THE VICTORY ODE IN PERFORMANCE:
THE CASE FOR THE CHORUS

CHRISTOPHER CAREY

I N THIS ISSUE Mary Lefkowitz and Malcolm Heath respond to the criticisms Anne Burnett and I raised independently against their case for solo performance of Pindar's odes.[1] In the belief that it may be of use to the reader to have both sides juxtaposed in a single issue, I have accepted the editor's invitation to append a response to the latest argument for the solo hypothesis. Since I have offered detailed arguments with supporting references elsewhere, this discussion will be brief. Since the proponent of any view must have a means of substantiating subjective impressions if the uncommitted reader is to be convinced, I shall follow the three principles quoted from my earlier discussion by Heath and Lefkowitz.[2]

I. THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

The unvarying assumption of Hellenistic scholars, as represented by the Pindaric scholia, was that the Pindaric victory-ode was performed by a chorus.[3] Unfortunately, the scholiasts at no point identify the authority for this confident assumption. But since they do on occasion offer historical fact without identifying their source, we can conclude from their silence that they have no authority only if we have ground to suspect that their statements are speculative. Heath and Lefkowitz find such ground in the tendency of the scholia to substitute "χορός and its cognates for Pindar's komastic vocabulary"; they cite Heath's assertion that "there is a tendency to distinguish κῶμος from χορός" in other early literature and a shortage of "unequivocal identifications of κῶμος and χορός." In fact Heath over-

---

1. For bibliography, see note 1 of Heath and Lefkowitz in this issue.
2. As to my first premise, there are in fact many aspects of Pindaric usage (the semantic range of a word, syntax, thematic structure, common motifs) which are independent of models of performance, and which may legitimately be used to test the interpretation of specific passages. Unless it is shown that parallels invoked are inapplicable or evidence is offered which is more persuasive on grounds of quantity or quality, they must be given due weight. My second premise offers a useful criterion for judging between alternative interpretations, since its effect is to reduce the degree of subjectivity. Heath and Lefkowitz state: "If (as we have argued) there is reason to believe that the context of the epinician was the κῶμος, it is not uneconomic to invoke standard features of komastic practice in their interpretation." As they themselves observe later, however, "komastic activity was diverse"; see below on the variety of dance involved in κῶμοι. Thus the choice of a model to supplement the text becomes highly subjective. As to their third objection, the issue is not the amount of space devoted to discussion of evidence for a given model but the relative volume of evidence adducible in support of rival models; this has to be a factor in any rational choice.
3. Cf. Callim. frag. 384. 38.

simplifies. Certainly, three of the passages he cites ([Hes.] *Shield* 280–82, *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 480–81, Eur. frag. 453 N.)[4] treat χορός and κῶμος as distinct activities. However, from the presence of song and dance in the κῶμος at [Hes.] *Shield* 281 it seems that there the two activities have some features in common. The precise role of song and dance in the κῶμος is not specified. But presumably the distinction is between formality and organization in the case of the χορός and informality and extemporization in the case of the κῶμος. As Heath notes, Xenophon *Symposium* 2. 1 likewise suggests that dance might figure in the κῶμος. There the dance is a solo performance by a hired dancer. But in no less than three cases (Ar. *Thesm.* 101–4, 988, frag. 505 *PCG*) we have an unambiguous reference to choral song and dance by a κῶμος, and in a fourth (Eur. *Phoen.* 791) we have a clear reference to a group dance.[5] This indicates that the nature of dance in κῶμοι varied considerably from impromptu dance at informal celebrations to more elaborate combinations of group song and dance, presumably on more formal occasions and primarily but not exclusively (as Ar. frag. 505, where an ἐγκώμιον μέλος in the manner of a χορός is to be sung in honor of a human being, indicates) in religious contexts. And the matter-of-fact nature of these references suggests that κῶμοι consisting of choral performance were not uncommon. Since an occasion which merited the commissioning of an international poet was evidently one of some importance, there is no difficulty whatsoever in the supposition that the κῶμοι envisaged by Pindar belong at the more formal end of the scale. Heath and Lefkowitz rightly stress that they assert only a tendency to distinguish κῶμος and χορός. But if we are to dismiss the evidence of the scholiasts on terminological grounds, we need to demonstrate that their terminology is *incorrect;* for that we require a rule, not a tendency, and certainly not a tendency with a high exception rate in favor of the scholiasts; at least three, and probably four,[6] out of ten passages cited by Heath envisage a κῶμος which is also a χορός. There is therefore nothing inherently implausible in the scholiasts' assumption that Pindar uses the term κῶμος of a celebration which takes the form of choral performance. This does not necessarily mean that the scholiasts are correct. It does however mean that

4. Of the passages cited or discussed by Heath (pp. 185–86) I omit here Eur. *El.* 864–65; since our concern is with the relationship between κῶμος and χορός, we cannot legitimately invoke passages in which one of these terms is absent. I also ignore Aesch. *Ag.* 1186–89, since this passage does not make clear the relationship between χορός and κῶμος, and *Anacr.* 43. 4–7, which is out of place in any discussion of linguistic and social usage of the archaic and classical periods (the same is true of *Anacr.* 42. 2, 14 and Triphiodoros 559–60, which are not cited by Heath).

5. Ares is described as taking the lead in dancing the κῶμος = "revel" (the verb used is προχορεύειν; for the meaning, cf. LSJ, s.v., and E. M. Craik, *Euripides: "Phoenician Women"* [Warminster, 1989], ad loc.) together with men in armor (σὺν ὁπλοφόροις), who clearly make up the κῶμος = "revellers" (confirmed by *Suppl.* 390). Ares is evidently the leader of a dancing κῶμος (the dance is of course metaphorical, but that is irrelevant). The elaborate contrast within this stanza is not a simple distinction between κῶμος and χορός but between the Bacchic rites which should be celebrated, and which typify peace, and the war against Thebes, which is treated as a perverted Bacchic rite. This suggests strongly that the κῶμος of Ares is a Bacchic κῶμος (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 988, Eur. *Bacch.* 1167). What we appear to have, therefore, is a contrast between the normal Bacchic κῶμος and the perverted κῶμος of Ares. If so, we have in *Phoen.* 787–88 another instance of the religious κῶμος consisting of group song and dance.

6. See n. 5 above.

their tendency to speak of χορός where Pindar speaks of κῶμος cannot be used in evidence against them.[7]

A second factor underlying the traditional view is the metrical and linguistic form of the victory odes—mainly triadic, less often strophic, and based on an artificial doricizing poetic dialect. Davies has argued against the assumption that these features necessarily indicate choral performance. In my view, however, he underestimates the strength of the evidence from lyric poetry; and of course he discusses only the lyric poets. We have evidence for an enormous body of lyric poetry written in this form (not just individual poems but entire genres) which was undoubtedly choral (dithyrambs, paeans, partheneia, hyporchems, prosodia, dirges, and probably hymns).[8] We also have in the lyrics of Greek tragedy another large corpus of material which shares the formal features of the victory ode and which was certainly choral. Given the absence of objective evidence for solo performance with reference to any lyric poem displaying these features, the complete absence of these features from poets whose output was predominantly or exclusively for solo performance, and the Greek tendency toward conservatism in matters of form relating to established genres, it is natural to suppose that the consistency of metrical and linguistic form in all these cases reflects the presuppositions of poet and public concerning the form of serious choral poetry. There is thus a large body of evidence to support, and no evidence to refute, the Hellenistic association of strophic composition with the use of the chorus. We do of course find tragic songs strophic in form which were sung solo, as Heath and Lefkowitz rightly point out. The problem here is that since the chorus is the origin of tragedy the formal features of tragic lyrics originate with the chorus; the presence of these features in some tragic monodies (κομμός of course is complicated by the involvement of the chorus) may be due simply to assimilation to the song-form already established in tragedy.

II. THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE

It is however upon the internal evidence of the odes themselves that a final judgment must rest. I shall ignore here four passages which I earlier offered as corroborative evidence for choral delivery, *Olympian* 14. 8–12, *Pythian* 1. 1–12,[9] *Pythian* 10. 37–39, *Nemean* 5. 22–23;[10] while these passages gain

---

7. But why, if the odes are choral, do Pindar and Bacchylides avoid explicit use of related terminology? Bremer suggests that χορός and cognates are avoided because the terminology had sacral associations, reflecting the predominantly religious use of choral song and dance, and that the poets did not wish to emphasize their application of "themes and forms of choral = sacred poetry to secular praise-songs"; certainly it is striking that the one use of the root χορ- with reference to the performance of an epinician (see below on *Isthm.* 1. 1–10) is in the same context as a religious song. It should also be borne in mind that the terminology of the κῶμος has connotations of festivity which make it especially appropriate to the celebration of a success.

8. My statement (see Carey, p. 562, n. 44) that there is no evidence for the performance of Pindar's dirges is very probably erroneous; cf. frag. 128e(a).2–3, (b).6–7, a refrain consisting of a second person plural imperative, which appears to be addressed to the chorus (cf. *Pae.* 6. 121–22).

9. For *Pyth.* 1. *init.*, see the Appendix below.

10. I also ignore the passages I cited in passing as corroborative evidence (Carey, p. 551, n. 14), which have more point in the context of choral performance, but where the degree of subjectivity is too great to enable one to rely on them.

considerably in point if they are sung by a chorus, it cannot be maintained that they offer in themselves a case for choral delivery.

Olympian 1. 17–18

Taken literally, this would indicate that *Olympian* 1 was performed solo. I shall return to this passage after considering the rest of the evidence.

Olympian 6. 87–92

Though they rightly draw attention to a certain clumsiness in presentation, Heath and Lefkowitz do not really meet the thrust of my argument: since the assertion of the poet's truth is a *topos* in Pindar, the command that Aeneas' companions be urged to affirm Pindar's veracity is in all probability a "performative utterance," i.e., Pindar is using the command to attest his own veracity rather than literally asking for the affirmation of Aeneas' companions.[11] Furthermore, since the command to mention Syracuse and Ortygia is itself both an honorific mention of the victor's home of a familiar sort and a bridge to the praise of Hieron (that is, another command whose fulfillment is effected by the utterance), the other command in the context, that Hera be praised, is likely to be a performative utterance also. The objection that the bare mention of the goddess is insufficient to fulfill this command fails to take account of equally brief praises of deities elsewhere in Pindar (*Ol.* 2. 2–3, *Nem.* 7. 80–84, *Isthm.* 1. 52–59, the latter a whole series of brief mentions), in which a statement of intention or obligation to praise itself effects the praise. The simplest explanation of *Olympian* 6. 87–92 is that Aeneas' "companions" perform *Olympian* 6.

Olympian 14. 13–18

Heath says (p. 187): "The κῶμος is seen, but what is heard is the singing, which is what 'I' do, not what 'this κῶμος' does." That is not what the text says. The imperative ἐπακοοῖτε in 15 has no expressed object. Τόνδε κῶμον in 16 may belong logically with the imperative as well as syntactically with the participle, in which case the κῶμος is heard as well as seen. If γάρ in 17 explains the requests both to see and to hear in the preceding verses, then the sound and movement in 17 may be identical with the sound and movement in 15–16. If so, the proposed distinction between "I" and "this κῶμος" (or between the speaker and the rest of the celebrants) falls. This passage is irrelevant.

Pythian 5. 22, 103–7

In *Pythian* 5. 22, Pindar congratulates Arcesilaus on his receipt of "this κῶμος of men." Heath and Lefkowitz observe: "That Pindar sometimes

---

11. For the technique whereby an appeal to a third party to confirm the poet's truth is itself the assertion of truth, cf. *Nem.* 7. 68–69. For the fictive appeal to a specific individual to provide information which the poet in fact provides himself, cf. *Pae.* 6. 128–31, on which S. L. Radt, *Pindars zweite und sechste "Paian"* (Amsterdam, 1958), p. 177, observes: "Die Antwort auf diese Frage gibt Pindar selbst im Folgenden (V. 132 ff.)."

elsewhere uses song as an index of felicity (Carey, p. 549) does not, of course, prove that he does so here." But it does create a natural presumption in favor of a reference to Pindar's song, other things being equal, particularly in the light of Pindar's consistent emphasis in the odes on the importance of his song for the victor. This presumption receives support from the clear similarity between the praise of Arcesilaus and that of Carrhotus (who is congratulated for his receipt of Pindar's song).[12] The presence of the "reception-motif" (δέδεξαι) does not affect the issue either way, for both deities and humans may receive Pindar's song (*Pyth.* 2. 70, 8. 5, 12. 5, *Nem.* 4. 11). Κῶμος as ὕμνος seems inescapable at the very least at *Olympian* 4. 9, where the phrase "the most lasting illumination of mighty achievements" describes song (which in and out of Pindar preserves achievement), not the ephemeral victory-celebration. Compare also *Nemean* 4. 11, where the use of ὕμνου προκώμιον for προοίμιον ὕμνου supports the equivalence (subject to context) of κῶμος and ὕμνος.

For the second passage I refer to my earlier discussion.[13]

Pythian 10. 4–6, 55–59

The suggestion that the phrase ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὄπα in *Pythian* 10. 6 is a "metonymy for the κῶμος itself" is unsatisfactory. If we had for instance ἐπικώμιον ἀνδρῶν ἀγῶνα ("gathering of men in κῶμος") there would be no problem. But Pindar is made to say here on the solo hypothesis: "the Aleuadai have summoned my [solo] song because they want to have the [collective] voice of men in κῶμος." This is not a natural way to take Pindar's words.

My treatment of 55–59 is based not on a theory of concentric ring structure but on the undeniable fact that Pindar as often returns in the post-mythic part of the ode to themes announced in the section preceding the myth. In this context it makes sense to identify the reference to men singing in 55–59 with that in 6, especially given the obvious verbal similarity and the complete absence of any indication to the contrary, and to conclude therefore that *Pythian* 10 was performed by a male chorus. Appeal to *Olympian* 10. 91–96, where the reference to posthumous renown indicates quite clearly that the poet has subsequent performance in mind, merely accentuates the absence of any such hint in *Pythian* 10.

Nemean 3. 1–12, 65–66

Pindar describes the young men as singers desiring his song and promises to supply it. To take these singers as fellow-komasts who have their own song(s) and who wish only to hear Pindar's solo performance is to supply a second song where Pindar speaks only of one (his) and to introduce the

12. Carey, p. 549.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 548.

notion of singers as audience.[14] To conclude that the singers perform Pindar's song is incontrovertibly to make more economical use of Pindar's words, for it involves only one song, that mentioned in the text, one role, that mentioned in the text for the singers, to sing. Since the idea of listening is elsewhere supplied by Pindar himself (*Pyth.* 1. 84, 9. 78), an interpretation which requires us to supply it without any hint from the text does not commend itself. Furthermore, the fact that Pindar mentions accompaniment in almost half of the odes would suggest that the lyre in 11–12 accompanies the performance of Pindar's song.[15] If the lyre is an instrument for the performance of *Nemean* 3, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the voices perform the same role, given the close syntactical association of lyre and voices; this has the support of a good half dozen Pindaric parallels.[16] All this suggests that the voices sing Pindar's song to the accompaniment of the lyre.

It is argued that the fiction in Pindar's text on the solo hypothesis is more straightforward than on the choral hypothesis. But when one notes the complexity of fiction already evident in the work of the earliest choral poet to survive (Alcman *PMG* 3 *init.*) this argument has little weight.

In the second passage τεὸν γὰρ αἷμα looks back unambiguously to the lengthy praise of the Aeacidae (whose descent from Zeus is stressed by Pindar in *Nem.* 8 and *Isthm.* 8) in 33–64. When Pindar adds σέο δ᾽ ἀγών, τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν, it is natural to refer this too to what precedes, especially 15–18.[17] It is difficult to believe that without any hint Pindar has changed direction in mid-sentence to mention some other song, evidently identical in theme with *Nemean* 3. This is the more unlikely in that it is Pindar's practice elsewhere (*Ol.* 9. 1–4, *Pyth.* 8. 19–20, *Isthm.* 4. 27) to make references to other songs and other celebrations explicit. It is not in fact uncommon for Pindar to refer backward in the odes; we may compare *Olympian* 10. 97–100, *Pythian* 11. 38, *Nemean* 1. 18, 7. 76, 9. 33, *Isthm.* 2. 35.[18] There is thus no reason to suppose a reference to some other song, beyond a disinclination to accept choral performance; that is not reason enough. If the reference is to *Nemean* 3 itself, we have a clear indication of choral performance.

Isthmian 1. 1–10

Χορεύω means "dance" and by extension "celebrate by means of dance"; it is further extended here with reference to the paean to mean "celebrate by means of dance (by others)," that is, compose a song and (presumably)

---

14. Heath and Lefkowitz state: "on our hypothesis 'sweet-voiced' and 'voices' [vv. 4, 11] allude precisely to such songs"; but, as they go on to say, "the phrase which describes their singing is a generalizing one, without specific reference . . . : 'builders of sweet-voiced κῶμοι.'"

15. C. J. Herington, *Poetry into Drama* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1985), p. 28.

16. Carey, p. 554, n. 19.

17. The structure of *Nem.* 3 also favors a reference to the ode itself here; see Carey, p. 556, with nn. 21 and 22. Heath and Lefkowitz speak of a "κῶμος-song to Zeus" and "the hymn to Zeus"; in fact the subject of the ὕμνος is the games (i.e., Aristocleides' victory).

18. For *Isthm.* 2. 35, see W. J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar,* vol. 2 (Leiden, 1988), p. 139.

provide instructions for a dance in someone's honor. The last extension is natural, since dance remains the instrument of the poet's praise. If *Isthmian* 1 is performed solo, however, the verb is used to mean "celebrate by means of solo song *in a context which includes extempore dance by others.*" This use of the verb, paradoxical in itself (since it removes the close and necessary connection between the subject and the act of dancing), is entirely without parallel.[19] Furthermore, the idea of formal group performance of song and dance, which unites all Pindar's other uses of the root χορ- with reference to his own compositions, including the use here with reference to the paean, is missing. Heath and Lefkowitz invoke Pindar's taste for zeugma. But an interpretation which relies both on a forced and unparalleled use of the verb and one at odds with Pindar's established usage cannot reasonably be preferred when an alternative (to take χορεύων . . . τὰν ἁλιερκέα Ἰσθμοῦ δειράδ᾽ as indicating choral performance of *Isthm.* 1) which is unexceptionable in both respects is not only available but is actually recommended by the context (the explicit parallel between paean and epinician).[20]

Isthmian 8. 62–65

In my earlier discussion I drew attention to a number of Pindaric passages in which a command to praise is followed by praise, and where we can be sure on syntactical grounds that the praise fulfills the command, that is, that there is no reference beyond the ode. It is natural to interpret the same sequence in *Isthmian* 8 in the same way; if so, the address is to the performers and the ode is choral.[21] Heath and Lefkowitz counter that "if the solo hypothesis is in fact correct, . . . since it would . . . be obvious to any audience that singular imperatives may, and plural imperatives cannot, refer within the ode, the contrast between singular and plural would itself be a relevant difference." This is true, just as it would be obvious, if *Olympian* 1 were choral, that verses 17–18 were not to be taken literally as a description of solo performance. But to appeal to either model in support of an interpretation is to beg the question we are trying to settle. Of course the audience knew how each ode was performed. We do not. We only have Pindar's words; we must make what sense we can of them and seek to objectify judgments on ambiguous cases by drawing on more straightforward passages.

---

19. Heath and Lefkowitz appeal to Heath (pp. 185–86) to prove that a reference to informal dance is "within the range of possible meanings of χορεύειν." That is not the point. Heath shows that the verb can be used of informal dance; but he offers no evidence to show that it can be used to refer to someone who neither dances nor choreographs nor even composes specifically for dance but merely produces a solo song which may offer an opportunity for informal dance.

20. Cf. Heath, p. 185: "Admittedly, there is nothing in *I.* 1 to suggest informality; the parallel with the paean in fact must count against it."

21. For plural commands addressed to the chorus, cf. n. 8 above.

Bacchylides 13. 190–91

The case for taking this as an address to the performers is essentially the same as for *Isthmian* 8. 62–65.

The proponents of solo performance must argue away a substantial number of passages in which the poet's words taken in their most natural sense in context present a prima facie case for choral performance, and where the most natural interpretation of the context can be further supported with appeal to Pindaric usage. The proponents of the traditional view are faced with only a single passage which offers a prima facie case for solo performance, *Olympian* 1. 17–18. Moreover, as I have pointed out elsewhere, Pindar frequently ascribes to himself activities which the audience can see to be fictitious.[22] So it is easy to account for *Olympian* 1. 17–18. Thus the evidence advanced for solo delivery is weaker in quality as well as in quantity.[23] The case for choral performance receives further support from a body of external evidence which is by no means negligible. I therefore remain convinced that Pindar's odes were composed for choral delivery. That said, I leave the debate for the reader to decide.

<div align="center">APPENDIX</div>

Independently of the question of the performance of the victory ode, I should like to take issue both with Heath and Lefkowitz and with Bremer on the opening of *Pythian* 1. Heath and Lefkowitz state: "The opening lines of *Pythian* 1 would seem to refer to solo-performance accompanied by the dancing of the komasts. The poet imagines the preliminary notes of Apollo's golden φόρμιγξ serving 'as signal and guide' to dancers . . . and bards . . . [T]here is no reference to choreuts or to a chorus singing in unison, although the musical term βάσις ('beat') can also denote a dancer's step. . . . " A careful reading of Pindar's words, however, suggests rather a performance by a chorus which sings and dances. First, the clause in verse 4 expresses a frequent (ὁπόταν), not a unique or rare occurrence. What is said there must therefore agree with normal practice. Pindar says "the ἀοιδοί obey your signs whenever you strike up the preludes which lead the dance."[24] The ἀοιδοί take orders or instructions from the instrument. This is clear from the use of πείθονται and is confirmed by the balance ἀκούει μὲν . . . πείθονται δέ. Now, unlike the aulode, who of necessity is accompanied by an instrumentalist, the

22. See Carey, p. 560, with n. 35. One's readiness to detect a fiction in *Ol.* 1 is significantly increased by Bacchylides' presentation of himself no less than twice (20B. 1–5, 20C. 1–7) as taking down the lyre in a context which makes explicit that he was not present at the performance. In *Ol.* 1 the fiction of impromptu solo performance arises naturally from the preceding reference to playful compositions about the table. The passages from Bacchylides also tell against the obvious compromise solution to this debate, which is to suppose that some odes were choral, others solo (U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* [Berlin, 1922], p. 233, took *Ol.* 1. 17–18 as evidence that the ode was performed solo).
23. Heath and Lefkowitz themselves describe the evidence for solo performance as "admittedly tenuous."
24. Heath and Lefkowitz prefer "phrases" for ἀμβολάς; for my present purposes the difference is unimportant.

soloist singing to the lyre (kitharode) regularly plays the lyre himself. That
is, he controls the instrument; he does not take orders or instructions from it,
nor does the creative poet.[25] But the choral singer does.[26] The primary mean-
ing of βάσις is "step"; "beat" is secondary. The primary meaning almost
forces itself on us in a context which explicitly speaks of dance. The word
itself gives no hint as to the number of dancers, but in the context of a choral
song a group dance is more likely than a solo dance. The correlatives μέν and
δέ, together with the parallel phraseology, would naturally suggest that both
clauses in 2–3 govern the subordinate clause in 4; so song and dance would
appear to be contemporaneous. While we are free in theory to imagine sep-
arate groups of singers and dancers, the analogy of other choral performance
suggests rather a single body of performers. It appears therefore that we have
here a reference to a performance of song and dance by a single chorus to the
accompaniment of the phorminx.

A separate issue is raised by Bremer, who locates verses 1–13 on
Olympus. In fact, Pindar is deliberately unspecific in verses 1–4. Ἀπόλλ-
ωνος καὶ . . . Μοισᾶν κτέανον in 1–2 could mean either that the lyre ad-
dressed is literally that owned and played by Apollo or that it is an (or the
typical) earthly lyre, in which case Apollo and the Muses may be said to
"own" the lyre as patrons of music (just as horses are Ποσειδάνιον γένος
at *Pae.* 2. 41); χρυσέα in verse 1 suggests a divine lyre, but not exclu-
sively, for Pindar uses this adjective to express value as well as material
(as at *Nem.* 1. 17). Pindar also leaves inexplicit the identity of the player
by placing the emphasis entirely on the lyre in accordance with his hym-
nal invocation.[27] With 4 ἐλελιζομένα we may contrast *Olympian* 9. 13
φόρμιγγ' ἐλελίζων; with 4 ἀμβολὰς τεύχης we may contrast Homer *Odys-
sey* 1. 155 ὁ φορμίζων ἀνεβάλλετο καλὸν ἀείδειν. The result is a general-
ized treatment in verses 1–4 which refers to performances anywhere,
divine or human. Specificity begins in verse 5. If *Pythian* 1 was per-
formed by a chorus, then the audience as it heard verses 1–4 would think
of the performance they were witnessing; but that is a separate issue.

*Royal Holloway and Bedford New College,
London*

---

25. For the relationship between poet and instrument, cf. *Ol.* 2. 1 Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι.
26. For ἀοιδός used of choral singers, cf. Eur. *HF* 110, 692.
27. Cf. M. R. Lefkowitz, *The Victory Ode* (Park Ridge, N.J., 1976), p. 106.