

**Zeitschrift:** Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

**Band:** 78 (2021)

**Heft:** 2

**Artikel:** Notes on Pindar's dithyrambs

**Autor:** Prodi, Enrico Emanuele

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-965880>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 16.01.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# Notes on Pindar's *Dithyrambs*

Enrico Emanuele Prodi, Oxford

*Abstract:* Il presente articolo argomenta che il fr. 85 M. di Pindaro proviene dal ditirambo citato da schol. Pind. *Ol.* 3.25c Drachmann (fr. 71 M.) (parte I), quindi esamina il significato e i sottesi del fr. 83 M., prima isolatamente e poi in relazione al fr. 75 M., al quale è stato attribuito per congettura (parte II). Dopo aver mostrato il vero significato di ἐν ... τῶι πρώτωι τῶν διθυράμβων in schol. Pind. *Ol.* 3.25c Drachmann (parte III), propone che il fr. 75 M. possa essere stato posto in apertura al primo libro dei *Ditirambi* pindarici e che i fr. 71 e 85 M. si possano ricondurre allo stesso componimento (parte IV).

*Keywords:* Pindar, dithyrambs, fragments, Boeotia, ecdotics.

## I Frr. 71, 85 M.

In the thirteenth *Olympian*, Pindar enlists the dithyramb in a parade of Corinthian inventions (vv. 18–22):<sup>1</sup>

ταὶ Διονύσου πόθεν ἐξέφανεν  
σὺν βοηλάται χάριτες  
διθυράμβωι; τίς γάρ ἵππει-  
οις ἐν ἔντεσσιν μέτρα,  
ἢ θεῶν ναοῖσιν οἰω-  
νῶν βασιλέα δίδυμον  
ἐπέθηκ;

Whence did the delights of Dionysos appear with the ox-driving dithyramb? Who then added the restrainer to the horse's gear or the twin kings of birds to the temples of the gods?

(transl. Race)

A scholion references two other places where Pindar linked the invention of the dithyramb with different localities (schol. **BCEQ** 25c, I p. 361 Drachmann):

\* Section I of this article was first presented as part of a lecture at Venice International University on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2018. I am grateful to all participants in the discussion that followed, especially Ettore Cingano and Stefano Vecchiato. Fragments of Pindar are cited according to Maehler 1989 ("M.").

<sup>1</sup> Commentators since scholl. **BDEQ** 26b, **BCEQ** 26c, I p. 362 Drachmann must be right that the reference is to Arion, who was the first to compose and produce a dithyramb in Corinth and was part of the tyrant Periander's entourage (Hdt. 1.23–4; Aristotle too according to Procl. *Chrest.* 43 Severyns *ap. Phot. Bibl.* p. 320a Bekker): see e.g. D'Angour 1997, 348; Ieranò 1997, 171; Lomiento in Gentili et al. 2013, 596–597; Briand 2014, 181; Spelman 2018, 256.

ο Πίνδαρος δὲ ἐν μὲν τοῖς ὑπορχήμασιν ἐν Νάξῳ φησὶ πρῶτον εύρεθῆναι διθύραμβον, ἐν δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν διθυράμβων ἐν Θήβαις, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἐν Κορίνθῳ.

Pindar says in the *Hyporchemes* that the dithyramb was first invented in Naxos, in the first of the *Dithyrambs* in Thebes, and here (sc. in this passage) in Corinth.

This notice appears in the Teubner Pindar among both the *Dithyrambs* (fr. 71 M.) and the *Hyporchemes* (fr. 115 M.). It seems to have escaped general notice that there is another possible fragment from the same composition as fr. 71, namely fr. 85 M. This fragment is preserved in slightly different forms by one manuscript of the lexicon falsely attributed to St Cyril and by some of the Byzantine *Etymologica*, perhaps deriving from Herodian (Περὶ παθῶν 643, II p. 375 Lentz).<sup>2</sup> In all these texts it is part of a longer entry on διθύραμβος. Here follows the relevant part of the versions preserved by cod. Vindob. phil. gr. 319 of Cyril (first published by Bergk 1853, 246) and by the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (AB 53, p. 23 Calame) and *Gudianum* (d marg., II p. 363 De Stefani).<sup>3</sup>

ο Πίνδαρος λυθίραμμόν φησι αὐτόν· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς τικτομένου (Vecchiato: τικτόμενος cod.) αὐτοῦ ἔκραζεν “λῦθι λῦθι ράμμα”.

Pindar calls him *lythirammos*, because Zeus, when he (sc. Dionysus) was being born, kept screaming “unstitch, unstitch the seam!”

ο δὲ Πίνδαρός φησι λυθίραμβον· καὶ γὰρ Ζεὺς τικτομένου αὐτοῦ ἔκραζεν “λῦθι ράμμα, λῦθι ράμμα”· λυθίραμβος καὶ διθύραμβος κατὰ τροπὴν καὶ πλεονασμόν.

<sup>2</sup> A possible alternative is Didymus' Περὶ λυρικῶν ποιητῶν (IV 9 Schmidt = XXXIX Coward-Prodi), which dealt with the lyric genres and their characteristics (including, crucially, the etymology of their names) and is known to have been among the sources of the Byzantine *Etymologica*. Didymus was also a source of Proclus' *Chrestomathy*, which preserved a version of these materials, though without the ascription to Pindar (42 Severyns ap. Phot. *Bibl.* p. 320a Bekker). On Didymus' treatise see Grandolini 1999; Prodi 2020, 22–23.

<sup>3</sup> The other *Etymologica* that preserve versions of the same entry are that of Simeon (EF 8 260, p. 107 Baldi), the *Etymologicum Magnum* (p. 274 Callierges/col. 789 Gaisford), and the Μεγάλη γραμματική (CPV 8 260, p. 107 Baldi). All of these align more or less closely with the text given by the *Genuinum*, for the relevant part of which an apparatus can also be found in Baldi *ad loc.* The 'Etymologicum Angelicanum' still cited by van der Weiden 1991, 227 and Lavecchia 2000, 72 as a separate witness belongs to an interpolated recension of the *Gudianum*: Reitzenstein 1897, 87–89; Cellerini 1988, 27. — The relationship between the Vienna ms. of Cyril and the *Etymologica* is unclear. Reciprocal contamination is known to have occurred between some mss. of the Vatican recension of Cyril (v) and the *Etymologicum Gudianum* (Reitzenstein 1897, 84–90; Naoumides 1979, 111–113; Cellerini 1988, 26–27), but the Vienna ms. belongs to the Laurentian recension (g), teste Naoumides 1979, 116. The available evidence would point to this gloss being an interpolation originating in the etymological tradition (the reverse is a less attractive possibility if this gloss is a *unicum* in the mss. of Cyril), but in the absence of further information about the text of the Vindobonensis and its position in the complex and still underexplored transmission of Cyril, a definite conclusion is out of reach.

Pindar says *lythirambos*, because Zeus, when he (sc. Dionysus) was being born, kept screaming “unstitch the seam, unstitch the seam!”; *lythirambos* and *dithyrambos* by change and addition.

[Πίν]δαρος δέ φησιν ὅτι τίκτων αὐτὸν ἐπεβόα ὁ Ζεὺς “λῦθι λῦθι ράμμα”, ἵν’ ἡι λυθίραμμος<sup>4</sup> καὶ ἐν τροπῇ διθύραμβος.

Pindar says that, when giving birth to him (sc. Dionysus), Zeus kept yelling “unstitch, unstitch the seam!”, which makes *lythirambos* and, with a change, *dithyrambos*.

The fragment clearly belongs within a mythical aetiology of the dithyramb, just as the scholion said of fr. 71 M. The episode is that of Zeus giving birth to Dionysus from his thigh; his entreaty to “unstitch the seam” (*lythi rhamma*) which held the unborn god is said to have given the song, and the god himself, its name.

Dionysus’ birthplace was famously disputed already in antiquity. The first *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* lists five alternatives – including Naxos and Thebes (vv. 2, 5) – before branding them as lies and asserting the god’s birth in Nyse, which the poet places in the southernmost part of Phoenicia.<sup>5</sup> But the localisation of Nysa/Nyse – a place more mythical than real which provided a convenient folk etymology for the god’s name – was itself contested. ὄρος οὐ καθ’ ἔνα τόπον, says Hesychius before listing fifteen possible locations, including Naxos (v 742 Latte). πόλεις πολλαί, goes Stephanus of Byzantium, introducing a numbered list of ten which includes Naxos and Boeotia (v 83 Billerbeck). A D-scholion to the *Iliad* professes nine, neatly divided between mountains (including the Nysai in Naxos and Boeotia), cities, and islands (Z 133/Y<sup>s</sup> van Thiel<sup>2</sup>). As the D-scholion observes, the ἡγάθεον Νυσῆιον of *Iliad* 6.133 must be located in Thrace even though the poet does not say so explicitly; the *Homeric Hymn*, as we saw, places Nyse in Phoenicia; Herodotus, in Ethiopia (2.146.2, cf. 3.97.2). Pindar too said that Dionysus was born and raised on mount Nysa (fr. \*85a M.), but the *Etymologica* that transmit this piece of information (perhaps once again going back to Herodian: Περὶ ὄρθογραφίας, II p. 492 Lentz)<sup>6</sup> do not specify where the mountain may have been or wheth-

<sup>4</sup> As De Stefani notes and the photographs confirm ([https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Barb.gr.70](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.gr.70)), it is unclear whether prior to being damaged **δ** had λυθίραμμος like the Vienna Cyril or λυθίραμβος like the *Genuinum* and the other *Etymologica*.

<sup>5</sup> Line-numbers of the *Hymn* are taken from West 2003, which takes account of the papyri. West 2011, 34–39; 2012, 238–239 dates it very early – to the mid-seventh century at the latest – in the belief that it influenced the *Iliad* and other *Homeric Hymns*. Dihle 2002 makes a case for a date not before the Hellenistic age; this, however, becomes impossible if Hunter and Fuhrer 2002, 172–173 are correct that Callimachus alluded to the opening of *Dionysus* in that of his own *Hymn to Zeus*, implying that the former was older and suggesting that the scholar-poet knew a collection of *Homeric Hymns* which opened with *Dionysus*.

<sup>6</sup> *Genuinum* AB 54, p. 23 Calame; *Magnum*, p. 277 Callierges/col. 797 Gaisford. The mythological material – but not the crucial ως Πίνδαρος – is also present in the *Gudianum* (**δ** marg., II p. 367 De

er Pindar gave any indication to that effect in the poem – which may or may not have been the same poem as fr. 85 M.<sup>7</sup>

So we cannot be certain where Pindar located the episode he narrated in fr. 85 M. ‘Where’ in geographical, but also in bibliographical terms. Maehler edits the fragment among the *Dithyrambs*, following a tradition that goes back to the eighteenth century;<sup>8</sup> the lack of an asterisk before the number indicates certainty on his part as to the attribution to that book. But while it stands to reason that an aetiology of the dithyramb should be narrated in a dithyramb, there is no testimony or proof of this fact. Indeed, the Pindaric scholion quoted at the beginning of this article shows that the origin of the dithyramb could be told in poems assigned to different genres: epinicians, dithyrambs, hyporchemes.

However, such tellings can happen in very different ways. The reference in *Olympian* 13 is nothing more than the intimation, in the shape of a rhetorical question, that the dithyramb originated from Corinth: no narrative element; no myth. Whether the reference to the Naxian origin of the dithyramb in the *Hyporchemes* (fr. 115 M.) was similarly a brief allusion or a more extended mythical narrative such as could have accommodated fr. 85 M. is impossible to say with certainty. The island did have substantial Dionysiac connections,<sup>9</sup> so it may have made sense for a Naxian (?) hyporcheme to make the best of them regardless of context, with or without a mythical narrative being involved. If one such narrative was involved, the episode of Dionysiac myth that one most readily associates with Naxos today is the rescue of Ariadne by the god and his cortège; the first ever dithyramb can easily be imagined to have been sung on that joyful occasion. But Naxos was one of the candidates for Dionysus’ birthplace too, from the *Homeric Hymn* (v. 3) to Diodorus (5.52.2), not to mention the possible Naxian location of Nysa. This leaves the door open to the possibility that fr. 85 M. may belong to the *Hyporcheme* of fr. 115 M.<sup>10</sup>

The different thesis advocated here – that fr. 85 M. may have belonged to the *Dithyramb* of fr. 71 M. – is not altogether new. It was adumbrated by Schroeder in his 1914 *editio minor* of Pindar, where he lumped together the known fragments of

Stefani), Simeon and the Μεγάλη Γραμματική (EF, CPV 8 277, p. 111 Baldi), and ‘Zonaras’ (col. 508 Tittmann).

<sup>7</sup> The same poem according to Spelman 2018, 193.

<sup>8</sup> Schneider 1776, 46; cf. Boeckh 1821, 585 “Haud dubie ad *Dithyrambos* pertinet”.

<sup>9</sup> References in RE XVI (1935) 2085 s. v. Naxos 5 (R. Herbst); Simantoni-Bournia 2006, 89–93. Dionysus has been identified (however conjecturally) as the titular deity of the archaic temple excavated at Hyria in the 1980s: Gruben and Lambrinoudakis 1987, 613–614; Lambrinoudakis 1989, 341–343; Simantoni-Bournia 2000, 217.

<sup>10</sup> Stefano Vecchiato advocated this thesis both in the discussion that followed the lecture mentioned in the opening note and subsequently in a paper of his own presented at the Celtic Conference in Classics in St Andrews on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2018. I am grateful to him for allowing me to cite his argument. Spelman 2018, 193 links fr. 85 M. with fr. \*85a M. (Dionysus’ birth in Nysa) while claiming that frs. 71 and 115 M., like O. 13.18–19, pertain to “certain changes” which the dithyramb later underwent; but any link between frs. 85 and 85a M. need not be mutually exclusive with one between frs. 71 and 85 M.

what we now call the second *Dithyramb* (frr. 70b, 81 M.) and frr. 80 and 84–\*86 M. under the heading “ΟΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ cl fr 71”.<sup>11</sup> After the publication of *P.Oxy.* XIII 1604, whose fr. 1 is a crucial witness for the ‘second *Dithyramb*’ and for its stated focus on Heracles,<sup>12</sup> the combination of all these became untenable; when revising his *editio maior* in 1923, Schroeder restricted the link with fr. 71 M. – still presented as a mere comparison – to frr. 85 and \*86 M.<sup>13</sup> Snell restricted the comparison further, to fr. 85 M. alone.<sup>14</sup> This meagre “cf. fr. 85” in the apparatus to fr. 71 M. – there is nothing in the opposite direction, curiously – is all that survives of Schroeder’s hypothesis down to the most recent Teubner.<sup>15</sup> This suggested comparison was never elaborated upon or explained, and it seems to have gone entirely unremarked outside the Stuttgart–Leipzig axis except for three words in a footnote by Wilamowitz.<sup>16</sup> Neither of the recent commentaries on the *Dithyrambs* authored by van der Weiden and Lavecchia connects the two fragments; following a hypothesis of Del Corno’s, Lavecchia instead links fr. 71 with frr. 72–\*74 M., which narrate the myth of Orion.<sup>17</sup>

But there is a good chance that fr. 85 M. does come from the *Dithyramb* mentioned in the scholion to *Olympian* 13. There are several reasons why a composition that must have included a fairly detailed narrative of Dionysus’ birth and the aetiology of the dithyramb may have belonged to the *Dithyrambs*. The first and most obvious is the content of the myth. From the ancient editor’s standpoint –

<sup>11</sup> Schroeder <sup>2</sup>1914, 298–300.

<sup>12</sup> The title assigned to the poem by its ancient editor – referring, as is the rule for dithyrambs, to the content of its mythical narrative – is Ἡρακλῆς ἡ Κέρβερος Θηβαίοις; on the true reading of the papyrus see Prodi 2016, 1164. Further evidence for the Heraclean theme comes from *P.Oxy.* XXXII 2622 fr. 1 (fr. dub. 346 M.) and the commentary to the same verses in *PSI XIV* 1391 fr. B. The connection between these two papyri was recognised by Lobel 1967, 65; that between them and the ‘second *Dithyramb*’, also first suggested by Lobel 1967, 63, has been corroborated by Lavecchia 1996, see also *id.* 2000, 106–108.

<sup>13</sup> Schroeder <sup>6</sup>1923, 550. The *supplementum* of the next *editio minor*, Schroeder <sup>3</sup>1930, 344–347, makes no mention of our fragments. A connection between fr. 71 M. and the ‘second *Dithyramb*’ is revived (in aptly dubitative fashion) by Sutton 1989, 36, but given that poem’s subject-matter it seems less likely that a narrative of the birth of Dionysus could also fit there.

<sup>14</sup> Snell <sup>1</sup>1953, 239.

<sup>15</sup> Maehler 1989, 82.

<sup>16</sup> Wilamowitz 1922, 345 n. 3.

<sup>17</sup> Del Corno 1974, 108–109; Lavecchia 2000, 274–276. The link stems from the erroneous belief that ἐν ... τῶι πρώτωι τῶν διθυράμβων and διθυράμβων πρώτωι in the citations of (respectively) frr. 71 and 72 M. indicate not the first book of the *Dithyrambs* but the first poem in it, which would necessarily make frr. 71 and 72 M. into fragments of the same poem. This supposition was already criticised by Sutton 1989, 35. For discussion and bibliography see section III. — Hornblower 2004, 145–156 follows Lavecchia in taking frr. 71–74 M. together but argues intriguingly, following a suggestion by Hamilton 1990, 213, that they represent a Chian, not a Theban poem. Like Kleingünther 1933, 136 before him, he is probably right that Thebes is not the only place where the dithyramb could have been given a Theban origin (p. 152); but if one dismisses the spurious link between fr. 71 M. and frr. 72–74 M., his argument in favour of a Chian context for the latter group of fragments becomes stronger. See however the counterarguments of Olivieri 2011, 128 n. 54.

from the standpoint of genre as a critical and bibliographical tool – a poem narrating the aetiology of the dithyramb would probably have been a prime candidate for classification in the *Dithyrambs*. From the standpoint of the poet and of his immediate audience – genre as a nexus of occasion, function, tradition – a dithyramb is where it would have made most sense for such a myth to be sung. Compare on the one hand fr. 128c M. = 56 Cannatà Fera, the opening of a *Threnos* where an evocation of paeans and dithyrambs (vv. 1–4) serves to focus attention on various forms of lament and of the mythical grief underpinning them, with an evident *mise en abyme* of the song's own genre (4–12); on the other hand fr. 70b M., a *Dithyramb* that opens with an explicitly Bacchic revel on Olympus (vv. 6–23) which is said to constitute the speaker's knowledge (5) and appears to function as an authorising parallel for the Bacchus-honouring dithyrambic performance in which he is engaged.<sup>18</sup> If the song to which fr. 85 M. belonged was itself a dithyramb, it will have situated itself, implicitly or explicitly, as a successor to that first mythical dithyrambic performance that arose from Zeus' words at Dionysus' birth.

Another plausible reason for fr. 85 M.'s pertinence to the *Dithyrambs* are its Dionysiac connections. While already in the early fifth century not all dithyrambs had much to do with Dionysus, at least on the textual level, the genre did nonetheless maintain a notional – and, in many cases, a ceremonial – link with the god.<sup>19</sup> The 'second *Dithyramb*' is again a useful term of comparison: its core was a mythical narrative concerning Heracles' journey to the underworld (frr. 81, \*249a–b, dub. 346 M.),<sup>20</sup> but the frame is, or forcefully beckons to be understood as, Dionysiac (fr. 70b M.).<sup>21</sup> Conversely, Dionysiac themes are remarkably uncommon in the extant Pindar outside the *Dithyrambs*.<sup>22</sup> Bear in mind also the long-standing

<sup>18</sup> Lavecchia 2000, 133–135; 2013, 69.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *Ol.* 13.18–19 cited above; frr. 70b, 75 M.; A. fr. 355 Radt. See Lavecchia 2013 and D'Alessio 2013, arguing against Fearn 2007, 165–181. On Dionysus in Pindaric dithyramb see Privitera 1970, 122–130; Zimmermann 2008, 62–63; in Pindar more generally, Olivieri 2011, 123–160.

<sup>20</sup> See n. 12 above.

<sup>21</sup> See Lavecchia 2000, 108–125; 2013, 68–75.

<sup>22</sup> Much like Privitera 1970, 120–122 (contrast Olivieri 2011, 123), Hamilton 1990, 214 argues that "Dionysus has a place in Pindar's odes ... as well as his dithyrambs", but in truth it is a small and unprepossessing place. Out of 45 complete *Epinicians*, not one has a Dionysiac myth as its main narrative, only brief and mostly perfunctory references. In *Ol.* 2 a *gnome* on how joys can overturn sufferings is exemplified by Semele's death and subsequent divinisation, whereupon her son is said to love her (22–28; Pindar's choice of a sequence of Theban myths is relevant to the asserted Theban origin of the *laudandus* Theron's family). The "delights of Dionysus" are evoked in *Ol.* 13.18–19 while praising Corinth for the invention of the dithyramb; he is functional to a statement about dithyrambs also in the catalogue of genres in fr. \*128c M. = 56 Cannatà Fera (*Threnoi*). The roll-call of Theban glories that opens *Isth.* 7 duly name-checks him (3–5), as does the one at the beginning of the first *Hymn* (fr. 29.5 M.). In *Pyth.* 3.96–9, Semele's death and her intercourse with Zeus are briefly mentioned as an illustration of her father Cadmus' mixed fortunes; Dionysus himself does not appear. His only occurrence in the *Paeans* is in a circumlocution for wine (4.25 = D4 Rutherford); likewise in fr. \*124.3 M. (*Encomia*) and seemingly in frr. 153 and 248 M. too (*incerti generis*). As remarked by Wilamowitz 1922, 274 n. 2, fr. 236 M. (*incerti generis*) is the only certain attestation of a Dionysiac-themed

association between the dithyramb and the birth of Dionysus specifically, from its evocation in Euripides' *Bacchae* (519–521, emphasising the Theban location of the event) to Plato's Socrates, who nonchalantly equates the dithyramb with Διονύσου γένεσις (*Leg.* 3.700b), and from the anonymous epigram that qualifies Dionysus as διθυραμβογενῆ (*Anth. Pal.* 9.524.5) to the rich tradition of folk etymology to which fr. 85 M. itself belongs.<sup>23</sup>

Finally, the other identifying characteristic that was ascribed to dithyrambs in antiquity was the presence of extended narrative.<sup>24</sup> Granted, dithyrambs were certainly not the only genre of which this was true. We do not know enough about hyporchemes to exclude that they, too, may have contained mythical narratives, as many of the genres practised by Pindar did. Nevertheless, the presence of a seemingly extended mythological narrative may have been, if not a determining, at least a facilitating criterion for the attribution of the composition containing fr. 85 M. to the *Dithyrambs*. When all these factors are combined together, there is a fairly strong case for fr. 85 M. to be assigned to the *Dithyrambs* and, as a result, identified with fr. 71 M.

## II Fr. 83 M.

Pindar's fellow Boeotians did not have a reputation for fine intellect. A slur likening them to swine is recorded by several sources and finds its earliest extant attestations in two passages of Pindar.<sup>25</sup> One is from the sixth *Olympian* (87–90):

ὅτρυνον νῦν ἔταιρους,  
Αἰνέα, πρῶτον μὲν "Η-  
ραν Παρθενίαν κελαδῆσαι,

myth in Pindar – beside our fr. 85 M., that is. It may well have come from a *Dithyramb*, too: the dolphins who “did not leave their man-loving life” (but keep dancing around ships?) would be a splendid analogy for the fifty choreutes who danced in a circle while singing Pindar's poem. (See now the much more thorough argument by Lightfoot 2019; I thank the editors for allowing me to add this reference at proof stage.) The one securely non-dithyrambic instance where one may have reason to imagine a significant role for the god is fr. 115 M. (*Hyporchemes*) discussed above. The Dionysiac overtones of the epithet θυλαιγίδι in ‘Pae.’ 13.13 = S5 Rutherford (really a *Prosodion*, see D'Alessio 1997, 32–34; 1999, 16–17) are less obvious to me than they are to Rutherford and Irvine 1988, 51 or Ferrari 1991, 388; D'Alessio 1997, 33 and 1999, 18 is right to be cautious. The case for a Dionysiac context (but of what sort and extent?) would be stronger if one accepted the supralinear ε in the papyrus and took it to indicate correction into the *hapax* εύλαιγίδι, as divined by D'Alessio 1999, 17–18, but I cannot confidently exclude that what the corrector meant was εύλαιγίδ (not Dionysiac, and probably wrong).

<sup>23</sup> See Ieranò 1997, 159–164; on the passage from the *Laws*, Schöpsdau 1994, 510.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Pl. *Resp.* 3.394c; [Plut.] *De mus.* 1134e; *P.Oxy.* XXIII 2368 (*CLGP* I 1.4<sup>2</sup> Bacchylides 4) col. i 9–13; schol. Ar. *Av.* 918b Holwerda. See Ieranò 1997, 322–325; D'Alessio 2013, 119–121; on the passage from the *Republic*, Peponi 2013, 355–359.

<sup>25</sup> For other sources and a discussion see Tosi <sup>16</sup>2007, 192–193; Gentili in Gentili et al. 2013, 160; and the apparatus to Cratin. fr. 77 Kassel–Austin.

γνῶναι τ' ἔπειτ', ἀρχαῖον ὄνειδος ἀλα-  
θέσιν λόγοις εἰ φεύγομεν, Βοιωτίαν  
ῦν.

Now, Aineas, urge your companions first to celebrate Hera the Maiden, and then to know if with truthful words we escape the age-old taunt of “Boiotian pig”.

(transl. Race, adapted)

The second is fr. 83 M., a line from the *Dithyrambs* quoted by the scholia to that passage (schol. B(C)EQ 152, I p. 188 Drachmann) as well as by Strabo (7.7.1) and Galen (*Protr.* 7.7):

ἢν ὅτε σύας Βοιώτιον ἔθνος ἔνεπον

There was a time when they called the Boiotian people pigs

(transl. Race)

Recent commentators have little to say about the possible context and function of this line beyond noting its relevance to the common slur on the Boeotians' alleged stupidity.<sup>26</sup> “Perhaps”, remarks van der Weiden, “this is wishful thinking on Pindar's part who thereby wanted to suggest that in his own time the reproach was not heard anymore”, unlike other instances of the slur, which make no such temporal distinction.<sup>27</sup> But rather than wishful thinking, we should see this verse as rhetorical strategy. The imperfect *ἢν* suggests that the broader passage contrasted a past time when the Boeotians were reputed to be uncultivated with a present time when, evidently, this charge could no longer be sustained. In a Pindaric composition, such a contrast is unlikely to be a matter of pure chronology – the days of old vs. modern times – detached from the reality of the song.<sup>28</sup> Rather, ‘now’ must be specifically the time of the present song, that is to say, the present song itself.<sup>29</sup>

One thinks once again of fr. 70b M., where the ropey dithyrambs of old (πρίν, v. 1) are contrasted with Pindar's enthusiastic new performance, which ‘knows’ the Dionysiac *τελετά* taking place in the halls of Olympus (vv. 5–8). There, too, the contrast is not between the past and the present as such, but between the present song and a past denoted by its absence;<sup>30</sup> a device to give lustre to Pindar's song by contrasting it with an explicitly inferior foil. The point being made in this way in

<sup>26</sup> Van der Weiden 1991, 224–225; Lavecchia 2000, 286.

<sup>27</sup> Van der Weiden 1991, 224.

<sup>28</sup> Here and in the following paragraphs I refer to the ‘song’ for simplicity's sake. The reader should keep in mind that what is at issue in cases like these is not the words alone, or the words and the music, but the totality of the performance in its audible and visible concreteness. For a similar *caveat* see Kurke 2012, 221; on the importance (and cost) of costume and other ‘scenic’ materials in dithyrambic performances see Wilson 2000, 86–88; 2003, 168 and n. 22.

<sup>29</sup> So Wilamowitz 1922, 274; Sevieri <sup>2</sup>2010, 208.

<sup>30</sup> So already Privitera 1970, 124; Lavecchia 2000, 131; now also Spelman 2018, 144–145.

fr. 83 M. will have been much the same as in the passage of *Olympian* 6 quoted above: there is an old prejudice against Boeotians, but we are proving it wrong here and now with the fine skill that we are displaying.<sup>31</sup> Galen, who, like the scholar, brought together the two passages, similarly understood them both as references to Pindar's song: ἀξιῶν ὅλου σχεδὸν ἔθνους τὸν ἐπ' ἀμαθίαι ψόγον ἀπολύεσθαι διὰ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ μουσικήν, 'wishing to refute the charge of ignorance against almost his entire nation through his own *mousike*' (*Protr.* 7.7).

A corollary is the relevance of Boeotia to the song. One explanation for it could be that the performing chorus may be Theban, like that of fr. 70b M.; compare vv. 22–30 of that ode, where the Theban origin of the *persona loquens* is linked to that of Dionysus, with a clear authorising function. But there is an alternative: that the reference is not to the chorus' origin, but to Pindar's.<sup>32</sup> The obvious parallel is, once again, the passage in *Olympian* 6, where φεύγομεν (v. 90) refers neither to the performing chorus nor, probably, to the shadowy Aineas (who likewise does not seem to have been a Theban),<sup>33</sup> but to a poetic first person. One should also keep in mind that the 'choice herald of skilled words' that is the *persona loquens* of fr. 70b M. (ἐξαίρετο[ν] κάρυκα σοφῶν ἐπέων, vv. 23–24) may just as well be the poet, too.<sup>34</sup>

A reference to the poet rather than to the chorus would become inescapable if Wilamowitz was right to hypothesise that fr. 83 M. comes from the same poem as fr. 75 M.<sup>35</sup> The latter is an Athenian poem (v. 4) which can only have been composed for an Athenian chorus to perform. A poetic first person has been plausibly discerned already in the opening of the ode, fr. 75 M. itself (vv. 7–8, 13, perhaps 12).<sup>36</sup> Fr. 83 M. may perhaps have come from the *coda*; its metrical pattern is not

<sup>31</sup> Aptly, ἀρχαῖον at *Ol.* 6.89 intimates that the swine slur is both long-standing and outdated; see also Hutchinson 2001, 416.

<sup>32</sup> A third possible hypothesis, namely that the relevance of Boeotia for the purpose of this line comes from the content of the myth, is precluded by the conclusion reached above on the place of fr. 83 M. within a contrast between past and present. By definition, a mythical narrative is set in the past, so it cannot have been utilised as an argument to glorify the present song *in opposition* to the past. This of course does not preclude that the ode may have indeed contained a Boeotian-related myth; for just one such hypothesis see section IV.

<sup>33</sup> Adorjáni 2014, 48–51, esp. n. 68, reviewing the evidence that connects the name Aineas with Arcadia; Hornblower 2004, 183–184.

<sup>34</sup> So Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 31; Wilamowitz 1922, 343; Bowra 1964, 6–7; Privitera 1970, 124, 127; Tsagarakis 1977, 130–131; Kirkwood 1982, 326–327; van der Weiden 1991, 78–79 and *passim*; Lavecchia 2000, 169–172; Zimmermann<sup>2</sup>2008, 47, 49; Sevieri<sup>2</sup>2010, 202, 204; Olivieri 2011, 146–149; Spelman 2018, 145.

<sup>35</sup> Wilamowitz 1922, 274.

<sup>36</sup> So in modern times Wilamowitz 1922, 274; van Groningen 1955; Bowra 1964, 63; Privitera 1970, 128; Kirkwood 1982, 327–328; Lavecchia 2000, 267–268; Hutchinson 2001, 365; Zimmermann<sup>2</sup>2008, 54–55, 57. Van der Weiden 1991, 195–196 is more hesitant. No obstacle to this interpretation can be found in μελπόμεν·οι, conjectured by Hermann 1817, 300 at v. 11 (μέλπομεν **FMV** and the epitome, μέλπε **P**): the plural subsumes both the poet and the chorus, and the act of dancing in choral performance is ascribed even to the poet alone elsewhere (*Isthm.* 1.7 χορεύων, in a passage that fore-

found exactly in fr. 75 M., suggesting that, if it does belong to the same poem, it will have occurred in an epode. Whatever the exact position of fr. 83 M., and whether the *persona loquens* was the poet or not, on this interpretation we have a poem praising itself and its author while explicitly rebutting a long-standing, widespread slur before an audience who will have been well acquainted with it – and arguably not unsympathetic to its implications. Furthermore, the metapoetic reference to choruses approaching Semele at the end of the proem (fr. 75.19 M.) invites a link between Pindar's Thebanness and Dionysus', bestowing on the poet a further layer of authorisation.

### III 'The first of the *Dithyrambs*'

Scholars have debated for centuries the precise meaning of the phrase  $\epsilon\nu \dots \tau\omega\iota \pi\rho\omega\tau\omega\iota \tau\omega\nu \delta\iota\theta\upsilon\rho\mu\beta\omega\nu$  in schol. *Ol.* 13.25c Drachmann (section I). In theory, two interpretations of the 'first of the *Dithyrambs*' are possible: the first poem (with a word like  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$  or  $\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  implied) or the first book ( $\beta\iota\beta\lambda\omega\iota$  *vel sim.*).<sup>37</sup> What has suggested the first to some is the phrasing of the scholion, which gives a number for the *Dithyrambs* but not for the *Hyporchemes*. Since both the *Dithyrambs* and the *Hyporchemes* had two books each<sup>38</sup> (the argument goes), if the scholiast had wanted to indicate the book where the respective passage was found, he would have done so for both the *Dithyrambs* and the *Hyporchemes*, not only for the former; the fact that he did otherwise indicates that he meant instead the first ode of the *Dithyrambs*, while in the *Hyporchemes* the passage was in an ode other than the first.<sup>39</sup> (As the evidence of papyri shows, in ancient poetry books the individual poems were not numbered sequentially, as they are in modern editions, so the only immediately recognisable position was the first.<sup>40</sup>) But such an argument

---

grounds the authorial function of the speaking 'I'). But D'Alessio 1991, 105 suggests  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\pi\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\cdot\omega\zeta$  in order to retain the transmitted  $\xi\mu\lambda\omega\zeta$  at v. 12 (expunged by Hermann but defended by Farnell 1932, 415), which forestalls the problem altogether; the same does  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\pi\mu\mu\epsilon\nu$  proposed by Boeckh 1821, 576–577. As Lavecchia 2000, 266 points out,  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\nu$  at v. 10 (with which Hermann's  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\pi\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\cdot\omega\zeta$  would have to agree) has a much broader referent than the performer(s) alone. D'Alessio and Boeckh's conjectures are thus superior to Hermann's; which of the two is the true one is harder to say (Lavecchia's argument against D'Alessio's is somewhat literal-minded).

<sup>37</sup> Poem: e.g. Schneider 1776, 46; Wilamowitz 1922, 345; Lehnus 1973, 398–400. Book: e.g. Boeckh 1821, 584; Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 27; Sutton 1989, 35; Filoni 2007, 75–76; cf. Turyn 1948, 290 and already Sylburg 1594, 157 on fr. 72 M.

<sup>38</sup> The list of Pindar's works in the *Vita Ambrosiana*, I p. 3 Drachmann has two books for each; the one in *P.Oxy.* XXVI 2438 gives two books to the *Dithyrambs* (col. ii 36) and only one to the *Hyporchemes* (39). However, the latter falls one book short of the canonical total of 17 (which is known to both biographies as well as to *Suda* π 1617, IV p. 133 Adler), suggesting that the person who copied the papyrus mistakenly gave the *Hyporchemes* one book fewer than their due: Gallo 1968, 77–78.

<sup>39</sup> Lehnus 1973, 398–400.

<sup>40</sup> There are in fact some numbered references to poems other than the first (collected in n. 50 below), but they are very few and, unsurprisingly, they refer to poems near the beginning of the

from stylistics, however logical in the abstract, is intrinsically precarious in a text whose present aspect is the result of centuries of excerption and epitomation, at several removes from any ‘original’ (itself a problematic term in this context).<sup>41</sup> Conversely, usage tips the scales decisively towards the other interpretation: that πρώτωι in the scholion indicates the first book.

ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν παρθενείων in schol. REILH Ar. Ach. 720 Wilson (fr. 94d M.) has also been taken as a reference to the first poem of the *Partheneia*, rather than the first book,<sup>42</sup> but the odds are against it: the corresponding expression ἐν τῷ β' τῶν παρθενείων in the Vienna palimpsest of Herodian, cod. hist. gr. 10 (fr. 94e M.),<sup>43</sup> must ‘mean the second book, not the second poem. As Filoni points out, ἐν τῷ α' [τῷ]ν προσοδίων φέρεται in the marginal scholion to the ‘third triad’ of *Paean* 6 in *P.Oxy.* V 841 (schol. D6 124, p. 304 Rutherford) likewise has to mean ‘it is transmitted in Book 1 of the *Prosodia*: in the *Prosodia* – just as in the *Paeans*, as far as one can tell from the papyrus – the piece was a self-standing composition, not part of another poem.<sup>44</sup> The reference to Didymus’ ὑπομνήματι τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν παιάνων Πινδάρου in Ammon. *Diff.* 231 Nickau (fr. 68 Braswell = °172 Coward-Prodi) does not shift the balance of the question, despite intimations to the contrary.<sup>45</sup> True, Pindar’s *Paeans* only took up one book,<sup>46</sup> which precludes interpretation as a “commentary to the first book”, but Ammonius’ words will not mean “the commentary to the first of Pindar’s *Paeans*” – in whichever sense – unless τῷ πρώτῳ is emended into the genitive;<sup>47</sup> and if one does this, the result-

---

book: the second and the third. Contrast the *scholia metrika* to Pindar’s *Epinicians*, the only case known to me of a (relatively) ancient Greek text numbering odes continuously from the beginning to the end. These, however, are not citations like the ones we are concerned with, in that they are meant to be read together with the text in the first place.

41 Similarly Filoni 2007, 75, blaming “una incoerenza dello scriba”.

42 So Schneider 1776, 18 and the other scholars mentioned by Lehnus 1973, 397 n. 14 (with their opponents listed in n. 13). An extended argument in that direction, including the parallel with our scholion, is provided by Lehnus 1973, 397–400; the contrary view is advocated by Filoni 2007, 75–76 and confirmed by the parallels listed in these paragraphs.

43 Text as published by Hunger 1967, 20; note that the text printed by Maehler is incorrect, based on Hunger’s list of citations in the ms. (p. 5) rather than on his actual edition of the passage. I am grateful to Stefano Vecchiato for alerting me to this problem and for sharing with me his ongoing research on fr. 94e M.

44 Filoni 2007, 75–76. That the piece was a self-standing poem in the *Prosodia* is strongly suggested not only by the scholion itself but also by *P.Oxy.* XXVI 2442 fr. 86, which probably preserves a morsel of its first line, of the title above it, and of the end of the preceding poem: D’Alessio 1997, 37 n. 92, see also Prodi 2013, 54. What suggests the same in the case of the *Paeans* is the presence of an *asteriskos* denoting poem-end after the ‘second triad’ and of a poem-title next to the beginning of the ‘third’ in *P.Oxy.* V 841.

45 Cited in this connection by Lehnus 1973, 397–398; taken for a reference to the first poem already by Wilamowitz 1922, 185.

46 *P.Oxy.* XXVI 2438 col. ii 37; *Vita Ambrosiana*, I p. 3 Drachmann.

47 So emends Wilamowitz 1922, 185.

ing idea that Didymus wrote a whole *hypomnema* on one poem is so strange as to caution against the emendation in the first place.<sup>48</sup>

Similar references by number and title are attested for other lyricists too, and they always indicate book-numbers: Ἀλκμὰν ἐν α' μελῶν (*PMGF* 14(a).3 = fr. 4.3 Calame *ap.* *Erotian.* p. 63 Nachmanson), Σαπφώ ... ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ μελῶν (fr. 101 Voigt *ap.* *Ath.* 9.410d), παρ' Ἀλκαίῳ ... ἐν δευτέρῳ μελῶν (fr. 417 A Voigt = 312 Liberman *ap.* *Poll.* 4.169, 10.113, pp. I 251, II 224 *Bethe*), Ἰβυκος ... ἐν πέμπτῳ μελῶν (*PMGF* 285 *ap.* *Ath.* 2.57f), Ἀνακρέων ἐν τῷ β' τῷ μελῶν (*PMG* 353 *ap.* *Et.Gen.* AB 125, p. 37 Calame = *EM* p. 593 Callierges/col. 1693 Gaisford, cf. *PMG* 352 *ap.* *Ath.* 15.671d), Σιμωνίδης ἐν δευτέρῳ ιάμβων (*Semon.* fr. 11 West = 3 Pellizer-Tedeschi *ap.* *Ath.* *epit.* 2.57d), Ἰππῶναξ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῷ ιάμβων (fr. 42 West = 7 Degani *ap.* *schol.* *Nic.* *Th.* 633, p. 237 Crugnola, fr. 123 West = 12 Degani *ap.* *Poll.* 4.169, I p. 251 *Bethe*, cf. 10.113, II p. 224 *Bethe*), ἐν ... τῷ δευτέρῳ τῷ ιππώνακτος ιάμβων (fr. 118a West = 15 Degani *ap.* *Poll.* 10.19, II p. 195 *Bethe*), and more. Compare the colophon of Sappho's Book 1 in *P.Oxy.* X 1231 fr. 56 ΜΕΛΩΝ Α and the title of an uncertain book of Alcaeus across the *verso* of *P.Oxy.* XXIII 2358 ΑΛΚΑΙΟ[Υ] ΜΕΛΩΝ.<sup>49</sup> To sum up: whenever its referent can be determined, the phrase ἐν (τῷ) [numeral] (τῷ) [title] means "in the *n*<sup>th</sup> book", not "in the *n*<sup>th</sup> poem".

The usage of a form of words as a set phrase, with an established meaning specific to that phrase, trumps the other possible meanings that the form of words in question could theoretically have on the basis of its constituent words and their grammatical relations. We thus do not expect ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῷ διθυράμβων, which the usage just discussed beckons be understood as "in the first book of the *Dithyrambs*", to be used to mean anything other than that. The few explicit citations of the first poem in a book confirm this expectation *e contrario* by using other, unambiguous expressions for this purpose. The opening of the first *Hymn* of Pindar is ἀρχαί ... τῷ Πιγδάρου τοῦ μελοποιοῦ ὕμνων (fr. 29 M. *ap.* *schol.* ψU *Luc.* 58.19, p. 225 Rabe); Anacreon's hymn to Artemis is τὸ πρῶτον Ἀνακρέοντος ἄισμα (*PMG* 348 *ap.* *Heph.* *Poēm.* 4.8, p. 68 *Consbruch*); an extract from the first ode in Book 2 of Alcman's *Partheneia* can be introduced as ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ β' τῷ παρθενείων ἄισμάτων (*PMGF* 16 *ap.* *Steph.* *Byz.* ε 137, II p. 170 *Billerbeck-Zubler*);

<sup>48</sup> For a discussion of the problem see D'Alessio 1997, 45–46; Filoni 2007, 72–75; Braswell 2017<sup>2</sup>, 258–259. Filoni intriguingly proposes deleting ὑπομνήματι as an intrusive gloss and understanding ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ as a reference to the first book, not however of Pindar's *Paeans* (which would be nonsense, for the reasons given above) but of Didymus' commentary, which on this interpretation will have been so long as to comprise several volumes. This is not an impossible contention given what we know of the author: as we read in the colophon of *P.Berol.* inv. 9780 *recto*, Didymus' *On Demosthenes* devoted three whole books to the *Philippics*, and this was a work in Attic which required very little linguistic or stylistic comment, unlike Pindar's poetry. The sort of brachiology that turns "in the commentary to X" into "in X" is well attested in ancient scholarly writings, see Käppel 1992, esp. 46. But one wonders if Filoni's persuasive interpretation of the sense really requires textual intervention, cf. the examples of ἐν τῷ [numeral] ὑπομνήματι indicating "the *n*<sup>th</sup> book" in Strabo and Galen cited by Braswell 2017<sup>2</sup>, 258–259 n. 351.

<sup>49</sup> Either Book 1 (Α) or Book 4 (Δ), given the traces: Lobel 1956.

the first ode in Book 1 of Alcaeus is  $\tauὴν πρώτην ὡιδήν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Ἀλκαίου$  (fr. 307 Voigt *ap. Heph. Poëm.* 3.6, p. 66 Consbruch; again  $\eta$  πρώτη and  $\tauῆς$  ... πρώτης ὡιδῆς in the A scholia, p. 169 Consbruch).<sup>50</sup> Note how  $\tauοῦ β'$  and  $\tauῷ πρώτῳ$  in the last two examples need no qualification to be understood as the number of the book.

#### IV The first Dithyramb?

So, all that schol. *Ol.* 13.25c Drachmann tells us is that the aetiology of the dithyramb (frr. 71 + 85 M., as argued in section I) was found in Book 1 of the *Dithyrambs*.<sup>51</sup> It says nothing about what the first poem in that book might have contained. But there may nonetheless be a piece of evidence for the identification of the opening poem of the *Dithyrambs* if one is willing to look elsewhere.

Fr. 75 M. survives thanks to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who quotes it as an example of the “austere” style of composition (*Comp.* 22.11). In this section of the Περὶ συνθέσεως (ch. 21–24), Dionysius discusses three ways of joining words into sentences (ἀρμονία): the austere (αὐστηρά, 22), the polished (γλαφυρά, 23), and the well-blended (εὔκρατος, 24).<sup>52</sup> For each of the first two he gives examples from both poetry and prose. Those of the austere style are fr. 75 M. of Pindar and the opening of Thucydides’ *Histories* (1.1.1–1.2.2); those of the polished style, the first poem in the first book of Sappho (fr. 1 Voigt) and the opening of Isocrates’ *Areopagiticus* (1–4). The last three of these four passages can be placed with certainty within their respective book: they all constitute its very beginning. This fact raises the prospect that fr. 75 M. too may have been a beginning: that of Pindar’s *Dithyrambs*. While the citation context in Dionysius cannot be said to be definitive proof that the poem of which fr. 75 M. was the opening was the first *Dithyramb*,<sup>53</sup> it is an

<sup>50</sup> The same goes for the few explicit citations of poems in places other than the first: the second ode ( $\tauὴν δευτέραν$ , fr. 308 Voigt) in Book 1 of Alcaeus in the passage of Hephaestion just cited; the third ( $\eta$  δέ τρίτη, fr. 343 Voigt = 308 A Liberman) in *P.Oxy.* XXXV 2734 (CLGP I 1.1 Alcaeus 15) frr. 1 + 12; the second ode of Alcman ( $\eta$  τῇ δευτέρᾳ ὡιδῇ, *PMGF* 2) in Hdn. *Fig.*, *RhG* III p. 101 Spengel; the second poem ( $\beta'$  τέτακται) in an uncertain book of Sappho in *PSI Com.* 6 7 (Prauscello 2005 suggests Book 1); and indeed the second Psalm ( $\eta$  τῷ ψαλμῷ ... τῷ δευτέρῳ) in *Acts* 13:33.

<sup>51</sup> Likewise for fr. 72 M. (*EM* p. 460 Callierges/col. 1317 Gaisford), which accordingly there is no reason to join to ours, as advocated by Lehnus 1973, 398 and Lavecchia 2000, 274–276 and accepted by Hornblower 2004, 145, 152; see further n. 17 above. The same conclusion will apply to fr. 94d M. (schol. *RETLh Ar. Ach.* 720 Wilson) cited above, from Book 1 of the *Partheneia*.

<sup>52</sup> I borrow the English translation of these three terms from Usher 1985, 167.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. the next section (ch. 25–26), on “how language without metre is made to resemble a beautiful poem or lyric, and how a poem or song is made similar to beautiful prose” (transl. Usher). It examines four principal examples: the opening of Demosthenes’ *Against Aristocrates* (23), the beginning of Book 14 of the *Odyssey*, the first few lines of the prologue of Euripides’ *Telephus* (fr. 696 Kannicht), and Simonides’ Danae fragment (*PMG* 543 = fr. 271 Poltera). Of all these, the only one which does not certainly constitute the beginning of a book – *a fortiori*, since it does not seem to come from even the beginning of a poem – is the last one. So, whereas one cannot institute a rule that Dionysius

important piece of circumstantial evidence which future editors would do well to consider.

In an earlier article I suggested that the first *Dithyramb* may nevertheless have been fr. 71 M., even though this conclusion was not imposed by the text of the scholion, and that the poem in question may have been composed for Pindar's home city of Thebes, as had long been surmised by others.<sup>54</sup> If the argument presented in the previous paragraph hits the mark, the first *Dithyramb* – fr. 75 M. – was an Athenian rather than a Theban poem. But, if we put aside Thebes as the location of the performance, it is not impossible that frr. 71 + 85 M. come from that first *Dithyramb* nonetheless. Vv. 8–13 of fr. 75 M. intimates that the subject of the poem will be Dionysus, and v. 19 hints that Semele – who was not a cult figure in fifth-century Athens – will play a role in the narrative.<sup>55</sup> Taken together, these two elements suggest a myth centred on the birth of Dionysus,<sup>56</sup> such as we also infer from frr. 71 + 85 M.<sup>57</sup> That myth, combined with the aetiology of the dithyramb, would make the poem a very fitting one to open the book of the *Dithyrambs*, as the earlier article argued.

Furthermore, if Wilamowitz was right to assign fr. 83 M. to the same composition as fr. 75 M., then that composition made explicit reference to Thebes in an encomiastic context which suggests a reference to the person of the poet (section

---

only cites extensively from the beginning of books, in this part of *Comp.* he does so much more often than not. Especially in a section exploring styles which are ascribed to *authors* rather than to particular passages, such as the one under discussion (ch. 21–24), it makes argumentative sense for Dionysius to have illustrated his point with (ostensibly) the first bit of text which came his way rather than with a specially selected example, thus forestalling any suspicion of cherry-picking the evidence.

<sup>54</sup> Prodi 2017, 568–569. Fr. 71 M. had been localised in Thebes by, among others, Wilamowitz 1922, 345; Puech <sup>3</sup>1961, 155 n. 3; Lehnus 1979, 45; and, dubitatively, Lavecchia 2000, 276. This assumption was challenged by Kleingünther 1933, 136 (a *Dithyramb* of Pindar could have discussed the birthplace of the dithyramb as a matter of literary history, without interference from local patriotism) and Hornblower 2004, 152 (suggesting a Chian context for frr. 71–74 M. together, but see n. 17 above).

<sup>55</sup> On the connection between Semele and dithyrambs – arguably occasioned by the genre's specific connection with the birth of Dionysus, and not always predicated on the actual telling of a myth centred around Semele – see Ieranò 1997, 162–165.

<sup>56</sup> So already Sutton 1989, 39, who conjectures Σεμέλη as the poem's title.

<sup>57</sup> A further point is admittedly a stretch, but not too great a stretch to mention. In fr. 75.7–10 M., the *persona loquens* claims to be 'proceed[ing] from Zeus with splendor of song secondly to that ivy-knowing god, whom we mortals call Bromios and Eriboas' (transl. Race). According to one attractive interpretation, first proposed by Boeckh 1821, 578 and adopted by some modern scholars – e.g. Keyßner 1932, 11; Puech <sup>3</sup>1961, 153 n. 3; Race 1997, II 311 n. 2; Wilson 2003, 169–170; Neer and Kurke 2014, 564–566 – the reference is to the trajectory of the song from Zeus ( $\Delta\iota\theta\epsilon\nu$ , v. 7), the first god to be evoked, to Dionysus, mentioned second ( $\delta\varepsilon\acute{u}\tau\epsilon\rho\nu$ , v. 8). A possible connexion with fr. 85 M. is that the latter fragment tells how Dionysus was born from Zeus and how the name of the dithyramb – which is also one of Dionysus' own names – arose from the words Zeus uttered on that occasion. If the two fragments belonged to the same composition, it would be easy for the audience to understand retrospectively those few lines in the opening as not only describing performatively the train of thought of the opening itself, but also as foreshadowing the content of the mythical narrative that followed.

II). Such a reference may have been self-contained, like the similar one in *Olympian* 6; but it may also have been connected to something else in the poem, like the self-reference by the Theban *persona loquens* in fr. 70b M. If the latter is true in our case, one can easily imagine that the poem demonstrated its Boeotian author's unswinelike skill not only with the evidence of its own *mousike* but also by associating him, *via* his home city, with the birth of its genre's patron deity and with that of the genre itself.

Correspondence:

Enrico Emanuele Prodi  
 Magdalen College  
 Oxford OX1 4AU  
 United Kingdom  
 enrico.prodi@classics.ox.ac.uk

## Bibliography

Adorjáni, Zs. (2014) *Pindars sechste olympische Siegesode*, Leiden/Boston.

Bergk, Th. (1853) *Poetae lyrici Graeci*, Lipsiae.

Boeckh, A. (1821) *Pindari opera quae supersunt*, II/2: *Pindari epiniorum interpretatio Latina cum commentario perpetuo, fragmenta et indices*, Lipsiae.

Bowra, C.M. (1964) *Pindar*, Oxford.

Braswell, B.K. (2017<sup>2</sup>) *Didymos of Alexandria. Commentary on Pindar*, Basel.

Briand, M. (2014) *Pindare. Olympiques*, Paris.

Cellerini, A. (1988) *Introduzione all'Etymologicum Genuinum*, Roma.

D'Alessio, G.B. (1991) "Osservazioni e paralipomeni ad una nuova edizione dei frammenti di Pindaro", *RFIC* 119: 91–117.

D'Alessio, G.B. (1997) "Pindar's Prosodia and the classification of Pindaric papyrus fragments", *ZPE* 118: 23–60.

D'Alessio, G.B. (1999) "Su di un papiro berlinese di lirica corale (P. Berol. inv. 13411 = Pind. fr. 52N S.M.)", *ZPE* 126: 15–25.

D'Alessio, G.B. (2013) "The name of the dithyramb: diachronic and diatopic variations", in Kowalzig and Wilson (eds.) 2013: 113–132.

D'Angour, A. (1997) "How the dithyramb got its shape", *CQ* 47: 331–351.

Del Corno, D. (1974) "P. Berol. 9751 verso über den Dithyrambos: Pindar und die Poetik des Aristoteles", in E. Kießling and H.-A. Rupprecht (eds.), *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses*, München: 99–110.

Dihle, A. (2002) "Zu den Fragmenten eines Dionysos-Hymnus", *RhM* 145: 427–430.

Farnell, L.R. (1932) *The Works of Pindar*, II: Critical Commentary, London.

Fearn, D. (2007) *Bacchylides. Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*, Oxford.

Ferrari, F. (1991) "Tre papiri pindarici. In margine ai frr. 52n (a), 94a, 94b, 169a Maehler", *RFIC* 119: 385–407.

Filoni, A. (2007) *Il peana di Pindaro per Dodona (frr. 57–60 M.)*, Milano.

Gallo, I. (1968) *Una nuova biografia di Pindaro (POxy. 2438)*, Salerno.

Gentili, B. et al. (2013) *Pindaro. Le Olimpiche*, Milano.

Grandolini, S. (1999) "Didimo e la classificazione della poesia lirica", GIF 50: 1–22.

Grenfell, B.P. and A.S. Hunt (1919) "1604. Pindar, Dithyrambs", in The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII, London: 27–45.

van Groningen, B.A. (1955) "Ad Pindari dithyrambi fragmentum 75 S.", *Mnemosyne* s. IV 8: 192.

Hamilton, R. (1990) "The Pindaric dithyramb", *HSCP* 93: 211–222.

Hermann, G. (1817) *Dissertationes Pindaricae*, IV: *Notae ad Pindarum*, in Ch.G. Heyne, *Pindari carmina*, III/1, Lipsiae: 276–410.

Hornblower, S. (2004) *Thucydides and Pindar. Historical Narrative and the World of Epikian Poetry*, Oxford.

Hunger, H. (1967) "Palimpsest-Fragmente aus Herodians Καθολικὴ Προσωιδία, Buch 5–7", *JÖByz* 16: 1–33.

Hunter, R. and Th. Fuhrer (2002) "Imaginary gods? Poetic theology in the Hymns of Callimachus", in F. Montanari and L. Lehnus (eds), *Callimaque* (Entr. Hardt 48), Vandœuvres/Genève: 143–75.

Hutchinson, G.O. (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*, Oxford.

Ieranò, G. (1997) *Il ditirambo di Dioniso. Le testimonianze antiche*, Pisa/Roma.

Käppel, L. (1992) "Pindar, Pae. Fr. 67, 68, 69, 70 + \*249b Sn.–M.", *RhM* 135: 44–48.

Keyßner, K. (1932) *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung in griechischen Hymnus*, Stuttgart.

Kirkwood, G. (1982) *Selections from Pindar*, Chico (CA).

Kleingünther, A. (1933) *Πρῶτος εὑρετής: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung*, Leipzig.

Kowalzig, B. and P. Wilson (eds.) (2013), *Dithyramb in Context*, Oxford.

Kurke, L. (2012) "The value of chorality in ancient Greece", in J.K. Papadopoulos and G. Urton (eds.), *The Construction of Value in the Ancient World*, Los Angeles: 218–235.

Lambrinoudakis, V. and Gruben, G. (1987) "Das neuentdeckte Heiligtum von Iria auf Naxos", *AA* 1987: 569–621.

Lambrinoudakis, V. (1989) "Neues zur Ikonographie der Dirke", in H.-U. Cain, H. Gabeln, and D. Salzmann (eds), *Beiträge zur Ikonographie und Hermeneutik. Festschrift für Nikolaus Himmelmann*, Mainz am Rhein: 341–350.

Lavecchia, S. (1996) "P. Oxy. 2622 e il 'secondo ditirambo' di Pindaro", *ZPE* 110: 1–26.

Lavecchia, S. (2000) *Pindari Dithyramborum fragmenta*, Romae/Pisis.

Lavecchia, S. (2013) "Becoming like Dionysos: dithyramb and Dionysian initiation", in Kowalzig and Wilson (eds.) 2013: 59–75.

Lehnus, L. (1973) "Una glossa pindarica in Corinna di Tanagra", *IRL* 107: 393–422.

Lehnus, L. (1979) *L'Inno a Pan di Pindaro*, Milano.

Lightfoot, J. (2019) "Something to do with Dionysus? Dolphins and dithyramb in Pindar fragment 236 SM", *CPh* 114: 481–492.

Lobel, E. (1956) "2358. Alcaeus, Book i or iv (?)", in The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXIII, London: 10.

Lobel, E. (1967) "2622. Lyric verses", in The Oxyrhynchus Papyry XXXII, London: 63–66.

Maehler, H. (1989) *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, II: *Fragmenta. Indices*, Leipzig.

Naoumides, M. (1979) "The v-recension of St. Cyril's Lexicon", *ICS* 4: 94–135.

Neer, R.T. and L. Kurke (2014) "Pindar Fr. 75 SM and the politics of Athenian space", *GRBS* 54: 527–579.

Olivieri, O. (2011) *Miti e culti tebani nella poesia di Pindaro*, Pisa/Roma.

Peponi, A.-E. (2013) “Dithyramb in Greek thought: the problem of choral mimesis”, in Kowalzig and Wilson (eds.) 2013: 353–367.

Prauscello, L. (2005) “7. Note di commento a testi poetici”, in *Comunicazioni dell’Istituto papirologico G. Vitelli* 6, Firenze: 51–67.

Privitera, G.A. (1970) *Dioniso in Omero e nella poesia greca arcaica*, Roma.

Prodi, E.E. (2013) “P.Oxy. 2448 (Pi. fr. 215 Sn.-M.) and Pindar’s Prosodia”, *ZPE* 185: 53–59.

Prodi, E.E. (2016) “Titles and markers of poem-end in the papyri of Greek choral lyric”, in T. Derda, A. Łajtar, and J. Urbanik (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Papyrology*, Warsaw: II 1137–1184.

Prodi, E.E. (2017) “Text as paratext: Pindar, Sappho, and Alexandrian editions”, *GRBS* 57: 547–582.

Prodi, E.E. (2020) “Didymus and Lyric”, in T.R.P. Coward and E.E. Prodi (eds.), *Didymus and Greco-Roman Learning* (BICS 63/2): 21–33.

Puech, A. (3<sup>1961</sup>) *Pindare*, IV: *Isthmiques et fragments*, Paris.

Race, W.H. (1997) *Pindar*, Cambridge (MA)/London.

Rutherford, I. and J. Irvine (1988) “The race in the Athenian Oschophoria and an oschophorikon by Pindar”, *ZPE* 72: 43–51.

Schöpsdau, K. (1994) *Platon. Werke*, IX.2: *Nomoi (Gesetze)*, Göttingen.

Schneider, J.G. (1776) *Carminum Pindaricorum fragmenta*, Argentorati.

Schroeder, O. (2<sup>1914</sup>), (3<sup>1930</sup>) *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis selectis*, Lipsiae.

Schroeder, O. (6<sup>1923</sup>) *Pindari carmina*, Lipsiae/Berolini.

Sevieri, R. (2<sup>2010</sup>) *Pindaro. Frammenti*, Milano.

Simantoni-Bournia, E. (2000) “Les premières phases du sanctuaire d’Hyria d’après les objets retrouvés”, *RA* n.s. 1: 209–219.

Simantoni-Bournia, E. (2006) “Μύθοι και παραδόσεις της αρχαίας Νάξου”, in M. Sergis and S. Psarras (eds.), *Νάξος. Αρμενίζοντας στο χρόνο*, [Athens]: 87–94.

Snell, B. (1<sup>1953</sup>) *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, Lipsiae.

Spelman, H. (2018) *Pindar and the Poetics of Performance*, Oxford.

Sutton, D.F. (1989) *Dithyrambographi Graeci*, Hildesheim/München/Zürich.

Sylburg, F. (1594) *Ἐτυμολογικὸν τὸ μέγα, ἥγουν ἡ μεγάλη γραμματική. Etymologicum Magnum, seu magnum grammaticae penu(m)*. II: In *etymologicon graecum notae Friderici Sylburgi*, [Heidelberg].

Tosi, R. (16<sup>2007</sup>) *Dizionario delle sentenze latine e greche*, Milano.

Tsagarakis, O. (1977) *Self-Expression in Early Greek Lyric Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*, Wiesbaden.

Usher, S. (1985) *Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The Critical Essays*, II, Cambridge (MA)/London.

van der Weiden, M.J.H. (1991) *The Dithyrambs of Pindar*, Amsterdam.

West, M.L. (2003) *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer*, Cambridge (MA)/London.

West, M.L. (2011) “The first Homeric Hymn to Dionysus”, in A. Faulkner (ed.), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, Oxford: 29–43.

West, M.L. (2012) “Towards a chronology of early Greek epic”, in Ø. Andersen and D.T.T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, Cambridge: 224–241.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1922) *Pindaros*, Berlin.

Wilson, P. (2000) The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage, Cambridge.

Wilson, P. (2003) "The politics of dance: dithyrambic contest and social order in ancient Greece", in D.J. Phillips and D. Pritchard (eds.), Sport and Festivals in the Ancient Greek World. Swansea: 163–196.

Zimmermann, B. (2008) *Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung*, Berlin.