THE INFLUENTIAL FICTIONS IN THE SCHOLIA TO PINDAR'S *PYTHIAN* 8*

MARY R. LEFKOWITZ

THE substance of ancient poetry, like the texts of the poems themselves, has reached us only through the mediation of many minds and hands. In particular, the *Odes* of Pindar have survived inextricably enmeshed in critical opinion, since they required interpretation to be understood even in antiquity, once they had been removed from the original provenance of their performance. In the third century B.C. the text was edited by Aristophanes of Byzantium, and an explanatory commentary was written by Aristarchus in Alexandria. Other scholars, like Aristarchus' student Aristodemus, added interpretations; in the first century Didymus wrote a commentary, disputing Aristarchus' interpretations on many points. Over the next centuries these scholars' contributions were preserved, elaborated, and finally condensed and compiled into our present scholia to Pindar.[1]

Since the scholia in turn provide the basis for all modern commentaries, in practice it is impossible to read an Ode without confronting, at least indirectly, interpretative problems defined by Aristarchus and his successors. Perhaps respect for the past demands no less: the Hellenistic commentators and their later excerptors were native speakers of Greek and had access to books of poetry and of

history that we shall never see.[2] But antiquity alone has never been a guarantee of accuracy, and criticism, consciously or unconsciously, always involves some degree of subjectivity. For the writers of commentaries, as for Thucydides and Polybius, gathering and selecting information was a fictive act, no less structured on convention, or animated by new insight, than the human behavior their art described. In the same way as events in a historian's own time affect his outlook on the past, contemporary aesthetics can shape a critic's judgment of poetry from an earlier age. Some details will not seem to matter; others will assume an importance that the poet himself would never have perceived.

Modern interpretation of *Pythian* 8 reflects the pervasive influence of ancient criticism. This austere, reflective Ode has reached us with important judgments about its purpose and its contents already made. On the basis of the scholia, references to war in its opening stanza are interpreted as commentary on Athens' hegemony over Aegina, and a sudden description of an encounter with the hero Alcmeon (55–60), along with a closing invocation to "Aegina dear mother" (98), has caused continuing speculation that the chorus speaks out intermittently in the Ode either in the

victor's person or for itself.[3] If we accept either or both of these interpretations, our understanding of every other line in the Ode will be affected. The famous passage τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὔ τις; σκιᾶς ὄναρ / ἄνθρωπος (95–96) takes on meanings that we could not have imagined when we first saw the lines out of context in our beginning Greek texts. Do they express Pindar's despair at Aegina's fall, as Bowra suggested?[4] Are they spoken in a special solo passage by the Aeginetan chorus, as proposed by Floyd?[5]

It is possible to ignore the scholia and to argue on literary grounds that neither of these interpretations is correct. As recent study in conventional themes in victory odes indicates, references to war are commonplace in the description of athletic games, which are themselves a ritual mimesis of life-and-death struggle.[6] Examination of the respective styles of monodic and choral song indicates that the "I" in the victory odes is the poet himself, since the first personal statements in the odes resemble individual bards' characterization of their art, rather than the more dramatically detailed self-description of choruses speaking *in propria persona*.[7] But these arguments, based on the internal evidence of the poems themselves, do not confront directly the basic question of the validity of the scholia. As long as it can be believed that the ancient commentators had accurate information about the odes'

historical environment and the circumstances of their performance, the scholia cannot safely be ignored.

Accordingly it is necessary to turn back again to the scholia. But instead of choosing from them whatever information seems valid or relevant, as one might glance at a dictionary or modern commentary, I would like to suggest that we compare the influential scholia on *Pythian* 8 to the scholia with similar functions in other Odes, in order to determine the nature of the problems they sought to solve, and the means with which they arrived at their solutions. Comparison reveals a consistent pattern: the scholarly debates recorded in the scholia focus on matters of particular interest to Aristarchus and his successors at Alexandria; the critical attitudes of these scholars were influenced by the aesthetics of Hellenistic poetry; when applied to the fifth-century poet Pindar, these late aesthetics inevitably led to misapprehension, which in turn compelled the commentators to look outside the poems for solutions to the problems their method of reading made them find.

I. The Political Scholia

Φιλόφρον 'Ησυχία, Δίκας
ὦ μεγιστόπολι θύγατερ,
βουλᾶν τε καὶ πολέμων
ἔχοισα κλαῖδας ὑπερτάτας
Πυθιόνικον τιμὰν Ἀριστομένει δέκευ
[*Pyth.* 8. 1–5].

---

3. On the proem as reflection of Aegina's current political situation, see J. H. Finley, Jr., *Pindar and Aeschylus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), pp. 166–68; C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 339–40; R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford, 1962), p. 174. Arguments in favor of a choral speaker in 55 ff. have most recently been suggested by E. Thummer, *Die Religiosität Pindars* (Innsbruck, 1957), pp. 31–33; Elroy Bundy, "Studia Pindarica II," *CPCP*, XVIII (1962), 69–70 and n. 84; and E. D. Floyd, "The Performance of Pindar, *Pythian* 8. 55–70," *GRBS*, VI (1965), 187–200.

4. Bowra (n. 3) sees in all sections of the Ode commentary on the political fate of Aegina, e.g. (p. 340), "the contrast in human existence between its usual unsubstantial and shadowy character and its unforeseen moments of god-given radiance

(93–97) belongs both to the athletic victory and the political victory for which Pindar prays in his final words (98–100)."

5. Floyd (n. 3), p. 200, tentatively proposes that the performance was assigned in solo parts to chorus and poet according to "the natural divisions of the poem."

6. On analogies drawn in the *Odes* between martial and athletic endeavor, see esp. Young, *Isthmian* 7 (n. 2), pp. 39–40, and esp. n. 39 on *Pythian* 8.

7. See my article, "Τὼ καὶ ἐγώ: The First Person in Pindar," *HSCP*, LXVII (1963), 177–253. The issue is complicated by the fact that ancient scholars do not appear to have made a distinction between monodic and choral song in classifying lyric poetry; see R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 1968), p. 283.

1a. ἰδίᾳ Αἰγινήταις ἦσαν στάσεις περὶ τὸν τῆς νίκης τοῦ Ἀριστομένους καιρόν· διὸ καὶ οἰκείως τὴν Ἡσυχίαν κατεύχεται, ποιητικώτατα δὲ τὴν ἡσυχίαν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἔφη παῖδα εἶναι, ᾗ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων τῆς ἀδικίας τὸν θόρυβον.

1b. Φιλόφρον Ἡσυχία: τὴν Ἡσυχίαν κατακαλεῖται διὰ τὸ νεωστὶ λελύσθαι τὰ Περσικά. δύναται δὲ καὶ ἁπλῶς λέγειν ὁ Πίνδαρος ὡς περὶ εὐνομουμένων τῶν Αἰγινητῶν. καὶ ἐπαινεῖ τὴν ἡσυχίαν ὡς μεγιστόπολιν· ὅπου γὰρ ἡσυχία, καὶ εἰρήνη. εἰρήνη δ' ἀνὰ γῆν κουρο-τρόφος (Hes. O.D. 228).

[Drachmann, II, 206]

"Kind Calm, O Right's daughter with greatest city, who hold of plans and wars the highest keys, receive for Aristomenes the honor of a Pythian victory." The scholia on the opening lines of *Pythian* 8 preserve two interpretations of the political significance of the invocation to Hesychia: *(1a)* "political disturbances around the time of Aristomenes' victory" (dated from the victor lists in Pythiad 35, i.e., 446 B.C.); *(1b)* "because the Persian Wars have recently ended." The interpretations are, of course, mutually contradictory. Since the Persian Wars had been over for more than thirty years before Pindar wrote *Pythian* 8, modern critics have tended to disregard the scholium *1b* and to consider only the statement in *1a* about "political disturbances around the time of the victory." Though no particular event is specified in the scholia, it seems natural to infer that these "disturbances" had something to do with the domination of Aegina by Athens after 459 B.C.

If only the single reference to events around the time of the victory were retained in the scholia, there might be reason to assume that the commentators had access to direct information about the political climate of Aegina at the time when the Ode was written. But the co-existence of an alternative opinion, clearly inaccurate, casts doubt also on the source of the more reasonable suggestion. If one

was recognized as authoritative, why were both preserved?

The practice elsewhere in the scholia of recording variant opinions suggests that both the conflicting scholia to *Pythian* 8. 1 date from no earlier than the third century B.C. and that both are based on hypothesis. Comparison with the scholium on *Nemean* 7. *1a* (III, 116–17) is illuminating:

1a. Εἰλείθυια πάρεδρε Μοιρᾶν: ζητεῖται διατί ἀπὸ τῆς Εἰλειθυίας εἰσβέβληκε, καὶ τί δήποτε τῇ Εἰλειθυίᾳ προσδιαλέγεται. ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν φασι νέον ὄντα τὸν Σωγένην ἑτέρου νικήσαντος αὐτὸν κατὰ χάριν ἀνηγγέλθαι τοῦ πατρὸς Θεαρίωνος εἰς τοῦτο φιλοτιμηθέντος, τὸν δὲ ἀγωνισάμενον Νεοπτόλεμον τοὔνομα Ἀχαιὸν· παρὸ καὶ εἰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ Νεοπτολέμου τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως τὸν ποιητὴν παρεκβῆναι λόγους. αὐτοσχέδιον δέ φησι τοῦτο εἶναι ὁ Δίδυμος· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀφ' ἑτέρου ὀνόματος κηρύττεται, μόνον δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἱππικοῖς ἀγῶσι νενόμισται τὸ ἔθος, ὥστε τοὺς βασιλέας καὶ τυράννους ἀναγράφεσθαι· πλούτου γὰρ καὶ χορηγίας τὴν ἱπποτροφίαν ἐπίδειξιν εἶναι καὶ οὐ ῥώμης. ἔνιοι δέ φασι πρὸς τοὔνομα τοῦ Σωγένους παρειλκύσθαι τὴν Εἰλείθυιαν· εἶναι γὰρ αὐτὴν σωγενῆ τινα διὰ τὸ τὰ γεννώμενα ἀνασῴζειν· τὸν οὖν Πίνδαρον ψυχρευσάμενον πρὸς τοὔνομα τῆς Εἰλειθυίας μεμνῆσθαι. καὶ τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ εὖ· τότε γὰρ καταφέρεται εἰς τοῦτο ὁ Πίνδαρος, ὅταν ὑπῇ τις ὁμωνυμία· οἷον ... Ὀλβίων ὁμώνυμε Δαρδανιδᾶν, παῖ θρασύμηδες Ἀμύντα· καὶ ... Σύνες ὅ τι λέγω, ζαθέων ἱερῶν ὁμώνυμε πάτερ, κτίστορ Αἴτνας. νῦν δὲ οὐδὲν τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν. ἔνιοι δὲ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Σωγένους Θεαρίωνα τῇ Εἰλειθυίᾳ ἔφασαν ἱεράσθαι· ἀμάρτυρον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο. οἱ δὲ, ὅτι ἐν γειτόνων ἦν τῷ Σωγένει ἱερὸν Εἰλειθυίας. οὐδὲ τοῦτο δὲ ἱστορεῖται. ἄλλοι δὲ ἔφασαν, ὅτι τοὺς ἐκ φύσεως ἀγαθοὺς ἐπαινεῖ πάντοτε ὁ Πίνδαρος μᾶλλον τῶν ἐκ διδασκαλίας· καὶ ἡ Εἰλείθυια οὖν τὸν Σωγένην εὐθέως ὑπὸ τὴν γένεσιν ἐπιτήδειον κατεσκεύασε πρὸς ἄθλησιν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι τῶν θεῶν αὐξανομένοις ἀγαθὰ δωροῦνται, ἡ δὲ Εἰλείθυια αὐτὴν τὴν πρώτην καταβολήν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο λέγειν· τί δήποτε τὴν Εἰλείθυιαν ἰδίως ἐπὶ τοῦ Σωγένους παρέλαβεν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλων εὐφυΐᾳ διενεγκόντων; Ἀριστό-δημος δὲ ὁ Ἀριστάρχου μαθητὴς βέλτιον οὕτω φησίν· ὀψέ ποτε τῷ Θεαρίωνι καὶ παρὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἤδη προήκοντι, εὐξαμένῳ τῇ θεῷ Σωγένην τεκνωθῆναι, καὶ τὴν τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ γέννησιν οἷον Εἰλειθυίας εἶναι χάριν. διὰ τὴν ἰδιότητα οὖν τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ ἀθλητοῦ πρὸς τὴν θεὸν ταύτην ἐπήρεισε τὸν λόγον. ἐπιστοῦτο δὲ τοῦτο ἐξ ἐπιγράμματος Σιμωνίδου ... ἑνικῶς δὲ εἶπεν Εἰλείθυια, ὡς καὶ Ἡσίοδος.

This scholium preserves an extensive

debate ($\zeta\eta\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$) about the possible relevance of the Ode's invocation: "why does he start with Eileithuia, and why indeed does he talk to Eileithuia?" The first suggestion is that, because Sogenes the victor was young, his father arranged to have a proxy, an Achaean named Neoptolemus, compete for him. This interpretation, attributed to Aristarchus in the scholium to *Nemean 7. 56a* (III, 124), also solves another critical problem later in the Ode, the relevance of reference to the hero Neoptolemus. Didymus rejected Aristarchus' view as nonsense, because it was based on an undocumentable analogy, i.e., that athletes in the pentathlon, like victors in chariot and horse races, did not necessarily engage in the actual competition. Didymus' comment provides us with valuable insight into Aristarchus' critical methodology: like ancient historians and lawyers, he seems to have relied on $\epsilon\grave{\iota}\kappa\acute{o}s$, or reasonable hypothesis.[8]

The other suggestions recorded in the scholium to *Nemean 7. 1a* appear also to be based on guesswork: the idea of a pun "in bad taste" on Sogenes' name, i.e., Eileithuia "saves ($\mathring{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$) what has been born ($\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$)," is dismissed on the grounds that in other poems Pindar deliberately calls attention to such onomastic puns; that Sogenes' father was a priest of Eileithuia is dismissed for lack of evidence, along with the analogous suggestion that there was a temple of Eileithuia in the neighborhood; the view that Pindar mentions the birth goddess to emphasize

his belief that talent derives from birth rather than from training is disregarded on the grounds that no other Ode begins with Eileithuia. As in the case of the first suggestion about the victor's surrogate Neoptolemus, these additional "facts" about the victor seem to be deduced directly from the Ode itself, without the benefit of external historical information.

Only the last suggestion cited seems to have struck the compiler of the scholium as convincing: Aristarchus' pupil Aristodemus' explanation that Sogenes was born late in his father Thearion's life and that, accordingly, special thanks are made to Eileithuia; reference is made in support to an epigram (not quoted) of Simonides.[9] This interpretation seems plausible, but in fact, it is no less hypothetical than all the others. We can recognize in Aristodemus' biographical data a standard event in folk tale: special thanks must be paid to the divinity responsible for the welfare of a lateborn child or his family will suffer, like Demophon's parents in the *Hymn to Demeter*, who realized too late the true purpose of Demeter's placing their only son in the fire.[10] Aristodemus' explanation of the reason why Pindar in *Pythian 3* represents himself as praying to the Mother is similarly based on biographical information that closely resembles folk tale: Pindar saw a stone statue of the Mother come before his feet, and accordingly set up a shrine to her and Pan before his house (*137b*; II, 80); one thinks of Zeus sending the Palladium to Dardanus.[11]

8. On the use of $\epsilon\grave{\iota}\kappa\acute{o}s$ in Thucydides' history and in contemporary legal arguments, see J. H. Finley, Jr., *Thucydides* (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), pp. 46–50. On the Hellenistic historians' practice of reporting what might have been said and what should have happened, see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, I (Oxford, 1957), 13–16.

9. On the scholium *Nem.* 7. *1a*, see esp. H. Fraenkel, "Schrullen in den Scholien zu Pindars Nemeen 7 und Olympien 3," *Hermes*, LXXXIX (1961), 391–94. D. C. Young, "Pindar Nemean 7: Some Preliminary Remarks (vv. 1–20)," *TAPA*, CI (1970), 637, suggests that the epigram cited by Aristodemus is in fact 161 Diehl with its extended onomastic pun on the

names $\Sigma\hat{\omega}\sigma\sigma s$ and $\Sigma\omega\sigma\acute{\omega}$, rather than some other epigram (now lost) detailing Sogenes' biography.

10. On Aristodemus, see D. C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7* (Leyden, 1968), pp. 47–49 and 48, n. 2; *idem*, "Nemean 7" (n. 9), pp. 636–37; and W. J. Slater, "Pindar's House," *GRBS*, XII (1971), 149 and n. 37.

11. The development of the prayer to the Mother in *Pythian 3* into an event in Pindar's life is discussed by Slater, "Pindar's House" (n. 10), pp. 141–52. With Aristodemus' story of the falling statue, compare the numerous tales of sacred falling objects in Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*

The archetypal character of Aristodemus' stories suggests that they were generated to explain the poems and did not derive from any historical evidence. In constructing history from poetry, Aristodemus was conforming to accepted practice. Hellenistic biographers seem habitually to have turned for information about a poet's life to the work of the poet himself or to statements about him in the works of other poets.[12] Satyrus, in his *Life of Euripides*, treats Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* as an account of an actual event in Euripides' life (*POxy.* 1176. Frag. 39. Col. x–xii); a discussion about Alcman's origins is similarly based on citations from lyric poetry (*Poet. Mel. Gr.* 13=*POxy.* 2389. Frag. 9. Col. i).[13]

The *Nemean* 7 scholia also display a consistent introversion. It is remarkable that in all the recorded debate, reference to the rest of the Ode is made only to recall another interpretational problem, the presence of the hero Neoptolemus. Though reference is made to two hyporchemes to dispute the possibility of a pun on Sogenes' name, there is no citation, anywhere in the discussion, of the proems of other victory odes which begin with invocations to goddesses, like *Isthmian* 5 or *Pythian* 8.

The way the commentators on *Nemean* 7 defined and solved the critical problem of Eileithuia's relevance has a direct parallel in the scholia to *Pythian* 8. 1. The suggestion in *Ib* about the "recently ended Persian Wars" looks like a piece of guesswork, designed to justify the presence of a reference to war in an ode of celebration. We may compare the reasons given for the debate in *Nemean* 7: "why

does he start with Eileithuia, and why indeed does he talk to Eileithuia?" The vague statement in *Ia* about "political disturbances" appears only to be another, though more plausible, guess. As in the case of the *Nemean* 7 scholium, no reference is made in the *Pythian* 8 scholia to the proems of other Odes. The new word, μεγιστόπολις is explained not by reference to the analogous μεγαλοπόλιες ὦ Συράκοσαι in the invocation to *Pythian* 2, but by a citation from Hesiod which emphasizes the association of Hesychia with politics, "peace is a nourisher of young throughout the land" (*Op.* 228). The genealogy of Hesychia likewise is not explained by discussion of how parentage defines the character of the offspring, as, e.g., in *Isthmian* 5, where Theia is mother of the sun. Instead the commentators provide an illustration from another poem (Frag. 250*a*, now lost), that also helps fix in our minds the definition of Hesychia as "Peace": "Clamor is the daughter of Injustice." The possibility that Hesychia can connote rest and tranquillity in a more general sense (such as after physical exertion in an athletic contest) does not seem to have deserved consideration. Missing also from these scholia and the other scholia to the opening lines of *Pythian* 8 is any specific commentary on the way in which the action described in the opening lines is recalled and developed later in the Ode. By reading one line at a time, with the possibility of easy reference within or outside the poem restricted by the format of the papyrus roll, the commentators concentrated on individual words and so lost the sense of context that gives Pindar's words their full meaning.

(Bloomington, 1955), F 962. The story of Simonides' miraculous escape from the falling house of the Scopads seems to have been generated by the same process; see W. J. Slater, "Simonides' House," *Phoenix*, XXVI (1972), 232–40.

12. The practice of developing biography from poetry may have originated with the Peripatetic Chamaeleon (e.g.,

Poet. Mel. Gr. 193); see A. D. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), p. 80.

13. The Alexandrian life of Alcman is discussed by E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (Princeton, 1968), p. 104. See also Turner's analysis of an Alexandrian *Life of Pindar*, pp. 105–106; and Young, *Three Odes* (n. 10), p. 101, n. 1.

In sum, the scholia on the opening lines of *Pythian* 8 tell us more about Hellenistic scholarship and late Greek education than about Pindar's poetry or the historical context surrounding the Ode's performance. The commentators had no particular difficulty with the other Odes where an explicit connection exists between the opening lines and the victory celebration, e.g., *Olympian* 1 (μηδ᾽ Ὀλυμπίας ἀγῶνα φέρτερον αὐδάσομεν, 7) or *Pythian* 2 (μεγαλοπόλιες ὦ Συράκοσαι, 1). They were ·accustomed to hearing connections stated directly in the poetry of their contemporaries. When Apollonius of Rhodes invokes a god, he makes his reason for the invocation clear: "cruel Eros, great pain, object of men's great hate, from you come deadly quarrels and moans and lamentations" (4. 445–46) introduces the account of Jason and Medea's murder of her brother Apsyrtus. But when, as in the case of the proems to *Pythian* 8 and *Nemean* 7, Pindar does not indicate explicitly the relation of the invocation to the victory, the commentators turned outside the Odes for answers. On the analogy of the literature of their day, mythological obscurity could be explained as allegory, as if Pindar were disguising references to real people and events behind the names of gods and heroes. If Callimachus could speak of his literary enemies as Telchines (*Aet.* 1. 1), why could

there not be some hint of Aegina's political situation in an invocation to Hesychia?[14]

The need to find an explicit connection between the proem and the victory seems to have demanded the production of explanatory "facts." We learn in the case of *Pythian* 1, which begins with an invocation to χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, that "Hieron provided Pindar with a golden lyre" (*1a*; II, 8); in *Pythian* 3, which begins with a reference to the healer Chiron, that Hieron was sick at the time of the Ode's composition (*inscr. b*; II, 63); in *Olympian* 10, which calls upon the Muses to remind the poet of a song he owed but had forgotten, that Pindar was late in composing the Ode (*1g*; I, 309). There is little reason to think that these interpretations, plausible as they may seem, were based on external information about the circumstances of the Odes' performance. They are rather educated guesses, based on unstated premises, limited in focus. To prove any of them right, we must look for confirmation from some other source.

In the case of the proem to *Pythian* 8, we should feel safe in concluding that the ancient commentators had no more specific information than we do about the historical ambiance in which the Ode was performed. It seems likely (εἰκός), though we cannot prove it, that Pindar would have regretted Aegina's loss of independence.[15]

14. Hellenistic use of allegory can also account for the commentators' tendency to try to find specific references to rivalry between Pindar and Bacchylides, whenever Pindar speaks of his poetry in terms of competition, e.g., *Ol.* 2. 82–85. But such statements of supremacy comparing the poet's art to the athlete's are standard in victory odes; see my article, "Bacchylides' Ode 5: Imitation and Originality," *HSCP*, LXXIII (1969), 54–56 and nn. 13–14, and my book (forthcoming), *The Victory Ode: An Introduction*, chap. i, n. 8 and chap. ii, sec. 1 on Bacchylides 5. 16–30. The scholia on *Ol.* 2. 29cd (I, 68–69) also suggest that the Ode contains veiled references to dissension between Hieron and Theron. The source of this historical information is Timaeus (see also *Ol.* 2 *inscr.* [I, 58] = *FGrH* 566 F 92), cited often elsewhere in the scholia by Didymus. But one of Timaeus' principal sources would have been Pindar's *Odes*. Polyb. 12. 24 gives us an impression of how Timaeus used poetry as source material: "Timaeus says that poets and authors because

of extreme excesses in their work reveal their own natures," i.e., according to Timaeus, since Homer frequently describes banquets he must have been a glutton. Polybius also accuses Timaeus of having relied heavily on dreams, miracles, and myths. In other words, the historical data on which Didymus and the other commentators based their interpretations of the *Odes* was at least in part extrapolated from the *Odes* themselves; see Jacoby's note on Timaeus F 92–97, *FGrH*, IIIb, 578 and n. 458.

15. Aristarchus' equally plausible suggestion that in *Isthm.* 7 Pindar is referring to rivalry between Thebes and Sparta (*23a*; III, 264) has generally been accepted. But the expressions of grief in this Ode follow conventional patterns and have a general frame of reference that can be fixed to no particular place or time; see Young, *Isthmian* 7 (n. 2), pp. 1–46, with amplifications noted by W. J. Slater in his review, *Gnomon*, XLV (1973), 198–99. No one seems to take seriously Aristarchus' suggestion in *Pyth.* 7 that "it seems likely" (εἰκός)

But whether he said so indirectly in this poem is something we cannot know. To begin a discussion of the Ode with reference to historical background is to give prime emphasis to events which quite possibly had no bearing on the Ode and to divert our attention from what Pindar himself says.

II. The Choral Scholia

τοιαῦτα μέν
ἐφθέγξατ' Ἀμφιάρηος. χαίρων δὲ καὶ αὐτός
Ἀλκμᾶνα στεφάνοισι βάλλω, ῥαίνω δὲ καὶ ὕμνῳ,
γείτων ὅτι μοι καὶ κτεάνων φύλαξ ἐμῶν
ὑπάντασεν ἰόντι γᾶς ὀμφαλὸν παρ' ἀοίδιμον,
μαντευμάτων τ' ἐφάψατο συγγόνοισι τέχναις

[*Pyth.* 8. 55–60].

78a. τοιαῦτα μὲν ἐφθέγξατ' Ἀμφίαρηος: ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ τὸ πρόσωπον μιμουμένου τοῦ νενικηκότος. ταῦτα δὲ εἴρηκεν ὡς ὑπάρχοντος ἥρωου καὶ γειτνιῶντος τῇ τοῦ νικηφόρου οἰκίᾳ, προσυποτίθεται δὲ ὅτι καὶ ὑπήντησε πορευομένῳ εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τῆς μαντείας ἐφήψατο καὶ αὐτὸς ὢν μάντις. ἐμφαίνει δὲ διὰ τούτων, ὅτι ἐγεγόνει τις μαντεία περὶ τῆς νίκης αὐτοῦ. b. ἄλλως· ἐφηδόμενος δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν Ἀλκμάονα στεφανῶ τῇ ᾠδῇ, ὅτι δή μοι ὁ τούτου πατὴρ Ἀμφιάραος γείτων ἐστὶ καὶ φύλαξ τῶν ἐμῶν κτημάτων, καὶ ὅτι ἀπιόντι εἰς τὸν τῆς γῆς ὀμφαλόν, τουτέστιν εἰς τὴν Πυθῶνα, ἀπήντησε καὶ τῶν μαντευμάτων ἐφήψατο τοῖς συγγεννηθεῖσιν αὐτῷ τυχὸν [δὲ λέγει συγγόνοις τέχναις].
82. γείτων ὅτι μοι: τῇ Ἀριστομένους οἰκίᾳ παρίδρυτο Ἀλκμάονος ἥρωον, ἴσως δὲ καὶ τῇ αὐτοῦ μαντείᾳ χρησάμενος ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐπορεύθη καὶ ἐνίκησεν.
83a. κτεάνων φύλαξ ἐμῶν: ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ Αἰγινῆταί εἰσιν. b. ἐπεὶ ἐκ προγόνων ἦν μάντις, διὰ τοῦτο εἶπε συγγόνοισι.

[II, 214–15]

After the opening invocation to Hesychia and the prayer for her to receive the honor of Aristomenes' Pythian victory, Pindar describes how Hesychia quells the violence of her enemies. Apollo likewise

subdues violence with force, but has received the victor Aristomenes with glad intent in his temple at Delphi. Then follows praise of the achievements of Aegina, the victor's homeland, too many to recall without danger of excess. Then comes praise for the victor's own family, his two uncles, one an Olympian victor, the other an Isthmian. Aristomenes' victory illustrates what Amphiaraus said, as the Seven were being defeated before Thebes, about the return of their sons, the Epigonoi: his own son Alcmeon would be victorious, but Adrastus would carry the bones of his son back to Argos, the one casualty of the successful war. Then comes the passage in question: "So spoke Amphiaraus. And rejoicing, I too throw crowns on Alcmeon, and sprinkle him with song, since as my neighbor and guard of my possessions he encountered me as I was coming to the famed navel of the earth, and he touched me with his inherited skills of prophecies."

The scholia, as in the case of Hesychia, give two mutually exclusive interpretations of what Pindar's description of this joyous encounter with Alcmeon might mean. The first is that the chorus is imitating the victor (78a). The commentator postulates: "He says this presumably (ὡς) because there was a *heroon* near the victor's house, and he adds beside that Alcmeon met him as he was going to the contest." At 82b a restatement of this interpretation adds further detail: "a *heroon* of Alcmeon was established near Aristomenes' house, and perhaps (ἴσως) also consulting Alcmeon's oracle he (Aristomenes) went to the contest and won." The scholium on 83a

---

that the victor Megacles' father had just died (*18a*; II, 204), since the reference to φθόνος in the Ode seems better applied to Megacles' ostracism. Yet both Aristarchus' suggestions are based on the same historical principle, εἰκός. So explicitly also is Didymus' suggestion in *Isthm.* 1 (*inscr. a*; III, 196) that the victor's father settled in Orchomenus because of "some political disturbances," which is accepted by Bundy (n. 3), pp. 49–53 and E. Thummer, *Pindar: Die isthmischen Gedichte*

(Heidelberg, 1968), II, 21. The "political disturbances" are identified specifically as the results of the battle of Plataea by Bowra (n. 3), p. 410. We might equally well accept as based on valid historical research Aristarchus' statement in *Pyth.* 5. 76b (II, 181) that "at the time of Cyrene's founding there were many lions in the vicinity." Fraenkel (n. 9) demonstrates that the ancient title for *Ol.* 3, εἰς θεοξενίαν, likewise derives from critical hypothesis.

designates the phrase "guard of my possessions" as spoken specifically in the person of the chorus.

The second interpretation is that Pindar crowns Alcmeon because Alcmeon's father, Amphiaraus, rather than Alcmeon himself, is Pindar's neighbor: "Rejoicing I myself also crown Alcmeon with song, since his father Amphiaraus is my neighbor and guard of my possessions, and when I was coming to the navel of the earth, that is, to Pytho, he met me and touched me with prophecies born with him [since it happens that they were inherited]" (78b). This reading can be discarded after reference to Pindar's text: a sudden switch of subject from Alcmeon to Amphiaraus, without an intervening particle or demonstrative pronoun, would have been incomprehensible. But the fact that the substitution of Amphiaraus for Alcmeon was made at least reveals why the ancient critics found it hard to interpret this passage. The problem appears primarily to concern geographical probability: how can Alcmeon be called Pindar's neighbor? εἰκός once again provides a solution: Amphiaraus, swallowed up with his horses by the earth before Thebes and worshiped there, could more readily be regarded as the Theban poet's neighbor and guard. The substitution of Amphiaraus' name is a critical device, like Sogenes' surrogate Neoptolemus in the scholium to Nemean 7. 1a. A similar phantom haunts the scholium to Pythian 4. 256 (455b; II, 160–61), where Didymus is quoted as having accounted for the prominence of the Argonaut Euphemus by asserting that "there

was also another later Euphemus who was a companion of Battus," a "fact" unattested elsewhere.[16]

The scholiasts' first suggestion, that the chorus is speaking about a shrine of Alcmeon in Aegina, seems more plausible. But whether or not it is based on actual historical information is another matter. The statement that there was a shrine of Alcmeon near the victor's house seems less convincing if we compare it to the statements in the scholia on Nemean 7. 1a that "Thearion (Sogenes' father) was a priest of Eileithuia" and that "in the neighborhood there was a shrine of Eileithuia" (III, 117).[17] As we have seen, both these interpretations, which were intended to account for the unexplained invocation to Eileithuia, were rejected by the ancient compiler of the scholia as "without evidence." We may suspect that the origins of Alcmeon's shrine in Aegina are the same as the origins of Eileithuia's: hypothesis.

Such topological possibilities in fifth-century Greece are easily postulated at a distance of two hundred years or more, and from the rather different environment of Alexandria. We have already seen how Aristodemus explained Pindar's prayer to the Mother in Pythian 3 by stating that Pindar built a shrine to the Mother and to Pan outside his house in Thebes (137b; II, 80).[18] Similarly, to explain the relevance of the Asopus River (in Boeotia) to an Aeginetan's victory in the opening lines of Nemean 3, the Alexandrian Didymus asserted that there was an Asopus River also in Aegina (1c; III, 42), where

16. See, e.g., the scholium on Ap. Rhod. 4. 1750–57 (p. 327 Wendel).

17. The similarity in the explanations is noted by Slater, "Pindar's House" (n. 9), p. 142.

18. On Aristodemus, see n. 10. In Ol. 7. 87, where Pindar refers to Mt. Atabyrius in Rhodes, Didymus asserts, citing Timaeus, that Mt. Atabyrius was in Sicily (160c [I, 233]=

FGrH 566 F 396). But Timaeus may have obtained this information (which is not recorded elsewhere) from Ol. 7 itself; see n. 13, and Walbank's commentary, II (Oxford, 1967), 159–60 on Polyb. 9. 27. 7. In Ol. 10. 46 Didymus' undocumentable statement that after the Eleans took over Pisa they called it Elis also solves an interpretational difficulty by hypothesis (55c; I, 324).

direct observation would have shown that no rivers at all existed. To explain a difficult metaphor in *Olympian* 5, Aristarchus stated that the Hipparis River near Camarina in Sicily had a delta, like the Nile's (*20e*, *27b*, *29e*; I, 145–47). Evidently the commentators did not have access to or did not consult an accurate descriptive geography of the Greek world.[19]

Absence of a comprehensive treatment of the nature of hero-cults must also have been another hindrance. Had the scholiasts had access to the services of a religious historian, they would have been able to discard the hypothesis of a hero-cult of Alcmeon in Aegina, since heroes tend to be worshiped where they or their relics are buried, and no legend connects Alcmeon with that island.[20] Alcmeon's shrine is a geographical fiction, a product of scholarly rationalization.

The insecure documentation of the commentators' statements about Alcmeon's Aeginetan *heroon* calls into question also their assertions about the role of the chorus in connection with his cult there. It is of course theoretically conceivable that the earlier commentators on Pindar had access to specific information, now lost, about the actual performance of victory odes.[21] But, given the tendency of ancient scholars to provide hypothetical solutions to other critical problems, we should also be suspicious of these supposedly factual details.

The speaking role of the chorus in *Pythian* 8, whether in imitation of the victor (*78a*) or directly for themselves (*83a*), may simply be another critical fiction, a reasonable possibility like "the recently ended Persian Wars" behind the Ode's proem. It is interesting to note that the other attributions in the scholia of lines to choral speakers occur only in interpretation of passages that are construed as referring to events in the victor's home territory, i.e., where the chorus could be supposed to be speaking about its own experience. In all but two cases, the scholia attribute the statement to *either* the poet *or* the chorus, since what is said logically (κατὰ τὰ εἰκότα) could fit both. In *Nemean* 1. 19–20, for Chromius of Aetna, either Pindar or the chorus could be described as standing before the victor's door, ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις / ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου καλὰ μελπόμενος (*29a*; III, 15). In *Pythian* 5. 72–73, for Arcesilaus of Cyrene, τὸ δ' ἐμὸν / γαρύει ἀπὸ Σπάρτας ἐπήρατον κλέος (*96ab*; II, 183), "fame from Sparta" describes the conquest of Amyclae by the Aegidae, ancestors of both Pindar and the Cyrenians. In *Isthmian* 7. 37, for Strepsiades of Thebes, ἔτλαν δὲ πένθος οὐ φατόν (*51abc*; III, 266–67), the sorrow unspeakable could belong to Pindar, or to the chorus (speaking in the first person), or to the victor's family (speaking in the third person). In *Nemean* 9. 1–2 both Pindar and the chorus could be described as singing in honor of the victor Chromius of Aetna, κωμάσομεν παρ' Ἀπόλλωνος Σικυωνόθε, Μοῖσαι, / τὰν νεοκτίσταν ἐς Αἴτναν (*1a*; III, 150). At the end of *Pythian* 8, the chorus

---

19. Sources available to the first commentators included Herodotus, Ephorus, and Timaeus, but it should be remembered that these historians' standards of accuracy were different from ours, and that they did not visit every place they described. Callimachus wrote a *Collection of Marvels in All the Earth According to Localities.* Pfeiffer (n. 7), p. 134, assumes that he derived his compilation from "historical, geographical, and antiquarian sources." Other available sources were the poems he read and edited.

20. One exception to the rule that the *heroon* was located

at the hero's burial place seems to be Iolaus, who had a *heroon* at Thebes, even though the Thebans themselves acknowledge that he had been buried at Sardis (Paus. 9. 23. 1). But Iolaus had at least been born in Thebes and associated with that city all his life. Alcmeon was buried at Psophis in Arcadia; Pausanias saw his tomb, which was surrounded by a sacred grove of old cypress trees (8. 24. 7).

21. Floyd (n. 3) suggests that the scholiasts may have had access to the original musical notation.

or Pindar, as an Aegid related by blood to the Aeginetan aristoc racy, could speak of Aegina as "dear mother" (*140c*; II, 219).

Geographical probability likewise determines the assignment in the scholia of lines exclusively to the chorus: in *Nemean 7*. 84–85, for the Aeginetan Sogenes, Αἰακόν . . . ἐμᾷ μὲν πολίαρχον εὐωνύμῳ πάτρᾳ (*123a*; III, 134); and in *Pythian 9*. 97–98, πλεῖστα νικήσαντά σε καὶ τελεταῖς / ὡρίαις ἐν Παλλάδος εἶδον (*172*; II, 236). This last attribution is a mistake: had the commentator looked at the next line, he would have seen that εἶδον was the third person plural and its subject was ἕκασται: "very many times they saw you win in the seasonal rites of Pallas, and in the silence each of the young women prayed for you to be her husband or son." In the *Nemean 7* passage the exclusive assignment to the chorus of the line about "Aeacus, protector of my famous clan" is based on the erroneous assumption that πάτρα must mean "fatherland." On these grounds it would be impossible for the poet to be speaking in his own person, "since Pindar was not an Aeginetan." But πάτρα can connote "clan" elsewhere in Pindar (e.g., *Pythian 8*. 38 and *Nemean 6*. 35*b*); as in *Pythian 5*, the poet is speaking of himself as a member of the Aegid tribe which had ties to Aegina.[22] In every case, the attribution of lines to choral speakers seems primarily intended to solve a critical problem: it is significant that in the whole corpus of Pindar scholia no reference is made to choral speakers in any other type of context. All of the passages can be equally well construed as spoken in the person of the poet (or, in the case of the *Pythian 9* and *Isthmian 7* passages, as third person plurals).[23]

The role played by the chorus elsewhere

in the scholia indicates that the suggestions about the chorus in the Alcmeon story also are based on hypothesis. Again the chorus' presence depends upon geography: if Alcmeon's shrine is located in Aegina, the victor's homeland, the chorus must be speaking; if it is not, then Pindar is speaking, as the scholium to *78b* suggests. It is not hard to understand why the commentators devised such desperate and contradictory hypotheses about this passage. The reference to Alcmeon, in its abruptness, defies ready comprehension, since the obvious connectives are nowhere explicitly stated, e.g., that Alcmeon was Amphiaraus' son; that his encounter with the poet confirms the poet's statement that talent endures through the generations. Pindar's archaic allusiveness must have presented a formidable challenge to critics whose contemporaries drew careful attention to transitions: one thinks of the way Callimachus makes sure that we understand in advance the point of his story about Athena's blinding Tiresias ("if anyone should look on Pallas cityholder naked, this is the last time he will see Argos," *Hymn 5*. 53–54) or the way in which Apollonius carefully marks the introduction and conclusion to his account of the Argonaut Canthus' death ("Canthus, the deadly fates seized you in Libya," 4. 1485; "it was he who then because of his sheep slew Canthus," 4. 1497).

We do not now possess any more factual information about Pindar's (or Aristomenes') houses than the ancient commentators did. But our present knowledge of the conventional structure of the *Odes* and of the unifying function of reiteration can help us understand that the puzzling terms "neighbor" and "guard" in fact

22. On these passages, see also my "First Person" (n. 7), pp. 225–37.

23. Thummer, *Isthmischen Gedichte* (n. 15), II, 122, believes

that it is possible that ἔτλαν in *Isthm*. 7. 37 is third person plural; Young, *Isthmian 7* (n. 2), pp. 28–30, and Slater in his review of Young (n. 15), p. 198, read first person singular.

link Alcmeon to earlier descriptions in the Ode of man's relation to divinity.[24] In the proem, Hesychia is asked to receive (δέκευ, 5) Aristomenes; Apollo has already received him (ἔδεκτο, 19) into his temple. Hesychia is φιλόφρων (1); Apollo welcomes Aristomenes εὐμενεῖ νόῳ (18), the poet χαίρων throws a crown on Alcmeon (56). In line 58, "neighbor" (γείτων) recalls these expressions of friendship; "guard" (φύλαξ) reminds us of the "keys" (κλαῖδας, 4) to plans and wars held by Hesychia.[25] These recollections of the proem in the Alcmeon passage are reinforced by repetition: the statement μοι . . . ὑπάντασεν ἰόντι γᾶς ὀμφαλὸν παρ' ἀοίδιμον (58–59) echoes the description of Hesychia ὑπαντιάξαισα her enemies' insolence and putting it in the bilge (11–12). Alcmeon, as guard of the poet's possessions, i.e., the subjects of his poetry, like the song for Aristomenes that is νεότατον καλῶν (33), "touches" (ἐφάψατο) the poet with his inherited skills of prophecy, as Hesychia allows Aristomenes to share in her gifts of plans and wars. The poet's joyful meeting with Alcmeon exemplifies a general truth, of which the violent end of Hesychia's enemies earlier provides a negative illustration, κέρδος δὲ φίλτατον, / ἑκόντος εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων φέροι (13–14).

Since this Ode honors a victor in wrestling, the emphasis on physical contact (friendly and unfriendly) has special significance. In the lines immediately following the Alcmeon passage, the poet prays to "see down" some ἁρμονίαν ("union") with Apollo.[26] Then we hear of fate throwing one man high, another low (76–77), like Aristomenes himself, who fell on four bodies in the games (81–82). The subsequent rejection at home of his defeated opponents by their mothers (85–86) is the reverse image of Hesychia's glad reception of Aristomenes: the losing contestants slink down side roads beyond their enemies' reach (86–87); whereas earlier in the Ode we heard how Adrastus returned in victory "to the streets of Abas broad for dancing" (53–55). Man's joy, as if in defeat, falls to the ground, shaken by intent that is "turned aside" (92–94).[27] In contrast to the confined and broken return of the defeated, the final prayer to mother Aegina to "bring back this city in a free voyage, with Zeus and ruler Aeacus and Peleus and good Telamon and with Achilles" (98–100) suggests the homeward journey of the victorious Adrastus "with his army unharmed" or of the victor Aristomenes himself.

Seen against the context of the entire Ode, the terms γείτων, φύλαξ, and ὑπάντασεν in the Alcmeon passage have an integrating function that the ancient commentators, reading line by line, did not perceive. Our present understanding of Pindar's methods of exposition depends ultimately on mechanical aids unavailable in antiquity, that make it possible simultaneously to compare

24. On the function of repetition in the Odes, see my Victory Ode (n. 14), chap. i and nn. 13, 14; chap. iv, n. 5. On Pindar's tendency throughout the Ode to return to the language of the opening lines, see chap. iv, sec. 2 and chap. iii, sec. 1 (end).

25. One thinks of Penelope, who seizes the "well-bent key" (κληῗδ') and opens the storeroom to bring out the bow with which Odysseus will kill the suitors (Od. 21. 6). The collocation of βουλή and πόλεμος is also Homeric (Il. 2. 202, 273).

26. On the meaning of line 68, see W. J. Slater, Lexicon to Pindar (Berlin, 1969), s.v. ἁρμονία. In myth, as in music, ἁρμονία is the pleasing product of a union of unlikes (Ares and Aphrodite in Hes. Theog. 937); in Hymn. Hom. Herm. 195

Harmonia dances with the Graces, Seasons, Hebe, and Aphrodite. In Pyth. 8 the poet's ἁρμονία with Apollo is reflected in the γέλως γλυκύς of victory (85) and the μείλιχος αἰών after success (97); cf. the contrasting ἀμείλιχος κότος of Hesychia's enemies (8–9). Bundy (n. 3), 70, n. 84, analyzes the poet's prayer to Apollo as a formal rejection of Alcmeon in favor of the god, which he attributes to the chorus, on the ground that Pindar as speaker "makes little if any sense." But if Alcmeon's relation to Pindar can be accounted for in the ways I have described above, there is nothing in Bundy's structural analysis that could not also suit the poet as speaker.

27. On the meaning of ἀπότροπος see W. J. Slater, "Futures in Pindar," CQ, XIX (1969), 93.

many different passages and to discover the linguistic and functional similarities among them. There is no reason to assume, as the scholiasts seem to have done, that the encounter with Alcmeon took place at a *heroon*. The lines may simply describe the kind of confrontation Hesiod had with the Muses on Mount Helicon, which serves as proof of the authenticity of what the poet says.[28] Pindar's words suggest that he thought of Alcmeon's presence as more than an insubstantial vision (cf. Patroclus' ghost in *Il*. 23. 99–107). στεφά-νοισι βάλλω and ῥαίνω ὕμνῳ describe the actions of a poet toward a victorious athlete.[29] One wonders (εἰκός) if Pindar had in mind the statue of Alcmeon made by Theban artists and dedicated at Delphi in the 450's by the Argives.[30]

The scholia on the Alcmeon passage, like the scholia on *Pythian* 8 in general, thus prove to be a historical document not of the mechanics of choral performance, but of the methods and capabilities of Hellenistic scholarship. We cannot count on the commentators for reliable information about the cult of Alcmeon in Aegina or about the role of the choral speaker any more than we trust their suggestions on the Ode's opening line about "political disturbances" and the Persian Wars. Their hypotheses about the Alcmeon

passage must be verified by external evidence before we can take them seriously. But such documentation may not be forthcoming, if we accept what archaeology has confirmed about the normal geographical patterns of hero-worship, and if we compare to this passage the clearly divergent styles of passages in other choral poetry where the chorus is known to be speaking for itself.[31]

How then should we use the Pindar scholia? Not as trustworthy sources for information about historical background; not for interpretation of the meaning of any passage in its larger context, since we have seen the tendency of the commentators to read poems as if they were a series of unrelated fragments. The commentators' practice of defining new words by references to epic poetry, rather than to Pindar's other poems, also helps divert our attention from the special meaning words acquire from their setting within a given Ode. When the commentators use an objective external source, like the victor lists for the Olympian and Pythian games, or compilations of the names of the various Greek athletic contests, or handbooks of mythology, their annotation usually turns out to be accurate.[32] But whenever they turn to more subjective sources, like history based on poetry, or

---

28. Miracles confirm a poet's (or prophet's) association with divinity; cf. the story of serpents feeding the infant Iamus (the future prophet) honey in *Ol*. 6. 45–47, and the similar stories told of Pindar (*Life* 1. 1) and Plato (Olympiodorus' *Life* in *Biographoi*, ed. Westermann, p. 328). A nightingale is said to have settled on Stesichorus' lips (*Anth. Pal.* 2. 129–30); Horace states that doves protected him when he slept in the woods as a child (*Odes* 3. 4. 12–20); see Thompson (n. 11), M 312, and M. A. Grant, *Folktale and Hero-Tale Motifs in the Odes of Pindar* (Lawrence, 1967), p. 28. Pindar's encounter with Alcmeon has been interpreted as an epiphany (e.g., Burton [n. 3], pp. 182–83) or as literary convention (Slater, "Pindar's House" [n. 10], p. 141). It could, at least in the fifth century, have been both at once, in a way which we find difficult to understand on the basis of modern definitions of reality.

29. On the ceremony of crowning the victor, see esp. E. N. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1930), pp. 227–28. ῥαίνω connotes the expression of praise in song also in *Pyth* 5. 100 and *Isthm*. 6. 21 .

30. On the Argive dedication of statues of the Epigonoi at Delphi, see J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece* (London, 1913), V, 267–68.

31. See "First Person" (n. 7). I would now place less emphasis on the distinction between the "personal" and "bardic" I's; see T. G. Rosenmeyer, "Alcman's *Parthenion* I Reconsidered," *GRBS*, VII (1966), 329–30 and n. 34. Nonetheless, the general distinctions drawn between the style of song with choral and with bardic speakers (not discussed by Floyd [n. 3]) still seems valid; see M. Kaimio, *The Chorus of Greek Drama within the Light of the Person and Number Used* (Helsinki, 1970), pp. 33–35. Kaimio suggests (pp. 34–35) that in some cases the poet may intend a deliberate ambiguity between choral and bardic speaker.

32. A list of minor games may be the source of the identifying information in the scholia to *Ol*. 13. *150a*, *155*, *156a*, *159a*; I, 385–87. Outside sources confirm that most of these games existed; see *Victory Ode* (n. 14), chap. iv, n. 2 on the otherwise unattested Aetnaean Isthmia and Syracusan Nemea.

extrapolate their interpretations from the literary practices of their day, their notes become misleading both in information and in emphasis. We must remember that for the ancients, writing commentaries

($ὑπομνήματα$) or history ($ἱστορία$) did not necessarily involve, as it should for us, empirical research.[33]

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

---

33. On the similarity of methodology in all types of ancient research, see W. J. Slater, "Asklepiades and *Historia*," *GRBS*, XIII (1972), 327–28. $ἱστοριῶν$ $ἀπόδοσις$ in the Aristophanes scholia appears to be speculation based on the text. See W. G. Rutherford, *A Chapter in the History of Annotation* (= *Scholia Aristophanica*, III; London, 1905), pp. 382–88: "There is no reason why rubbish should be treated as erudition merely because it is presented in a brown Greek manuscript and rubbish undoubtedly the bulk of $ἱστοριῶν$ $ἀπόδοσις$ is that appears in the scholia. If judged without prejudice it is just the sort of thing comedy exists to make fun of" (p. 388). Alexandrian textual emendations likewise seem to be based on subjective interpretation rather than on collation and analysis of various readings; see Turner (n. 3), pp. 110–12. The unreliability of emendation to Latin texts by ancient editors is discussed by J. E. G. Zetzel, "Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity" (Diss. Harvard, 1972).