

PINDAR AND THE AEGINETAN CHORUS:
NEMEAN 3.9–13

THOMAS HUBBARD

- τὰς ἀφθονίαν ὄπαζε μήτιος ἀμᾶς ἄπο·
10 ἄρχε δ' οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι, θύγατερ,
δοκιμον ὕμνον· ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν ὁάροις
λύρα τε κοινάσομαι. χαρίεντα δ' ἔξει πόνον
χώρας ἄγαλμα, Μυρμιδόνες ἵνα πρότεροι
ῥῆκῃσαν, ὧν παλαίφατον ἀγοράν
15 οὐκ ἐλεγχέεσσιν Ἀριστοκλείδας τεάν
ἐμίανε κατ' αἴσαν ἐν περισθηνεῖ μαλαχθεῖς
παγκρατίου στόλῳ·

THE STATEMENT ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν ὁάροις / λύρα τε κοινάσομαι (11–12) has been misunderstood by nearly all modern translations and commentaries, which interpret it to mean, “I will share it (the song) with their (the chorus-members’) voices and with the lyre.”¹ However, a closer semantic and typological study of the terms and motifs involved suggests that we should follow the scholia in construing the datives as instrumental rather than as indirect objects, and that we should translate the verb as “communicate to the public.” This will yield a meaning which fits better with both the immediate context of vv. 9–17 and the broader thematic development of *Nemean* 3. Understanding the passage will also contribute to our perception of the relationships between Muse, poet, chorus, athlete, and public.

Aside from one highly dubious parallel, which we shall discuss in a moment, there are no Pindaric contexts in which the poet “gives” a song or any-

¹Representative are the translations of L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* (London 1930–32) 1.166: “I will share it with the song-speech of those young men and with the lyre,” and F. J. Nisetich, *Pindar’s Victory Songs* (Baltimore 1980) 240: “and I will entrust the words to the young men’s voices and to the lyre.” Similar renditions are also found in J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London 1890) 46; G. Fraccaroli, *Le odi di Pindaro* (Verona 1894) 549; J. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar*² (London 1919) 335; C. A. P. Ruck and W. H. Matheson, *Pindar: Selected Odes* (Ann Arbor, Mich. 1968) 188; G. S. Conway, *The Odes of Pindar* (London 1972) 178–179; R. A. Swanson, *Pindar’s Odes* (Indianapolis 1974) 138; G. M. Kirkwood, “Pythian 5.72–76, 9.90–92, and the Voice of Pindar,” *ICS* 6 (1981) 12–33, at 15; W. Mullen, *Choreia: Pindar and Dance* (Princeton 1982) 39; D. S. Carne-Ross, *Pindar* (New Haven 1985) 70. R. Lattimore, *The Odes of Pindar*² (Chicago 1976) 105, and A. Puech, *Pindare*³ (Paris 1958) 42, appear to be alone in construing the datives instrumentally (“and I shall elaborate it / with their voices and in the lyre’s strain;” “l’hymne précieux que je ferai redire à leurs voix et à la lyre”), but as will be seen, I do not agree with their translations of the verb. Works mentioned above will be cited by author’s name below.

thing else to the lyre or voice. On the other hand, there are many indisputable passages where the song is celebrated *by means of* musical instruments (O. 5.21, O. 7.11–12, O. 9.12–13, N. 5.38, I. 5.27) or the voice of the chorus (P. 1.97–98, P. 5.103–104, N. 2.25, N. 3.66, N. 7.82–84, I. 2.25, *Paeon* 2.100–101). Pindar makes it quite clear that the instruments and chorus are subordinate accompaniments to the verbal content or the personal originator of the message (cf. O. 2.1 Ἀναξιδόρμιγγες ὕμνοι; N. 4.5 εὐλογία φόρμιγγι συνάορος; I. 2.1–2 Οἱ μὲν πάλοι . . . φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι).² Given this fairly consistent pattern of subordination and instrumentality elsewhere in Pindar's usage, our tendency should be to take the lyre and the voice in N. 3.11–12 as instrumental also, unless there is compelling evidence otherwise.

Those who favor taking the datives as indirect objects sometimes cite as a parallel P. 8.29–32:³ εἰμὶ δ' ἄσχυλος ἀναθέμεν / πᾶσαν μακραγορίαν / λύρα τε καὶ φθέγματι μαλθακῶ, / μὴ κόρος ἔλθων κνίξῃ. But the datives even here are probably instrumental.⁴ The verb ἀναθέμεν does not mean “dedicate” in our rather watered-down sense of the term, but literally refers to “making an offering,”⁵ and almost always takes a god as its indirect object when bearing this meaning:⁶ it is therefore far more likely that the verbal offering here is made *by means of* the lyre and voice rather than *to* them,⁷ and that the

²In the latter two examples, the position of εὐλογία and the “ancient poets” respectively as the nominatives makes them the terms of emphasis, to which the φόρμιγγις is an accompaniment.

³Cf. J. W. Donaldson, *Pindar's Epinician or Triumphal Odes* (London 1841) 206; Bury 47.

⁴Again, this is contrary to the general consensus of translators. Cf. Sandys 263; Farnell 127; Lattimore 82; Ruck and Matheson 108; Conway 141; Swanson 107. However, Nisetich (202), seems to imply an instrumental construction with “to set the whole story down / in melody and lyrics.”

⁵The sacral overtones of the verb in Pindar (literally, “to set up as an ἀνάθημα”) are acutely noted by B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1890) 329.

⁶While not a common word in the poetic diction of the fifth century, ἀνατίθημι was formulaic in inscriptions of the period, with the dative indirect object always in reference to a god to whom the dedication has been made. Cf. Thucydides 1.132.2; *SIG*³ 18.1, 28.1, 48.1, 56.11, 80.1–2, 83.41–42. There is not one instance of this verb's use in the sense of “dedicate” in the fifth century or earlier where the indirect object is not a god (Lycophronides fr. 844 *PMG* is clearly a parody of the usual dedicatory formula).

⁷A parallel for making a dedication *by means of* song is provided by the prayer to Apollo in *Paeon* 9.38–40 λιτανεύω, ἑκαβόλε, / Μοισαίαις ἀνατιθεῖς τέχναισιν / χρηστήριον, [ᾧ πολ]-λον, [τ]εόν. Surely the poet is ritually affirming the oracle's dedication to Apollo by performing the paean in its precincts, rather than saying that he has dedicated the shrine to his songs (which would be rather presumptuous). The emphatic delay of the possessive τεόν (assuming that this is a correct reading) until after the vocative appellation of the god serves to underscore that the temple is his and has been affirmed as such by the ritual celebration of the present paean; for a parallel predicative use of the delayed possessive, cf. I. 8.28–29. The emphasis of the surrounding passage is not so much on the Ismenion as a subject of Pindar's song as on Apollo and his offspring; the Ismenion is merely the background-locus for both the myth and the present celebration. The song is clearly instrumental in *Paeon* 9.36–37 (καλάμῳ . . . μῆδεσί τε φρενός) and would thus tend to be this way in the next sentence as well.

recipient of the offering is Aegina (praised in *P.* 8.21–28 as the beneficiary of musical celebration).⁸ While it sounds quite natural in English to “dedicate a long utterance to the lyre and voice” (because of the semantic vagueness of “dedicate” as “direct to any given purpose”), it sounds much less natural to speak of “setting up a long utterance as a votive offering to the lyre and voice,” which is closer to the specific meaning of this verb. “Setting up a long utterance as a votive offering to Aegina, through the instruments of lyre and voice” clearly makes better sense. Moreover, the lyre and voice are in no danger of experiencing *koros*, but the ultimately pan-Hellenic audience of Pindar’s odes might become satiated by overlong praise of Aegina; it is not lengthy musical performance *per se* which produces satiety (as the usual construction of the datives might suggest), so much as excessive dilation on a single encomiastic topic (Aegina) which will eventually alienate the sympathy and good will of the broader Greek audience (an overtone emphasized if we take Aegina as the implied indirect object).⁹ In contrast with this potential over-elaboration of praise for the Aeginetan heroes initiated in *P.* 8.21–28 stands the poet’s self-limitation to the epinician theme at hand (*P.* 8.32–33 τὸ δ’ ἐν ποσὶ μοι τράχον / . . . τεὸν χρέος, ὦ παῖ), which will be elevated through the instrumentality of his art (*P.* 8.34 ἐμᾶ ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾷ), even as the themes terminated by the break-off formula of *P.* 8.29–32 were to be celebrated by the instruments of lyre and voice; this antithesis loses focus if we take the datives of *P.* 8.31 as anything other than instrumental. This passage thus supports our interpretation of *N.* 3.11–12.

The second issue raised by the interpretation of *N.* 3.11–12 relates to the semantics of κοινάσσομαι. This verb is not attested in Greek prior to the generation of Pindar, Aeschylus, and Bacchylides; its meaning and syntax were probably in a state of some flux, not yet having been established into the conventional usage-patterns which we can document for the later fifth

⁸Given that an implication of divine status attaches to any indirect object of ἀνατίθηναι when used in this dedicatory sense, we should understand Aegina (who is, of course, also the island’s eponymous nymph; cf. *O.* 9.70, *P.* 8.98, *N.* 4.22, *N.* 7.50, *N.* 8.6, *I.* 8.18, *Paeon* 6.137) as the unexpected indirect object, rather than suppose that the lyre and the voice should be implicitly deified (which is hardly appropriate in this context; in any event, objects are not made into divine presences in an oblique case, but only when addressed in the vocative, as with the Χρυσέα Φόρμυξ of *P.* 1). No editor chooses to capitalize λύρα and φθέγματι here, which would be necessary if one were to personify and deify them. However, for a parallel use of the city’s eponymous nymph as recipient of such a metaphorical offering, cf. *O.* 5.7–8 τὴν δὲ κῦδος ἄβρον / νικᾶσαις ἀνέθηκε, addressed to Camarina (*O.* 5.2–4 Ὀκεανοῦ θυγάτηρ . . . Καμάρινα).

⁹On this association of *koros* specifically with encomiastic over-indulgence, see H. Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Frankfurt-am-Main 1935) 68–76; E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica II: The First Isthmian Ode* (Berkeley 1962) 73–76; E. L. Bundy, “The ‘Quarrel Between Apollonios and Kallimachos,’ Part I: The Epilogue of Kallimachos’s *Hymn to Apollo*,” *CSCA* 5 (1972) 88–91; P. A. Bernardini, “Linguaggio e programma poetico in Pindaro,” *QUCC* 26 (1977) 86–87.

and fourth centuries. Critics who translate the verb here as “share,” “confide,” or “entrust” cite as evidence Pindar’s one other use of the verb in *P.* 4.115 (νυκτὶ κοινάσαντες ὁδόν).¹⁰ But this expression, however we translate it, is highly metaphorical and thus of little value as a normative parallel; given Pindar’s semantic breadth and variety, it is certainly not legitimate to conclude that because the verb bears such a meaning in *P.* 4.115, we must render it exactly the same way here. One of the verb’s most frequent meanings in fifth-century usage is simply “communicate” (without necessarily having any connotations of secretiveness), and this meaning is the one which we should naturally expect whenever the direct object is a verbal utterance, as it is here.¹¹ This rendition is also implied by the scholia in paraphrasing, ἐκ τῶν νεανίσκων, φησί, τῶν μενόντων παρ’ ἐμοὶ τὸν ὕμνον κοινῶς ᾄσομαι· μετ’

¹⁰Cf. C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge 1883) 23; Bury 47; W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969) 283.

¹¹The verb has four principal meanings in the fifth century: (1) “communicate,” with 15 occurrences, 13 in the active (Aeschylus *Choe.* 673, 717, *Supp.* 369; Euripides *IA* 44, *Medea* 685, 811; Aristophanes *Nubes* 197; Thucydides 2.72.2, 2.73.1, 3.95.2, 4.4.1, 5.60.1, 8.48.3), two in the middle (Aristophanes fr. 62.29 Kassel-Austin; Xenophon *Cyr.* 5.4.20); (2) “share,” with fourteen occurrences, one in the active (Thucydides 1.39.3), twelve in the middle (Euripides *Alc.* 426, *Andr.* 654, 933, *Cyc.* 297, 634, *Ion* 608, 858, *Phoen.* 1079, *Troades* 61, fr. 493.3; Lysias 12.93; Xenophon *Vect.* 4.30), and one in the passive (Euripides *Andr.* 38); (3) “take counsel (with),” with four instances, all middle (Aeschylus *Ag.* 1347; Sophocles *Ant.* 539; Euripides *Medea* 499; Xenophon *Anab.* 6.2.15); (4) “collaborate (in),” with three instances, one active (Bacchylides 15.49—however, see the alternative explanation of D. E. Gerber, *Lexicon in Bacchylidem* [Hildesheim 1984] 128), two middle (Thucydides 8.8.1, 8.82.3). “Take counsel (with)” never has a direct object, and “collaborate (in)” may occur with either a direct object (cf. Thucydides 8.8.1, 8.82.3; Plato *Laches* 196c; Isaeus 11.20, 11.26; Demosthenes 32.30) or an indirect object (cf. Bacchylides 15.49; Plato *Menex.* 244c), but nowhere appears with both. We are thus left with “communicate” and “share” as the two most likely possibilities. One might be inclined to prefer “share,” since it is more commonly used in the middle (as both standard lexica and translators have noted). But “communicate” does also occur in the middle (in addition to the two examples above, cf. Plato *Leges* 930c; Polybius 8.9.17, 8.16.1, 9.13.3, 31.13.2; and the regular use of the middle ἀνακοινόομαι to mean “communicate”). One should not in any event insist on the distinction between active and middle for a future form like Pindar’s κοινάσομαι, given the tendency of so many active words to evolve middle forms in the future, sometimes even in competition with future active forms (see the examples in E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* [Munich 1939] 781–782); a future active form of κοινῶω is attested only in Aeschylus’ *Choephoroi* (673, 717), with the future form always being middle elsewhere. It is important to note for our present purposes that this verb, in all its meanings, very often takes a dative indirect object (hence leading many to believe that it must in *N.* 3.11–12 as well); however, we must also note that the indirect object almost always refers to persons or groups, not to things, and particularly not to things which could be instruments of communication (like the lyre and the voice). That this verb could also be associated with an instrumental dative, where appropriate, is proven by Aristotle *Politica* 2.5, 1264a1 (on which, see 15 below); if we do not find the instrumental dative more frequently, it is only because instruments were not needed for “sharing,” and, in a pre-telegraphic age, not often needed for “communicating.”

ῥδῆς γὰρ καὶ λύρας ἀπηγγέλλοντο οἱ ἐπῖνικοι (Σ N. 3.18a Drachmann).¹² Construing Greek syntax and semantics is one area where the scholia should perhaps not be ignored altogether, and in this case it is quite clear that they interpret the datives as instruments rather than as recipients of the message (hence ἐκ τῶν νεανίσκων and μετ' ῥδῆς καὶ λύρας), and the verb as a statement of public proclamation (κοινῶς ἄσομαι can hardly mean "share," "confide," or "entrust").

The definition given by the scholia and the history of the verb's usage in later authors may help us in identifying its general meaning here as "communicate," but if we are to go further in isolating its nuances of meaning, we must rely on evidence internal to the Pindaric corpus. Since we have only one other instance of the verb itself, it may be more productive to start by noting that κοινῶς is essentially the factitive verb derived from κοινός, and that the adjective bears two very precise meanings for Pindar: (1) in reference to something shared by the victor and his family (O. 2.48–51, O. 7.92–93, P. 4.222–223, P. 5.101–103, P. 6.15–19, I. 7.24; cf. ξυνός in O. 7.21), and (2) in reference to something which is common to the whole public (O. 10.11–12, O. 13.49, P. 3.2, N. 1.32–33, N. 4.12–13, N. 7.30–31, fr. 109.1; cf. πάγκοινος in O. 6.63, *Paeon* 9.10, fr. 188, and πολύκοινος in P. 2.41). The first sense is clearly not relevant here, but the second sense of κοινός is quite appropriate: the poet makes the song κοινός by imparting it to the entire public by means of lyre and voice. This public sense of κοινός is especially prominent when the adjective is used in relation to verbal utterances or the poet's activity. Twice it is used of "common-places," or sayings which are uttered by all men (P. 3.2, the κοινὸν ἔπος being the wish that Cheiron were still alive to provide a miraculous care for the sick; fr. 188, the φθέγμα πάγκοινον of Polymnastus of Colophon, which everyone knows). Most illuminating for our purposes, however, are the self-referential applications of the term to Pindar's own song: O. 10.11–12 asserts that the poet's debt of praise to the victor will be paid by a κοινὸν λόγον; while O. 13.49 characterizes the poet as ἴδιος ἐν κοινῷ σταλαῖς in praising the virtues of Corinth. Both contexts are transitional and concern the extension of the poet's praise from the realm of purely personal relationships to the more broadly political domain, as represented respectively by the *atrekeia* of the Epizephyrian Locrians (O. 10.13–15)¹³ and the feats of

¹²Σ N. 3.18b, c Drachman state the same thing with minor changes in wording, using the dative ταῖς ἐκείνων τῶν χορευτῶν φωναῖς καὶ ταῖς λύραις, which they took as self-evidently instrumental.

¹³The previous context of O. 10.1–10 concerns the poet's particular debt of overdue praise to the victor Hagesidamus; in vv. 9–12 he proceeds to explain that the long wait will be amply rewarded, fulfilling the debt with "interest"—i.e., more than just the obligatory praise of the victor, but a κοινός λόγος which will also praise his city.

the Corinthian heroes (O. 13.50–92).¹⁴ Pindar's use of the adjective κοινός thus provides the semantic field within which we can properly assess the connotations of the verb, and allows us to infer that κοινάσσομαι here means not only "communicate," and not only "communicate to the public," but more precisely "communicate to the public in such a way as to make it of broadly public concern."¹⁵ The verb implies community as well as communication.

I would also argue that the future tense of κοινάσσομαι, rather than being the poet's literal promise to the Muse to share the hymn with instruments and chorus, should be interpreted as an "encomiastic future:" a programmatic statement directly proclaiming the present act of celebration.¹⁶ The verb certainly cannot be construed as a literal future, since the lyre and the chorus are in fact celebrating the song at the very moment that this line is uttered. But the future-as-present which we are required to understand both in κοινάσσομαι and in ἔξει (12) is applicable only in direct announcements of praise; and ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν ὄαροις λύρα τε κοινάσσομαι is a direct announcement of praise only if we take it to refer to the public proclamation of the song by chorus and lyre, and not if we take it as the poet's transmission of the song to the musicians.

This construction makes better sense of the whole antistrophe: vv. 9–12 can be seen as an analysis of the song's sources on various levels, identifying it as a composite mixture of the poet's craft (9, μῆτις ἀμᾶς ἄπο), the Muse's inspiration and warrant of divine authority (10–11),¹⁷ and the performance by the chorus and musicians (11–12). The song is not a static entity communicated from Muse to poet to chorus, but is framed and modified by the active contributions of all three. ἐγὼ δὲ . . . κοινάσσομαι plays an important transitional role in moving from the song's composition (9–11) to its performance (11–12) to its effect (12–13), which is to transform both its own toil and the toil of the athletic victory into a glory of the entire country.¹⁸ The connotation of κοινάσσομαι as a mode of public communication

¹⁴The previous context of O. 13.29–46 contains the catalogue of victories for Xenophon and his family, which is terminated by the break-off formula of v. 47 f. and the subsequent transition of v. 49 to more general Corinthian themes.

¹⁵This sense of "giving something to the public" is evident in the verb's one other usage in an explicitly political context (Aristotle *Politica* 2.5, 1263b40–1264a1), where we also find the verb coupled with an instrumental dative: τὰ περὶ τὰς κτήσεις ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι καὶ Κρήτῃ τοῖς συσσιτίοις ὁ νομοθέτης ἐκοίνωσε.

¹⁶See E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica I: The Eleventh Olympian Ode* (Berkeley 1962) 21–22, and W. J. Slater, "Futures in Pindar," *CQ* NS 19 (1969) 86–94.

¹⁷As daughters of Mnemosyne, the Muses' primary function is the linguistic preservation of poetic raw material—i.e., the myths, sagas, and literary traditions on which common poetic discourse is based. See Bundy (above, n. 9—"Quarrel") 79, n. 95, and W. W. Minton, "Invocation and Catalogue in Homer and Hesiod," *TAPA* 93 (1962) 188–212.

¹⁸χαρίεντα δ' ἔξει πόνον / χώρας ἄγαλμα (v. 12 f.) is another line which has occasioned controversy. Bury (47), Fraccaroli (540), Farnell (2.255), and Carne-Ross (70), are all right in

which broadens the interest of a topic into the arena of the *polis* and its concerns is crucial to this transitional function.

This same broadening of focus from the particular achievement of the victor to the greater glory of all Aegina, through the medium of the encomiastic song, is also highlighted in the final strophe of the ode:

τηλαυγές ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν·
 65 Ζεῦ, τεόν γάρ αἶμα, σέο δ' ἄγών, τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν
 ὅπῃ νέων ἐπιχώριον χάρμα κελαδέων.
 βοᾶ δὲ νικαφόρῳ σὺν Ἀριστοκλείδῃ πρέπει,
 ὃς τάνδε νᾶσον εὐκλέϊ προσέθηκε λόγῳ
 καὶ σεμνὸν ἀγλααῖσι μερίμναις
 Πυθίου Θεάριον.

Aristocleides' athletic achievement (σέο δ' ἄγών) is associated with the Aeacidae, who have been the subject of the extended mythological digression to which vv. 9–20 built up, and is joined with this glorious ancestry (τεόν γάρ αἶμα) as a reflection of Zeus' favor and a general credit to Aeginetan prowess. The ἐπιχώριον χάρμα which the ὕμνος provides reminds us of the χαρίεντα πόνον . . . χώρας ἄγαλμα which the song was to have in vv. 12–13.¹⁹ It is no accident that the song celebrates this "joy of the country" by means of the young men's voice (ὅπῃ νέων . . . κελαδέων), even as before the poet communicated the hymn by means of their voices (11, κείνων ὁἴοις) in order to make it a joy of the country (as revealed by vv. 12–13). The role of the chorus is important in both cases as the medium through which the athlete's individual achievement is brought into the public domain, as it is sung and celebrated by these representative members of the community.²⁰

taking ὕμνος as the implied subject, with ἄγαλμα in apposition to πόνον; but they have not recognized that the πόνος not only refers to the labor of the ode's composition and presentation (described in vv. 9–12) but also adumbrates the athlete's toil (described so vividly in vv. 15–18). The term πόνος frequently refers to athletic training and competition; cf. O. 5.15, O. 11.4, N. 4.1, N. 6.24, N. 10.24, I. 1.42, I. 3.17, I. 4.47, I. 5.15, I. 6.11, I. 8.8, fr. 227.1, and A. Szastyńska-Siemion, "Le Pónos du sportif dans l'épínice grec," *Acta Conventus XI "Eirene"* (Wrocław 1968) 81–85. It has been argued by C. Segal, "Pindar's Seventh Nemean," *TAPA* 98 (1967) 431–480, at 439, that the gnomic εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλέον πεδέχεται of N. 7.74 reflects the toil of both athlete and poet (in his lengthy self-defense); it may thus provide a parallel to the ambiguity of πόνος here. On poet/victor-parallelism generally in Pindar's epinicia, see T. K. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry* (Leiden 1985) 133–162.

¹⁹The responson was noted by Bury (58), and certainly supports the interpretation of ὕμνος as the subject of ἔξει in v. 12.

²⁰K. Crotty, in *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar* (Baltimore 1982) 120, has recently commented on the victorious athlete's position as someone who has transcended his community and must be reintegrated with his former status. It is important to emphasize that this reintegration takes place not only through the epinician song, but also through the physical presence of the welcoming chorus, as representatives of the community.

Indeed, I believe that commentators have been seduced into misinterpretation of vv. 9–13 largely by misconceiving the status of the chorus. We are first introduced to the young men in vv. 3–5: ὕδατι γὰρ / μένοντ' ἐπ' Ἀσωπίῳ / μελιγαρύων τέκτονες / κώμων νεανίαι, σέθεν ὅπα μαϊόμενοι. This charming picture of the choristers waiting assembled on a river-bank, eager in their desire for the Muse's inspiration, has led many readers to suppose that the Muse's beginning of the song in vv. 9–11 and the poet's subsequent ἐγὼ δέ . . . κοινάσομαι in vv. 11–12 must be meant as fulfillments of their expressed desire.²¹ Although superficially attractive, this construction of the passage ignores the very important role of vv. 6–8 in focussing our attention at the end of the strophe on the athletic victory and its need for encomiastic celebration, to which the chorus' desire is a parallel and a foil: δὴ δὲ πρῶτος ἄλλο μὲν ἄλλου, / ἀθλονομία δὲ μάλιστα' αἰοῖαν φιλεῖ, / στεφάνων ἀρετῶν τε δεξιωτάταν ὁπαδόν.²² We must therefore understand the Muse's response and the poet's activity in the antistrophe (9–12) as primarily directed to the fulfillment of this epinician obligation;²³ the contexts both immediately before (6–8) and immediately after (12–17) vv. 9–12 concern the athletic victory and its relation to the song, not the needs or desires of the chorus. To interpret vv. 3–12 as primarily concerned with the fulfillment of the Aeginetan chorus, so that the discussion of song as a response to athletic victory in vv. 6–8 is a mere interruption, is to accentuate the role and importance of the chorus beyond all proportion. The chorus in Pindar's epinicia is never an independent personality in its own right, but is significant mainly as a reflection of community spirit in celebration of the athletic victory or some other object of praise.²⁴

Although he may exhort the chorus, Pindar does not elsewhere present himself as teaching or directing it in detail, nor is the Muse characteristically relevant to the chorus' activity. It is the Graces who are more closely con-

²¹U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, at *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 277, n. 1, has argued that the χώρας ἄγαλμα in v. 11 is the chorus, and should be taken as the subject of ἔξει. But this construction would make the rather lengthy description of Aegina which follows seem tacked on, whereas it is well prepared for under the interpretation of vv. 11–12 which we have advanced.

²²On the nature of this passage as a summary-priamel, cf. Bundy (above, n. 16) 10, and W. H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden 1982) 10–15.

²³On the formulary nature of this *Sieg-Lied* complex in Pindar, see W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion*² (Tübingen 1966) 298–306.

²⁴One sometimes finds the chorus-leader as an individualized persona, as in *I.* 2.47–48, where Nicasippus is asked to transmit the song to Thrasybulus, or in *O.* 6.87–91, where Aeneas is praised for his critical judgment and asked to rouse his companions in celebration of Hera. But even here, the personal references to chorus-leaders are primarily vehicles of encomiastic exhortation, not unlike the opening of *I.* 8.1–5, where the chorus is urged to form a revel to the house of Cleander. In none of these cases do we see the poet "teaching the song" to the chorus.

nected with the chorus and the performance of songs (cf. *O.* 4.10–11, *O.* 14.8–9, 15–17, *P.* 12.26–27).²⁵ Pindar's invocations to the Muse always ask for her assistance to the poet, and, at least in the epinicia, are closely connected with the bestowing of praise upon the victor or other *laudandi*. *N.* 9.1–3 shows us the poet and Muses together forming a musical revel to the house of Chromius. In *O.* 10.3–6, the Muse and Truth are asked to hold off the reproach of lies (immediately after the naming of the victor in v. 1–2); in *P.* 1.58–59, she is directly asked to celebrate Deinomenes' victory, as she is in *P.* 11.41–45 for Thrasydaeus and his family; in *N.* 6.28–29, she is asked to send a fair wind of words for the Bassidae. The Muse's activity may be directed to the celebration of other worthy objects of praise, as in *P.* 4.1–3, where she is asked to stand beside Arcesilas and sing hymns for Pytho and the Letoidae. The Muse can also be used as a witness to the poet's own asseverations of praise, as in *I.* 6.57–58 (declaring that he has come to celebrate Pytheas and Euthymenes) or in *O.* 11.16–19 (declaring that the Locrians are a noble race). *Dith.* 2.23–25 (ἐμέ δ' ἐξαίρετον / κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων / Μοῖσ' ἀνέστας' Ἑλλάδι καλλιχόρῳ) and fr. 151 show the Muse rousing the poet to his task of public celebration; fr. 150 (μαντεύο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ) reveals the same mechanism of the poet transmitting the Muse's inspiration to the general public that we see in *N.* 3.9–12.

Given the Muse's typical connection with public celebration of a *laudandus*, and the close connection of vv. 9–12 with the build-up to victor-praise in vv. 6–8 and the communal extension of the victor's glory in vv. 12–17, and also with the parallel formulations of vv. 64–70, it is highly probable that vv. 11–12 are meant as a public proclamation of the song's encomiastic subject-matter. This conclusion is strongly supported by our preliminary observations concerning the characteristic instrumentality of the choral song and music in Pindar, and the semantics of κοινάσομαι as an encomiastic future referring to public communication about topics of public interest. "Entrusting the hymn to lyre and voice" unduly confines and limits the implications of what Pindar surely intended as a very open-ended process of "communicating the hymn by means of lyre and voice." The primary concern of this passage is not the poet's relationship to his musicians, but the relation of his verbal message to the public.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
120 GOLDWIN SMITH HALL
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
ITHACA, N.Y. 14853-3201

²⁵On the roles of the Muses and Graces in Pindar as the material and formal elements of the song respectively, see Bundy (above, n. 9—"Quarrel") 79, n. 95.