The Dating of Pindaric Odes by Comparison
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Whenever the lack of external evidence forces scholars to search for internal evidence of chronology, as is so often the case, caution must restrain imagination and enthusiasm. In the case of Pindar’s Odes we are fortunate to have considerable external evidence for the dating of Olympians and Pythians. This, alas, is not true of Nemeans and Isthmians, where we depend entirely on internal evidence, often of an elusive nature. I wish to examine here one type of internal evidence that has at times been adduced to establish a date for a Nemean or Isthmian ode: the comparison of similarities in diction or thought. The difficulties of this approach to Pindaric chronology are several:

1. Since only a portion of Pindar’s poems are extant, internal evidence of this type is necessarily incomplete. How can we be sure that a given expression, now found in only two odes and eagerly seized upon as a revealing clue, did not occur repeatedly in those poems now lost to us?

2. When a parallel has been found it may not always be possible to distinguish between coincidental similarity, unconscious borrowing, and conscious borrowing.

3. In most cases we lack clear criteria to decide which of two parallels is the original, which the copy.

4. If we have succeeded in determining the original and if the date of the original is known, we still have only a terminus post quem for the copy, because we cannot be certain that the borrowing occurred immediately. If the date of the copy is known, we only have a terminus ante quem for the original.

It is no wonder, then, that this approach has led to widely varying results. Nevertheless some dates arrived at by this method have found their way into standard editions and commentaries. This essay will seek to demonstrate that the commonly accepted date of Nemean 3
cannot be secure, and that similar attempts to date such other odes as Nemean 11 and Isthmian 4 from parallels have failed.

The Date of Nemean 3

Let us examine first Nem. 3, which was written in honor of Aristocleides of Aegina, winner in the pancration. Two facts are well known: the conquest of Aegina by Athens in 458 B.C. and the poet’s fondness for Aegina. Yet nowhere in the ode does Pindar give us any indication of the disaster that has befallen his beloved “Doric island of Aegina, thronged with strangers” (ll. 2–3). Pyth. 8, which was written in 446 B.C., if we may trust the scholiast, and is thus the latest among Pindar’s dated extant odes, is also for an Aeginetan victor. In this ode, especially in its concluding prayer (ll. 98–100), the poet expresses his hope that somehow the island will regain its former freedom:1 “Aegina, dear mother, guide this city on freedom’s course by the aid of Zeus, king Aeacus, Peleus, goodly Telamon, and Achilles.” Nem. 3, significantly, does not express a similar sentiment and therefore, it is commonly agreed, cannot have been composed after 458 B.C.

Leopold Schmidt2 attempted to link Nem. 3 with Pyth. 3 by pointing to a similarity in thought and dated both poems to OL. 76, 2 = 475 B.C.

The date of Pyth. 3 is, however, not by any means firmly established, and we may safely say only that it was composed while Hieron was king of Syracuse (478–467 B.C.). Because of a reference to the king’s health (l. 73), the later years of his rule seem more likely than the earlier years; Pyth. 1 of 470 B.C. also informs us of Hieron’s ill health (ll. 50–57). Richmond Lattimore3 feels that Pyth. 3 “reads like a letter of farewell” and suggests 468 B.C. as a possible date.

More to the point of the present investigation, the similarity in thought supposedly linking the two odes does not seem to make necessary the assumption of a common date or even of borrowing. The similarity, according to Schmidt,4 is this: In Pyth. 3 Pindar aims “to lead the thoughts of Hieron from the non-attainable to the attainable” and counsels him “to be content with the fulfillment of only a part of his desires.” In Nem. 3 Pindar advises Aristocleides “to reach only for those things that are according to his own nature and

1 In this interpretation I am following John H. Finley, Jr, Pindar and Aeschylus (Cambridge [Mass.] 1955) 168.
2 Pindar’s Leben und Dichtung (Bonn 1862) 464–465.
3 The Odes of Pindar (Chicago 1947) 154.
4 Loc.cit.
way of life.” We may say that the common theme is moderation, σωφρονεία. But Pindar occupies himself with this theme also in Ol. 13 and voices similar warnings in Nem. 11.47–48, Isthm. 7.43–48, and elsewhere.

At the same time Schmidt believed that he had found further evidence for his chronology in verbal parallels between Nem. 3 on one hand and Pyth. 2, Ol. 2, Ol. 3, and Pyth. 3 on the other.

This approach to Pindarian chronology was more fully explored by another scholar, to whom we shall turn presently.

Wilhelm von Christ called attention to several points of resemblance between Nem. 3 and the “Sicilian Odes”, i.e. Ol. 1, 2, 3, Pyth. 2, and Nem. 9, and concluded that Nem. 3 must have been written at a time later than these, namely in 469. I repeat here Christ’s list: 6


   Ol. 3.43–45: Θήρων ἀρεταίαν ἱκάνων ἀπτεται / οἴκοθεν Ἠρακλέος / σταλὼν τὸ πόρσω δ’ ἐστι σοφίς ἀβατὼν / κασόφοις.

2. Nem. 3.29: ἡπταὶ δὲ λόγῳ δῖκαις ἀωτοὶ ἔσων (γρ. ἔσων) αἰνεῖν.

   Nem. 9.6–7: ἔστι δὲ τις λύγος ἀνθρώπων τετελεσμένος ἔσων / μὴ χαμαι σειγὴ καλὐψαι.


   Ibid. 80–82: ἔστι δ’ αἰετός ϊκαῖν ἐν ποτανώις, / ὅς ἐλαβέν αἴγα, τηλόθε μεταμαμίλεινεν, διάφοιν ἀγανα ποσίν / κραγέται δὲ κολοί ταπεινὰ νέμονται.

4. Nem. 3.65: Ζεῦ, τεόν γὰρ αἴμα, σέο δ’ ἀγών, τὸν ὄμνος ἐβαλεν.

   Ol. 2.89–90: ἔπεμε νῦν σκοπών τὸξον ἄγε, θυμέ: τίνα βάλλομεν / ἐκ μαλακάς ἀστε φρένος εὐκλέας δύστοις ίντες;

5. Nem. 3.76: τῶν οὖκ ἄπεσαν: χαῖρε, πῖλος. 7


   Ol. 1.93–95: τὸ δὲ κλέος / τηλόθεν δέδορκε τὰν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις / Πέλοπος.

While Christ was also aware of the resemblance between Nem. 3.72 and Pyth. 4.281–282, he overruled Giuseppe Fraccaroli’s objection

---

6 Sitz., München 1889, pp. 52–54.
6 The line numbers in this and subsequent lists have been changed to reflect C. M. Bowra’s OCT, 2nd ed.
7 ἄπεστι codd.
8 Le Odi di Pindaro dichiarate e tradotte (Verona 1894) 548, n.2.
with the remark that this single instance does not carry the same force as a number of them. 9

Camille Gaspar 10 used Christ's list to fix the date of Nem. 3 at 475. This date, or one close to it, has been accepted, if tentatively, by Wilamowitz, 11 Aimé Puech, 12 Lewis Richard Farnell, 13 Alexander Turyn, 14 and Bruno Snell. 15

The first pair of parallel passages in Christ's list does much to point out the weakness of the method. While the similarity of the two passages cannot be denied, an even closer parallel to Ol. 3 is found in Isthm. 4.11-13: 16 ἀνορέας δ' ἐσχάτων / οἴκοθεν στάλσαν ἄπτων' Ἡρακλείως, / καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδον ἄρετάν. Some similarity in thought, if not in diction, can be discerned also in Nem. 4.69-70: Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς ξόφον σοὶ περατῶν: ἀπότρεπε / αὐτίς Εὔρώπαν ποτὲ χέρον ἐνεα ναός.

Could not Nem. 3 have borrowed from Isthm. 4 just as well as from Ol. 3? Are we to claim that all four odes were written within a short time of each other, or are we to admit that such borrowing, if borrowing indeed it is, may have occurred over a number of years?

The gnomic character of these passages must not be overlooked. Pindar here expresses the common Greek ideal of σωφροσύνη, to which, as we have seen, he returns frequently. It lies in the very nature of gnomes to repeat themselves.

The two passages of the second comparison are likewise gnomic; the same gnome is found also in Pyth. 9.93-94: τὸ γ' ἐν ξυνῷ πεπονημένον εἰς / μῆ λόγον βλάπτων ἀλοίπο γέροντος κρυπτέω. Nem. 3.41-42, in Christ's third comparison, will be more complete if we include line 40: συγγενεῖ δὲ τις εὐδοξία μέγα βριθεί.

The whole passage, lines 40-42, again gnomic, bears resemblance not only to Ol. 2.86-88, but also to the following:

Ol. 9.100-104: τὸ δὲ φυν κράτιστον ἀπαν· πολλοὶ δὲ διδακταῖς / ἀνθρώπων ἄρεταὶ κλέος / ἀρουναν ἄρεσθαι· / ἀνευ δὲ θεοῦ σεσιγαμένον / οὐ σκαίτερον χρῆμα ἐκαστον.

Ol. 13.13: ἄμαχον δὲ κρύψα τὸ συγγενές ἡθος.

9 Pindari Carmina (Leipzig 1896) 249.
10 Essai de chronologie Pindarique (Brussels 1900) 104-107.
11 Pindaros (Berlin 1922) 276.
14 Pindari Carmina (Oxford 1952) 153.
15 Pindari Carmina, I² (Leipzig 1959) 128.
16 All citations are from C. M. Bowra's OCT, 2nd ed.
Since Ol. 9 was written about 466 B.C., Ol. 13 in 464, and Pyth. 8, as mentioned above, probably in 446, we must either dismiss the idea of borrowing or allow for its occurrence over as many as thirty years. In either case we can say nothing about the date of Nem. 3.

The simile of the crows and the eagle, which made Christ link Nem. 3.80–82 with Ol. 2.86–88, is not at all peculiar to Pindar but is found in similar form in Greek literature both before and after Pindar, namely in Homer (Il. 16.582f and 17.755ff), Sophocles (Aj. 167–171), and Theocritus (7.47f). In comparisons 4, 5 and 6, no longer gnomic, the similarity is much less pronounced.

My own examination of Nem. 3 has yielded some additional words or phrases which might be thought to have been taken from the “Sicilian Odes.”

1. Nem 3.2: ἐν ἱερομνήιᾳ Νεμέαδι
   Ol. 3.19–20: διηχάμην.../...Μήνα
2. Nem. 3.2–3: τὰν πολυζέναν.../...νάσον Αἰγίναν
   Ol. 1.93: πολυζενωτάτῳ παρὰ βασιλείᾳ
   πολυζέναν occurs elsewhere in Pindar only in Fr. 107.1.
3. Nem. 3.5: μαίμενοι, and ibid. 81: μεταμαίμενος
   Ol. 1.46: μαίμενοι
   Elsewhere in Pindar this verb occurs only in Pyth. 11.51 and Ol. 8.5.
4. Nem. 3.14: παλαιφαστέον εἰραν (ἀγοράν codd.)
   Ol. 2.39–40: χρησθένει παλαιφαστέον
   παλαιφαστέον is found elsewhere in Pindar only in Nem. 2.16 and ibid. 6.31.
5. Nem. 3.41: ἀτρεκεῖ/...ποδί
   Ol. 3.12: ἀτρεκής Ἑλλανοδίκας
   ἀτρεκής elsewhere in Pindar is limited to Nem. 5.17 and Pyth. 8.7.
6. Nem. 3.44: θαμνά
   Ol. 1.53: θαμνά
   Pindar normally uses θαμά.
7. Nem. 3.84: Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τῷ ἀπὸ καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φαος.
   This resembles not only Ol. 1.93–95 (see above), but also Nem. 9.41–42:
   δέδορκεν / παιδὶ τοῦθ' Ἀγησιδάμου φέγγος
   Pindar uses δέδορκεν in the meaning “to shine” only in the three passages here cited.

On the other hand it is possible to point to much in the diction and thought of Nem. 3 that is similar to Pyth. 4.

1. Nem. 3.11–12: ἔγὼ δὲ κεῖνων τέ νυν δάροις / λύμα τε κοινάσομαι.
   Pyth. 4.136–137: πραβν δ' Ἰάσων /...ποιηστάζων δάρον
Pindar uses ἡρως in only two other passages, Pyth. 1.98 and Nem. 7.69.

2. Nem. 3.15–16: ἐλεγχέσσαν... ἐμένα
   Pyth. 4.99–100: ἵψεως / καταμάναις
Neither μαίνω nor καταμαίνω is used elsewhere in Pindar.

3. Nem. 3.26–27: τίνα πρὸς ἀλλοδαπᾶν / ἄκραν
   Pyth. 4.50: ἀλλοδαπᾶν... γυναικῶν
   Ibid. 254–255: ἐν ἀλλοδαπαῖς... ἀρούαις
Elsewhere in Pindar ἀλλοδαπός occurs only in Nem. 1.22.

4. Nem. 3.33: γέγαθε
   Pyth. 4.122: γάθησεν
Pindar does not use this verb elsewhere.

5. Nem. 3.53–54: βαθυμήτα Χύρων τράφε ὀθίνω / Ἰάσων ἐνδόν τέγει
   Pyth. 4.102–103: ἀντράθε γὰρ νέομαι... ἵνα Κενταύρον με κυραί τρέψαν ἄγναί (scil. Jason).

6. Nem. 3.55: τὸν φαρμάκαν δίδαξε μαλακόχειρα νόμον
   Pyth. 4.271: χρὴ μαλακὰν χέρα προσβάλλοντα τρώματ έλκεος ἀμφιπολεῖν.
This bears a less pronounced resemblance to Pyth. 3.51: τοὺς μὲν μαλακαίς ἐπαισδαίς ἀμφέπων

7. Nem. 3.61–62: ἐγχεσφόροις ἐπιμείξας / Ἀθώπεψει χεῖρας
   Pyth. 4.212–213: κελαινώπεσσι Κόλχουσι μιᾶν / μείξαν
8. Nem. 3.63: ἀνεφιός
   Pyth. 4.127: ἀνεφιόν
This word occurs nowhere else in Pindar.

9. Nem. 3.72: ἐν παιών νέοις παῖς, ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἄνήρ
   Pyth. 4.281–282: κεῖνος γὰρ ἐν παιῶν νέοις / ἐν δὲ βουλαίς πρέσβυς ἐγκύρωσις ἐκατονταετεῖ βιότα
This resemblance was noticed by both Christ and Fraccaroli (see above).

My findings may be summarized quantitatively in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Similarities Added by Christ</th>
<th>Additional Similarities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ol. 1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ol. 2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ol. 3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyth. 2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nem. 9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pyth. 4 | 299    | 8                            | —                       | 9     |

² Nem. 3.84, δεδωρεῖν φάος, is counted twice in this total, since it resembles both Ol. 1.93–95 and Nem. 9.41–42.
The foregoing table reveals that both the "Sicilian Odes" and Pyth. 4 contributed similarities to Nem. 3 at a rate of roughly three for each 100 lines of their own length.

Ol. 1–3 are now firmly dated to 476, while Pyth. 2 and Nem. 9 are usually attributed to approximately the same period. Pyth. 4 was written in 462.

Whether Nem. 3 repeats Pyth. 4, or vice versa, since it also repeats the "Sicilian Odes," it is again apparent that such repetition can occur in Pindar over a considerable number of years. We must, therefore, reject Gaspar's specific date of 475 for Nem. 3 and once more be content with merely a terminus ante quem of 458 B.C.

The Date of Nemean 11

Christ\textsuperscript{17} employed the same method in an effort to fix the date of Nem. 11. He lists the following parallels:

1. Nem. 11.8–9: καὶ ἔξινον Διὸς ἀσκεῖται θέμις αἰενᾶις / ἐν τραπέζαις·
   Ol. 8.21–22: ἑνθα Σύμπερα Διὸς ἔξινον / πάρεδρος ἀσκεῖται Θέμις.
   (460 B.C.)

   Isthm. 1.28–29: ταῦν ἄθροις ἀνθησάμενοι θαμάκις / ἔρνεαι χαίται.
   (ca 458 B.C.?)

   Isthm. 1.40: ὅ πονήσαις δὲ νόω καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει.


Nem. 6.9–11: οὗτ’ ἀμειβόμεναι / τόκα μὲν ἄν ὄν ἄνδράσιν ἐπηγανῶν ἐκ πεδίων ἔδωσαν, / τόκα δ’ οὕτ’ ἀναπαύομεναι σθένος ἐμαρφαν. (465 or 463 B.C.?)

On the basis of these parallels and the reference in lines 33–34 to friendship between Sparta and Athens, Christ concluded that Nem. 11 was written approximately at the time of the battle of Tanagra (458 B.C.). I know of no one who has accepted Christ’s suggestion; a much later date, 446 B.C., is generally preferred. John H. Finley,\textsuperscript{18} for instance, repeatedly remarks that Nem. 11 is close in mood to Pyth. 8 and probably contemporary with it.

\textsuperscript{17} Sitz. München 1889, pp. 54–56.
\textsuperscript{18} Op.cit. 36, 73, 129, and 219.
The first comparison on Christ’s list is convincing; one can hardly escape the impression that borrowing, conscious or unconscious, has occurred.

In comparison 2 the similarity of the two passages is admittedly close. Considering, however, the occasion for Pindar’s Epinicians and the repeated occurrence of both ἀναδέω and ἔρνος elsewhere in Pindar, this similarity is not necessarily the result of borrowing. Furthermore Nem. 11.28–29 is equally close to Pyth. 10.40: δάφνις τε χρυσέας κόμας ἀναδέψαντες (498 B.C.).

In comparison 3 the similarity of the two passages is limited to the word προμάθεια. The fact that the line from Isthm. 1 stands at the beginning of a long gnomic passage further detracts from the validity of this comparison.

As for comparison 4, Finley19 has pointed out that Nem. 11 is marked by a much darker tone than Nem. 6.

Thus the evidence for Nem. 11 is, at best, controversial.

Ol. 13, firmly dated to 46420, contains several phrases echoing odes of the year 476, including two of Christ’s "Sicilian Odes."

   Ol. 11.19–20: τὸ γὰρ ἐμφύες οὐτ’ . . . / οὗτ’ . . . διαλλάξατ' ἀν ἤδος.
   Ol. 2.98: ἐπεὶ ψάμμοις ἀριθμὸν περιπέθενε γεν (476)
3. Ol. 13.88: αἴθέρος . . . ἐρήμου
   Ol. 1.6: ἐρήμιος δὲ αἴθέρος (476)
   Ol. 1.111–112: ἐμοὶ μὲν ὄν / Μοῖσα καρπερώμεστον βέλος ἀλκατρέφει.
   Ol. 2.83–85: πολλὰ μοι ὄπ’ ἀγκάως ὥκεα βέλη / ἐνδον ἐντί φαρέτρας / φωνάεντα συνετοῦσιν

Pyth. 4 repeats phrases and words not only from Nem. 3, as pointed out above, but from other earlier odes as well. A few examples will suffice.

1. Pyth. 4.5: οὔκ άποδάμου Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος
   Pyth. 10.37: Μοῖσα δ’ οὔκ άποδαμεῖ (498)
Neither ἀποδαμέω nor ἀπόδαμος is encountered elsewhere in Pindar.

20 The scholiast’s date is confirmed by Diod. Sic. 11.70, Dion. Hal., Ant. Rom. 9.61, and Paus. 4.24.5.
2. *Pyth.* 4.65: τούτοις ὑγίου ... μέρος Ἀρκεσίλας
   *Pyth.* 12.11: τρίτων ... καυσυγητῶν μέρος (490)
   *Ol.* 1.111: παρ’ εὐδείελον ἐδώκεν Κρόνον. (476)
   εὐδείελος does not occur elsewhere in Pindar, while ἐδώκει is found only in
   *Nem.* 9.49: μαλθακὰ ... σὺν ἄοιδε’ (after 476)
   *Pyth.* 7.3: κρηπίδα ἄοιδαν ... βαλέσθαι. (486)
   *Nem.* 10.89: ὦς ἄρ’ αὐθάσαντος (date uncertain).

There can be no more doubt now that Pindaric odes widely separated by time can show considerable similarities of thought or diction. Thus we must reject the comparison of parallels within Pindar not only as a means of dating *Nem.* 3 and *Nem.* 11 but as an approach to Pindaric chronology generally.

*Isthmian 4 and Bacchylides 5*

Camille Gaspar\(^{21}\) dated *Isthm.* 4 to 476 B.C. and based this date in part on the resemblance between *Isthm.* 4.11–13 and *Ol.* 3.43–45. We have seen above in our discussion of *Nem.* 3.21–22 that this resemblance is far from being reliable evidence for any chronological relationship.

More significant in this case is a resemblance between Pindar and Bacchylides.

*Isthm.* 4.1–3: Ἐστι μοι θεῶν ἐκατ’ μυρίᾳ παντὶ κέλευσο, | ... | ὑμετέρας ἄρετᾶς ὑμιν διώκειν.

*Bach.* 5.31–33: τῶς νῦν καὶ ἔμοι μυρίᾳ πάντα κέλευσο | ὑμετέραν ἄρετάν | ὑμενεῖν.

*Bach.* 5 was written for Hieron of Syracuse in 476; efforts have been made to associate *Isthm.* 3/4 with it in date. Since *Isthm.* 4.15–18 is best taken as a reference to the battle of Plataea, we have a probable *terminus post quem* of 479 B.C., which does not conflict with such association.

I agree with Gilbert Norwood\(^{22}\) that the near identity of the two phrases points to conscious borrowing. Otto Schroeder\(^{23}\) and Sir John

---


\(^{22}\) *Pindar* (Berkeley 1945) 269–270, n.49.

\(^{23}\) *PLG* I, pp. 71–72.
Sandys\textsuperscript{24} thought that Bacchylides borrowed from Pindar. Schroeder later, apparently, reversed himself.\textsuperscript{25} Farnell\textsuperscript{26} pointed out that it is by no means certain who borrowed from whom, but was inclined to think that, if there was borrowing, Pindar borrowed from Bacchylides. The latter view is held also by Alexander Turyn,\textsuperscript{27} who also approves of Gaspar’s conclusions (see above). Before Farnell and Turyn, Wilamowitz\textsuperscript{28} already had placed Bacch. 5 before \textit{Isthm.} 4.

Norwood,\textsuperscript{29} in my opinion, settled the matter by pointing to two other passages:

Bacch. 9(8).47–50: \textit{στείχει δὲ εὐρείας κελεύθου / μνῆμα πάντα φάτις / σᾶς γενεὰς λίπαρο- / ζῶνων θυγατρῶν.}

Bacch. 19(18).1–4: \textit{Πάρεστι μνῆμα κέλευθος / ἀμβροσίων μελέων, / ὅς ἂν παρὰ Πειρίδων λά- / χησὶ δώρα Μουσάν.}

Unless we wish to claim that Bacchylides thrice borrowed from Pindar, we must admit borrowing on the part of Pindar\textsuperscript{30} and date \textit{Isthm.} 3/4 after 476; how much after 476 must be left open to question.

The pitfalls of the method, even when a parallel outside Pindar is available, again become apparent. It is only a fortunate circumstance which in this one case allows a more definite conclusion. If some characteristic accident of papyri had preserved only Bacch. 5 and not Bacch. 8 and 18, should we not then have thought with Schroeder and Sandys that Bacchylides borrowed from Pindar?

The three Bacchylides passages quoted above certainly tell us nothing about the dates of Bacch. 8 and 18. It seems likely that the attempt to establish the chronology of other classical authors by a comparison of verbal parallels may call for equal caution.

\textbf{State University of New York at Albany}

\textit{March, 1963}

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{The Odes of Pindar} (London 1930) 455.
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Pindari Carmina} (Leipzig 1930) viii and ix.
\textsuperscript{26} Op.cit. 347.
\textsuperscript{27} Op.cit. 203.
\textsuperscript{28} Op.cit. 336f.
\textsuperscript{29} Loc.cit.
\textsuperscript{30} Norwood denied the authenticity of \textit{Isthm.} 3/4 and referred to its author as “the Anonymous.” This, it seems to me, does not affect our present argument about the chronological relationship of the two odes.