974; S. Scheinberg, *The Bee Maidens of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, *HSPH* 83 (1979), 1-28, esp. 23; H. Wagenvoort, *Inspiratie door bijen in de droom*, *Mededelingen der KNAW, afd. Letterkunde Nieuwe reeks*, deel 29, 8 (1966), pp. 60-61; Lehnus 1979, 170-176.

7] πλόκον σ[τεφά]νων κικκίων : the marginal note probably referred to πλόκον and read ἀν(τὶ τοῦ) πλ[εκτῶν] (Grenfell-Hunt 1919, 37). Cf. *E. Hipp.* 73 πλεκτὸν στέφανον.

For πλόκος 'wreath' cf. *Pi. O.* 13, 33 πλόκοι κελίνων; *E. El.* 778 μυρρίνης ... πλόκου; *Med.* 841 ροδέων πλόκον ἀνθέων.

It is impossible to determine from the text whether Dionysus (addressed in l. 11 ἐλθέ) or the subject of μελίζοι in l. 6 wears the ivy wreath that is mentioned here. The connection between Dionysus and ivy is traditional and is expressed in many epithets, cf. esp. *AP* 9, 524, 11 κικκοπέφανον. For ivy wreaths worn by Dionysian revellers cf. fr. 128c, 2-4 ἐντὶ [δὲ καί] / θιᾶλλοντος ἐκ κικκοῦ στεφάνων {ἐκ} Διο[νύ]σου / ο[ἱ]βρομι < ? παιόμεναι; *E. Ba.* 81 κικκῶ ... στεφανωθείς; 177;

702-703. Ivy typifies in its evergreen vitality the victory of vegetation over its enemy the winter (Dodds 1960², 77) and is therefore very suitable for the spring god Dionysus.

8 κρόταφον : κρόταφον, and especially the singular of it, is a rather infrequent word. Pindar does not use it elsewhere in his extant works, and Bacchylides uses it once as 'slope of a mountain' (17, 30). The regular word to be used with wreaths is κάρα, cf. *I.* 3/4, 87-88 λευκῶθεις κάρα / μύρτοις; fr. 94b, 11-12 ὑμνήσω στεφάνοισι θάλ- / λοισα παρθένιον κάρα.

9 Ἰεων ἐλθέ φίλαν δὴ πόλε .. : an important element in hymns is the invitation to the god to attend, formulated as ἐλθέ, βαῖνε, ἰκοῦ, μόλε (Norden 1912, 148; Zuntz 1951, 338). Cf. fr. 75, 1 Δεῦτ' ἐν χορόν; *h. Hom.* 24, 4 ἔρχεο; fr. adesp. *PMG* 871, 1 ἐλθεῖν ἦρω Διόνυσε. Zimmermann 1988b, 36 concludes from this clitic ἐλθέ that this must be the beginning of the poem. This is, however, not necessary, because clitic elements can also be found later in a poem, see note on fr. 78 *Contents*.

For Pindaric examples of ἔρχομαι with the accusative of direction, see Slater *Lex. s.v.* ἔρχομαι 1.c.

The last word is difficult. The original πολεῶ has been changed, probably into πόλεας, which can only be explained as a plural accusative (cf. *II.* 4, 308 *v.l.* Aristarch.). We expect, however, a singular accusative to go with φίλαν (in that case the α would have a very long, strange tail), or perhaps a genitive to go with e.g. φίλαν ἄκραν, χώραν *sim.* This last suggestion is made impossible because the correction cannot be read as πόλεος. It seems certain, however, that it is some case of πόλις.

Ἰεων can be the end of a participle with ἐλθέ, or a plural genitive with πόλε .., indicating its inhabitants.

φίλαν : to call a city φίλος implies a relationship of nearness, to be translated by 'dear' or 'one's own'. Cf. *O.* 1, 38 φίλαν ... Σίπυλον (Sipyron of Tantalus); 9, 21 φίλαν πόλιν (Orous, hometown of Epharmostus); *N.* 8, 13 πόλιός θ' ὑπὲρ φίλας (Aegina of Aeacus). See also Kienzle 1936, 87. The emphatic δὴ intensifies the meaning; cf. *P.* 4, 273 δυσπαλὲς δὴ γίνεται; fr. 108a, 2-3 εὐθεία δὴ / κέλευθος. Dionysus' 'own' city is Thebes, cf. *I.* 7, 5, but it seems reasonable to suppose that in a dithyramb any city for which it is composed can justly be called 'Dionysus' city'.

10 Ἴόν τε κόπελον γείτονα πύταιν [: the κόπελος γείτων is probably a mountain near the φίλαν πόλιν ?; if Thebes is the city (cf. fr. 196 λιπαρᾶν τε Θηβαῖν μέγαν κόπελον), we may think of Mt. Cithaeron (cf. *E. Ba.* 33; 62-63; 661-665 etc.). Or perhaps it is another height with a sanctuary, in this context most

likely one of Dionysus. Cf. *I.* 1, 53 where γείτων refers to a sanctuary of Poseidon. Theoretically the κόπελος may also refer to the acropolis of a city, cf. *Pae.* 4, 21 (Ceos); *E. Ion* 871, 1434, 1578 (Athens). But this would imply that two neighbouring cities are meant, which is unlikely: we have no examples of songs composed for more than one city.

πρύτανι : perhaps a vocative πρύτανι κ[ύριε *sim.* as in *P.* 2, 58, or an accusative, in apposition to κόπελον γείτονα. Although πρύτανις is mostly said of persons, esp. gods, it is also possible with things, as e.g. οἶνος (*Ion PMG* 744, 5, 4-5), ᾠδή (fr. adesp. *PMG* 954a). There is generally a genitive connected with πρύτανις (cf. e.g. *P.* 6, 24), or sometimes an adjective (cf. *E. Tr.* 1288 Φρύγυε). In this line such an adjective or genitive would have to be supplied after πρύτανι[.

11]αμα· καὶ στρατιά : the first word is rather difficult to read. It is most likely]αμα, followed by a high stop, but probably not θ]αμά, because the imperatives indicate that the fragment refers to a particular occasion where 'often' does not suit. Another possibility would be παλ]άμα in the sense of 'hand as used in deeds of violence', hence 'a deed of force' (*LSJ* I.2). But in this sense the word is an abstractum and therefore difficult to connect with a concrete word like στρατιά. The most likely then would be ἄμα, 'at the same time', (as the god who was invited in l. 9) although the high stop is awkward if ἄμα must be connected with καὶ στρατιά. On the other hand, the mistake στρατιαῖς could be an argument in favour of ἄμα.

Although the c is strange we could also read]αμος or]λμος.

The correction of the last word is unclear. It looks as if a small α has been added above the deleted ιc, to make it clear that a nominative is meant.

12]τ' ἀκναμπτεὶ κρέμασον : *LSJ Suppl.* corrects into ἀκναμπτί, Schroeder 1923², 548 into ἀκαμπτεῖ. For the adjective ἄκ(ν)αμπτος cf. *P.* 4, 72 βουλαῖς ἀκ(ν)άμπτοις; *I.* 3/4, 71b ψυχὰν δ' ἄκαμπτος; *Pae.* 6, 88 ἄκναμπτον μένος; *P. Oxy.* 2445, 15a, 5.

Whatever the spelling is (see Braswell 1988 on *P.* 4, 72 pleading to print ἀκναμπτος consistently), the translation remains 'inflexibly', 'unafraid', suggesting resistance to a counterforce. This means that ἀκναμπτεῖ cannot belong with κρέμασον, so that]τ' must represent]τ(ε). Perhaps the text must be reconstructed to give e.g. 'you, the army (must come) too, and (after having fought?) without fear hang up (your shields?) and (put down?) your spears' (see my note on l. 13).

The adverbial ending -εῖ is to be expected when the preceding letter is a τ which belongs to the stem (*Kühner-Blass* 2, 303), so there is no reason to change the papyrus text.

For κρέμασcon in a dionysiac context cf. *Ar. Ach.* 279 ἡ δ' ἀσπίς ἐν τῷ φειψάλῳ κρεμήσεται (Zimmermann 1988, 22); in a more general context of peace cf. *E. fr.* 369 κείσθω δόρυ μοι μίτον ἀμφιπλέκειν ἀράχλαις, / μετὰ δ' ἡσυχίας πολιῶι γῆραι σύνοικος / αἰδοίμι κάρα στεφάνοις πολιῶν στεφανώσας / Θρηῖκιον πέλταν πρὸς Ἀθάνας / περικίσειν ἀγκρεμάσας θαλάμοις / δέλτων τ' ἀναπτύσσοιμι γᾶ- / ρυν αἰ σοφοὶ κλέονται.

13]ε τε χάρμασ : the scholiast adds τὰς ἐπιδορατίδας, cf. *Σ Pi. O.* 9, 128 about a similar use of χάρμη by Stesichorus (*PMG* 267) and Ibycus (*PMG* 340). Its meaning must be 'spear-heads', something added onto the δόρυ, the shaft. Cf. *Demad.* 20 μετὰ βραχὺ δὲ καὶ αἱ τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐπιδορατίδες ἤπτοντ' ἤδη τῆς Ἀττικῆς; *Plb.* 6, 25, 5; *Plu. Apophth. Lac.* p. 217e. Since a spear-head by itself is not very useful, we must understand it here as a *pars pro toto*, indicating the whole spear. The word's etymology excludes the meaning 'spear-shaft' (as *LSJ s.v.* ἐπιδορατίς III proposes). The marginal remark makes it clear that χάρμα cannot mean 'dionysische Festesfreude' (as Zimmermann 1988, 22 thinks).

Τε indicates that the spears are mentioned with something else. The other object may have been shields, cf. *E. fr.* 369 (cited above). Shields are a logical object with κρέμασcon, but the spears need another verb, e.g. ἀποτίθημι *sim*. Such a second verb may have stood in the lacuna, but zeugma is also possible.

14]π[....]ντος ἀύχην ρύοιτο πα[: the only meaning of ἀύχην in Pindar is 'neck'. In a dionysiac context the word could refer to the frenzy of Dionysus and his worshippers, cf. *fr.* 70b, 13 ριψαύχευι (Zimmermann 1988, 22). It is difficult, however, to fit ρύοιτο into this interpretation, as Grenfell and Hunt (1919, 45) have already noted. Bury interprets ἀύχην as 'neck of land, isthmus', cf. *B.* 2, 7 ἀύχην Ἰσθμοῦ. The meaning would then be 'put aside arms and preparations for war and trust for defence to the Isthmus' (Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 45). It is true that the geographical position of an isthmus has such a great strategic advantage that only part of an army is needed for its defence. A small group may be left to guard it. If the Corinthian isthmus is intended here, the dithyramb may have been composed for Corinth (Bury; see Grenfell-Hunt 1919, 31-32).

15]ων πέλοι : the stop at the end makes it likely that the optatives of ll. 14 and 15 belong together and contain two connected ideas. The optative πέλοι implies that]ων is the end of a word with a positive connotation (unless πέλοι stood with a negation).

16]λαν πόνοι χορῶν : connected with χορῶν we must assume a positive interpretation of πόνοι. Such a positive connotation of the words πόνοσ and μόχθοσ is typical of Pindar, see Dornseiff 1921, 59; Radt 1958, 40. The idea that exertion

in the service of a god is easy to perform is found elsewhere, cf. *E. Ba.* 66-67 Βρομίωι πόνον ἦδὺν / κάματόν τ' εὐκάματον.

17]εεε τ' αἰοδαί, : if]εεε is the end of an adjective, it will certainly express a notion of pleasure and charm (see Verdenius 1983, 48), e.g. πολυγαθ]εεε (*Grenfell and Hunt* 1919, 45; cf. fr. 29, 5 Διωνύσου πολυγαθέα τιμάν; fr. 153 Διωνύσου πολυγαθήε), εὐμελ]εεε (*Snell* 1975⁴, 76; only found in later authors). It is likely that αἰοδαί refers to the dithyramb itself.

18]οιο φῦλον ω[: the φῦλον may refer to the city for which this dithyramb was composed.

19]ε πετάλοισ ἦρ[ινοῖε : for spring leaves cf. *Nonn. D.* 44, 126 εἰαρινοῖε πετάλοισιν ἐμιτρώθησαν ἀγυαί; *Pi. P.* 9, 46 ἦρινά φύλλ'. Much more frequent is ἀνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν (e.g. *Il.* 2, 89; *Hes. Th.* 279; *Op.* 75; *h. Hom.* 2, 401; *Simon. PMG* 581, 2).

Not all festivals of Dionysus are celebrated in spring (the Lenaea, the Delphic Orgia and the festival in Arcadian Cynaetha were winter festivals) but most of them are: the Dionysia, Anthesteria, Agriania, and cf. *Ar. Nu.* 310-313 ἦρί τ' ἐπερχομένωι βρομία χάριε, / εὐκελάδων τε χορῶν ἐρεθίσματα, / καὶ μούσα βαρύβρομος ἀλλῶν; *Philod. Scarph.* 6, 252 (*Diehl*) [Δεῦρ' ἄνα Δ]ιθύραμβε Βάκχ' / ε]ῦιε, ταῦρε, κισσο]χαῖ- / τα, Βρόμι', ἦρινα[ῖε ἴκου] / [ταῖεδ'] ἱεραῖε ἐν ὠραιε; *Paus.* 3, 22, 2 ἦρος ἀρχομένου Διωνύσει τὴν ἑορτὴν ἄγουσιν (see also *F.A. Voigt* in *Roscher Lex. s.v. Dionysos* pp. 1059-1063).

23]τι ταμίαε [: for Dionysus as τάμιαε cf. *S. Ant.* 1154 (see *J.B. Bury, Pindar. Nemean Odes*, London 1890 [r Amsterdam 1965], 237-238, who suggests that there may be 'some technical use of ταμίαε in dithyrambic worship or the mysteries of Dionysus'). Other possibilities are Zeus, cf. e.g. *Il.* 4, 84, or a mortal king or authority. This last use is more frequent in *Pindar*, cf. *P.* 5, 62 ταμίαι Κυράνας; *N.* 10, 52 ταμίαι Σπάρτας; of the poet himself: *I.* 6, 57-58 ταμίαε / ... κώμων; 9, 7-8 ταμίαι τε σοφοί / Μοισᾶν.

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 1 col. I

]υοσ [] [
] [] [
] λθε [
]ήτανπιφανυκω [
 5] αρκει [] [
] [
 -ν
]διωριναπερων [
] [
]υαλαμι [
 10] ιτοταντο [
] [
] ,μον[...]αντε [
]ωμφ [...]ντα [
] υτενευματρι [] [
 15] ανλεχεάτ'ανα [] κραιαδο [
]ν'
 ι
]ριωννευσεων .. κα [] [
]δολιχάδ'όδ [] ςαθ νατ [
] νων [] [
 20] κορυφαί [] [
] ραγγελιν [] [
] ροτοι, σπευδ [
] ετοτ .. έ [
] [] [
 25] .. [

unknown number of lines missing

3] dot at medium height | . [a stroke rising from below left | 4 . [an upright | 5]. tip of an upright | 10]. right-hand side of α or λ | 12]. right-hand side of a curved letter, e.g. ο or θ | 13 φ. [upright with traces of ink at the top of the letter on the right-hand side | .], top of a stroke | . [upright, descending below the line, probably ρ | 14]. right-hand part of a circle | 15]. trace on the line | 17 . [trace on the line | .]. horizontal stroke | 18 perhaps a high stop before δολ | δ. no traces left | θ. left-hand part of a stroke rising to the right | . { trace of ink, touching the right-hand edge of τ | 19]. right-hand edge of a stroke touching the apex of ν | 20]. accent? | 22 .] right-hand part of the loop of ρ | 23]. right-hand end of a horizontal stroke | .. tip of slightly rising cross-stroke, followed by the apex of δ or λ | 25 .. tips of uprights

Fr. 70d

]υος
]
]
]ήταν πιφαύσκων[
 5] .αρκει[]
]
]
]
 10 γ]ύαλα μι-
]αιτοταυτο[
]
] .μον[...]αντε
]ων φ .[...] .νίαρ[
]φύτευεν ματρί
 15] .αν λέχεά τ' άνα[γ]καῖα δολ[
]ν'
 Κρ]ονίων νεύσεν άνάγκαι[
]δολιχά δ' όδ[ό]ς άθανάτω[ν
] .ων
 20] . κορυφαί
 π]ράγειν
]ροτοι σπευδ[
] .ετοτεδέ[
] [] []
 25] ..[

deest incertus numerus vv.

Scholia 3 λθε || 7 διορν(ύμενος) άν(τι) περῶν

4 ά]ήταν, κασι-γν]ήταν Snell 1975⁴ | 9-10 γ]ύαλα Μι-[δέας ? Lobel 1961 | 13 φέ[ρων] άνίαρ[όν τε sc. γάμον Snell | 17 suppl. Lobel | 18 suppl. Lobel | 21 suppl. Lobel | 22 β]ροτοι ? Snell

Fr. 70d

26]ν ..[
] []
]κενε[
] .ον [
 30]
]άνεργηξαν[
] .
]ε
] ...[]οιαν
 35 ... μ]έμ , λεν πατρός νόωι,
]σσε υιν υπάτοιειν βουλεύμαει <ν>·
 'Ολυμ]πόθεν δέ οι χρυσόρραπιν ὤρσεν 'Ερμᾶν .[
 ... π]ολίοχον γλαυ-
 κώπιδ]α· τὸ μὲν ἔλευσεν ἕδον τ' ἄποππα
 40]τ· ἧ γάρ [α]ύτῶν μετάρταειν ἀκραν[
]κε· πέτραι δ' [ἔφ]α[ν]θεν ἀνη[ι] φωτῶν

Scholia 35 ἀποκοψ[

31 Snell | **34-35** τ]οιαῦ-]τα Lobel | **35** μ]έμαλεν Lobel; μ]έμηλεν Snell | **36** (ἐ)φύλα]σσε Snell |
37 'Ο(υ)λυμ]πόθεν Lobel | **38** καὶ (τὰν? Lobel) π]ολίοχον Snell | **38-39** Γλαυ-]κώπιδ]α Lobel |
40 θεάμα]τ' Snell | **41** .. θη]κε Snell | [ἔφ]α[ν]θεν Snell *Hermes* 90 (1962), 6; [ἔπ]α[χ]θεν Lobel

]ν τ' ἔρωτος ἀντ' ἀμοιβάν ἐδάσσατο[
 στρα]τάρχων·
] . ισε . [.....]ου
 45]ον . [.....] . γένος τε δαιμο-
 φ]ιλτε[ρ]ται· τὸ δὲ φυγεῖν
] . α[.....]ετε παμπα[]ν κα[]μοροι

42 λυγρά]ν Lobel; ἀινά]ν Snell; μοῖρα]ν Pavese 1964 | 43 suppl. Lobel | 45-46 δαιμο-[κιν φ]ιλτε[ρον
 ἔε]ται Snell | 46 suppl. Lobel | 47 παμπά[λ]αι ? Snell

P.Oxy. 2445, fr. 2

] [
] .. ατα[
] [
] [
 5] . αχ[
] εηρ[
] [

2 .. traces compatible with the right-hand side of a small circle, followed by a tall interrupted upright,
 perhaps οφ | 5]. upper tip of a diagonal descending from upper right, perhaps κ or υ

2 προ]φρατα[Lobel 1961, ὑπ]οφρατα[? | 3 λυ]γαχ[, ε]ύαχ[Lobel

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 3

]τ[] . [
]α .. [
]δρεϛ [
].... [
 5] . [] . ν . [
] .. μοναν [
]εχοιρα . [

1] . [only traces of ink | **2** .. [first π or ν, followed by a dot below the line | **4** only traces of ink |
5] . [the lower tip of an upright below the line |] . the end of a letter, as of ω or ν | . ο or lower part
 of ε or ϛ | **6**] . upper tip of a very tall upright, perhaps interlinear between ll. 5 and 6 | . upright
 | **7**] . [start of a stroke rising to right

7 cf. *P. 10, 52* πρώιραθε χοιράδος Lobel 1961

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 4

] . ν [
] [
 5] [
] [
] [
] .. [..] ν [

2 right-hand side of ο or ω | **7**] . high horizontal stroke | . [slightly rising horizontal stroke level with the tops of the letters

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 5

]πεφ . [
] [
] . ονος . [
] [
 5]εϛϛταθμου .. [
] [

1] . [start of a stroke rising to right | **3**] . right-hand tip of a stroke touching ο | . period | **5** . two
 dots on the line, probably ι + another letter because they are so close together

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 6

]υc [

ζου

]κεμεγαθε .[

2 .[dot on the line

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 7

]..[.,].[.,].[

]αύπ̄ιcά ..[

] [

] [

5]αυότοου[

]ει [

1]..[dot, followed by the lower part of c or ε |].[upright below the line |].[upright below the line
 ¶ 2 of]α only the tail | á acutus in different ink, α corrected from ο | ..[most likely υ, followed by
 the beginning of a stroke rising to right

Fr. 70d (g)

]
]
]
 5]
 Κλ]ωθστ
] [] [

Scholia 2 φλεγες[|]λω π(ερί) π[|| 3]δαις δ' .[|| 4]ρεως· || 5 .. 'Αταλάντηι τῆι 'Ιάκο[υ || 6 ούχ
 ούτω πο[

6 suppl. Lobel 1961

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 10

] , [
] άτω . [
] [
] ΕΥΕΠΕΥ [
 5] . ς , τιμεπλ [

1 . end of a rising stroke | 2 . [beginning of a rising stroke | 5 .] top of an upright, with the tip of a thin stroke above (accent?) | . a dot level with the tops of the letters

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 11

] λππο [
] . ανου [

2] . traces of a short upright

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 12

4 lines blank

5] . δάκκιον [
] . υ [
] [

5] . horizontal stroke, touching δ at the middle, perhaps ε? | 6] . [tip of a tall upright

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 13

]ραῖ [
 ν
], αβουλησε]

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 14

τ] [
]σησ..[
] [
 η
 συχομ τ.[
 5]...η...[
]νος [
] [
] [] [

2 ..[small upright, followed by a dot] 4¹ .[lower part of an upright, a stroke rising from its lower tip] 4² after η perhaps λι or ν

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 15

(a)] [

] . οδοστετα[

] αιμαλ'επις[

] εκτοριχαλ[

] . ωνύπερ'όδα[

5] άκναμπτο[

] . ταθείεε . [

] οιζον .. [

] [

(b)] [] [

10] . χαυ . [

] ελε .. [

] [

] [

] εα . [

 . αφοβ

15] ν [

] . [

1] . upper part of an upright | 4] . end of a horizontal stroke touching at the bottom of ω | 6] . end of a horizontal stroke, perhaps overhang of c | . [dot on the line | 7 .. [κ without upper arm or left-hand part of μ or anomalously upright λ, followed by a small dot | 10] . perhaps right-hand stroke of α | . [left-hand angle of δ, α or ω | 11 . ν or η | . [start of a stroke rising to right | 14¹ . [left-hand side of a rising stroke | 14² . upright, with the right-hand end of a stroke from left touching its top | 16] . [slightly concave upright

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 16

] [

] κατέφ[

] δ'εκμα[

] . π[

4] . upper part of an upright

Fr. 70d (a)

(a)] .οῖος τετα[
 κ]αὶ μαλ' ἐπις[τα
] Ἐκτορι χαλ[
] .ῶν ὑπερ' ὁ δα[
 5] ἀκνάμπτο[
] σταθεῖς ε .[
 ῥ]οῖζον ..[
] [

(b)] [
 10] .χαῖ .[
] ελευ .[
]
]
]
 15]ν

2 suppl. Lobel 1961 | 3 χαλ[κ(ε)ο- Lobel | 4 sc. Achilles? Machler 1989 | 7 suppl. Lobel

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 17

] , ονπ[
] , ψα₄ναφ[
] , ιοιηλ₃υθ[
] , ναθ₅α₁γ[
 5]φι₁λαι₂κρ₃ . [
] [
] [
] , ουκ₁λε₂ . [

1], horizontal stroke on the line | **2**], above the line the lower part of a convex stroke | **3**], only traces of ink | **4**], right-hand end of a high horizontal stroke, perhaps of ε | α marked long or accented with a gravis, probably the latter | **5** above α a washed-out sign | [lower tip of a rising stroke

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 18

(a)] [
] [] [
].νεκ[γ.[
] γα[
 5] .[

(b)]'πε.[
]..[] [
] [
].ρατ[
 5].. [
]..' [

(c)] [
]ουγεγο [
]ετ.[
]..[
 5] [

(a) 2] [lower left-hand curve of c or ε? | 3] [left-hand tail of λ? | 5] [α or δ | (b) 1] . two horizontal strokes above each other | . [dot on the line | 2] . small horizontal stroke | . [dot at medium height | 4] . traces on the top of the line | 5] . dot on the line | 6 traces of two letters and a gravis on the second letter? | (c) 3] [perhaps η, but anomalous | 4] . more likely λ or μ than α | . [short upright off the line, perhaps left-hand side of π?

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 19

- (a) υ[
 χου[
 υ .[
 π[
 5 α ..[
 ουκέτ'αυτ .[
 κοτέσσατ'ε .[
 πέλωραβου[
 φλόγαδερκο .[
 10 πέσον'ατα .[
 τίκετιςες .[
]ᾱ[..] 'έκ .[
- (b)]τ'ιθ'ενειπ[
]σανδ[
]εικος[
] [
 5] .[
- (c)] .τ .[
]αϛειτ[
]εν .αρα[
]ᾰδεσ .[
- (d)] . ' ..[
] .σιδᾰ[

(a) 3 .[lower part of an upright | 5 ..[cχ possible, but perhaps ια? | 6 in the margin a sign, the right-hand part of an upside triangle | .[α or ω? | 7 .[an upright | 9 .[start of a stroke rising to right | 10 .[upper left-hand arc of a circle | 11 .[perhaps the left-hand tips of χ? | 12] . dot at medium height | .[upright with a cross-stroke beginning at medium height | (b) 2 δ perhaps ζ, suggested by some ink above the left angle of δ | 5 only traces of ink | (c) 1] . lower part of an upright | .[left-hand corner of ε, c or o, perhaps ω | 3 . tail of an upright | 4 .[c or ω | (d) 1] . stroke curving to left, perhaps foot of τ | . lower angle as of ε or c | .[η or ν | 2] . right-hand tail of α or λ

Fr. 70d (b)

(a) υ[(b)
 ού[]]τ' ἴσθ' ενειπ[
 υ . []]σανδ[
 π[]]ν]εἶκος[
 5 α . []
 ούκέτ' ἀύτα[
 κοτέσσατ' ε . []
 πέλωρα βου[
 φλόγα δερκομ[
 10 πέσον' ἀτασ[
 τί κέ τις ἐσχ[
 ..]ᾶ[..] . ' ἔκ . []

4 suppl. Machler 1989 | 8 vel πέλωρ' ἀβου[Lobel 1961 | 10 ἀτασ[θαλ- Lobel

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 20

		τ	
]	βελ το[
		πλ[
]ν	[
]αι	[
		η	
]αντ ερα	[
5]		[
]		[
]ν		[
]		[
]		[
10]υκυ[
]χαυ[

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 21

(a) }δμ[..]ο.[
]υρωστωμεπ[
] []
] []
 5]μαλιςταβ.[
] []
]ερον []
] ... []
] ... []
]. ... []

(a) 1 .{ an upright | 5 .{ an upright | 6 rubbed ink | 8-9 traces of a note | 9 }. top of an upright

Fr. 70d (c)

] . [] υ []
] . ι τε ροδ[ων] []
] . ἰακινθ[] ιων κρόκω[ν τ(ε)
] τανερ . [] τι πάντα[
 5] ατ[] αρ . μενον []
 τί] να πτόλιν, τίν' ἐ . []
] . ε κέο κλεόμενοι γε[
] ξιον .
] . πη . εν Βαβυ[λων
 10] εν . ι χείρ ... []
] πολὺς λό . []
] ρελλ . []
] χομε . []

(b) 6 ἴνυ[γ-? Lobel 1961 | (c) 2 στεφάνοι]ci, ἀνθε]ci sim. Maehler 1989 | suppl. Lobel | 3 ἰακιν-
 θ{ε}ίων? Maehler | suppl. Lobel | 4 ἐρί[ζων]τι Maehler | 5 μ]αρνάμενον Snell 1975⁴ | 6 suppl.
 Lobel | τίν' ἐπ[ιχώριον ἥρωα Snell | 7 μᾶλλον] κε Maehler | 8 ἄ]ξιον Maehler | 9 suppl. Lobel
 | 11 λόγ[ος Maehler

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 22

']τε[

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 23

(beginning of column)

]αικεινωιχρονωι·[
]·έξεννο ... μωιτελ[
]·έντ·]τηρκαιε·[
]·c·[

5

]...[

2]· a slight trace of the top of an upright | ... the top of a circle, a dot level with the tops of the letters, the upper part of an upright | 3]· a loop as of ρ or φ | ·[the start of a stroke rising to right | ·[two dots side by side level with the tops of the letters | 4]· the upper part of an upright | ·[cross-stroke slightly sloping downward | 5 tip of an upright descending slightly to right | dot level with the tops of the letters | two dots at medium height

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 24

]....[
]ατᾶν[
] [
]καλυδών [
 ε
 5]αιχ[[α]]ρμαδ[
]τ'εσαντον[
].χιον [
]αν [
]ιμν'ακάμ[
 10].ω.[
].αυ[
]..[

1 the lower tip of an upright | a small horizontal stroke on the line | the beginning of a stroke rising to right | the left-hand side of a circle, a little lower than the other letters | **7**]. the right-hand tip of a stroke level with the tops of the letters | **10**]. traces consistent with ν or ω, ω most likely | .[μ or ν, μ most likely | **11**]. the right-hand end of a cross-stroke level with the tops of the letters | **12** perhaps part of a note, it could be interpreted as ι^οc

Fr. 70d (f)

]....[
]ατᾶν[
] [
]Καλυδών [
 5]αι χερμαδ[
]τ' ἐς αὐτὸν [
]·χιον [
]αν [
 10 μ]ίμν' ἀκάμ[
]·ω[
]·αν[
]..[

9 suppl. Snell 1975⁴

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 25

] ε [
] ω ξ ι π π [
] α τ ε π ε [
] υ δ ρ ω ν [
 5 . [.] ε ὕ ν τ ι .. [
 λογίων [
 / και τρε τάρ [
 φ θ ι τ ο μ ε ν γ α [

1] . perhaps the lower part of the right-hand loop of φ | . [the lower left-hand arc of a circle | 3
 . [only traces of ink | 4 . [only traces of ink | 5 . [perhaps the left-hand base angle of δ |] . a trace
 consistent with the lower part of the diagonal of ν | .. [only traces of ink | 7 in the margin a curved
 line

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 26

κα [
 _ ο τ η [
 ι τε [

Fr. 70d (e)

] . ε . [
] ω ξ ι π π [
] α τ ε π ε . [
 κ ά] ν δ ρ ώ ν . [
 5 δ [ο] ν ε ὕ ν τ ι .. [
 λ ο γ ί ω ν [
 κ α ί τ ρ ε τ ά ρ [
 φ θ ί τ ο μ ἔ ν γ α [

2 δι]ωξιππ[- Lobel 1961 | 3 ἔπε[α ? Maehler 1989 | 4 suppl. Snell 1975⁴ | 5 δ[ι]νεῦντι propter spatium potius quam δ[ο]νεῦντι, Lobel

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 27

]επο . [
]ολύπ[
]ἄιψαμετ[
]ενδροιδ[
 .ο.
 5]υάλων κρε[
][[. ιαι]] επικώκεχο[
]γανάενταχ[
]ν·λεύςσειδ . [
 ν
]. 'ὠν .. [
 10]ίξεαῶμα[
]θαμαγαροίκοθ . [
]ακατ . [] . ουε . [
]πεδ[
 \ .. [

1 . [the start of a stroke rising to right | 2 π might be γ followed by an upright | 6]. probably the right-hand tips of κ or χ | 8 . [the left-hand arc of a circle | 9]. the ink below ' does not suggest any vowel | 11 . [dot on the line | 12 . [the left-hand bottom angle of α would suit |]. the right-hand arc of a circle, perhaps θ | . [the lower part of the left-hand side of c or the like | 14 three tips of letters

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 28

(beginning of column)

]αδαντικ[
]τεχ[

Fr. 70d (h)

]επο .[
 π]ολύπ[
] αἴψα μετ[
]ενδροι δ[
 5 γ]υάλων· κρε[
]
] γανάνειντα χ[
]ν· λεύσσει δ .[
] . ἔων
 10]ίξεαι ᾧ μα[
]θαμὰ γὰρ οὔκοθε[ν
]α κατὰ [χ]θόν' ε .[
]πεδ[
 `]-.[

2 suppl. Maehler 1989 | 4 εὐδ]ενδροι Lobel 1961 | 5 suppl. Lobel | 10 ἔξεαι vel ἀφίξεαι Maehler
 | μά[καρ, μά[καιρα Maehler | 11 suppl. Snell 1975⁴ | 12 suppl. Lobel

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 29

] . [
] . νέχ[
] λεν . [
] . céρχ[
 5] βροτω[
] οἰσδο . [
] πειτ[
] ροσα[
] νόν . [
 10] . άγ .. [
] . [

1 tail of an upright | 2 |. speck of ink | 3 |. left-hand tip of a cross-stroke, perhaps τ? | 4 |. speck of ink | 5 β might be taken as the tail of α with the right-hand end of a 'hyphen' below but for a trace above, which presumably represents the upper loop of β. But a compound of άροός with α marked long or short is possible | 6 |. the upper end of a stroke descending to right | 9 |. α or δ | 10 |. perhaps ιτ or γη but neither accounts for the thick curved stroke between the upright parts of these letters | 11 a small horizontal stroke

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 30

] νδ[
] νου[
] ειφ[
] νεύφ . [
 5] νσαια[
] . cέλ[
] . λότη[
] . ακα[
] . ι [
 10] ατ[
] [

1 specks of ink very close to δ | 2 ν[might be μ[| 4 |. beginning of a stroke rising to right | 6 |. a dot level with the tops of the letters | 7 |. two dots, one high and one low | 8 |. right-hand side of λ, α or perhaps δ | of α[only the left-hand angle | 9 |. middle part of an upright

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 31

]θρέψα[
] . ωιϰθεν[
]περμιν . [
 5] [
]ἄιφον[
]στουμε[
]ανδε [
 σν
]εννυχ . [
]μον' [
 10]ἄι τσντ ..[
 ολετοιφ
]γαλλᾶ . [
] [
]τιλόγ . [
]ἄι [
 15]ειρεϰ[

2] . tip of a cross-stroke touching ω at medium height | 3 .[upper left-hand tip of a stroke descending to right | 6 c might be α or κ | 8 .[an upright sloping to right | 11 .[tip of an upright | 13 γ[might be π

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 32

] [
]κο . [
]λκο .. [
]ιγγε [
]λαϊᾶ . [
 5] . δελ . [
]ονα . [
] . κτυ [
] . [
]λαχ . [
 10]ειδε . [
]ο'ρεω [
]υμ . [
]άδ . [
]οιρά [

1 . [γ or the left-hand part of π | above it the left-hand part of a heavy dot | 2 .. [a stroke rising to right followed by the extreme lower end of a stroke descending below the line, perhaps αρ | 4 . [an upright | 5] . the foot of a stroke descending from left | . [beginning of a letter touching λ | 6 . [an upright | 7] . the upper part of an upright | 9 . [the top of an upright well above the letters | 10 . [perhaps a stroke rising to right | 12 . [ε, o or c | 13 . [α or δ, but either slightly anomalous

2 χα)λκοαρ[α Lobel 1961

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 1 = fr. 70d

Tradition

P. Oxy. 2445 and *P. Oxy.* 1604 (Pi. frs. 70a-c) probably come from the same roll (Grenfell and Hunt 1922, 47). The handwriting of both papyri seems identical. This suggests that the poet and the genre are the same and that *P. Oxy.* 2445 fr. 1 comes from the Dithyrambs of Pindar.

Pindaric authorship is not inconsistent with the language and a mythical narrative is characteristic of dithyrambs. We find no references to Dionysus and the dithyrambic festival, but these may have been mentioned in part of the missing contents.

Contents

The papyrus does not give much indication of the structure of the poem: no paragraphus and no changes in contents such as invocations or 'I'-statements. The whole fragment is a (mythical) narrative. The second column tells how Perseus, supported by Hermes and Athena (ll. 37-39) and protected by Zeus (ll. 35-36), used the Gorgon's head to petrify Polydectes (ll. 42-43) and the people of Seriphus (ll. 39-41). The first column refers to a mother (l. 14) and a forced (marriage-?)bed (l. 15), followed by the mention of Zeus nodding and of necessity (l. 17) and the long road of (?) the immortals (l. 18). The other words cannot be brought into a meaningful whole.

Metre

The metrical scheme of the columns is as follows:

] -
]
]
] - - - - - [
5] - -
]
]

]
]...?
 10]...? [
]
]-? []-
]-[]-? [
]-
 15]-...? [
]?
]-...- [
]-...- [
]-
 20]-
]-
]-...- [
]-...? [
]
 25]

 26]
]
]-? [
]-
 30]
]-...? [
]
]-
]-
 35]-...-
 -]...
 ?-]...- [
 -]...-
 -]...-
 40]-...? - [
]-? -...-
 -]...- [
 -]--
]?? []-
 45]? []-...-

] - - [] - - - - -
] ? [] - - - ? ? ? - -

Führer 1972, 41-42 recognizes responsion between ll. 4-14 and ll. 31-41, which is quite an accomplishment in such incomplete lines. But the risk is that the relevant lines do not overlap enough to warrant the conclusion of metrical correspondence. Ll. 4 and 31 both fit - - - - -, but l. 4 uses only the last five syllables, and l. 31 the first four. In ll. 5-8 and 32-35 the lines of either col. I or col. II are completely missing. Of ll. 9 and 36 we have the endings, so that there is more ground for certainty, although l. 9 only has its last four syllables. The same can be said of ll. 10 and 37, but there it is not completely certain that we have the last syllables. L. 11 is missing completely, and ll. 12 and 13 can be fitted into the last part of the metre of ll. 39-40, but they are missing quite a few letters, so that they might as well fit in another scheme. Besides, l. 40 would need at least three syllables more, which would make it quite long. In l. 14 the ν must be deleted to correspond to l. 41, which in itself would not be objectionable, if all the other lines fitted more obviously. The extant end of l. 42 overlaps metrically with the first six remaining syllables of l. 15 (after which follow at least three more syllables), but l. 16 seems much too long to correspond to l. 43, and l. 43 seems to be a short colon, to be connected with the preceding line to form a period, so that Führer concludes that in ll. 15 and 42 a new antistrophe or epode begins.

The conclusion must be that there may well be metrical correspondence between ll. 4-14 and 31-41, but that there are so many gaps and irregularities (ν to be deleted in l. 14, and making a very long line of l. 40) that we may as well argue that there is none.

Commentary

4 ἦσαν παραύσκωϛ : παραύσκω does not occur elsewhere in Pindar's extant work, but is a common epic and lyric word (cf. e.g. B. 5, 42; 9, 81). With the preceding accusative the act. may mean either 'tell of' (cf. e.g. *Il.* 10, 477-478 ἵπποι, / οὐκ νῶν παραύσκε Δόλων; A. *Ch.* 279) or 'tell to' with acc. + inf. (cf. A. *Eu.* 620). The interlinear ἦλθε in l. 3 indicates perhaps that somebody 'came to tell', but the contents of what he or she said remain unknown.

On the basis of the accent and the fact that η has not been changed into α , two words are possible, sc. ἀήσαν and καελγῆσαν. The context gives no information to help decide which is more likely.

7 Σ διορν(ύμενος) ἀν(τι) περῶν : the verb διορνυμαι occurs twice elsewhere, in Nonn. *Paraphr. Ev. Jo.* 15, 106 and in *A. Supp.* 549-552 (Io) περᾶι δὲ Τεϋθραν-τος ἄστῃ Μυκόν / Λύδιά τ' ἄν γύαλα, / καὶ δι' ὄρῶν Κιλίκων / Παμφύλων τε διορνυμένα. Perhaps γύαλα in l. 9 belongs to the same clause: e.g. 'hurrying through the valleys' or 'hurrying through ... (reached) the valleys'. The possible objection that the distance between the words is rather large, does not have to count too heavily because ll. 7 and 8 are short and more countries may have been mentioned, as in *A. Supp.* 549-552.

9 γύαλα μι : the first word is almost certainly the plural of γύαλον which usually means 'valley'. The context of a possible διορνύμενος in l. 7 strengthens this suggestion. With γύαλα goes as a rule a genitive or an adjective indicating the place where the valley lies (cf. e.g. *P.* 8, 63 Πυθῶνος ἐν γυάλοις; fr. 140a, 63(37) Πάρου ἐν γυάλοις; Hes. *Th.* 499; *A. Supp.* 550) or its 'owner' (cf. *E. Ph.* 237 γύαλα Φοίβου). Lobel's suggestion of connecting it with the Argolic town Μιδέα (1961, 88) is not unjustified, but other names can be thought of, e.g. the legendary Midas, Μίνυας or the Μίνυανς. Of course the supposed adjective or genitive may have stood before γύαλα, so that μι- is the beginning of something completely different.

10]αιτοσαντο] : to be divided into]αι τότ' αὐτο],]αιτο τ' αὐτο] or]αι τό τ' αὐτο]. In a narrative τότε would be suitable.]αιτο ταυτό [would be defensible, because if the story is about somebody travelling, ταυτό can indicate something local, cf. *A. Ch.* 210 εἰς ταυτό συμβαίνουσι τοῖς ἑμοῖς τίβοις; *X. An.* 3, 1, 30. But ταυτό is Attic and Pindar would probably use the Ionic τῶυτό, cf. *O.* 1, 45.

13]ων φ ..[..] . νιαρ] : since words beginning with φν- do not exist (except for the comic φνεῖ) the traces after φ must belong to two letters: ι plus the left-hand tip of τ, ζ, ξ or υ. Φιζ- and φιν- do not exist. The Boeotic Φίξ for Σφίγξ is possible, but more likely (because they are more frequent) are words beginning with φιν-. In the context of a mother (l. 14) we may think of φίτ[υμα 'shoot, scion' (cf. *A. Ag.* 1281; *Plu.* 2, 241a); φῖτ[υς 'begetter, father' (cf. *Lyc.* 462; 486) or φιτ[ύω 'plant, beget' (cf. e.g. *A. Pr.* 235; *Supp.* 313; *S. Ant.* 645; *E. Alc.* 294).

The last letters probably represent a case of ἀνίαρος = ἀνίερος, because ἀνίαρός is inconsistent with the accent given in the papyrus. For ιαρός as a West-Greek dialect form, see Buck 1955², 24. The form is also found in fr. 338,7 ιαροῖς.

If this clause is about a mother (l. 14) and a 'forced bed' (see note on l. 15), we may think of φιτ[ύς] ἀνίαρ[ος] referring to the father, or of φίτ[υμι] ἀνίαρ[ον] referring to the child. For the latter cf. *Pl. R.* 461b νόθον γὰρ καὶ ἀνέγγυον καὶ ἀνίερον φήσομεν αὐτὸν παῖδα τῆι πόλει καθιστάναι. We must not forget the possibility that φ ..[..] . νιαρ] is the object of a participle represented by]ων. In that case the object of l. 14 φύτευεν is to be sought in l. 15.

14]φόντευεν ματρί : the verb φντεύω may be interpreted as ‘beget’ or as ‘cause’ in a more general sense. For φντεύω in the sense of ‘beget’ cf. e.g. Hes. *Op.* 812; Hdt. 4, 145; Pi. *N.* 7, 84; S. *OT.* 793; E. *Alc.* 662. In this case the subject is the father and the object the child, perhaps to be looked for in l. 13. Ματρί is then used proleptically, while γυναικί would be strictly logical. In the context this is the most plausible suggestion, but also possible is φντεύω in the sense of ‘cause, produce’, cf. of evils e.g. *Od.* 5, 340; Pi. *N.* 4, 59; S. *Aj.* 953; of good things e.g. Pi. *P.* 9, 111; *I.* 6, 12; *N.* 8, 17; B. 16, 68.

The ν is deleted by Führer (1972, 41-42) to make the line correspond to l. 41, but see above on *Metre*.

15]αν λέχεά τ’ ἀνα[γ]καῖα δολ[: the λέχεα ἀνα[γ]καῖα can refer to a forced cohabitation, such as between Danae and Polydectes (suggested by Lobel 1961, 88). Cf. *P.* 12, 14-15 λυγρόν τ’ ἔρανον Πολυδέκται θῆκε ματρός τ’ ἔμπεδον / δουλοσύναν τό τ’ ἀναγκαῖον λέχος. This would fit with the story of Perseus in col. Π. Or we may think of rape, e.g. that of Danae by Proetus (suggested by Snell 1975⁴, 77). Cf. Σ *D II.* 14, 319 Δανάη ... ἐφθάρθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατραδέλφου αὐτῆς Προΐτου ... ὡς φησι Πίνδαρος (fr. 284).

δολ[may be the beginning of δολιχά, or of a word expressing shrewdness (on the side of the one who enforces the marriage or relationship), e.g. δολ[όμη-τις, δολ[οφραδής, δόλ[ωι.

17 Κρ]οῖων νεῦσεν ἀνάγκαι [: for the nodding of Zeus cf. e.g. *II.* 1, 528 κνανήριον ἐπ’ ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κροῖων; 8, 175 μοι πρόφρων κατένευσε Κροῖων; Pi. *P.* 1, 72 λίσσομαι νεῦσον, Κροῖων; E. *Alc.* 978-979 Ζεὺς ὃ τι νεύσει, / ... τελευτᾷ. The clause may mean that Zeus is forced to nod his assent (cf. Pi. fr. 93 ... κεραίξει ... Τυφῶνα πεντηκοντοκέφαλον ἀνάγκαι Ζεὺς πατήρ ...) because Fate had it so decreed. But ἀνάγκαι may also indicate that the nodding of Zeus makes events unalterable, e.g. ἀνάγκαι ζεύσαις or δήσαις (cf. *P.* 4, 234 and Braswell 1988 *ad loc.*; fr. adesp. *PMG* 1017 χῶιπερ μόνον ὀφρύσι νεύσει, καρτερὰ τούτω κέκλωστ’ ἀνάγκη). See also H. Schreckenberg, *Ananke*, München 1964, 72-81.

18]· δολιχά δ’ ὀδ[δ]ς ἀθανάτω[ν : the presence of δ’ after δολιχά makes it likely that the trace of ink before δολιχά is a high stop.

For δολιχά ὀδός cf. *Od.* 4, 393 δολιχὴν ὀδὸν ἀργαλέην τε, 4, 483; 17, 426; *h. Hom.* 4, 86; 143.

The interpretation of the text is extremely doubtful. It seems plausible to take ὀδ[δ]ς ἀθανάτω[ν together. In that case we may interpret the words as a special road for gods. Cf. *Od.* 13, 111-112 αἱ δ’ αὖ πρὸς Νότου εἰς θεώτεραι· οὐδέ τι κείνη / ἄνδρες ἐσέρχονται, ἀλλ’ ἀθανάτων ὀδός ἐστιν; Pi. *O.* 2, 70 Διὸς ὀδόν; Quint. Smyrn. 14, 225-226 καταβασίη τ’ ἄνοδος τε / ἀθανάτοις μακάρεσσιν; Pl. *Phdr.* 247a-b. More specifically this would be the Milky Way. Cf. Orph. fr. 168,

15 ἀντολίη τε δύσλις τε, θεῶν ὁδοὶ οὐρανόων; *Ov. Met.* 1, 168-171 *est via sublimis, caelo manifesta sereno; / lactea nomen habet, candore notabilis ipso. / hac iter est superis ad magni tecta Tonantis / regalemque domum.* This interpretation would imply that Zeus, after nodding his assent (l. 17), went somewhere and used a special path belonging to the immortals. That path was long (l. 18).

The notion that punishment by the gods can be delayed for a considerable time could perhaps be expressed by the 'long road of the immortals'. Cf. *Hes. Op.* 217-218 Δίκη δ' ὑπὲρ ὕβριος ἴσχει / ἐς τέλος ἐξελοῦσα; *E. fr.* 255 δοκεῖς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ξυνετὰ νικήσειν ποτὲ / καὶ τὴν Δίκην που μάκρ' ἀπωκίχθαι βροτῶν / ἢ δ' ἐγγύς ἐστιν, οὐχ ὀρωμένη δ' ὀραῖ / ὄν χρηὴ κολάζειν τ' οἴδεν· ἀλλ' οὐκ οἴσθθα cὺ / ὀπτόταν ἄφνω μολοῦσα διολέσει κακοῦς (and see Harder 1985, 253-258); *Call. SH* 239 οὐδ' ἴσθθαί τῶς κύνας εἰς θεοί.

If we separate ὁδ[ὸ]ς and ἀθανάτω[ν], we can interpret 'the road is long, when the immortals (do not help)' or something similar. For the same meaning, but expressed in a positive way, cf. *P.* 9, 67-68 ὠκεῖα δ' ἐπειγομένων ἤδη θεῶν / πρᾶξις ὁδοὶ τε βραχεῖαι. The idea of completing to ἀθανάτω[ν] ἀπέσιτων *sim.* is suggested by the possible interpretation that Zeus is reluctant to assent (l. 17).

Finally we must not forget the possibility that the last word was ἀθανάτω[ν].

20] κορυφαί : in connection with ll. 21-22 where striving gods or humans (?) and actions seem to be mentioned, κορυφαί may indicate 'the best, the top', cf. e.g. *O.* 2, 13 ἀέθλων κορυφάν, *N.* 1, 34 κορυφαῖς ἀρετῶν μεγάλας.

21] π[ρ]άγειν : πρᾶγος is the poetic equivalent of πρᾶγμα. Cf. e.g. *Pi. N.* 3, 6; *fr.* 108a, 2; *A. Th.* 861; *Pers.* 248.

23] ε[π]οπεδέ[] : if this is still a narrative the text may have been]ε ποτὲ δέ [.

31] ἀνέρρηξαν [: since the middle of this verb is not attested in contemporary authors, the word is probably complete as it is. Its meaning can be 'break up, break through', cf. *Il.* 20, 62-63 μὴ οἱ ὑπερθε / γαῖαν ἀναρρήξειε Ποσειδάων; *E. Hec.* 1040 οἴκων τῶνδ' ἀναρρήξω μυχοῦς; but it is also used in the sense 'make to break forth', esp. of loud and unfriendly words and disputes, cf. *Pi.* fr. 180, 1 μὴ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀναρρήξαι τὸν ἀχρεῖον λόγον; *Ag. Eq.* 626 ἀναρρηγνύς ἔπη; *Theoc.* 22, 172 νεῖκος ἀναρρήξαντας. A third use which can be relevant in the context, is the intransitive 'break forth', cf. *S. OT.* 1075 ἀναρρήξει κακά. In all cases the scene seems to be rather violent, full of discord.

Since ll. 35-43 deal with Perseus' quest for the Gorgon's head, this line may be part of the preparations for it. E.g. the discussion between Perseus and Polydectes when Polydectes refuses the horse that Perseus offers as his contribution to the banquet, but demands the Gorgon's head instead. Cf. *Pherecyd. FGH* 3 F 11 μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἔρανον τῆι ἐξῆς ἡμέραι, ὅτε οἱ ἄλλοι ἐρανίσται τὸν ἵππον ἀπεκόμζον, καὶ Περσεύς. ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἐδέχετο, ἀπήμει δὲ τὴν τῆς Γοργόνης κεφαλῆν

κατὰ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν. ἔαν δὲ μὴ κομίσει, τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ λήψεσθαι ἔφη. ὁ δὲ ἀνιθεὶς ἀπέρχεται ὀλοφυρόμενος τὴν συμφορὰν εἰς τὸ ἔσχατον τῆς νήσου.

34] ... []ουαυ : although a division in]ουαυ is possible, Lobel's suggestion τ]ουαυ-/τα (1961, 89, modified by Snell 1975⁴, 78 into τ]ουαυ-/θ') is very attractive, because we need a singular (or neuter plural) subject with l. 35 μ]έμ . λεν. 'Such things' may refer to the promise which Perseus made to fetch the Gorgon's head.

35-39 Γλαν- / κώπιδ]α (l. 39) is a virtually certain completion (Lobel 1961, 89), and assuming that the left margin was roughly vertical without a marked slant, we expect ll. 35-38 to be missing approximately four letters on the left-hand side since the lacuna is a little wider from l. 39. This is probably not enough for a connective at the beginning of l. 36. That means ll. 34-35 probably form a subordinate clause, which makes Snell's suggestion τ]ουαυ- / θ' ὥς (1975⁴, 78) very plausible: 'because such things are of concern to the father's mind', i.e. Zeus was worried, and therefore he made plans to help his son (ll. 36ff.). The mention of Zeus' anxiety makes Snell's φύλα]σσε plausible. In ll. 37-39 we can follow Lobel, completing to 'Ολυμ]πῶθεν, καὶ π]ολίοχον and κώπιδ]α (1961, 89). In this interpretation Zeus is the subject throughout, and l. 36 υν and l. 37 οἱ are Perseus.

35 ... μ]έμ . λεν : the two small dots between μ and λ might be α, but η cannot be excluded as a possibility. The regular epic form is μέμηλεν, cf. *Il.* 2, 25; *Od.* 1, 151; Hes. *Op.* 238. Lobel thinks α is more likely, and explains the form as hyperdoric, analogous to *O.* 1, 89 μεμαλότας *v.l.* (1961, 89). The existence of hyperdoric is denied by Forssman 1966, 84, who explains μεμαλώς as a very old form, developed from *me-mi-uos via μεμαλφώς. By analogy the long α was then inserted in μέμαλεν to replace η (Forssman 1966, 65-70). The advantage of Forssman's suggestion is that it tries to explain (the development of) the form. However, the reading of the papyrus is very uncertain, which makes the discussion rather hypothetical.

πατρός νόωι : because the story is about Perseus, the father is undoubtedly Zeus. This is underlined by the fact that his plans are called ὑπάτοιειν (l. 36), a regular epithet of Zeus, cf. e.g. *Il.* 19, 258 θεῶν ὑπατος καὶ ἄριστος; Pi. *O.* 13, 24-26 ὑπατ' εὐρύ ἀνάστων / 'Ολυμπίας ... / ... Ζεῦ πάτερ; fr. 75, 11 γόνον ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων (Dionysus).

36]σσε υν ὑπάτοιειν βουλεύμασι <ν> : if Zeus is the subject, the verb must be 'protect, help' *sim.*, which makes Snell's φύλα]σσε suitable (1975⁴, 78). For the protective role of Zeus towards mortal beings, cf. e.g. Pi. *Pae.* 12, 9-11 λέγο[ντι / Ζῆνα καθεζόμενον / κορυφαίειν ὑπερθε φυλάξαι π[ρ]ονοί[α]; Ar. *Eq.* 499-500 σε φυλάττοι / Ζεῦς.

37-38 Zeus' help consisted in sending Hermes and Athena to Perseus with useful advice on how to locate the Gorgons and how to take possession of

Medusa's head without becoming petrified himself. After the successful completion of the adventure Perseus gives the head to Athena and the κίβικα to Hermes. For Athena's assistance cf. *P.* 12, 18-19 ἐπεὶ ἐκ τούτων φίλον ἄνδρα πόνων / ἐρρύσαιτο παρθένος, and for an illustration see K. Schefold, *Frühgriechische Sagenbilder*, München 1964, plate 44a (620 B.C.); for Hermes' help cf. *E. El.* 459-463; and for both Hermes and Athena see Schefold plate 45 (after 600 B.C.). An overview of illustrations of different episodes of the Perseus myth can be found in F. Knatz, *Quomodo Persei fabulam artifices Graeci et Romani tractaverint*, Diss. Bonn, 1893.

37 Ὀλυμ]πόθεν : the choice between Ὀλυμ]πόθεν and Οὔλυμ]πόθεν cannot be made on metrical grounds because there is too much uncertainty about the metre of this fragment. The width of the lacuna makes Ὀλυμ]πόθεν more likely (see note on 35-39). For O/Ou see also Schroeder 1923², 12.

The only other instance of O(ύ)λυμπόθεν is found in *P.* 4, 214. Braswell 1988 *ad loc.* suggests that Pindar combined the two Homeric adverbs Οὔλυμπόνδε and ούρανόθεν.

δέ οί : the digamma of οί is observed and 'most poets (...) regularly so place the pronoun that the digamma is metrically effective' (P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1962, 82-83). The only two exceptions in Pindar are *O.* 1, 57 and fr. 169a, 51. The former is therefore emended by Fennell 1893² *ad loc.* to τοι and the same emendation is suggested for fr. 169a, 51 by Pavese 1967, 85.

χρυσόραπιν ... Ἑρμῶν : the wand of Hermes is traditional, cf. e.g. *Od.* 5, 87; 10, 277; *h. Hom.* 2, 335; *Pi. P.* 4, 178 (see Braswell 1988 *ad loc.* and his references).

It is not part of the traditional myth that the wand is used to cast a spell on the Gorgons or the Graeae. Hermes carries the wand to show that he is a representative of Zeus. See F.J.M. De Waele, *The Magic Staff or Rod in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*, Gent 1927, 33-69. For epithets of gods with χρυσο- or χρυσεο-, see my note on fr. 346, 4 χρυσοθρόνω.

Pindar had the choice between -ρ- and -ρρ-, depending on his metrical needs. For an overview of the influence of ρ (duplicated or not) on the preceding syllable, see Maehler 1989, 188. Cf. also fr. 70d, 31 ἀνέρρηξαν.

38-39 ... π[ολί]οχον Γλαυ- / [κώπιδ]α : πολίοχος with short second ο is rare. It is found elsewhere at *E. Rh.* 166 and 821; *Lys.* 18, 13, 2; *Ath.* 2, 56, 3; 7, 92, 19 and in a Cretan inscription of the third century B.C. (*Inscr. Cret.* IV, 171, 14). The more regular form is πολιόχος (cf. *Pi. O.* 5, 10; *Pae.* 10,12), πολιήχος (A.R. 1, 312) or πολιοῦχος (cf. *Ar. Eq.* 581; *Nu.* 602). Although the adjective is used for other divinities (cf. *Pl. Lg.* 921c Ζεὺς πολιοῦχος; A.R. 1, 312 Ἀρτέμιδος πολιτήχου), Athena is the goddess who is most often called by this epithet (cf.

Hdt. 1, 160; Pi. *O.* 5, 10; Ar. *Eq.* 581; *Nu.* 602), and not only in relation to the city of Athens.

Γλαυκῶπις is a Homeric epithet of Athena, cf. e.g. *Il.* 1, 206; *Od.* 1, 156. Pindar uses it as an adjective (*N.* 7, 96 κόραν τε γλαυκῶπιδα) or as a name (*O.* 7, 50-51 αὐτὰ ... / Γλαυκῶπις; *N.* 10, 7 ξανθά ... Γλαυκῶπις). The adjective γλαυκῶψ is used with snakes, cf. Pi. *O.* 6, 45; *P.* 4, 249, and with a personalized Προνοίη by Euph. 2. The best interpretation of γλαυκῶπις/γλαυκῶψ is 'with grey-gleaming eyes'. It is uncertain whether the colour predominates (silver-grey, suggested by *O.* 3, 13 γλαυκόχροα κόμμον ἐλαίας; *B.* 11, 29 ἐλαία γλαυκά, *S. OC.* 701, *E. IT.* 1101; or the glare (suggested by Σ φοβεροί *ad O.* 8, 37 γλαυκοὶ δὲ δράκοντες and adopted by Fogelmark 1972, 33-34), but since Athena is regularly depicted as a war goddess, the comparison with the glittering eyes of dangerous snakes is more appropriate than a mere description of the colour of her eyes, so that even if γλαυκῶπις is translated as 'grey' the emotional connotation of 'glittering, glaring' must be included. See also Platnauer 1921, 156; Leumann 1950, 148-154; P.G. Maxwell-Stuart, *Studies in Greek Colour Terminology I.* Γλαυκός, Leiden 1981, 126-129, 169-170.

39 τὸ μὲν ἔλευσεν : The mention of the two immortals who helped Perseus implies that the mission was successful, so that the next stage in the story is the return of Perseus to Seriphus. The fact that λεύω is not found in the sense 'to petrify' (see already Lobel 1961, 89) and the punctuation after ἔλευσεν, make it necessary to derive ἔλευσεν from ἐλεύθω. The causal form of the stem ἐλυθ- means 'to bring', so that the subject is Perseus and the object is τὸ μὲν, the head. For the verb ἐλεύθω cf. Hsch. ἐλευσίω οἴσω; *Ibyc. PMG* 282a, 17-19 οὐς τε κοίλα[ι / νᾶες] πολυγόμοφοι ἐλεύσα[ν / Τροί]αι κακόν, ἤρωας ἐςθ[λοῦς]. There is no explicit noun in the preceding lines to which τὸ μὲν refers, but the Gorgon's head is so essential to the myth that it was certainly not difficult to understand what 'he brought'.

For μὲν, see Denniston 1954², 360: 'When μὲν follows a pronoun at the beginning of a sentence which is not introduced by a connecting particle proper, it seems to acquire a quasi-connective, progressive, force'.

39-40 ἴδον τ' ἄποπτα / ἦ: the mention of Perseus' return with the Gorgon's head is followed by a description of its petrifying effect on Polydectes and his people, the Seriphians: 'and they saw ...'. Cf. *P.* 10, 46-48 ἔπεφνέν τε Γοργόνα, καὶ ποικίλον κάρα / δρακόντων φόβαισιν ἤλυθε νασιώταις / λίθινον θάνατον φέρων; *P.* 12, 12.

Pavese 1964, 310-311) rightly suggests that ἄποπτα must mean '(things) to be looked away from', cf. LSJ s.v. ἀφοράω II 'look away, have the back turned'. This meaning is rare (it is found in *X. Cyr.* 7, 1, 36 καὶ εἰςπεπόντες παίουσιν

ἀφορῶντας καὶ πολλοὺς κατακαίνουσι, and probably in Thphr. *HP.* 4, 16, 6 ὅταν ὁ βλαστὸς πλησίον γένηται πάλιν ἀναστρέφειν καὶ ἀφορᾶν ὡς πολεμίας οὐσης τῆς ὀσμῆς), but the more frequent sense of ‘to look from afar, to look towards’ is useless here.

For the verbal adjective ending in -τος with the meaning of a Latin gerundive, see Kühner-Blass 2, 289; Schwyzer 1, 501. Cf. *P.* 4, 163-164 μεμάντευμαι δ’ ἐπὶ Κασταλίαι, / εἰ μετάλλατόν τι; *S. OC.* 1360 οὐ κλαντὰ δ’ ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ ἐμοὶ μὲν οἰστέα.

If ἄποπτα is an adjective, the word at the beginning of l. 40 must be a neuter plural noun, e.g. θεάμα]τ’ (Snell 1975⁴, 78) or perhaps ὄμμα]τ’ (of Medusa). Because α and μ are written fairly large, ὄμμα]τ’ fits easier than θεάμα]τ’.

40-41 ἦ γὰρ [α]ύτων μετάστασιν ἄκραν[/]κε’ : ἦ γὰρ explains the preceding ἄποπτα: why those things must be looked away from. Cf. e.g. *P.* 6, 1-3 ἀκούσατ’ ἦ γὰρ ἐλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας / ἄρουραν ἢ Χαρίτων / ἀναπολιζομεν; *Il.* 1, 78; *Od.* 16, 199; *S. Aj.* 1330; *E. Hipp.* 756. See Denniston 1954², 284.

The subject of μετάστασιν ... []κε is probably the noun which is called ἄποπτα, by which the Gorgon’s head is meant. In this context μετάστασις means ‘death’ (cf. Simon. *PMG* 521, 4) or ‘change’ (cf. *E. Hec.* 1266 μορφῆς τῆς ἐμῆς μετάστασιν). If we must read ἄκραν the best interpretation is ‘the most extreme, consummate’ (see *LSJ s.v.* ἄκρος III). In that case the two possible meanings of μετάστασις coincide, because ‘the most extreme change’ is death.

The verb is probably an aorist because it describes a point in the narrative. Its meaning must be ‘cause, bring about’. Snell 1975⁴, 78 suggests θῆ]κε, preceded by something else, to fill the lacuna.

We would expect αὐτοῖς rather than [α]ύτων. The genitive indicates that [α]ύτων belongs more with μετάστασιν than with the verb. It is possible that μετάστασιν ἄκραν was followed by μορφῆς *sim.* on which αὐτών would depend. The connection with μετάστασιν also explains the scribal error ἀνδρ[ών]: they were changed from men into stones, cf. also l. 41 and *P.* 12, 12 (Περσεύς) λαοῖσι τε μοῖραν ἄγων.

41 πέτραι δ’ [ἔ]φα[ν]θεν ἀντ[ι] φωτῶν : after the explanation ἦ γὰρ ...]κε (*Il.* 40-41), the narrative continues: ‘they (become, appear, are) stones instead of men (l. 41)’. The predicate [ἔ]φα[ν]θεν (Snell 1962, 6) is the best equivalent of the ἐγένοντο we need, but also possible is ἔπαχθεν (suggested by Lobel 1961, 89-90, cf. *Antiph.* 166 Κόκκ ἐγὼ τέως μὲν ωρόμην τὰς Γοργόνας / εἶναι τι λογοποίημα, πρὸς ἀγορὰν δ’ ὅταν / ἔλθω, πεπίστευκ’ ἐμβλέπων γὰρ ἀντόθι / τοῖς ἰχθυοπώλαις, λίθινος εὐθύς γίνομαι, / ὥστ’ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἔστ’ ἀποστραφέντι μοι / λαλεῖν πρὸς αὐτούς· ἂν ἴδω γὰρ ἠλίκον / ἰχθὺν ὄσου τιμῶσι, πῆγνυμαι σαφῶς.

42-43]ν τ' ἔρωτος ἀντ' ἀμοιβὰν ἐδάσσατο[/ στρα]τάρχων : for the sense of the clause cf. *P.* 12, 14-15 λυγρόν τ' ἔρανον Πολυδέκται θῆκε ματρός τ' ἔμπεδον / δουλοσύναν τό τ' ἀναγκαῖον λέχος.

The apostrophe in ἀντ'αμοιβαν may have been intended to show the parts of the compound (Lobel 1961, 90), cf. *P. Oxy.* 1787, 1+2, 11 φιλ'αίιδου; 1789, 6, 5 'Αντ'ανδρος. To make a choice between ἔρωτος ἀνταμοιβάν and ἔρωτος ἀντ' ἀμοιβάν we must consider ἀνταμοιβάν to be a rare word. In the sense of 'requital, repayment' it is only found in Charito 5, 2, 4, ταύτην ἀπαιτῶ σε τῆς εὐεργεσίας τῆν ἀνταμοιβήν. Earlier Heraclit. 90 used it in the sense of 'interchange': πυρός τε ἀνταμοιβή τὰ πάντα καὶ πῦρ ἀπάντων. It may also be an adjective,]ν being the noun, cf. *Call. H.* 4, 52 τοῦτο τοι ἀντημοιβόν ἀλίπλοοι οὔνομ' ἔθεντο. Although ἀνταμοιβά is rare, it cannot be excluded that Pindar used it, because the verb ἀνταμείβομαι in the sense of 'repay, requite, punish' is well-known in this time, cf. *Archil.* 126 West τὸν κακῶς <μ'> ἔρδοντα δεινοῖς ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς; *A. Th.* 1049 παθῶν κακῶς κακοῖσιν ἀντημείβετο; *Pr.* 221-223 τοιάδ' ἐξ ἔμοῦ / ὃ τῶν θεῶν τύραννος ὠφελημένος / κακαῖσι ποιναῖς ταῖς δὲ μ' ἐξημείψατο (v.l. ἀντημείψατο); 1041-1042; *Ch.* 123.

In favour of ἔρωτος ἀντ' ἀμοιβάν is the fact that ἀμοιβά is the more common word, cf. *Hes. Op.* 334 ἔργων ἀντ' ἀδίκων χαλεπήν ἐπέθηκεν ἀμοιβήν. For the sentiment of 'an eye for an eye' (but also the return of good for good), cf. *Archil.* fr. 23, 14-15 West ἐπι]σταμαί τοι τὸν φιλ[έο]ν[τα] μὲν φ[ι]λ[ε]ί[ν], / [τὸ]ν δ' ἔχθρὸν ἐχθαίρειν τε [κα]ὶ κακοῖ; *Solon* fr. 13, 5-6 West εἶναι δὲ γλυκὺν ὧδε φίλοις', ἐχθροῖσι δὲ πικρὸν, / τοῖσι μὲν αἰδοῖον, τοῖσι δὲ δεινὸν ἰδεῖν.

The first word was either a fem. adj. with (ἀντ)αμοιβάν with a negative connotation, e.g. λυγρὰ]ν (Lobel 1961, 90), αἰνὰ]ν (Snell 1975⁴, 78), or a fem. noun with an adj. ἀνταμοιβάν or as an apposition with ἀμοιβάν, e.g. μοῖρα]ν (Pavese 1964, 311). Μοῖρα means 'death' but also expresses the idea of the sharing of a meal, fitting for the ἔρανος where the guests were supposed to contribute something. Cf. *P.* 12, 12 ἐνναλίαι Σερίφω λαοῖσι τε μοῖραν ἄγων, and Dornseiff's remark (1921, 76) on the word-play of μοῖραν. In this fragment the idea is made even more explicit by the verb δατέομαι 'share, deal out'. An important context for δατέομαι in the meaning of 'share' is banquets, cf. *Od.* 3, 66 μοῖρας δακκάμενοι δαίνυντ'; 19, 423 δάκσαντό τε μοῖρας.

With στρα]τάρχων we expect a gen. pl., cf. *P.* 6, 31 στρατάρχων Αἰθιοπῶν, *I.* 5, 40. But the word occurs elsewhere in the form στρατάρχης (*Hdt.* 3, 157; 8, 44) without a genitive, so that the additional Σερίφω is not necessary here either.

44-47 After the revenge on Polydectes Pindar may have told of Perseus' return to Argos, of his giving back the aegis and the κίβικτις or he may have gone over

to the present by a fitting remark to finish the mythical part, as e.g. in *O.* 1, 90; 2, 30; 3, 38; 6, 71; 7, 77.

45-46 γένος τε δαίμο- / ...φίλτε[ρ ...]ται : the γένος mentioned is probably Perseus' folk, the Argives. Cf. fr. 164 φιλόμαχον γένος ἐκ Περσέος.

There are no alternatives for φίλτε[ρ- (Lobel 1961, 90), so that Snell's γένος τε δαίμο- / σιν φίλτε[ρον seems a good solution. The future ἔσται (Snell 1975⁴, 78) could indicate that Perseus is told that his γένος (the Argives, the present population for which the poem is performed?) 'will always be dear to the gods'; or it could be a more general remark, such as '(obeying Fate) a nation will always be dear to the gods'. See also Zimmermann 1988b, 184 n. 15, who thinks that τὸ δὲ φυγεῖν at l. 46 may be part of a gnomic sentence.

The comp. φίλτερον is used to indicate the implicit contrast with its opposite (sc. ἔχθιον), see Kühner-Blass 1, 576, 564 Anm. 9; F. Bechtel, *Lexilogus zu Homer*, Halle 1914, 10. Cf. fr. 70b, 21 ἀγρότερον; fr. 81, 2-3 τὸ δὲ μὴ Δί / φίλτερον.

46 τὸ δὲ φυγεῖν : for the articular infinitive cf. e.g. *O.* 2, 51 τὸ δὲ τυχεῖν; *P.* 2, 56 τὸ πλουτεῖν; 1, 99 τὸ δὲ παθεῖν εὖ (followed by εὖ δ' ἀκούειν). It is not very common in Pindar and only used as a nominative, see Kühner-Gerth 2, 38-39; B.L. Gildersleeve, *Contributions to the History of the Articular Infinitive*, *TAPA* 9 (1878), 11 and O. Erdmann, *De Pindari usu syntactico*, Halle 1867, 75-76.

47] να[....]ετεπαμπά[..]κα[μ]οροι[: it is unlikely that]ν represents the tail of an α linked with an ι, but if we accept a deviation in the handwriting (since the last part is also written differently: the letters are smaller and more crowded) we can suppose παμπά[λ]αι. This word is not found elsewhere, but is analogous to παμπάλαιος 'very old', Pl. *Th.* 181b; Arist. *Metaph.* 1074b1. If we want to read]ν, the only possibility seems to be πάμπα[λι]ν, cf. Crates Com. 17 K-A (cod. A) 'altogether to the contrary'.

Κα[μ]οροι[is difficult. There is a small lacuna between α and μ, which suggests κα[μ]οροι 'ill-fated'. This could be a vocative, in which case]ετε could be part of a verb. The lacuna seems, however, rather narrow to accommodate a μ. Combining with this the fact that the scribe added []ων above α[μ]ο and the possibility that the final ι might be the left hand side of another letter, e.g. ν, another suggestion could be κα[ι]] ιτών] μόρον[.

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 3

Snell 1975⁴, 134 suggests that ll. 1-3 overlap with fr. 210 = Plu. *Cohib. ira* p. 457b χαλεπώτατοι δ' ἄγαν φιλοτιμίαν μνώμενοι ἐν πόλεσιν ἄνδρες' ἰστᾶσιν ἄλγος ἐμφανές', κατὰ Πίνδαρον. The text would be reconstructed as follows:

χαλεπώτατοι
 ἄγαν φιλοτιμίαν μνώμενοι
 ἐν πόλεσιν ἄνδρες'
].....[
 5] . Π . ν . [
] .. μοναν[
]εχοιρα . [

Even if ἄγαν ... ἄνδρες is indeed the original text of fr. 3, 2-3 (which must remain speculative with such few legible letters) l. 1 χαλεπώτατοι cannot be right, since the context shows that that belongs almost certainly to Plutarch's own words.

7]εχοιρα . [· Lobel 1961, 100 recognizes part of *P. 10, 52* πρώραθε χοιράδος, but other divisions are possible,] ἔχοι ρα . [, τρ]έχοι ρα . [etc.

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 6

1]υς : since both frs. 8 and 24 contain words which may refer to the mythical story of Meleager and the Calydonian boar hunt, it is possible that more fragments belong with them. If fr. 6 is one we might read c]υς, cf. B. 5, 115-116 θάπτομεν οὐς κατέπεφνεν / cυς ἐριβρύχας ἐπαίττων βίαι (part of the Meleager-story).

2]κε μέζον θε . [: the first two letters may be the end of the predicate, while μέζον θε . [perhaps refers to the boar, e.g. μέζον θεά[σασθαι, μέζον θεῖ[ον τε, sc. θηρίον.

The regular Pindaric form is μείζων; while correcting the original μέγας into μείζων the scribe may have been so much concentrating on the ending -γας / -ζων that he left out the ι accidentally.

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 8 = fr. 70d (g)

The reference to Atalanta in the note on l. 5 and the further combination of φλεγει[, δαικδ'] and Κλωθοῖ suggest that this fragment contained the story of Meleager (Lobel 1961, 100). It should be noted that the story seems to be told in reverse: Klotho plays a role at Meleager's birth, Atalanta in the hunt of the Calydonian boar, and only after the disastrous fight with Meleager's uncles do we expect to hear about the burning of the log on which Meleager's life depended. Of course ring composition is not unusual in Pindar, but it is also possible that the notes were rather independent of the text and only enlarged on a few words of the main text.

3]πανυεν' Σ δαικδ'] : the reference to Atalanta in the note on l. 5 suggests that the δαικ is the log on which Meleager's life depended.

For]πανυεν we may think of ἔ]πανυεν: Althaea stopped Meleager. How she did this is explained by δαικ δ'] : 'the log (determined the length of his life)'. For παύω in this sense cf. *Il.* 21, 314 ἵνα παύσομεν ἄγριον ἄνδρα. Also possible is οὐκ ἔ]πανυεν: there was no end to Artemis' wrath (cf. *B.* 5, 122-124 οὐ γὰρ πω δαίφρων / παύσει) χόλον ἀγροτέρα / Λατοῦς θυγάτηρ) or Althaea's (after he [accidentally?] killed her brothers). The mention of δαικ makes it more likely that Althaea is directly involved than Artemis.

4 Σ -ρεωσ[: the high stop suggests that -ρεωσ belongs with the preceding line(s). We may think of e.g. στε]ρεῶς 'harshly', supposing that 'the log was consumed by fire fiercely' *sim.* Cf. *O.* 10, 36 στερεῶι πυρί.

5 Σ] .. 'Αταλάντη τῆι 'Ιάκο]υ : if this note is intended to explain why the log was burned, it probably described (part of) the hunting of the boar, and the role of Atalanta in it. For her presence cf. *E.* fr. 530, 4-5 Κύπριδος δὲ μίσημ', 'Αρκὰς 'Αταλάντη, κύνας / καὶ τόξ' ἔχουσα. The dative makes it possible to supply e.g. 'Meleager awarded the spoils to Atalanta'.

6 Κλωθοῖ : Clotho may be taken here as the representative of the Moirae, cf. *I.* 6, 17-18 Κλωθὴ κασιγνήτας τε ... / ... Μοίρας. For the role of the Moirae in Meleager's destination cf. *B.* 5, 121 ὦ]λεσε μοῖρ' ὄλοα; 143 μοῖρ' ἐπέκλωσεν; Apollod. 1, 8, 2.

Σ οὐχ οὔτω πο[: the note perhaps calls attention to other versions of the Meleager myth, suggesting e.g. οὐχ οὔτω πο[ίησεν Ὀμηρος, cf. *Il.* 9, 529-599; Apollod. 1, 8, 3. If the reference is to Meleager's death we must perhaps supply (a case of) πότμος; for another version about his death cf. *Hes.* fr. 25, 12-13 M-W. (Meleager) ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος χερ[σιν] θ[/ μαρνάμενος Κουρ[ῆσι περὶ Πλ[ε]υ[ρῶν] μακεδνῆι.

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 15 = fr. 70d (a)

2 κ]αῖ μαλ' ἐπις[τα- : cf. *Od.* 13, 313 καὶ μαλ' ἐπιςταμένωι (Lobel 1961, 101).

3] Ἔκτορι χαλ[: the second word is most likely an adjective e.g. χαλ[κοκορυστῆι (cf. *Il.* 5, 699 Ἔκτορι χαλκοκορυστῆι; 6, 398; 16, 358 etc.), χαλ[κοάραι (cf. *Pi. I.* 5, 41), χαλ[κομίτραι (Lobel 1961, 101), but a second possibility is χαλ[ινός 'bit', metaphorical for the will of Zeus (cf. *A. Pr.* 671-672 ἐπηγάραζέ νιν / Διὸς χαλινὸς πρὸς βίαν πράσσειν τάδε) or of a mortal (cf. *A. Ag.* 238 βίαι χαλινῶν τ' ἀναύδωι μένει; *Plu. Comp. Per. Fab.* 1 τῶι δῆμωι χαλινὸν ἐμβαλεῖν ὕβρεωσ). The dative can then be explained by supplying a verb like ἐμβάλλω, cf. *Il.* 19, 393; *E. Alc.* 492.

4] ὦν ὕπερ· ὁ δα[: the first words perhaps represent the reason for the fight between Hector and an opponent. E.g. πατρί]δων, or ἐρί]δων (cf. *E. Andr.* 489-490 [Helen] κτείνει δὲ τὴν τάλαιναν· Ἰλιάδα κόραν / παῖδά τε δύσφρονος ἐριδος ὕπερ).

The following ὁ δ' may refer to Hector: something has happened to him in l. 3, and now he reacts. Cf. e.g. *O.* 1, 72-74 ἄπνεν βαρύκτυπον / Εὐτρίαιναν· ὁ δ' αὐτῶι / πᾶρ ποδὶ χρεδὸν φάνη; fr. 70b, 21 (and note).

Maehler's suggestion (*post* Snell 1975⁴, 79 = 1989, 80) that ὁ δ' α[might be Achilles is not impossible, because Pindar does use the article with proper names. For Achilles as Hector's opponent cf. *O.* 2, 81 (Achilles) ὄσ Ἔκτορα φᾶλε; *I.* 8, 55-56. But Ajax is equally likely (cf. *Il.* 16, 358-361 Αἴας δ' ὁ μέγας αἰὲν ἐφ' Ἔκτορι χαλκοκορυστῆι / ἔστ' ἀκοντίσσαι· ὁ δὲ ... / σκέπτετ' οἰκτῶν τε ροῖζον καὶ δοῦπον ἀκόντων; *Pi. N.* 2, 14 ἐν Τροίαι μὲν Ἔκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν), and there are too many nouns and adjectives that could have been mentioned here, to make conjecture worthwhile.

5]ἀκνάμ[πτο[: a fitting adjective for a stubborn enemy, ready for anything. Cf. the description of Hector in *Il.* 22, 96 ὡς Ἔκτωρ ἄσβεστον ἔχων μένος οὐχ ὑπεχώρει; *Pi. O.* 2, 81-82 Τροίας / ἄμαχον ἀστραβῆ κίονα; cf. also fr. 70c, 12 ἀκναμπτεῖ in the context of an army.

7 ρ]οῖζον .. [in this context, probably of a fight between Hector and a Greek, ροῖζος is best interpreted as the whirring sound of an arrow (cf. *Il.* 16, 361 cited above), a javelin etc.

10] χα[ι . [: the ink is compatible with Ἀχαιῶ]ν or Ἀχαιῶ]ι.

11]ελεν . [: although this letter combination is too common to allow any conclusions, the name of Helen must at least be mentioned as a possibility.

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 19a-b = fr. 70d (b)

Fr. 19 seems to be about some antagonism (l. 4 ν]εῖκος, l. 7 κοτέσσατ'), but the remains are too small to determine who the actors are.

4 ν]εῖκος : the only complement is ν]εῖκος [(Maehler *post* Snell 1975⁴, 79 = 1989, 80). Because l. 8 πέλωρ(α) is predominantly found in epic poetry an epic context is suggested.

7 κοτέσσατ' ε . [: cf. e.g. fr. 140a, 56-57 (Heracles) βασιλῆ- / ος ἀτασθαλῖαι κοτέω[ν].

8 πέλωραβου] : either of τὸ πέλωρ, τὸ πέλωρον or a case of πέλωρος. These words are often used to indicate monsters, such as the Cyclops (*Od.* 9, 428), Scylla (*Od.* 12, 87), Gorgon (*Il.* 5, 741), Echidna (*Hes. Th.* 295), Typhoeus (*Hes. Th.* 845; 856). It seems that πελώριος is more frequently used of heroes and their weapons, in the sense of 'mighty, huge'. Cf. *Il.* 11, 820 πελώριον Ἔκτορ'; 21, 527 Ἀχιλλῆα πελώριον. See P. Von der Mühl, *Der grosse Aias*, in *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, Basel 1975, 437. The distinction between πέλωρ(ος) and πελώριος is not absolute, cf. e.g. *Od.* 9, 187 ἀνῆρ ... πελώριος and 257 πέλωρον, both of the Cyclope. The only difference is that in the former place Odysseus does not yet know who lives on the island, he only knows that it is a giant, and in the latter he has met Polyphemus in person.

If we must divide πέλωρ ἀβου] we could think of ἀβου]λία (cf. *O.* 10, 41-42 καὶ κείνος ἀβουλίαι ὑστατος / ... θάνατον αἰπὺν οὐκ ἐξέφυγεν), corresponding to l. 10 ἀτασ[θαλ- (?).

9 φλόγα δερκομ] : if φλόγα is a direct object it is perhaps a fire or Zeus' lightning (cf. *A. Pr.* 1017 κεραυνῖαι φλογί; *E. Med.* 144 φλόξ οὐρανία), but it can also be an accusativus cognatus as in *Od.* 19, 446 πῦρ ὀφθαλμοῖσι δεδορκώς.

10 πέσον ἀτασ] : πέσον gives the outcome of the episode. This does not necessarily have to be an unfavourable outcome, because πίτνω can be used in the neutral sense of 'fall out, happen' (cf. *O.* 7, 68-69 τελεύταθεν δὲ λόγων κορυφαί / ἐν ἀλαθείαι πετοῖσαι), but since the text contains quite a few negative words (l. 4 ν]εῖκος, l. 7 κοτέσσατ', l. 8 πέλωρ and perhaps we must include l. 9 φλόγα δερκομ]) the verb probably indicates somebody's defeat.

The second word can be either the genitive of ἄτασ or the beginning of a case of ἀτασθαλία (cf. *Il.* 4, 409 κείνοι δὲ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο; 22, 104; *Pi.* fr. 140a, 57 [cited above]) or ἀτάσθαλος (cf. *Il.* 11, 694; 13, 634; 22, 418).

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 21c = fr. 70d (c)

2-3]ι τε ρόδ[ων] [/] . ὑάκινθ[]ίων κρόκω[ν τ(ε) : such a combination of flowers seems to be connected specifically with spring and natural abundance, cf. *h. Hom.* 2, 6-8 ἄνθεά τ' αἰνυμένην, ρόδα καὶ κρόκον ἥδ' ἴα καλὰ / λειμῶν' ἄμ μαλακὸν καὶ ἀγαλλίδας ἥδ' ὑάκινθον / νάρκιττον θ'; *Cypr.* fr. 6, 1-6 εἴματα μὲν χροὶ ἔστο τὰ οἱ Χάριτες τε καὶ Ὕραι / ποίησαν καὶ ἔβασαν ἐν ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσι, / οἷα φοροῦς Ὕραι, ἐν τε κρόκω ἐν θ' ὑάκινθω / ἐν τε ἴω θαλέθοντι ρόδου τ' ἐνὶ ἄνθει καλῶι / ἥδέι νεκταρέωι ἐν τ' ἀμβροσίαις καλύκεσσι / ἄνθεσι ναρκίττου καὶ λειρίου. For spring and dithyrambs cf. fr. 70c, 19 and fr. 75, 14-17.

5]αρ ..μενον : μ]αργόμενον (Snell 1975⁴, 79) in the sense 'strive, exert oneself' could refer to the poet's effort to win the dithyrambic contest. For this sense cf. *N.* 1, 25 χρῆ δ' ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα μάρνασθαι φῦαι. The usual context, however, is of physical struggle.

6-7 τί]να πτόλιν, τίν' ἐ [/] . ε celo κλεόμενοι γε[: the middle κλέομαι in the sense of 'tell of, celebrate' is rare; it is found in *E.* fr. 369, 7 γῆρυν, ἄν σοφοὶ κλέονται.

The repeated question serves as an introduction to the poet's subject, cf. *P.* 7, 5-7 ἐπεὶ τίνα πάτραν, τίνα οἶκον ναίων ὀνυμάξαι / ἐπιφανέστερον; *O.* 2, 2 τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν;

Different is e.g. *P.* 4, 70-71 τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίαις, / τίς δὲ κίνδυνος; where the questions are not used to illustrate a problem of choice or the worthiness of the subject, but where these are used as an introduction to a narrative in which those very questions are in fact answered. See Braswell 1988 *ad loc.* and cf. also e.g. *Il.* 1, 8 τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέτηκε μάχεσθαι; *B.* 15, 47; 18, 31-32.

The genitive celo makes a comparative form, e.g. μᾶλλον]κε celo ... / ἄ]ξιον (Maehler *post* Snell 1975⁴, 80 = 1989, 81), a very reasonable suggestion. For the completion of γε[we might think of a form of γεγωνέω, cf. *P.* 9, 1-3 Ἐθέλω χαλκάσπιδα Πυθιονίκαν / ... ἀγγέλλων / Τελεσικράτη ... γεγωνεῖν, where ἀγγέλλων is comparable with our κλεόμενοι.

8]ξιον : the likeliest word is ἄ]ξιον (Maehler *post* Snell 1975⁴, 80 = 1989, 81), especially in this context where apparently a subject is selected. The propriety of praise is expressed in many ways (see Bundy 1986², 10-11; Schadewaldt 1928, 278 n. 1). One of the words is ἄξιος, cf. *I.* 3, 3 (see Bundy 1986², 56).

9]αρ ..εν Βαβυλων : for the proverbial might and wealth of Babylon cf. *A. Pers.* 53-54 Βαβυλῶν / δ' ἡ πολύχρυσος; *Ar. Av.* 551-552 κάπειτα τὸν ἀέρα πάντα κύκλω καὶ πᾶν τουτὶ τὸ μεταξύ / περιτεχίζειν μεγάλας πλῆθους ὀπταῖς ὡσπερ Βαβυλῶνα; *X. Cyr.* 7, 2, 11 νομίζοντας πόλιν ἔχειν τὴν πλουσιωτάτην ἐν τῆι Ἀσίαι

μετὰ Βαβυλῶνα; 5, 2, 8; 7, 5, 7. Pindar probably wants to express the idea that not even the city of Babylon is to be accepted in exchange for the city of I. 6 (Zimmermann 1988b, 37).

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 24 = fr. 70d (f)

4]Καλυδῶν [: this city is connected with the Meleager myth (frs. 6?, 8), cf. B. 5, 104-107 εὐρυβίαν δ' ἔσσευε κούρα (Artemis) / κάπρον ἀναιδομάχων / ἐς καλλίχορον Καλυδῶ- / υ'; E. fr. 515 Καλυδῶν μὲν ἦδε γαῖα, Πελοπίας χθονός ἐν ἀντιπύρθμοις πεδί' ἔχουε' εὐδαίμονα· Οἴνευς δ' ἀνάσσει τῆσδε γῆς Αἰτωλίας, Πορθάουος παῖς, ὅς ποτ' Ἀλθαίαν γαμεῖ, Λήδαο ὄμαιμον, Θεστίου δὲ παρθένον.

5]αι χερμαδ[: for the sling stone cf. e.g. *P. 3*, 48-49 ἡ πολιώω χαλκῶι μέλη τετρωμένοι / ἡ χερμάδι τηλεβόλωι.

7]χιων [: why Chios is mentioned here is unclear. The island is famous for its wine and as Homer's birthplace (cf. *Ps. Plu. Vit. Hom.* 25, 4 [Wil.] "Ὀμηρον τοῖνον Πίνδαρος (fr. 264) μὲν ἔφη Χιόν τε καὶ Σμυρναῖον γενέσθαι; *Theoc.* 7, 47 Χιόν αἰιδόν; 22, 218). It is also the place where Orion, being drunk, made a pass at his host's wife, cf. fr. 72 (ἐν Χίωι) ἀλόχωι ποτὲ θωραρχεῖς ἔπεχ' ἄλλοτρίαι Ὀαρίων. Some versions of the Orion myth say that he was killed by Artemis, cf. *Od.* 5, 121-124; *Σ Nic. Ther.* 15a. The wrath of Artemis might be the connection between the Meleager myth (suggested by l. 4 Καλυδῶν) and Orion (suggested by l. 7 Χιόν).

9 μ]ίμν' ἀκάμ[: the sense seems to be that somebody 'waits without tiring'. Since ἀκάμας (cf. e.g. *O.* 1, 87; *N.* 6, 39) is not applied to human beings, the adjective may in this violent context be completed to e.g. ἀκαμ[αντοχάρμας (fr. 184), ἀκαμ[αντομάχας (*P.* 4, 171; *Pae.* 22[f], 6), ἀκαμ[αντολόγχας (*I.* 7, 10). On Pindar's fondness for compounds with ἀκαμαντο- see Braswell 1988 on *P.* 4, 171.

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 25 = fr. 70d (e)

2]ωξιππ[: with]ππ[we may think of an aorist of either ἀνώγω or διώκω, but if]ωξιππ[represents one word, the adjective δι]ώξιππ[ος (Lobel 1961, 101) is very likely. This is found with cities (*P.* 9, 4 διωξιππου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας; fr. 333a, 8-9 πόλιν ἐς Ὀρχομενῶ διώ- / ξιππον), with Ares (*B.* 9, 44 διωξιπποι' Ἄρηος; Leonidas *AP* 9, 322, 9) and with a spur (Maecius *AP* 6, 233). If Maehler's suggestion (l. 3 ἔπεα[, *post* Snell 1975⁴, 80 = 1989, 82) is accepted and l. 6 λογίων

is taken as 'poets' (see my note *ad loc.*) this might be taken as an invitation to a διώξιππ- city to receive the song.

5 δ[]ρεῦντι ..[: the form on -εῦντι represents the original diphthongal pronunciation of εο, see Buck 1955², 40.

The choice is between δ[ι]ρεῦντι and δ[ο]ρεῦντι. Since the scribe made small ο's the size of the lacuna provides no conclusive argument. Both verbs are found in Pindar, but in combination with l. 6 λογίων the latter seems to me more attractive. For δονέω in musical contexts cf. *N.* 7, 81 πολύφατον θρόον ἕμνων δόνει; *P.* 10, 38-39 πανταῖ δὲ χοροὶ παρθένων / λυραῖν τε βοαὶ καναχαί τ' αὐλῶν δονέονται. In a war context both verbs are suitable, for δονέω cf. *P.* 1, 44 χαλκοπάραρον ἄκουθ' ... παλάμαι δονέων; for δινέω of warriors cf. *Il.* 4, 540-541 ὄς τις ... / δινεύοι κατὰ μέσσον.

6 λογίων [: cf. *P.* 1, 92-94 ὀπιθόμβροτον αὐχτημα δόξας / ὄϊον ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν δίαιταν μανύει / καὶ λογιόισι καὶ αἰδοῖς; *N.* 6, 45-46 πλατεῖται πάντοθεν λογιόισιν ἐντὶ πρόσοδοι / νᾶσον εὐκλέα τάνδε κοσμεῖν. Although a distinction between λόγιος (for prose authors) and αἰδοῖς (for poets) may have developed in later authors, for Pindar and Herodotus they are both craftsmen with the same goal, i.e. giving immortal fame to whoever or whatever deserves it. See G. Nagy, Herodotus the logios, *Arethusa* 20 (1987), 175-184; G. Pfligersdorffer, Λόγιος und die λόγιοι ἄνθρωποι bei Demokrit, *WS* 61-62 (1943-1947), 5-49.

7 καὶ τρετάρ[: there is no word beginning with τρεταρ-. Because τέταρτος may replace τέτρατος (cf. καρτερός / κρατερός and Braswell 1988 on *P.* 4, 166) the scribe was perhaps confused, and wrote a ρ too much in the wrong place. See West 1974, 90 (Metathesis of liquids).

P. Oxy. 2445 fr. 27 = fr. 70d (h)

2-4 This fragment seems to be a positively coloured piece. The adjective in l. 2 π[ολύπ] cannot be completed with any confidence, but l. 4]ενδροι is almost certainly complimentary: trees are welcome in a dry and sunny land as Greece. We may think of ἀγλαόδ]ενδροσ (cf. *O.* 9, 20), εὐδ]ενδροσ (Lobel 1961, 101, cf. *O.* 8, 9; *N.* 11, 25; *P.* 4, 73) or πολυδ]ενδροσ (cf. *E. Ba.* 560; *Str.* 17, 3, 4).

7]γανάνετα χ[This adjective is a ἄπαξ. The noun γάνος 'brightness, gladness' is not unknown, cf. e.g. *Sapph.* fr. 20, 2 Voigt; *A. Ag.* 579, as several related verbs such as γανᾶω (cf. e.g. *Il.* 13, 265; *Od.* 7, 128), γανῶω (cf. *Ar. Ach.* 7), γάνυμαι (cf. *Il.* 13, 493).

8]ν λεύσσει δ . [: the present tense of λεύσσει and the future in l. 10]ίξεαι perhaps implies an opposition between what somebody sees now, and where he/she will arrive later.

10]ίξεαι ὧ μα [: the destination of the addressee is not mentioned. The identity of the addressee is not clear either. Since the scribe regularly adds lectional signs it is probably not μά[τερ (Maehler *post* Snell 1975⁴, 80 = 1989, 82). The greater frequency of μάκαρ over μάταιος (also mentioned by Maehler), and the presumably positive context (see my note on ll. 2-4), make μά[καρ or μά[και-ρα the likeliest suggestion (see also Lehms 1979, 153 n. 7). Cf. *P.* 4, 59; *N.* 7, 94; *I.* 7, 1; fr. 96, 1.

11]θαμά γὰρ οὔκοθε[ν : if this is an explanation (γὰρ) of the preceding lines the destination of the addressee in l. 10 is probably not his or her own hometown or country.

12]α κατὰ [χ]θόν' ε . [: for κατὰ with the accusative in the sense of 'on, over, throughout' cf. e.g. *Od.* 1, 344 καθ' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος; *Pi. P.* 1, 14 γᾶν τε καὶ πόντον κατ' ἀμαιμάκετον.

Ll. 11-12 seem to imply that the poet refers to frequent and far travels.

Fr. 71

Σ Pi. O. 13, 25c Drachmann

ὁ Πίνδαρος δὲ ἐν μὲν τοῖς ὑπορχήμασιν (fr. 115) ἐν Νάξῳ φησὶ πρῶτον εὐρεθῆναι διθύραμβον, ἐν δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν διθύραμβων ἐν Θήβαις, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἐν Κορίνθῳ.

1 ὑπορχήμασιν E | ἐν Νάξῳ: ἀνάγῳ E || 2 εὐρεθῆναι πρῶτον B V

Pindar says in the Hyporchemata (fr. 115) that the dithyramb was first invented in Naxos, in the first book of the Dithyrambos in Thebes, and here in Corinth.

The list of Corinthian inventions in O. 13 (one of which is the dithyramb) is meant as a compliment to the victor's city. In the same way it seems reasonable to assume that a similar compliment to Thebes was part of a Theban poem. See Puech 1923, 155 n. 3; Wilamowitz 1922, 345. A. Kleingünther, *Πρώτος Εὐρετής*, Leipzig 1933, 136 on the other hand argues that the mention of the fact that the dithyramb was invented in Thebes does not necessarily mean that this dithyramb was composed for Thebes, firstly because Pindar himself was Theban and secondly because the connection between Dionysus and Thebes was so familiar to all Greeks that it could not have been used as a special compliment. However, the fact that the invention of the dithyramb is also ascribed to Corinth and Naxos (O. 13, 18-19 and fr. 115) shows that the connection of Thebes and Dionysus does not necessarily imply the connection of Thebes and the invention of the dithyramb. So it may still have had the effect of a compliment to a Theban audience.

The text ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν διθύραμβων can be interpreted in two ways: Pindar may have ascribed the invention of the dithyramb to Thebes in the first Dithyramb or in the first book of Dithyrambos. If we accept the first interpretation frs. 71 and 72 (and then probably also frs. 73 and 74) are part of one dithyramb, since fr. 72 is also preceded by Πίνδαρος διθύραμβων πρώτῳ (Del Corno 1974, 108). But such a specific indication of a text is not found elsewhere. Usually a poem is identified by its opening words (cf. *Vit. Ambr.* I, 2, 5 Dr.; I, 2. 8. Dr.; *Vit. Thom.* I, 7, 14 Dr.). Since it is certain that Pindar wrote two books of dithyrambos (cf. *Vit. Ambr.* I, 3, 7 Dr.) the second option, i.e. 'in the first book of dithyrambos',

seems better (so also J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, Paris 1952, 37; Turyn 1952, 290).

The Dionysiac festivals of Naxos (*IG* II 5, 45-46) and Thebes (Agronia, cf. Hsch.), where cult hymns must have been dedicated to Dionysus, together with the claim of being the god's birthplace (cf. *h. Hom.* 1, 1-9), can easily have led the poet to say in both cities that the dithyramb originated there.

The mention of Corinth must be explained differently. Here Pindar may have meant a different kind of dithyramb, i.e. the literary form introduced by Arion (cf. *Σ O.* 13, 26b αἱ τοῦ Διονύσου διθυράμβων ἐν Κορίνθῳ ἐφάνησαν χάριτες, τουτέστι τὸ σπουδαιότατον τῶν Διονύσου διθυράμβων ἐν Κορίνθῳ πρῶτον ἐφάνη ἐκεῖ γὰρ ὠράθη ὁ χορὸς ὀρχούμενος· ἔστησε δὲ αὐτὸν πρῶτος Ἀρίων ὁ Μηθυμναῖος, εἶπα Λάκος ὁ Ἑρμιονεύς (see Introduction 1.1).

Another reason may be that if a city had made a craft better known, it could be called its 'inventor' as a mark of praise. E.g. Corinth for the dithyramb, the reins and the temple pediments (*Pi. O.* 13, 18-22), Thebes for the chariot (*Critias* 1, 10 Diehl Θήβη δ' ἀρματόεινα δίφρον συνεπήξατο πρώτη) and Athens for its ceramics (*Critias* 1, 12-14 Diehl τὸν δὲ τροχόν, γαίαια τε καμίνοσσι τ' ἔκγονον, ἡῦρεν, / κλεινότατον κέραμον, χρήσιμον οἰκονόμον, / ἢ τὸ καλὸν Μαραθῶνι καταστήσασα τρόπαιον). See Kienzle 1936, 72; K. Thraede, *Das Lob des Erfinders*, *RhM* 105 (1962), 158-186, esp. 171-172.

Other places where Pindar refers to a πρῶτος εὐρέτης are *P.* 12, 22 (πολυκέφαλος νόμος), fr. 125 (βάρβιτος), and cf. *O.* 13, 17 ἅπαν δ' εὐρόντος ἔργον.

Fr. 72

ἀλόχῳ ποτὲ θωραχθεὶς ἔπεχ' ἀλλοτρία
'Ωαρίων

Test. Et. M. 460, 35 καὶ θώραξ, ὁ δεκτικὸς τῆς τροφῆς τόπος· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὸ ἐμπύλασθαι οἴνου 'θωράσασθαι' λέγεται, ὡς παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει ... καὶ Πίνδαρος Διθυράμβων πρῶτῳ, 'ἀλόχῳ - ἀλλοτρία' || Meletius, *De natura hominis* (Cramer, *Anecd. Oxon.* III, p. 89, 27; cf. Ritschl, *Opuscula* I, p. 700) θώραξ οὖν ὁ δεκτικὸς τῆς τροφῆς τόπος· τὸν γὰρ οἴνον ἐμπυλάμενοι θωρίξασθαι λέγομεν· καὶ Ἰπποκράτης· 'λοιμὸν θωρίξαι λυεῖ' τὴν πολυπόσιαν λέγων· ὡς καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ Πίνδαρος διθυράμβων· 'ἀλόχῳ - ἀλλοτρία' (Petr. = Interpretatio Meleti latina a Nicolao Petreio Corcyraeo [Venetis 1552], cf. Cramer, *Anecd. Oxon.* III, p. 89, note t; Turyn p. 291) || Cyrillus Alex. (Cramer, *Anecd. Paris.* IV, p. 194, 7· Ὠρίων· ἐπεὶ καὶ Ὠαρίων ἐν κυστολή, καὶ Πίνδαρος καὶ Εὐριπίδης 'ἀλλ' σὺχ δ' Ὠαρίων' || Et. Angel. (Ritschl, *Opuscula* I, p. 690) Ὠρίων· ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ ἀρίων ἐν κυστολή, καὶ Πίνδαρος καὶ Εὐριπίδης 'ἀλλόχῳ - ἀλλοτρία' || Et. Sorb. (Gaisford ad Et. M. 460, 39) Ὠρίων, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ ἀρίων ἐν κυστολή, καὶ Πίνδαρος καὶ Εὐριπίδης, 'ἀλόχῳ - Ὠαρίων'

1 ἀλόχῳ Et. M.: ἀλόχῳ Meletius cod. A; ἀλόχῳ Meletius cod. M, Petr.; ἀλόχῳ Et. Sorb.; ἀλλ' σὺχ δ' Cyrillus Alex.; ἀλλόχῳ Et. Angel. | ποτὲ Et. M., Meletius cod. M, Petr., Et. Angel., Et. Sorb.: ποτε Meletius cod. A, Cyrillus Alex. | θωραχθεὶς Meletius cod. M, Petr., Cyrillus Alex.: θωρηχθεὶς Et. M.; θωρηχθεὶς Meletius cod. A; θεωραχθεὶς Et. Angel., Et. Sorb. | ἔπεχ' Meletius cod. M, Et. Sorb.: ἐπέειχεν Et. M., Meletius cod. A; ἐπέχεε Meletius cod. Petr.; ἐπεχ' Cyrillus Alex.; ἐπέχ' Et. Angel. | ἀλλοτρία Et. M.: ἀλλοτρία Meletius, Et. Angel., Et. Sorb.; ἀλλοτρία Cyrillus Alex. || 2 Ὠαρίων Cyrillus Alex.: Ὠαρίων Et. Sorb.; om. Et. M., Meletius, Et. Angel.

once, being drunk, Orion attacked somebody else's wife.

Contents

It is probable that frs. 72-74 are from one poem. Both fr. 72 and fr. 73 are explicitly said to be from a dithyramb and the metre is dactylo-epitritic in both fr. 72 and fr. 74. All three fragments deal with Orion. Although generally speaking Orion as a mythical giant and hunter must be distinguished from the stellar constellation (see Kuentzle in Roscher *Lex.* 1019-1025; Fontenrose 1981, 15-18) Pindar clearly connects the two. In frs. 72 and 73 Orion is a mythical hero, and fr. 74 is part of a poem where his καταστερικμὸς is described. Cf. Et. M. 675, 34. It is possible that Pindar described the whole story of Orion in one poem, this dithyramb.

account the sort of changes to mythical material which Pindar permits himself to make, this variation seems not too far-fetched.

But the question remains why did Pindar make this change which made the act look worse. For the rape of Oenopion's daughter Orion had some sort of excuse: he had asked for her hand, had cleared the island of wild animals on Oenopion's request, had gathered a dowry, and still Oenopion refused to give his daughter in marriage (Parth. *Erot.* 20). For the attack on Oenopion's wife there is no reason but Orion's uninhibited character. See Fontenrose 1981, 25-26.

Orion was punished by Oenopion by being blinded and removed from the country. Cf. Ps. Eratosth. *Catast.* 32; Parth. *Erot.* 20; Σ Nic. *Ther.* 15 Keil; Hyg. *Astr.* 2, 34 Bunte; *P. Berol.* 9571v, 32-34 [τὴν τοῦ Ὀρίωνος τύφλωσιν / τῆ[ν ἐν] Χίῳ γενομέ[ν]ην ... Οἶνω-] / πί[ων]ο[ς].

θωραχθεῖς : θωράσσω 'make drunk' and its med./pass. belong to the 'technical' vocabulary of the symposion (Van Groningen 1966 on Thgn. 413). In the medical literature the verb loses its negative connotation and means simply 'drink wine'. Cf. Hp. *Nat. Hom.* 9, 3 τῶν θωρησσομένων καὶ τῶν ὑδροποτεόντων and J. Jouanna, *Hippocrate. La nature de l' homme* (CMG I, 1, 3), Berlin 1975, 277. Cf. also Boissonade, *Anecd. Graeca* IV, 381 θόρηξ ὁ οἶνος λέγεται· θόρηξις, καὶ ἡ μέθη.

For the absolute use cf. Thgn. 413-414 πίνων δ' οὐχ οὕτως θωρήξομαι, οὐδέ με οἶνος / ἐξάγει, ὥστ' εἰπεῖν δεινὸν ἔπος περὶ σοῦ, 508, 884, and the word play in Ar. *Ach.* 1134-1135 ἐν τῷδε πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους θωρήξομαι. / - ἐν τῷδε πρὸς τοὺς συμπότας θωρήξομαι and *Pax* 1284-1286. The agent οἶνος *sim.* is added in Thgn. 841-842 οἶνος ... / εὐτ' ἂν θωρήξας μ' ἄνδρα πρὸς ἐχθρὸν ἄγηι; 470; Nic. *Alex.* 32; Hp. *Morb.* 4, 56 (7, 608 Littré).

Although wine is also described as relaxing, cf. e.g. Thgn. 884 θωρηχθεῖς δ' ἔσει πολλὸν ἐλαφρότερος; 469-470 ὄντιν' ἂν ἡμῶν / θωρηχθέντ' οἶνω μαλθακὸς ὕπνος ἔληι; E. *Ba.* 772 τὴν πανσίλνπον ἄμπελον; 280-281; 381; 423; S. fr. 172; Astydamas II *TrGF* 1, 60 F 6, it seems that the special meaning of θωράσσω comes from the violence that drunken people often exhibit. Cf. Eust. 166, 11 ἰστέον δὲ ὡς Ὀμηρος μὲν θωρήσσειν αἰεὶ ἐπὶ ὀπλιτικοῦ φησιν, οἱ δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπὶ μέθης τὴν λέξιν τιθέασιν, ὅθεν καὶ θώρηξις κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς οἰνοποσία καὶ ἀκρατοποσία, ἕως δὲ καὶ αὐτὸ διὰ τὸ μάχιμον τῶν μεθύοντων; Thgn. 507-508 δέδοικα δὲ μὴ τι μάταιον / ἔρξω θωρηχθεῖς καὶ μέγ' ὄνειδος ἔχω; 413-414; 841-842. Cf. also Pi. *N.* 9, 51-52 where Pindar calls wine βιατάν / ἀμπέλου παῖδ'. For this context an interesting parallel is Ov. *Am.* 1, 6, 37-39 *Ergo Amor et modicum circa mea tempora vinum / mecum est ... / arma quis haec timeat?* (see R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Leipzig 1906 [F Darmstadt

1963], 158 who sees a correspondence with 'einem griechischen Spiel mit dem pathetischen Ausdruck θωρήσσεσθαι, θωρηχθείς.')

ἔπεχ' : here used as a synonym of βιάομαι and *comprendere* (cf. Hes. fr. 148a and Hyg. *Astr.* 2, 34). Cf. for the sense 'attack, aim at' also *Od.* 19, 71 τί μοι ᾧδ' ἐπέχεις; 22, 75 (tmesis); Hes. *Th.* 711-712; E. *Ba.* 1130-1131; Σ Pi. *N.* 2, 17c ἐν τούτοις μὲν ταῖς Πλειάδι φησὶ τὸν Ὀρίωνα ἐπέχειν, ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ τὴν Πλημίονην φησὶν αὐτὸν διώκειν; ... ἐπέχει γὰρ τῆι ἐπιτολῆι τοῦ ταύρου ὁ Ὀρίων κυνηγετικὸς ὢν.

2 Ὀρίων : the same spelling occurs in *N.* 2, 12; *I.* 3/4, 67; *Corinn.* *PMG* 654, iii, 38; 662, 2; E. *Hec.* 1103; *Nic. Ther.* 15; *Call. H.* 3, 265; *Cat.* 66, 94; but more often Ὀρίων, cf. e.g. *Corinn.* *PMG* 655, 1, 14; *Od.* 5, 121; 11, 310. Cf. *Eust.* 932, 42 ὁ παρὰ Πινδάρῳ δὲ Ὀαρίων καὶ κατὰ κρᾶσιν Ὀρίων. Such alternative forms were of course very useful for poets. For an overview of Pindar's use of metrically alternative forms in *P.* 4, see Braswell 1988, 402-403.

Fr. 73

Str. 9, 2, 12, p. 404

καὶ ἡ Ὑρία δὲ τῆς Ταναγραΐας νῦν ἐστὶ, πρότερον δὲ τῆς Θηβαΐδος· ὅπου ὁ Ὑριεὺς μεμύθευται καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ὠρίωνος γένεσις, ἣν φησι Πίνδαρος ἐν τοῖς διθυράμβοις.

ὕρρια codd. | Ταναγραΐας I | ὕρριεὺς a c g h

Hyria is now part of the region of Tanagra, but before of the region of Thebes; they tell that Hyrieus lived there and that it was the place of Orion's birth, which is mentioned by Pindar in the dithyrambs.

Cf. also Eust. 264, 44 ὁ δὲ Στράβων λέγει, ὅτι Ὑρία τῆς Ταναγραΐας πρότερον, ὕστερον δὲ Θηβαΐδος, ὅπου ὁ Ὑριεὺς καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ὠρίωνος μεμύθευται γέννησις (who confused the temporal relationships!).

Strabo makes it clear that Pindar adhered to the Boeotian version of the Orion myth, where Orion's birthplace is said to be Hyria (cf. *Ov. F.* 6, 719 *Hyriea proles*). It is probably because of Hyria's vicinity to Tanagra on the Eastern side and to Thebes on the Western side that these cities too are mentioned as Orion's birthplace. For Tanagra cf. e.g. Σ *Nic. Ther.* 15 Keil οἱ δὲ πλείους Ταναγραῖον εἶναι φασι τὸν Ὠρίωνα; *Palaeph.* 51 Festa; *Paus.* 9, 20, 3 ἐστὶ δ' Ὠρίωνος μνημα ἐν Τανάγραι. For Thebes cf. *Hyg. Astr.* 2, 34 *Aristomachus autem dicit quendam Hyriea fuisse Thebis, Pindarus autem in insula Chio... hic (Orion) dicitur Thebis Chium venisse*. The clause '*Pindarus autem in insula Chio*' must be a mistake, caused by the fact that Pindar does mention the Chian part of the Orion myth (fr. 72). See also Kuentzle in *Roscher Lex.* 1029; Frazer 1929 on *Ov. F.* 5, 494.

Orion's mortal father is Hyrieus, the eponym of Hyria. For the story of Orion's birth cf. *Palaeph.* 51 Festa Περὶ τοῦ Ὠρίωνος. Διὸς Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἑρμοῦ παῖς. Ὑριεὺς ... ὤκει μὲν ἐν Τανάγραι τῆς Βοιωτίας, φιλοξενώτατος δὲ ὦν ὑπεδέξατό ποτε τοὺς θεοὺς. Ζεὺς δὲ καὶ Ποσειδῶν καὶ Ἑρμῆς ἐπιξενωθέντες αὐτῶι καὶ τὴν φιλοφροσύνην ἀποδεξάμενοι παρήνεσαν αἰτεῖν ὃ τι ἂν βούλοιο· ὁ δὲ ἄτεκνος ὦν ἠτήσατο παῖδα. λαβόντες οὖν οἱ θεοὶ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροουργήεντος αὐτοῖς βοῆς βύρσαν ἀπεσπέρμησαν εἰς αὐτὴν καὶ ἐκέλευσαν κρῦψαι κατὰ γῆν καὶ μετὰ δέκα

μηνας ανέλεσθαι ὧν διελθόντων ἐγένετο ὁ Οὐρίων, οὕτως ὀνομασθεὶς διὰ τὸ οὐρῆσαι [ἄσπερ] τοὺς θεούς, ἔπειτα κατ' εὐφημισμὸν Ὀρίων...; Σ Nic. *Theor.* 15 Keil Ὑριεύς γὰρ ὁ πατήρ Ὀρίωνος Βοιωτός ἐστιν. Οὐαρίων δὲ ἐκλήθη ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρῶν τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ποσειδῶνος ἐγένετο...; Σ AD *ad Il.* 18, 486; Eust. 1156, 6 ff.; 1535, 42; Et. M. 823, 57 ff.; Tzetz. *ad Lycophr. Alex.* 328 (II, p. 130, 20-27 Scheer); Σ Stat. *Theb.* 7, 256 Jahnke; Nonn. *D.* 96-103; Ov. *F.* 493-544; Hyg. *Astr.* 2, 34.

Most testimonies do not explain οὐρεῖν, οὔρον etc. and may intend to convey that urine was the life-giving fluid, but Palaephatus explains οὐρεῖν = ἀποσπερμαίνειν and Eust. 1535, 42 says οἱ δὲ ἀνθρωπίνως ἐτυμολογοῦντες, τὴν μὲν βύρσαν καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον οὐρῆμα ἐξ ὧν ὄσα καὶ γαστρός καὶ σπέρματος μυθικὴ ἐρεσχελία τὸν Ὀρίωνα ἐβρέφωσε. See R. Muth, *RE Suppl.* 11, 1300-1303 on the original life-giving force of urine, which may not have been understood in later times, and which was therefore replaced by semen. For this original force cf. Hdt. 1, 107 καὶ οἱ ἐγένετο θυγάτηρ τῆι οὔνομα ἔθετο Μανδάνην, τὴν ἐδόκει Ἀστυάγης ἐν τῶι ὕπνω οὐρῆσαι τοσοῦτο ὥστε πλησθαι μὲν τὴν ἑνωτοῦ πόλιν, ἐπικατακλύσαι δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἀσίην πᾶσαν. The explanation of the Magi was that Mandane's child would be king in Astyages' place.

The variant spelling Ὀαρίων for Ὀρίων calls into doubt the etymology Ὀρίων = Οὐρίων.

* Fr. 74

τρεχέτω μετὰ Πληρόναν, ἄμα δ' αὐτῶι κύων.

Test. Σ N. 2, 17c Drachmann καὶ ὅτε μὲν Πληιάδας καλεῖ πληθυντικῶς, ὅτε δὲ Πληρόνην ὡς μίαν 'τρεχέτω - κύων' δοκεῖ γὰρ κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν Πίνδαρον ἔρασεθῆναι αὐτῆς ὁ Ὀρίων, καὶ διώκειν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ πολλοὺς χρόνους· ὑπομνήματα δὲ τούτων ὁ Ζεὺς κατηστέρεισε | Et. M. 675, 34 λέγει δὲ Πίνδαρος περὶ τοῦ καταστερισμοῦ (κατηστερισμένου Et. Gen. B) αὐτῶν, (ὡς add. Et. Gen.) ὅτι τῆς (om. Et. Gen. B) Πληρόνης πορευομένης μετὰ τῶν (αὐτῆς add. Et. Gen. B) θυγατρῶν κατὰ τὴν (om. Et. Gen. A) Βοιωτίαν, συναντῆσαι αὐτῆι Ὀρίωνα, εἴτα ἔρασεθεις (ἔρασεθέντος Et. Gen.) ὤρμησε πρὸς τὸ ἀρπάσαι· τὴν δὲ φεύγουσαν μετὰ τῶν θυγατρῶν Ὀρίων ἐδίωκε (ἐδίωκεν Ὀρίων Et. Gen.)· γενέσθαι δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν δρόμον πέντε ἔτη (ἔτη πέντε Et. Gen. B) ἀδιάλειπτον. τὸν δὲ Δία (om. Et. Gen.) διὰ τὴν κακοπάθειαν αὐτῶν ολονεῖ μνήματα (αὐτῶν add. Et. Gen. B) κατηστερίσθαι τὰς Πλειάδας φεγούσας τὸν Ὀρίωνα

τρεχέτω Σ Pi. N. 2, 17c codd. T U V: τρέχε τοι Τυγῆ; τρεχέτω δὲ cod. B

He must run after Pleione, and with him his dog.

Contents

After chasing Pleione and her daughters in Boeotia, Orion is forced to continue running after them in the sky. The imperative τρεχέτω expresses the inevitability, the law of nature governing the constellations (so also Lehnus 1979, 206). Cf. Ath. 11, 490e *κύνεγγυς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Ὀρίων τῆ ἀστροθεσίαι τῶν Πλειάδων διὸ καὶ ὁ περὶ ταύτας μῦθος, ὅτι φεύγουσι μετὰ τῆς μητρὸς τῆς Πληρόνης τὸν Ὀρίωνα*; Σ A.R. 3, 225; Σ II. 18, 486.

On Pleione and her daughters cf. also Eust. 1712, 48 αἰ (sc. Πλειάδες) τὸν προειρημένον Ὀρίωνα μυθεύονται φεύγειν διώκοντα τὴν αὐτῶν μητέρα Πληρόνην, ἧ κατὰ τινας αἱ Πληιάδες παρονομάζονται; Σ Agat. 254; Hyg. *Astr.* 2, 21.

Metre

Fr. 74 consists of dactylo-epitrites. If the syllable preceding the consonants Πλ- is long, we have

----- e D e or d² e D e (cf. N. 8 ep. 4)

If the fifth syllable is short the scansion is d² d² d² d² e. This would be more regular if a long syllable preceded, resulting in D d² d² e (cf. P. 3 str. 4).

Lucian. *Pr. Im.* 19

ὡς ὁ τὸν Ὀρίωνος κύνα ἔπαινων ἔφη ποιητῆς λεοντοδάμαν αἰτόν· οὗτος γὰρ δὴ κυνὸς ἐντελής ἔπαινος.

lion-taming

It is natural for Orion as a hunter (cf. Σ Pi. *N.* 2, 17c κυνηγετικός; Nic. *Ther.* 19-20 κυνηλατέοντος) to have his dog Sirius with him. In the winter sky the constellation Sirius follows Orion (cf. Arat. 322-332). For Orion's dog cf. *Il.* 22, 29; Hes. *Op.* 609-610 εὗτ' ἂν δ' Ὀρίων καὶ Σείριος ἐς μέσον ἔλθῃ / οὐρανόν.

The poet who is said to describe Orion's dog as λεοντοδάμας may well be Pindar. The adjective is a ἄπαξ, comparable with the equally unique γυιοδάμας (*I.* 5, 59) and χαλκοδάμας (*I.* 6, 73).

Fr. 75

Δεῦτ' ἐν χορόν, Ὀλύμπιοι,
 ἐπὶ τε κλυτὰν πέμπετε χάριν, θεοί,
 πολύβατον οἷ τ' ἄστεος ὀμφαλὸν θυόεντ'
 ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς Ἀθάναις
 5 οἶχνεῖτε πανδαίδαλον τ' εὐκλέ' ἀγοράν
 ἰοδέτων λάχετε στεφάνων τᾶν τ' ἑαριδρόπων
 ἀοιδᾶν,
 Διόθεν τέ με σὺν ἀγλαΐαι
 ἴδετε πορευθέντ' ἀοιδᾶν δεύτερον
 ἐπὶ τὸν κικκοδαῆ θεόν,
 10 τὸν Βρόμιον, τὸν Ἐριβόαν τε βροτοὶ καλέομεν,
 γόνον ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων μελπόμεν <οι >
 γυναικῶν τε Καδμειᾶν.
 ἐναργέα τ' ἔμ' ὅτε μάντιν οὐ λαυθάνει,
 φοινικοεάνων ὀπότ' οἶχθέντος Ὀρᾶν θαλάμου
 15 εὐδομον ἐπάγοισιν ἕαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεια.
 τότε βάλλεται, τότε, ἐπ' ἀμβρόταν χθόν' ἔραται
 ἴων φόβαι, ῥόδα τε κόμαισι μείγνυται,
 ἀχει τ' ὀμφαί μελέων σὺν ἀύλοισ,
 οἶχνεῖ τε Σεμέλαν ἑλικάμπυκα χοροί.

Test. 1-19 D.H. *Comp.* 22 (2, 99-100 U.-R.) ποιητῶν μὲν σὺν Πίνδαρος ἀρκέσει παραληφθεῖς, συγγραφέων δὲ Θουκυδίδης· κράτιστοι γὰρ οὗτοι ποιηταὶ τῆς ἀύστηρᾶς ἀρμονίας. ἀρχέτω δὲ Πίνδαρος, καὶ τούτου διθύραμβός τις οὐ ἐστὶν ἢ ἀρχὴ 'Δεῦτ' - χοροί' | D.H. *Comp. Epit.* 22 (2, 180-181 U.-R.) προκείσθω δὴ καὶ παραδείγματα (τῆς ἀύστηρᾶς ἀρμονίας): Πινδάρου μὲν διθύραμβός τις οὐ ἐστὶν ἢ ἀρχὴ 'Δεῦτ' - χοροί' | 1 Anon. de barbarismo et soloecismo (Boissonade, *Anecd. Gr.* 3, 239) περὶ τὰς διαθέσεις, ὡς παρὰ Πινδάρου· 'καλεῖτ' ἐς χορόν Ὀλύμπια' ἀντὶ τοῦ καλεῖσθε | *Cramer Anecd. Oxon.* I, p. 169, 19 ἢ ἐν κατὰ μὲν συνήθειαν συντάσσεται δοτικῆ, κατὰ δὲ Ἀττικὸν γενικῆ, κατὰ δὲ Βοιωτὸς καὶ αἰτιατικῆ· οὕτως γὰρ ἔχει καὶ τὸ παρὰ Πινδάρου 'ἴδετε δ' ἐν χορόν Ὀλύμπιοι' | *idem*, p. 176, 4 Βοιωτοὶ γὰρ τὴν ἐν προθέσει συντάσσουσιν αἰτιατικῆ 'ἴδετ' ἐν χορόν Ὀλύμπιοι' Πίνδαρος | *Greg. Cor.* p. 355 Schaefer τρέπουσι δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ (sc. Dores) τῆς ἐς προθέσεως τὸ c εἰς τὸ ν. οἶον ἐς χορόν 'ἐν χορόν', ἐς τὴν ἀγοράν ἐν τᾶν ἀγοράν | 11-12 Σ Pi. I, 8, 75 *Drachmann* Διὰ μιγεσμέναν ἢ Διδος παρ' ἀδελφεοῖσιν' (...) πληθυντικῶς δὲ εἶπεν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀδελφῶν, τῶν Ποσειδῶν· σύνθετος δὲ τὸ σχῆμα Πινδάρου· ὑπάτων - Καδμειᾶν' ἀντὶ τοῦ Διδος καὶ Σεμέλης | 18 A.D. *Synt.* 3, 50 (316, 2 Uhlig) ὡς Βοιωτῶν ἐστὶν ἔθος, ὅμοιον τῶν παρὰ Πινδάρου· 'ἀχειται - ἀύλοισ'

1 δεῦτ' D.H. codd. F, M², V, Erit.: ἕδειτ' D.H. codd. P, M¹, Anecd. Oxon. 176, 4; ἕδετε δ' Anecd. Oxon. 169, 19; καλεῖτ' Anecd. Gr. | ἐν χορὸν D.H. codd. F, V, Erit., Anecd. Oxon., Greg. Cor.: ἐν εχορὸν D.H. cod. P; ἐς χορὸν D.H. cod. Mcopt., Anecd. Gr. | 'Ολύμπια Anecd. Gr. | 2 πέμπεται D.H. cod. P | 3 οἱ τ': οἱ D.H. cod. F | ἀστεως D.H. cod. F | ὄφθαλμὸν D.H. cod. Msscr. | θυόειντ' Snell 1975⁴: θυόεινα D.H. | 4 ἀθάναυ D.H. *Comp.* 22 (2, 104 U.-R.) cod. F: ἀθήναυ D.H. codd. F, P, M, Erit.; ἀθήναι D.H. cod. V | 5 τ' om. D.H. cod. F¹ | 6 ἰαδέτων D.H. codd. P, M, V: ἰαδέτων D.H. Erit.; δδ' ἐγὼν D.H. cod. F | λάχετε D.H. codd. P, M, V, Erit.: λάχει D.H. cod. F; λαχεῖν Usener 1878 | τᾶν τ' ἐαριδρόπων Usener: ἄντε ἀριδρόπων D.H. cod. F; τ' ἀντ' ἐαριδρέπων D.H. cod. P; τᾶν τε ἀριδρέπων D.H. Erit.; τ' ἀντ' ἐπαριδρέπων D.H. cod. M; τῶν ἐαριδρέπων D.H. cod. V | αἰοιδᾶν D.H. codd. F, V, Erit.: λαιβᾶν D.H. codd. P, M | 7 Διόθεν τέ με: διατεθέντε D.H. cod. F | ἀγλαῖαι D.H. cod. P: ἀγλαῖα D.H. codd. F, M, V, Erit. | 8 εἶδετε D.H. cod. M | πορευθέντα αἰοιδᾶν Schneider 1776; πορευθέντα οἱ δ' ἄν D.H. cod. F; πορευθέντες αἰοιδᾶν D.H. codd. P, M; πορευθέντες αἰοιδᾶς D.H. cod. V, Erit. | 9 ἐπὶ τὸν D.H. codd. F, P, M, Erit.: ἐπὶ D.H. cod. V; ἐπὶ τε Bergk 1878⁴ | κισσοδατ D.H. codd. F, M, V, Erit.: κισσοδό[ν]ταν D.H. cod. P; κισσοδέτον Schneider; κισσοκόμαν Bergk; κισσοάραν Schroeder 1900 | 10 τὸν βρόμιον. τον D.H. cod. P: ὄν βρόμιον ὄν D.H. codd. F, M, V, Erit.; Βρόμιον ὄντ' Bergk; ὄν Βρόμιον Turyn 1952 | τε D.H. codd. P, M: om. D.H. codd. F, V, Erit. | 11 γονέων D.H. cod. V; om. Σ Pi. | ὑπάτω D.H. cod. P | μὲν D.H. cod. P: τε D.H. cod. V, Erit.; μὲν τε D.H. codd. F, M, Σ Pi.; νῦν τε Usener | μελπόμενοι Hermann 1824: μέλομεν D.H. codd. F, M, V, Erit.; μέλπε D.H. cod. P; μελπόμεν Boeckh 1821, Schroeder 1900; om. Σ Pi. | 12 τε om. D.H. cod. F | καδμίαν D.H. cod. F; καδμείαν D.H. codd. P, M, V, Erit. | ἔμολον D.H. cod. P: σεμέλαν D.H. cod. V, Erit.; σεμέλην D.H. codd. F, M; secl. Boeckh, Schroeder | 13 ἐναργέα τ' ἔμ' ὄτε μάντιν Van Groningen 1955: ἐναργεα νεμέω μάντιν D.H. cod. P, Erit.; ἐν ἄλγεα τεμεῶν τε μάντιν D.H. cod. F; ἐν ἀργέα νεμέα μάντιν D.H. codd. M, V; ἐναργέα τελέων κάματ' Usener | 14 φοινικοεάνων Koch 1851: φοινικοεᾶν D.H. cod. F; φοινικος ἐανῶν D.H. codd. P, M, V, Erit. | ὀπότε D.H. cod. F | οἰχθόντες D.H. cod. F | ὦραν D.H. cod. F: ὦραν D.H. codd. P, M, V, Erit. | θάλαμοι D.H. cod. F | 15 εὐάμοιν D.H. cod. F | ἐπάγοισιν D.H. cod. F: ἐπαῖωσιν D.H. codd. P, M, V, Erit.; ἐπάγωγισιν Usener 1868; ἐπάγωγισιν Bergk | 16 τότε om. D.H. cod. F | βάλλετε D.H. cod. V, Erit. | τότε D.H. cod. V | ἀμβρόταν (ἀμυβρόταν D.H. cod. P) χθόν' D.H. codd. P, M: ἀμβροτον χέρσον D.H. codd. F, V, Erit. | 16-17 ἐραταῖ ὤων φόβαι ρόδατε D.H. Erit.: ἐρατάς ὤων φόβαι ρόδατε D.H. cod. V; ἐρατέων φοβερόδατε D.H. cod. F; ἐρατᾶν ὤων φοβεράτε D.H. codd. P, M | 17 κόμισι D.H. cod. F | μείγνυται Schroeder: μίγνυται D.H. codd. P, M; μίγνυται D.H. codd. F, V, Erit. | 18 ἀχει τε D.H. cod. F: ἀχειται A.D.; οἰχνεῖ τ' D.H. codd. P, M, Erit.; οἰχνεῖτε D.H. cod. V | ὄμφαι A.D.: ὄμφαι D.H. cod. F; ὄμφᾶ D.H. Erit.; ὄμφα D.H. cod. V; ὄμφαῖς D.H. codd. P, M | 19 ἀχει τε Hermann | χορὸν D.H. cod. V | χοροὶ // ἔλικ. ~ 1sq.? Snell 1975⁴

1968, 389-430, esp. 416). The hymnal style of the opening is clearly recognizable: gods are invoked (ll. 1-2), described (ll. 3-5) and asked for assistance (ll. 1-2, 6-9). This belongs traditionally in cletic hymns (see Wunsch 1914, 182; Zuntz 1951, 337-341; Lenz 1980, 85; Bremer 1981, 194-197).

The fact, however, that the invoked gods are not the recipients of the poem (which is, of course, Dionysus), must make us aware that this is not a real hymnal opening. It has no cult intention, but is 'merely' meant to make a *πρόσωπον τηλαυγές* (*O.* 6, 3-4), a grand opening (see Meyer 1933, 60-64). Similar openings are found in *O.* 4; 5; 8; 12; *P.* 8; 12; *N.* 3; 7; 10; 11; *B.* 11. All these open with the invocation of a god(dess) or city, enlarged by descriptive appositions, and with a request (to accept the song, to come, to help, to sing). *O.* 14 cannot be included here because the hymnal elements dominate the whole poem and are not limited to the opening. Since dithyramps are hymns to Dionysus we expect hymnal elements directed at him, and they can be found in the second part of the fragment. In ll. 9-12 Pindar mentions very concisely Dionysus' parentage and some characteristic epithets and names (κικκοδαής, Βρόμιος, Ἐριβόας) and we might expect further references to the story of his birth shortly after l. 19 Σεμέλαν. Zimmermann 1988b, 38-39 arrives at a similar analysis of fr. 75.

The poem expresses a joyful atmosphere, as witnessed by the many positive and festive adjectives and nouns (2 κλυτὰν ... χάριν, 3 θυόεντα, 4 Ιεραῖς, 5 πανδαίδαλον, εὐκλέ', 6 Ιοδέτων, ἑαριδρόπων, 7 ἀγλαίαι, 14 φοινικοεάνων, 15 εὐόδομον, νεκτάρεια, 16 ἀμβρόταν, ἔραταί, 17 ἴων φόβαι, ῥόδα, 19 ἐλικάμπυκα. It is not necessary to explain this as expressive of Pindar's religious attitude (see Rudberg 1945, 317-336 = 1970, 259-277, esp. 267-269, who explains this vocabulary as a way for Pindar to express the joyful side of the holy, the ἄρρητον). The festal atmosphere is indispensable in a dithyramb, a spring song, for a rich and powerful city like Athens (cf. frs. 76-77).

Date

There is papyrological evidence of an Athenian Dithyramb which brought Pindar a victory in 497/496 B.C. The evidence is found in a Life of Pindar, *P. Oxy.* 2438, 9-10 ἐ]π' Ἀρχίου γὰρ ἡγώνισται ἐν Ἀθήναι[ς διθυράμ-] / βω<ι> καὶ νεν{ε}ικηκεν. See D.M. Lewis, The Archon of 497/6 B.C., *CR N.S.* 12 (1962), 201; I. Gallo, Nota alla Vita di Pindaro del Papiro di Ossirinco 2438: Archia o Ipparco? *QUCC* 7 (1969), 113-115. It is unclear whether or not fr. 75 is part of the Dithyramb of 497/496. If δεύτερον at l. 8 means that fr. 75 is Pindar's second Athenian

Dithyramb, it was probably not composed as early as 497/496, because in that case Pindar must have composed his first Athenian Dithyramb in or before 498 (the date of *P.* 10, the earliest poem we can assign with certainty). This is not impossible, but rather unlikely.

It is tempting to look for internal evidence in πανδαίδαλον at l. 5 and to assume that this adjective refers to the embellishment of the Agora by Cimon (470-461, see G. Donnay, *Pindare et Cimon, Thème et contenu politique du premier dithyrambe en l'honneur d'Athènes, RBPh* 42 [1964], 206). For this role of Cimon see also H.A. Thompson and R.E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens, The Athenian Agora Vol. XIV*, Princeton New Jersey, 1972, 20; and cf. *Plu. Cim.* 13, 8; *Praec. ger. reipubl.* 24 p. 818d. But citizens usually call their own city beautiful regardless of the number of stately buildings or parks, so that we cannot use πανδαίδαλον as evidence to date the fragment.

Other attempts to assign a date to fr. 75 are equally futile. Bowra 1964, 408 suggests the spring of 474 because it 'clearly comes after, but not long after, the Persian wars, and may have been composed when the Persian menace had ceased, e.g. after the capture of Eion by Cimon.' Puech 1923, 151 considers it likely that the two known Athenian Dithyramps (frs. 75 and 76-77) were written in approximately the same period, probably in the middle of Pindar's career when his relationship with Athens was especially good, following the second Persian war. This would lead to a date around 486 (such as *P.* 7) or 485 (such as *N.* 2) or, more probably, a little later, since frs. 76 and 77 must be after 480 (Battle of Artemisium).

It is clear that frs. 76-77 refer to a concrete historical event (although not even this leads automatically to a certain date), but neither the text nor the tradition of fr. 75 gives us any useful information which helps to date it with confidence.

Metre

Fragment 75 is composed in a metre consisting of iambic and aeolic metres. Since there is no antistrophe the division is highly uncertain.

The first period contains the invocation of the Olympians. It is unlikely that the second period does not end until the end of l. 8 (we might expect pauses after l. 4, Ἀθάναϊc and after l. 6, αἰδᾶν), but the lack of a corresponding strophe prohibits a certain division. L. 7 and l. 8 form a period each, probably emphasizing the praise of the poet himself and of his poem. Semantically, ll. 9-12 are complete, but, once again, the position of the period-end after l. 12 is not certain.

Ll. 13-14 evoke the time of spring, while a new period in ll. 15-16 elaborates on the floral abundance. The next period, l. 17, is about the people who look festive; and the final period (ll. 18-19) concentrates on the music and the dance.

	---~ ---	ia cr
	~--- ---	ia cr cr
	~--- ---	ia cho ia
	~--- ---	^hipp
5	~--- ---	ia cr ia
	~--- ---	^chodim gl ba
	~---	
	~--- ---	ia cho
	~--- ---	ia cr ia
	~--- ---	gl
10	~--- ---	cho ia cr ba
	~--- ---	ia cho cho
	~--- ---	chodim
	~--- ---	ia tr ia
	~--- ---	ia cho cr cho
15	~--- ---	ia cho ia
	~--- ---	ia ia cr (ba)
	~--- ---	ia ia ia
	~--- ---	^chodim ba
	~--- ---	ia cho cr (ba)

This cannot be reduced to iambs only, not even by calling on resolution and syncopation, as was done by M.L. West, iambs in Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar, *ZPE* 37 (1980), 137-155, following Wilamowitz 1921 († 1975), 310-313. For a defence of metrical variety as opposed to a forced iambic unity see B. Gentili, *Trittico pindarico*, *QUCC* n.s. 2 (1979), 7-33, esp. 15-29, and R. Pretagostini, *Considerazioni sui cosiddetti 'metra ex iambis orta' in Simonide, Pindaro e Bacchilide*, *QUCC* n.s. 6 (1980), 127-136.

It cannot be denied, however, that iambs play an important role in this fragment. They are seldom the only metre to fill a line; only l. 17 is that regular. In all other lines other metres are (also) found. And even in the case of the iambic metre, we find eight different variations:

∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	ll. 3, 17 (2 times)
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	ll. 5, 8, 13
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	ll. 2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 17
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	l. 5
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	l. 13
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	ll. 1, 14, 15, 19
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	ll. 15, 16 (2 times)
∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	l. 7

For ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ cf. fr. 109, 4.

Pindar plays with the differences and similarities between the iambics and other metres. Zimmermann 1988b, 42 points especially to the choriambic members, easing the link between the iambics and the aeolic metres, by making 'gleitende Uebergänge'. This phenomenon occurs mostly in tragedy, but is also found in *P.* 8, 1-3 (see B. Snell, *Griechische Metrik*, Göttingen 1982⁴, 58 n. 53). For the close connection between choriambic and aeolic metres, see Snell 1982⁴, 37.

Maehler (*post* Snell 1975⁴, 82) suggests a strophe-end after l. 18. In l. 19 the order of ἐλικάμπυκα and χοροί would have to be reversed and the line would end after χοροί, so that its metre corresponds to l. 1: ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪. To accommodate ἐλικάμπυκα the metre of l. 2 would have to be ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ and the syllable preceding κλ would have to be long. This is not impossible, and the reversal of ἐλικάμπυκα χοροί could be explained by the fact that 'scribes would tend to bring the name and epithet together' (West 1980, 145 n. 18). One drawback, however, is that in l. 2 ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ seems likelier than ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪, because the former occurs quite frequently in this fragment. Besides, Dionysius' διθύραμβός τις οὐ̄ ἐστιν ἢ ἀρχή ought perhaps to be interpreted to mean that his quotation concerned a complete unit, such as the first strophe of the dithyramb.

Commentary

1-2 Lines 1-2 are illustrative of Pindar's grand, majestic opening lines, his way of giving his poems a τηλαυγὲς πρόσωπον (cf. *O.* 6, 3-4). The case is not as clear as in the opening of the other known Athenian Dithyramb, fr. 76, but the imperative tone and the mentioning of the Olympian gods easily draw the public's attention.

1 Δεῦτ' ἐν χορόν, Ὀλύμπιοι : as discussed above (on *Contents*), the opening lines show certain characteristics of a cletic hymn. An essential element in such hymns is the invitation to the god to attend, formulated as ἐλθέ, βαῖνε, ἰκοῦ, μόλε (Norden 1912, 148; Zuntz 1951, 338). Δεῦτε can be regarded as synonymous with these. Cf. Hes. *Op.* 1-2 Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν ... / δεῦτε; Sapph. fr. 53 Voigt βροδοπάχεες ἄγναι Χάριτες, δεῦτε Δίος κόραι; Alc. fr. 34, 1 Voigt Δεῦτέ μοι νᾶ]σον Πέλοπος λίποντε[ς (cf. *SLG* 286, II, 1); *SLG* 286, II, 8 δεῦτ' ὄλβιαι.

It is not exactly clear why Pindar introduced the Olympians into this Dionysiac hymn. Of course they make a grand introduction, but Pindar could have made one with Dionysus himself. Perhaps it is an expression of typical Greek polytheism: 'Einen Gott übersehen oder gering achten, heisst die Fülle der Welt und damit auch die Ganzheit des Humanen amputieren. (...) Die Tatsachen des Kultes sind unmissverständlich: Bei Götterfesten wird regelmässig nicht einem, sondern einer ganzen Reihe von Göttern geopfert' (Burkert 1977, 332). Cf. also X. *Eq. Mag.* 3, 2 ...καὶ ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίοις δὲ οἱ χοροὶ προσεπιχαρίζονται ἄλλοις τε θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς δώδεκα χορεύοντες.

An additional reason may be found in the fact that the invited gods are those connected with the city which furnishes the chorus (Pavese 1968, 416): Pindar flatters Athens by connecting all the Olympian gods with the city (see also Kambylis 1964, 151 n. 2). Finally Pindar may want to enhance Dionysus' status with the Olympian audience at his festival.

Δεῦτ' : the reading in P and M (before correction) is ἕδετ', which may have crept into the MS from l. 8. The words ἐν χορόν are no argument in favour of either δεῦτ' or ἕδετ', since ὄραω can be constructed with ἐν/είς, cf. *Il.* 2, 271 ἰδῶν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον; Pi. fr. 123, 11-12 ἕδω / ... ἐς ἦβαν; for this intransitive use see Van Groningen 1960, 69-70 on fr. 123, 11-12. Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses the term ῥῆμα for the first word, but this is not an argument in favour of ἕδετε either, since δεῦτε was also classed as a verb, cf. Et. Gud. 139, 44 (see also D.M. Schenkeveld, *Linguistic Theories in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, *Glotta* 61 [1983], 67-94, esp. 73-74). Δεῦτ' is more likely not only because ἕδετ' also occurs in l. 8, but also because the austere style seems to be better represented by a long first syllable than by two brevia.

Δεῦτε 'adv. as pl. of δεῦρο' (LSJ *s.v.* δεῦτε) is not as infrequent in lyric poetry, as LSJ suggest. See Renehan 1975, 63; 1982, 52 and above on Δεῦτ' ἐν χορόν, Ὀλύμπιοι. Pi. fr. 122, 17 δεῦτ' is best emended to δηῦτ' > δαῦτ', because δεῦτε is only used as 'come hither' and not as the 'hither'; besides the plural is not called for, since the addressee is Κύπρον δέσποινα. See Van Groningen 1960, 39-40.

P. Von der Mühl, Zu Anakreon 43 Diehl und den Lyrikern, *Hermes* 75 (1940), 424-425 argues that the first meaning of δεῦτε is ἄγετε δῆ rather than δεῦρο and prefers this interpretation here too. This is not very likely, because in that case the connective τε in l. 2 would have no function. Besides, Von der Mühl shows himself that this distinction already seems lost in Homer (cf. *Od.* 8, 307; *Il.* 13, 481; and especially *Od.* 9, 11 δεῦτ' ἄγε).

ἐν χορόν : cf. Greg. Cor. p. 355 Schaefer; Gramm. Meermannianus (Ioannes Grammaticus?) p. 658 Schaefer ἐς χορόν ἐν χορόν, regarding this as a Doric peculiarity (also found, however, in Argos and Crete, see comm. Koenii ad Greg. Cor.). Pindar uses ἐν with the accusative nine times: cf. also *P.* 2, 11; 86; 4, 258; 5, 38; *N.* 4, 68; 7, 31; *Pae.* 7b, 46; fr. 108, 2, while we find ἐς/εἰς almost a hundred times in the extant works.

For a similar invitation to Zeus cf. *Ar. Nu.* 564-565 Ζῆνα τύραννον ἐς χορόν / πρῶτα μέγαν κικλήσκω, and to Poseidon cf. *Ar. Eq.* 559 δεῦρ' ἔλθ' ἐς χορόν.

χορόν : it is not true that the words χορός and χάρις come from the same root, as *Pl. Lg.* 654a (... χορούς τε ὠνομακέναι παρὰ τὸ τῆς χαρᾶς ἔμφυτον ὄνομα) asserts, but that does not mean that Pindar could not use those words in a combination suggesting an etymological relationship. This is a quite common poetical device, and he seems to do so again in *Pae.* 12(a), 10-11, although the text is very mutilated: ..] ε χορόν ὑπερτα[/ ...]χαριν λ[.]...τεκ[. Another example is to be found in *O.* 6 where Ἴαμος (l. 43) is linked with λός (l. 47) and with ῥον (l. 55). See for a discussion of more examples Barkhuizen 1975, esp. 119-120 and M. Buccellato, Modi etimomitologici nella 'Techne Poietike' di Pindaro, in: *Linguaggio e società alle origine nel pensiero filosofico greco*, *RSF* 16 (1961), 24-29.

1-2 Ὀλύμπιοι ... θεοί : the Olympians' divinity is stressed by the late position of θεοί. See Kühner-Gerth, 2, 600-601 for such cases of hyperbaton and their effect, especially when one or both of the separated words is/are found in special places, such as the end of a clause. The position of θεοί also gives the poet the possibility of making a more direct connection with the following relative clause. For other cases of hyperbaton in an invocation see Kambylis 1964, 176.

2 ἐπί τε ... πέμπετε : a case of tmesis or, rather, an accentuation of the original independence of the preposition, see Schwyzer 2, 424-426; Kühner-Gerth 1, 530-538 (esp. 535-536); B.K. Braswell, Notes on the Prooemium to Pindar's Seventh Olympian Ode, *Mnem.* 4.29 (1976), 239 and n. 24.

The imperative is the most usual form of invocation, in which according to Weilbach 1938, 36-42 the aorist is more common when the Olympic gods are addressed. For minor deities, including the Muses, the present is to be expected.

Pindar, however, does not seem to adhere closely to this distinction (see the table produced in Bakker 1966, 13). Bakker sets out an aspectual theory to account for the occurrence of present or aorist imperatives. The aorist imperative is used when the speaker leaves the moment of action to the discretion of the addressee, and makes no direct connection between the command or wish and the present situation. The present is used when the speaker wishes such a connection to be made, e.g. in situations of stress, or after the request is introduced by an aorist imperative (the present imperative is then used as a signal 'now you may start'), or when the speaker can reasonably expect that the order or request will be carried out immediately. This may be because the addressee is in an inferior position, or because it is the normal function of the addressee to perform the act asked for, or because the speaker promises to give something in return. General wishes, asking for a repetition of actions or for a state that must last forever or for a certain length of time, are also expressed by the present imperative (Bakker 1966, 116). Ruijgh 1985, 1-61 starts out from the essentially temporal value of the present and aorist forms, but comes to the same conclusion regarding the present and aorist imperatives. The present indicates that the required action is to be performed immediately and is therefore called 'inceptive' present (see esp. 29-38). The imperative ἐπί ... πέμπετε must be seen as an example of such an 'inceptive' or 'hortative' present imperative, where the poet apparently expects the gods to comply (Bakker 1966, 112-113 and n. 39; Ruijgh 1985, 35-36 and n. 74).

χάρην : for χάρις in a dithyrambic context cf. Pi. *O.* 13, 18-19 ταῖ Διωνύσου πόθεν ἐξέφανεν / cὺν βοηλάται χάριτες διθυράμβωι;

3-5 The relative sentence following an invitation or an appeal to gods, is a regular hymnal feature (see Norden 1912, 168; Meyer 1933, 3-4; H. Kleinknecht, *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike*, Stuttgart 1937 [Hildesheim 1967], 18-20; Zuntz 1951, 338; Kambylis 1964, 174-175; Lenz 1980, 22-23) intended to describe the deity completely, in the first place to ensure that the correct god(dess) is paying attention and in the second place to please and to flatter, so that the god(dess) will be willing to answer the prayer. In this case the description of the haunts of the gods is more flattering to Athens than to the gods themselves. Relative clauses are so common for predicates in hymns that Norden 1912, 168-176 called it 'Der Relativstil der Prädikation'. Cf. e.g. Pi. *O.* 4, 6-7 ἀλλὰ Κρόνου παῖ, ὃς Αἴτναν ἔχεις / Ἴπνον ἀνεμόεσσαν ἑκατογκεφάλα Τυφῶνος ὀβρίμου; *P.* 1, 30; *h. Hom.* 2, 2 (and Richardson 1974 *ad loc.*); 3, 2; *A. Eu.* 3; *S. Ant.* 1115-1120; *OT.* 161; *E. Hipp.* 67; *Ar. Ra.* 659; 665.

3 πολύβατον : the adjective πολύβατος is a ἄπαξ, but not so exceptional that it can be regarded as typical or characteristic of a dithyrambic style, as was argued by Seaford 1977/78, 88 n. 59. Very similar adjectives are ὑψίβατος (Pi. *N.* 10, 47; S. *Aj.* 1404), εὐβατος (e.g. A. *Pr.* 718), δύσβατος (e.g. Pi. *N.* 7, 97; A. *Pers.* 1069). A similarly unremarkable ἄπαξ is found in l. 5 πανδαίδαλος.

οἷ τε : see Ruijgh 1971, 984-987 for this 'digressive' use of ὅτε referring to a permanent fact or a habitual activity; sixteen more examples are found in Pindar: *O.* 2, 35; 14, 2; *P.* 4, 30; 11, 59; 12, 2; *N.* 6, 9; 6, 31; 8, 2; 11, 1; *I.* 3/4, 65; 8, 40; fr. 33c, 4; 96, 1; 122, 3; 140b, 4; 146, 1. See also Des Places 1947, 55-56.

ἄστεος ὀμφαλόν : the expression ἄστεος ὀμφαλός refers to some central point in the city. It is further described as πολύβατος 'much frequented' and θυόεις 'rich in frankincense', and mentioned along with the Agora (l. 5). It is therefore probably not the Agora itself nor a part of it, such as the altar of the Twelve Gods (as proposed by Wilamowitz 1922, 274 and by Puech 1923, 153 n. 1) or the Tholos (as proposed by I. Svoronos, *Athena* 33 [1921], 213). It is more likely the Acropolis, an equally central part of the city, where the great temple of Athena and the rites performed there warrant the adjectives πολύβατος and θυόεις.

Other places referred to as 'navel' are Delphi, the 'navel of the earth' (e.g. Pi. *P.* 8, 59 γὰρ ὀμφαλόν; *N.* 7, 33-34 μέγαν ὀμφαλόν εὐρυκόλπου / ... χθονός) and Enna, known as the 'navel of Sicily' (Cic. *Verr.* 4, 48, 106 *ex Hennensium nemore, qui locus, quod in media est insula situs, umbilicus Siciliae nominatur*).

θυόεντα : cf. Pi. *Pae.* 3, 8-9 θυόε[ντα] / βωμόν, E. *Tr.* 1061.

4 ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς Ἀθήναις : the use of ἱερός as an epithet of cities (and other specific localities) goes back to Homer, see J.P. Locher, *Untersuchungen zu ἱερός hauptsächlich bei Homer*, Diss. Bern 1963, 63-71. For its use with Athens cf. *Od.* 11, 323; S. *Aj.* 1221-1222; Ar. *Eq.* 1319; B. 18, 1; 23, 1. The adjective denotes the close relationship between a deity (often an eponymous nymph, here the goddess Athena and perhaps also the other Olympians) and a place, resulting in divine protection (see LSJ s.v. ἱερός I. 3).

5 οἰχνεῖτε : οἰχνέω with just an accusative seems to be typically Pindaric. Cf. *P.* 5, 86 οἰχνέοντές σφε; and l. 19 of this dithyramb, οἰχνεῖτε Σεμέλαν.

Since the emphasis in this line is more on the presence of the Olympians in Athens than on their intention to come and visit, it seems better to regard οἰχνέω as a transitive verb with an object accusative than as an intransitive verb with a goal accusative (see G. de Boel, *Goal accusative and object accusative in Homer. A contribution to the theory of transitivity*, Verhandelingen van de Kon. Akad. voor Wet., Lett. en Schone Kunsten, Kl. der Lett., 50 (1988) nr. 125, esp. 157-165).

πανδαίδαλον : see note on l. 3 πολύβατον. It refers to the statues and monuments decorating the Agora and may be meant to supply a superlative for the Homeric πολυδαίδαλος, cf. *Il.* 3, 358 πολυδαίδαλου θώρηκος; 11, 32; *Od.* 18, 295, etc.

6 ἰοδέτων ... στεφάνων : the presentation of violet crowns at the altar of the twelve gods was part of the Great Dionysia (Cook 1900, 5-6). Cf. *Ar. Nu.* 308 εὐστεφανοὶ τε θεῶν θυεῖαι θαλίαι τε.

The Athenians themselves also wore wreaths, cf. *Ath.* 11, 464f' Ἀθηναῖοι τοῖς Διονυσιακοῖς ἀγῶσι ... ἐστεφανωμένοι ἐθεώρου; *orac. ap.* D. 21, 52 μεμνησθαι Βάκχοιο ... κάρη στεφάνοις πυκάσαντας.

Duchemin 1955, 242 n. 2 suggests that Pindar alludes here to the wreaths given to the poet who won the victory in the dithyrambic contest. It is possible that Pindar used στέφανος to make us think of him as victorious with this poem, but this is not the primary sense.

The ἶον is the archetypal spring flower, cf. *Plin. NH.* 21, 11, 38 *florum primavera nuntiantium viola alba*. For its connection with Dionysus cf. *AP* 9, 524, 10 ἰοπλόκον. See also on l. 17 ἶων φόβαι. Ἰόδετος is another ἄπαξ.

λάχετε : 'take your share of', a variation of the traditional δέξαι-motif, 'ein durch den Festgebrauch gerechtfertigtes eigentliches Prooimion-motiv' (Schadewaldt 1928, 269). For the traditional formula cf. *O.* 4, 9 δέξαι ... τόνδε κῶμον; 8, 10 τόνδε κῶμον καὶ στεφαναφορίαν δέξαι; variations of object are found in *O.* 13, 28; *P.* 12, 5; *N.* 11, 3; *Pae.* 6, 5; variations of verb and/or construction in *P.* 2, 3-4; *N.* 4, 11; 8, 14. See also Carey 1981, 24-25.

Here we have the expected aorist as opposed to l. 2 ἐπί ... πέμπετε, see Weilbach 1938, 36-42; Bakker 1966, 126-127; Ruijgh 1985, 35-36 and n. 74.

τᾶν τ' ἔαριδρόπων αἰοιδᾶν : although the exact spelling of the adjective is not certain (see app. crit.), the sense is in all cases 'plucked in spring'. Other examples of the figurative use of 'plucking' in Pindar are *P.* 1, 48-49 τιμάν / οἶαν οὔτις Ἑλλάνων δρέπει; 4, 130-131 δραπῶν ... / ἱερὸν εὐζοίας ἄωτον; 9, 109-110; *N.* 2, 9; fr. 122, 8; 123, 1; 209, and especially *Pae.* 12, 4-5 ἀν]θεα τοια[ύτα / .]ῆμνησιος δρέπηι. Perhaps fr. 6b(f) belongs here too:] ἄρδοντ' αἰοιδᾶϊς [/]γενναίων ἄωτος νεκταριέας αἰ.[/] καρπὸν δρέποντες. See on this and similar expressions G. McCracken, Pindar's Figurative Use of Plants, *AJP* 55 (1934), 340-345.

This is the fourth epithet in four lines that is not found elsewhere, and it is the most striking because of the metaphorical meaning of δρέπω. The accumulation of newly formed adjectives in these lines is conspicuous.

7 Διόθεν : the best explanation is to interpret Διόθεν as 'having begun with Zeus', referring back to l. 1, Ὀλύμπιοι (see Puech 1923, 153; Slater *Lex. s.v.*

Διόθεν), Zeus being their main deity. This makes all the more sense because then the connection between the Olympian gods and Dionysus is explicitly made: from Zeus (and his Olympians) the poet is sent on his way (e.g. by the Muses) to Dionysus. For the same construction cf. *N.* 1, 4-5 *κέθεν ... / ὕμνος ὀρμάται; Pae.* 2, 3-4 *κέθ]εν ... / παι]ᾶνα [δι]ώξω* (cf. Σ ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν λαβών), *h. Hom.* 9, 8-9 *αἰτάρ ἐγὼ σε πρῶτα καὶ ἐκ κέθεν ἄρχομι' αἰεῖδεν, / σεῦ δ' ἐγὼ ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον;* for the same meaning cf. *N.* 5, 25 *ἕμνησαν Διὸς ἀρχόμενοι σεμνὰν θέτιν;* 2, 2-3 *αἰοδοί / ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προομίου;* *Agat.* 1 *ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα.*

Another interpretation of Διόθεν is 'sent' by Zeus, according to his will' (Kirkwood 1982, 329). Cf. *Π.* 15, 489 *Διόθεν βλαφθέντα βέλεμνα;* *A. Ag.* 43-44 *διθρόνου Διόθεν καὶ δικκήπτρου / τιμῆς ὄχυρόν ζεῦγος Ἀτρειδᾶν.* This explanation has as its weak point that the usual meaning of *πορευθέντ'* is not 'being sent', but 'travelling, going' (see below on l. 8 *πορευθέντ'*) and that it is not usually Zeus' task to send or support a poet. We would more readily expect Apollo or the Muses in that role. For Apollo cf. *Hes. Th.* 94-95; *Tim. PMG* 791, 202-205; *B.* 28, 5-11; 17, 132 and Schmidt 1990, 19; for the Muses cf. *B.* 19, 5-7.

A more specific variant of Διόθεν = 'according to Zeus' will' is given by Privitera 1972, 139-140. Zeus is the one who makes Pindar go second (l. 8 *δεύτερον*), because Zeus controls the lots, cf. *Π.* 7, 179-180. However, the Pindaric examples mentioned by Privitera are more about fate than about lots (*N.* 4, 61 *τὸ μόριμον Διόθεν πεπρωμένον ἔκφερον;* 6, 13 *μεθέπων Διόθεν αἴσαν*).

Finally Διόθεν may be taken as 'from Zeus, Zeus-given', to be connected with *ἀγλαΐαι*. The position of Διόθεν, however, does not favour this interpretation.

The first interpretation seems the best, mainly because it offers the advantage of explaining Διόθεν from the text itself and of drawing the Olympians and Dionysus together.

με : for the first person pronoun representing a choral or a bardic 'I' in dithyrambs, see also my note on fr. 70b, 23 *ἐμέ*. In this fragment the interpretation of *με* is uncertain. In a choral statement in the first person, the choral speaker is expected to express primarily choral concerns and to describe and characterize himself and his actions (Lefkowitz 1963, 185-194), but the references to the first person in fr. 75 are not so clear in this respect. L. 8 *πορευθέντ'* can be taken as an argument for a processional dithyramb, where *με* refers to the chorus (Privitera 1972, 139-140). It is, however, better (see below on l. 8 *πορευθέντ'*) to connect *πορευθέντ'* with the poet's persona, translating 'going' or 'being sent on my way', especially since there are many similar expressions in Pindar, cf. *O.* 4, 1-2^τ *Ωραι / ... μ' ἔπεμψαν;* 7, 13, *Pae.* 6, 13 *κατέβαν;* *O.* 14, 18 *αἰείδων ἔμολον;* *P.* 2, 3-4

φέρων / μέλος ἔρχομαι; *I.* 5, 21 *σὺν* Χάρικιν δ' ἔμολον; *Pae.* 6, 9 ἤλθον (see further Becker 1937, 80-82). "Ὦτε μάντιν at l. 13 seems to point to a bardic 'T', because expressions such as μάντις are more appropriate for a poet than for a chorus. However, Pindar never calls himself a μάντις (this is the Muse's role, cf. fr. 150) and besides he only says 'as if I were a μάντις'. The fact that in l. 19 χοροί is described in the third person may imply that ἐγώ is a bardic 'T'. However, the reference is perhaps to dithyrambic choruses in general. There is no definitive argument in favour of either interpretation, but because originally the first person refers to the poet as distinct from the performer(s) (see Calame 1986, 40-43), it seems best to regard με here as a bardic 'T'. See also M.R. Lefkowitz, Pindar's Pythian V, in A. Hurst (ed.), *Pindare. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 31, Genève 1985, 45-49; W. Rosler, L'interpretazione dell' 'io' nella lirica greca arcaica, *QUCC* n.s. 19, 1 (1985), 143; J.M. Bremer, Pindar's Paradoxical ἐγώ, in: S.R. Slings (ed.), *The Poet's 'T' in Archaic Greek Lyric*, Amsterdam 1990, 41-50.

In most cases bardic 'T'-statements have a structural function, to effect a transition in the poem. Such a transition cannot be detected here, but the structural function can perhaps be understood in the poet's presentation of himself at the beginning of the poem, equivalent to Lefkowitz's ' "unrelated" personal information ... only in songs intended for public competition, as a necessary means of self-identification' (Lefkowitz 1963, 251 n. 108).

7-8 *σὺν ἀγλαΐαι ... ἀοιδᾶν* : for the noun ἀγλαΐα in similar musical contexts cf. Hes. *Sc.* 272-273 τοὶ δ' ἄνδρες ἐν ἀγλαΐης τε χοροῖς τε / τέρψιν ἔχον; 284-285 πᾶσαν δὲ πόλιν θαλῖαι τε χοροὶ τε / ἀγλαΐαι τ' εἶχον; *h. Hom.* 4, 476 μέλπεο καὶ κιθάριζε καὶ ἀγλαΐας ἀλέγνυε; *Pi. P.* 1, 1-2 Χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, ... / τᾶς ἀκούει μὲν βάσις ἀγλαΐας ἀρχά; fr. 148 ὀρχήσ' ἀγλαΐας ἀνάσσων, εὐρυφάρετ' Ἀπολλων; *B.* fr. 4, 56-57 ἀγλαΐαι / τ' ἀνθ]εῦς[ι] καὶ μολπαὶ λίγ[ε]ιαι.

8 ἴδετε : με ... ἴδετε πορευθέντ' can be taken as an *accusativus cum participio* construction (cf. *O.* 7, 62; 10, 36; 10, 100; 14, 16; *P.* 2, 54; 5, 84; 8, 39; 9, 98; *N.* 10, 61), but the verb becomes more forceful and poetic if it is interpreted as 'look favourably upon', cf. Hes. *Th.* 81-82 ὄν τινα τιμήσσωσι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο / γεινόμενον τε ἴδωσι διοτρεφέντων βασιλῆων; *Pi. I.* 2, 18 εὐρυςθενήης εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων ἔνν πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν. See Ziegler 1905, 67-74 for this use of ἰδεῖν (esp. frequent in tragedy, cf. *A. Th.* 111; *Supp.* 78; 103; 206; 207; 359; *Ch.* 247; 253; 406; 407; 501; *E. Med.* 1252) and many synonymous expressions.

For the imperative aorist as the normal form to phrase requests to gods, see on l. 2 ἐπί ... πέμπετε and l. 6 λάχετε.

πορευθέντ' : since πορεύομαι is a *deponens passivum* it seems preferable to interpret as 'going, travelling' although it is rather prosaic. The passive meaning

of πορεύομαι (as defended by Privitera 1972, 139-140) is attested, cf. *S. Aj.* 1254; *OC* 845. But if we interpret πορευθέντ' here in that sense, the lack of an agent would require that Διόθεν = ὑπὸ Διός. As argued above (on l. 7 Διόθεν), this role would suit the Muses or Apollo better.

The verb is no evidence for a processional dithyramb (as argued by Privitera 1972, 139-140). Dithyrambs were circular dances (cf. e.g. *Ar. Nu.* 333; *Ra.* 366; *Av.* 918) and there is no reason to assume that fr. 75 is an exception. It is also unlikely that the Altar of the Twelve Gods was the place of the performance of this dithyramb (as was suggested by Wilamowitz 1922, 274; Puech 1923, 151; Pickard-Cambridge 1962², 38). The reference in *X. Eq. Mag.* 3, 2 ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίοις δὲ οἱ χοροὶ προσεπιχαρίζονται ἄλλοις τε θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς δώδεκα χορεύοντες does not refer to dithyrambic choruses. The regular practice was that the dithyrambic contests took place in the Theatre. Since the procession was an important element of the City Dionysia, it is possible that Pindar alludes to it by the explicit mention of the Olympians (l. 1), the sacrifices (l. 3 θύοεντ'), the agora (l. 5) and the verb πορεύω (l. 8) which can also be used for processions. This does not mean, however, that we must assume a deviation from the regular practice of performance.

δεύτερον : 'for the second time': indicating that this was Pindar's second Dithyramb for Athens. See also above on *Date*. Privitera 1972 suggests that drawing lots gave the second position to Pindar and his chorus in the procession of competing dithyrambic choruses. The drawing of lots for the choice of a poet and a flute-player is attested (see Introduction 1.5), but it is not clear if this also determined the order of contestants. Privitera's interpretation of Διόθεν was not convincing (see note on l. 7 Διόθεν), but a more serious objection is that there is no reason to boast on being second, even if this does not mean being second best in the contest.

κικκοδαῖη : since the MS variant κικκοδόταν and the emendations do not explain why most MSS have the otherwise unknown κικκοδαῖη, this *lectio difficilior* should be kept in the text if possible.

Interpreting κικκοδαῖης as 'ivy-burning' is theoretically possible (cf. ἡμιδαῖης, θεσπιδαῖης, πυρδαῖης, ταχυδαῖης), but does not give a plausible meaning. It seems better to take the word as 'ivy-knowing', but whether this means 'knowing the ivy' or 'taught by the ivy' is unclear. In the second interpretation the function of -δαῖης is roughly equivalent to the one in ἀντοδαῖης 'self-taught, knowing from themselves' (cf. Diagor. *PMG* 738, 3 ἀντοδαῖης ... ἀρετά; *S. Aj.* 700 ὀρχήματ' ἀντοδαῖη). See also Kirkwood 1982, 329: 'the word would mean "ivy-knowing", "whose knowledge is in the ivy", suggesting the Dionysiac κοφία celebrated in

Euripides' *Bacchae* and associated with the enthusiasm of the θίασος, in which the κίσσοσ has a prominent place'. The relationship between τελεταί, ὄργαι, initiations etc. and special knowledge is often stressed (cf. Pi. fr. 137; E. *Ba.* 72-73) and the connection between Dionysus and ivy is of course traditional (cf. Pi. *O.* 2, 27; Ar. *Th.* 988, Nonn. *D.* 12, 109 κίσσοφόρος; *h. Hom.* 26, 1 κίσσοκόμη; Pratin. *PMG* 708, 15 κίσσοχαίτ'; E. *Ph.* 651 κίσσοσ δὲν περιστεφής (ἐνώπιον); *AP* 9, 524, 11 κίσσοστέφανον; see also Blech 1982, 185-210). All these adjectives, however, refer to κίσσοσ as something external, as a decoration, and ivy is not known to induce an orgiastic state of mind. Nor is such a causal connection to be read into Honestus *Epigr. Gr.* 788 Kaibel (A.F.S. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Garland of Philip*, Cambridge 1968, I, 274 Text; II, 306-307 Comm.) κίσσοσ Τερψιχόρη, Βρομίω δ' ἔπρεψεν ὁ λωτός, / τῆι μὲν ἔνθεος ἦι, τῶι δ' ἔνα τερπνότερος. The κίσσοσ belongs with Dionysus, who is also ἔνθεος in his revels, but the latter is not caused by the former.

The other compounds ending in -δαής, where the first part indicates an aspect of the learning process or its results (ἀδαής, ἀρτυδαής, παλινδαής, πρωτοδαής), do not seem comparable, because they are mostly compounds based on adverbs.

Therefore it is perhaps safer to regard κίσσο- as the object of -δαής. This would be equivalent to the function of the first part of the compounds πανδαής (*Tz. H.* 4, 529), παντοδαής (*Epigr. ad D.L.* 9, 43) and perhaps ὀρθοδαής 'knowing the right things' (*A. Ag.* 1022), which may also be classed with the former category, meaning 'knowing in the right way'. Its meaning would be 'knowing the ivy', although it is rather flat.

10 τὸν Βρόμιον, τὸν Ἐριβόαν τε βροτοὶ καλέομεν : the alliteration is clearly audible and draws the attention to the description of the god. Alliteration may be a remnant of religious and magic formulas (J. Defradas, *Le rôle d' allitération dans la poésie grecque*, *REA* 60 [1958], 44), but then the function of the third β- word, βροτοὶ, does not fit. It seems to me that here the antithetical relationship between θεόν and βροτοὶ (see below on βροτοὶ) is emphasized because Βρόμιον and Ἐριβόαν are related semantically with θεόν and Βρόμιον is related aurally with βροτοὶ. For such 'aural interactions' and their function, see Silk 1974, 173-193.

τὸν... τόν : the repetition of τόν, despite the presence of τε, is reminiscent of cult language. Cf. fr. 75, 16 τότε; *Cat.* 63, 20; 21-25; E. *Ba.* 68; 83; 107; 116; 142; 152; 165.

Βρόμιον : cf. E. *Ba.* 87 τὸν Βρόμιον; *h. Hom.* 7, 56 ἐρίβρομον; 26, 1; Anacr. *PMG* 365; *Orph. H.* 49, 3 ἐρίβρεμέτης.

'**Ἐριβόαν** : Kaimio 1977, 154 discusses the different ἐρι-compounds in Pindar and ascribes great effect to such words in their context. It is surprising, however, that she takes fr. 6a(d) and 75, 10 as exceptions, calling them ornamental epithets. If normally ἐρι- makes very effective words, epithets are not to be excluded from this, especially when they are not very common. For one other occurrence cf. Simias *AP* 15, 27, 5 ἐριβόας Ἐρμᾶς. Cf. also A. fr. 355 μειξοβόαν ... διθύραμβον ... Διονύω.

βροτοί : the use of βροτοί is emphatic, opposed to l. 9 θεόν, because βροτός means 'mortal', not just 'man', see *LfrgE s.v.* It is not to be understood as a real opposition, as antagonism between god and man, but rather as a sign of reverence to Dionysus, whose divinity is thus stressed.

The omission of other gods or other names or epithets does not necessarily imply that mortals have another name for the god than the gods themselves, such as in fr. 33c, 4-6 ἄν τε βροτοί / Δᾶλον κυκλήρκοικιν, μάκαρες δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπω / τηλέφαντον κνανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον; *Il.* 1, 403-404 δν Βριάρεων καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δέ τε πάντες / Αἰγαίων; 2, 813-814; 14, 291; 20, 74; *Od.* 10, 305; 12, 61; *h. Hom.* 1, 21 (see Allen and Halliday 1936 *ad loc.*). Cf. also Pl. *Cra.* 391d and see M.L. West, *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford 1966, 386-388; Barkhuizen 1975, 101-103 on Pi. fr. 33c; Lehnus 1979, 152.

11-12 γόνον ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων μελπόμεν<οι> / γυναικῶν τε Καδμείων : cf. S. *Ant.* 1115-1118 πολυώνυμε, Καδμείας ἄγαλμα νύμφας / καὶ Διὸς βαρυβρεμέτα / γένος; *h. Hom.* 7, 56-57 εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ Διόνυκος ἐρίβρομος, δν τέκε μήτηρ / Καδμηῆς Σεμέλη Διὸς ἐν φιλόττη μιγεῖσα; 26, 2 Ζητὸς καὶ Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος ἀγλαὸν υἱόν; Hes. *Th.* 940-941 Καδμείη δ' ἄρα οἱ (Zeus) Σεμέλη τέκε φαίδιμον υἱὸν / μιχθεῖς ἐν φιλόττη, Διώνυσον πολυγηθέα.

The word γόνον is more abstract, and therefore more elevated than υἱόν, which explains Pindar's preference for it here, coupled with the majestic plural (see Dornseiff 1921, 19-21). Cf. *O.* 9, 76 Θέτιος γόνος; 6, 36 θεοῖο γόνον.

On the plural see Kühner-Gerth 1, 18-19 Anm. 2 and Schwyzer 2, 44-47. It was typical of poetic language as opposed to everyday language to use the plural, and this plural was therefore preferably called *pluralis poeticus* (Schwyzer) or *pluralis majesticus* (Kühner-Gerth). It fits well in the elevated style of hymns since its aim is to amplify a word or a name (see also Dornseiff 1921, 23-24). Cf. *O.* 9, 56 κοῦροι κορᾶν καὶ φερτάτων Κρουιδᾶν (Zeus); *I.* 5, 43 τοῖσιν Αἴγιον προφέρει στόμα πάτραν (Achilles); 8, 35a ἢ Διὸς παρ' ἀδελφοῖσιν (Poseidon). Other places adduced as comparable cases, such as S. *OT.* 1176 κτενεῖν υἱν τοὺς τεκόντας ἦν λόγος; *El.* 838 χρυσοδέτοις ἔρκεσι κρυφθέντα γυναικῶν, seem to me better explained as examples of the plural's general effect of abstraction and vagueness

(see also Schwyzer 2, 45-46 ζ and Barrett 1964 on E. *Hipp.* 797-798 οὐκ εἰς γέροντας ἦδε σοὶ τείνει τύχη, / Θησεῦ· νέοι θανόντες ἀλγύνουσί σε).

μὲν ... τε : following μὲν we often find a non-adversative particle. '(...) the contrast conveyed by μὲν and δέ may be so slight as hardly to be a contrast at all. It is therefore not surprising that, instead of δέ, we often find a particle expressing mere addition. The great majority of the examples are poetical' (Denniston 1954², 374). Cf. E. *Cyc.* 41-42 παῖ γενναίων μὲν πατέρων / γενναίων τ' ἐκ τοκάδων.

11 ὑπάτων ... πατέρων : cf. *O.* 13, 24-26 ὑπάτ' εὐρὺ ἀνάσσων / ... Ζεῦ πάτερ; *A. Ag.* 509 ὑπάτος ... Ζεῦς.

μελπόμεν<οι> : the correction is by Hermann 1824, 196. It ensures a close connection with the preceding lines, i.e. the subject of καλέομεν, whereas μέλπουμεν (Boeckh 1821, 575-579) would have to be connected with l. 8, πορευθέντ' ('on my way to sing'). Both could be possible metrically, but the lack of strophic respension precludes a clear-cut decision.

The verb μέλπω/-ομαι is more than just αἰείδω. In the first place μέλπω is singing *and* dancing (the recitative character of the Homeric hymns explains the exclusive use of αἰείδω there, cf. *h. Hom.* 2, 1; 9, 8; 11, 1; 12, 1; 16, 1 etc.). In the second place Pindar generally adheres to the verb's original religious colouring (see K. Bielowlawek, Μέλπεται und μολπή. Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der antiken Homerischen Bedeutungslehre, *WS* 44 [1924/25], 1-18, 125-145, 45 [1926/27], 1-11 and V. Magnien, Origines de la langue poétique grecque, *Société Toulousaine d'études classiques. Mélanges* 1 [1946], 23-33, esp. 28). Three of the four other places where he uses μέλπομαι have one or more deities as their object (*P.* 3, 78; 90; *Pae.* 6, 17), the exception is *N.* 1, 20 where the object is Chromios. Where αἰείδω is used transitively, the object is only once divine: Leto and Artemis in fr. 89a, 3. In the other ten cases it is used of mortal victors, the games, minor deities such as Aegina, Cyrene etc.

12 γυναικῶν τε Καδμείων : cf. fr. 70b, 27-30; *h. Hom.* 7, 57 Καδμηϊς Σεμέλη; *S. Ant.* 1115 Καδμεία ... νύμφας.

Following this clause some MSS have Σεμέλην, which is certainly a gloss. It ought to have been Σεμέλης anyway. On such interpolations see e.g. C.G. Cobet, *Novae Lectiones*, Leiden 1858, 640-641; R. Merkelbach, Zwei Euripidesinterpolationen, *RhM* 97 (1954), 373-375; R. Merkelbach, Interpolierte Eigennamen, *ZPE* 1 (1967), 100-102; Kirkwood 1982, 329-330; Barrett 1964 on E. *Hipp.* 72 and 1403; Kannicht 1969 on E. *Hel.* 679 and cf. also *Pi. O.* 7, 49 ὁ μὲν ... {Ζεῦς}; 10, 25 ἐκτίσσατο ν.λ. ἐκτ(ι)καθ' Ἡρακλέης).

Instead of Σεμέλην MS P has ἔμολον. Boeckh, Schroeder, Snell and Maehler omit the word altogether, while Turyn and Bowra have kept ἔμολον. They probably take it as a one-word clause, 'I have come', preceding l. 13. The expression is not unusual, cf. *O.* 14, 18 ἀείδων ἔμολον; *I.* 5, 21 σὺν Χάρισιν δ' ἔμολον and the other places mentioned on l. 7 με. However, the verb is not necessary. The connection between the preceding lines and the description of spring is made well enough by ἔμ', so that ἔμολον must be considered as a consequence of the gloss Σεμέλην.

13-19 For this description of the spring time as an argument for the City Dionysia as the festival of performance, see Introduction 2.4; Wilamowitz 1921, 311; Puech 1923, 151 and Van Groningen 1955, 192.

13 ἐναργέα : 'clear, distinct'. Μάντις seems to imply that the 'clear signs' are given by a divine source, as in an oracle, cf. *A. Pr.* 663 ἐναργῆς βάξις ἦλθεν Ἰνάχωι. Cf. also *Pl. Ti.* 72b σήμερις ἐναργέστερα; *P. Oxy.* 2624, 1, 8-9]αϛ θεὸς αὐτίκα καμή[ια / ἐ]ναργέα θεσπεσίω [. There are two other 'divine' words in this scene, l. 15 νεκάρεια and l. 16 ἀμβρόταν.

ἔμ' ὥτε μάντιν : 'me like a seer', 'as if I were a seer' stresses the distinction between the μάντις and the προφάτας. 'Etymologically, προφήτης means "announcer", "proclaimer", esp. of a divine will or message. The μάντις could himself announce what he had received and became, in this case, a προφήτης but usually the functions seem to have been separated, as in Delphi where the προφήτης was a priest, though the Pythia was sometimes called προφήτης, the official title being προμάντις' (Tigerstedt 1970, 173-174; see also Radt 1966, 60). Cf. also fr. 94a, 5-6 μάντις ὡς τελέσσω / ἱεραπόλος; fr. 150 μαντεύο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύω δ' ἐγώ; *Pl. Ti.* 72b. Pindar is the προφάτας (*Pae.* 6, 6), the κάρυξ (fr. 70b, 24, see my note *ad loc.*). See also Dodds 1951, 82.

ὥτε : the Doric form, adopted by the editors of Pindar when it has a comparative meaning. The consecutive use is reflected by the epic spelling ὥστε (see Ruijgh 1971, 981-983). Whether this division in forms is authentic or introduced by scribes and editors, is difficult to decide (see J.L. García-Ramón, ὥτε und ὥστε bei Alkman und Pindar, *MSS* 46 [1985], 81-101).

οὐ λαμβάνει : a case of litotes, cf. fr. 81, 2-3.

14 φοινικοἰάνων ... Ὀρᾶν : φοινικοἰάνος 'purpurgewandet' was restored by Koch 1851, 734 and accepted by Renehan 1975, 200. Cf. Porson's conjecture φοινικείμενος in Epich. fr. 45 Kaibel.

The adjective evokes an abundant Greek springtime where all flowers seem to burst into bloom at the same time, thus providing a most colourful spectacle. (so also Fogelmark 1972, 25). For spring in Greece see E. Irwin, *The Crocus*

and the Rose, in: D.E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, Chico 1984, 152 and n. 24. Cf. *I.* 3/4, 36b χθών ... φοινικέοισιν ἀνθήσεν ῥόδοις; *P.* 4, 64 φοινικανθέμου ἦρος. Spring is also mentioned and/or described in fr. 70c, 19 and fr. 70d (c).

Cf. Etym. Angel. (Ritschl, *Opusc.* I, 685) εἶαρ· τὸ αἶμα παρὰ τὸ ῥόδον ὅτι φοινικοῦν. καὶ Πίνδαρος ‘φοινικέας’ τὰς ὥρας ἐκάλεσεν. πολὺ γὰρ τὸ ῥόδον τῷ ἔαρ. καὶ τὸ πολὺ δὲ ῥόδον ἔαρ καλοῦμεν, trying to explain the relationship between the homonyms ἔαρ/εἶαρ by the red colour that is common to both.

The Ὠραι are goddesses of the seasons, of vegetation, cf. *Pi. O.* 13, 17 Ὠραι πολυάνθεμοι.

ὀπότ’ : the indicative ἐπάγοισιν indicates that ὀπότ’ introduces an indirect question: ‘clear signs (to show) when spring...’ ‘Whenever, every year when’ would require ὀπόταν, or at least a subjunctive.

οιχθέντος Ὠρᾶν θαλάμου : cf. *Alc.* fr. 296b, 3-4 Voigt ὡς γὰρ ὁ <ε>{[[γ]οιτ’ ἔαρὸς πύλ[αι / ἀμβ]ροσίας ὁσδόμενοι[]αἰς ὑπαμ[ε]; *Aristid.* 46, 25 (II, p. 370, 8 Keil) where Corinth is called θάλαμον Ὠρᾶν, ὡς πάντα τὸν χρόνον ἐγκάθηται καὶ ὄθεν προσέρχονται ἀνοιγνύσαι τὰς πύλας; *Lucr.* 1, 10 *nam simul ac species patefactast verna diei.*

15 εὐδομον ἐπάγοισιν ἔαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεια : a neuter plural subject with a plural verb is irregular (see Kühner-Gerth 1, 64-66; Schwyzer 2, 607). The reason for the plural here must be its metrical convenience and to make clear which is subject and which is object. The following vowel then made the poet choose for the Aeolic, or more specifically, Lesbian (Buck 1955², 346) ending with a ν, instead of the more regular Doric ending in -οιτι (see Verdier 1972, 58-61; Gerber 1982, 64).

εὐδομον ... ἔαρ : cf. *Simon. PMG* 597 ἔαρὸς ἀδυνόδμου. Even though ‘sweet-smelling’ may be a standard epithet of spring, it seems that that smell is the result of just these nectarous plants, so that εὐδομον is perhaps also to be understood as predicative, ‘so that it becomes ever more sweet-smelling’.

φυτὰ νεκτάρεια : ‘nectarous’ in the sense of ‘fragrant’ is already found in *Homer*, cf. *Il.* 3, 385 νεκταρέου ἔανου; 18, 25 νεκταρέω χιτῶν. This sense agrees well with εὐδομον ἔαρ. Cf. *Theoc.* 17, 29 νέκταρος εὐδόμοιο. Its derivation from νέκταρ and the close vicinity of ἀμβρόταν (l. 16) give it, however, a stronger meaning, indicating that nature, constantly rejuvenating itself, is immortal and divine.

The Greeks, when trying to imagine what nectar was like, thought mainly of wine or honey. For wine cf. *Il.* 1, 598 οἰνοχόει γλυκὺ νέκταρ ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων; 4, 3; *Od.* 5, 93 κέρασσε δὲ νέκταρ ἐρυθρόν; *h. Hom.* 2, 49 νέκταρος

ἡδυνότοιο; 3, 10 νέκταρ ἔδωκε πατήρ δέπαι χρυσεῖω; Moero *AP* 6, 119. For honey cf. *E. Ba.* 143 μελισσᾶν νέκταρι; Antiphilus *AP* 9, 404, 8 αἰθερίου πτηναὶ νέκταρος ἐργάτιδες; Apollonides *AP* 6, 239, 5-6 εὐὲ δὲ μελιχροῦ / νέκταρος ἐμπλή-
 ραις κηροπαγεῖς θαλάμας; Verg. *G.* 4, 163-164 *aliae purissima mella / stipant et liquido distendunt nectare cellas*. For a combination of these cf. Ath. 2, 38f διὸ καὶ τὸ καλούμενον νέκταρ κατασκευάζειν τινὰς περὶ τὸν Λυδίας Ὀλυμπον οἶνον καὶ κηρία κυγκρινάντας εἰς ταῦτά καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀνθῶν εὐώδη. Because the text is about flowers, the nectar is here probably to be equated with honey. See also W.H. Roscher, *Nektar und Ambrosia*, Leipzig 1883.

For spring and honey cf. Apollonides *AP* 6, 239, 3 ἀμβροσίω ἔαρος κηρῶν μέλι πολλὸν ἀμέλας.

16-17 When nature, prompted by the advent of spring, decks itself with flowers, so do the Athenians, decorating their city (ἐπ' ἀμβρόταν χθόν') and themselves (κόμαισι) with violets and roses.

16 τότε ... τότε : see note on l. 10 τὸν ... τὸν.

βάλλεται : for the *σχῆμα* Πινδαρικόν see note on fr. 70b, 8 *κατάρχει*.

ἀμβρόταν : see on l. 15 φυτὰ νεκτάρεια. Cf. *Corp. Herm.* 18, 11 τὰ τῶν φυτῶν ἀμβροσιωδέστατα; fr. adesp. *PMG* 926a, 1 ποικίλων ἀνθέων ἀμβροτοὶ λείμακες.

17 ἴων φόβαι : the primary meaning of φόβη is 'lock' or 'curl of hair', but it is frequently used in the sense of 'foliage, leafage' (*LSJ s.v.*). Here the primary meaning may be hinted at through κόμαισι.

The ἴον is the most frequently mentioned flower in Pindar. While the rose is mentioned three times (*I.* 3/4, 36b; fr. 70d[c], 2; fr. 75, 18) and the crocus and the hyacinth once each (fr. 70d[c], 3), the violet (including compounds) is found eight times (fr. 30, 7; fr. 75, 6; *O.* 6, 55; fr. 75, 17; *P.* 1, 1; *O.* 6, 30; *I.* 7, 23; fr. 76, 1). It is not certain which of the flowers that we know is its equivalent; Theophrastus writes that the ἴον τὸ λευκόν (*Matthiola incana*) is the first flower to appear (cf. also Plin. *NH.* 21, 11, 38 cited on l. 6 ἰοδέτων ... στεφάνων). It depends on the climate whether it appears when it is still winter, or after the onset of spring. Later, after narcissus and anemone, and at the same time as gold-flower and hyacinth, the μέλαν ἴον (*Viola odorata*) comes, finally followed by the rose, the last of the spring flowers (Thphr. *HP* 6, 8, 1). The connection with the rose in l. 17 would favour the μέλαν ἴον, but elsewhere Theophrastus says (6, 8, 2) that the μέλαν ἴον blooms throughout the year if it receives tendance, so that it has no place in our spring fragment. We could try and find arguments for either one in the use that was made of them in wreaths (cf. l. 6 ἰοδέτων ... στεφάνων), but that does not help much: the ἴον τὸ λευκόν is mentioned by Theophrastus (6, 8, 1) as one of the favourite flowers for wreaths, but Theoc. 10, 28-29 says καὶ

τὸ ἴον μέλαν ἐστὶ, καὶ ἅ γραπτὰ ὑάκινθος / ἄλλ' ἔμπαρ ἐν τοῖς στεφάνοις τὰ πρῶτα λέγονται. See Cook 1900, 8 and M. Schuster, *RE s.v. Veilchen* (esp. 594-596) for more places of evidence and a more elaborate discussion.

ρόδα τε κόμαισι μείγνυται : on rose wreaths cf. Simon. *PMG* 506, 1-2 τίς δὴ τῶν νῦν τοσάδ' ἢ πετάλοισι μύρτων / ἢ στεφάνοισι ρόδων ἀνεδήκατο; Stesich. *PMG* 187, 2-3 πολλὰ δὲ μύρσινα φύλλα / καὶ ροδίονους στεφάνους ἴων τε κορωνίδας σύλας; Apact. *PMG* 434 στεφάνους ... ροδίονους; *AP* 13, 28, 3-4 ρόδων ἀώτοις / ... ἐκκίασαν λιπαρὰν ἔθειραν; Philostr. *Im.* 1, 15, 2 τὴν κεφαλὴν ρόδοις ἀνθίσας ἔρχεται ... ὁ Διόνυσος.

18-19 For dancing and flute-music cf. *P.* 10, 38-39 πανταῖ δὲ χοροὶ παρθένων / λυρᾶν τε βοαὶ καναχαὶ τ' αὐλῶν δονεοῦνται; *Ag. Nu.* 311-313 cited on fr. 70c, 19; for song and flute cf. *O.* 10, 84 μολπὰ πρὸς κάλαμον ἀντιάξει μελέων; *N.* 3, 79 πόμ' αἰοίδιμον Αἰολίσσιν ἐν πνοαῖσιν αὐλῶν; fr. 94b, 11-15 ὕμνήσω ... / κειρήνα δὲ κόμπου / αὐλίσκων ὑπὸ λατίνων / μιμήσομ' αἰοδαῖς; *AP* 13, 28, 7-8 εὖ δ' ἐτιθηεῖτο γλυκερὰν ὅσα Δωρῖοις Ἀριστων / Ἀργεῖος ἡδὺ πνεῦμα χέων καθαρῶς ἐν αὐλοῖς.

18 ἀχεῖ τ' ὄμφαί μελέων σὺν αὐλοῖς : the grammatical construction does not indicate a predominance of one above the other, but is quite neutral, just as Pindar elsewhere uses simple copulative conjunctions (*P.* 10, 38), prepositions (*O.* 5, 19 ἐν; 94b, 14 ὑπὸ) or words such as *συμμεῖξαι* (*O.* 3, 8), *κοινάομαι* (*N.* 3, 10), *κοιναῖα* (*P.* 1, 97). Yet the predominance of the lyrics over the music seems to be an accepted fact (R.W.B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation*, Oxford 1962, 95; Kaimio 1977, 147; Zimmermann 1986, 152) and several other authors offer support for this view, cf. Pratin. *PMG* 708, 6-7 τὰν αἰοιδᾶν κατέετασε Πιερίς βασιλείαν· ὁ δ' αὐλὸς / ὕπερον χορευέτω; *Pi. O.* 2, 1 ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι (with J. van Leeuwen, 1964 *ad loc.*, who explains that ἀναξι- has a strong active sense, as in *B.* 20, 8 ἀναξίαλος Ποσειδᾶν, 17, 65-66 Κρόνιος ... / ἀναξιβρέντας, 6, 10-11 ἀναξιμόλπου / Οὐρανίας). *P.* 1, 1-4 χρυσέα φόρμιγγς, ... πείθονται δ' αἰοῖδοι ... ὁπότεν προσιμίων ἀμβολὰς τεύχης ἐλελιζομένα does not refute this, because in *P.* 1 'the lyre and its effect (...) are the main concern of the poet, and consequently the chief emphasis is upon the role it plays in the performance. At the same time there is nothing in these lines to suggest that the words should be completely subservient to the music' (Burton 1962, 95).

ἀχεῖ : for the singular see on fr. 70b, 8 *κατάρχη*.

As far as we know ὄμφαί as the subject of ἀχεῖ is exceptional. The songs are more often the object of ἤχεω, cf. *A. Th.* 868-869 ὕμνον ... / ἤχεῖν; *E. Ion* 883-884 ἀχεῖ / ... ὕμνους.

ὄμφαι : in Homer ὄμφη is only used of the voice of a god, cf. *Il.* 20, 129 τὰῦτα θεῶν ἐκ πεύσεται ὄμφης; *Od.* 3, 215 ἐπιεπόμενοι θεοῦ ὄμφῃ. This includes oracles and dreams, cf. *Il.* 2, 41; Thgn. 808. Besides this use (as in fr. 70b, 29 Δ[ιὸς]c ... ὀ]μφᾶν, see my note *ad loc.*) Pindar uses the word only in musical contexts (Slater *Lex. s.v.*) and considering the divine origin of music and poetry this should not surprise us. Cf. fr. 152 μελιεσσέουσιν κηρίων ἐμὰ γλυκερώτερος ὄμφα; *Pae.* 3, 94 αὐλῶν ὄμφαν; *N.* 10, 33-35; *Pae.* 5, 48; *B.* 14, 13 φόρμιγγος ὄμφα. In tragedy we also find ὄμφη as 'voice, sound' in a more general sense.

μελέων : one of the many synonyms Pindar had at his disposal for 'song' (see Rudberg 1970 [1945], 268 and Gianotti 1975, 85). The meaning of μέλος itself is not restricted to 'song'; it can also be the 'music to which a song is set, tune' or the 'melody of an instrument' (LSJ *s.v.* B). Cf. *P.* 12, 19 αὐλῶν πάμφωνον μέλος; fr. adesp. *PMG* 947b ἤρξατο τερπνοτάτων μελέων ὁ καλλιβόας πολύχορδος αὐλός, if μελέων refers to the melody of the flute. Although here it is clearly used as 'song', the position of μελέων between ὄμφαι and αὐλοῖς may point to this wider range.

19 οἶχνεῖ τε Σεμέλαν ἐλικάμπυκα χοροί : on οἶχνέω with an object accusative see on l. 5. Similar constructions with a personal accusative are *I.* 2, 48 ξείνον ἐμόν ... ἔλθης; *S. Ph.* 141 ἐδ' ... ἐλήλυθεν; *E. Hipp.* 1371 ὀδύνα μ' ... βαίνει.

For the *σχήμα* Πινδαρικόν see on fr. 70b, 8 κατάρχει.

ἐλικάμπυκα : cf. *Pae.* 3, 15 θεᾶς θ' ἐλικάμπυκ[ος] (perhaps Selene, suggested by Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part V*, London 1908, 88; Schroeder 1923², 532); *B.* 9, 62-63 ἐλικοστέφα[νον] / κ[ο]ύραν.

'Her head wreathed with a circlet', or 'wearing an intertwined diadem', in which case ἐλικ- would have a double function, both indicating the intertwining of the metal thus forming the circlet and the encircling of the head.

᾽Ω ταῖ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ αἰοίδιμοι,
Ἐλλάδος ἔρει-
μα, κλειναὶ Ἀθᾶναι, δαιμόνιον ποτολιεθρον.

Test. Ar. *Eq.* 1329 ὦ ταῖ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ ἀριζήλωτοι Ἀθῆναι et Σ 1329b ἀπὸ Πινδάρου παρωδῆται | Σ Ar. *Ach.* 637 ἰοστέφανους· παρὰ τὰ ἐκ τῶν Πινδάρου διθυράμβων· αἱ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι Ἀθῆναι | Σ Ar. *Nub.* 299b λιπαρὰν· εὐθαλίη, τὴν πᾶσι κομῶσαν. καὶ Πίνδαρος· ὦ ταῖ λιπαραὶ καὶ αἰοίδιμοι, Ἐλλάδος ἔρεισμα, κλειναὶ Ἀθῆναι | *Aeschin. Ep.* 4, 2 Blass ἐν γούν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις Μελανώπου ἐκάστοτε ἀκούεις λέγοντος, ὦ ταῖ λιπαραὶ καὶ αἰοίδιμοι Ἐλλάδος ἔρεισμα Ἀθᾶναι, καὶ ὅτι Πινδάρου τοῦ Θηβαίου τὸ ἔπος τοῦτό ἐστι | Σ *Aristid.* 3, 341 Dind. τὸ δὲ ἔρεισμα πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι καὶ Πίνδαρος δὲ φησιν· ἔρεισμα Ἀθῆνας δαιμόνιον ποτολιεθρον | Σ *Call. fr.* 7, 20-22 Pf. p. 19 ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦς Ἑλληνας Ἀθηναίους εἴρηκεν. ὄν τρόπον καὶ Πίνδαρος· Ἐλλάδος ἔρεισμα Ἀθῆναι | *Eust.* 284, 4 ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἄλλως πολὺ τὸ σεμνὸν αἰ· Ἀθῆναι πάλαι ποτὲ εἶχον, δηλοῖ καὶ ὁ εἰπὼν τὰς Ἀθῆνας Ἐλλάδος Μουσεῖον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Πίνδαρος Ἐλλάδος αὐτὰς ἔρεισμα καλέσας | *Plu. glor. Ath.* 7 p. 350a ταῦτα τὴν πόλιν ἦρεν εἰς δόξαν, ταῦτ' εἰς μέγεθος· ἐπὶ τούτοις Πίνδαρος ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἐλλάδος προσέειπε τὰς Ἀθῆνας | *Plu. aporoth. Lac.* p. 232e Πινδάρου δὲ γράψαντος Ἐλλάδος ἔρεισμα Ἀθῆναι· Λάκων ἔφη καταπεσεῖν ἀν τὴν Ἐλλάδα ὀχουμένην ἐρείσεται τοιοῦτω | *Isoct. Or.* 15, 166 ἔτι δὲ δεινότερον, εἰ Πίνδαρον μὲν τὸν ποιητὴν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν γεγονότες ὑπὲρ ἐνὸς μόνου βήματος, ὅτι τὴν πόλιν ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἐλλάδος ὠνόμασεν, οὕτως ἐτίμησαν ὥστε καὶ πράξενον πησάσθαι καὶ δωρεὰν μυρίας αὐτῶν δοῦναι δραχμάς, ἔμοι δὲ πολὺ πλεῖω καὶ κάλλιον ἐγκεκωμμάκоти καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς προγόνους μῆδ' ἀσφαλῶς ἐγγένοιτο καταβῶναι τὸν ἐπίλοιπον χρόνον | *Dionysius Phaselites in Σ Pi. P.* 2 inscr. (2, 31, 14 *Drachmann*) ἀτύκτα γούν Διονύσιος ὁ Φασηλίτης οὐκ οἶεται δεῖν γράφειν τῶν λιπαρῶν ἀπὸ Θηβῶν, ἀλλὰ τῶν λιπαρῶν ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων διὰ τὸ Παναθηναϊκὸν εἶναι τὸν ἐπίπικον· καταφέρεσθαι γὰρ πως τὸν Πίνδαρον εἰς τὸ τὰ Ἀθῆνας λιπαρὰς προσαγορεύειν, τὰς δὲ Θήβας χρυσαρμάτους καὶ ἐβαρμάτους καὶ λευκίππους καὶ κινανάμπυκας | *Lucianus Dem. Enc.* 10 τί γὰρ οὐ μέγα τῶν Δημοσθένει καὶ λαμπρὸν ἢ τύχη προσῆψε; τί δ' οὐ γνώριμον; οὐκ Ἀθῆναι μὲν αὐτῶν πατρίς, αἱ λιπαραὶ καὶ αἰοίδιμοι καὶ τῆς Ἐλλάδος ἔρεισμα; | *Aristid.* 1, 9 (1, 11, 4 L.-B.) πρόκειται (sc. Attica) γὰρ ἀντ' ἄλλου φυλακτηρίου τῆς Ἐλλάδος τὴν γυγνομένην τάξιν ἔχουσα πρώτη πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα, προμήκης εἰς τὸ πέλαγος, καὶ μάλ' ἐναργῆς συμβαλεῖν, ὅτι τῆς Ἐλλάδος ἐστὶν ἔρισμα ὑπὸ τῶν κρειττόνων πεποιημένον (ἔρισμα: u et ex parte μ. i. fas. Ba, fuit ἔρεισμα?, L.-B.) | *Aristid.* 1, 401 (1, 136, 20 L.-B.) τὸ τῆς σοφίας πρυναιεῖον καὶ τὴν τῆς Ἐλλάδος ἐστίαν καὶ τὸ ἔρεισμα καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα εἰς τὴν πόλιν (Athenae) ἤδετο | *Aristid.* 2, 13 (p. 20, 14 Keil) τοῦ γένους ἔρεισμα ἢ πόλις (Athenae) ἤδετο | *Ath.* 5, 187d (1 p. 418, 7 *Kaibel*) τὴν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν, τὸ τῆς Ἐλλάδος μουσεῖον, ἦν ὁ μὲν Πίνδαρος Ἐλλάδος ἔρεισμα ἔφη | *Philostr. Im.* 2, 12, 4 (p. 358, 25 *Kayser*; p. 85, 19 *Semin. Vindobona. Sodales*) ἐξ Ὑμεττοῦ τάχα ἦκουσι (sc. μέλιτται) καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λιπαρῶν καὶ αἰοιδίμων· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο οἶμαι αὐτὰς ἐνστάξαι Πινδάρω | *Iul. Or.* 1, 6 (p. 19, 22 *Bidez*) καλὸν ἴσως ἐνταῦθα καὶ τῶν αἰοιδίμων Ἀθηναίων μνησθῆναι | *Lib. Decl.* 1, 79 (V p. 57, 15 *Foerster*) τῶν δ' (sc. Πινδάρω) ὅτι τῆς Ἐλλάδος ἢ πόλις ἔρεισμα προσερρήθη, λόγους ἔργους ἀμειβόμενοι | *Lib. Decl.* 17, 26 (VI p. 206, 2 *Foerster*) καὶ γένηται τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἀδεῖν περὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἀδὴ καὶ ἦσαν ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἐλλάδος τὴν πόλιν καλέσαντες | *Him. Or.* 62, 2 (p. 224, 11 *Colonna*)

καὶ μοι δοκῶ καὶ τῆς Πινδάρου λύρας λαβὼν μέλος ἐκείθεν εἰς αὐτὴν ἀναφθέγγασθαι, εἰ καὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος μὲν εἰπεῖν ἔρεισμα μικρὸν, ὅπερ εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἦμεται Πινδάρῳ | Damascius, Vita Isidori apud Phot. *Bibl.* 341b, 37 Bekker (Σουπτηριανός) ... ὕστερον ἐν ταῖς λιπαραῖς καὶ αὐιδίμοις Ἀθήναις ἀντηγορεύετο σοφιστῆς | Suda s.v. Σουπτηριανός' ... ἀλλὰ μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐν ταῖς λιπαραῖς καὶ αὐιδίμοις Ἀθήναις ἀντηγορεύετο σοφιστῆς | Vita Pind. Ambr. (1, 1, 15 Drachmann) ἔρεισμα δὲ τῆς Ἑλλάδος εἰπὼν Ἀθήνας (fr. 76) ἐξημιώθη ὑπὸ Θηβαίων χιλίαις δραχμαῖς ἄς ἐξέτιςαν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ Ἀθηναῖοι | Vita Pind. Thomana (1, 5, 17 Drachmann) ἐχθρωδῶς δὲ διακειμένων τῶν Ἀθηναίων πρὸς τοὺς Θηβαίους, ἐπεὶ εἶπεν ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασιν 'ὦ ταὶ λιπαραὶ καὶ μεγαλοπόλιες Ἀθᾶναι' ἐξημιώσαν αὐτὸν χρήμασι Θηβαῖοι, ἄτερ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἔτισαν Ἀθηναῖοι || Eust. *Prooem.* 28 (3, 300, 9 Drachmann) ἐχθρὰ δέ, φάσι, φρονούντων ἀλλήλους Ἀθηναίων καὶ Θηβαίων, ἐπεὶ ἔγραψέ που 'ὦ ταὶ λιπαραὶ καὶ μεγαλοπόλιες Ἀθᾶναι', κατὰ δέ τινας ἐπεὶ ἔρεισμα Ἑλλάδος ἔφη τὰς Ἀθήνας, ἐξημιώσαν αὐτὸν Θηβαῖοι χιλίαις δραχμαῖς, ἄς ἐξέτιςαν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ Ἀθηναῖοι ὡς φιλαπτικῶς | Tzetzes ad Hes. *Op.* 412 (Poetae Graeci Minores II 1823 p. 269 Gaisford) ὁμοίως καὶ Πινδαρος χιλίαις δραχμαῖς ἐξέτιςε Θηβαῖους, ὅτι τὰς Ἀθήνας Ἑλλάδος γεγράφηκεν ἔρεισμα

1 ὦ ταὶ Ar. *Eq.*, Σ Ar. *Nu.*, Aeschin. cod. f, Vita Pind. Thom. (Eust.), Eust. *Prooem.*: ὦ τε Aeschin. codd. a, m; αἴτε Aeschin. codd. B, V; αἰ Σ Ar. *Ach.*, Luc. | λιπαραὶ Ar., Σ Ar., Aeschin., (Dion. Phas.), Luc., (Philostr.), (Damascius), (Suda), Vita Pind. Thom. (Eust.), Eust. *Prooem.*: λιπαραὶ Aeschin. cod. m; ὦ ταλαίπωροι Vita. Pind. Thom. codd. E, H, K, Q; ὦ ταλαίπωροι Θῆβαι Vita Pind. Thom. cod. b ex recce. | ἰοχτέφανοι Ar. *Eq.*, Σ Ar. *Ach.* | αὐιδίμοι Σ Ar. *Nu.*, Aeschin., Luc., (Philostr.), (Iul.), (Damascius), (Suda): δίδυμοι Aeschin. codd. f, a²; δίδυμα Aeschin. cod. m; διδύμα Aeschin. cod. a¹; ἀριζήλωτοι Ar. *Eq.* | 2 Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα Σ Ar. *Nu.*, Σ Call., Eust., Plu. 232e, Ath., Tzetzes: τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα Luc., Lib. 1, 79, Him.; τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἔρυμα Aristid. 1, 9; ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος Plu. 350a, Isocr., Lib. 17, 26, Vita Pind. Ambr.; Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμ' Aeschin.; Ἑλλάδος om. Σ Aristid.; τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐστὶν καὶ τὸ ἔρεισμα Aristid. 1, 401; τοῦ γένους ἔρεισμα Aristid. 2, 13 | 3 κλειναὶ Σ Ar. *Nu.* | Ἀθᾶναι Aeschin. codd. a², f, B, V, Vita Pind. Thom. codd. Q, Q^p; Ἀθῆναι Ar., Σ Ar., Aeschin., Σ Aristid. cod. a¹, Σ Call., Plu. 232e, Vita Pind. Thom. codd. E, H, K, Eust., v, Eust. *Prooem.*; Ἀθήνας Σ Aristic.; Ἀθήνα Aeschin. cod. m;)Aqhnaí/wn Σ Aristid. cod. D | δαυμόνιον πολλιεθρον Σ Aristid.

O you, brilliant and violet-crowned and celebrated in song,
bulwark of Greece, famous Athens, divine city.

Fr. 77

(ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ)

ὄθι παῖδες Ἀθηναίων ἐβάλλοντο φαεινῶν
κρηπίδ' ἐλευθερίας

Test. Plu. glor. Ath. 7, p. 350a Πίνδαρος ἔρευμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος (fr. 76) προσεῖπε τὰς Ἀθήνας, οὐχ ὅτι ταῖς Φρυγίχου τραγωιδίας καὶ Θέσπιδος ὄρθον τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἀλλ' ὅτι πρῶτον, ὡς φησιν αἰτός, 'παῖδες - ἐλευθερίας' | **Plu. de sera num. vind.** 6, p. 552b ἄρ' οὐκ ἂν ἀπωλώεσαν ἤμιν οἱ Μαραθῶνες οἱ Εὐρυμέδοντες τὸ καλὸν Ἀρτεμίσιον, 'ὄθι - ἐλευθερίας' | **Plu. de Herod. malign.** 34, p. 867c ὁ μὲν Πίνδαρος, οὐκ ὦν συμμαχῶν πόλεως ἀλλὰ μηδίζεν αἰτίαν ἐχούσης, ὅμως τοῦ Ἀρτεμίσίου μνησθεὶς ἐπιπεφώνηκεν 'ὄθι - ἐλευθερίας' | **IV Plu. Them.** 8, 2 ὁ δὲ καὶ Πίνδαρος οὐ κακῶς ἔοικε κυνιδῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν Ἀρτεμισίῳ μάχης εἰπεῖν 'ὄθι - ἐλευθερίας'. ἀρχὴ γὰρ οὕτως τοῦ νικᾶν τὸ θαρρεῖν | **Aristid.** 3, 238 (1, 373, 10 L-B.) καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἐπ' Ἀρτεμίσιον πλεύσας δυοῖν ναυμαχίαις δύο ἕσται τρόπαια, οὐτε λόγους ἀσχήμονας εἰπὼν οἶμαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐμπλέοντας Ἀθηναίων ἢ τῶν Ἑλλήνων αὐτε ἔργα φαῖλα ἀποδειξάμενος, ἀλλ', ὡς φησι Πίνδαρος, κρηπίδα τῆς ἐλευθερίας τοῖς Ἕλλησι βαλλόμενος | **Michael Acominat.** (= Michael Choniates) 1, 232, 19 **Lampros** ἔσται τῶι τοσοῦτω κακῶι, ἀδούλωτον φρόνημα καὶ χεῖρα γενναίαν κρηπίδα τῆς ἐλευθερίας βαλλόμενος | **Michael Acominat.** (= Michael Choniates) 2, 195, 8 **Lampros** διὰ τοῦ μεταξύ καὶ Ἐρετριέων καὶ τοῦ καλοῦ Ἀρτεμίσίου πελάγους, ἐνθα κατὰ Πίνδαρον φαεινὴν ἐλευθερίας κρηπίδα ἐβάλλοντο Ἕλλητες

1 ὄθι Plu. 552b, 867c cod. B, *Them.* Steph.: ὅτι Plu. 867c Ald., *Them.* codd.; ὡς οἱ Plu. 867c cod. E; om. Plu. 350a | Ἀθηναίων Boeckh 1821: Ἀθηναίων Plu. | ἐβάλλοντο Plu. 350a, 552b, 867c Steph., *Them.*: ἐβάλλοντο Plu. 867c codd. E, B (βαλλόμενος *Aristid.* codd. T, Q, E, U; *Mich. Acom.* 1, 232, 19 cod. H, *Tafel*: βαλλόμενος *Aristid.* codd. V, A, R, a; *Mich. Acom.* 1, 232, 19; βουλόμενος *Aristid.* cod. M) | φαεινῶν Plu. 350a Boeckh, 552b, 867c cod. E, *Them.*: φαεινῶν Plu. 350a codd., *Mich. Acom.* 2, 195, 8; φαεινῶν Plu. 867c cod. B; om. *Aristid.* | 2 κρηπίδ' Plu. 867c cod. B, *Mich. Acom.* 1, 232, 19 codd., *Tafel*, *Mich. Acom.* 2, 195, 8 cod., *Bergk* 1878⁴; κρηπίδ' Plu. 350a, 552b, 867c cod. E, *Them.*, *Aristid.*

(at Artemisium)

where the sons of the Athenians laid down the radiant
basis of freedom.

Tradition

Plutarch quotes part of fr. 76 (*glor. Ath.* 7, p. 350a), and continues to say that the very complimentary text is justified by Pindar himself (fr. 77) ὅτι πρῶτον, ὡς ... ἐλευθερίας. This formulation makes it likely that both fragments belong to one poem. The scholiast on *Ar. Ach.* 637 makes it clear that the poem was a dithyramb, and the contents ensure that it was written for the city of Athens.

Contents

Several sources mention that the Athenians were so happy to be called ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος that they rewarded Pindar lavishly by granting him the title of πρόξενος and giving him a sum of ten thousand drachmas (*Isocr. Or.* 15, 166). They gave him a statue besides (*Paus.* 1, 8, 4; *Aeschin. Ep.* 4, 2). They also paid the fine which was exacted from him by the Thebans who were angry at the fact that their political enemies were praised by a Theban poet, (*Aeschin. Ep.* 4, 2; *Vita Ambr.* 3, 1, 16 Dr.; *Vita Thomana* 3, 5, 17 Dr.; *Eust. Prooem.* 3, 300, 9 Dr.).

It is impossible to reconstruct what really happened at the time. There may of course be some truth in the story (see also Wilamowitz 1922, 273), but such anecdotes must not be taken at face-value (see M.R. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, London 1981, VII-X). Cf. also the certainly untrue detail mentioned by Libanius (fr. 49) that the Thebans even stoned Pindar and declared war on Athens, which was apparently used as a topic for an oratory exercise.

For another very flattering opening to an Athenian poem cf. *P.* 7, 1-12 Κάλλιπτον αἰ μεγαλοπόλιες Ἀθᾶναι / προοίμιον ...

Metre

The metre is as follows:

fr. 76: _ _ _ _ _ ? _ _ _ _ _ ? _ _ _ _ _
 _ _ _ _ _ ? _ ? _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Assuming a regular metre we see that fr. 76 has three cases of epic correption (epic correption is not uncommon in Pindar, see Braswell 1988 on *P.* 4, 5 and the examples and literature quoted there).

fr. 76 -----

fr. 77: -----

The metre can be interpreted as aeolic (Snell 1975⁴, 83):

fr. 76 ^gl^{3d} | ia ^pher 3da |

fr. 77 ^pher 3 da | ia ... (taking the second syllable of fr. 77, 2 as a longum:
 -----)

but also as dactylo-epitritic (Turyn 1952, 300):

fr. 76 - D d² d² - - || - -e x d¹ - D - |

fr. 77 d² d² - D - | D

For D d² d² cf. *P.* 3 str. 4; fr. 51 str. 3?; for - - at period-end cf. *N.* 8 ep. 4; for -e cf. e.g. *O.* 7 ep. 5; *P.* 1 ep. 3, 7, 8; for d¹ - D cf. fr. 129 str. 9. For d² d² at the beginning of a period cf. *P.* 3 ep. 9; *N.* 8 str. 4.

Date

The mention of Artemisium as the place where the Athenians laid the foundation of freedom, shows that the Dithyramb must have been composed after 480. It is plausible that Pindar did not express this praise until it was absolutely clear that the Persians had been defeated, which means that the date is more probably after 475 (capture of Eion by Cimon) or even later than that. See also Wilamowitz 1922, 273.

Commentary

Fr. 76

The address is very elaborate, enlarged by more than one apposition (see Kambylis 1964, 114-115), comparable with *P.* 2, 1-2 Μεγαλοπόλιες ὦ Συράκοσαι, βαθυπολέμου / τέμενος Ἄρεος, ἀνδρῶν ἵππων τε κυδαροχαρμῶν δαιμόνιαι τροφοί; *Pae.* 9, 1-2 (with ὦ) and *N.* 7, 1-2 and 1, 1-4 (without ὦ). In the Epinicia such

addresses are always opening invocations, which brought Meyer 1933, 57-58 to the conclusion that similar addresses in the fragments should also be considered as openings. The similarity with the above mentioned Pindaric openings makes it likely that fr. 76 stood at the beginning, but *Pae.* 6, 123-126 ὄνομακλύτα γ' ἔνευσι Δωριεῖ / μ[ε]δέουσα [πό]ντωι / νᾶκος, [ᾶ] Διὸς Ἑλ- / λανίου φαεινὸν ἄστρον shows that this is not necessarily so (see Kambylis 1964, 164 n. 5). Cf. also *B.* 1, 13-14 ἰῶ Πέλοπος λιπαρᾶς / νάκου θεόδματοι πύλαι₁; 9, 45 ᾧ πολυζήλωτε ἀναξ ποταμῶν; 13, 77-78 ᾧ ποταμοῦ θύγατερ / διναῖντος Αἴγυ' ἠπιόφρον; 94-95 ᾧ / δέσποινα παγξε[ί]νου χθονός.

1 **λιπαράι** : Pindar uses the adjective λιπαρός frequently with Athens (also in *N.* 4, 18; *I.* 2, 20) and other cities (Thebes: *P.* 2, 3; fr. 196; Marathon: *O.* 13, 110; Orchomenos: *O.* 14, 3; Naxos: *P.* 4, 88; Egypt: fr. 82; Smyrna: fr. 204). In itself this use is old, cf. *Od.* 13, 388 Τροίης λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα; *h. Hom.* 3, 38; Sim. *PMG* 511 fr. 1(a), 7; Thgn. 947; but the frequency of it is new. Especially as an epithet of Athens it is often copied or parodied, cf. *Ar. Eq.* 1329; *Ach.* 639-640; fr. 112 K.-A.; *E. IT.* 1130-1131; *Alc.* 452; *Tr.* 803; *Hdt.* 8, 77, 1.

The primary meaning of λιπαρός is 'bright, radiant' (Slater *Lex. s.v.*; Chantraine 1968, 642; Σ *Ar. Nu.* 299b; Van Groningen 1966 on Thgn. 947), referring to the wealth of the city (Σ *Ar. Nu.* 299c). In the case of Athens it also refers to its fertility and especially to the olive tree and its oil (see Σ *Ar. Nu.* 299a, c; R.W. Macan 1908, 481 on *Hdt.* 8, 77 and esp. Kienzle 1936, 31-32). Kienzle's suggestion that λιπαράι Ἀθᾶναι was a solemn word combination, reminiscent of an oracle (as in *Hdt.* 8, 77), is probably not right. In the first place λιπαρός seems too common an adjective of cities, and secondly the Herodotean Bacis-oracle at least seems to be a later interpolation and is expelled by Krüger (but see also Masaracchia 1977, 195-197 who is not convinced of its spuriousness).

ιοτέφανοι : it is known that at the Dionysia the gods received wreaths of violets, cf. fr. 75, 6 ἰοδέτων λάχετε στεφάνων. The Athenians themselves also wore wreaths, although it is not explicitly stated from which flowers or leaves they were made (cf. *Ath.* 11, 464f; *orac. ap.* D. 21, 52 and *Ar. Nu.* 309, see my note on fr. 75, 6). These facts make the literal interpretation 'crowned with violets' the most plausible, meaning that the whole city, both the citizens and the cult statues, were decked with crowns at this festival (so also Fogelmark 1972, 27; Blech 1982, 29). This is easy to visualize and fits the festive atmosphere of this hymnal address. Kienzle 1936, 42 suggests that ἰοτέφανος refers to the abundance of the violets in spring and compares *Sapph.* fr. 168c *Voigt* ποικίλλεται μὲν γαῖα πολυτέφανος.

A drawback of these interpretations is that all the other adjectives and circumscriptioins refer to permanent characteristics of Athens. Yet it is less likely that Pindar meant the purple hue of Mt. Hymettus at sunset, a view which was defended by B.L. Gildersleeve, *Brief Mention*, *AJPh* 32 (1911), 366-367, and accepted as at least partly true by Kirkwood 1982, 331. In the first place, this purple hue would only be a possible interpretation if the mountain had been as deforested then as it is now (as remarked by Professor S.L. Radt in a letter). A second objection lies in the burden of interpretation which this seems to lay on the audience. Again, it does not seem so self-evident that the mountain should be called a 'crown' and in spring *ιο-* is more readily explained as the flower than as the colour, especially since this colour is seen only at sunset. Expressions such as *ροδοδάκτυλος* 'Hώς *sim.* are not comparable, see Cook 1900, 4-5, because there 'the ordinary colour of a natural object is transferred to its mythological personification'.

ἀοίδιμοι : usually *ἀοίδιμος* has a passive meaning 'sung of', which is mostly positive, i.e. 'celebrated in song, famous': cf. *P.* 8, 59 *γὰρ ὄμφαλὸν παρ' ἀοίδιμον*; *Hdt.* 2, 79, 1; *Aristot. PMG* 842, 17. This must be its interpretation here too. The active sense is found in *Pae.* 6, 6; *N.* 3, 79; *E. El.* 471, and perhaps in *Pi. O.* 14, 3. See Radt 1958, 105-108.

Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα : literally 'the prop, stay, support' of Greece, preventing the country falling into Persian slavery (cf. fr. 77). Pindar seems to have been the first to use this metaphor of a city. In *O.* 2, 6 he calls Theron the *ἔρεισμα* of Acragas. The expression *Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα* is literally copied, also referring to Athens, by many authors. A variant is found in *Luc. Tim.* 50 *τὸ ἔρεισμα τῶν Ἀθηνῶν, τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς Ἑλλάδος* and in *S. OC.* 58 *ἔρεισμ' Ἀθηνῶν*. Pan is called *ἔρεισμα πάντων* in an Epidaurian hymn (*PMG* 936, 17) of which the date is uncertain (*P. Maas, Epidaurische Hymnen*, Halle 1933, 130-134 ascribes it to the fourth or the beginning of the third century).

A similar image is *κίων*, 'column' in the sense of 'support'. Cf. *O.* 8, 27 where Aegina is described as a *κίονα δαιμονίαν* for *ξένοισι*, and 2, 81-82 where Hector is called *Τροίαις / ἄμαχον ἀτραβῆ κίονα*. I have not found this metaphorical use in other writers. For other building metaphors see on fr. 77, 1-2.

κλειναὶ Ἀθῆναι : *κλεινός* or its metrically alternative form *κλεεινός* (see Braswell 1988, 380-381 on *P.* 4, 280 and his Appendix) is a frequent epithet of places and cities; cf. e.g. *Sol.* 19, 3 West *κλεινῆς ἀπὸ νήσου*; *Pi. O.* 3, 2 *κλεινὰν Ἀκράγαντα*; 6, 6; *Stesich. PMG* 184, 1; *B.* 10, 30; *S. Tr.* 750. Of Athens cf. e.g. *A. Pers.* 474; *S. Aj.* 861; fr. 323, 2; *E. Ph.* 1758; *Hipp.* 423.

δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον : indicating a relationship with the δαίμων, therefore best rendered as 'divine', meaning also 'miraculous, marvellous' (see Braswell 1988, 117 on *P.* 4, 37). Pindar always uses the adjective in a laudatory sense. Other instances of cities called δαιμόνιος are *P.* 2, 1-2 Μεγαλοπόλιες ὧ Συράκοιαι, ... δαιμόνιαι τροφοί; *O.* 8, 27 where Aegina is called a κίονα δαιμονίαν.

Πτολίεθρον is an epic word, the lengthened form of π(τ)όλις. Cf. e.g. *Il.* 2, 133 'Ιλίου πτολίεθρον; *Od.* 3, 485 Πύλον αἰπὺ πτολίεθρον; Hes. *Sc.* 81; *A.R.* 1, 186. It does not seem to occur outside epic poetry. Pindar may have chosen this form for its metrical convenience. For Pindar's epic diction, see Bowra 1964, 214-219.

Fr. 77

Why did Pindar mention the battle of Artemisium as the glorious event on which Greek freedom was founded? After all, the battle was not won. The Greeks withdrew after the announcement that Thermopylae had been lost, and only after several more battles (at Salamis, Mycale and Plataea) was freedom won. Plutarch must be right when he says that this battle was of the greatest service to the Greeks in giving them experience, and teaching them 'ἀρχὴ ... ὄντως τοῦ νικᾶν τὸ θαρρεῖν' (*Plu. Them.* 8, 1-2). If Pindar wanted to draw attention to the valour and courage of the Athenians, the battle of Artemisium was more appropriate than the battle of Salamis, where naval tactics secured the victory.

Cf. also Simon. *PMG* 532-535 ἡ ἐπ' Ἀρτεμιείῳ ναυμαχία; 536 ἡ ἐν Σαλαμῶνι ναυμαχία; *Ag. Lys.* 1251-1253; *Isocr. Or.* 4, 90. See also N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, Cambridge Mass./London 1986, 132-171 (Ch. III, The Athenian History of Athens).

1 παῖδες Ἀθηναίων : comparable with the Homeric stock expression υἱες Ἀχαιῶν (e.g. *Il.* 1, 162; 237; 276). Similar periphrases are found in poetry (cf. e.g. *A. Pers.* 402 παῖδες Ἑλλήνων; *Pi. I.* 3/4, 54b; fr. 118; *E. Andr.* 1124 Δελφῶν παῖδας; *B.* 8, 11 παῖδας Ἑλλάδων; 15, 39) and Ionic prose (cf. *Hdt.* 1, 27, 3 Λυδῶν παῖδας; 5, 49, 2 Ἴωνων παῖδας). For more examples see Renehan 1975, 156. Παῖδες Ἀθηναίων is also found in the elegy mentioned by Plutarch as referring to the battle of Artemisium (*Plu. Them.* 8, 3; *de Herod. malign.* 34, p. 867f = Simon. fr. 109 Diehl).

1-2 ἐβάλοντο ... κρηπίδ' ἐλευθερίας : Pindar's fondness for building metaphors is obvious, especially in the context of speech and song, cf. *P.* 4, 138 κρηπίδα σοφῶν ἐπέων; 7, 3 κρηπίδ' αἰοιδᾶν; fr. 194 κρηπίς ἱεραΐειν αἰοδαΐς; *N.* 1, 8 ἀρχαί

δὲ βέβληνται; *O.* 6, 1-4 χρυσεὰς ὑποστάσαντες ... πρόσωπον / χρῆ θέμεν τηλαυγέες; *P.* 6, 7-9 ὕμνων θησαυρὸς .. / .. τετείχισται; *N.* 4, 81; 8, 47; *P.* 3, 113. In a more general context we find *N.* 2, 4 καταβολὰν ἱερῶν ἀγῶνων; *O.* 8, 26 ὑπέστασε ... κίονα δαιμονίαν. On these metaphors see D. Steiner, *The Crown of Song. Metaphor in Pindar*, London 1986, 55, 150.

The image of the base or foundation is taken over by *E. Hel.* 164 ὦ μεγάλων ἀχέων καταβαλλομένα μέγαν οἶκτον ('der Ersatz des epischen ἀναβάλλεσθαι "anheben" [...] durch den eig. bautechnischen Terminus καταβάλλεσθαι is durch Pindar vorbereitet', see Kannicht 1969 *ad loc.*) and is also found in *X. Mem.* 1, 5, 4 ἡ ἐγκράτεια ἀρετῆς κρηπίς.

Building metaphors are also found in other authors, be it less frequently. Cf. *Il.* 10, 19 μῆτιν τεκτῆναιτο; *S. fr.* 159 τεκτόναρχος μοῦσα; *B. fr.* 5; *E. Andr.* 476; *Ag. Ra.* 820; 824; 1004; *Pax* 749-750; *Pherecr. fr.* 100 K.-A. See also J. Taillardat, *Les images d' Aristophane*, Paris 1962, 438-439.

1 φαεινάν : elsewhere Pindar uses the Aeolic form consistently (ten times), so that the transmitted φαεινάν/φαεινήν should be changed into φαεινάν. Regarding the pair κλεινός/κλεινός Pindar is not so consistent, but uses both forms. This may be because φαεινός and the Homeric φαεινός are metrically equivalent, so there is nothing to be gained by alternating the forms. For a list of metrically alternative forms see Braswell's Appendix (1988, 402-403).

Other abstract concepts called φαεινός are ὄλβος (*P.* 5, 56) and ἀρετά (*N.* 7, 51). Cf. also *A. Pr.* 537-538 φανᾶς ... ἐν εὐφροσύνας.

2 κρηπίδ' : the ι of κρηπίς is always long, both in Pindar and in other authors. It has, however, been suggested (Bergk 1878⁴, 397: κρηπίδ', in ed. 2 scripsi κρηπίδ') that here we must write κρηπίδ', on the authority of Σ Townley *Il.* 11, 677 (V p. 420, 3 Maas) λήϊδα ὡς κρηπίδα (connected by Maas with fr. 77, probably because in all other Pindaric instances the syllable is long). Cf. the variant reading in *Plu. de Herod. malign.* 34, p. 867c and the similar variation of κλαῖδες (*P.* 9, 39) and κλαῖδας (*P.* 8, 4). The short syllable -ιδ- instead of -ιδ- is explained as an Aeolic form by Schwyzer 1, 465. Although the scholiast may of course have referred to another instance of κρηπίδα which has been lost, the short ι would make the line metrically more regular. The sequence _ e d² (if ι is long) is not found elsewhere in Pindar.

ἐλευθερίας : cf. the description of the battle of Cumae in *P.* 1, 72-75, ending in a compliment to Hieron, 'Ελλάδ' ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίαν, and the subsequent mention of the battles against the Persians at Salamis (in l. 76 explicitly connected with the city of Athens) and Plataea, implying that there also the result was the deliverance from slavery.

Other places where Pindar mentions the power and glory of freedom are *P.* 1, 61 θεοδμάτωι σὺν ἐλευθερίαι; *I.* 8, 15-15a ἰατὰ δ' ἔστι βροτοῖς σὺν γ' ἐλευθερίαι / καὶ τά. Cf. also his prayer for a free Aegina in *P.* 8, 98-100 Ἀΐγινα φίλα μάτερ, ἐλευθέρωι στόλωι / πόλιν τάνδε κόμιζε.

Fr. 78

Κλυθ' Ἄλαλά, Πολέμου θύγατερ,
 ἐγγέων προοίμιον, ἄι θύεται
 ἄνδρες ὑπὲρ πόλιος τὸν ἱρόθντον θάνατον.

Test. 1-3 *Plu. glor. Ath.* 7, p. 349c 'Κλυθι - θάνατον' ὡς ὁ Θηβαῖος Ἐπαμεινώνδας (Πινδαρος Wyttenbach; Ἐπαμεινώνδας del. Haupt, defend. Sternbach) εἶπεν, ὑπὲρ πατρίδος καὶ τάφων καὶ ἱερῶν ἐπιδιδόντες ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς καλλίστοις καὶ λαμπροτάτοις ἀγῶσιν | *Σ Μ Α. Pers.* 49 'Κλυθ' - ἄνδρες' ἐν διθυράμβοις. οὕτως στεύεται ἐνικὸν ἀντὶ πληθυντικοῦ | 1-2 *Ath.* 1, 19a οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ 'Διακτῇ πολιτείας μονοσὺ βοῶσι' 'Κλυθ' - προοίμιον' | *Eust.* 944, 59 τῶν δὲ ἀλαατῶν ὄν, ὡς εἴρηται, φωνὴν ἠρμήνευσεν Ὀμηρος, καὶ ἡ ἀλαλή παρακείσθαι δοκεῖ, ὅπερ ἐστὶ στρατιωτικὸς ἀλαλαγμός, ὃν ἀλαλᾶν λέγουσιν οἱ Δωριεῖς, βοήν οὖσαν πρὸ μάχης. χρῆσις δὲ αὐτῆς ἐν τῷ 'Κλυθ' - προοίμιον' | 1 *Plu. de frat. am.* 11, p. 483d μὴ καταγγεῖλαινας ἀλλήλοισι πόλεμον ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοὶ, 'κλυθ' - θύγατερ' | *Hdn. Gr. II* p. 944, 16 *Leitz* τὸ γὰρ ἀλαλή οὐ φύσει τρικύλλαβον, 'Κλυθ' - θυγάτηρ' | 2-3 *P. Ryl.* 13, 535, 2-4 *Πιν-* / δαρικὸν ἐστὶ τὸ σχῆμα [οἶον τὸ] / 'θύεται ἄνδρες' (*Πιν-* δαρικὸν *Roberts*: *Πιν*βαγκον *Π* | *suppl. Roberts*) | 3 *Hdn. Fig.* 3, 100, 27 *Sprengel* *Πινδαρικὸν* δὲ τὰ τοῖς πληθυντικοῖς ἀνόμασις ἐνικὰ ῥήματα ἔχοντα ἐπιφοράν, ὅλον 'ἄνδρες ἐπὶ πόλεωσ'. καὶ 'λαχεῖ βαρυφθεγκτᾶν ἀγέλαι λεόντων' | *Gnomol. Vat.* 280 (*L. Sternbach, WS* 10 [1888], 238) ὁ αὐτὸς (sc. Ἐπαμεινώνδας) τὸν κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον θάνατον εἶπεν ἱερόθντον εἶναι | *Plu. Reg. et imp. apophth.* p. 192c ἔλεγε (sc. Ἐπαμεινώνδας) δὲ τὸν ἐν πολέμῳ θάνατον εἶναι ἱερόθντον (ἱερόθντον *Stob.*: κάλλιστον *codd.*)

1 *Κλυθ'* *Plu.* 483d, *Σ Α. Pers.*, *Hdn. Gr. II*, *Eust.*: *Κλυθι* *Plu.* 349c, *Σ Α. Pers. manus secunda*; *Κλυθ'* *Ath.* | Ἄλαλά *Plu.* 483d, *Σ Α. Pers.*, *Hdn. Gr. II*: ἄννα [lacuna] γῶ *Plu.* 349c; ἀλλὰ *Ath.*; ἀλλαπολέμον *Σ Α. Pers. manus secunda* | θύγατερ *Plu.*, *Ath.*, *Σ Α. Pers.*, *Eust.*: θυγάτηρ *Hdn. Gr. II* | 2 ἐγγέων προοίμιον *om.* *Σ Α. Pers.* | ἄι θύεται *Σ Α. Pers.*, *Haupt* 1851: αἰθύεται *Σ Α. Pers. manus secunda*; ἀμφότετε *Plu.* 349c; *om.* *Ath.*, *Eust.* | 3 ὑπὲρ πόλιος *Bergk* 1878⁴: ὑπὲρ πολλῶν *Haupt*; ἐπὶ πόλεωσ *Hdn. Fig.*; *om.* *Plu.* 349c | ἱρόθντον *Haupt*: ἱερόθντον *Plu.* 349c, *Gnomol. Vat.*, *Plu.* 192c *Stob.*

Listen Battle Cry, daughter of War,
 prelude of spears, for whom men offer
 on behalf of their city their death as a holy sacrifice.

Contents

Fr. 78 is a good example of the opening of a cletic hymn: a goddess is invoked and invited to listen, her parentage is made clear, her essential function is

mentioned, as is her power. For these characteristics see Norden 1912, 147-149; Wünsch 1914, 182; Zuntz 1951, 337-341; Lenz 1980, 85. About such an elaborate address, extended by both appositions and a relative sentence, see Kambylis 1964, 181-183 and cf. *O.* 8, 1-3; *P.* 12, 1-3; *N.* 11, 1-2, fr. 33c. Fr. 78 is a case where the 'Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder' is recognizable (see Kambylis 1964, 177-179).

That this is not a real hymn is certain because the scholiast on *A. Pers.* 49 explicitly says that this quotation comes from a Dithyramb. In fr. 75 too the elements of the cletic hymn were not directed at the god who was to receive the poem (see note on fr. 75 *Contents*).

It is generally assumed that this fragment constituted the beginning of a poem, because of its similarity to the opening of other cletic hymns, e.g. the Orphic hymns. Cf. e.g. *Orph. H.* 2, 1 Κλυθή μοι, ὦ πολύεμνε θεά, πολυώνυμε δαίμων; 8, 1 κλυθή μάκαρ; 9, 1 κλυθή, θεά βασιλεια. Cf. also the many examples quoted on fr. 75, 1 where a god(dess) is invited to come, which has of course the same function as a request to the god(dess)'s attention. I think, however, that we must reckon with the possibility that this was not the poem's beginning, because it is difficult to understand what the function of a Battle cry could be as the opening of a festive poem such as a dithyramb. There are other instances where the request κλυθή appears later in a hymn. This is then either a very long invocation where the god(dess) is named by many adjectives and epithets, (cf. e.g. *Orph. H.* 4, where κλυθή is postponed until l. 9, and *Pi. O.* 14 where we find κλυτή only in l. 5. Cf. also *h. Hom.* 8, 9 κλυθή) or an address to the Muses which may be postponed to any point in a poem where the poet wants to make a transition, cf. *Pae.* 6, 54-58 ἀλλὰ παρθένου γάρ, ... κλυτε νῦν. Neither case is applicable to our fragment.

The likeliest suggestion would seem to be that the dithyramb contained a (mythical) narrative in which a person uttered the 'prayer' to 'Ἀλαλά' (cf. *O.* 1, 75ff. [prayer of Pelops to Poseidon]; *N.* 10, 76ff. [Polydeuces to Zeus]; *I.* 6, 42ff. [Heracles to Zeus] and the many instances of direct speech in *P.* 4). This context would be more similar to the one found at *Plu. glor. Ath.* 7, p. 349c, where Epaminondas is said to utter these pindaric words. It is possible that this was another very famous poem of Pindar, parts of which came almost automatically into a Greek's mind in appropriate situations, as seems to have been the case with fr. 76 (cf. its many later quotations). Such quotations do not necessarily come from the beginning of a poem, cf. e.g. fr. 33c; fr. 57; fr. 96; fr. 122, 16-20.

The fragment is a prayer, but its contents are not preserved. The likeliest object to ask from a goddess like 'Ἀλαλά' would be 'victory'. There are places in the *Iliad* where ἀλαλητός is connected with the winning party (cf. 16, 78-79 Τρωῶσι

..., οἱ δ' ἀλαλητῶν / πᾶν πεδίον κατέχουσι, μάχηι νικῶντες Ἀχαιοῦς; 18, 148-150), but ἀλαλητῶς is also used of the fleeing warriors (2, 149-150; 21, 10-11) and in cases where it is not clear yet which side will win. Cf. also *Pi. P.* 1, 72. Probably ἀλαλά secures victory indirectly, by making the warriors eager to fight without restraint. For this effect cf. *Il.* 11, 10-14 ἐνθα σταῖς ἤϊε θεὰ (Ἑρις) μέγα τε δεινόν τε / ὄρθι', Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὲ μέγα σθένος ἔμβαι' ἐκάστωι / καρδίηι, ἄλληκτον πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι. / τοῖσι δ' ἄφαρ πόλεμος γλυκίων γένετ' ἤε νέεσθαι / ἐν νηυσὶ γλαφυρῆσι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν. See Fränkel 1962², 553 and n. 7.

Metre

-----	D d ²
-----	e . D
-----	D . D

The metre shows a very regular variation of longa and brevia, different from frs. 76 and 77 because here a longum is never followed by another longum. The combination _ _ _ _ _ (D) is found in all three fragments, albeit in different combinations. For the combination D d² cf. e.g. *P.* 4 str. 4, 6, ep. 5; *N.* 1 str. 6, ep. 2, 3. For short anceps cf. e.g. *I.* 5 ep. 7 and *O.* 12 ep. 5 (e . D).

Commentary

1 κλυθ' : for κλυθι *sim.* in prayers cf. *O.* 14, 5; *Pae.* 6, 58; *h. Hom.* 8, 9; *Orph. H.* 2, 1; *Anacr. PMG* 418; *Melanipp. PMG* 762; fr. *adesp. PMG* 978b; *A. Ch.* 139; 157; *Supp.* 348; *E. Ba.* 576. See Ziegler 1905, 59-65.

Ἀλαλά : although the word ἀλαλητῶς is known from Homer (cf. e.g. *Il.* 12, 138; *Hes. Th.* 686) and ἀλαλάζω is found in *A.* fr. 57, 7, all other related words, including ἀλαλά, are not attested before Pindar. Pindar uses ἀλαλά, comparable with the Homeric ἀλαλητῶς (which Pindar uses once in *P.* 1, 72), in the sense of 'battle cry' in *N.* 3, 60 and *I.* 7, 10, and the context shows that that is certainly its meaning here. See also Deubner 1941, 5-7.

Because fr. 78 is said to be part of a dithyramb, it should be remarked that ἀλαλά and related words such as ἀλαλάζω and ἀλαλαγμός are also used in dionysiac contexts. See note on fr. 70b, 13 ἀλαλαίαι.

Πολέμου θυγάτηρ : 'Αλαλά is a personification illustrating a relationship of cause and effect, comparable to the places where Ὑβρις is called mother of Κόρος (*O.* 13, 10), Πρόφαις daughter of Ἐπιμαθεύς (*P.* 5, 27-28) and Ἥκυχια, Δίκας / ... θυγάτηρ (*P.* 8, 1-2). Personifications can also be used to indicate the attribute of a god, cf. e.g. Ἀγγελία, daughter of Ἑρμῆς (*O.* 8, 81-82) or θυγάτηρ / Ἀλάθεια Διός (*O.* 10, 3-4). For genealogical relationships used to clarify the nature of non-personified concepts cf. *O.* 2, 32 ἀμέραν ... παῖδ' ἀελίου; *N.* 9, 51-52 wine, βιατάν / ἀμπέλου παῖδ'; *Pae.* 9, 1-2 Ἀκτις ἀελίου, ... / ὦ μᾶτερ ὀμμάτων; *O.* 11, 2-3 οὐρανίων ἰδάτων, / ὀμβρίων παίδων νεφέλας. See Dornseiff 1921, 50-54; Schadewaldt 1928, 274 n. 4; Bowra 1964, 198-199; Kambylis 1964, 152-153. For such genealogical information as an essential part of hymns, see Lehms 1979, 119 n. 62; Bremer 1981, 195.

2 ἔγγεων προοίμιον : a battle cry can be called a προοίμιον, a prelude to the battle, because it is a sound of human voices, but προοίμιον can also be used outside a musical or otherwise verbal atmosphere, cf. *A. Supp.* 830 φροίμια ... πόνων. Later examples are *Alex.* 110, 3-4 προοίμιον / δείπνον; *Plb.* 22, 4, 15 πολεμικῆς ἔχθρας ... καταρχῆ καὶ προοίμιον; 25, 3, 8 τὰ προοίμια τῆς Περσέως ἀρχῆς. See LSJ s.v. I, 2.

Perhaps Pindar alludes to the comparison of war and dance such as it is found in *Il.* 16, 617-618 Μηριόνη, τάχα κέν σε καὶ ὀρχηστὴν περ ἔοντα / ἔγχοσ ἐμόν κατέπαυσε διαμπερές, εἴ σ' ἔβαλόν περ, and the scholiast's explanation of ὀρχηστὴν εὐκίνητον κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον, - ἀρμόδιος (*Σ A Il.* 16, 617 [4, 282, 68 Erbse]). Cf. also Hesch. s.v. ὀρχηστής: pote\ me\ n o(choriko/c, pote\ de\ \ o(e)n pole/-mw i eu)ki/nhtoc; s.v. ὀρχιστής: συγκεκριημένος περι τὰ πολεμικά.

ἄι θύεται : for the relative style in predications, hymns and hymnal addresses see note on fr. 75, 3-5 and the literature quoted there. The fact that the relative pronoun is a dative is exceptional (Kambylis 1964, 175). Usually the nominative is found, or the accusative as the object of καλέω *sim*.

θύεται : the verb θύεσθαι is consistent with the deification of Ἄλαλά and is emphasized by the adjective ἱρόθυτον. Sacrifices are usually made by somebody other than the victim, so that θύεται may be passive. On the other hand, since here the victims are human beings, θύεται may also be a middle, thereby expressing that the men offer their own lives in order to secure victory, freedom, etc.

2-3 θύεται ἄνδρες : another case of the *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν* in the dithyrambs. See note on fr. 70b, 8 κατάρχει. For the interpretation of this case O. Wilpert, *Das Schema Pindaricum und ähnliche grammatische Konstruktionen*, Progr. Oppeln 1900, 6-7 could be right when he maintains that the *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν* is often

a construction κατὰ σύνεσιν (so also J. Humbert, *Syntaxe grecque*, Paris 1954, 82-83), where the plural subject can be replaced by a collective noun. Similar to this are fr. 239 ἰαχεῖ βαρυφθεγκτᾶν ἀγέλαι λεόντων and TGF 191 N² ἦλθεν δὲ λαοὶ μύριοι πρὸς ἡλιόνα.

3 ὑπὲρ πόλιος : the words ὑπὲρ πόλιος imply that the battle is defensive rather than aggressive. With θύειν/θύεσθαι ὑπὲρ always means 'on behalf of'; cf. *Pae.* 6, 62-63 θύεται γὰρ ἀγλαῶς ὑπὲρ Πανελ- / λάδος. See LSJ s.v. ὑπὲρ A II; Radt 1958, 131-132.

τὸν ἰρόθυτον θάνατον : for the alliteration see Stockert 1969, 5-6 and Silk 1974, 178-181, where other examples are also to be found.

For the notion that death in battle is beautiful cf. Epaminondas' saying in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* 280 and in *Plu. reg. et imp. apophth.* p. 192c; Callin. fr. 1 West; Tyrt. fr. 10; fr. 11; fr. 12 West. Cf. also Stob. 4, 520, 20 Wachsmuth-Hense 'Ἐπαμινώνδας ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ὀνεῖται ὁ μὴ γήμας μηδὲ παιδοποιησάμενος 'τὸ μὴ ὀκνεῖν' εἶπεν 'ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθνήσκειν'. To die for one's country is not a common ideal. In the *Iliad* death is consistently called 'black, heavy, ill-sounding' etc. These negative epithets are found in all subsequent authors, see D. Arnould, *Guerre et paix dans la poésie grecque. De Callinos à Pindare*, New York 1981, 79-83. Cf. Pi. fr. 110 γλυκὺ δὲ πόλεμος ἀπείροισιν, ἐμπείρων δὲ τις / ταρβεῖ προσιόντα νιν καρδίαι περισσωσ.

ἰρόθυτον : the Ionic ἰρο- (Buck 1955, 24; A. Thumb- A. Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, Heidelberg 1959², 250) or Aeolic ἰρο- (Thumb-Scherer 1959², 88) is metrically more convenient than ἱρο- because that would give a sequence of five brevia. For ἰρο- cf. Semon. 7, 56 West; Herod. 4, 79.

The adjective refers to a traditional element of prayers, i.e. reminding the god(dess) of previous offerings, to propitiate him or her and have the new request granted. Cf. e.g. A. *Th.* 179-180 φιλοθύτων δὲ τοι πόλεος ὀργίων / μνήστορες ἔστέ μοι; *Eu.* 106-109; *Il.* 15, 372-375. See Bremer 1981, 196.

* Fr. 80

[δέεπ]οιυ[αν] Κυβέ[λαν] ματ[έρα]

Test. Phld. *Piet.* 47a17 (A. Schober, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 18 [1988], 77) ΕΙς] τις δὲ Κρόνον τε κ]αί [Ρ]έαν, οἱ δὲ [Δία καί]“Ἡραν πατέρ[ρα καί] μητέρα θε[ῶν νο]μίζουσιν, Πίν[δαρος] δ[ὲ ἐκ] Κυβέ[λης] μητρὸς ἐν τῶι [...]οιυ[αν] Κυβέ[λ...] ματ[...], Φερε[κύδη]ς δ' ὁ [Σύ]ριος

Πίν[δαρος] - ἐν τῶι suppl. F. Bücheler, *Kl. Schr.* I 585 | [δέεπ]οιυ[αν] suppl. Henrichs 1972 | Κυβέ[λαν] ματ[έρα] suppl. Snell 1975⁴

Queen Cybele, mother

Contents

The attribution of this fragment to Pindar's Dithyrambs is due to Bergk's assumption (1878⁴, 399) that the text must be read as 'Πίν[δαρος] δ' [ἐκ] Κυβέ[λης] μητρὸς ἐν τῶι [προ]οιμ[ίω]· Κυβέ[λα] μᾶτ[ερ θεῶν]', and that the supposed prooemium belonged to the same poem as the dithyramb found in Strabo (fr. 79, now part of fr. 70b), where the Great Mother was also mentioned. The identification of *P. Oxy.* 1604 refuted this, but it is still far from certain to which genre fr. 80 should be ascribed.

Wilamowitz suggested that fr. 80 is part of fr. 95 (1922, 271 n. 31), a hymn to Pan, the beginning of which we have. Philodemus' use of ἐν τῶι suggests, however, that the words quoted thereafter are the opening words of a song (see W.J. Slater, *Pindar's House, GRBS* 12 [1971], 151), which undermines Wilamowitz's suggestion. A stylistic analysis (the address of the goddess as δέεπινα, and the accusative as a possible object of ὑμνέω *sim.*) shows that the poem may be a hymn to Cybele (see Lehnus 1973, 275-277; 1979, 16 n. 40). For the accusative as the beginning of a hymn cf. e.g. *h. Hom.* 2, 1 Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον, σεμνήν θεόν, ἄρχομ' αἰεΐειν; 4, 1 Ἐρμῆν ὑμνεῖ, Μοῦσα, Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱόν; 6, 1; 9, 1; 10, 1; 14, 1; *Lasus PMG* 702 Δάματρα μέλπω; *Lamprocl. PMG* 735a Παλλάδα περρέπολι κλήμζω; *Scol. PMG* 885, 1-2; B. 3, 1-3. On these echoes of epic hymns in lyric poets see Wünsch 1914, 160; Meyer 1933, 50; Lehnus 1973, 276. Most hymnal openings of Pindar are more elaborate (see Lehnus 1979, 112 n. 31), cf. *Pi.* fr. 29 Ἴκμητὸν ἢ χρυσαλάκατον Μελίαν ... ὑμνήσομεν; fr. 89a τί κάλλιον ... ἢ βαθύζωνόν τε λατῶ καὶ θοᾶν ἕππων ἐλάτειραν αἰεΐσαι;

Metre

Metrical analysis shows a sequence of

This may be interpreted as a pherecratean, expanded by a choriamb (Henrichs 1972, 85) or as 'a dactylo-epitritic pattern of a less common type' (86). The dactylo-epitritic d¹D is found in *N.* 5 (ep. 4) and fr. 133 (str. 3), and three longa at the beginning are found in *N.* 8 (str. 1) and fr. 221 (str. 2). Lehnus's remark (1979, 88 n. 125) that the dactylo-epitritic interpretation would make it impossible for fr. 80 to be the beginning of an ode, is not justified, cf. *N.* 8. But because of the rarity of these sequences it seems better to take the metre of this fragment as aeolic (cf. *O.* 5).

Commentary

[δέσπ]ου[αν] : for δέσποινα coupled with the names of goddesses, cf. A. fr. 388 δέσποινα Ἐκάτη; *S. El.* 626 μὰ τὴν δέσποιναν Ἄρτεμιν; B. 11, 117; A. fr. 342; *Ag. Nu.* 266.

Κυβέ[λαν] ματ[τέρα] : on Pindar and Cybele see my note on fr. 70b, 8-9 *κεμναῖ* ... *Ματέρει* ... *μυεγάλαι*; Lehnus 1979, 16 and n. 41.

Fr. 82

τὰν λιπαρὰν μὲν Αἴγυπτον ἀγχικρημμον

Test. Σ Pi. P. 2 inscr. ... καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλας πλείους λιπαρὰς καλεῖ, ὥσπερ τὴν Σμύρναν (fr. 204)· καὶ λιπαρῶν Σμυρναίων ἄστει· καὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐν Διθυράμβοις ‘-’

ἀγχικρημμον E, F, G, Q: ἄγει κρίμων C, P

This radiant Egypt, clinging to its river banks.

τὰν : since the article without a demonstrative value is not yet frequent in Pindar and because of the addition of μὲν, we may suppose that an opposition is implied to another concept, e.g. another country. See R. Ullmann, *L' usage de l' article dans Pindare*, *SO* 1 (1922), 64.

λιπαρὰν : cf. fr. 76, 1 and note *ad loc.* The adjective here refers to the wealth of the region, due to the fertility of the Nile delta.

Αἴγυπτον ἀγχικρημμον : Egypt was probably far from Pindar's experience and perhaps also his interest. He mentions Egypt only three times (*N.* 10, 5; fr. 82; fr. 201) and his geography is reported to be quite incorrect. Cf. Aristid. 36, 112-113 (2, 298 K.) αὐτίκα Πινδάρῳ πεποίηται, ὅσπερ μάλιςτ' ἀληθείας ἀντέχεσθαι δοκεῖ τῶν ποιητῶν περὶ τὰς ἱστορίας, καὶ οὐ πόρρωθεν, ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν τόπων καὶ οὗτος ὁ ἔλεγχος· φησὶ γὰρ 'Αἴγυπτίαν Μένδητα παρὰ κρημνὸν θαλάσσης' (fr. 201, 1). καίτοι οὔτε κρημνός ἐστιν οὐδεὶς ἐκεῖ οὔτε θάλαττα προσηγεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐν πεδίοις πολλῶν καὶ κεχυμένων.

Κρημνός usually refers to a river bank (cf. *O.* 3, 22 ζαθέοις ἐπὶ κρημοῖς 'Αλφεοῦ) or the bank of a lake (cf. *P.* 3, 34 παρὰ Βοιβιάδος κρημοῦσιν). The bank of the sea (fr. 201, 1) is theoretically possible but here it is better taken as referring to the Nile's banks, because Egypt's existence is entirely dependent on the river and its concomitant fertility; the expression 'Egypt clinging to its river banks' (Slater *Lex. s.v. ἀγχικρημνος*) is therefore very suitable, although the adjective in itself denotes nothing else but 'near the banks'.

If Pindar chose the word -κρημνος on purpose (but cf. fr. 201,1 and the negative judgement of its suitability by Aristid. 36, 112-113) the steepness usually implied in κρημνός is no problem because the upper Nile often has steep banks especially in the South and on the Eastern side (see R. Pietschmann, *RE* 1, 981). Cf. Str. 17, 1, 4 about the shape of the river varying with the proximity of the flanking mountains.

ἦν ὅτε κύας Βοιώτιον ἔθνος ἔνεπον

Test. Σ Pi. O. 6, 152 εἰ φεύγομεν, Βοιωτίαν ἔν' ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἀγροικίαν καὶ τὴν ἀναγωγίαν τὸ παλαιὸν οἱ Βοιωτοὶ ἕες ἐκάλουντο· καθάπερ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς διθυράμβοις· ἦν ὅτε κύας τὸ Βοιώτιον ἔθνος ἔλεγον | Str. 7, 7, 1 ὡς δὲ Πίνδαρος φησιν, ἦν ὅτε κύας Βοιώτιον ἔθνος ἔνεπον | Gal. *Prot.* 9, 1 Kaibel 'ἦν - ἔνεπον' ὁ Πίνδαρος φησί | Them. *Or.* 27, 334b Downey-Norman (p. 403, 16 Dindorf) καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἡ Βοιωτία χωρίον μὲν ἀμαθίας εἶναι ἐδόκει, καὶ ἔν τινα, οἴμαι, Βοιωτίαν ἐκάλουν, εἰς ἀπαυδευσίαν τὸ φύλον ἐπικώπωντες. ἀλλ' ὅμως Πίνδαρος καὶ Κορίννα καὶ Ἡσίοδος οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν τῆι κυί

κύας Σ Pi., Str. cod. E, Gal.: κυας Str. codd. A, B, C; ἕας Str. codd. L, n, o; κύας Gal. cod. A | τὸ add. Σ Pi. | Βοιώτιον Σ Pi., Str., Gal.: Βοιώτιον Gal. cod. A | ἔνεπον Str., Gal.: ἔνεπον Str. cod. E; ἔλεγον Σ Pi.

There was a time when they called the Boeotian people 'swine'.

Metre

Wilamowitz 1922, 274 suggested on metrical grounds that fr. 83 is part of the same dithyramb as fr. 75, but the uncertainty about the metre of fr. 75 makes a conclusion about the similarity with fr. 83 difficult. A possible division would be

--- -- -- -- -- -- ia ion ia

Commentary

ἦν ὅτε : this reference to the past ('there was a time when') is equivalent to O. 6, 89-90 ἀρχαῖον ὄνειδος ... Βοιωτίαν ἔν and the scholiast's τὸ παλαιόν. Perhaps this is wishful thinking on Pindar's part who thereby wanted to suggest that in his own time the reproach was not heard anymore. However, other authors seem to refer to the present: cf. Plu. *de esu carn.* 1 b, p. 995e τοὺς γὰρ Βοιωτοὺς ἡμᾶς οἱ Ἄττικοὶ καὶ παχεῖς καὶ ἀναισθητοὺς καὶ ἡλιθίους, μάλιστα διὰ τὰς ἀδιθηραγίας προστηγόρευον· οὗτοι δ' αὖ κύς ...' καὶ ὁ Μέναυδρος 'οἷ γνάθους ἔχουσι' καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος 'γῶνάι τ' ἔπειτ', ἀρχαῖον ὄνειδος ἀλαθέειν λόγοις εἰ

φεύγομεν, Βοιωτίαν ἔν'; Crat. fr. 77 K.-A. So also D. 18, 43 ἀναίεσθητοι Θηβαῖοι; 35 τῆς ἀναλγησίας καὶ τῆς βαρύτητος ... τῶν Θηβαίων.

κύακ : proverbial for their stupidity, cf. the proverb ἡ ὕς τῆν' Ἀθηναίων (cf. Plu. *praec. ger. reip.* 7, p. 803d; Theoc. 5, 23). For its Latin variant '*sus Minervam*', see A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer*, Hildesheim 1962, 224. The original population of Boeotia were the Ὑαντες (see *RE* 9, 22). The name Ὑαντες may through the phonetic relationship have facilitated or caused the Boeotians to be called ὕεσ.

Βοιώπιον ἔθνος : Pindar always mentions 'his' city of Thebes with pride, cf. fr. 194; fr. 198a οὔτοι με ξένον οὐδ' ἀδαήμονα Μοισᾶν ἐπαίδευσαν κλυταὶ Θῆβαι; *I.* 1, 1 μᾶτερ ἐμά ... χρύσαπι Θήβα. The 'ancient reproach' cannot have been very pleasant, even if he found the praise of political opponents justified (cf. frs. 75-77; *P.* 7, 1-12). On Pindar's patriotism see E. des Places, *Pindare et Platon*, Paris 1949, 31-40.

ἔνεπον : the scholiast's ἔλεγον is probably a simplification of the less frequent ἔνεπον. On Pindar's use of ἐνέπω see Schmidt *Syn.* 1, 76.

παλιναίρετα

Test. Harpocr. p. 231-232 Dindorf παλιναίρετος: ... ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν καθαιρεθέντων οἰκοδομημάτων καὶ ἀνοικοδομηθέντων Πίνδαρος Διθυράμβου | Photius s.v. p. 373, 11 (p. 322 Porson) ... Πίνδαρος δὲ ἐν Διθυράμβου ἐπὶ τῶν καθαιρεθέντων οἰκοδομημάτων καὶ ἀνοικοδομηθέντων ἐχρήσατο τῆς λέξεως | Suda s.v. (IV, 11, 11 Adler) idem | Phrynichus PS p. 102, 10 Borries παλιναίρετα· τὰ ἐκ καταλύσεως οἰκοδομίας παλαιᾶς εἰς ἑτέραν πρόσφατον οἰκοδόμησιν ἐμβαλλόμενα

Recycled

The various lexica refer παλιναίρετος primarily to contexts where an orator or an official was excluded from the execution of his profession or office, because he was caught committing some offence, but is admitted again later, either after the fine has been paid or after the people have chosen to re-elect him notwithstanding his former offence. Pindar's use must be exceptional, because it is mentioned explicitly by all sources. Phrynichus explains its use in greatest detail, from which we may surmise that he means the use of building material from a demolished house for a new one.

This would accord with the use of *κιδέρο παλινηαιρέτο* (*IG* 1² 313, 131, 408/407, 407/406 B.C.), which could refer to the melting down of iron for the manufacture of new implements. The context does not give any clarification since it consists of a list of all sorts of goods received by the Ἐπιστάται of Eleusis, such as crab and saw-fish (l. 130) and hammer-axes and baskets (l. 132).

This fragment probably shows another example of Pindar's fondness for using either new or old adjectives in a new way.

* Fr. 85

Et. M. 274, 44 Διθύραμβος ὁ Διόνυσος· ἐπίθετόν ἐστι τοῦ Διονύσου· ὅτι ἐν διθύρῳ ἀντρῳ τῆς Νύκτες ἐτράφη· καὶ ὁμωνύμως τῷ θεῷ ὁ εἰς αὐτὸν ὕμνος· ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ δύο θύρας βαίνειν, τὴν τε κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς Σεμέλης καὶ τὸν μηρὸν τοῦ Διὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ δις τετέχθαι, ἅπαξ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς, δεῦτερον δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ μηροῦ τοῦ Διὸς, ἔν' ἧ ὁ δις θύραζε βεβηκώς. Πίνδαρος δὲ φησι λυθίραμβον· καὶ γὰρ Ζεὺς τικτομένου αὐτοῦ ἐπέβόα 'λῦθι ράμμα, λῦθι ράμμα', ἔν' ἧ λυθίραμμος καὶ διθύραμβος κατὰ τροπὴν καὶ πλεονασμόν. Ἡρωδιανὸς δὲ φησι (2, 375, 14 Lentz) τὰ προστακτικὰ μὴ συντίθεσθαι | Cyrill. cod. Vind. 319 (PLG Bergk⁴ 1, 400) ὁ Πίνδαρος λυθίραμμὸν φησι αὐτόν· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς τικτόμενος αὐτοῦ ἔκράζει· λῦθι λῦθι ράμμα | Et. Angel. (Ritschl, *Opusc.* I, 685) Διθύραμος (sic)· Πίνδαρος δὲ ὅτι τίκτων αὐτὸν ἐπέβόα ὁ Ζεὺς 'λῦθι λῦθι ράμμα', ἔν' ἧ λυθίραμβος ... Ἡρωδιανὸς δὲ τὴν Πίνδαρον ἀποδοκιμάζει φάσκων τὰ προστακτικὰ μὴ συντίθεσθαι | Et. Gud. (p. 363, 22 Stefani) s.v. Διθύραμβος· ... [Πίν]δαρος δὲ φησιν, ὅτι τίκτων αὐτὸν ἐπέβόα ὁ Ζεὺς 'λῦθι λῦθι ράμμα', ἔν' ἧ λυθίραμμος καὶ ἐν τροπῇ διθύραμβος. Ἡρωδιανὸς (2, 375 Lentz) δὲ τὴν Πινδάρου ἀποδοκιμάζει φάσκων τὰ προστακτικὰ μὴ συντίθεσθαι

Πίνδαρος δὲ φησι λυθίραμβον· καὶ γὰρ Ζεὺς τικτομένου αὐτοῦ ἐπέβόα 'λῦθι ράμμα, λῦθι ράμμα'

λυθίραμβον Et.M., Et.Angel.: λυθίραμμον Cyrill.; λυθίραμμος an -μβος non liquet Et. Gud. | λῦθι λῦθι Et. Gud. cod. d² | prius ράμμα om. Cyrill., Et. Ang., Et. Gud.

Pindar says 'λυθίραμμος' for, when he (i.e. Dionysus) was born, Zeus called 'λῦθι ράμμα, λῦθι ράμμα' ('open the stitches').

* Fr. 85a

Et. M. 277, 39 (= Hdn. Gr. 2, 492, 28 Lentz)

Διόνυσος· ... οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τῆς Νύκτες τοῦ ὄρουσ ὀνομάσθαι, ἐπεὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἐγεννήθη, ὡς Πίνδαρος, καὶ ἀνετράφη.

Dionysus: some (say) that he is so called after Zeus and Mt. Nyssa, because he was born there, as Pindar says, and raised.

Fragments 85 and 85a both show the ancient grammarians' interest in etymology. It is not certain if Pindar's words, quoted in the process, were intended to be etymological explanations or allusions, but they may well have been, because Pindar referred to etymology on other occasions also. See Barkhuizen 1975, 90 (fr. 85a) and 141-142 (fr. 85) and his other examples (see also on fr. 75, 1).

About Dionysus and Mt. Nysa cf. *Il.* 6, 132-133 (Lycurgus) ὅς ποτε μαινομένοιο Διωνύκοιο τιθήνας / κεῦε κατ' ἠγάθειον Νυκίμων; *E. Ba.* 556-559; *Cycl.* 68-70; *h. Hom.* 26, 5; 1, 8; *Orph. H.* 50, 15; 52, 2; 46, 2; *Ar. Ra.* 215-216.

For Dionysus in Zeus' thigh cf. *E. Ba.* 95-100; 243; 286-287; 295; 523-528; *h. Hom.* 26, 3-4; *Nonn. D.* 9, 3; 6-7; 23-24; *Orph. H.* 48, 3; 52, 3.

* Fr. 86

διθύραμβα

Test. Choerob. in *Theod. Gramm. Gr. IV*, 1 p. 267, 15 Hilgard εἶτα αὐτῆ ἡ αἰτιατικὴ φημί δὴ ἡ ἴκτινον, κατὰ μεταπλασμὸν γέγονεν ἴκτινα, ... ὥσπερ ... διθύραμβον διθύραμβα παρὰ Πινδάρῳ | Hda. Gr. 2, 626, 35 Lentz εἶτα αὐτῆ ἡ αἰτιατικὴ, κατὰ μεταπλασμὸν γέγονεν ἴκτινα, ... ὥσπερ ... διθύραμβον διθύραμβα παρὰ Πινδάρῳ.

The phenomenon where a word of the first or second declension has an accusative (or other oblique case) as of the third declension, is called *metaplasm* (Kühner-Blass 1, 495-519) or *heteroclisia* (J. Egli, *Heteroklisie im Griechischen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Fälle von Gelenkheteroklisie*, Diss. Zürich 1954, 17; West 1974, 98).

In this case Pindar seems to presuppose a nominative *διθύραμψ, of which διθύραμβος would be the genitive.

As opposed to the grammarian's first example ἴκτιν/ἴκτινος, where examples of both forms are found (see LSJ s.v.), there are no other traces left of *διθύραμψ, nor of any of its oblique cases. The same goes for ἀλίτροχος/*ἀλίτροξ (Choerob. ... ὥσπερ ἀλίτροχον ἀλίτροχα παρ' Ἰβύκῳ [PMG 327] ...).

θύκων διθύραμβον

Test. Phld. *Mus.* 4 p. 89 Kemke καὶ [τ]ὸν Π[ί]νδαρον οὕτω νομ[ί]ζειν, ὅτ' ἔφη θύκων πο[ί]ησεσθαι διθύραμβον | Diog. Bab. fr. 86 (*Stoic.* 3, 233, 13 Arnim) καὶ [τ]ὸν Π[ί]νδαρον οὕτω νομ[ί]ζειν, ὅτ' ἔφη θύκων πο[ί]ησεσθαι διθύραμβον

Going to sacrifice a dithyramb.

Cf. Eust. *Prooem.* 31 (3, 302, 13 Drachmann) (Πίνδαρος) Δελφοῖς δὲ ἐρωτηθεὶς τί παρέσθαι θύκων, παιᾶνα εἶπε; Call. fr. 494 Pfeiffer ἄκαπνα γὰρ αἰὲν ἀοιδοὶ θύομεν; Leonidas Alex. *AP* 6, 321, 3 Καλλιόπης γὰρ ἄκαπνον αἰεὶ θύο.

As far as the tradition shows, Pindar was the first to compare his poetry to offerings. The metaphor is prepared for by other, related, images, such as a song compared with wine to be poured as a libation, cf. *I.* 6, 9 σπένδειν μελιφθόγοις ἀοιδαῖς; *P. Oxy.* 2624, 10-12 ὀππότε' ἐγὼ μὲν ἐρε[/ εὐ]αγάας θυκίας γλυκε[/]. τοὶ σπένδων.

* Fr. 335

PSI 2, 146

...
] .ε.[
] .σεπ[
]γει[
 ...]εγοι .[
 5 ..]μεπρω .[
 ..]ητε ποθε[
 οπαδωνω[
 πατροσειο[
 θειοδάμ .ν[
 10 πεφνεδρυ[

1 .[λ or α | 2 π[likelier than γ[| 4 .[α or δ | 5 .[perhaps γ or π, τ not possible

fr. 335

....] .ελ[
] .σεπ[
]γει[
 ...]εγοι .[
 5 ..]μεπρωγ[
 ..]ητε ποθε[
 όπαδόν ω[
 πατρός έοί[
 θειοδαμ .ν[
 10 πέφνε Δρυ[

9 θειόδαμον Lodi 1913, Maehler post Snell 1975⁴: Θειοδάμαν[τα Wilamowitz 1922, Turyn 1952 |
 5 πρωτ[Turyn | 6 πόθε[ν Turyn | 10 Δρύ[αντα παίδα Lodi, Maehler; Δρύ[αντος υίος Körte 1924;
 Δρύ[σπα Wilamowitz, Turyn

The fragment was first edited by Teresa Lodi (*Papiri greci e Latini, Vol II, Firenze* 1913, 72-73), who suggested that this lyrical fragment might be ascribed to Pindar:

'naturalmente non è il caso di affermar nulla, sia per il contenuto sia per l' autore. Non è escluso Pindaro ... L' epiteto *θειοδάμος* non sconverrebbe a costui'. Lodi thought that the possible mention of Dryas in l. 10 could point to a dithyramb, because the story of Lycurgus, father of Dryas, and Dionysus is situated on Mt. Nysa (cf. *Il.* 6, 132-133 ὅς [sc. Λυκόοργος] ποτε μαινομένοιο Διωνύσοιο τιθήνας / *κεῦε κατ' ἡγάθεον Νυκτῆμον*; Pindar mentions Mt. Nysa in fr. 85).

The story according to Apollodorus (3, 5, 1) is that Lycurgus, son of Dryas, insulted and expelled Dionysus. After Dionysus was released, he drove Lycurgus mad (other versions of Lycurgus' punishment are found in *S. Ant.* 955-958 [imprisonment] and *Il.* 6, 135ff. [blindness]). In his madness Lycurgus struck his son Dryas dead with an axe, imagining that he was lopping the branch of a vine. This might fit our text:

7 companion

8 of his father (Lycurgus)

9 compelled by the god (Dionysus)

10 (Lycurgus) killed (his son) Dryas.

L. 9 *θειόδαμον* is a rare word, only found in an oracle (*orac. ap. Porph.* [Euseb. *P.E.* 5, 8, 6] τίπτε μ' αἰεὶ θείοντος ἀπ' αἰθέρος ὄδε χατίζων / *θειοδάμοις* 'Ἐκάτην με θεῆν ἐκάλεσσας ἀνάγκαις;). Here it should reflect the power of Dionysus over Lycurgus, but in Eusebius the adjective indicates that the god(dess) is compelled to do something against his/her will. Since so much of the text is missing it is impossible to form any conclusions about this reconstruction. It would seem a disadvantage, however, that Lycurgus is referred to by a genitive in l. 8, by an accusative in l. 9 and by a nominative in l. 10.

An alternative suggestion was made by Wilamowitz, who denies that *θειόδαμον* can be read and who reads *Θειοδάμαν[τα]* (1922, 134-135 n. 3). This would make the fragment refer to the story of Heracles' fight with Theiodamas, king of the Dryopes, about a plough-ox which Heracles had killed and eaten. In the resulting fight Heracles killed Theiodamas, but spared his son Hylas whom he took with him on his further voyages. The text would then contain:

7 (Heracles took Hylas) as his companion

8 (after the death) of his father (Theiodamas).

9 (for Heracles) killed Theiodamas,

10 (king of the) Dryopes.

L. 9 *Θειοδάμαν[* might also be a genitive, an explanation of l. 8 *πατρός εἰοῖο*. For this story cf. *Ov. Ib.* 487 *tamque cades domitus quam quisquis ad arma vocantem iuvit inhumanum Thiodamanta Dryops*; *Call. H.* 3, 161; fr. 24-25 Pf.; *A. R.* 1, 1213ff. and scholium a. *ad loc.*

It is just as difficult to judge the merits of this reconstruction as of the former, because there is so little to base it on. It seems, however, that if this fragment is about Heracles and Theiodamas, there is no reason to assume that it belonged to a dithyramb.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- ABV*: J.D. Beazley, *Attic Black-figure Vase Painters*, Oxford 1956.
- ARV²*: J.D. Beazley, *Attic Red-figure Vase Painters*, Oxford 1963².
- CEG I*: P.A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca I*, Berlin/New York 1983.
- EGF*: G. Kinkel, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1877.
- FGH*: F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Leiden 1957-1958 († 1968-1969).
- LfrgrE*: B. Snell (u.a.), *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, Göttingen 1955-...
- LIMC*: H.C. Ackermann - J.R. Gisler, *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zürich 1981-
...
LSJ: H.G. Liddell - R. Scott - H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1968.
- OCD*: N.G.L. Hammond - H.H. Scullard, *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford 1970².
- PMG*: D.L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962.
- P. Oxy.*: B.P. Grenfell - A.S. Hunt and others, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, London 1898-...
- PRIM*: A. Vogliano, *Papiri della Regia Università di Milano, Vol. I*, Milano 1937.
- PSI*: G. Vitelli, M. Norsa, V. Bartoletti ed altri, *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la Ricerca dei Papiri Greci e Latini in Egitto. Papiri Greci e Latini, Vols. 1-14*, Firenze 1912 - 1957.
- RE*: A. Pauly - G. Wissowa u.a., *Real-Encyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart 1893-1978.
- Roscher Lex.*: W.H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig 1884-1909.
- Schmidt Syn.*: J.H.H. Schmidt, *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1876-1886 († Amsterdam 1967-1969).
- SH*: H. Lloyd-Jones - P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Berlin/New York 1983.
- Slater Lex.*: W.J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin 1969.
- SLG*: D. Page, *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis*, Oxford 1974.
- TrGF*: B. Snell (et al.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen 1971-...

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakker, W.F. *The Greek Imperative*, Diss. Utrecht 1966.
- Barkhuizen, J.H. *Etimologisering by Pindaros*, Diss. Pretoria 1975.
- Barrett, W.S. *Euripides. Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964.
- Bartoletti, V. *Papiri Greci e Latini. Vol. XIV*, Firenze 1957.
- Becker, O. *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken*, Berlin 1937.
- Bergk, Th. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci I*, Leipzig 1878⁴.
- Bernardini, P.A. Linguaggio e programma poetico in Pindaro. *QUCC* 4 (1967), 80-97.
- Bissinger, M. *Das Adjektiv me/gac in der griechischen Dichtung*, München 1966.
- Blech, M. *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin/New York 1982.
- Boeckh, A. *Pindari opera quae supersunt. Vol. 2.2*, Lipsiae 1821.
- Bona, G. *Pindaro. I Peani*, 1988.
- Bornmann, F. Zur Geryoneis des Stesichoros und Pindar Herakles-Dithyrambos, *ZPE* 31 (1978), 33-35.
- Bowra, C.M. *Pindari Carmina*, Oxford 1947² († 1968).
- *Pindar*, Oxford 1964.
- Braswell, B.K. *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*, Berlin/New York 1988.
- Bremer, J.M. Greek Hymns. in: H.S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of religious mentality in the ancient world*, Leiden 1981, 193-215.
- Brize, Ph. *Die Geryoneis des Stesichoros und die frühe griechische Kunst*, Würzburg 1980.
- Buck, C.D. *The Greek Dialects*, Chicago 1955².
- Bundy, E.L. *Studia Pindarica*, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1986².
- Burkert, W. *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*, Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz 1977.
- Calame, C. *Le récit en Grèce ancienne*, Paris 1986.
- Carey, C. *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*, Salem 1981.
- Chantraine, P. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968.
- Cook, A.B. Iostephanos, *JHS* 20 (1900), 1-13.
- Del Corno, D. P. Berol. 9571 verso über den Dithyrambos. *Akten XIII. Intern. Papyrologenkongr. Marburg/Lahn 1971*, München 1974, 99-110.
- Denniston, J.D. *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954².
- Deubner, L. Ololyge und Verwandtes, *Abh. der Preussischen Akad. der Wissensch.*, Berlin 1941, 1-28 (= *Kl. Schr.* 607-634).
- Dittenberger, W. *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum*, Lipsiae 1915 (*Editio tertia*, Lipsiae 1921³).
- Dodds, E.R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1951.
- *Euripides Bacchae*, Oxford 1960².
- Dornseiff, F. *Pindars Stil*, Berlin 1921.

- Duchemin, J. *Pindare. Poète et prophète*, Paris 1955.
- Farnell, L.R. *The Works of Pindar. Vol. II. Critical Commentary*, London 1932 (f Amsterdam 1961).
- Färber, H. *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*, München 1936.
- Fogelmark, S. *Studies in Pindar. With Particular Reference to Paean VI and Nemean VII*, Diss. Lund 1972.
- Fontenrose, J. *The Myth of the Hunter and the Huntress*, Univ. of Calif. Publications in Class. Studies. Vol. 23, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1981.
- Forssman, B. *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars*, Wiesbaden 1966.
- Fränkel, H. *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, München 1962².
- Führer, R. Responsionen in Pindarfragmenten, *ZPE* 9 (1972), 41-42.
- Garrod, H.W. The Hyporcheme of Pratinas, *CR* 34 (1920), 129-136.
- Gerber, D.E. *Pindar's Olympian One: a Commentary*, Toronto 1982.
- Gianotti, G.F. *Per una poetica pindarica*, Torino 1975.
- Gildersleeve, B.L. *Syntax of Classical Greek*, New York 1900.
- Gomperz, Th. *Philodem über Frömmigkeit*, Leipzig 1866.
- Grenfell, B.P. and A.S. Hunt (eds.). *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XIII*, London 1919.
- *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XV*, London 1922.
- Groningen, B.A. van Ad Pindari Dithyrambi Fragmentum 75 S, *Mnemosyne* 8 (1955), 192.
- *Pindare au banquet*, Leiden 1960.
- Hamilton, R. *Epinikion. General Form in the Odes of Pindar*, Den Haag 1974.
- Harder, M.A. *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos*, Leiden 1985.
- Hardie, A. Horace Odes 1, 37 and Pindar Dithyramb 2, *PLLS* 1 (1976), 113-140.
- Haupt, M. Über ein Bruchstück eines pindarischen Dithyrambus, *Berichte der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig* 3 (1851), 313-316.
- Heer, C. de Μάκαρ - Εὐδαίμων - Ὀλβίος - Ἐβρυχή, Amsterdam 1968.
- Henrichs, A. Toward a New Edition of Philodemus' Treatise 'On Piety', *GRBS* 13 (1972), 67-98.
- Herculanensium Voluminum quae supersunt Collectio Altera II*, Napoli 1863.
- Hermann, G. Notae ad Pindarum, in: C.G. Heyne, *Pindari Carmina*, London 1824, 181-269.
- *De officio interpretis*, Lipsiae 1834 (= *Opuscula VII*, Lipsiae 1839, 97-128).
- Illig, L. *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung*, (Diss. Kiel 1925) Borna-Leipzig 1932.
- Irigoin, J. *Histoire du texte de Pindare*. Paris 1952.
- Kaimio, M. *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature*, Helsinki 1977.
- Kambylis, A. Anredeformen bei Pindar, in: *Festschrift Vourveris*, Athena 1964, 95-199.
- Kienzle, E. *Der Lobpreis von Städten und Ländern in der älteren griechischen Dichtung*, (Diss. Basel) Kallmünz 1936.
- Kirkwood, G. *Selections from Pindar*, Chico California 1982.
- Koch, H.A. Zu Pindar, Simonides, Aeschylus, *Philologus* 6 (1851), 734-736.
- Körte, A. Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der Christlichen, *APF* 7 (1924), 114-160.
- Kühner, R. and Blass, F. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. I*, Hannover 1890-1892.

- Kühner, R. and Gerth, B. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. II*, Hannover 1898-1904.
- Lecuwen, J. van *Pindarus' tweede Olympische ode*, Assen 1964.
- Lefkowitz, M.R. *Τὸ καὶ ἐγώ*, The First Person in Pindar, *HSPh* 67 (1963), 177-253.
- Lehnus, L. Nota al fr. 80 di Pindaro, *ZPE* 10 (1973), 275-277.
- *L'inno a Pan di Pindaro*, Milano 1979.
- Lenz, A. *Das Proöm des frühen griechischen Epos*, Bonn 1980.
- Leumann, M. *Homerische Wörter*, Basel 1950.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. *Gnomon* 31 (1959), 111-112.
- Heracles at Eleusis: P. Oxy. 2622 and P.S.I. 1391, *Maia* 19 (1967), 206-229.
- Lobel, E. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XXVI*, London 1961.
- *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XXXII*, London 1967.
- Lodi, T. *Papiri Greci e Latini. Vol. II*, Firenze 1913.
- Machler, H. *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars*, Göttingen 1963.
- *Die Lieder des Bakchylides. Erster Teil. Die Siegeslieder. II. Kommentar*, Leiden 1982.
- *Pindarus. Pars II. Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1989.
- Meyer, H. *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Diss. Köln 1933.
- Murray, P. Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece, *JHS* 101 (1981), 87-100.
- Nilsson, M.P. *Griechische Feste*, Stuttgart 1906 († Darmstadt 1957).
- Norden, E. *Agnostos Theos*, Stuttgart 1912 († Darmstadt 1956).
- Pavese, C.O. Pindarica, *Maia* n.s. 16 (1964), 307-312.
- The New Heracles Poem of Pindar, *HSPh* 72 (1967), 47-88.
- Semantematica della poesia corale greca, *Belfagor* 23 (1968), 389-430.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, Oxford 1962².
- *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, Oxford 1968².
- Places, E. des *Le pronom chez Pindare*, Paris 1947.
- Platnauer, M. Greek Colour-Perception, *CQ* 15 (1921), 153-162.
- Pohl, K. *Die Lehre von den drei Wortfugungsarten*, Diss. Tübingen 1968.
- Privitera, G.A. Archiloco e il ditrambo letterario pre-simonideo, *Maia* 9 (1957), 95-110.
- *Laso di Ermione*, Roma 1965.
- Sappho, Anacreonte, Pindaro, *QUCC* 13 (1972), 131-140.
- Puech, A. *Pindare. Isthmiques et fragments*, Paris 1923.
- Radt, S.L. *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paeon*, Amsterdam 1958.
- Implicite poetica bij Pindarus, *Handelingen van het 29e Nederlands Filologencongres* 1966, 58-68.
- Renehan, R. *Greek Lexicographical Notes I*, Göttingen 1975.
- *Greek Lexicographical Notes II*, Göttingen 1982.
- Richardson, N.J. Pindar and Later Literary Criticism in Antiquity, *PLLS* 5 (1985), 383-401.

- Robertson, N. Heracles' 'Catabasis', *Hermes* 108 (1980), 274-300.
- Robinson, D.M. The Robinson Collection of Greek Gems, *Hesperia. Suppl. 8* (1949), 305-323.
- Rudberg, G. Zu Pindaros' Religion, *Eranos* 43 (1945), 317-336 = *WdF* 134 (1970), 259-277.
- Ruijgh, C.J. *Autour de 'te épique'*, Amsterdam 1971.
- L'emploi 'inceptif' du thème du présent du verbe grec, *Mnem.* 4.38 (1985), 1-61.
- Sandys, J. *The Odes of Pindar, including the Principal Fragments*, Cambridge Mass. 1919² († 1968).
- Schadewaldt, W. *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*, Halle 1928 († Darmstadt 1966).
- Schmidt, D.A. Bacchylides 17 - Paean or Dithyramb? *Hermes* 118 (1990), 18-31.
- Schmidt, K.F.W. *GGA* 184 (1922), 87-99.
- Schneider, J.G. *Carminum pindaricorum fragmenta*, Argentorati 1776.
- Schober, A. Philodemi De Pietate. Pars Prior, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 18 (1988), 67-125.
- Schroeder, O. *Pindari Carmina*, Lipsiae 1900.
- Aus dem neusten Oxyrhynchosband (XIII. Pind. dithyr.), *Sokrates* 7 (1919), 141-142.
- *Pindars Pythien*, Leipzig 1922.
- *Pindari Carmina*, Leipzig/Berlin 1923².
- Schubart, W. Über den Dithyrambus, *APF* 14 (1941), 24-29.
- Schwyzler, E. *Griechische Grammatik*, München 1950.
- Seaford, R. The 'hyporchema' of Pratinas, *Maia* 29 (1977/78), 81-94.
- Silk, M.S. *Interaction in Poetic Imagery with Special Reference to Early Greek Poetry*, Cambridge 1974.
- Snell, B. *Hermes* 90 (1962),
- *Dichtung und Gesellschaft*, Hamburg 1965.
- *Pindarus. Pars II. Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1975⁴.
- Stockert, W. *Klangfiguren und Wortresponionen bei Pindar*, Diss. Wien 1969.
- Tigerstedt, E.N. Furor Poeticus: Poetic Inspiration in Greek Literature before Democritus and Plato, *JHI* 31 (1970), 163-178.
- Tsagarakis, O. *Self-Expression in Early Greek Lyric; Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*, Wiesbaden 1977.
- Turyn, A. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, Oxford 1952.
- Usener, H. Lectiones Graecae, *RhM* 23 (1868), 147-169.
- Grammatische Bemerkungen VI. Adverbia auf τευ, *JPh* 117 (1878), 62-66.
- Verdenius, W.J. The Principles of Greek Literary Criticism, *Mnemosyne* 36 (1983), 1-59.
- Verdier, C. *Les éolismes non-épiques de la langue de Pindare*, Innsbruck 1972.
- Wegner, M. *Das Musikleben der Griechen*, Berlin 1949.
- Weilbach, M. *Die Formen der Aufforderung in der griechischen Lyrik*, Diss. Lengerich 1938.
- Werner, O. *Pindar. Siegesgesänge und Fragmente*, München 1967.
- West, M.L. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin/New York 1974.
- Wilamowitz-Moelendorff, U. von *Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921 († Darmstadt 1975).
- *Pindarus*, Berlin 1922.
- Wünsch, R. Hymnos, *RE* 9.1 (1914), 140-183.
- Ziegler, K. *De precatationum apud Graecos formis quaestiones selectae*, Diss. Vratislaviae 1905.

- Zimmermann, B. Überlegungen zum sogenannten Pratinasfragment, *MH* 43 (1986), 145-154.
- Pindar, Dithyrambos III, 3 (Fragment 70c Snell-Maehler), *ZPE* 72 (1988), 22.
- *Studien zum griechischen Dithyrambos*, Habilitationsschrift Konstanz 1988b.
- Zuntz, G. Zum Hymnus des Kleantes, *RhM* 94 (1951), 337-341.

INDEXES

1. *Index of places discussed*

Archil. fr. 120 West: 1, 2, 11, 16
 B. 11, 65: 41
 Call. fr. 1, 18: 63
 Call. fr. 1, 25-28: 64
 CEG 1, 34: 68-69
 D.H. *Comp.* 22-23: 21-24
 E. *Andr.* 1198: 68-69
 E. *Hel.* 1308-1309: 71
 fr. adesp. *PMG* 1027: 74
 Hdt. 1, 23: 2-3
 Hes. fr. 148a: 176
Il. 18, 483-485: 70
Honestus Epigr. Gr. 788 Kaibel: 198
Hor. Od. 4, 2, 10-12: 21
 Ibycus *PMG* 340: 118
IG 1², 313, 131: 226
P. Berol. 9571v, 36-38: 4
P. Berol. 9571v, 61-66: 4
P. Oxy. 2438, 9-10: 186
 Philoxenus *PMG* 815-824: 12-13, 14
 Σ *Pi. O.* 13, 26b: 9
Pi. P. 1, 5-6: 73, 74
Pi. P. 1, 10-12: 73, 74
Pi. N. 1, 20: 200
Pi. Pae. 12(a), 10-11: 191
Pi. fr. 89a, 3: 200
Pi. fr. 169a, 1-17: 89-91
Pi. fr. 249b: 84, 88
 Pratin. *PMG* 708: 5-7, 19
 Sapph. fr. 1: 24-25
 Sapph. fr. 2: 70
 S. *El.* 838: 199
 S. *OT.* 1176: 199
 Stesich. *PMG* 267: 118
 Theoc. 10, 28-29: 203-204

Thphr. *HP.* 6, 8, 1-2: 203
 X. *Eq. Mag.* 3, 2: 190

2. *Index of Greek words*

ἀκ[ν]αμπτ-: 117, 167, 170
 ἀλαλά: 72-73, 218
 ἀνάγκα: 157
 ἄργος: 43
 βρόμιος: 66-67, 74, 198
 γάρ: 48
 γε μάν: 104
 γλαυκός: 161
 γόνος: 199
 γοργός: 42-43
 δὲ νῦν: 65
 δέξαι-motif: 194
 δέσποινα: 222
 δεῦτε: 190-191
 δεύτερον: 197
 ἐν + acc.: 191
 ἐπέχω: 178
 εὐχομαι: 49, 81
 ἦ γάρ: 162
 θάλος: 48
 -θε(ν): 101, 160, 194-195
 θωράσσω: 177
 ἱερός: 193
 ἴον + compounds: 194, 203, 211-212
 κάρυξ: 79
 κατάρχω: 68-69
 κέχλαδεν: 70
 κλαγγή: 75
 κορυφά: 46-47, 158

κυνάνεος: 114
 λέγοντι sim.: 49, 104
 λιπαρός: 211, 223
 μάντις: 201
 μέγας: 43
 μέλας: 50
 μέλος/μελίζω: 205
 μέλπομαι: 200
 μέν: 92, 113, 161, 200
 μιν/νιν: 49-50, 92
 ολοπόλος: 76
 οίχνη + acc.: 193, 205
 όμφά: 83, 205
 όμφαλός: 193
 όργή: 76
 πυραύσκω: 156
 παρεύομαι: 196-197
 πρίν: 63
 πρύτανις: 117
 ρχοινοσενής: 63-64
 σοφός: 79
 τάμιας: 119
 τελετά: 67, 102, 115, 198
 ύπατος: 159
 φίλος: 116
 χάρμα: 118
 χρυκόθρονος: 101

3. Index of subjects and names

α - η: 92, 159
 Abbruchsformel: 92-93
 bacchic rituals: 66
 bardic 'P': 49, 78, 195-196
 Callimachus: 63-64
 Chios: 170, 176
 circular dance: 2, 9-10, 27, 66, 197
 colometry: 47, 60-61

contrast: 42, 62, 89-90, 113
 contrasting comparative: 93, 164
 digamma: 160
 epic correction: 209
 etymology: 1-2, 180, 191, 228
 fem. adj.:
 - ending in -άς: 46, 76
 - ending in -εια: 64
 genitive absolute: 42
 gleitende Übergänge: 189
 gloss: 200
 Great Mother: 67, 68, 221
 Heracles: 82, 84, 88, 89-91, 103, 106, 232
 heteroclisia: 229
 hymn:
 - of Cybele: 20, 221
 - of Dionysus: 2, 186
 - hymnic features: 20, 25, 26, 48, 186, 190, 192, 216-217, 220
 hyperbaton: 47, 191
 imperative: 47, 48, 181, 191-192, 194, 196
 infinitive:
 - articular infinitive: 164
 - ending in -εν: 45
 invocation: 47, 48, 115-116, 190, 210-211
 ivy: 115-116, 197-198
 Lasus: 2, 5-8, 9-10, 14-15, 16, 17, 19, 63
 litotes: 93, 201
 Meleager: 84, 86-87, 98, 106, 165, 166, 170
 metaphor: 46, 48, 212, 213-214, 230
 metathesis: 171
 metres
 - aeolic: 39, 187, 210
 - dactylo-epitritic: 59, 176, 181, 210, 222
 - iambic: 39, 187-189, 224
 metrical alternatives: 83, 160, 178, 202, 212, 214
 Muses: 46, 47, 48, 79, 80

musical instruments:

- flute: 5-7, 15, 204

- κρόταλα: 66, 71

- τύπανον: 66, 69-70

ν ephelkustikon: 71, 155, 157

nectar: 202-203

originality: 62

parallel *P.* 1: 67, 74

personification: 219

plural:

- neutral plural subject with plural verb: 202

- pluralis majestaticus: 50, 199

poet's task: 46, 78

relative style: 83, 192, 219

repetition: 70, 169, 198, 203

schema Pindaricum: 69, 73, 203, 205, 219-220

scribal errors: 68, 70, 73, 75, 76, 77, 102, 114, 165, 171

short linking ancipitia: 60, 218

spring: 112, 119, 169, 185, 194, 201-202

strophic division: 59, 113, 155, 189

Thebes: 81-82, 116, 173, 209, 225 .

title: 61-62

transition: 47, 49, 78, 92

verbal adjective ending in *-roc*: 162

verbum intensivum: 75

words:

- new and compound words: 13, 48, 115, 182, 193, 194, 197-198, 201, 226

- epic words: 71, 72, 168, 213

wreath: 115, 194, 204, 211

SAMENVATTING

Uit de overlevering is bekend dat Pindarus dithyramben heeft geschreven, die door de Alexandrijnen verzameld werden in twee boeken. Van deze gedichten zijn slechts fragmenten bewaard gebleven. Een teksteditie van al deze fragmenten en een commentaar ontbraken tot nu toe. Dit proefschrift hoopt in deze leemte te voorzien.

De dithyrambe is een gedicht voor de god Dionysus. De eerste dichter die de naam dithyrambe gebruikt, is Archilochus (7e eeuw voor Christus). Uit zijn beschrijving krijgen we de indruk dat het om een geïmproviseerd gezang gaat, waarbij Dionysus wordt aangeropen.

Herodotus vertelt dat Arion als eerste dithyramben componeerde en ze instudeerde met een koor in Corinthe. De tekst is niet helemaal duidelijk, maar het is mogelijk dat Arion ook als eerste titels gaf aan zijn dithyramben. Dat zou betekenen dat een dithyrambe in deze tijd een verhaal uit de mythologie tot onderwerp had, want een titel zou niet zinvol zijn als de dithyrambe alleen over Dionysus ging. Het is bekend dat er in deze tijd zulke dithyramben met mythologische inhoud bestonden, want Ibycus schreef een dithyrambe waarin Menelaos en Helena voorkwamen.

Ook bij Pindarus komen mythologische figuren en gebeurtenissen voor (Heraclides, Perseus, Orion), maar Dionysus blijft een belangrijke rol spelen. In de dithyramben van Bacchylides is het aandeel van Dionysus in de inhoud veel geringer. Dit heeft er zelfs toe geleid dat men eraan twijfelde of deze gedichten wel echte dithyramben waren. Misschien bestond er ook een soort dithyrambe waarin Dionysus niet of nauwelijks voorkwam. Van de Nieuwe Dithyrambe (tweede helft 5e eeuw v. Chr.) is slechts weinig over. Als onderwerpen lijken Dionysus, zijn feest en attributen zoals fluit, wijn en dergelijke voor te komen, naast onderwerpen uit de mythologie (de Cycloop, Asclepius).

De dithyrambe werd altijd begeleid door de fluit, en de muziek stond in de Phrygische toonsoort. Van beide zei men in de Oudheid dat ze goed pasten bij de opgewonden stemming van de dithyrambe. Tot aan de tweede helft van de vijfde eeuw was de muziek uitsluitend begeleidend, maar in de Nieuwe Dithyrambe speelde de fluit steeds meer de boventoon. Het is niet duidelijk of deze tendens al een eerste aanzet kreeg in de dithyramben van Lasus (tweede helft 6e eeuw). We weten te weinig over de poëzie en de muziek in deze tijd om de bronnen met zekerheid te kunnen interpreteren. Er is een gedicht dat wordt toegeschreven aan Pratinas (\pm 600 v. Chr.) en waarvan gezegd wordt dat het een reactie was op de overheersende positie van de fluit, vermoedelijk dus van Lasus.

Het is ook mogelijk dat dit gedicht gedateerd moet worden in de tijd van de Nieuwe Dithyrambe, en dat er ten tijde van Lasus nog geen sprake was van grote muzikale veranderingen.

Oorspronkelijk bestond het koor uit burgers. In de tweede helft van de vijfde eeuw kwamen er ook gedeelten die moeilijker te zingen waren. Hiervoor werden waarschijnlijk solisten aangetrokken.

De dithyrambe was een rondedans met een heftig ritme, die werd gezongen en gedanst ter gelegenheid van Dionysusfeesten in het voorjaar. In het begin was dat op informele feesten met veel drank, vanaf \pm 600 waren er officiële staatsfeesten waar dithyrambewedstrijden waren. Zo'n verandering heeft ongetwijfeld haar weerslag gehad op het taalgebruik van de gedichten. In ieder geval roemde men in de Oudheid de verheven stijl van Pindarus. De stijl van Bacchylides' dithyramben is anders. In Bacchylides vinden we meer directe rede (een gedicht is zelfs helemaal in dialoogvorm) en lijkt de wijze van presenteren meer op die van de tragedie, doordat Bacchylides kennelijk streeft naar eenheid van plaats en tijd. Van de Nieuwe Dithyrambe wordt gezegd dat de mimetische (= uitbeeldende) tendenzen steeds meer de overhand krijgen: zangers en fluitisten beelden in geluid en gebaar de personages uit. Dit roept veel negatieve reacties op, vooral bij de komediedichter Aristophanes en bij filosofen als Plato en Aristoteles. Ook het woordgebruik wordt steeds experimenteler: men maakt nieuwe, veelal samengestelde woorden die door de critici worden afgekeurd als holle, loze woorden.

Over de dithyrambenopvoeringen in Athene weten we vrij veel. De bevolking van Athene was verdeeld in tien stammen. Van elke stam deden twee koren aan de wedstrijd mee, een van vijftig jongens en een van vijftig mannen. Elke stam koos een koorleider, elf maanden vóór het feest. De koorleider droeg alle kosten voor de opvoering door zijn koor. De tien koorleiders lootten om de volgorde waarin zij hun dichter mochten kiezen. In het begin lootten zij ook om de keuzevolgorde voor de fluitist, maar vanaf \pm 550 werden de fluitspelers gekozen door de dichters. Vervolgens stelden de koorleiders hun koren samen en zorgden voor een dansmeester. De prijs voor de stam en de koorleider was een drievoet, een grote schaal met drie poten. De eerste prijs voor de dichter was een stier, de tweede prijs een kruik wijn (\pm 26 l.) en de derde prijs een geit.

Van Pindarus zijn aanzienlijke dithyrambenfragmenten gevonden op papyri, die in Egypte zijn opgegraven aan het einde van de vorige eeuw. De papyri worden momenteel bewaard in Oxford.

Fragment 70a bevat de rechterhelft van een kolom van 38 regels. Geen enkele regel is compleet, maar het is duidelijk dat het over een deel van de Perseus-legende gaat. Tussen twee delen van het verhaal vinden we een intermezzo waarin

de dichter de hulp van de Muzen inroept en vermoedelijk verwijst naar het feest waarop de dithyrambe werd opgevoerd.

Het gedicht waarvan fragment 70b het begin is, gaat volgens de titel over de tocht naar de Onderwereld van Heracles, maar dat gedeelte van de tekst is verloren gegaan. In het overgeleverde gedeelte begint de dichter met een verwijzing naar de oude dithyrambe en beschrijft vervolgens hoe de Olympische goden het Dionysusfeest vieren. Aan het einde van het fragment vermeldt de dichter trots zijn belangrijke positie en via de naam van zijn vaderstad Thebe komt hij op het huwelijk van Cadmus en Harmonia, grootouders van Dionysus. Hierbij hoort misschien ook fragment 346 waarin beschreven wordt hoe Heracles wordt ingewijd in de Mystериën van Eleusis voordat hij de tocht naar de Onderwereld aanvaardt.

Van fragment 70c zijn resten van 26 regels overgeleverd. Het gaat vrijwel zeker over een Dionysusfeest, maar meer valt er niet over te zeggen.

Fragment 70d gaat over Perseus die met hulp van de goden het hoofd van Medusa verovert, en dat hoofd meeneemt naar het eiland Seriphus, waar Perseus' moeder door de koning tot een huwelijk is gedwongen. Wie het hoofd van Medusa aanschouwt, verandert in steen, en zo straft Perseus de bevolking van Seriphus.

Fragment 75 was al bekend voordat de papyri gevonden waren uit een citaat bij de grammaticus Dionysius van Halicarnassus. In 19 regels nodigt de dichter de Olympische goden uit om naar Athene te komen en goedgunstig op hem neer te zien als hij in zijn dithyrambe de god Dionysus laat bezingen. Het laatste deel van het gedicht beschrijft de lente, het seizoen van de dithyrambe.

Fragment 76 is de aanhef van een dithyrambe en bevat een uitbundige lofprijzing van Athene. Omdat Pindarus een Thebaan was, leverde dat nog politieke problemen voor hem op. Fragment 77 komt waarschijnlijk van dezelfde dithyrambe en roemt de Atheners als grondleggers van de vrijheid, doordat zij bij Artemisium een overwinning behaalden op de Perzen.

Fragment 78 is een aanroeping van de godin Strijdkreet.

Voor het overige bestaan de fragmenten van Pindarus' dithyramben uit losse regels of woorden.

De inhoud van Pindarus' dithyramben betreft voor een groot deel Dionysus, zijn geschiedenis, de feesten ter ere van hem, en verwante godheden en ritен. We vinden ook veel hymnische elementen, zoals aanroepingen, cultusnamen en gegevens over zijn afkomst. Mythische verhalen spelen een grote rol, en hadden vermoedelijk een relatie met de stad waar de dithyrambe werd opgevoerd. Dit

gaf de dichter de kans de stedelingen zich trots te laten voelen op hun stad. De dichter heeft het ook regelmatig over zichzelf en zijn kunst.

Het metrum van Pindarus' dithyramben kan niet altijd met zekerheid worden bepaald omdat er geen enkel gedicht compleet bekend is. Toch kunnen we concluderen dat Horatius overdrijft als hij zegt dat Pindarus' verzen zich van geen enkele wet iets aantrekken.

Pindarus wordt door Galenus geprezen om zijn verheven stijl en door Dionysius van Halicarnassus aangehaald als voorbeeld van de strenge stijl. Met de strenge stijl wordt bedoeld dat de dichter streeft naar lange woorden met lange lettergrepen, naar een woordvolgorde die elk woord de ruimte geeft (bijvoorbeeld door een bepaalde opeenvolging van klanken), naar een majestueus ritme dat niet al te gepolijst en gekunsteld klinkt, en naar syntactische onregelmatigheden. Deze kenmerken gelden grotendeels voor alle gedichten van Pindarus. Alleen het schema Pindaricum (een grammatische constructie waarbij een meervoudig onderwerp een enkelvoudig gezegde heeft) lijkt typisch te zijn voor de dithyramben.

De tekst van de papyrusfragmenten is gebaseerd op persoonlijke inspectie van de papyri in Oxford en Berlijn. In de transcriptie en het apparaat heb ik zo exact mogelijk aangegeven wat ik zag. Conjecturen worden vermeld met de auteur en jaartal van publikatie.

Van elke tekst is, voorzover zinvol, een vertaling gegeven.

Het commentaar is vooral filologisch, maar waar mogelijk heb ik geprobeerd in te gaan op de historische achtergrond, met name de Dionysusverering en de opvoeringssituatie.

Na het commentaar volgen de bibliografie en de indexen. In de bibliografie zijn alle publikaties vermeld waarnaar meer dan eenmaal in de inleiding en het commentaar is verwezen. De index bevat de besproken passages uit Pindarus en andere auteurs, de Griekse woorden en de onderwerpen die wat uitgebreider in het commentaar behandeld zijn.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Marianne van der Weiden was born on March 18th, 1954 in Rotterdam. She took the gymnasium alpha diploma in 1971 at the Bonifatiuslyceum in Utrecht and graduated from Parkside Highschool, Jackson (Michigan, USA) in 1972 as an exchange student.

From 1972 until 1978 she studied Psychology at the University of Utrecht and received her doctoral degree in Clinical Psychology in December 1978. She worked as an educational researcher at the Catholic University of Nijmegen, from 1979 until 1981 at the department of political studies, from 1981 until 1986 at the IOWO, institute for research and development in higher education. From 1986 until 1987 she was given an appointment at the department of Psychology of the Brabant University of Tilburg. Since 1987 she has worked for the VSNU, Association of Dutch Universities, as a policy adviser in the field of research and development of higher education.

From 1978 she studied Classical Languages at the University of Utrecht and graduated with honours in 1986. From 1987 until 1991 she has received a grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) to write a dissertation on the Dithyrambs of Pindar.

Stellingen behorende bij het proefschrift
'The Dithyrambs of Pindar. Introduction, text and commentary'

1. Het feit dat fragment 78 een hymnische aanroeping is, maakt het niet vanzelfsprekend dat dit fragment het begin van een gedicht is.
contra B. Snell-H. Maehler (ed.), *Pindari carminum cum fragmentis*, Leipzig.
2. Behoudens een grotere frequentie van het schema Pindaricum in de dithyramben zijn er geen bewijzen voor een specifiek dithyrambische stijl in Pindarus.
contra R. Seaford, *Maia* 29 (1977-78), 81-94.
3. Het verbum $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\iota\omicron$ en de marginale toevoeging $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota\delta\omicron\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\varsigma$ maken de interpretatie van fr. 70c, 13-14 als een dionysische feestscène onhoudbaar.
contra B. Zimmermann, *ZPE* 72 (1988), 22.
4. Bij een zorgvuldige uitwerking is een bindend studieadvies aan het einde van de propedeuse nuttig voor zowel student als studierichting.
5. Voor de motivatie van studenten is een te lichte studiebelasting even slecht als een te zware.
6. Promovendi die naast een andere baan willen promoveren, zijn zelden in staat een realistische inschatting te maken van de benodigde inspanning en het vereiste uithoudingsvermogen.
7. Verandering van inspanning is ontspanning.
8. Het heeft een gunstige uitwerking op zowel ouders als kinderen als de dagelijkse zorg en opvoeding door de vader en de moeder gelijkelijk worden gedeeld.
9. Het is vernietiging van menselijk kapitaal als vrouwen zichzelf en elkaar niet aansporen om functies na te streven die passen bij hun capaciteiten.

M.J.H. van der Weiden

