

EPINICIAN PERFORMANCE

MALCOLM HEATH and MARY LEFKOWITZ

IN AN EARLIER PAPER on the context and performance of epinician odes Malcolm Heath advanced two theses: first, that the context of performance was the κῶμος, and that reconstructions ought consequently to start from what is known of komastic practices; second, that the mode of performance may not have been choral, in the sense of rehearsed unison song and dance, as has traditionally been supposed. Heath argued that epinician performance was in fact not choral, or at least not typically choral, but this conclusion was avowedly speculative and tentative; a purely negative formulation of the second thesis could be maintained more confidently, namely, that there are not adequate grounds for believing that epinician performance typically was choral.

Other aspects of the case for solo performance had been discussed in a paper by Mary Lefkowitz, who suggested that the odes should be thought of as belonging to the bardic tradition, since like epic they were always presented in the voice of the poet. She described how the ancient scholars identified choral speakers in the odes only when attempting to account for references that they could not understand, and attempted to show how certain passages that had previously been explained in terms of choral performance might be interpreted in other ways. She questioned whether choral and monodic poetry should be regarded as separate genres. In a separate paper Malcolm Davies has shown conclusively that the notion of "choral genre" is modern.

These papers have evoked responses from Anne Burnett and Christopher Carey. We shall argue that despite their efforts the choral hypothesis has not yet been adequately reinstated.¹

I

A discussion of this kind inevitably raises methodological issues, turning as it often does on disagreement about the conclusions which can

1. M. Heath, "Receiving the κῶμος: The Context and Performance of Epinician," *AJP* 109 (1988): 180–95; M. R. Lefkowitz, "Who Sang Pindar's Victory Odes?" *AJP* 109 (1988): 1–11; M. Davies, "Monody, Choral Lyric and the Tyranny of the Handbook," *CQ* 38 (1988): 52–64; A. Burnett, "Performing Pindar's Odes," *CP* 84 (1989): 283–93; C. Carey, "The Performance of the Victory Ode," *AJP* 110 (1989): 545–65. These papers will be cited by author's name. After this article had been submitted, J. M. Bremer sent us the MS of his article, "Pindar's Paradoxical ἐγὼ and a Recent Controversy about the Performance of His Epinikia," in *The Poet's "I" in Archaic Greek Lyric*, ed. S. Slings (Amsterdam, 1990), pp. 41–58. We have not revised our response to include specific reference to Bremer's article, since virtually all of the issues raised by him were already discussed in the present paper.

legitimately be drawn from given bodies of evidence. Since Carey helpfully begins by setting out three methodological premises (p. 545), we shall begin by stating our reservations about them:

(i) "An interpretation gains in cogency according to its consistency with Pindar's linguistic or literary usage": we agree, but opinions about Pindaric usage are not wholly independent of opinions about Pindaric performance. To take one pertinent example, W. J. Slater's influential paper on futures in Pindar takes the choral hypothesis for granted; if that hypothesis is questioned, his conclusions will need to be modified.²

(ii) "An economical interpretation (by which is meant one which does not require the reader to supply facts not mentioned in the text) is to be preferred": this premise is not acceptable, since no text can make all its presuppositions explicit; and among the presuppositions which Pindar's texts show no systematic tendency to make explicit are facts about their own performance, as "the general paucity of information concerning the performance of Pindar's odes" (Carey, p. 557) shows. If the facts which the reader is required to supply are affirmed on grounds independent of the interpretation that invokes them, and if they are such that Pindar's audiences and readers were probably able to supply them, then the interpretation is not uneconomic. If (as we have argued) there is reason to believe that the context of epinician was the *κῶμος*, it is not uneconomic to invoke known standard features of komastic practice in their interpretation.

(iii) "The volume of evidence which must be explained away if a belief is to be rejected is a useful indicator of the plausibility of the belief in question": it would, however, be unreasonable to insist that a theory is implausible because its advocates have to devote space to discussion of possible contrary evidence; the presentation of an unconventional position necessarily involves criticism and reinterpretation of the evidence traditionally adduced in favor of its established rival.

In the discussions of individual passages which follow we shall assume that there is no presumption in favor either of the choral or of the solo hypothesis, such as might require us to resolve ambiguities in the internal evidence in one way rather than another. This premise is apparently conceded by our critics. Carey believes that the choral hypothesis can be sustained on internal evidence "without any presuppositions about the manner of delivery" (p. 557); Burnett also appears to be willing to proceed without a presumption in favor of her position: "it may be best to take up the challenge as it is offered" (p. 285).³

But before we turn to the individual passages, we ought perhaps to explain why we do not think that there should be an initial presumption in

2. "Futures in Pindar," *CQ* 19 (1969): 86-94.

3. It should be noted, however, that she misunderstands the nature of that challenge (p. 283): "One scholar . . . now assures us that—barring evidence to the contrary—we should assume of any Pindaric ode that it was meant for the solo voice"; a glance at the passage cited (Lefkowitz, p. 4) shows that the assumption was adopted simply as a heuristic device in order to test the choral hypothesis. The dogmatism which Burnett alleges cannot be reconciled with the caution which Lefkowitz displays in drawing her conclusions ("cannot prove conclusively that Pindar did not use a choir . . . the possibility that victory odes could be sung as solos," pp. 10-11).

favor of the choral hypothesis. Such a presumption would have to be grounded not on internal evidence (for it is only in the absence of unambiguous internal evidence that the presumption need be invoked), but on external evidence; and in our opinion, the external evidence cannot be regarded as reliable.

THE ANCIENT COMMENTARIES

Although the Hellenistic scholars uniformly accepted the choral hypothesis, there is reason to treat their evidence with caution. The point here is not (as Burnett, p. 285, supposes) that the scholia “are not to be trusted, for they are capable of error”—a self-evidently fatuous argument. It is rather that, besides demonstrable discontinuities in general culture and in poetic practice which make it hazardous to treat them as primary sources, there is a systematic divergence between Hellenistic sources and Pindar in epinician vocabulary. In epinician (by contrast with his practice in other genres) Pindar consistently refers to the κῶμος, never to a χορός (Heath, p. 184); his Hellenistic commentators reverse this pattern, regularly substituting χορός and its cognates for Pindar’s komastic vocabulary.⁴

If the terms χορός and κῶμος could be straightforwardly equated, it would not matter that the scholia tend to confound them. But Heath has argued (p. 186) that in other early literature there is “a tendency to distinguish κῶμος from χορός” and a corresponding shortage of “unequivocal identifications of κῶμος and χορός.”⁵ Burnett, however, continues to equate κῶμος uncritically with chorus,⁶ and indeed defines κῶμος in terms which imply the equation: “Since a κῶμος is a group of males who sing and dance, it is natural to suppose that the victory songs bear witness, with these terms [sc. κῶμος and cognates], to the mode of their own performance” (p. 286). But a κῶμος cannot be characterized simply as “a group of males who sing and dance”; for example, a tragic chorus is not a κῶμος. In any case, κῶμος cannot designate one particular mode of performance, since komastic activity was diverse: komasts did not only sing and dance; not all komastic song and dance was in unison; and

4. Heath, p. 184, gives as illustration *Pyth.* 8. 70 κῶμῳ μὲν ἄδουμελεῖ = Σ *Pyth.* 8. 99a (2:215 Dr) τῷ μὲν χορῷ ἡμῶν. Other examples: *Ol.* 11. 16 συγκωμάξατε = Σ *Ol.* 11. 16a (1:346 Dr) συγχορεύσατε; *Ol.* 14. 16 κῶμον = Σ *Ol.* 14. 21b (1:393 Dr) τοῦτον τὸν χορόν; *Pyth.* 5. 22 κῶμος = Σ *Pyth.* 5. 24a (2:174 Dr) κῶμος καὶ ὕμνος ἀπὸ τῶν χορευτῶν . . . παιδία γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνι ἢ χορεία; *Pyth.* 10. 6 ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὅπα = Σ *Pyth.* 10. 8b (2:243 Dr) ἐγκωμαστικὴν τῶν χορευόντων . . . φωνήν; *Nem.* 3. 4 τέκτονες κῶμων νεανίαι = Σ *Nem.* 3. 4–5 (3:43 Dr) οἱ νεανία τέκτονες καὶ χορευταί; *Nem.* 3. 11 κείνων ὄαροι = Σ *Nem.* 3. 18a–c (2:44 Dr) ταῖς ἐκείνων τῶν χορευτῶν φωναῖς; *Nem.* 9. 1 κωμάσομεν = Σ *Nem.* 9. 1ab (3:150 Dr) ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ ὁ λόγος . . . χορεύσομεν . . . καὶ ὕμνησομεν. Cf. also the presumption that a group of men is a chorus in *Ol.* 4. 5 ἑσλοῖ (i.e., friends) ἔσαν = Σ *Ol.* 4. 7h (1:131 Dr) ὁ χορὸς ἦδετα.

5. Burnett (p. 287, n. 16) incorrectly reports Heath as “contending that κῶμος and χορός must be mutually exclusive terms”; in his paper Heath referred to some probable exceptions. Although, as Carey says (p. 549, n. 9), these exceptions do not “bear out” the claim, they are consistent with it, since only a tendency was asserted; other evidence was cited in its support. Carey adds to the list of exceptions Eur. *Phoen.* 791 κῶμον . . . προχορεύεις, but this verb does not entail a chorus (cf. below on *Isthm.* 1. 1–10).

6. E.g., p. 288: “explicitly assigns itself . . . to a chorus” (on *Nem.* 3. 4–5 τέκτονες κῶμων νεανία); p. 290: “the visible chorus” (on *Pyth.* 5. 22 τόνδε κῶμον), “the members of a citizen chorus” (on *Nem.* 2. 24 πολῖται, κωμάξατε). But the distinction had already been noted by L. Lawler, “Orchēsis Kallinikos,” *TAPA* 79 (1948): 259.

komastic unison song and dance was (to say the least) often informal.⁷ So *kōmos*-terminology does not necessarily imply that victory odes were sung in unison by a choir and in itself does not provide a key to the mode of performance.

We do not mean, however, to deny that *kōmos*-terminology is relevant to performance; on the contrary, the evidence it provides for the context of performance is crucial to our interpretation. It is mistaken to suppose that the solo hypothesis involves a "separation of the Pindaric *kōmos* from the Pindaric ode" (Burnett, p. 287).⁸ Rather, the performance of the ode is seen as one of the diverse activities that take place within the komastic context; passages which have traditionally been interpreted as references to a chorus are, on this view, references to the *kōmos*-celebration as a whole or to other elements of it, and serve in part to integrate the ode with the festivities to which it is a contribution. Pindar's ode is thus a song for a *kōmos* (which does not entail that it is for unison performance by the komasts), and it is for this reason that Pindar applies to it such terms as *ἐπικώμιος*, *ἐγκώμιος*, and *ἀγλαόκωμος* (Heath, p. 183).⁹

METRICAL AND LINGUISTIC FORM

The tenet that triadic form is exclusively choral has been undermined by Davies' article; Carey (pp. 562–65) argues against Davies' conclusions, but he does so on the assumption that choral performance of epinician has already been established. He points out that there is explicit evidence for choral performance of other genres of like linguistic and metrical form in the fragments of Pindar and Bacchylides (p. 562, n. 44); but this observation simply draws attention to a problem already mentioned—that although there are specific references to *χορός* in the exiguous remains of other genres, they are conspicuously absent in the extensive remains of epinician.¹⁰ If (as we shall argue) Carey has in fact failed to establish choral performance of epinician on internal evidence, the absence in the victory odes of internal references to the *χορός* will seem even more significant. There is, at any rate, no doubt that epinician could enter the solo repertoire after its original performance, despite its formal characteristics (Davies, pp. 56–67). While the possibility of subsequent solo per-

7. After the sentence quoted Burnett continues: "Those who believe in solo performance, however, counteract this easy supposition with the assertion (indemonstrable) that *kōmos*-singing could only be impromptu, and that the *kōmos* thus could not, by definition, sing a formal epinician ode": this assertion is not to be found in the passages she cites from Lefkowitz, and Heath (p. 193) carefully refrains from making it.

8. An ambiguity of the term *kōmos* should perhaps be noted here: it can designate both the group of komasts, and the celebration in which the komasts take part. The solo hypothesis does, in a sense, separate the ode from the komasts, but emphatically not from the celebration.

9. That Burnett (p. 287) regards these terms as posing a difficulty for the solo hypothesis is symptomatic of her failure to grasp the position she is attacking. The last paragraph on the same page has this extraordinary argument: "If the melody of the *kōmos* [in *Pyth.* 8. 70] has precisely the same quality [sc. of being sweetly melodious] as that of the ode [in *Isthm.* 7. 20] . . . it is singing the tune that Pindar has composed." Do no other tunes have that quality? It is a general characteristic of the *φάρμακον* in *Ol.* 7. 11.

10. Thus in the paeans and *παρθένεια*, the speaker is always the chorus; cf. I. Rutherford, "Pindar on Apollo," *CQ* 38 (1988): 67.

formance does not prove that the original performances were solo, it at least forbids us to rule out the possibility on any formal grounds.

There is in fact no reason to assume that triadic structure is an exclusive characteristic of choral performance. Although in some late dramas, solos occasionally lack formal strophic organization (e.g., Soph. *OC* 237–53, Eur. *Ion* 154–83), it is more usual for dramatic monody to retain a format similar to that of choral lyrics; in Sophocles, for example, the last sections of the κομμοί between Antigone and the chorus and between Electra and the chorus have a triadic structure (*Ant.* 838–82, *El.* 193–250). Burnett insists that commissioned solo odes “would almost certainly not have retained the potentially tedious repetitions of the strophic system, whose function was to get a multiplicity of amateur performers through the difficulties of memorization” (p. 293). But the very fact that all extant victory odes are strophic casts doubt on the assumption that Pindar’s audiences would have found this form tedious; nor, given the uniqueness and complexity of each song’s metrical structure, is there any reason why they should have done so.¹¹

The notion that the strophic form was intended to help guide amateur performers through an ode derives from Ps.-Aristotle *Problemata* 19. 15 918b.¹² But in that passage Ps.-Aristotle is concerned with dithyramb and the choral songs of tragedy, not with Stesichorean or Pindaric odes; and he is in any case thinking of performances of dithyramps as they were known in the Hellenistic age.¹³ Moreover, Ps.-Aristotle is not talking about triads, since he speaks only of antistrophes, never of epodes. It is of course possible that Ps.-Aristotle has derived his notion of amateur performance as a means of explaining the disuse into which the antistrophe had fallen in his day, from some historical source; but it is even more likely that like most ancient information about the history of the theater it is based on imaginative speculation.¹⁴

Aside from Ps.-Aristotle, no other ancient writer appears to assume that antistrophic form necessarily implies choral performance. In *Rhetorica* 3. 9 1409b25 ff. Aristotle himself, in a discussion of long periods (which he compares to dithyrambic ἀναβολαί), makes no reference to choral

11. It is surprising that an article which sets out to establish things that we need to know “if we are to appreciate the odes” (Burnett, p. 283), ends up by finding in them an aesthetic deficiency (potential tedium) which can only be explained by the inadequate skills of their performers. The consistent metrical sophistication of the odes would seem rather to count in favor of the solo hypothesis, as Burnett herself implies (p. 293) when she suggests that a victor would most naturally have wanted the “showiest and most professional kind” of song that only a trained kitharode could provide, though she mistakenly assumes that even in the fifth century such songs would have taken the astrophic form preferred by Timotheus and his successors. Cf. Ps.-Arist. *Pr.* 19. 15 918b “it is easier for one person to execute many variations (μεταβάλλειν πολλὰς μεταβολὰς) than a group,” and the description in Plut. *Phil.* 11. 306E of Timotheus’ virtuosity; C. J. Herington, *Poetry into Drama* (Berkeley, 1985), p. 153.

12. Cf. A. Burnett, “Jocasta in the West: The Lille Stesichorus,” *CA* 7 (1988): 133.

13. Cf. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy* (Oxford, 1927), pp. 54 ff.

14. Cf. Lefkowitz, “Aristophanes and Other Historians of the Fifth-Century Theater,” *Hermes* 112 (1984): 143–53; certainly the Suda reference to Sophocles’ “prose discourse” on the chorus in contention with Thespis and Choerilus (Soph. T2 Radt; cf. Lefkowitz, *ibid.*, p. 147) cannot be taken as secure evidence of interest in “the principles of choral poetry” in the fifth century (or indeed of nondramatic poetry), as Carey would wish (p. 559).

performance of antistrophes, but only talks about how Melanippides ruined poetry by substituting long ἀναβολαί for ἀντίστροφοι (Μελανιππίδην ποιήσαντα ἀντὶ τῶν ἀντιστρόφων ἀναβολάς). T. B. L. Webster observes that this criticism is directed at changes in the number of strings, or more probably the number of notes or tones.¹⁵

Although Burnett insists that the terms στροφή and ἀντιστροφή “imply motion,” the idea that they apply specifically to dancing rather than to melodic structure appears also to be based on speculation in the Hellenistic age and after (Lefkowitz, p. 4).¹⁶ Burnett also suggests that a reference to motion is implied in the phrase ἐξαρμονίους καμπὰς ποιῶν ἐν ταῖς στροφαῖς in Pherecrates *Cheiron* frag. 155. 9 PCG (=145K) apud [Plut.] *De musica* 30 1114C–D, where “the basic metaphor would seem to refer either to ploughing or to riding.”¹⁷ But that connotation is unlikely in this context, since καμπή (like στροφή) is a well-established musical term, denoting “inflections” in musical sequence.¹⁸ In any case, Pherecrates is talking about the dithyramb and not about the victory ode, and the use of strophe and antistrophe in the dithyramb, for all we know, may have been different from the ἐπινίκιον.

If the passages cited by Burnett cannot be used as evidence for the performance of choral poetry in the fifth century other than in dramatic or dithyrambic contexts, what arguments might be made against her other hypothesis, that Stesichorus invented the use of the lyre for the convenience of the chorus?¹⁹ Burnett cites Suda Σ 1095 IV 433 Adler ἐκλήθη δὲ Στησίχορος, ὅτι πρῶτος κιθαρωδία χορὸν ἔστησεν, which she translates, “first set a chorus to the song of the lyre.” But κιθαρωδία might also be rendered “kitharodic singing” or “a kitharode’s song,” and χορὸς could denote dance rather than a singing chorus (Lefkowitz, p. 2). The Suda reference, if it is historical and not simply an ancient etymological conjecture, would then denote the first use of the concert κιθάρα to accompany a group of dancers (cf. *Hymn. Hom.* 3. 131, 200–203); in Homer Demodocus plays the φόρμιγξ (*Od.* 8. 256–60; cf. *Hymn. Hom.* 3. 182–85).

The presumption that Stesichorus composed solo-song accords better with Ps.-Plutarch, who includes Stesichorus among the ancient lyric poets “who composed epic verses and set them to music” (1132C ποιοῦντες ἔπη τούτοις μέλη περιετίθεσαν; cf. Quint. 10. 1. 62 *epici carminis onera lyra sustinentem*). Although it seems natural to infer that songs as long as Stesichorus’ *Geryoneis* (1500 lines) or the Lille papyrus were sung as solos (a

15. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy*² (Oxford, 1962), pp. 40–41.

16. Testimonia in E. K. Borthwick, “Notes on the Plutarch *De Musica* and the *Cheiron* of Pherecrates,” *Hermes* 96 (1968): 68.

17. “Jocasta in the West,” p. 133, n. 80.

18. Cf. J. Taillardat, *Les images d’Aristophane* (Paris, 1962), pp. 456–57; Borthwick, “Notes,” pp. 71–73; D. Restani, “Il *Chirone* di Ferecrate e la “Nuova” Musica Greca,” *Rivista Ital. di Musicologia* 18 (1983): 158–63.

19. Burnett, “Jocasta in the West,” p. 134; cf. G. Nagy, “Early Greek Views of Poets and Poetry,” in *Cambridge History of Classical Criticism*, ed. G. Kennedy (Cambridge, 1989), p. 59, who attempts to resolve the problem of length by suggesting that Stesichorus offered a “monodic mimesis of choral performance”; cf. G. Nagy, *Pindar’s Homer* (Baltimore, 1990), p. 371.

stichometric mark indicates that the Lille fragment ends at about line 300, presumably toward the beginning of the poem), Burnett ingeniously proposed some alternative explanations for the stichometry, in order to contrive a length more suitable for choral performance. But Quintilian speaks of Stesichorus' compositions as overlong and repetitious (10. 1. 62 *si tenuisset modum . . . redundat atque effunditur*).²⁰ Carey argues that choral dithyrambs in Athens were "substantial poems" (p. 564), though the longest of these that survives, Bacchylides 17, is only 132 lines. While it is true that the sum total of lines sung by the chorus of a trilogy by Aeschylus—if we imagine them to be sung without interruption—might equal that of a complete poem by Stesichorus or in any case exceed that of the longest surviving victory ode, *Pythian* 4, Athenian choral song, whether dithyrambic or dramatic, does not provide a valid analogy to Stesichorus' mini-epics or to epinician odes. In contrast to the informal κῶμοι of friends and family assembled to celebrate a victory (Heath, p. 185), Athenian choruses were specially—and in the Greek world uniquely—formally trained for public performance. In Athens it was a civic duty, as well as a religious obligation, for citizens to organize and rehearse choruses for the festivals of Dionysus; chorus members were required to be citizens and were exempted from military service (Dem. *Or.* 21. 56, 15).²¹

There is also no reason to accept Burnett's suggestion that Stesichorus invented the notion of using lyre-playing as a guide to choral singers. According to Burnett's hypothesis, Stesichorus taught stanzas to singers by fixing the lyre rather than the αὐλός as a musical guide. She bases her notion that Stesichorus belonged to the auletic tradition on Ps.-Plutarch *De musica* 1133–34, which says only that Stesichorus took from the aulete Olympus the Chariot nome and the dactylic rhythm, and so cannot be taken also to imply that Stesichorus also substituted κιθάρα for the αὐλός. His use of the κιθάρα cannot be used as an argument for the choral hypothesis, since choral singers were ordinarily accompanied by the αὐλός. No hypothetical constructions are needed to interpret the Suda passage as meaning that Stesichorus was the first to arrange a dancing accompaniment to (solo)-song set to the lyre (κιθαρῳδία).

Nor do references to musical instruments in Pindar's odes provide unequivocal support for the choral hypothesis. Soloists ordinarily accompanied themselves on strings, because of course no one could sing and simultaneously play the αὐλός. Lyres are mentioned in many odes (*Ol.* 1. 17, 2. 1, 4. 2, 9. 13, *Pyth.* 2. 71, 8. 31, *Nem.* 4. 5, 10. 21; cf. *Isthm.* 2. 2). Often, the poet addresses his lyre in order to signal, like other forms

20. Burnett, "Jocasta in the West," p. 132, but compare E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (Oxford, 1968), p. 95, for description of stichometric signs. Ps.-Arist. notes that the hero's departure and arming in the *Geryones* was not a choral song because it was written in the hypophrygian mode (*Pr.* 19. 48 922b). Welcker thought that Ps.-Arist. had in mind the Alexandrian poet Nicomachus' tragedy *Geryones* (mentioned in the Suda; cf. *TGrF* I 127 T and F3; Bergk, p. 207). But since Ps.-Arist. omits the poet's name he would have had in mind a famous, and in any case a nondramatic, text; he could easily have referred to the poem as *Geryones* rather than *Geryoneis*.

21. Cf. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*,³ rev. J. Gould and D. M. Lewis (Oxford, 1988), p. 77.

of self-reference in the odes, a change of theme (*Ol.* 1. 17, 9. 13, *Nem.* 3. 26, 4. 44).²² Pindar's use of the term φόρμιγξ (rather than κιθάρα, the professional's lyre) is idiosyncratic and perhaps intended to recall the φόρμιγξ of the Homeric bard.²³

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 (μέν) and bards (δ' αἰδοί):²⁴

χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων
 σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον· τὰς ἀκούει
 μὲν βάσις ἀγλαΐας ἀρχά,
 πείθονται δ' αἰδοί σάμασιν
 ἀγῆσιχόρων ὁπότεν προοιμίων
 ἀμβολὰς τεύχης ἐλελιζομένα.

Pace Burnett (p. 286), there is no reference to choreuts or to a chorus singing in unison, although the musical term βάσις can also denote a dancer's step (cf. *Ar. Thesm.* 968). In this context, ἀμβολαί (i.e., ἀναβολαί) are not preludes but "phrases" of the prooemia that set musical performances going.²⁵ Nothing in this or any other passage in the odes is inconsistent with the notion of dancing by a κῶμος. In *Olympian* 2. 47 the victor gets "songs of κῶμοι and of lyres" (ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρᾶν τε τυγχανέμεν). Komasts (and presumably other groups) could dance to the lyre, and are shown carrying lyres in vase paintings.²⁶

A number of odes refer to both the playing of the lyre and the playing of the single or double αὐλός (*Ol.* 3. 7–8, 7. 11–12, *Nem.* 9. 8, *Isthm.* 5. 26–27; cf. also *Nem.* 3. 12, 79). Since ordinarily lyric song was accompanied by either lyre or αὐλός (but not both at once),²⁷ Burnett (p. 292) imagines that in such passages Pindar is describing a "new fashion" of orchestration: for example, *Olympian* 3. 4–6 refers to "more elegant manipulation of the dancers' voices," and *Olympian* 10. 84–85 refers to "adding instruments, using pipe as well as lyre, or increasing length." But a simpler interpretation exists that accords easily with the solo hy-

22. Cf. Lefkowitz, "The First Person in Pindar," *HSCP* 67 (1963): 178–88.

23. Cf. also M. Maas and J. M. Snyder, *The Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece* (New Haven, 1989), p. 60.

24. Cf. M. L. West, "The Singing of Homer and the Modes of Early Greek Music," *JHS* 101 (1981): 122 and n. 56. On the use of the φόρμιγξ, cf. Maas and Snyder, *Stringed Instruments*, p. 60. Presumably in private performances the singer could use a smaller instrument, though in *Nem.* 4. 14 Pindar imagines that the victor's father would play the κιθάρα.

25. Cf. Restani, "Il *Chirone* di Ferecrate," pp. 147–49.

26. Cf. Maas and Snyder, *Stringed Instruments*, fig. 6 (p. 44), fig. 14b (p. 49); in *PMG* 900 the poet of a scolion wishes that he were a lyre so that beautiful boys might carry him in the dance (χορός) of Dionysus.

27. Cf. J. M. Snyder, "Aulos and Kithara on the Greek Stage," in *Panathenaia: Studies in Athenian Life and Thought in the Classical Age*, ed. T. E. Gregory and A. J. Podlecki (Lawrence, Kans., 1979), p. 86. *Soph.* frag. 60 refers to the playing of the lyre (ἐπιψάλλειν) and συναυλία; in *Ar. Eq.* 9–10 συναυλία is equated with the αὐλός-player Oulympos' nomos, and rendered by voices as a wordless τερπτισμός (μουῦ for the length of the line); in later authors συναυλία refers to playing in concert with αὔλοι or κιθάρα (schol. ad loc.; cf. *Ephippus*, frag. 7 *PCG*), but apparently not in accompaniment to songs with words; see A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge, 1917), vol. 1, p. 39.

pothesis. The combination of lyre- and αὐλός-orchestration appears to be particularly appropriate to a convivial setting; in Xenophon *Symposium* 3. 1 a boy and girl dance to the piping of an αὐλητρίς, and then the boy tunes his lyre to the αὐλός and sings a solo, presumably to the accompaniment of both instruments.²⁸ The αὐλός was ordinarily used to accompany group activities, such as the κῶμος (Heath, p. 194), as well as folk songs, marching songs, and songs to Dionysus, such as the dithyramb.²⁹ If we think of the αὐλοί (and, occasionally, one or more lyres) as playing for the κῶμος, phrases like ἐν αὐλοῖς can readily be understood to refer to the activities of the κῶμος, as, for example, in *Olympian* 10. 84–85, where the dance that swells to the pipe (πρὸς κάλαμον) will meet the poet's song that has come to light (though late) beside the stream of Dirce.

II

In the remainder of this article we will examine some of the passages which have been cited as evidence in this debate; a number of further general considerations will be raised at appropriate points. It will be argued that there is some, admittedly tenuous, internal evidence in favor of solo performance and nothing that is inconsistent with it. We still incline therefore toward the solo hypothesis, although it would be foolish to claim that the choral hypothesis is demonstrably incorrect.

ἀλλὰ Δω-
ρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα πασσάλου
λάμβαν'

Olympian 1. 17–18

Lefkowitz (p. 4) sees in this passage evidence of solo performance, citing *Odyssey* 8. 68; Davies (p. 56) aptly compares Bacchylides fragments 20B. 1–3, 20C. 1–2 (from encomia). Carey is apparently willing to concede the prima facie point (p. 561), but warns against “taking this command too literally” (p. 560; cf. p. 564, n. 49). It is true that there is an element of fiction in this passage; Pindar's lyre was presumably in use from the start (cf. *Nemean* 7. 77 ἀναβάλεο). But the use of a patently fictional “beginning” to a song already in process cannot be taken as evidence that the song was not sung as a solo to lyre accompaniment; unless we are to suppose that Pindar constructed his fictions with no regard to verisimilitude, a fiction implying solo performance is more likely in a

28. Cf. A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 120 n. 13, with 274 n. 67; followed by Nagy, *Pindar's Homer*, p. 103, n. 107. Both lyre and αὐλός accompany the processional dance to the “Hymn of the Curetes” (CA 160. 7–8) preserved in an inscription of 200 B.C. and the procession of χοροί of boys in Lucian *Salt.* 16; cf. K. Latte, *De Saltationibus Graecorum* (Berlin, 1967), p. 48.

29. Ath. 14. 618C; cf. M. I. Henderson, “Ancient Greek Music,” *Oxford History of Music* (Oxford, 1957), p. 381. On the αὐλός as the accompaniment for the (unison?) song of young men at a symposium, see Theognis 239 ff. (Carey, p. 554); for (tragic) monody, cf. Ps.-Arist. *Pr.* 19. 43 922a; Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals*, pp. 165–66; Snyder, “Aulos and Kithara,” pp. 85–87; for dithyramb, see, e.g., D. L. Page, ed., *Further Greek Epigrams*, no. 40 = AP 13. 28. 81.

song written for solo performance than in one for which only choral performance could be envisaged.

Carey's willingness to treat elements of the text as fiction, and to read certain expressions (such as imperatives that might otherwise be taken to refer beyond the ode) figuratively, sits uneasily with his second methodological premise: in assuming fiction or figuration, one necessarily postulates facts which the text does not mention and rejects as nonfacts things which it does mention. We agree that fiction and figuration are indispensable concepts in the interpretation of a poet as rhetorically sophisticated as Pindar; but unless they are invoked in particular cases on some principle independent of a commitment to the choral (or, equally, to the solo) hypothesis they compromise any claim to be offering a natural, obvious, or unbiased reading of the text.

δτρυνον νῦν ἑταίρους,
 Αἰνέα, πρῶτον μὲν Ἦραν
 Παρθενίαν κελαδῆσαι
 γυνῶναί τ' ἔπειτ', ἀρχαῖον ὄνειδος ἀλαθέσιν
 λόγοις εἰ φεύγομεν, Βοιωτίαν ὕν.
 ἔσσι γὰρ ἄγγελος ὀρθός,
 ἡυκόμων σκυτάλα Μοι-
 σᾶν, γλυκὺς κρατὴρ ἀγαφθέγκτων ἀοιδᾶν·
 εἶπον δὲ μεμνᾶσθαι Συρα-
 κοσσᾶν τε καὶ Ὀρτυγίας·

Olympian 6. 87–92

On the solo hypothesis, Aeneas, acting as Pindar's messenger, proclaims Pindar's message (which means, since the message is a song, that he sings it); the message includes instructions addressed to Aeneas himself, so he sings those, too. His instructions are that he should encourage his fellow-komasts to sing a hymn to Hera Parthenia (or παῖς; cf. Paus. 8. 22. 2) in Stymphalos and to solicit their praise for Pindar's song. The hymn is distinct from Pindar's song, but closely related to it, since both are aspects of the same κῶμος. Aeneas serves as ἔξαρχος for the song the κῶμος will sing to Hera, as Hippolytus in Euripides' drama acts as ἔξαρχος for his ὀπισθόπους κῶμος, leading off their singing of a short hymn to Artemis (54–55).³⁰

Burnett comments (p. 284, n. 9): "Heath does not . . . explain why, if the two songs are wholly separate . . . the members of the local hymn-singing κῶμος . . . should be termed the ἑταῖροι of Aeneas (or, indeed, what business he has meddling with their presumably traditional performance)." As we have already explained, we do not believe that the two songs are "wholly separate." Pindar's song is designed as a contribution to a komastic celebration, and the hymn will be sung when the κῶμος arrives at the temple of Hera. The two songs therefore have a close contextual relation,

30. Cf. *Ol.* 5. 9–12, where the victor sings on his return from Olympia of Athena's τέμενος in Camarina. Other possible short hymns to deities: Lamprocles frag. 1, Stesichorus frag. 97, Anacreon frag. 3 *PMG*; Ar. *Nub.* 967; and the hymn to Zeus in *Nem.* 3. 65–66 (see below).

since both are components of the same κῶμος-celebration. The komasts are Aeneas' companions because he is a participant in the κῶμος with them. Pindar (as an absent well-wisher) and Aeneas (as a participant) both have reason to desire the success of the κῶμος and therefore to offer friendly encouragement (which Burnett oddly regards as "meddling").

Carey argues from the context that the commands in these lines are self-fulfilling (p. 557): the command in 89–90 is "in all likelihood equivalent to a statement of the truth of Pindar's praise of Hagesias rather than a reference to activity to be carried on outside the ode." This is a false antithesis: a claim about the function of the command ("equivalent to a statement . . .") is opposed to a claim about its reference; but a command may be issued for reasons internal to an utterance and still refer to something outside it.³¹ Carey's rhetorical analysis of the context therefore does not show that in this passage "the commands do not refer beyond the ode."³² While it is theoretically possible that the instruction to sing (κελαδῆσαι) Hera Parthenia is self-fulfilling, a bare mention that says nothing of her cult or her powers would hardly do the goddess due honor; a more elaborate performance seems to be called for.

ἰδοῖσα τόνδε κῶμον ἐπ' εὐμενεῖ τύχῃ
κοῦφα βιβῶντα. Λυδῶ γάρ Ἀσώπιχον ἐν τρόπῳ
ἐν μελέταις τ' αἰείδων ἔμολον . . .

Olympian 14. 16–18

Heath in his paper (p. 187) pointed out that in a context which refers to the κῶμος as a whole the subject of "singing" is nevertheless just "I"; this counts in favor of the solo hypothesis. Carey offers in reply an interpretation which "would make the singer . . . part of the *komos*" (p. 560); but the solo hypothesis is precisely that the song was performed by a member of the κῶμος. The implication of solo performance seems, therefore, to stand.³³

δέδεξαι τόνδε κῶμον ἀνέρων
Ἀπολλώνιον ἄθυρμα

Pythian 5. 22–23

This passage is a μακαρισμός: Arcesilaus is blessed because he is the recipient of a κῶμος. Since the κῶμος attests to his victory it is an appropriate index of felicity. The κῶμος is the delight of Apollo, perhaps because it sang his praises at Delphi in a short song like that sung by Hippolytus' κῶμος (see above on *Olympian* 6). That κῶμος does mean here the whole

31. For example, in conversation one might try to add weight to some statement by saying "you ask George if you don't believe me"; although the function of this command is rhetorical, wholly internal to the utterance, there is undeniably a reference to something (an appeal to George) that is outside the utterance.

32. Carey adds that the description of Aeneas in 90–91 "suggests that his role is to drill them"; we cannot see any such implication. Heath (p. 191) referred to "the song and (perhaps) its performance"; but Aeneas is likely to have been Stympheian, not Boeotian: Slater, "Futures in Pindar," p. 89.

33. Carey also claims that Heath's interpretation rests on an arbitrary restriction of the scope of γάρ (v. 17), but this is not correct; Heath never doubted that the sentence thus introduced backs up the whole request to the Graces, seeing as well as hearing.

mobile celebration to which Pindar's song was a contribution is strongly suggested by the reception-motif; presumably the κῶμος was received by Arcesilaus at the site of the victory banquet (cf. Bacchyl. 6. 13–15, Pind. *Nem.* 1. 19–20) before going on to be received at the temple of Apollo (103–4; cf. Heath, pp. 180–82, 188–90). Carey refers κῶμος specifically to Pindar's song, arguing that "it is far more likely . . . that Pindar would count his patron 'blessed' for the receipt of his song than for any other part of the celebration" (pp. 548–49). But the κῶμος is not another part of the celebration: it is the whole celebration; and it is more likely that Pindar would count his patron blessed for the whole celebration than for any part. That Pindar sometimes elsewhere uses song as an index of felicity (Carey, p. 549) does not, of course, prove that he does so here.

Carey claims that κῶμος is used of the epinician itself in Pindar.³⁴ But all of the instances that Carey cites as "highly probable" (p. 549) can be referred to the celebration as a whole without difficulty. It is true that in *Olympian* 4. 9, which Carey regards as "certain," χρονιώτατον can be more readily understood as applying to the song rather than the whole celebration; but even here the appearance of the reception-motif (Οὐλυμπιονίκαν δέξαι Χαρίτων θ' ἕκατι τόνδε κῶμον, χρονιώτατον φάος . . . Ψαύμιος γὰρ ἦκει. . .) suggests that the poet means κῶμος in its most inclusive sense, the celebration as a whole. That the term sometimes has this more inclusive sense is, of course, beyond question (see, e.g., *Isthm.* 2. 30–32 οὔτε κῶμων . . . οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν).

τὸν ἐν ἀοιδᾷ νέων
πρέπει χρυσάορα Φοῖβον ἀπύειν . . .

Pythian 5. 103–4

On the solo hypothesis ἀοιδᾶ νέων refers to the unison singing of the κῶμος; Arcesilaus is under an obligation to honor Apollo by a celebratory κῶμος to his temple, in the course of the victory celebration (in 22 the κῶμος ἀνέρων is called the "delight of Apollo"); compare the reception of the κῶμος at a temple or sacred precinct in *Olympian* 4. 9–10, 13. 29–30, 14. 16, *Pythian* 8. 5, *Nemean* 11. 1–5 (Heath, pp. 189–90). Burnett asserts that the phrase refers to Pindar's song, seeking confirmation by cross-reference to 22–23, "where the visible chorus is described as Apollo's delight" (p. 290); but since Pindar there refers to "this κῶμος" (not "this χορός") the parallel hardly counts against the interpretation she rejects.

κόμφ μὲν ἄδυμελεῖ
Δίκα παρέστακε

Pythian 8. 70–71

34. The ancient commentators likewise assumed that the κῶμος could be equated with the ὕμνος to the victor; their failure to grasp the komastic nature of the odes (see n. 4 above) led them to interpret κῶμος as ἐγκώμιον; see Σ *Nem.* 2. 37b (3:39 Dr) ἀπὸ τοῦ κώμου τὸ ἐγκώμιον νοητέον; cf., e.g., *Ol.* 6. 98 = Σ *Ol.* 6. 167d (1:193 Dr); *Ol.* 8. 10 = Σ *Ol.* 8. 12e (1:240 Dr); *Ol.* 10. 77 = Σ *Ol.* 10. 92b (1:335 Dr); *Ol.* 13. 29 = Σ *Ol.* 13. 39a (1:365 Dr); *Pyth.* 3. 73 = Σ *Pyth.* 3. 127a (2:79 Dr); *Pyth.* 8. 20 = Σ *Pyth.* 8. 29a (2:209 Dr); *Nem.* 9. 50 = Σ *Nem.* 9. 119a, b (3:162 Dr); *Nem.* 10. 35 = Σ *Nem.* 10. 61 (3:174 Dr); *Isthm.* 2. 31–32 = Σ *Isthm.* 2. 44a (3:219 Dr); *Isthm.* 8. 4 = Σ *Isthm.* 8. 1a, b (3:269 Dr).

On this reference to the κῶμος Burnett comments (pp. 291–92): “He cannot mean that Justice took part in some disorderly revel that has preceded the singing of his ode, for that would be both irrelevant and absurd.” Pindar might however mean that the whole celebration (the κῶμος) to which his ode is a contribution is taking place with the support of Justice; this would not be irrelevant or absurd. Pindar links the statement about Justice with a prayer that the gods will look on Aristomenes without φθόνος. A celebration of this kind, because it is highly honorific to the victor, risks incurring divine φθόνος; but in this case the celebration is warranted, as the divine patronage of Justice attests, and the risk may be deflected. The assumption that the κῶμος is a “disorderly revel” is gratuitous; as we have said, the κῶμος is a very diverse phenomenon, and not all of its forms were riotous (Heath, p. 182).

ἀλλά με Πυθώ
τε καὶ τὸ Πελινναῖον ἀπύει
Ἀλεῦα τε παῖδες, Ἴπποκλέα θέλοντες
ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὅπα.

Pythian 10. 4–6

This passage offers justification for Pindar’s song by listing the forces which prompt it: the place of victory, the victor’s home town, and the victor’s patrons. The patrons call on Pindar θέλοντες ἀγαγεῖν ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν κλυτὰν ὅπα (5–6); and it is reasonable to see in this phrase a reference to “collective singing by a group of men” (Carey, p. 547; cf. Burnett, p. 287, n. 16). But the phrase is also consistent with the solo hypothesis, which places the performance of Pindar’s song in the context of a κῶμος; κῶμοι typically involved unison singing, and ἐπικωμίαν ἀνδρῶν . . . ὅπα is therefore an apt metonymy for the κῶμος itself. To say that the Aleuads have commissioned Pindar’s ode desiring to organize a κῶμος would make perfect sense, since the desire to have a κῶμος is a readily intelligible motive for commissioning a showpiece song which will add the crowning touch of splendor to their komastic celebration. The passage has therefore not been shown to imply choral performance of Pindar’s ode.

ἔλπομαι δ’ Ἐφουραίῳ
ὅπ’ ἀμφὶ Πηνεῖδον γλυκεῖαν προχεόντων ἐμάν
τὸν Ἴπποκλέαν ἔτι καὶ μάλλον σὺν αἰοδαῖς
ἔκατι στεφάνων θαητὸν ἐν ἄλι-
ξι θησέμεν ἐν καὶ παλαιτέροις
νεαῖσιν τε παρθένοισι μέλημα.

Pythian 10. 55–59

On the solo hypothesis, this passage refers to subsequent informal performances of the ode by individual singers.³⁵ Against this Carey argues (p. 548) that ring-composition links this passage with 4–6; but his own schema (p. 548, n. 7) shows that it does not occupy the place in the ring

35. As in *Nem.* 4. 14 (implied in *Nem.* 5. 3); cf. Hippothales’ solo encomium to Lysis, *Pl. Lys.* 205D–E. Burnett (p. 291) misunderstands this point (for which see Lefkowitz, pp. 4–5; Heath, p. 187, n. 18).

which the alleged correspondence requires.³⁶ He points out also that “there is nothing in the text to suggest that the reference is to later performances,” but this argument is two-edged; there is no reference in the text to dancers, either. This is not the only case in which Carey fails to notice that the choral hypothesis, no less than its rival, goes beyond the explicit content of the text.

It should be noted that implicit reference to subsequent performances is relatively common in Pindar, as (for example) at *Olympian* 10. 91–98; for it is unlikely that the preservation and dissemination of the victor’s fame which he promises through song is to be secured solely through the written text (Heath, p. 187, n. 18). There is therefore no intrinsic difficulty in interpreting this passage as expressing the wish that Hippocleas’ fame and attractiveness will continue to be enhanced by subsequent performance of Pindar’s song.

ὦ πότνια Μοῖσα, μᾶτερ ἀμέτερα, λίσσομαι,
τὰν πολυξέναν ἐν ἱερομηνία Νεμεάδι
ἵκεο Δωρίδα νᾶσον Αἴγιναν· ὕδατι γάρ
μένοντ’ ἐπ’ Ἀσωπίῳ μελιγαρύων τέκτονες
κώμων νεανίαί, σέθεν ὅπα μαιόμενοι.
διψῇ δὲ πρᾶγος ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου,
ἀεθλονικία δὲ μάλιστ’ αἰοιδᾶν φιλεῖ,
στεφάνων ἀρετᾶν τε δεξιωτάταν ὁπαδόν·
τᾶς ἀφθονίαν ὅπαζε μῆτιος ἀμᾶς ἄπο·
ἄρχε δ’ οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι, θύγατερ,
δόκιμον ὕμνον· ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν ὅαροις
λύρα τε κοινάσομαι.

Nemean 3. 1–12

On the solo hypothesis, Pindar (maintaining a pose of spontaneity) asks the Muse to inspire his song and gives two reasons for his request: his audience is eager to hear the song, and the thing they are celebrating—athletic victory—demands it. The audience consists of Aeginetan komasts,³⁷ and komasts typically sing (hence they are aptly described as “builders of sweet-voiced κῶμοι”);³⁸ so Pindar’s solo song contributes to a celebration that also involves unison singing (he will “share” his song with the young men’s voices and with the lyre).³⁹

Lefkowitz (p. 8) complicated the interpretation of this passage by translating ὅαροι (11) as “talk,” which Burnett was led to characterize as a

36. “B1 Poet’s song, commission by the Aleuadae (4–6). . . . B2 Poet’s song, commission by the Aleuadae (56, 64–66)”: there is no structural warrant for including 56 in B2, from which it is separated by another element of the ring (C2 = 61–63).

37. G. A. Privitera has shown that the Asopian water where the young men are waiting is in Aegina (“Pindaro, *Nem.* 3. 1–5 e l’acqua di Egina,” *QUCC* n.s. 29 [1988]: 63–70); accepted by Carey, p. 552 (contrast Burnett, p. 288).

38. Μελίγαρος denotes choral singing in Alcman frag. 26 *PMG*; but in *Pyth.* 3. 113, epic poets are described as τέκτονες σοφοί.

39. Burnett (p. 289, n. 19) objects to Heath’s “contorted reading of line 12 . . . where the solo singer must somehow make his song the common property of his instrument and these young men’s past songs. How can komast voices that have stopped singing share a ὕμνος with a presently sounding lyre?” But Heath (p. 187) assumes that the lyre in question is that which will accompany the young men’s singing; the text does not specify “his” or “presently sounding.”

background of manifold vocal noises (pp. 283–85). But although ὄσπος can on occasion denote informal discourse, in Pindar it always seems to mean “voices.”⁴⁰ *Pythian* 1. 97 provides an analogy. If, as Carey shows (p. 554), παίδων ὄσποισι must denote the song of boys at a banquet, we must imagine that they are singing a song of praise in a celebratory context. This interpretation would be supported by the passage from Theognis (239 ff.) that Carey cites, which refers to young men singing to the accompaniment of αὐλοί. The instrumentation in *Pythian* 1. 97 differs, not, as Carey supposes, simply because Pindar wishes to recall his description of the golden lyre at the ode’s opening, but because in a victory celebration both lyre- and αὐλός-song might be involved. So also in *Nemean* 3 the young men’s song need not be synonymous with what the poet proposes to sing with the lyre, even though it is coordinated with it in the same celebration (11–12 ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τε νιν ὄσποις λύρα τε κοινάσομαι; cf. *Ol.* 3. 8–9).

What then are the young men in the κῶμος singing on the occasion of the performance of *Nemean* 3? On the choral hypothesis, it would of course be Pindar’s victory ode itself; on the solo hypothesis, it would be some other song or songs in celebration of the victory—there being no doubt that on occasion a κῶμος might sing the τήνελλα καλλινίκη (as in *Ol.* 9. 1–4), or some other song suitable to the occasion, like the hymn to Zeus mentioned in 65–66.⁴¹ Carey comments that the passage “is perfectly intelligible without any supplement as a statement that Pindar is to supply the singers with the song they desire” (p. 555); but that is how we too understand it. We disagree only about whether to specify “desire to sing” or “desire to hear”; the text is not explicit in this respect, and here again both hypotheses supplement it. Further, the objection that “Pindar says nothing of any song which has already been sung by the young men,” thus stated, begs the question; on our hypothesis “sweet-voiced” and “voices” allude precisely to such songs. If the point is that Pindar does not state explicitly that they sing other songs, then the objection works both ways: neither does he state explicitly that they sing Pindar’s song; that is at most implied. The implication that the young men are singing the victory ode, however, cannot be substantiated. The inference that the young men must desire to sing the song because they are described as

40. Cf. B. K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin, 1988), pp. 222–23. Since in Pindar ὄσπος seems always to denote articulate speech (e.g., *Nem.* 7. 69), Burnett is right to reject Lefkowitz’s speculation that the ὄσποι might on occasion have been humming or providing some sort of rhythmic accompaniment to the odes; see “Pindar’s *Pythian* 5,” *EH* 31 (1985): 48. Nonetheless, the notion of non-verbal singing is by no means so ridiculous as Burnett implies (pp. 283–85), since τερπεῖζειν in a musical context does not mean “twittering,” but denotes humming a melody or the human voice imitating the sound of the lyre; cf. n. 27 above, and Restani, “Il *Chirone* di Ferecrate,” pp. 186–88.

41. Although some ancient commentators believed that τήνελλα was meant to imitate the sound of the lyre or αὐλός (cf. Archil. frag. 324W.; Suda s.v., I 4, p. 542 Adler), it was probably a ritual cry like ἰή ἰη Παιάν; cf. Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Berlin, 1932), vol. 1, p. 292, n. 2. On the καλλινίκος [κῶμος], cf. G. W. Bond, *Euripides: “Heracles”* (Oxford, 1981), p. 115 (on Eur. *HF* 180), and Lawler, “Orchêsis Kallinikos,” pp. 259–62; cf. the short congratulatory songs sung by choruses for heroes (e.g., Ar. *Ach.* 1008–17; *Pax* 856–62; frag. 505 *PCG*; but compare *Nub.* 1201–11, where Strepsiades sings a similar song to himself); C. W. Macleod, “The Comic Encomium,” *Phoenix* 35 (1981): 142–44 = *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 49–51; Heath, p. 183.

singers is unsound; for the young men (being komasts) are singers on any interpretation (the phrase which describes their singing is a generalizing one, without specific reference to this song: “builders of sweet-voiced κῶμοι”).

On either interpretation, there is an element of fiction in this passage.⁴² On the solo interpretation, the fiction lies solely in the pretense that the rest of his song has not yet been composed; the audience and its desire are real (the komasts’ desire for song will not have been sated, nor indeed will the poet’s need for the Muses’ aid have ceased, until the song is over). The choral hypothesis requires a more elaborate fiction: the poet pretends in addition that the chorus which has in fact rehearsed and is currently performing his song is waiting for him to provide them with it—and he adopts this pretense precisely in that song. We do not want to claim that this interpretation is impossible; but its complexity is unnecessary, given the more straightforward alternative.

Lines 65–66 explicitly refer to a song sung by young men:

Ζεῦ, τεδὸν γὰρ αἶμα, σέο δ’ ἀγών, τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν
ὅπῃ νέων ἐπιχώριον χάρμα κελαδέων.

We had assumed that this was a song sung by a κῶμος at the site of the victory. But Carey (p. 556) remarks that “there is nothing in the context to support” the view that the reference is to an earlier celebration. The tense (ἔβαλεν) offers some support for a past occasion, since Pindar’s odes normally refer to themselves in the present or future; the aorist, as one would expect, is rare.⁴³ Though not conclusive, the tense does suggest a past reference, and at least shows that it is not arbitrary to suppose that the reference is to an earlier occasion, though nothing precludes it from referring to a κῶμος-song to Zeus sung in Aegina.

πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείνοις αἶειδ’ ἐν Παλῑῳ
Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός

Nemean 5. 22–23

Carey and Burnett both argue that conclusions may be drawn about the mode of performance of Pindar’s song from that of the Muses’ song with which it is compared (Carey, p. 558) or on which it is modeled (Burnett, p. 285). The weakness of this argument is evident; the proem of Hesiod’s *Theogony* establishes an even clearer connection with the Muses’ χορός, but no one believes that Hesiod’s poetry was choral. In both cases, what is important to the poet is not so much the model’s mode of performance as its content and its divinity.

One song or poem can be inspired or influenced by another without adopting its mode of performance; and since mode of performance is (in archaic Greece) an aspect of genre, it is particularly unwise to infer a

42. Heath, p. 188, was badly expressed: he did not wish to imply that the passage could be taken literally (Carey, p. 555), meaning by “we have to suppose” something like “we are invited to imagine.”

43. Slater, “Futures in Pindar,” p. 88 n. 1, cites only *Ol.* 10. 100 (αἰνῆσα); at the very end of the song the aorist is perhaps less surprising.

shared mode of performance from cross-generic influence. It should be noted, therefore, that *Nemean* 5. 22–23 refers to a wedding-song and *Isthmian* 8. 57–62 (cited in the same context by Carey and Burnett) to a θρῆνος; neither can safely be assimilated to epinician—a point reinforced by the observation that in both cases we have a χορός of παρθένοι, which no one has proposed for epinician.

Another passage cited by Carey (p. 558) is *Olympian* 14. 8–10, which is however a generalization (χοροὺς οὔτε δαΐτας), as are *Pythian* 1. 1–6 and *Pythian* 10. 37 ff. (χοροὶ παρθένων); it would again be unwise to draw conclusions about epinician.⁴⁴

ἀμφοτερᾶν
 τοὶ χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος,
 καὶ τὸν ἀκερσεκόμαν Φοῖβον χορεύων
 ἐν Κέφ' ἀμφιρύτῃ σὺν ποντίοις
 ἀνδράσιν, καὶ τὰν ἀλιερκέα Ἴσθμοῦ
 δειράδ'.

Isthmian 1. 6–10

Pindar uses one verb (χορεύειν) to refer to a paean and an epinician; if the verb implies exactly the same mode of performance in each case, then both songs were performed chorally. But this interpretation is not inevitable. On the solo hypothesis, Pindar applies the word simultaneously to a choral performance of the paean and to informal dance accompanying the solo performance of the epinician; the latter sense is within the range of possible meanings of χορεύειν (Heath, pp. 185–86), and the use of a verb in two senses with different objects is consistent with Pindaric usage.⁴⁵

Carey claims that “Pindar is clearly indicating an inevitable aspect of the performance as he intends it” (p. 546). This claim is, however, consistent with the solo hypothesis, according to which the performance of his song is intended to be an integral part of the komastic celebration, of which dance was a normal feature.

τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον, ἔσ-
 συταί τε Μοισαῖον ἄρμα Νικοκλέος
 μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆσαι· γεραίρετέ νιν . . .

Isthmian 8. 67–69

Carey (p. 550) argues that the praise of Nicocles in 63–65 is the fulfillment of the command γεραίρετε, which is addressed to the κῶμος of νέοι summoned in the poem's opening lines. If this command can have only an internal reference, the notion of solo performance would be excluded. But we would emphasize again the distinction between function and reference: functionally this command is equivalent to a statement that Nicocles is

44. Cf. Heath, p. 185, where “generalisation” was italicized (to the confusion of Burnett, p. 286, n. 15) to emphasize the antithesis with “specifically” (also italicized).

45. Cf. *Ol.* 1. 88, *Nem.* 10. 25–26, *Pyth.* 1. 40. Strictly speaking, it may not even be necessary to take the verb in two senses: the single inclusive sense “dance” is applicable to both objects. There are in any case much more violent forms of zeugma in Pindar (e.g., *Pyth.* 8. 19, 4. 104); cf. D. E. Gerber, *Pindar's Olympian One* (Toronto, 1982), pp. 136–37; F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (Berlin, 1921), p. 106.

praiseworthy, and this “statement” is substantiated in 63–65. But it does not follow that 63–65 is the execution of the command; Pindar could equally well be making his oblique statement about Nicocles by means of a command which looks beyond the poem.

Carey acknowledges that the command’s reference could be external to the poem, but points to passages in which an imperative demanding praise is followed by the praise demanded, and in which “reference beyond the ode appears to be excluded by the use of the singular.” If the solo hypothesis is in fact correct, however, these passages are not valid parallels; since it would (on that supposition) 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. For that reason the parallels only constitute reason to reject a reference beyond the ode if the choral hypothesis is correct, which is the point at issue. Carey is therefore right to say that the point is “not conclusive.”⁴⁶

We would in fact still be inclined to give this command (and many others) an external reference, even if we were to readopt the choral hypothesis. If epinician is interpreted as κῶμος-song, then it is designed not to stand in isolation but to function as part of a specific communal festivity. We should therefore expect it to make connections in various ways with its context of performance, and the restricted horizon of reference envisaged by current doctrine, with its radical extension of the phenomenon of futures and imperatives with internal reference, is correspondingly questionable.

σέθεν δ' ἔκατι
καὶ νῦν [ν Μετ]απόντιον εὐ-
γυίων κ[ατέ]χουσι νέων
κῶμοί τε καὶ εὐφροσύναι θεότιμον ἄστυ·

Bacchylides 11. 9–12

Burnett (p. 287, n. 18) points out that νέων κῶμοι are praising the victor; but the question is not whether κῶμοι sang songs in praise of the victor in unison (we know they did: Heath, pp. 187–88), but whether this and similar commissioned epinicians were the songs they sang in unison.

Carey (p. 551, n. 14) does see in this passage a reference to the mode of performance of the ode itself. But the plural should be noted. Although (as Carey points out in another context, p. 549, n. 9) the plural can be used of a single song, it seems odd to say of one song—or even one κῶμος—that it fills (κατέχουσι) the town; the point is surely that κῶμοι and feasts in celebration of the victory are occurring all over the city, and in all of them Alexidamus’ praise is being sung—a claim that is more honorific to the victor than a restricted reference to this one song would be. Here, therefore, we can see how the broad horizon of reference which we have argued is appropriate for κῶμος-song is also apt for epinician’s function as (in the later sense of the term) encomium.

46. The same considerations apply to Bacchyl. 13. 190–92 (Carey, pp. 550–51).

III

In conclusion, we will try to state briefly the conditions of performance that might be envisaged under the two hypotheses.

Choral hypothesis: The victory ode is performed by a group of young men of the victor's acquaintance singing in unison, who have been trained by the poet or by his delegate. This hypothesis has the advantage of conforming with the opinions of commentators in the Hellenistic age and after.

Solo hypothesis: The victory ode is sung by the poet to the lyre, perhaps most commonly after the κῶμος has arrived at a sacred place where it is "received," such as a temple, or at another site of celebration (a τέμενος, or the patron's house).⁴⁷ Naturally, the young men of the κῶμος dance and sing songs in the course of the celebration, perhaps to the accompaniment of the αὐλός, but they do not sing the words of the victory ode in unison. On this hypothesis, it is possible to explain why the "I" in the odes always refers to the poet, and how complex metrical patterns and long odes such as *Pythian* 4 could be performed both at the time of the victory celebration for which they were commissioned and afterwards, privately by other, even amateur soloists.

We must reiterate that the existing evidence does not allow us to reconstruct the conditions of epinician performance with confidence or in detail on either hypothesis. But we still believe that the available data can be accommodated more easily on the assumption that the victory odes were composed to be sung as solos.⁴⁸

*University of Leeds
Wellesley College*

47. It is possible, however, to envisage a variety of opportunities for solo performance within the overall context of the κῶμος, as Heath, pp. 192–93, stressed; thus (for example) S. Instone, *BICS* 36 (1989): 112, may be right in arguing that *Nem.* 2 preceded the κῶμος. Instone's more general criticisms of Heath's position (p. 112, n. 13) fail, however: he understates the distribution of komastic terminology in the epinicians and does not consider the parallels for the reception-motif adduced from other komastic literature.

48. Our thanks to M. Howatson, E. Robbins, and L. Holford-Strevens for advice and comments. Cf. also M. R. Lefkowitz, *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic "I"* (Oxford, 1991), a collection (with revisions and new bibliography) of her earlier articles.