

einige Ungereimtheiten und Unklarheiten der Partie verständlicher werden, wenn man sie vor dem Hintergrund des sophokleischen Dramas interpretiert. Daß der Verfasser handgreiflichere Anregungen durch den *Aias* als seitens der *Antigone* erfahren zu haben scheint, mag auf den ersten Blick verwundern. Das effektvoll-polemische und im Umfang begrenzte Streitgespräch zwischen Menelaos und Teukros entsprach aber offenbar eher seinen Wirkungsabsichten als die metaphysisch begründete und über das Dramenganze ausgebreitete Problematik der *Antigone*, und der Umstand, daß Teukros für seinen (Halb-) Bruder eintritt, konnte die Parallele zu Antigone auch sachlich nahelegen. Für den modernen Interpreten ist die Interpolation nicht zuletzt deshalb von einigem Interesse, weil sie den Erfolg des *Aias* auf der Bühne einer späteren Zeit bezeugt.

Saarbrücken

Kurt Sier

bedenklich an den Umgangston der Frauen in der Komödie; stilgemäßer sind die Worte, die Teukros dem abgehenden Menelaos nachwirft: κάμοι γὰρ αἰσχιστον κλύειν | ἀνδρὸς ματαίου φλαῦρ' ἔπη μυθουμένου.

THEBAN NATIONALISM AND POETIC APOLOGY IN PINDAR, PYTHIAN 9.76–96

Pindar's *Ninth Pythian* is justly one of his most popular odes, appreciated especially for its extended mythical narrative concerning Apollo's courtship of the nymph Cyrene. The poem's structure is dominated by its two Cyrenean myths – the myth about the nymph (vv. 5–70) filling the first three triads, and that concerning the marriage of Alexidamus and the daughter of Antaeus (vv. 105–25) closing the poem. But most critical attention has focussed on the poem's encomiastic kernel in the fourth triad: after the myth explains Cyrene's background, the poet again proclaims Telesicrates' Pythian victory and the glory which it confers on Cyrene (vv. 71–5), and initiates the conventional catalogue of victories with an allusion to his victory at the Theban Iolaea

(v. 79 f.)¹), but quickly digresses from the catalogue to glorify the achievements of Iolaus and his relatives (vv. 80–6). It seems fairly clear that vv. 87–9 are meant to close this brief digression, but the reference and text of the following lines are controversial:

καφὸς ἀνήρ τις, ὃς Ἡρακλεῖ στόμα μὴ περιβάλλει,
 μηδὲ Διορκάων ὑδάτων ἀε μέ-
 μναιται, τὰ νιν θρέψαντο καὶ Ἰφικλέα·
 τοῖσι τέλειον ἐπ' εὐχῆ κωμάσομαί τι παθῶν
 89a ἐσλόν. Χαρίτων κελαδεννῶν
 90 μὴ με λίποι καθαρόν φέγγος. Αἰγίνα τε γάρ
 φαμί Νίσου τ' ἐν λόφῳ τρις
 δὴ πόλιν τάνδ' εὐκλειῖσαι,
 σιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν ἔργω φυγῶν·
 οὐνεκεν, εἰ φίλος ἀσπῶν, εἴ τις ἀντά-
 εις, τό γ' ἐν ξυνῶ πεποναμένον εὔ
 μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἀλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω·
 95 κείνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν
 παντὶ θυμῷ σὺν τε δίκῃ καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν. (P. 9.87–96)

Contrary to the preponderance of modern criticism, I do not believe that vv. 89–96 are either a resumption of the victory-catalogue or the poet's answer to Theban critics, but wish to argue that they are an extension of the poet's apology for digression²) on Theban themes in a non-Theban ode.

Past explanations of the passage are many and diverse, but can be summarized as follows:

(1) Vv. 90–2 state that Pindar has praised Thebes previously, in odes written for Theban victors at the games in Megara and Aegina. These lines, together with vv. 93–6, thus constitute the poet's response to critics at Thebes who have complained that he

1) This interpretation of Ἰόλαον/οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντά νιν has been persuasively defended by R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes*, Oxford 1962, 48 f.; A. Köhnen, *Gebrauch und Funktion der Litotes bei Pindar*: *Glotta* 54 (1976) 63–6; J. Péron, *Pindare et la victoire de Télésicrate dans la IX^e Pythique* (v. 76–96): *RPh* 50 (1976) 64 f. On the Iolaia, see also ΣP. 9.156a Drachmann.

2) On the general function and importance of apologetic statements in Greek poetry, see E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, Berkeley 1962, II, 40 f., and the "Quarrel Between Kallimachos and Apollonios", Part I: The Epilogue of Kallimachos's Hymn to Apollo: *CSCA* 5 (1972) 46: "Apologetic are all devices whereby an author seeks to enlist the sympathies of the person or persons to whom his work is addressed. We may include under this heading all attempts to justify, defend, or render aesthetically pleasing an author's selection or rejection of a topic or manner of treating it."

ignores Theban interests while busying himself with the praise of Athens³) or of the Sicilian tyrants⁴).

(2) Vv. 90–2 are the poet's proclamation of his own victories in musical contests at Megara and Aegina⁵).

(3) Telesicrates was a scion of the Aegeid clan and thus had relatives at Thebes, where the ode (under this thesis) was performed⁶). Since Telesicrates was an "honorary Theban", Pindar's celebration of his athletic victories at Megara and Aegina has the effect of glorifying Thebes. Vv. 90–2 thus constitute a resumption of the catalogue of victories⁷).

(4) Pindar glorifies Cyrene by having previously celebrated Telesicrates' (or other Cyreneans') victories at Megara and Aegina⁸).

(5) Several emendations have been proposed which would make Telesicrates the subject of vv. 90–2, rather than the poet himself⁹). The passage would thus state that Telesicrates

3) Cf. C. Gaspar, *Essai de chronologie pindarique*, Bruxelles 1900, 111 f.; L. R. Farnell, *Pindar, Athens and Thebes: Pyth. IX. 151–170: CQ 9 (1915) 196 f.*; A. Puech, *Pindare*, Paris 1922, II, 129 f.; H. Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf*, Frankfurt a. M. 1935, 84; C. M. Bowra, *Pindar*, Oxford 1964, 143 f.; J. Duchemin, *Pindare: Pythiques (III, IX, IV, V)*, Paris 1967, 65–8; R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Pindar's Ninth Pythian Ode: BICS 16 (1969) 12*.

4) Cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922, 265–9.

5) Cf. L. Schmidt, *Pindar's Leben und Dichtung*, Bonn 1862, 169 f.; A. Croiset, *La poésie de Pindare et les lois du lyrisme grec*, Paris ²1886, 277.

6) The thesis that Telesicrates was an Aegeid was originally put forward by K. O. Müller, *Orchomenos und die Minyer*, Breslau ²1844, 340. The idea of a Theban performance has recently been argued by Péron (above, n. 1) 70–2, in an otherwise judicious article.

7) Cf. L. Dissen, *Pindari Carmina quae supersunt*, Gotha 1847, II, 339–41 (who believes, however, that Telesicrates is the implied subject of the infinitive εὐκλείξαι); F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder*, Leipzig 1880, 237 f.; B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, New York 1885, 345 f.; W. Christ, *Pindari Carmina prolegomenis et commentariis instructa*, Leipzig 1896, 211. E. D. Floyd, *The Premiere of Pindar's Third and Ninth Pythian Odes: TAPA 99 (1968) 194–8*, also follows this interpretation, but argues that vv. 87–89a and 90b–91 are spoken in the victor's persona (a procedure quite without parallel in the conventions of encomiastic lyric) and thus dissociates the passage from the poet's activity.

8) Cf. C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, Cambridge 1893, 256.

9) Probably the most popular is Hermann's second-person εὐκλείξας in place of the infinitive; this emendation has been advocated by A. B. Drachmann, *De duobus Pindari locis: Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi 1 (1892/93) 164*; O. Schroeder, *Pindars Pythien*, Leipzig 1922, 86; H. Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, tr. M. Hadas & J. Willis, Oxford 1975, 444, 448; Burton (above, n. 1) 50–4; G. M. Kirkwood, *Pythian 5.72–76, 9.90–92, and the Voice of Pindar: ICS 6.1 (1981) 19 f.*; W. H. Race, *Negative Expressions and Pindaric Ποιητικά: TAPA 113*

honored his city (Cyrene) by winning victories at Megara and Aegina.

The first and third approach rely on the reconstruction of external circumstances not made explicit in the ode, while the second and fourth involve the poet in contests which we have no other evidence that he was ever involved in, either as competitor or celebrant.

It is accordingly the strategy of emendation that has found the most favor among recent critics. However, there are serious objections to all of the proposed alternatives. The primary impulse behind critics' desire to refer vv. 90–2 to Telesicrates is their belief that πόλιν τάνδ' must be Cyrene, and not Thebes; we are told that it is a matter of fixed encomiastic convention that the demonstrative ὄδε connected with a geographical place must designate the home of the victor¹⁰). But in fact there is no such encomiastic convention. Bacchylides never uses ὄδε in connection with the victor's home. And while it may be quite true that ὄδε with cities or lands in Pindar usually refers to the victor's homeland¹¹), this correlation only indicates that the victor's city is usually the only one which receives a sufficiently extended description in the victory ode to merit a demonstrative: in every case where we find ὄδε referring to the victor's city, the line is immediately preceded or followed by a passage describing either the city or its mythical heroes¹²), such that the reference of the demonstrative is absolu-

(1983) 121. εὐκλείξας is printed in the texts of Schroeder, Bowra, Turyn, and Kirkwood, but the MSS reading is preserved by Snell-Maehler. C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*, New York 1981, 94 f., prefers Pauw's third-person εὐκλείξεν. P. Maas, *Ährenlese: Sokrates 74* (1920) 25, and L. L. Nash, *The Theban Myth at Pythian 9, 79–103: QUCC N.S. 11* (1982) 98 f., support Bornemann's σὲ for τε in v. 90. G. Fraccaroli, *Le Odi di Pindaro*, Verona 1894, 475 n. 2, proposes emending φηγών to the accusative φηγόνθ', while L. Cerrato, *Di alcuni luoghi controversi nelle Pitiche Pindariche: RFIC 18* (1890) 208 f., simply understands an unexpressed third-person subject of the infinitive (as does Disson [above, n. 7] II, 341), and takes φηγών as modifying that unexpressed subject by enallage; this construction is strained, but seems also to be that of ΣΡ. 9.160,163 Dr.

10) Cf. Drachmann (above, n. 9) 164; Fennell (above, n. 8) 256; Fraccaroli (above, n. 9) 478 f.; Maas (above, n. 9) 26; Bundy (above, n. 2) I, 23 n. 53; Kirkwood (above, n. 9) 20; Race (above, n. 9) 121 n. 72. Others merely say that this formula designates the place of performance: cf. Gaspar (above, n. 3) 110; Wilamowitz (above, n. 4) 265 f.; Péron (above, n. 1) 70 f.; Carey (above, n. 9) 94.

11) However, in O. 2.58, P. 4.14,42,51, and P. 9.51 f., the reference is clearly not to the victor's home (or place of performance).

12) O. 5.14 and 20 follow the description of Camarina in vv. 11–13; O. 8.25 is part of a lengthy passage (vv. 20–30) devoted entirely to Aegina; P. 8.99 is part of a prayer to the nymph Aegina. O. 7.30 is part of a myth concerning Tlepolemus,

tely clear from the context, without having to posit any implicit convention. Indeed, the reference of πόλιν τάνδ' is also absolutely clear from the context here, and it is clearly Thebes (which is named in v. 80, whose heroes are celebrated in vv. 79–89, and whose Διοκαίων ὑδάτων are recalled in v. 88), not Cyrene (which was last named in v. 73, and is not alluded to again until v. 102 f. καὶ πᾶσιν ἐπιχωροῖς)¹³).

What the study of encomiastic conventions does suggest is that we should not have Aegina and Megara listed at this point in a catalogue of victories. Pindar is very careful about enumerating athletic festivals in the proper order of importance, when listing a long series of victories: first is Olympia, then the Pythian games at Delphi, followed by Nemea and the Isthmus. Among the local festivals, the Panathenaea outrank the others, being very close to the Panhellenic contests in stature; a Panathenaeic victory invariably precedes other local victories in the catalogues¹⁴). The Panathenaea are undoubtedly the contest referred to as τελεταῖς ὥραις Παλλάδος (v. 97 f.)¹⁵). While the Theban Iolaea would not nor-

the founder of Rhodes; similarly, N. 3.68, N. 6.48, N. 7.83, I. 5.22, and I. 6.21 are all part of passages concerning Aeacus or the Aeacidae and thus obviously relate to Aegina.

13) It is not even certain whether these contests are Cyrenean; it could be that Pindar is referring to all the local festivals throughout Greece, as is understood by ΣP. 9.173 Dr. In this case, πᾶσιν is probably an exaggeration.

14) Cf. O. 7.80–7 (where it precedes Aegina and Megara, among other contests), O. 9.83–99 (where it is ranked equal with Argos), O. 13.30–40, N. 4.17–22, N. 10.22–36, I. 2.12–22, I. 4.25–29.

15) See ΣP. 9.172 Dr., and L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, London 1932, II, 210 f. Many earlier commentators believed that all the contests listed in vv. 97–103 are local Cyrenean games: cf. A. Boeckh, *Pindari Opera quae supersunt*, Leipzig 1821, II 2, 327 f.; Mezger (above, n. 7) 247; Gildersleeve (above, n. 7) 346; Fennell (above, n. 8) 256 f.; Fraccaroli (above, n. 9) 472. Boeckh notes the importance of Athena's cult in Cyrene, but this does not in itself constitute evidence for games in her honor. The *Olympieia* (cf. ΣP. 9.177 Dr.; IG II/III², 1496, col. IV, 82 f., 113 f.; L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, Berlin 1932, 177; H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians*, Ithaca 1977, 144; E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary*, Madison 1983, 15 f.) and games for Earth (cf. ΣP. 9.177, 178 Dr., citing Didymus; on the general importance of the Ge-cult in Attica, see L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, Oxford 1907, III, 15–22) are both independently attested as Attic festivals, whereas we have no evidence concerning such games at Cyrene; indeed, it seems most unlikely that there should be such a profusion of athletic competitions in so remote and isolated an outpost of Greek civilization. The local games at Cyrene seem rather to be dismissed with the formula καὶ πᾶσιν ἐπιχωροῖς in v. 102 f. (however, see n. 13 above). We need not suppose that the women imagined as looking at Telesicrates in vv. 97–100 are necessarily Cyrenean women; even if we assume that they are, the aorist participle νικάσαντα merely indicates that they saw him as a victor (literally, “a man who won” these contests),

mally outrank the Panathenaea in order of importance, they are made a matter of special emphasis here by being highlighted with an extended digression; Pindar's placement of the Iolaea where they are in the catalogue may be in part what motivates the lengthy apology in vv. 87–96¹⁶). It seems far more likely that we resume and quickly conclude the victory-catalogue in vv. 97–103, led by the Panathenaea and ending with local Cyrenaean contests (καὶ πᾶσιν ἐπιχωροῖς), than to suppose that we resume the catalogue in vv. 90–2 with the minor contests at Megara and Aegina, only to digress again in vv. 93–6, and then resume a second time in v. 97.

In addition to these general objections, there are grave problems with each of the proposed emendations. Probably the most popular among recent editors and critics is Hermann's εὐκλείξας for the infinitive εὐκλείξαι¹⁷). This conjecture would require φαμί to be parenthetical¹⁸). Although we do find φαμί used this way in P. 3.75, it is clearly emphatic in that context, calling attention to the vivid metaphor ἀστέρος οὐρανοῦ φαμί τηλαυγέστερον . . . φάος, and lending a degree of intensified asseveration to the otherwise weak apodosis ἐξικόμαν κε; no such emphatic function could be served by φαμί in the present context of Αἰγίνα τε γὰρ φαμί Νίσου τ' ἐν λόφῳ, since there is nothing particularly remarkable about Aegina and Megara as sites for Telesicrates' putative athletic glorification of Cyrene. The poet has already stated in v. 73 that Telesicrates proclaimed Cyrene by winning at Delphi (ἔνθα νικάσας ἀνέφανε Κυράνα); using the even stronger verb εὐκλείξω here of the far less prominent contests at Aegina and Megara would be not only repetitive, but anti-climactic.

The most serious difficulty with εὐκλείξας is the abrupt introduction of the second-person at this point. Pindar's second-person statements to the victor or his relatives are characteristically coupled with a vocative address which clearly identifies the subject¹⁹).

not that they saw him in the process of winning his athletic victories (for which we would expect a present participle).

16) See H. J. Rose, Iolaos and the Ninth Pythian Ode: CQ 25 (1931) 159.

17) See n. 9 above.

18) Aside from the one example mentioned above, the first-person of φαμί is not used as an asseverative parenthesis elsewhere in Greek poetry of the classical period.

19) Cf. O. 1.106–15, O. 5.21–3, O. 6.11, 74–81, O. 8.15–18, O. 10.91–6, O. 11.11–15, O. 12.13–19, P. 2.18–20, 57–73, P. 3.80–6, P. 4.250–99, P. 5.5–33, 45–53, P. 6.14–23, P. 7.17, P. 8.32–42, 71–8, 78–87, N. 1.29f., N. 2.14f., N. 4.77–81, N. 5.41f., 43–54, N. 6.59–65, N. 7.58–60, N. 8.44–8, N. 10.37f., I. 2.1–12, 30–2, I. 4.1–3, I. 5.14–19, I. 7.31–6. Even in those few contexts where the second-person

There is no such vocative in vv. 90–2, nor has Telesicrates been referred to in the second-person previously in the ode; even the last third-person reference was in v. 80. However, after the *gnomes* of vv. 93–6, there is an emphatic shift to the second-person in vv. 97–100 with the pronoun *σε* and the vocative ὦ Τελεσίκρατες, which would only be undercut by a more casual use of the second-person in vv. 90–2²⁰). Pauw's εὐκλείξει avoids this problem, but introduces an equally troubling unidentified third-person: since the last third-person reference to Telesicrates (v. 80 νιν), we have had mention of Iolaus, Eurystheus, Amphitryon, Zeus, Alcmene, Heracles, Iphicles, and the Graces, with the last pronoun (v. 88 νιν) referring to Heracles. If the poet wished to resume reference to the victor (either in the second or third person) after a ten-line digression, a more clear-cut and unambiguous identification would be needed. Bornemann's emendation of *τε* to *σε* avoids the parenthetical *φαμί*, but retains the problem of the unidentified second-person and adds the intolerable *Αἰγίνα σε γάο*²¹).

Another weakness of Hermann's and Pauw's emendations is the anti-climactic redundancy involved in referring v. 92 to Telesicrates. While it is possible for the victor to escape *σιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν*²²), there is no point in saying that he escapes personal

address is not directly connected with a vocative, it is made quite clear who is addressed from a third-person reference in the preceding lines: cf. O. 13.41–4, N. 3.67–84, N. 4.9–14. The one exception to the rule is P. 1.81–92, where it seems purposefully to be left ambiguous whether the poet is addressing himself or Hieron; this case may be analogous to Pindar's more frequent use of an ambiguous first-person, on which see D. C. Young, *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7*, Leiden 1968, 58 f., and T. K. Hubbard, *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry*, Leiden 1985, 145–8. Usually, a completely unidentified second-person will be either the poet's self-address or address to the song itself: cf. P. 10.51 f., N. 7.77–82; on such self-address generally, see A. Kambylis, *Anredeformen bei Pindar*, in *Χάρις: Κωνσταντῖνῳ Ι. Βουθβέγγη Ἀφιέρωμα* . . ., Athens 1964, 165–7.

20) The same point is made by Carey (above, n. 9) 94 f.

21) *γάο* is regularly postponed after articles (cf. N. 7.12, N. 9.4, I. 2.6, I. 4.30), prepositions (cf. O. 13.6, P. 1.41, P. 5.49,83, N. 8.17, N. 11.24, I. 4.23), and other particles (cf. O. 2.48, O. 7.23, 48, O. 8.56, P. 4.272, P. 8.25), including *τε* (cf. P. 4.148, P. 11.29, I. 4.33); see Denniston, *GP*², 95–8. It is never postponed in Pindar for any other reason, and is never postponed after a pronoun. Denniston's examples prove that the rules become more relaxed in Attic drama, but even there, *γάο* is not postponed due to a pronoun.

22) An essential point for Pindar is that the athlete escapes oblivion not merely by his athletic *ἔργον*, but by the poet's celebration of the triumph (cf. N. 4.6, N. 7.12 f., N. 9.6 f., I. 2.43–6, fr. 121.4), an element completely absent from this passage if we refer vv. 90–2 to the athlete. P. 8.83–7 suggests that victory itself does not liberate the athlete from silence, so much as from shame.

silence after having just declared that he confers κλέος on his city. But if we refer vv. 90–2 to the poet, v. 92 can bear a specialized meaning which is not at all repetitive of v. 90 f. ἀμαχανία can refer to the lack of poetic inspiration²³), even as its opposite εὐμαχανία refers to an abundance thereof (cf. I. 4.2 f., Paeon 7B. 16 f.), and μαχανά often designates poetic craft (cf. P. 3.109, P. 8.34, N. 7.22):

ἔμὲ δὲ χρεῶν
φεύγειν δάκος ἀδινὸν καταγοριᾶν.
εἶδον γὰρ ἔκας ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανία
ψογερὸν Ἀρχιλόχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσι
παινόμενον.

(P. 2.52–6)

ὔδατι γὰρ ἐπὶ χαλκοπύλῳ
ψόφον αἰῶν Κασταλίας
ὄρφανὸν ἀνδρῶν χορεύσιος ἦλθον
ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἀλέξων
τεοῖσιν ἑμαῖς τε τιμαῖς·

(Paeon 6.7–11)

In both cases, we see that it is the poet who avoids or defends against the danger of ἀμαχανία. In the present passage, he does so by means of an athlete's victory (ἔργῳ)²⁴), which gives him a theme for celebration (= εὐμαχανία)²⁵), but it is nonetheless the poet who must provide κλέος, not the athlete. V. 92 should thus be seen not as a watered-down rephrasing of v. 90 f., but as an identification of the source and inspiration for the poet's gift of κλέος.

Under my interpretation, vv. 90–2 justify the poet's enthusiasm for celebrating Thebes and his prayer for the Graces' continued assistance in doing so by pointing out that he has on three occasions in the past glorified Thebes in the context of non-Theban odes (at Aegina and Megara), with the opportunity for

23) See A. M. Miller, Pindar, Archilochus and Hieron in P. 2.52–56: TAPA 111 (1981) 139 f.

24) Drachmann (above, n. 9) 164, and Burton (above, n. 1) 52, correctly point out that ἔργον typically refers to the athlete's achievement, never the poet's. But nothing requires us to take ἔργῳ here as belonging to the subject of the sentence. Nor is there a need to argue, as does Rose (above, n. 16) 159, that we have an implied λόγος/ἔργον antithesis, or with Péron (above, n. 1) 69, that ἔργῳ is in antithesis to ἀμαχανίαν.

25) The phrase ἀμαχανίαν φυγῶν should be considered a litotes, equivalent to εὐμαχανίαν φανῶν (I. 4.2 f.). Cf. Fränkel (above, n. 9) 448 n. 18; Race (above, n. 9) 111; and in general, Köhnken (above, n. 1) 62–7.

celebration being provided by an athlete's ἔργων. The poet effectively cites precedent for his Theban digression in an ode for a victor from Cyrene by saying that he has also praised Thebes in odes for Aeginetan and Megarian victors. The athletic contests at Aegina and Megara were fairly insignificant and not likely to rate so much attention here; but Aegina was prominent as a place from which Pindar had many commissions to write odes (including eleven of the 45 extant epinicia and probably also I. 9). Indeed, at least two of the Aeginetan odes do feature praise of Thebes: I. 8.17–22 calls attention to the common origin of Thebe and Aegina as daughters of Asopus and the appropriateness of friendship between the two cities²⁶), and N. 4.19–32 uses the occasion of the athlete's previous victory at the Iolaea²⁷) to expound the same theme of friendship between Thebes and Aegina, represented by the collaboration of the Theban Heracles and Aeginetan Telamon in the sack of Troy and other exploits²⁸). The latter example is also cut off by an extended series of apologetic statements (N. 4.33–41), like that in P. 9.87–96²⁹). In the decade following Thebes' defeat at Plataea, to which all three odes are dated³⁰), Pindar was concerned to rehabilitate his city's standing and reputation among the other Greek states³¹); it is in this light that we must see not only the

26) It has long been recognized that I. 8, written in the wake of Plataea, has political implications concerning Thebes' relationship to the rest of Greece, and to Aegina in particular: cf. Wilamowitz (above, n. 4) 195–8; J. H. Finley, *Pindar and the Persian Invasion*: HSCP 63 (1958) 129 f.; G. Méautis, *Pindare le dorien*, Neuchâtel 1962, 305–8; W. Kierdorf, *Erlebnis und Darstellung der Perserkriege*, Göttingen 1966, 33–5; and my *Two Notes on the Myth of Aeacus in Pindar*: GRBS 28 (1987) 14–16.

27) Köhnken (above, n. 1) 65 n. 10, notes the parallel formulaic structure of N. 4.19–21 and P. 9.79 f., introducing each victory at the Iolaea.

28) The cooperation of the Theban and Aeginetan heroes is a leitmotif in Pindar's Aeginetan odes: in addition to N. 4, cf. O. 8.45 f., N. 3.36 f., I. 5.35–8, I. 6.27–31.

29) On the apologetic conventions involved in this passage, see A. M. Miller, N. 4.33–43 and the *Defense of Digressive Leisure*: CJ 78 (1983) 202–20. Note the prominence of the rhetorical opposition both in this passage (especially N. 4.36–41) and P. 9.93–6. Of course, N. 4 “apologizes” for not elaborating the theme further, whereas P. 9 “apologizes” for elaborating the theme.

30) The date of P. 9 is firmly fixed by the scholia (ΣP. 9. inscr. a,b Drachmann) to 474. It is universally agreed that I. 8 must date to the first Isthmian festival after Plataea (in April of 478). The date of N. 4 is less secure, but is generally assigned to the 470s; the formula λιπαρῶν Ἀθῶν (N. 4.19) need not mean that it postdates the dithyramb to Athens.

31) Pindar certainly saw the reach of his odes as extending beyond their original audience to include the entire Greek-speaking world; cf. O. 9.21–6, N. 5.1–5, I. 2.39–42. For another example of Pindar's attempt to advertise Theban

references to Theban myth and heroes (particularly as they interact with other Greek heroes), but also P. 9's self-conscious commitment to the defense of Thebes. Like Pindar's other apologetic passages, the apology itself becomes important as a programmatic statement of the poet's ἦθος and intentions³²).

The apology for digression does not start only with v. 87, but is implicit even in the gnomic statements which introduce Telesicrates' Theban victory:

ἀρεταὶ δ' αἰεὶ μεγάλαι πολύμυθοι·
 βαῖα δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν
 ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς· ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁμοίως
 παντὸς ἔχει κορυφάν.

(P. 9.76–9)

After having proclaimed Telesicrates' Pythian victory in vv. 71–5, the poet hesitates before proceeding with the conventional catalogue of victories, and even seems to tell us that we are not going to have the usual enumeration, but a filtered and carefully selected version. Great spirits like Telesicrates' provide many feats to tell, but the wise poet will observe καιρὸς and “embroider” (ποικίλλειν) a few, rather than narrating everything at length³³). The audience is thus prepared for the focus on the Iolaea here³⁴), and also for the *variatio* involved in highlighting one victory with a mythical digression while alluding to the others from a different perspective

institutions in the eyes of the rest of Greece, see the allusions to the ἐπὶ πύραϊ in O. 6.13–17 and N. 9.22–7 (both non-Theban odes written several years after Plataea); we may also have in these passages a defense of the oracle of Amphiaraus at Theban Cnopia.

32) In addition to N. 4.33–41, mentioned above, cf. O. 9.35–41, P. 10.51–4, N. 3.26–32, N. 5.16–21, and N. 7.50–3, 64–76. The last example is a particularly relevant parallel, similarly “apologizing” for what the poet fears that some might see as over-elaboration of a given theme; see my remarks in *The Subject/Object-Relation in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean*: QUCC N.S. 22 (1986) 69–71.

33) For the correct translation of this much misunderstood passage, see Péron (above, n. 1) 59–63, and D. C. Young, *Pindar, Aristotle, and Homer: A Study in Ancient Criticism*: *ClAnt* 2 (1983) 158–61. Carey (above, n. 9) 88, contends that the statements here refer to compression rather than selection; but the two cannot really be separated.

34) P. A. Bernardini, *Mito e attualità nelle Odi di Pindaro*, Roma 1983, 33 f., is correct to point out that ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς has to do not only with the behavior of wise poets, but especially with what a wise audience should expect to *hear*. On Pindar's general consciousness of the audience and its expectations, see B. Gentili, *Aspetti del rapporto poeta, committente, uditorio nella lirica corale greca*: *Studi Urbinati* 39 (1965) 70–88.

(vv. 97–103)³⁵). Indeed, the principles of selection and *variatio* also apply to the texture of the Theban digression itself, which does not tell a typical narrative story from beginning to end, but focuses on discrete points of interest – the killing of Eurystheus, Iolaus' burial, Amphitryon's immigration, the birth of the twin sons. Varying the pace of a victory-catalogue with a brief mythological narrative is not uncommon for Pindar: as we have seen, N. 4.20–32 is based upon Timasarchus' victory at Thebes, even as N. 6.45–53 expands the victories of Alcimidas' relatives by reflecting on the clan of Aeacus, before returning to Alcimidas' own victories in vv. 57–63 (again, with the transition mediated by elaborate break-off formulae in vv. 53–7). We may also be meant to see the myth of Alexidamus' footrace to win the daughter of Antaeus here in P. 9.103–25 as an elaboration of the Cyrenean ἐπιχώρια which end the catalogue in v. 102 f.

V. 87 f. clearly closes the digression by defending the praise which has been given to Heracles and his family, as well as the whole city of Thebes. Young is certainly correct in interpreting κωφός to mean “deaf and dumb”: i. e., only a man without the capacity for speech would fail to praise Heracles and Thebes³⁶). This statement should not be taken as a *praeteritio*, in the sense that “everyone praises Heracles and Thebes, so there is no reason for me to continue any further on the subject”³⁷), but as a justification of the digression, in the sense that “no articulate man can resist praising Heracles and Thebes, least of all me.” Heracles' career was so distinguished that he was not merely a local Theban hero, but a figure of Panhellenic stature, evoking universal acclaim³⁸); in this sense, Pindar's digression becomes more than just an effusion of local Theban patriotism, but a statement of Thebes' centrality to the mythological heritage and poetic tradition of Greece. It is no accident that the second feature of Thebes which everyone celebrates (in addition to Heracles) is the water of

35) On the significance of ποικιλία in Pindar as a term for stylistic *variatio*, see H. Maehler, *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars*, Göttingen 1963, 90 f.

36) D. C. Young, *Pindar's Style at Pythian 9.87 f.*: GRBS 20 (1979) 136 f.

37) It is so interpreted by Race (above, n. 9) 120.

38) For Heracles as a civilizer, founder, and explorer of human limits, see O. 3.11–35, O. 10.43–51, N. 1.61–8, N. 3.21–6, I.4.61–3, fr. 169, and generally, G. K. Galinsky, *The Herakles Theme*, Oxford 1972, 31 f. That Heracles is here made an object of universal praise is argued by Carey (above, n. 9) 92, and Nash (above, n. 9) 85 f.

Dirce – the Theban spring which was famous as a source of poetic inspiration (cf. O. 10.84 f., I. 6.74 ff.)³⁹).

In v. 89, the poet proclaims, “I shall conduct a revel for them, since I have experienced something good in fulfillment of my prayer.” Clearly, the $\tau\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ which the poet has experienced is Telesicrates’ aforementioned victory at the Iolaea⁴⁰); as such, this proclamation serves to reintegrate the digression with the encomiastic context. However, the victory is $\epsilon\sigma\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ from the poet’s perspective not merely because it is a victory, but because it is a victory which *he* can celebrate and especially because it is a *Theban* victory which he can celebrate. It is precisely the identity of this victory as a victory at Thebes which allows the poet to perform a $\kappa\acute{\omega}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ for Iolaus, Amphitryon, Heracles, et al. at the same time that he performs a $\kappa\acute{\omega}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ for Telesicrates. We should certainly understand the fulfilled prayer as a prayer for Telesicrates’ victory, but we need not necessarily assume that the prayer was made to the heroes for whom the $\kappa\acute{\omega}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ is celebrated⁴¹). It is unclear just who the $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}$ was addressed to, but the following line ($\text{Χαρίτων κελαδεννῶν/μὴ με λίποι καθαρὸν φέγγος}$) suggests that it may be the Graces who are the object of prayer: the asyndeton sets this statement up as an extension of the $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}$ fulfilled in v. 89⁴²). Having conferred Telesicrates’ victory at the Iolaea⁴³) (and thus

39) On water generally as an important symbol of poetic inspiration in Pindar, see J. H. Finley, *Pindar and Aeschylus*, Cambridge Mass. 1955, 52 f.

40) Cf. ΣP. 9.156a,b Dr.; Bundy (above, n. 2) II, 70; Péron (above, n. 1) 66 f. The latter lists parallels for $\epsilon\sigma\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ in relation to an athletic victory. This is preferable to thinking that it refers to inspiration by the waters of Dirce, as Fraccaroli (above, n. 9) 479, proposes.

41) This assumption is explicit with Bundy (above, n. 2) II, 70; Nash (above, n. 9) 93 f.; Race (above, n. 9) 120, who see v. 89 as a “thank you” to the heroes. But Iolaus is the only hero who could be directly responsible for a victory in the Iolaea, whereas the $\kappa\acute{\omega}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ is clearly for all the Theban heroes whom Pindar has mentioned (= τοῖσι).

42) Schmidt (above, n. 5) 169; Fennell (above, n. 8) 255 and Péron (above, n. 1) 67, all see the close connection between v. 89a and 89b–90, but they are not right in viewing 89b–90 as the verbal content of the $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}$ in 89a, which was surely a prayer for victory. $\mu\eta\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\iota$ suggests rather a continuation of the favor which the Graces showed on a previous occasion. Bundy (above, n. 2) I, 18 n. 43 (following ΣP. 9.156b Dr., and later supported by Köhnken [above, n. 1] 65 n. 10) suggests that vv. 89b–90 are a quotation of the prayer made by Telesicrates before his victory; such a quotation of the victor is certainly not indicated by the text, nor is it paralleled elsewhere in epinician lyric. This approach is extended even further by Floyd (above, n. 7) 198–201.

43) For the Graces as givers of athletic victory, cf. O. 2.49–51, O. 6.75 f., O. 14.19 f., N. 10.37 f., and Gundert (above, n. 3) 123 n. 173. The connection between the Graces’ bestowing athletic victory and their entreated favor toward the song

the poet's opportunity to celebrate Thebes), the Graces are here asked to continue (μὴ λήτοι) their favor by assisting the subsequent κῶμος⁴⁴). This interpretation makes Pindar's prayer to the Graces a direct outgrowth of the preceding line with its mention of prayer and musical celebration, and is thus far preferable to the supposition that we are dealing with two entirely unrelated prayers. Critics who claim that vv. 90–2 deal with Telesicrates' victories argue that the prayer to the Graces completely abandons the preceding context and begs for renewed inspiration as the poet resumes his victory catalogue⁴⁵). Such a transition would not only be abrupt, but would be totally inconsistent with Pindar's conception of the Graces, who are elsewhere goddesses of active celebration and festivity (and thus closely identified with κωμάσομαι in v. 89)⁴⁶), not inspiration and memory (properly the domain of the Muses)⁴⁷).

The statement of vv. 90–2 is closely connected with the preceding prayer through γὰρ. In prayer-formulae, γὰρ typically gives the reason for a particular prayer being addressed to a particular divinity: the γὰρ-clause can motivate the prayer either by relating the special powers of the divinity which make it appropriate as a subject of invocation⁴⁸), or by giving the poet's own qualifications

celebrating that victory is made explicit in O. 14; see K. Deichgräber, *Charis und Chariten – Grazie und Grazien*, München 1971, 33 f.

44) Dissen (above, n. 7) II, 339–41, and Christ (above, n. 7) 211, believe that the wish of vv. 89b–90 is for future victories of Telesicrates. But in this case, the Graces' benefaction would primarily fall upon Telesicrates, and one would expect *viv* or *σε* as the direct object, not the first-person *με* (= Pindar, who would be only a secondary beneficiary).

45) Cf. R. Rauchenstein, *Zur Einleitung in Pindar's Siegeslieder*, Aarau 1843, 136; Drachmann (above, n. 9) 165; Bundy (above, n. 2) I, 18; Burton (above, n. 1) 53; Carey (above, n. 9) 93 f.; Race (above, n. 9) 120 f.

46) Cf. O. 14.8 f., P. 9.1–3, N. 5.53 f., N. 6.37 f., N. 9.54, N. 10.1 f., I. 5.21 f., I. 6.62–4; for their association specifically with the κῶμος, cf. O. 4.10 f., O. 14.13–17.

47) Pindar is very careful about the distinction between the Muses and Graces, and expresses it effectively in N. 9.54 f.: εὐχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδήσαι σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν, ὑπὲρ πολλῶν τε τιμαλφεῖν λόγοις / νίκαν, ἀκοντίζων σκοποῖ ἄγχιστα Μοισᾶν. Clearly, the Graces are connected with the actual celebration (κελαδήσαι), but the Muses have to do with the poet's intellectual aims and intentions (ἀκοντίζων σκοποῖ ἄγχιστα); for the same content/performance distinction between the Muses and Graces, see O. 7.7–12, N. 4.2–8, and generally, Bundy (above, n. 2) 79 n. 95.

48) Cf. O. 12.1–5, O. 14.1–7, P. 1.39–42, P. 8.1–7, Paeon 7B.15–20, Bacchylides 10.1 f., and generally E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig 1913, 157 f.; K. Keyssner, *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus*, Stuttgart 1932, 29 f.

as a worthy object of the divinity's attention⁴⁹). A good example combining both motivations is provided by O. 14.13–20, also a prayer to the Graces:

ὦ πότνι' Ἀγλαΐα
 φιλησίμολπέ τ' Εὐφροσύνα, θεῶν κρατίστου
 παῖδες, ἐπακοῦτε νῦν, Θάλια τε
 ἐρασίμολπε, ἰδοῖσα τόνδε κῶμον ἐπ' εὐμενεῖ τύχῃ
 κοῦφα βιβῶντα· Λυδῶ γὰρ Ἀσώπιχον ἐν τροπῶ
 ἐν μελέταις τ' ἀείδων ἔμολον,
 οὔνεκ' Ὀλυμπιόνικος ἅ Μινύεια
 σεῦ ἕκατι.

The Graces are asked to hear the poet, because he has come celebrating the victor in a Lydian mode, and moreover because that victory was obtained with the help of the Graces themselves (σεῦ ἕκατι). In P. 9.89–92, the poet is qualified for the Graces' continued support in celebrating a κῶμος for Thebes because of his past loyalty in glorifying the city; inasmuch as those past songs also enjoyed the Graces' support, he cites them as precedent for his present celebration and prayer⁵⁰). By drawing on precedent to justify a wish for the divinity's continued favor, vv. 90–2 serve as a *hypomnesis*⁵¹), unifying past, present, and future perspectives into a single vision of the poet's relationship to the gods. The connection of thought would be greatly complicated if the subject of vv. 90–2 were not the poet's actions, but the athlete's glorification of Cyrene, as most recent critics insist: the focus of v. 89 f. is on the first-person (εὐχᾶ, κωμάσσομαι, παθῶν, με) and the poet's relationship to the gods and Theban heroes⁵²), so it is only natural that these prayers should be justified by the poet's actions (v. 91 φαμί

49) In addition to P. 9.89–92 and the example given below, cf. O. 4.1–3, O. 10.3–8, Paean 6.1–11, N. 3.1–5 (relating to the chorus), Bacchylides 12.1–8.

50) W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin 1969, 102, correctly explains the connection of thought here: the γὰρ-clause justifies the prayer to the Graces by implying, "they did not leave me in the past, since I..." We have already seen the Graces' past support for Pindar in their fulfillment of his εὐχά (v. 89), as noted above.

51) On *hypomnesis*, see H. Meyer, *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Köln 1933, 4 f.; Keyssner (above, n. 48) 134; G. Appel, *De Romanorum precationibus*, Giessen 1909, 149–52.

52) A. Köhnken, 'Meilichos orga'. Liebesthematik und aktueller Sieg in der neunten pythischen Ode Pindars, in *Pindare (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 31)*, Genève 1985, 109, argues that v. 89 (and presumably the following lines) are spoken in the victor's persona; see also n. 42 above. His reference to Young's concept of the "first-person indefinite" (see n. 19 above) does not seem appropriate

... εὐκλεΐξαι), rather than by something which the athlete has done⁵³). Telesicrates' glorification of Cyrene in the past has nothing to do with why the Graces should help Pindar in the future.

As Péron recognizes⁵⁴), the gnomic statements of vv. 93–6 are ultimately ambiguous in their application. If we are correct in interpreting vv. 89–92 as concerned with the poet's past and present celebration of Thebes, it is easy to see τό γ' ἐν ξυνῶ πεπονημένον εὔ as the poet's defense of his native city⁵⁵) and the εἰ φίλος ἀστῶν, εἴ τις ἀντάεις as his fellow citizens, who will all join together in vindicating the justice of what he has said and done for Thebes. It is in a similar vein that Pindar defends his treatment of Neoptolemus by saying ἐν τε δαμόταις / ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν, οὐχ ὑπερβαλῶν, / βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδῶς ἐρύσαις, ... (N. 7.65–7)⁵⁶). But the statements made in vv. 93–6 all apply with equal validity to the athlete, who has performed a good feat for Cyrene, which must be recognized and affirmed by all of his fellow citizens⁵⁷): vv. 97–103 indisputably return to Telesicrates' athletic victories, and do so by depicting his reception by the women (presumably) of Cyrene⁵⁸). The statement in v. 95 f. (= the λόγος of the Old Man of

here, however; while v. 89 f. could make sense in reference to both poet and victor, vv. 90–2 clearly must refer to one or the other.

53) The γάρ-clause explaining a prayer may focus on the qualifications of the athlete or his family, but only if the prayer is specifically that the Muse celebrate the athlete named in the prayer (cf. N. 6.29–35, N. 9.1–5, Bacchylides 3.1–8). Such is clearly not the case here.

54) Péron (above, n. 1) 75 f.

55) Although πόνοσ in Pindar is usually objective, it is also sometimes subjective in reference: cf. N. 3.12, Paean 7B.21 f., Dith. 3.16 f., and N. 7.74 (on which, see C. Segal, *Pindar's Seventh Nemean*: TAPA 98 [1967] 439). For the poet's service of the "common good", cf. O. 10.11 f., O. 13.49, P. 11.54, I. 1.45 f.

56) Most commentators interpret this passage as referring to Pindar's standing among his fellow Thebans; however, C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes*, Cambridge 1883, 80, identifies the citizens as those of Aegina, a view recently defended in some detail by G. W. Most, *Pindar, Nemean 7.64–7*: GRBS 26 (1985) 327–30. In either case, the passage functions as an appeal to public recognition of the propriety of the poet's utterance.

57) On the problematic, liminal status of the "returning athlete," who is an object of envy as well as celebration in his community, see the interesting discussion of K. Crotty, *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar*, Baltimore 1982, 120.

58) One cannot rule out the possibility that vv. 93–100 also refer to the victor's reception by Thebans. Even without supposing that the ode was performed at Thebes or that Telesicrates had violated a Theban maiden (as Dissen [above, n. 7] II, 341, thought), he did celebrate an athletic triumph at Thebes, which Thebans should recognize as a public good (since by participating in a local Theban contest, he honored Thebes and its heroes).

the Sea) on the necessity of rendering praise to anyone who has performed noble actions provides an excellent preface to the resumption of the victory-catalogue and the poet's praise of Telesicrates⁵⁹). On a third level, the statements can also be seen as applying to Heracles and the other Theban heroes, who certainly undertook πόνος on behalf of the common interest and are now universally praised (as already implied in v. 87 f.). By this conscious overlapping of reference, Pindar uses vv. 93–6 simultaneously to justify his digressive praise of Thebes and Theban heroes, to introduce his resumed praise of the victor, and to establish a parallel between the Theban heroes, the victor, and himself – all three being participants in a shared community of aristocratic values and devotion to public service. With this parallel established, the digression on Theban heroes ceases to be a digression, but becomes a paradigm for the victor. Moreover, the poet's vigor and *élan* in praising Thebes becomes a paradigm for the same energy and enthusiasm which he now devotes to Telesicrates, against all potential opponents. We need not see the opposition implied here (τις ἀνταίεις, καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν) as real enemies of either the poet or victor, but as in other passages⁶⁰), the idea of opposition provides a rhetorical foil against which the common interests of poet and victor are unified: if even enemies must praise Telesicrates (or Heracles or Pindar), their praiseworthiness is absolute.

Vv. 87–96 form a continuous unity in their thematic emphasis on praise as a positive instrument of social cohesion and political solidarity. Almost no line is without a term for verbal activity and affirmation – v. 87 κωφὸς . . . ὃς . . . στόμα μὴ περιβάλλει, v. 88 μέναται, v. 89 εὐχῆ, κωμάσσομαι, κελαδεννάω, v. 91 φαρμί, εὐκλειῆσαι, v. 92 σιγαλὸν . . . φυγῶν, v. 94 λόγον, μὴ κρυπτέτω, v. 95 αἰνεῖν, v. 96 ἔννεπεν. Even the following victory-catalogue is expressed in terms of verbal activity, as the women “silently pray” that Telesicrates should be their husband or son (vv. 98–100). Given this context, it

59) See Hubbard (above, n. 19) 143–5, on the use of ambiguous gnomic statements to effect a transition from subject to object (or *vice versa*).

60) In addition to N. 4.36–41, cf. O. 2.86–8, O. 6.74–6, P. 2.73–96, P. 11.54–6, N. 1.24 f., N. 8.21 f. On the general topic of the envious opposition as a poetic foil, see W. J. Slater, *Futures in Pindar*: CQ 19 (1969) 94 n. 2; J. Péron, *Le thème du Phthonos dans la XI^e Pythique de Pindare* (v. 29–30, v. 55–56): REA 78/79 (1976–77) 65–83; G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Baltimore 1979, 222–30; G. Guzzoni, *Pindar: Der vormetaphysische Weltbezug*, Bonn 1981, 73–86; Bernardini (above, n. 34) 109–11; Race (above, n. 9) 108–10. On φθόνος as a general concept in Greek society, see P. Walcot, *Envy and the Greeks: A Study of Human Behaviour*, Warminster 1978.

is difficult to see how εὐκλείξαι and vv. 90–2 can refer to anything but the poet's provision of κλέος through active verbal celebration; εὐκλείξας and the other proposed emendations would eviscerate the word of its immediacy and presence as an oral act.

Overall, the passage subordinates private and particular interests to the general and public. Within the city, personal enmities and factions must be put aside in order to recognize τὸ γ' ἐν ξυνῶ πεπονημένον εὖ (vv. 93–6), whether constituted by an athlete's victory or a poet's celebration of the city. Even more generally, everyone in Greece must recognize Heracles and the place of Thebes in the common Panhellenic heritage (v. 87f.). It is thus legitimate for Pindar to celebrate a κῶμος for the Theban heroes in the context of a Cyrenean ode, as he has done before at Megara and Aegina (vv. 89–92). Ultimately, the political rivalries among Greek states must yield to acknowledgement of a city's virtues even as personal rivalries within the city must yield to praise of a triumphant athlete. The Cyreneans will not object to the praise of Thebes, even as Thebans happily host athletes from Cyrene, who honor Thebes by competition in games commemorating Iolaus. Paradoxically, it is in the very act of expressing his nationalism as a Theban patriot that Pindar articulates his consciousness of a Panhellenic audience whose values ultimately transcend national boundaries.

University of Texas
Austin

Thomas K. Hubbard