

Reading Pindar in Antiquity

Autor(en): **Braswell, Bruce Karl**

Objektyp: **Article**

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

Band (Jahr): **69 (2012)**

Heft 1

PDF erstellt am: **16.05.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-283554>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Reading Pindar in Antiquity

By Bruce Karl Braswell, Fribourg

Abstract: The extensive corpus of the scholia on the epinikia of Pindar provides ample evidence of how ancient readers interpreted this difficult and often elusive poetry. Their approach is well illustrated in the exegesis on the *Ninth Nemean* written to celebrate a victory in a chariot race by the Sicilian statesman Chromios. Notable is the use of historians to explain references in the text. The routine device of paraphrase occasionally helps in choosing the right reading. The frequent quotation of parallels from Pindar himself as well as from other poets shows how they situated the ode in its literary and linguistic tradition. Although their naïve understanding of etymology is an obvious weakness in their interpretation, it does offer a clue to why they found on occasion unexpected relevance in the text. In general however the interests of ancient readers were not very different from those of modern readers, who have good reason to be thankful that their predecessors preserved much invaluable information.

Ancient scholars reading Pindar were faced with many of the same problems which confront the poet's modern readers: the language was in part unfamiliar, the historical allusions often unclear, the mythical references sometimes obscure or at variance with tradition, the style frequently baffling with its conciseness and unexpected shifts in the narrative. When ancient scholars read Pindar, what did they consider needed explanation? Were they interested in the same things which interest us? Did they understand the texts in a way very different from our approach? Can we learn anything from them which we do not already know or could not discover on our own from the texts themselves?

Although not a single commentary on Pindar has survived from antiquity except in fragments, we do possess abundant evidence in the *scholia vetera* which can help us answer these questions in part. The very bulk of the material available, amounting to almost 1000 pages in the Teubner edition of A.B. Drachmann,¹ precludes anything like a comprehensive approach.² Instead I should like to discuss examples drawn from a single ode which will illustrate some aspects of Pindaric exegesis. For convenience I have chosen the *Ninth Nemean* not only

1 Drachmann (1903); (1910); (1927).

2 The absence of a comprehensive study of the Pindaric scholia is compensated in part by Lehrs (1873) (criticism in Bergk (1878)), Deas (1931), and Calvani Mariotti (1987). Gudemann (1921) 647–652, is not without use as a brief survey, while Irigoin (1952) 31–75, provides a valuable discussion of the known ancient scholars whose works were excerpted in the scholia. A renewed interest in the Pindaric scholia is evinced by the recent collective volume *Traduire les scholies de Pindare* (2009).

because I have had occasion elsewhere to deal with the problems presented by it,³ but, more importantly, because it is an ode commemorating the achievements of an historical figure of some importance and, accordingly, one for whom ancient scholars could supply independent information. The *Ninth Nemean* was written to celebrate a victory in a chariot race by Chromios, a partisan of the Deinomenid dynasty in Syracuse, who was then acting as regent of Aitna (Κατάνη) for the young son of his brother-in-law Hieron. The probable date of the ode is not too long before 470, if Wilamowitz was right in arguing that the *First Pythian* of that year commemorates the installation of Hieron's son Deinomenes as king of Aitna.⁴ The *Ninth Nemean*, we may add, presented a special problem for the Alexandrian classification and edition of the Pindaric text, since it does not celebrate a victory in the Nemean Games but one in the Pythian Games at Sikyon. This was solved by placing it as the first of three miscellaneous odes in an appendix at the end of the Nemean collection which itself originally occupied the last position in the edition of the four books of the epinikia.

1. Citation of Historians

1.1 As the first example of the ancient exegesis of the *Ninth Nemean* I have chosen the only one which the *scholia vetera* on the ode assign to a scholar by name. It is scholion 95a on verse 40 where Pindar mentions “the steep banks of the Heloros” as the place where Chromios first gained fame as a warrior in his youth. Here the scholia have preserved a long extract from the *Commentary on Pindar* by the prolific scholar Didymos who was active in Alexandria at the end of the Ptolemaic era:⁵

Around this river (the Heloros) Hippokrates, the tyrant of Gela, fought a battle against the Syracusans, and Gelon, whose comrade-in-arms this man (Chromios) was, commanded the cavalry for Hippokrates on that occasion. He (Pindar) says it was in this battle that Chromios displayed many feats of arms during the fighting. In book ten Timaios (*FGrHist* 566 F 18, 6ff.) has given an account of the battle. “For”, says Didymos (fr. 52, p. 235 Schmidt = fr. 59 Braswell), “we cannot find any other fight at all around the Heloros of tyrants who were contemporary with Chromios except that of Gelon together with Hippokrates against the Syracusans. That Hippokrates did in fact appoint Gelon to command the cavalry is made clear by Timaios (*FGrHist* 566 F 18, 10ff.) when he writes as follows: ‘After the death of Kleandros, because Gelon had stayed at his post and also because Hippokrates wished to please the people of Gela, he sent for Gelon and urged him to action, handing over to him the command of all his cavalry’. And that also Gelon associ-

3 Braswell (1998).

4 Wilamowitz 1901, 1282, n. 1 (= (1972) 244, n. 1); (1922) 296–304. On the date of the ode see further Braswell (1992) 25–27.

5 On Didymos and his Pindar commentary see Braswell (2011) and esp. Braswell (forthcoming).

ated Chromios with himself as comrade-in-arms is clear again from what Timaios says when he writes as follows in book twelve (*FGrHist* 566 F 21, 6ff.): ‘After him (i.e. in rank probably referring to Gelon’s brother Polyzēlos) he appointed his brothers-in-law Aristonous and Chromios guardians of his son. For Gelon had given his sisters to them in marriage’.”⁶

Clearly Didymos took the trouble to look up and cite the relevant text from Timaios’ history of Sicily in order to explain historical references in Pindar. In this respect his method is no different from that of a modern scholar, and, in the case of his comment on *Ne.* 9. 40, we may be sure that he was right.

1.2 In the otherwise anonymous scholia on *Nemean Nine* historical authorities are likewise cited on occasion to explain both details of the text and general background. An example of the latter is provided by the *inscriptio* to the ode:

About the Pythian Games in Sikyon the Halikarnassian writes as follows: ... he says that during the war (i.e. the First Sacred War) when the Krisaeans were easily bringing in supplies by sea and because of this the siege was dragging on, Kleisthenes of Sikyon provided a fleet on his own and closed off their food supply, and on account of this service they gave Kleisthenes and the Sikyonians a third of the spoils. From this the Sikyonians first established their Pythian Games.⁷

6 Sch. *Ne.* 9.95a (III 159, 13–160, 6 Dr. = fr. 52, pp. 235–236 Schmidt = fr. 59 Braswell) βαθυκρήμνοισι δ’ ἄμφ’ ἅκταῖς Ἐλῶρον· περὶ τοῦτον τὸν ποταμὸν συνέστη Ἴπποκράτει τῷ Γελῶων τυράνῳ πρὸς Συρακουσίους πόλεμος· ὁ δὲ Γέλων, (οὗ) οὗτος ἑταῖρος, ἱππάρχει τότε Ἴπποκράτει. ἐν δὴ τούτῳ φησὶ τῷ πολέμῳ Χρόμιον ἐπιδείξασθαι πολλὰ ἔργα κατὰ τὴν μάχην. περὶ δὲ τοῦτου τοῦ πολέμου Τίμαιος ἐν τῇ ι’ (*FGrHist* 566 F 18, 6ff.) δεδήλωκε. “καθάπαξ γάρ”, φησὶν ὁ Δίδυμος, “οὐδεμίαν ἄλλην μάχην ἔχομεν εὐρεῖν περὶ τὸν Ἐλῶρον τῶν συνηκμακότων τῷ Χρομίῳ τυράννων, ὅτι μὴ σὺν Ἴπποκράτει τοῦ Γέλωνος πρὸς Συρακουσίους. ὅτι μὲν οὖν Γέλωνα ἱππαρχεῖν κατέστησεν Ἴπποκράτης, σαφὲς ὁ Τίμαιος ποιήσει γράφων οὕτως (*FGrHist* 566 F 18, 10ff.)· “Ἴπποκράτης δὲ μετὰ τὴν Κλεάνδρου τελευτὴν ἅμα μὲν τοῦ Γέλωνος ἐν τῇ τεταγμένῃ μεμενηκότος, ἅμα δὲ τοῖς Γελῶσι χαρίσασθαι βουλόμενος, μεταπεμψάμενος αὐτὸν καὶ παρακαλέσας ἐπὶ τὰς πράξεις, ἀπάντων τῶν ἱππέων τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐκείνῳ παρέδωκεν”. ὅτι δὲ καὶ ὁ Γέλων τῷ Χρομίῳ ἐχρήτο ἑταίρῳ, δῆλον πάλιν ἐξ ὧν φησι Τίμαιος ἐν τῇ ιβ’ γράφων οὕτως (*FGrHist* 566 F 21, 6ff.): “ἐπιτρόπους δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς μετ’ ἐκείνον κατέστησεν Ἀριστόνουν καὶ Χρόμιον τοὺς κηδεστάς· τοῦτοις γὰρ ὁ Γέλων δέδωκε τὰς ἀδελφάς”.

7 Sch. *Ne.* 9, *inscriptio* (III 149, 14–22 Dr.) Περὶ τῶν ἐν Σικυῶνι Πυθίων ὁ Ἀλικαρνασεὺς οὕτω γράφει· ... (Iac. ind. Boeckh et Dr.) φησὶ δὲ ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῶν Κρισαίων κατὰ θάλασσαν ῥαδίως τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ποριζομένων καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μακρᾶς γινομένης τῆς πολιορκίας, Κλεισθένην τὸν Σικυώνιον ναυτικὸν ἰδίᾳ παρασκευάσαντα κωλύσαι τὴν σιτοπομπίαν αὐτῶν, καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν εὐεργεσίαν τὸ τρίτον τῶν λαφύρων ἔδωκεν τῷ Κλεισθένει καὶ Σικυωνίοις. ἄφ’ οὗ καὶ Σικυῶνιοι τὰ Πύθια πρῶτον παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς ἔθεσαν.

To explain the establishment of the Pythian Games at Sikyon the scholia cite, in an evidently abbreviated form, an historian whom they refer to simply as “the Halikarnassian”. His identity remains uncertain.⁸

1.3 In any case, this probable historical information is subsequently used in scholion 20 to explain the reason for Pindar’s anachronistic attribution of the foundation of the games to Adrastus (presumably also in *Is.* 3/4.44):

He (sc. Pindar) attributes the founding of the Pythian Games in Sikyon to Adrastus making use of poetic licence, although it was Kleisthenes who established them, as has been shown (sch. inscr.). [He does so] in order to make the contest appear more distinguished.⁹

Pindar’s use of “poetic licence”, as the scholia term it, increases in turn the prestige of the victor. Historical knowledge has thus contributed to an understanding of the poet’s encomiastic technique. In this the ancient scholar, whoever he may have been, was surely more perceptive than later critics such as Farnell who ascribed Pindar’s attribution of the foundation of the games to Adrastus to his dislike of Kleisthenes.¹⁰ Parenthetically we may add, Farnell’s “knowledge” that Pindar disliked Kleisthenes was presumably based on the unexpressed syllogism: “Pindar was an aristocrat, Kleisthenes was antiaristocratic, therefore

8 It is unlikely that Herodotos is meant, since the section on Kleisthenes in book five (67–68) makes no mention of the foundation of the games. Wilamowitz ((1889) 185, n. 125) plausibly identified the Halikarnassian as Dionysios ὁ μουσικός, a contemporary of Hadrian, who may have quoted Menaichmos of Sikyon (cf. sch. 30a quoted in n.11 below) whose name was possibly lost in the lacuna (so Deas (1931) 29 and Griffin (1979) 241–246 without mention of Wilamowitz and Deas). Lefkowitz (1985), 277 (= (1991) 155) understands the Halikarnassian to refer to Herodotos and then criticizes the scholia for claiming to base their information on him and not realizing that Kleisthenes “was in fact reconstituting a poetic contest that had originally been held in honour of Adrastus”. An original poetic contest for Adrastus is an inference from two statements in *Hdt.* 5.67.1 Κλεισθένης γὰρ Ἀργείοισι πολεμήσας τοῦτο μὲν ῥαψωδοὺς ἔπαυσε ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀγωνίζεσθαι τῶν Ὀμηρείων ἐπέων εἵνεκα, ὅτι Ἀργεῖοί τε καὶ Ἄργος τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ὑμνέεται (“For Kleisthenes, when he had gone to war with the Argives, put an end to the rhapsodes’ contests at Sikyon on account of the Homeric poems because the Argives and Argos are the main subject celebrated in them”) and 5.67.5 τὰ τε δὴ ἄλλα οἱ Σικυῶνιοι ἐτίμων τὸν Ἀδρηστον καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγέραιρον, τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον οὐ τιμώντες, τὸν δὲ Ἀδρηστον. Κλεισθένης δὲ χοροὺς μὲν τῷ Διονύσῳ ἀπέδωκε (“Besides other honours paid to Adrastus by the Sikyonians, they celebrated his misfortunes with tragic choruses in honour not of Dionysos but of Adrastus. Kleisthenes however gave the choruses back to Dionysos”). Even if we count the cyclic *Thebaid* as well as the *Iliad* as Homeric, their narratives are not the equivalent of a contest held in honour of Adrastus, while the tragic choruses in his honour are hardly the equivalent of the Pythian Games which Pindar ascribes to his foundation. The latter were athletic, not musical contests; v. further Griffin (1982) 158.

9 Sch. *Ne.* 9.20 (III 152, 4–9 Dr.) ἀνατίθησι γὰρ τὴν τῶν Πυθίων θέσιν ἐν Σικυῶνι Ἀδράστῳ, ποιητικὴν ἄγων ἄδειαν, Κλεισθένην αὐτὰ διαθέντος, καθὰ δεδήλωται, ἵν’ οὖν ἐνδοξότερον ἀποφῇ τὸν ἀγῶνα.

10 Farnell (1932) 310.

Pindar disliked Kleisthenes”. Here ancient criticism was definitely superior to impressionistic explanations of Pindar all too common before the middle of the last century.

1.4 The use of historical authority in the anonymous scholia to explain a detail of the text is, in turn, well illustrated in scholion 30a where three historians are successively cited on verse 13 to explain how the Argive Adrastus came to be king in Sikyon:

Concerning the removal of Adrastus to Sikyon Herodotos says as follows (5.674): “the Sikyonians were accustomed to pay very great honours to Adrastus. This land was in fact [under the rule] of Polybos. Now Adrastus was the son of Polybos’ daughter, and Polybos, when he died without a son, gave the land (‘rule’ MSS Her.) to Adrastus”. And Menaichmos of Sikyon writes as follows (*FGrHist* 131 F 10): “After much time had passed the king of Argos Pronax, the son of Talaos and Lysimache, the daughter of Polybos, died, having been overthrown by Amphiaraios, the Melampodidai, and the Anaxagoridai. Adrastus, the brother of Pronax, went in exile to Sikyon, and when he inherited the kingship of Polybos, his mother’s father, he ruled in Sikyon and founded the sanctuary of Hera called the Alea at the place where he settled. The sanctuary received this title on account of Adrastus, when in exile, founding and calling [it] the sanctuary of Hera Alea”. Some call φυγεῖν (‘to be in exile’) ἀλάσθαι (‘to wander’). Dieuchidas in the third book of his *Megarika* (*FGrHist* 485 F 3) says that “the grave of Adrastus in Sikyon is a cenotaph and that he is buried in Megara”.¹¹

All that was needed to explain why Adrastus became the ruler of Sikyon was contained in the quotation from Herodotos and in the first part of that from Menaichmos. The bit of antiquarian lore about the sanctuary of Hera Alea in Sikyon with an etymology of the name¹² is irrelevant to the point in question, but reveals the wider interest of an ancient reader. Fortunately for scholars interested in the local cults of Sikyon and Megara the scribe responsible for the archetype of our

11 Sch. *Nr.* 9.30a (III 152,19–153,10 Dr.) περὶ τῆς Ἀδράστου εἰς Σικυῶνα μεταστάσεως Ἡρόδοτος μὲν οὕτω φησὶν (5.674) · “οἱ δὲ Σικυῶνιοι εἰώθεισαν μεγαλωστέα κάρτα τιμᾶν τὸν Ἀδρηστον· ἡ γὰρ χώρα αὐτῇ ἦν Πολύβου ὁ δὲ Ἀδρηστος ἦν Πολύβου θυγατριδέος· ἅπας δὲ ὁ Πόλυβος τελευτῶν διδοῖ Ἀδρήστῳ τὴν χώραν (ἀρχήν codd. Her.)”. Μέναιχμος δὲ ὁ Σικυῶνιος οὕτω γράφει (*FGrHist* 131 F 10) · “χρόνου παρελθόντος πολλοῦ Πρώναξ μὲν ὁ Ταλαοῦ καὶ Λυσιμάχης τῆς Πολύβου βασιλεύων Ἀργείων ἀποθνήσκει, καταστασιασθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀμφιαράου καὶ τῶν Μελαμποδιδῶν καὶ τῶν Ἀναξαγοριδῶν· Ἀδραστος δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Πρώνακτος φυγὼν ἦλθεν εἰς Σικυῶνα, καὶ τὴν Πολύβου τοῦ μητροπάτορος βασιλείαν παραλαβὼν ἐβασίλευσε τῆς Σικυῶνος, καὶ τὸ τῆς Ἥρας τῆς Ἀλέας καλουμένης ἱερὸν καθ’ ὅνπερ ὄκει τόπον ἰδρύσατο· τὴν δὲ ἐπωνυμίαν ἔλαβε ταύτην τὸ ἱερὸν διὰ τὸ φεύγοντα τὸν Ἀδραστον ἰδρύσασθαι καὶ καλέσαι ἱερὸν Ἥρας Ἀλέας”. τὸ δὲ φυγεῖν τινες ἀλάσθαι ὠνόμαζον· Διευχίδας δὲ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῶν Μεγαρικῶν (*FGrHist* 485 F 3) · “τὸ μὲν κενήριον τοῦ Ἀδράστου ἐν Σικυῶνι φησιν, ἀποκεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν Μεγάροις”.

12 In fact Alea is not from ἀλάσθαι (‘to wander’, ‘to be banished’); the noun ἀλέα (‘escape’) is from the related form ἀλέομαι; v. Frisk (1973), 66 s.v. ἀλέα.

scholion did not excise the extraneous information which usefully supplements what we find in Pausanias.¹³

After the direct quotations from the three historians Herodotos, Menaichmos, and Dieuchidas to explain the reference to Adrastos in verse 13, the second part of the scholion (30b) continues with an anonymous account:

Some however say that Proitos was king in Argos and that when his daughters went mad,¹⁴ Melampous the seer arrived. When he (sc. Proitos) agreed to a wage of two parts of his kingdom, he purified them. After doing so, he received [his part] as promised, and shared half with his brother Bias and kept half for himself so that the whole kingdom was divided into three parts, [that of] the Melampodidai, the Biantidai, and the Proitidai. Now Melampous' son was Antiphates, whose son was Oïkles, whose son was Amphiaraios. Bias' son was Talaos, whose son was Adrastos. Proitos' son was Megapenthes, whose son was Hipponous, whose son was Kapaneus, whose son was Sthenelos. A quarrel arose between Amphiaraios together with his followers and Adrastos together with his, with the result that Talaos was killed by Amphiaraios and that Adrastos fled in exile to Sikyon and married the daughter of Polybos, and upon the death of Polybos without male issue Adrastos received the kingdom of Sikyon. He (sc. Pindar) has stated it reasonably. For Adrastos did flee Amphiaraios on account of the strife with the Melampodidai. Later however they came to an agreement on the terms of which Amphiaraios would marry Eriphyle, so that "if any great occasion for a quarrel should arise between the two" (*Il.* 4.38, immo *Theb.* fr. 7* West), she would arbitrate.¹⁵

In this fuller and slightly different version of the Argive stasis an unspecified division of royal power between two related clans provides the background to the dispute. In this version Adrastos flees to Sikyon not after the death of his brother Pronax as in the account of Menaichmos but after the murder of his father Talaos by Amphiaraios. At Sikyon he inherits the kingdom from Polybos as his son-in-law and not as his grandson as in Herodotos and Menaichmos. The

13 Cf. 2.11.1–2 (on the temple of Hera at Sikyon allegedly founded by Adrastos, epithet not mentioned) and 1.43.1 (death of Adrastos in Megara, burial there not explicitly mentioned).

14 Cf. B. 11.40–58.

15 Sch. *Nē.* 9.30b (III 153,10–154,5 Dr.) οἱ δὲ φασὶ· Προῖτος ἐβασίλευσε τοῦ Ἀργούς, τῶν θυγατέρων δὲ αὐτοῦ μανεισῶν Μελάμπους μάντις ὦν παρεγένετο· ὁμολογηθέντος δὲ αὐτῷ μισθοῦ τῶν δυεῖν μερῶν τῆς βασιλείας, ἐκάθηρεν αὐτάς· ὥς δὲ ἐκάθηρεν, ἔλαβε κατὰ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἡμῖς ἐκοινώσατο τῷ ἀδελφῷ Βίαντι, τὸ δὲ ἡμῖς κατέσχευεν αὐτῷ, ὥστε γεννηθῆναι τὴν ὅλην βασιλείαν τριμερῇ, Μελαμποδίδαι, Βιαντίδαι, Προϊτίδαι. Μελάμποδος μὲν οὖν Ἀντιφάτης, οὗ Ὀϊκλῆς, οὗ Ἀμφιάραιος· Βιαντος δὲ Ταλαός, οὗ Ἀδραστος· Προίτου δὲ Μεγαπένθης, οὗ Ἰππόνους, οὗ Καπανεύς, οὗ Σθένης. διαφορὰ δὲ ἐγενήθη τοῖς περὶ Ἀμφιάραιον καὶ Ἀδραστον, ὥστε τὸν μὲν Ταλαὸν ὑπὸ Ἀμφιάραιου ἀποθανεῖν, τὸν δὲ Ἀδραστον φυγεῖν εἰς Σικυῶνα καὶ γῆμαι τὴν Πολύβου θυγατέρα, τελευτήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Πολύβου χωρὶς ἐπιγονῆς ἀρσενικῆς τὸν Ἀδραστον ἔχειν τὴν Σικυωνίων βασιλείαν. εὐλόγως οὖν εἶπε· φεῦγε γὰρ Ἀμφιάραιον ὃ Ἀδραστος διὰ τὴν στάσιν τὴν πρὸς τοὺς Μελαμποδίδαις. ὕστερον μέντοι συνελήλυθασι πάλιν, ἐφ' ᾧ συνουκῆσαι τῇ Ἐριφύλῃ ὃ Ἀμφιάραιος, ἵν' εἴ τι "μέγ' ἔρισμα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι γένηται" (*Δ* 38, immo *Theb.* fr. 7* West), αὐτὴ διαιτῇ.

As scholion 127b notes, the text can be made to yield tolerable sense.²⁰ However, scholion 127a paraphrases the verse not with the genitive plural νικῶν, but with the accusative singular νίκην,²¹ as does scholion 127b initially,²² which shows that the preferred reading was the Doric accusative singular νίκαν (acute accent on the first syllable) and not the Doric genitive plural νικῶν (circumflex on the final syllable). Supplying as it does an object to the verb τιμαλφεῖν (“to honour”), this is clearly the correct reading and was rightly adopted by the young Swiss humanist Ceperinus (Jacob Wiesendanger)²³ in the Basel edition of 1526. Whether they contain extracts from learned commentaries or straightforward paraphrases, the scholia should never be dismissed without critical scrutiny, a point which, unfortunately, still needs repetition.

3. Use of Parallels

Besides the quotation of historical sources to explain the text, another type of exegetical aid found in the scholia is the use of parallels from Pindar himself as well as from other poets.²⁴ Of the eleven poetical citations in the scholia to *Nemean Nine* no less than six come from the Homeric corpus, not unsurprisingly considering the place of Homer in Greek education. Two Homeric citations derive from the *Iliad* and four from the *Odyssey*, a ratio almost exactly the reverse of that for the rest of the scholia where, as we would expect, the *Iliad*, which received more attention in antiquity, is more often cited. Presumably the disproportion here is simply a matter of chance.

3.1 To illustrate verse 27 ... ἐν γὰρ δαιμονίοισι φόβοις φεύγοντι καὶ παῖδες θεῶν (“for amid divine panic even the sons of gods flee”) scholion 63 first explicitly states what Pindar only implies, namely that it was pardonable for Amphiaraios to turn and flee at Thebes because Zeus was aiding the Thebans, and then adduces the memorable example of Aias who, roused by Zeus to flight, fled as he “kept turning about retreating slowly step by step”. The scholion cites the well-known verse *Iliad* 11.547 without mention of its Homeric source.²⁵ Interestingly, we may

20 Sch. *Ne.* 9.127b (III 164,4–6 Dr.) τινὲς δὲ ἀνέγνωσαν περισπωμένως νικῶν, ἢ ἡ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν νικῶν τιμᾶν τοῖς λόγοις (“Some read it as a perispomenon νικῶν, so that the sense is ‘to honour with words beyond many victories’”).

21 Sch. *Ne.* 9.127a (III 163, 25–26 Dr.) ... ἐπὶ πολλῶν τε καὶ ἄλλων τὴν νίκην αὐτοῦ ὑμνῆσαι τοῖς λόγοις (“to sing his victory over [and above] many others”).

22 Sch. *Ne.* 9.127b (III 164,2–4 Dr.) ἄλλως· τιμαλφεῖν λόγοις, ἀντὶ τοῦ τιμᾶν αὐτὸν λόγοις, προσβάλλων ταῖς Μούσαις τὴν νίκην καὶ συναρμόζων αὐτὴν τοῖς ὕμνοις βάλλων τὴν νίκην (“Alternatively: to honour [the victory] with words, instead of to honour him with words, assigning the victory to Muses and setting it [to music]; casting the victory to the songs”).

23 On this remarkable scholar who died very young see Riedweg (2000) 201–219, and cf. n. 60 below.

24 The indices in Calvani Mariotti (1987) 158–167, provide a convenient aperçu.

25 Sch. *Ne.* 9.63 (III 156,21–25 Dr.) συγγνώμη οὖν, φησί, καὶ τῷ Ἀμφιαράῳ φεύγοντι· ὁ γὰρ Ζεὺς συνεμάχει τότε τοῖς Θηβαίοις, διὸ ἔφευγε τότε ὁ Ἀμφιάραιος, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Αἴας ἔφευγεν

add, the Townley scholia on *Iliad* 8.97 explain Odysseus' failure to respond to Nestor's exhortation to stand fast with the remark that either Odysseus did not hear him because of the noise or else he was fleeing together with Aias because he was unwilling to fight against the gods (θεομαχεῖν). The Townley scholion then cites *Nemean* 9.27 without indicating Pindar as the source.²⁶

3.2 A similar use of parallels from the *Iliad* is found in scholion 85a on *Ne.* 9.35–37 ἔκρινας, ..., ἢ οὐνεκεν ἐν πολέμῳ κείνα θεὸς ἔντυεν αὐτοῦ ἢ θυμὸν αἰχματὰν ἀμύνειν λοιγὸν Ἐνυαλίου (“you could have discerned ... that in war that goddess [Αἰδώς] urged on Chromios' warrior spirit to ward off Enyalios”). After a paraphrase of the verses 36–37 the scholion quotes the *sententia*: “of men who have αἰδώς²⁷ more are saved than are slain”.²⁸ The verse is used in an appeal to stand ground first by Agamemnon in *Iliad* 5.531 and again by Aias in 15.563. These two parallels cited from the *Iliad* well illustrate the relative nearness of the basic moral and intellectual presuppositions of Pindar's poetry to those of the heroic *ethos* of the Homeric world.

3.3 The four citations from the *Odyssey* serve other functions. Scholion 1a²⁹ provides a Homeric parallel for the syntactic construction in verses 1–3 Κωμάσομεν παρ' Ἀπόλλωνος Σικυωνόθε, Μοῖσαι, ἢ τὰν νεοκτίσταν ἐς Αἴτναν, ἔνθ' ἀναπεπταμέναι ξείνων νενίκανται θύραι, ἢ ὄλβιον ἐς Χρομίου δῶμ' ... (“Let us go revelling, Muses from Apollo's shrine at Sikyon to that newly-founded Aitna, where the doors stand open yielding to the guests, to the rich house of Chromios”) in which the hortative verb of motion κωμάσομεν is followed first by a prepositional phrase ἐς Αἴτναν indicating the whole and then by a prepositional phrase ἐς Χρομίου δῶμα referring to a part. The Homeric parallel cited is *Od.* 8.362–863 where Aphrodite, after being caught by her husband *in flagrante*, goes off ἐς Κύπρον ... ἐς Πάφον, to Cyprus and, more specifically, to her birthplace Paphos. Here however the author ultimately responsible for the scholion has

“ἐντροπαλιζόμενος, ὀλίγον γόνυ γουνὸς ἀμείβων” (Λ 547), τὸν Δία ἔχων ἀντιστάτην (“It is pardonable, he says, for Amphiaras to flee, for Zeus was then fighting on the side of the Thebans; therefore Amphiaras took to flight. Thus too did Aias flee ‘as he kept turning about, retreating slowly step by step’ [*Il.* 11.547], when he had Zeus as an adversary”).

26 Sch. Θ 97b (II 320,56–59 Erbse) οὐκ ἦσθετο ὑπὸ τοῦ θορύβου, ἢ οὐκ ἐπέθη διὰ τὸν καιρὸν· φεύγει γὰρ σὺν Αἴαντι καὶ θεομαχεῖν οὐ θέλει· (bT) “ἐν γὰρ δαιμονίοις(ι) φόβοις ἢ φεύγοντι καὶ παῖδες θεῶν”. (T)

27 On αἰδώς (“sense of shame”) see Braswell (1998) 100 (on v. 33).

28 Sch. *Ne.* 9.85a (III 158,13–17 Dr.) ἦδεσαν οὖν, φησὶν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ πρὸς τοὺς Φοίνικας (immo Συρακουσίους) πολέμῳ ἐκείνη ἢ θεὸς, δηλονότι ἢ Αἰδώς, παρεσκεύαζεν αὐτοῦ τὸν θυμὸν αἰχμητὴν εἶναι, ὥστε ἀμύνειν λοιγὸν Ἐνυαλίου. Ὅμηρος (E 531, O 563)· “αἰδομένων δ' ἀνδρῶν πλέονες σόοι ἢ ἐπέφονται”.

29 Sch. *Ne.* 9.1a (III 150,11–15 Dr.) τὴν δὲ ὅλην Αἴτην εἰπὼν ἐπήνεγκε Χρομίου δῶμα, ὥστε ὅμοιον εἶναι τῷ “ἢ δ' ἐς Κύπρον ἵκανε φιλομειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη, ἢ ἐς Πάφον” (“In speaking of Aitna as a whole he adds the house of Chromios, so that the statement is similar to ‘and she, laughter-loving Aphrodite, went to Cyprus, to Paphos.’”).

fudged a bit, since the *Odyssey* manuscripts have in fact ἡ δ' ἄρα Κύπρον, and not ἡ δ' ἐς Κύπρον as in the Pindar scholion. The text of the scholion has presumably been influenced by verses 58–59 of the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* where the goddess is said to have gone ἐς Κύπρον ... | ἐς Πάφον.

3.4 The second example of the use of an alleged Odyssean parallel is rather less helpful. Scholion 18a³⁰ offers two explanations of why the *phorminx* is called βρομία in verse 8 ἀλλ' ἀνὰ μὲν βρομίαν φόρμιγγ', ἀνὰ δ' αὐλὸν ἐπ' αὐτὰν ὄρσομεν (“Come now, let us rouse the boisterous lyre, let us rouse the pipe”): “either from the noisy sound produced by playing a string instrument (κιθαρισμός) or because βρομία is associated with Dionysos”. The first explanation represents the literal meaning and was presumably the one preferred by the scholion since it is introduced by ἦτοι and not simply ἦ.³¹ We may be reasonably sure it was the sense which Pindar meant, but, and here is a typical Pindaric trick: the adjective is not the appropriate epithet for a *phorminx* but for an *aulos*, mention of which follows in the same verse. His motive for switching the reference was, I am almost certain, metrical convenience. The second explanation, which links βρομία to Dionysos, presumably reflects an attempt to find a further significance in the use of the adjective. Its author was aware that βρόμιος is also an epithet of the god Dionysos. Reflecting then on the association of music with banquets at which the drinking of wine (metonymically referred to as Dionysos) was an essential part, he quoted a verse which he ascribed to Homer: φόρμιγγός θ' ἦν δαίτι θεοὶ ποίησαν ἐταίρην (“the *phorminx*, which the gods made a companion of the banquet”). The verse is in fact a conflation of *Od.* 8.99 and 17.271, and is also quoted in this form at Athenaios 14.627e. The second explanation is not allegorical but simply an attempt to discover more in the text than I personally think is there. Interestingly enough, where ancient commentators normally present alternative explanations, modern critics often seem to want to have it both ways. A very relevant example is Kannicht's comment on Euripides, *Helena* 1308 κρόταλα ... βρόμια: “βρόμια ist deshalb vielleicht von gesuchter Ambivalenz: einerseits (vordergründig) = βρέμοντα ‘tönend, lärmend’ wie z.B. Pind. N. 9, 8 ἀλλ' ἀνὰ μὲν βρομίαν φόρμιγγ' ἀνὰ δ' αὐλὸν ἐπ' αὐτὰν ὄρσομεν, andererseits (hintergründig) = ‘dionysisch’ wie z.B. HF 893 βρομίῳ θύρῳ nach Βρόμιος = Dionysos”.³² I would agree with Diggle (in a note in Bond's commentary on Euripides' *Herakles* 890) that βρόμια means only “boisterous” and “has nothing to do with the god”.³³ Although the search

30 Sch. Ne. 9.18a (III 151,19–23 Dr.) βρομία δὲ ἡ φόρμιγγς, ἦτοι παρὰ τὸν βρόμον καὶ ἦχον τὸν ἀποτελούμενον κατὰ τὸν κιθαρισμόν, ἢ βρομίαν τὴν συναναστρεφομένην τῷ Διονύσῳ. Ὅμηρος· (θ 99 + ρ 271)· “φόρμιγγος θ' ἦν δαίτι θεοὶ ποίησαν ἐταίρην”.

31 See Kühner/Gerth (1904) 298, Smyth (1957) 648 (§ 2858). Exceptions are not difficult to find, e.g. Sch. Ne. 9.123b (quoted in n. 45 below) where the scholia apparently preferred the third alternative in the sequence ἦτοι ... ἦ ... ἦ.

32 Kannicht (1969) 339–340.

33 Bond (1981) 302.

for “gesuchte Ambivalenz” remains fashionable in some circles, I would insist that where there is deliberate ambiguity, it is almost always patent.³⁴

3.5 The third example of the use of the *Odyssey* by the scholia to illustrate the text is more to the point. Scholion 35c³⁵ explains the epithet ἀνδροδάμας in verse 16 first with a paraphrase “she who kills her husband” and then with an explanation: “For Eriphyle [is so called because] she treacherously sent her own husband to his destruction”. This is illustrated by a reference to the well-known passage in the *Nekyia* (11.326–327): “Homer also mentions this: ‘[I saw] hateful Eriphyle who accepted precious gold as the price of her own husband’s life’”. Interestingly enough, no mention is made of the other passage in the *Odyssey* which alludes to the same event (15.247): ἀλλ’ ὄλετ’ ἐν Θήβησι γυναῖων εἵνεκα δώρων (“but he [Amphiaraos] perished at Thebes on account of a woman’s presents”). Presumably for the author of the scholion the explicit reference to Eriphyle with her epithet στυγερή was deemed more appropriate as an explanation of Pindar’s ἀνδροδάμαντ’ Ἐριφύλαν than the allusive reference in the later passage. Apposite illustration, not the collection of parallels, was clearly the intention behind the scholia.

3.6 Finally, the fourth example of the use of a quotation from the *Odyssey* to illustrate the text seems artificial rather than apposite. After cataloguing in verses 34–43 Chromios’ past feats in battle, Pindar in verse 44 reassures the old retired general that “from toils accomplished in youth with right comes a gentle life toward the time of old age”.³⁶ Scholion 104c³⁷ remarks somewhat unhelpfully: “This is the opposite of the verse in Homer: ‘Mortal men quickly grow old in misfortune’,” a verse (*Od.* 19.360) which became proverbial.³⁸ The technique of a Homeric citation ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου is also found in the Pindaric scholia in the comment on *Ol.* 8.19 ἦν δ’ ἐσορᾶν καλός, ἔργω τ’ οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἐλέγχων (“he was handsome to look upon, and in action he did not belie his looks”) where scholion 25b³⁹ quotes a version of *Od.* 17.454 “your wits don’t match your looks”.

Moreover, in scholion 104 on *Ne.* 9.44, it is interesting to observe how ancient readers could confuse homonyms, in this case the Doric feminine adjective ἀμέρα “gentle” with the Doric noun ἀμέρα “day”, a form aspirated by Pindar but

34 On the technique Stanford (1939) remains valuable; on ambiguities in Pindar see 129–136.

35 Sch. *Ne.* 9.35c (III 154,22–27 Dr.) ἀνδροδάμαν δὲ τὴν τὸν ἄνδρα ἀνελοῦσάν φησιν· ἡ γὰρ Ἐριφύλη τὸν ἑαυτῆς ἄνδρα Ἀμφιάραον προῦδωκεν εἰς φόνον· μέμνηται τούτου καὶ Ὅμηρος (λ 326–327)· “στυγερὴν τ’ Ἐριφύλην, ἣ χρυσὸν φίλου ἀνδρὸς ἐδέξατο τιμήντα”.

36 *Ne.* 9.44 ἐκ πόνων δ’, οἳ σὺν νεότατι γένωνται σὺν τε δίκῃ, τελέθει πρὸς γῆρας αἰὼν ἀμέρα.

37 Sch. *Ne.* 9.104c (III 161,20–22 Dr.) ἔστι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου τῷ Ὀμήρῳ (τ 360)· “αἶψα γὰρ ἐν κακότητι βροτοὶ καταγυράσκουσιν”.

38 Cf. Hes. *Op.* 93 (interpolated), Plu. *Mor.* 24f, Sch. A. *Ch.* 282a, Sch. Ar. *Ra.* 18, Sch. Pi. *Ol.* 8, 93a, Sch. Theocr. 12, 2c.

39 Sch. *Ol.* 8.25b (I 242,11–13 Dr.) τὸ εἶδος, οὐ κατελέγχων· ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος (ρ 454) ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου· “οὐκ ἄρα σοὶ γε φρένες ᾗσαν καὶ εἶδος” (οὐκ ἄρα σοὶ γ’ ἐπὶ εἶδει καὶ φρένες ᾗσαν codd. Hom.).

normally psilotic in Doric dialects.⁴⁰ Taking *ἀμέρα* to mean “day”, the statement *τελέθει πρὸς γῆρας αἰὼν ἀμέρα* is supposed to mean “Life toward the time of old age is a day” or, as scholion 104a⁴¹ paraphrases it “One day in old age is comparable to the whole of life”. This, in turn, is explained in scholion 104b as implying that “all the time toward old age passes as one day because of good cheer and the absence of troubles”.⁴² Here we see how far ancient readers could go to justify a bad interpretation. This is all the more remarkable since scholion 104a⁴³ notes that “some say that *ἡμέραν* (i.e. Doric *ἀμέραν*) is used as a feminine (adjective instead of the two termination form) *ἡμερος* and that *αἰῶνα* is feminine”, which it is indeed here as well as in *Py.* 4.186 and *Py.* 5.7.⁴⁴ Perhaps we should not be too critical of the wrong choice made by some of the ancient readers considering the double difficulty of unfamiliar form and gender with which they were confronted.

Of the five remaining poetical quotations in the scholia to *Nemean Nine* three come from Pindar himself and one each from Hesiod and Kallimachos. The latter two, which we will consider first, are quoted in the same context.

3.7 In scholion 123b⁴⁵ three different explanations are offered of the *hapax legomenon* *θεμίπλεκος* used as an epithet of *στέφανος* in verse 52. The first understands the adjective as “woven according to custom” and the second as a reference to the goddess Themis who was an assessor (*πάρεδρος*) of Apollo, the god in whose honour the Pythian Games were held. The third, which the scholia apparently preferred, understood the epithet to imply that Chromios was “justly crowned”, i.e. without having to resort to bribery, presumably a practice common enough in sport in antiquity. In support of this interpretation the scholia quote

40 See Braswell (1988) 214–215 (ad. *Py.* 4.130d).

41 Sch. *Ne.* 9.104a (III 161,7–8 Dr.) *ἡμέρα μία ἐν τῷ γήρα συγκριτική ἐστι πρὸς ὅλον τὸν αἰῶνα.*

42 Sch. *Ne.* 9.104b (III 161,16–18 Dr.) *... ὁ πρὸς τὸ γῆρας πᾶς χρόνος ὥσπερ μία ἡμέρα παρατρέχει διὰ τὸ εὐθυμεῖν καὶ μὴ ἐπαισθάνεσθαι τῶν φαύλων.*

43 Sch. *Ne.* 9.104a (III 161,8–10 Dr.) *τινὲς δὲ θηλυκῶς φασιν ἐξενηγέχθαι τὴν ἡμέραν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡμερος, καὶ τὸν αἰῶνα θηλυκῶς εἰρησθαι.*

44 See Braswell (1988) 70 (ad *Py.* 4.186d).

45 Sch. *Ne.* 9.123b (III 163,11–23 Dr.) *θεμιπλέκτους δὲ τοὺς στεφάνους φησὶν ἥτοι νομίμως καὶ καθηκόντως πεπλεγμένους, ἢ καθὼ πάρεδρός ἐστι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἢ Θέμις χάριν τοῦ χρηστηρίου· καὶ γὰρ ἦν προφητις· ἢ ὅτι δικαίως καὶ ἄνευ δωροδοκίας ἐστέφθη. ἱστορεῖται δὲ τὰ ἐν Φωκίδι χρήμασιν ἀνύεσθαι, διὸ καὶ πρόσκειται ἐνταῦθα τὰ ἐν Σικυῶνι. οἰκείως δὲ ἱερὰν τὴν Σικυῶνα προσηγόρευσεν· ἢ γὰρ Μηκῶνῃ ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ἐστίν, ἐφ’ ἧς οἱ θεοὶ διεδάσαντο τὰς τιμὰς. Ἡσίοδος (*Th.* 535–536) “καὶ γὰρ ὅτ’ ἐκρίνοντο θεοὶ θνητοὶ τ’ ἄνθρωποι | Μηκῶνῃ”. καὶ Καλλίμαχος (fr.119.1 Pfeiffer) “Μηκῶνῃ μακάρων ἔδρανον αὐτίς ἰδεῖν” (“He says that the crowns have been woven in accordance with justice either because they have been woven in the customary way and fittingly, or in so far as Themis is an assessor of Apollo on account of the oracle (for she too was a prophetess), or because he (sc. Chromios) was crowned justly and without bribery. It is on record that awards were obtained by money in Phokis, for which reason those in Sikyon were transferred there. He (sc. Pindar) properly calls Sikyon ‘holy’. For Mekone is the place where the gods divided the honours among themselves. Hesiod (*Th.* 535–536): “For when the gods and men came to a settlement at Mekone ...” and Kallimachos (fr.119.1 Pf.): “to see again Mekone, seat of the blessed [gods]”).*

Hesiod (*Th.* 535–536) and Kallimachos (fr. 119.1 Pfeiffer) as evidence that the Pythian Games in Sikyon were free of the corruption alleged to be rife at those in Delphi. The train of thought is all too characteristic of the kind of associative logic often encountered in ancient argumentation. In the passage in question Pindar calls Sikyon “holy” (ἱερά), and since both Hesiod and Kallimachos mention Mekone, an earlier name for Sikyon, as the place where the gods came to a just settlement, therefore, the games at Sikyon must be free of corruption, and consequently Chromios must have won his crowns justly. It is not hard to understand why the ancient scholia have often been dismissed as containing too much rubbish to be of much use.⁴⁶ Paradoxically it is this kind of argumentation which can give insight into the way ancient readers treated their texts. Paying attention to it may sometimes help us to understand aspects of ancient thought which seem odd, to say the least.

The last three poetic quotations to be considered illustrate the principle of explaining Pindar through Pindar (Πίνδαρον ἐκ Πινδάρου σαφηνίζειν), abundant evidence for which we find elsewhere in the Pindaric scholia. I note a total of 138 citations of Pindar himself in the scholia to the epinikia.

3.8 First, scholion 35a on verse 15 κρέσσων δὲ καπαύει δίκαν τὸν πρόσθεν ἀνὴρ (“for the stronger man puts an end to the right that existed before”). The scholion⁴⁷ not only correctly paraphrases κρέσσων ἀνὴρ with ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἀνὴρ⁴⁸ but also aptly quotes the notorious fragment 169a, verses 1–4 “Law, the ruler of all (Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς), both of mortals and immortals, conducts with highest hand what is most violent making it just”

Like Kallikles who in Plato’s *Gorgias*⁴⁹ quotes the verses, the author of the scholion has understood Pindar’s simple realism better than many of his modern critics. They are surprisingly reluctant to ascribe to Pindar what might seem to be, but is not in fact, a doctrine of the right of the stronger. For Pindar, as I have argued elsewhere,⁵⁰ the rights of the weaker have become irrelevant wherever the stronger prevails.

46 Lefkowitz (1985) 269–282 (= (1991) 147–160) usefully points out some of the weaknesses of the scholia but sometimes fails to do them justice as in the instance discussed in n. 8 above.

47 Sch. *Ne.* 9.35a (III 154,14–17 Dr.) ὁ δὲ ἰσχυρὸς ἀνὴρ τὸ προὔπαρχον δίκαιον καταπαύει. ἐν ἄλλοις ὁ Πίνδαρος (fr. 169a.1–4 Maehler) “Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς | θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων | ἄγει δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον | ὑπερτάτα χειρὶ”.

48 On Pindar’s use of κρέσσων see Braswell (1998) 73 (on *Ne.* 9.15).

49 484b.

50 Braswell (1998) 73 (on *Ne.* 9.15).

3.9 Our second example of a Pindaric quotation being used to illustrate a passage in *Nemean Nine* is found in scholion 109b.⁵¹ After paraphrasing the verses 46–47 εἰ γὰρ ἅμα κτεάνοις πολλοῖς ἐδίδοξον ἄρηται | κῦδος, οὐκέτ' ἔστι πόρσω θνατὸν ἔτι σκοπιᾶς ἄλλας ἐφάψασθαι ποδοῖν (“For if together with many possessions he wins renowned glory, it is not possible for a mortal to reach with his feet still farther another peak”), the scholion quotes as a parallel *Ne.* 3.19–21 “But if being handsome and performing deeds befitting his form, not now still further et cetera”. The et cetera is of course the image of the pillar of Herakles as the farthest bound that can be reached.⁵² The writer of the scholion has recognized that both passages are examples of the *ne plus ultra* motif and, implicitly, its encomiastic function.⁵³

3.10 Our third example of the scholia’s use of a Pindaric quotation is of special interest, since it implies a manuscript reading which has not been preserved in the *paradosis* and which eventually found a place in all early printed editions. In verse 44 Pindar introduces the theme of the tranquil life which the victor now enjoys.⁵⁴ Then in verse 48 he prepares the audience for the continuation of the celebration after the end of the ode by declaring ἡσυχία δὲ φιλεῖ μὲν συμπόσιον (“peace loves a drinking party”). After scholion 114a⁵⁵ correctly paraphrases the text, scholion 114b⁵⁶ goes on to offer an alternative paraphrase of the text as though it read ἡσυχίαν δὲ φιλεῖ μὲν συμπόσιον (“A drinking party loves peace”). This interpretation was later adopted by Demetrios Triklinios⁵⁷ in the fourteenth century and held the field until Theodor Bergk banished it from his second edition of 1853.⁵⁸ This version, according to scholion 114b, is similar to *Nemean* 5.6 ταρείνας ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὁπώραν (“late summer, the mother of the soft down on the grape”). I think we would agree that the similarity is not obvious at first sight. However, the scholion 10a⁵⁹ on that verse makes it clear that the writer

51 Sch. *Ne.* 9.109b (III 162,1–6 Dr.) ὁ δὲ νοῦς· ὁ γὰρ ἅμα πλήθει περιουσίας καὶ δόξαν εὐκλεῆ καρπωσάμενος οὐκέτι περαιτέρω θνητὸς ὢν ὀφείλει περισκοπεῖν οὐδὲ ἄλλης εὐτυχίας ὁδοῦς ἐπιζητεῖν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ποσίν. ἀνυπέρβλητος γάρ, φησίν, αὕτη ἡ ἀρετή. παρέουκε δὲ τῇ ἄνω διανοίᾳ (*Ne.* 3.19–21) “εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων δ' (immo τ') εὐκότα μορφῇ | (...) οὐκέτι πόρσω, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

52 Verse 21 continues: ἀβάταν ἄλα κίωνων ὑπὲρ Ἡρακλέος περὶν εὐμαρές (“is it easy to go across the untracked sea beyond the pillars of Herakles”).

53 On the motif see Race (1990) 191–195.

54 See note 36 above.

55 Sch. *Ne.* 9.114a (III 162,7–8 Dr.) τῇ μὲν οὖν εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἡσυχίᾳ προσφιλέες ἐσσι τὸ συμπόσιον (“the drinking party is dear to peace and quiet”).

56 Sch. *Ne.* 9.114b (III 162,10–12 Dr.) ἡ οὕτω· τὸ συμπόσιον τὴν ἡσυχίαν φιλεῖ· καὶ ἔστιν ὅμοιον τῷ (*Ne.* 5.6) “ματέρ' οἰνάνθας ὁπώραν”. ἡ δὲ νικηφορία οὐ φιλεῖ ἡσυχίαν, ἀλλ' ὕμνους (“Or thus: the drinking party loves peace. And this is similar to (*Ne.* 5.6) ‘the mother of the down, late summer’. But victory does not love peace, but songs of praise”).

57 Cf. Mommsen (1864) 373 (apparatus ad loc.).

58 Bergk in fact adopted ἄσυχία, the reading in sch. *Ne.* 5.10a (v. n. 59 below), but see Braswell (1988) 397 (on *Py.* 4.296g) on the orthography in Pindar.

59 Sch. *Ne.* 5.10a (III 90,3–7 Dr.) ἡ δὲ ὁπώρα οὐκ ἔστι τῆς οἰνάνθης μήτηρ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἀντίου· προανθεῖ

is thinking of the causal sequence of events: “late summer is not the mother of the down on the grape, but the contrary. For first it blooms before its season, and then it becomes late summer”. The scholion goes on to observe that Pindar “quite often uses the same sort of reversal (i.e. of the natural order), [e.g.] ‘peace loves a drinking party’ (*Ne.* 9.48). For peace does not love the drinking party, but the drinking party loves peace”. Here we see why in scholion 114b an ancient reader was moved to change the text from ἡσυχία to ἡσυχίαν, which he thought would restore the natural order. The scholion 10a then apparently dismisses the alternative version with the remark: “For victory does not love peace, but songs of praise”. If the observation of the scholion 10a that Pindar often reverses the natural sequence of events had been taken seriously, Triklinios’ change of the text would not have had the unmerited success it received.⁶⁰

4. Conclusion

We are now in a position to give at least a partial answer to the questions we posed at the beginning of our survey of the scholia on *Nemean Nine*.

The scholia can sometimes help us with the language, notably by recording variants in the text which have not survived in the manuscript tradition as in verse 55 (νίκαν for νικᾶν). On the other hand, the scholion on verse 44, while making a hard time of it, does in the end confirm that ἡμέρα was rightly understood by some readers as “gentle” and not as “day”, apparently the prevailing interpretation in antiquity. In the case of historical allusions we must be grateful that the scholia have preserved the long extract from Didymos on the battle around the Heloros and Chromios’ role in it. Moreover, without Didymos and his excerpts from Timaios we would know much less about Sicilian history than we do. Likewise, the scholia provide us with unique information about the Pythian Games in Sikyon and correct at the same time Pindar’s inaccuracy in ascribing their foundation to Adrastus. They also make the relevant point that this change served an encomiastic function.

The mythical references to the conflict between Adrastus and Amphiaraos are more fully explained by the scholia than the account we find, for example, in Herodotos. For this the source of the scholia drew on the local Sikyonian historian Menaichmos. Without such information readers of Pindar, both ancient and modern, would be poorer in their understanding of the text.

γὰρ πρῶτον, εἶτα ὀπώρα γίνεται. χρῆται δὲ τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἀναστροφῇ συνεχῶς· “ἡσυχία φιλεῖ μὲν συμπόσιον” (*Ne.* 9.48)· οὐ γὰρ ἡ ἡσυχία φίλει τὸ συμπόσιον, ἀλλὰ τὸ συμπόσιον τὴν ἡσυχίαν.
 60 We may note that while Cepporinus (1526) 254, printed ἡσυχίαν in his text, he nevertheless recorded the variant reading ἡσυχία in the margin of his edition. This he will have deduced from the scholia ad loc. in the *editio Romana* (1515).

In short, we can be grateful to the ancient scholars who preserved for us the extracts from learned commentaries which make up the bulk of the ancient scholia on Pindar. Clearly they were interested in much the same things which occupy modern readers in their attempt to understand less obvious matters in the text. Some of their approaches are now largely irrelevant, for example, the attempt to find “true meanings” through *Volksetymologien*.

Nevertheless these may sometimes indicate what ancient scholars believed to have found in their text. The linking of Adrastos to the sanctuary of Hera Alea in Sikyon is, I suspect, one such example. On the balance there is certainly more useful material in the scholia than dross.

Finally, I would add that we should not expect too much in the scholia which could be recognized as literary criticism in the modern sense. We would have to look long and far to find any kind of aesthetic judgment comparable to that found in the Longinian treatise *On the Sublime*. Such judgments are, as often in modern criticism, subjective responses and not always helpful. From our examples we see that the ancient ὑπομνήματα from which the scholia were derived clearly set out to provide the kind of basic help which we would expect in any modern commentary. What is perhaps the most useful is the historical and mythological information which we would otherwise not have. Aside from occasional details of variant readings, much of the rest we could understand from the Pindaric text itself or from other sources still extant. With that we will have to be content.

Bibliography

- Bergk, Theodorus (1853), *Poetae lyriici Graeci*. Editio altera. Leipzig.
- Bergk, Theodor (1878), “Lesefrüchte VI. Zu den Pindarscholien”, *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 117, 37–46.
- Bond, Godfrey W. (1981), *Euripides Heracles*: With an Introduction and Commentary. Oxford.
- Braswell, Bruce Karl (1988), *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Texte und Kommentare 14. Berlin / New York.
- Braswell, Bruce Karl (1992), *A Commentary on Pindar, Nemean One*. Fribourg.
- Braswell, Bruce Karl (1998), *A Commentary on Pindar, Nemean Nine*. Texte und Kommentare 19. Berlin / New York.
- Braswell, Bruce Karl (2011), “Didymos on Pindar” in *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar*: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts edited by Stephanos Matthaios, Franco Montanari, Antonios Rengakos. *Trends in Classics*, Supplementary Volume 8. Berlin/New York.
- Braswell, Bruce Karl (forthcoming), *Didymos of Alexandria, Commentary on Pindar* edited and translated with Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and a Critical Catalogue of Didymos’ Works.
- Calvani Mariotti, Giovanna (1987), “Ricerche sulla tecnica esegetica degli *scholia vetera* a Pindaro”, *Ricerche di filologia classica*. III: *Interpretazioni antiche e moderne di testi greci*, 83–167.
- [Ceporinus, Jacobus] (1526), *Pindari Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia*. Basel.
- Deas, Henry Thomson (1931), “The Scholia Vetera to Pindar”, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 42, 1–78.
- Drachmann, A.B. (1903), *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*. I: *Scholia in Olympionicas*. Teubner. Leipzig.

- Drachmann, A.B. (1910), *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*. II: *Scholia in Pythionicas*. Teubner. Leipzig.
- Drachmann, A.B. (1927), *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*. III: *Scholia in Nemeonicas et Isthmionicas*. Teubner. Leipzig.
- Farnell, Lewis Richard (1932), *The Works of Pindar: Translated with Literary and Critical Commentaries*. II: *Critical Commentary*. London.
- Frisk, Hjalmar (1973), *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I. Heidelberg.
- Griffin, Audrey (1979), "A new Fragment of Dionysios of Halikarnassos ὁ μουντικός", *Historia* 28, 241–246.
- Griffin, Audrey (1982), *Sikyon*. Oxford.
- Gudemann, Alfred (1921), s.v. Scholien, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* II A 1, 625–705. München.
- Irigoin, Jean (1952), *Histoire du texte de Pindare*. Études et Commentaires 13. Paris.
- Kannicht, Richard (1969), *Euripides Helena*. II: *Kommentar*. Heidelberg.
- Kühner, Raphael / Gerth, Bernhard (1904), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. II: Satzlehre. Hannover / Leipzig.
- Lefkowitz, Mary R. (1985), "The Pindar Scholia", *American Journal of Philology* 106, 269–282.
- Lefkowitz, Mary R. (1991), *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic 'I'*. Oxford.
- Lehrs, K. (1873), *Die Pindarscholien. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur philologischen Quellenkunde*. Leipzig.
- Mommsen, Car. Ioh. Tycho (1864), *Pindari carmina*. Berlin.
- Race, William H. (1990), *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*. American Classical Studies 24. Atlanta, Georgia.
- Riedweg, Christoph (2000), "Ein Philologe an Zwinglis Seite: Zum 500. Geburtstag des Zürcher Humanisten Jacob Wiesendanger. gen. Ceporinus (1500–1525)", *Museum Helveticum* 57, 201–219.
- Schmidt, Mauricius (1854), *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*. Leipzig.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir (1956), *Greek Grammar*, revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge, Mass.
- Stanford, William Bedell (1939), *Ambiguity in Greek Literature: Studies in Theory and Practice*. Oxford.
- Traduire les scholies de Pindare ...* (2009). *De la traduction au commentaire: problèmes de méthode*. Édité par S. David, C. Daube, E. Geny et C. Muckensturm-Pouille. *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne*, Suppl. 2. Besançon.
- West, Martin L. (2003), *Greek Epic Fragments: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. / London.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von (1889), *Euripides Herakles*. I: *Einleitung in die attische Tragödie*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von (1901), "Hieron und Pindaros", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1273–1318. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von (1922), *Pindaros*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von (1972), *Kleine Schriften*. VI. Berlin.

Correspondence:

Bruce Karl Braswell

Institut für Altertumswissenschaften und Byzantinistik

Rue Pierre-Aeby 16

1700 Fribourg

bkb.sapheneia@bluewin.ch