Pindar, *Nemean* 7.64–67

Glenn W. Most

Snell and Maehler print *Nemean* 7.64–67 as follows:

64 

εὼν δ' ἐγγὺς Ἀχαϊῶς οὐ μεμψεται μ' ἀνήρ

65 Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἶ-

κέων, καὶ προξενίᾳ πέποιθ', ἔν τε δαμόταις

66 ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν, οὐχ ὑπερβαλόν,

67 βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσας.

With regard to the constitution of the text, this passage is quite straightforward. But its interpretation has provoked considerable perplexity and disagreement, particularly as the difficulties that have obscured it are not independent of one another but are instead thoroughly interconnected. These difficulties will be examined here in the following order: (1) the meaning of ὑπέρ and the identity of the

---

1 B. Snell and H. Maehler, edd., *Pindarus I* Epinicia and II Fragmenta (Leipzig 1971, 1975); where necessary I indicate and explain my divergences from this text.

2 The metrical correction of the transmitted ὑπερβαλῶν in line 66 is due to E. Schmid. There is, however, no metrical need to tamper with 65, analyzed by Snell-Maehler and Turyn, for example, as two choriambs (of which the first element of the second is, here as always in the poem, resolved into two shorts) followed by a hipponacteum and an iambus (whose first element is always short in this poem). Objection to this analysis has been based on (1) the synizesis required if οἰκέων is to yield a spondee, and (2) the resulting long in the first element of the hipponacteum (whereas elsewhere in the poem this element is short, with the probable single exception of line 86, pace P. Maas, “Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und Pindar,” Jahresh.d.Phil.Ver.zu Berl. 39 [1913] 289–320, esp. 301: the minor metrical license of ἐμαυν seems far preferable to the considerable morphological singularity of ἐμν, which appears in Homer but not in lyric or iambic, and in elegiac only in a doubtful conjectural exception at Theognis 806; it is never transmitted in Pindar and is always precluded by meter). Thus Hermann deleted καὶ, and Mommsen the first syllable of προξενίας; as a twin result of either step, οἰκέων yields a cletic and the first element of the hipponacteum is short. But synizesis in οἰκέων occurs elsewhere in Pindar at Isthm. 1.31 and 4.19, and in other -έων participles at Ol. 9.110 (θαρσέων), Ol. 12.19 (ἄμι-

κέων), and Pae. 2.31 (ἐρείσων; cf. the uncertain διακομπέων in fr.157.2). It happens quite often in Pindar that the first two elements of full aeolic bases (or the first element of aecpheric aeolics), which are on principle anecps, are not consistently long or short thoughout a whole poem, but show one or two exceptions within a single ode. Thus while in *Nem.* 7 this element is elsewhere short, it is probably long in line 86; and the first element of the aecpheric hipponacteum (which forms the second half of the eighth verse of the strophe) is short thoughout, with the single exception of line 37 (if we accept Boeckh’s unavoidable transposition). See, in general, A. M. Dale, “The Metrical Units of Greek Lyric Verse. II,” *CQ* 45 (1951) 20–30, esp. 23.
PINDAR, NEMEAN 7.64–67

1. 'Αχαϊῶς ἀνήρ Τοίνιας ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἰκέων

Who is the Achaean man who will not blame Pindar if he is near? The only answer Pindar gives us lies in the words Τοίνιας ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἰκέων. We must understand this phrase if we are to make use of that answer; in particular, we must determine what is meant by the preposition ὑπὲρ, for the various interpretations of the sentence turn upon the meaning we give it.

Pindar uses the preposition ὑπὲρ in its local sense in the following passages:3

(a) With verbs of motion, ὑπὲρ specifies that the movement takes place upon the surface of a finite body and traverses that body so as to end on its farther side; the substantive governed by ὑπὲρ can appear in the genitive or in the accusative, without any perceptible difference in meaning. This is the construction in Pyth. 2.68, 80, 4.26, and 9.52; at Nem. 3.21 the aspect of traversing to the other side seems to predominate over that of moving upon the surface. In three other passages the verb itself is not transmitted, but there can be no doubt that Pindar wrote a verb of motion: Pae. 8.14, fr. 189 and 292.

(b) With explicit or implied verbs of rest, ὑπὲρ denotes a stable location at an unspecified altitude above some reference point and in spatial separation from but direct relation to it; in this sense, ὑπὲρ in Pindar always governs the genitive case. This construction occurs in Pyth. 1.18.8 Isthm.

3 See K. Bossler, De praepositionum usu apud Pindarum (Darmstadt 1862) 31f (who nevertheless follows Dissen [n.23 infra] on this passage); cf. J. Rumpel, Lexicon Pindaricum (Leipzig 1883) s.v., and W. J. Slater, Lexicon to Pindar (Berlin 1969) s.v.


5 Accepting Wilamowitz’s unavoidable εἶμι for the transmitted ἐεύμι (Pindaros [Berlin 1922] 291); otherwise the preposition would mean, not that the cork was floating upon the surface of the water, but rather that it was hovering magically at some height above the water in the air.

6 Cf. Σ ad Pyth. 4.46.

7 Cf. Σ ad Pyth. 9.90a.

8 This must refer to the volcanic peaks on the Cape of Misenum above Cumae (on the mountains of this area cf. e.g. Agathias 1.8.2f, and on its volcanoes Vitr. De arch. 2.6). H. Fränkel, Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums4 (Munich 1976) 522 and n.28 (followed by Slater [supra n.3] s.v. ἀλεφρῆς, δὲθα, ὑπὲρ 1.6β), objects that ἀλεφρῆς can only describe an island, and consequently proposes instead to identify Pindar’s cliffs as the island of Ischia. Yet, as Fränkel himself parenthetically concedes, Pindar also applies the epithet to an isthmus (Isthm. 1.19); other non-technical authors use similar language in their descriptions of peninsulas, e.g. Hymn.Hom.Ap. 410, Liv. 5.33.7, Sil. Pun. 15.220f. Fränkel’s own translation (“die ‘meerumgürteten Klippen vor Kyme’”) gives ὑπὲρ an impossible meaning.
8.9, and *Pae.* 8.70. In one passage the verb is not transmitted but may be conjectured to have been some form of *vaiw*: fr.140b.6. To these may be added two other passages in which *vπερ* has the same meaning but is used adverbially: *Ol.* 1.57, fr.51a.3.\(^9\)

In view of these passages, we may reject the proposal that *′Ιονιάς* *vπερ* *άλος* *οἰκέων* means “dwelling beyond the Ionian Sea”;\(^11\) for the preposition to bear this sense, the verb would have to be one of motion. The most natural interpretation of the phrase is “dwelling above the Ionian Sea”: but in what sense “above”?

Fr.140b.2–6, cited above, provides a helpful parallel:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{άοιδ[άτ]κ[I]胝 ρομονιάν} \\
\text{αυλ[ώς ἐ]πεφράς[ατο} \\
\text{τω[ν τε Λοικρόν τις, ο[ε] τ’ ἀργίλοφον} \\
\text{πάρ’ Ζεφυρίου κολώναν} \\
\text{ν [. . . : νάονσ’] Grenfell-Hunt, ναίονθ’ Schroeder, υπέρ} \\
\text{Αὑσονιά[ς ἀλός Wilamowitz.}\(^12\)
\end{align*}
\]

Here, too, there is apparent reference to people who dwell *vπερ* a sea. What, then, was the spatial relationship between Locri Epizephyrii and the Ausonian Sea? From Strabo we learn that *Αὑσονινον* *πέλαγος* was the earlier name of what later came to be called *ἡ Σικελικὴ θαλάττη*, viz. the body of water bounded on the west by Sicily and on the northwest by the coast of Italy as far as Locri Epizephyrii (2.5.20, cf. 5.3.6): hence the Ausonian Sea lay immediately before the town, which was built upon a hill (Strab. 6.1.7). Evidently, therefore, *vπερ* in this passage has a quite concrete sense: the Epizephyrian Locrians lived above the Ausonian Sea, *i.e.*, on the

---

9 Cf. Σ ad Isthm. 8.17a.

10 This usage is not recorded in R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* II.1 (Hannover/Leipzig 1898 [hereafter ‘KG’]) 527.


12 Cf. supra n.5: 501f; although the designation ‘Ausonian Sea’ first recurs in the Hellenistic age, this supplement is regarded, generally as here, as certain.
hills overlooking the sea. It seems reasonable to suppose that in
the passage in question from the Seventh Nemean Pindar is refer­
ing to an Achaean who lives on the hills overlooking the Ionian
Sea.

But what, for Pindar, is the Ionian Sea? It is sometimes thought
that throughout the fifth century this term always referred to the
whole of what is now called the Adriatic Sea, stretching northwest
from the Peloponnesus beyond Illyria and bounded on the west by
the coasts of Italy and Sicily; but it is most unlikely that Pindar
would have had this whole region in mind. He never refers to any
location on the eastern side of the Adriatic more northerly than Do­
dona and Ephyra (such as Apollonia and Epidamnus in Illyria), nor,
on the western side, any point on the southeastern or eastern shore
of Italy more northerly than Locri Epizephyrii (such as Metapontum
or Tarentum). It appears that for Pindar these were simply non­
Greek regions in which he seems to have had no particular interest
or familiarity.

On the other hand, Pindar was capable of considerable precision
when referring to parts of the world that did interest him and with
which he may well have been familiar from personal experience. He
names the Ionian Sea in two other passages which together yield a
coherent geographical picture. In an ode to Hieron, Pindar writes of a
voyage from Thebes to Sicily “cleaving the Ionian Sea” (Ἰονίαν
τάμνων θάλασσαν, Pyth. 3.68). We need not understand him to
imply that the Ionian Sea extended from Thebes all the way to the

Jacoby, FGrHist Ia 337f ad 1Fr90–108, and W. S. Barrett, Euripides, Hippolytus (Oxford
1964) ad 735–37. See in general V. Burr, Die antiken Namen der einzelnen Teile des
Mittelmeeres (diss. Würzburg 1932) 56–68.

14 Cf. H. Reinhold, Griechische Oerlichkeit bei Pindaros (Progr. Quedlinburg 1894)
21, 26, 30. In one passage (Nem. 10.7) Pindar refers to Athena’s gift of immortality
to Diomedes; the scholia (ad Nem. 10.12a, b) see here a reference to the cult of
Diomedes, widespread throughout the Adriatic region (cf. R. L. Beaumont, “Greek
Influence in the Adriatic Sea Before the Fourth Century B.C.,” JHS 56 [1936] 159–
204, esp. 194ff, and L. R. Farnell, Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality [Ox­
ford 1921] 289ff). But it is not certain that Pindar is thinking here of a particular cult,
or if so, of this one. The story may well have been told in the Thebais (cf. Σ Gen. ad II. 5.126) and was certainly narrated by Ibycus (PMG 294) and Pherecydes
(FGrHist 3Fr97).

15 Greeks of this period certainly had some degree of familiarity with the upper Adri­
atic (cf. Beaumont [supra n.14] 159ff), but Pindar generally prefers the moral or legen­
dary aspects of distant geography to the actual facts. He declares it impossible, for
example, to sail beyond the pillars of Hercules (Ol. 3.44, Nem. 3.31, Isthm. 4.12); yet
by the end of the seventh century the Greeks had already sailed through the Straits of
Gibraltar. Cf. G. Norwood, Pindar (Berkeley 1945) 44f, and the discussion of Pindar’s
subjectivist geography infra.

18
island (as is unnecessarily assumed by Σ ad Pyth. 3.120b): the passage is written from the viewpoint of someone setting out on a journey westward from Thebes, and from such a perspective the Ionian Sea is that body of water one enters after having passed through the Corinthian Gulf, and of which the western boundary is neither clear nor relevant. The suggestion that, for Pindar, the Ionian sea is simply that body of water whose eastern shore is Greece is further strengthened by the second passage (cited by Σ ad Nem. 7.95a):

Νεοπτολέμος δ’ ἀπείρω διαπρυγία (scil. κρατεῖ),
βουβόται τόθι πρῶνες ἔδοξοι κατάκευναι
Δωδώναθεν ἄρχόμενοι πρὸς Ἰόνιον πόρον (Nem. 4.51–53).

Here, too, the Ionian Sea is defined from the point of view of Greece: it is that sea which begins at Epirus and stretches westward an indeterminate extent. In general, Pindar describes bodies of water subjectively from the point of view of people living on their shores. Just as the Ausonian Sea is that extending southeast from Locri Epizephyrii, so too the Ionian Sea is that extending westward from the shore of Epirus southward. This interpretation is not contradicted by the fact that Hecataeus— as well as the later Hellanicus and Herodotus—mention more northerly, and Pherecydes more westerly, locations as bordering on the Ionian Sea: Pindar, was not, after all, a professional historian or geographer. Further support may be found in our only other early poetic reference to the Ionian Sea, at Aesch. PV 836–41.

The passage from Nemean 4 just cited is of particular importance in this context, for it asserts a close relation between the people who revere Neoptolemus, the mountains of Epirus, and the Ionian Sea.

16 This kind of subjectivist geography has recently received a celebrated illustration: Steinberg’s map of America viewed from Manhattan, later imitated for many other cities.

17 FGrHist 1F91 (the Istrians), F106 (Oricus).

18 FGrHist 4F4 (the mouth of the Spina).

19 Hdt. 6.127 (Epidamnus), 9.92 (Apollonia).

20 FGrHist 3F156 (the Peucetians in Italy). Thuc. 6.10.1 can also be so interpreted, but it seems preferable to understand the sentence in the same way as Pyth. 3.68f.

21 While it is not quite certain what the great gulf of Rhea is, it seems best to take it as Ocean: cf. the scholia ad loc. and Wilamowitz, Aischylos. Interpretationen (Berlin 1914) 153f and n.1; this interpretation is supported by the phrase τὴν παρακτίαν / κέλευθον (836f), which implies a journey northward along the coast rather than westward across the sea towards Sicily. The stress upon Io’s being thrown backwards by counter-currents (838) leaves the northward extent of the Ionian Sea beyond the latitude of Dodona vague, perhaps purposely, and certainly unemphasized. The earliest poetic reference by name to the Adriatic is apparently Aesch. fr.67 Nauck; the earliest in prose is Hecataeus, FGrHist 1F90.
Pindar’s reference to the ἐξοχον πρῶνες indicates that he had at least heard of the most prominent feature of the landscape of Epirus, the jagged mountain ranges along the coastline that make this area ‘the Helvetia of Hellas’. Not only are Dodona and the Molossian kingdom located at a high altitude: even more interestingly Ephyra, the town Pindar has mentioned slightly earlier as the point where Neoptolemus landed after his wanderings (Nem. 7.37), was built upon a hill overlooking the Ionian Sea and is referred to by Greek prose writers in phrases that provide striking parallels to Pindar’s Ἰονίας ύπερ ἀλὸς οἰκέων.

Such passages do not prove that Pindar could have been referring only to the hills of Epirus with these words: they merely remove any linguistic or geographical objection to our interpreting him as having done so. On principle the phrase Ἄχαιός ἀνήρ Ἰονίας ύπερ ἀλὸς οἰκέων could be understood to denote an Achaean dwelling at any

---


23 Thuc. 1.46.4, ἐστὶ δὲ λυμήν, καὶ πόλις ύπερ αὐτοῦ κεῖται ... Ἐφύρη; Strab. 7.7.5, ὑπέρκειται δὲ τούτου μὲν τοῦ κόλπου Κίχυρος, ἡ πρότερον Ἐφύρα ... ἔγγος δὲ τῆς Κίχυρου πολύνων Βουχέτων Κασσυπαίων, μικρὸν ύπέρ τῆς θαλάσσης δὲ; 7.7.8, Ἡπειρώτως δ' εἰσὶ καὶ Ἀμφίλοχοι καὶ οἱ υπερείμενοι καὶ συνάπτοντες τοὺς Ἰλινοὺς ὅρεσι, τραχείαν οἰκούντες χώραν, Μολοσσοῖ ... ἀναμείκται δὲ τούτοις τὰ πρὸς τὸ νοτίῳ μέρει τῆς ὥρεως καὶ τὰ υπὲρ τῶν Ἰονίων κόλπων ... ἐπὶ ἐκπρατώντων αἰεὶ τοιμῶν κατέστρεφεν ἁπαντα εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν ἄρχην, πλὴν ὄλγων τῶν υπὲρ τῶν Ἰονίων κόλπων. L. Dissen, apud A. Boeckh, ed., Pindari opera quae supersunt (Leipzig 1811–21) ad Nem. 7.64ff, cited some of these passages to support the suggestion that υπὲρ ἀλὸς could mean simply “on or next to the sea,” so that Nem. 7.65 could be translated as “ad Ionium mare habitans” or “Ionium mare accolens.” He has been followed, for example, by LSJ (s.v. υπέρ) 1.1) Bossler (supra n.3), and H. Lloyd-Jones, “Modern Interpretation of Pindar: The Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes,” JHS 93 (1973) 109–37, esp. 135 and n.129, but is surely mistaken (cf. W. G. Cookesley, ed., Pindari Carmina [Eton 1842–51] 145ff ad loc., and C. A. M. Fennell, ed., Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes [Cambridge 18831, 18992] ad loc.). The single case of Epirus will not support this generalization; and in fact when the Greeks mean ‘ad mare’ they use the appropriate prepositions: ἐν θαλάσσῃ (KG 1.464 cite Xen. An. 4.8.22), ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ (KG 1.499 cite Hdt. 7.89), παρὰ θαλάσσῃ (KG 1.511 cite Xen. An. 7.2.25). ὑπὲρ θαλάσσης never means simply ‘next to the sea’, but always instead ‘at a significant altitude overlooking the sea’. Because the coastline in the Mediterranean is often a strip of low-lying land on whose inland side rise hills and mountains, υπὲρ very frequently takes on the meaning ‘inland from’: but in such cases it never denotes simply distance from the sea at the same altitude (for this, the usual expression is ἀπὸ θαλάσσης, e.g. Thuc. 1.46.4), but rather always includes the notion of moving upwards (so e.g. Hdt. 7.115.2). Cf. in general R. Helbing, Die Präpositionen bei Herodot und anderen Historikern (= Schanz’ Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache 16 [Würzburg 1904]) 148–50, and E. Reitz, De praepositionis υπὲρ apud Pausianiam periegetam usu locali (diss.Freiburg i.B. 1891) 25ff.
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point along the rocky eastern coast of the Ionian Sea: in Elis, in Acarnania, or in Epirus. But the passage quoted from the Fourth
Nemean, as well as the reference in this poem to Neoptolemus’
arrival at Ephyra and kingship over the Molossians, make the hypoth­

esis that in 64f Pindar is again referring to the Molossians by far the
most economical explanation available.25

Which, then, of the Epirotans is Pindar thinking of? His words
imply neither that only kings or members of the royal house might
be called Achaeans (which would imply an improbable journey by the
Molossian kings to Aegina to hear Pindar’s poem) nor that all mem­
bers of the Molossian tribe could be so called (which would suggest a
more thorough Hellenization than we expect of them in this period).
Instead, the words refer to any Molossian for whom the honor due
Neoptolemus was so important that he could be regarded, or could
regard himself, as an Achaean. What percentage of the Molossians
could be accurately described in these terms is not a question likely
to have occurred to Pindar.26

24 So Dissen (supra n.23).
25 This is the interpretation of the ancient scholia—which, to be sure, also offer the
implausible alternative that Neoptolemus himself could be meant: cf. Σ ad Nem. 7.94a, b.
The latter suggestion has been resurrected by L. Bornemann, “Pindar’s siebente
nemeische Ode ein Siegartotenlied,” Philologus 45 (1886) 596–613, esp. 608, and L.
Woodbury, “Neoptolemus at Delphi: Pindar, Nem. 7.30ff.,” Phoenix 33 (1979) 95–133,
esp. 123ff. But it seems unlikely that, after the emphasis upon Neoptolemus’ death and
burial at Delphi (34f, 42, 44ff), we should find him turning up in Aegina. Woodbury’s
observation that “in the Fourth Nemean Pindar says that Neoptolemus ‘reigns’ in
Epirus” does not help matters much: that is a far less immediate context; and in gen­
eral, under normal circumstances, strict limits were set to the spontaneous mobility of
heroes after their death (cf. W. Burkert, Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassi­
schen Epoche [Stuttgart/Berlin 1977] 316; M. P. Nilsson, GGR I 189, 715f; and E.
Rohde, Psyche II [Freiburg i.B./Leipzig/Tübingen 1898] 159ff).
26 Woodbury’s objection, that the Epirotans of this period seem to have been barbar­
ians (supra n.25: 114–33) is refuted by C. Carey, A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar
(New York 1981) 152 ad Nem. 7.40 and 162 ad 64–68. It is important that we not
overestimate the certainty of our knowledge of the history of the period at the cost of
the transmitted poetry. It would not be impossible, for example, for a tribe considered
by the Greeks as barbarians to have been ruled by a dynasty claiming descent from
Greek heroes. This is precisely what Strabo attests for the Molossians (7.7.8, καὶ τῶν
Πηνειωνών θευ τῶν Μολοστέων τῷ Πηνειωνών θεω τῶν Αχιλλεώς καὶ τῶν ἀπογόνων
αὐτῶν Θεταυίσις οὐκ ἐγενέτοις), and there is no adequate reason to reject his testi­
mony. The locus classicus for the barbarian nature of the Molossians is Thuc. 2.80.5f,
where they appear in the company of the Chaonians, the Thesprotians, and others; but
at least the Thesprotians seem to have traced their ruling dynasty back to Odysseus, as
implied by the Teleogony (Procl. 109.18ff Allen; cf. Apollod. Epit. 7.34f). The later
increase in the hellenization of the Molossians (cf. Hammond [supra n.22] 507ff; M. P.
Nilsson, Studien zur Geschichte des alten Epeiros (= Lunds Universitets Arsskrift N.F. Afd.
1,6-4 [Lund 1909] 32–46; Woodbury [supra n.25] 121f) by no means precludes this hy­
thesis: quite the contrary.
2. καὶ...τε

Traditional interpretation associates the reference to προξενία in line 65 closely with the preceding sentence concerning the Achaean man and sees the beginning of a new thought in the words ἐν τε δαμότας: however they may disagree about the precise denotation of Ἀχαιῶς ἀνήρ, of Ἰονίας ὑπέρ ἀλός, and of προξενία, commentators seem unanimous in interpreting these lines to mean that Pindar’s confidence in some proxeny relieves him of any fear that the Achaean man will blame him; there is similar agreement that the major break in thought occurs after πέποιθα.27

But this interpretation represents a grave violation of the syntax of καὶ and τε. It may be formulated as a general rule that, when three elements A, B, and C are coordinated by these particles in the form A-καὶ-B-C-τε, τε links only B and C with one another, while καὶ unites A with the complex formed by B and C together; hence the result is A + (B+C).28 This rule holds whether the elements in question are words or phrases. Consider the following examples:

(a) Substantive + (substantive + substantive):
1. Pyth. 11.59–64: ἀ τε τὸν Ἰφικλείδαν / διανείμει Ἰόλαον / ὑμνητὸν ἐόντα, καὶ Κάστορος βιαν, / σε τε, ἀναξ Πολύδευκες, νιὸι θεῶν, / τὸ μὲν παρ’ ἀμαρ ἐδρασε Θεράπτας, / τὸ δ’ οἰκέοντας ἐνδον Ὀλύμπων. Iolaus was the son of Iphicles, Castor and Polydeuces were the sons of Zeus (cf. Σ ad Pyth. 11.91).
2. Nem. 4.9–11: τὸ μοι θέμεν Κρονίδα τε Δι καὶ Νεμέα / Τιμασάρχου τε πάλα / ὑμνον προκώμων εἴη. Praise is due, on the one hand, to god, and on the other—almost by hendiadys (cf. Fennell [supra n.23] ad loc.)—to Timasarchus’ victory at Nemea.

(b) Phrase + (phrase + phrase):
1. Ol. 13.24–30: ὑπὲρ ἀνάσσων / Ὀλυμπίας, ἀφθόνητος ἐπεσσον / γένου χρόνον ἀπάντα, Ζεὺς πάτερ, / καὶ τοῦδε λαὸν ἀβλάβῃ νέμων / Ἑνοφώτος εὐθύνε δαίμονιν οὐρον, / δέξαι τε 29 οἱ στεφάνων ἐγκώμων / τεβμέν, τὸν ἀγεί πεδίων ἐκ Πίσας, / πενταεθῆκα ἄμα σταδίων / νικῶν δρόμων. Despite the conventional punctuation (a colon after οὐρον) it seems evident that the first phrase speaks in general terms of the relation between Zeus and the poet’s words, while the second two phrases, belonging closely together, describe specifically the reciprocal relation between Zeus on the one hand and Χενοφόντης and the Corinthians on the other; this is underlined by the use of an optative in the first phrase and then of two imperatives in the second two.

27 Many editions leave this unclear by punctuating with two commas or two cola; but that the interpreters have understood the passage in this way is beyond doubt.
28 This is implied by KG 2.242f, 246, 251f n.2, and J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles (Oxford 1954) 496; it is asserted clearly by Fennell (supra n.23) ad Pyth. 1.42.
29 One of the two families of manuscripts (v) offers δε instead of τε; modern editors accept the latter reading but punctuate as though they read the former.
2. Pyth. 3.93–95: καὶ θεοὶ δαίσαντο παρ᾽ ἀμφοτέρως, / καὶ Κρόνον πάϊς
βασιλῆς ἔδω χρυ- / σέας ἐν ἔδραις, ἔδω τε / δέξαντο. First the general
situation is described from the perspective of the gods, who are the gram­
matical subject; then two concrete particulars are depicted from the perspec­
tive of the mortals, who are the subjects of the last two verbs (cf. Σ ad Pyth.
3.165, first clause; 166, second two).

3. Pae. 5.35–42: ἔδω / βοιάν ἔδω καὶ ἕνας ἕκα / ἢρμὶ Δάλλο "Ἀπόλλων" /
kαὶ σποράδας φερεμήλους / ἐκτίσαν νάσους ἐρυκυδέα τ' ἐσχῶν / Δᾶλλον,
ἐπεὶ σφυν Ἀπόλλων / δῶκεν ὁ χρυσοκόμας / Ἀστερίας δέμας οἰκεῖν. First
Euboea, then the Sporades, the latter being further subdivided into the
Sporades in general and Delos in particular.

Clearly the lines in question from the Seventh Nemean should also,
if possible, be interpreted as being organized in this way, with the
primary division of thought located, not after πέποιθα, but after οἰκέων. This suggestion is confirmed by two further grammatical
considerations: first, the change in the person of the verbs, from
third person in the first clause to first person in the second two
clauses, with the consequent change in perspective from the speaker
as object in the first clause to the speaker as subject in the second
two clauses; and second, the change in tense of the verbs, from
future in the first clause to the more closely correlated perfect and
present in the second two clauses.30 The text is usually punctuated
with two cola or two commas, one after οἰκέων and one after πέποι­
θα; but in light of this discussion, it may be preferable to adopt a
different and less ambiguous punctuation, one as far as I know not
previously proposed, viz. a colon after οἰκέων and a comma after
πέποιθα. While this change is not absolutely necessary, it may help to
clarify the relations obtaining among the various clauses.

3. προξενία

With few exceptions, the προξενία to which Pindar refers in line 65
has been understood as the technical term for the office of πρόξενος,
the institution whereby—at least after approximately the end of the
sixth century (and perhaps much earlier)—a citizen of one city might
be charged by another with the honorable duty of looking after the
interests of those members of the second city who might, for one
reason or another, find themselves in the first.31 Those scholars who
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have mistakenly connected the words (καὶ) προξενία πέπουθα to the preceding phrase rather than to the following one were naturally led to believe that Pindar was referring to his own προξενία with regard to the Achaean man dwelling above the Ionian Sea: that, for example, Pindar was the official προξενος in Thebes for the Molossians, and therefore did not need to fear the blame of any Molossian who happened to be nearby.32

In addition to the syntactical difficulties we noted above, a closer study of the usage of προξενος and προξενία will show that a technical understanding of this term must also be rejected.

The first literary author33 to use the term προξενος as a regular designation of this quasi-ambassadorship is Herodotus, who speaks of the Macedonian προξενος for Athens (8.136.1, 143.1) and the Plataean προξενος for Aegina (9.85.3; cf. 6.57.2, where the term is applied to officials appointed by the Spartan king). But Herodotus is not the first author to use the words προξενος and προξενία: they occur repeatedly in poetic contexts throughout the fifth century in non-technical reference to any person in one city who acts as a protecting host for travellers from another city. In every such case, there is no permanent contractual obligation for the host to entertain and protect his guests: he does so because of his hospitality and humanity. That is, in poetry of this period the term indicates not so much an office as a concrete act of hospitality or a generally hospitable disposition. Such is the usage in the three other passages in Pindar in which these words occur:

(1) Ol. 9.83: προξενία 34 δ’ ἀμφότεροι κράτησαν / μᾶν ἔργον ἀν’ ἀμέραν.35 The

---

33 I exclude here non-literary sources such as the famous Corcyraean tomb of Menecrates (ca 600 B.C.; Epigr. 26 Friedländer-Hoffleit; M./L. 4): they can tell us nothing about the literary traditions to which Pindar’s poetry belongs.
34 Here, as in Parth. 2.41 and Nem. 7.65, Pindar uses the generalizing substantive in -α, derived from the adjective. As I have shown elsewhere (The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar’s Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes [Göttingen 1985] 141 and n.28), such substantives form an important part of his vocabulary; as here, they are usually abstract rather than concrete.
35 The scholia on this passage are divided: some (ad Ol. 9.123a, c) see a reference to the institution of proxeny, others (123c, d, e) interpret the word more broadly as
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Datives indicate the considerations that prompted Pindar to come: on the one hand, the excellence that manifested itself in athletic victory; on the other, the friendliness towards him indicated by the invitation. The former picks up ἄρεταίαταν from line 16 and ἑργοῦσαν from line 66, for the eponymous Opus is made closely parallel to his newly successful descendants (as is clear from the emphasis on the combination, shared in both cases, of physical beauty and practical valor; cf. 65f and 95); parallels for the latter appear not only in Pindar’s reference to the city of Opus as φλαν πόλιν (21), but also and more significantly in the statement that people travelled from other cities, including Thebes, to admire the hero Opus (67f).

(2) Isthm. 4.8: τοῖς μὲν ὑπὸ Θῆβαις τιμῶντες ἄρχαθεν λέγοντα / προξενοὶ τ’ ἀμφικτιῶνων κεκαθεννᾶς τ’ ὁρφανοὶ / ὕβρισι. Pindar contrasts the honor the Cleonymids received from their fellow Thebans with their friendly relations to members of neighboring cities. A narrow interpretation of the word προξένοι would be at variance with the generality and abstractness of the other two attributes of the Cleonymids; moreover, the word ἄρχαθεν refers us to a primordial age in which the institution of προξενία was not yet known.37

(3) Parth. 2.41: πιστὰ δ’ Ἀγασικλέει / μάρτυς ἡλυθὼν ἐς χορόν / ἐσθοίς τε γονεῖσιν / ἀμφὶ προξενίασιν: τί- / μαθεν γὰρ τὰ πάλαι τὰ νῦν / τ’ ἀμφικτιόνεσθαι / ὑπὼν τ’ ὁκυνύσθων πολυ- / γνώνηε εὖ ποινας .. Again the reference is to the continuity, since ancient times, of friendly relations between Agasicles’ ancestors and the surrounding towns, as manifested in honors after athletic victories, and excludes any notion of the concrete institution of proxeny.

The same holds for the usage of προξένος in Attic tragedy. In Aeschylus’ Supplices the word twice refers to the non-institutionalized protection King Pelasgus offers the Danaids who have arrived in his kingdom (419, 491); later it recurs in the dialogue between Pelasgus and the Egyptian herald to designate the kind of local patronage without which the latter’s conduct is foolhardy, and without denoting any kind of official ambassador (919 [note the plural] and perhaps 92038); the ideal combination of hospitality and protection is described explicitly by King Pelasgus in lines 954–65 (cf. προστάτης, 963). In a papyrus fragment of the Diktyoulkoi, where the dramatic situation is

37 Cf. Thummer (supra n.11) II 66 ad 25f.
38 At Suppl. 920 Page (OCT [Oxford 1972]) daggers προξένως as an intrusive dittography from 919.
similar—Danae and Perseus have been washed onto the shore of Seriphos and are offered protection and hospitality—Aeschylus glosses the word by juxtaposing with it προπράκτωρ (P. Oxy. XVIII 2161.1.4). Sophocles uses the word once in describing Clytemnestra’s hospitality to her spurious Phocian guests (El. 1451). Euripides uses it (Ion 551, 1039; Andr. 1103) in reference to the Delphic officials in charge of welcoming foreign guests from all other Greek cities, not just from those with which they had a special contractual relation;39 a fragment (fr. 721 Nauck) is transmitted by Ammonius s. v. πρόξενος, with the revealing comment, ὁ πρὸξενος ὁ πρὸξενος ἔχει δοκίμην τῶν ἰδιών. If the uncertainly transmitted πρόξενιαν in Med. 359 is accepted,40 it will have exactly the same meaning. So too in Aristophanes Thesm. 602, the word describes merely someone who watches out for another’s interests.41 Finally, the verb προξενέω, when used in its literal sense (rather than with the meaning ‘to effect’), refers in the fifth century to the general act of protecting, not to fulfilling the office of πρόξενος in its technical sense (Eur. Med. 724, Ar. Thesm. 576).

It would thus be anomalous if in Nem. 7.65 Pindar were referring to the institution of proxeny. But if he is not, then what specific protective hospitality towards a foreigner does he have in mind here? The answer is provided a few lines earlier when Pindar says of himself (with regard to Thearion, father of the victorious Sogenes) ξεινός εἶμι (61). Clearly the two words ξεινός (61) and προ-ξενία (65) balance and explain one another; both denote the relationship of guest-friendship obtaining between Pindar and his host Thearion, the former from Pindar’s point of view and the latter from Thearion’s. Neither the Molossians nor an official proxeny have any business here: if Pindar feels confident, it is because of the generous hospitality his host has extended to him. Understood in this way the passage has an exact parallel in the Tenth Pythian (64–66):

πέποιθα ξενία προσανεῖ Θώρα-
κος, ὅσπερ ἔμαν ποιητῶν χάριν
τὸ δ’ ξενεύειν ἅρμα Πιερίδων τετράορον,
φιλέων φιλέουν’, ἀγων ἀγοντα προφρόνως.42

39 Cf. Monceaux (supra n.31) 259ff; Gschnitzer (supra n.31) 636f is too skeptical here.
41 The ancient scholia interpret the other passage in which Aristophanes uses the noun (Av. 1021) in terms of proxeny; this seems possible but unlikely.
42 Cf. Σ. ad Pyth. 10.99a, the terminology of which echoes that of Σ. ad Ol. 9.123d, e.
4. δαμόται

Since antiquity the δαμόται to whom Pindar refers in line 65 have generally been understood as his fellow Thebans. Pindar would thus be describing, in Aegina, the merits of his conduct at home among his fellow citizens in Thebes.

But this interpretation is almost certainly mistaken. It is only in Attic Greek that the word δημότης has a reciprocal value: that is, only in Attic can two members of the same δημος call one another δημότης and thereby mean not only ‘member of a δημος’ but also ‘fellow member of the δημος to which I belong’. In this usage, of course, the δημος in question is not the folk or the populace at large, but rather the deme, the unit of municipal administration into which the reforms of Cleisthenes organized Attica. This usage is familiar, for example, from Aristophanes and the Attic orators.

On the other hand, in archaic and classical non-Attic Greek the word never has a reciprocal value but instead always denotes a member of the class of free citizens in explicit or implicit contrast to a ruling or otherwise prominent individual. In Tyrtaeus the δημόται ἀνδρας are contrasted to the θεοτιμήτους βασιλήας and the πρεσβυγενέας γε-

43 The few exceptions: Fennell (supra n.23) 80 (retracted in ed.2 92); G. Fraccaroli, Le Odi di Pindaro (Verona 1894) 592 n.3; H. M. Lee, “The TEPMA and the Javelin in Pindar, Nemean vii 70–73, and Greek Athletics,” JHS 96 (1976) 70–79, esp. 72 and n.2c, follows and clarifies Thummer (supra n.11), who implies a more correct understanding of the word but offers no argumentation in support; Woodbury (supra n.25) 126 (as Thummer). E. Bundy, “The ‘Quarrel between Kallimachos and Apollonios.’ Part I. The Epilogue of Kallimachos’ Hymn to Apollo,” CSCA 5 (1972) 39–94, esp. 81 n.99, applies the word to the Aeginetans but misconstrues it as “Thearion’s fellow townsman.” Misunderstanding of this word is at least as old as the scholia (ad Nem. 7.97a, b, c), whose ignorance of the subtleties of non-Attic Greek is perhaps not surprising.

44 On such reciprocal terms cf. E. Benveniste, Problèmes de linguistique générale (Paris 1966–74) II 273–80. The restriction to Attic is recognized in passing by F. Ellendt, Lexicon Sophocleum (Berlin 1872) s.v. προάξειον; I have been unable to trace his source.


46 Ach. 319, 328, 333 (ἔμοι δ.), 349, 675; Eccl. 1023, 1115 (+ γεῖτονς); Eq. 320; Lys. 335 (εὐμάις δ.), 685; Nub. 210 (οίμοι δ.), 1210, 1219, 1322 (ὡ γεῖτονες καὶ ἐνυγ- γενεῖς καὶ δ.); Plut. 254 (+ φέλος), 322. Only in Pax 920, where the term is opposed to γεωργικόν, is non-Attic usage likely. Cf. in general V. Ehrenberg, The People of Aristophanes (Oxford 1951) 214ff, on the duties and relations among δημόται.

47 E.g., [Dem.] 52.28; Dem. 57.24, 61, 62, 69, etc.
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ροντας (4.3–5 West). Susarion addresses the Icarian populace as ὄ δημότα but emphasizes in the previous line that he himself is a Megarian (2f West); obviously he does not mean to suggest by this form of address that he belongs to the same δῆμος as the Athenians of Icaria. So also in Herodotus the word occurs three times, in each case designating ordinary citizens in contrast to rulers (2.172.2, 5; 5.11.2).

Since the reciprocal meaning of δημότης is peculiarly Attic, one might expect to find it in the Athenian tragedians. But almost without exception they exclude the local usage in preference to the non-Attic, non-reciprocal one. This self-censorship may well be evidence for a sense of dramatic propriety: presumably there was a desire to avoid the embarrassing incongruity of mythic figures speaking like Athenian burghers. In Sophocles’ Ajax 1071, Menelaus refers contemptuously to the dead hero as ἄνδρα δημότην, that is, as a common soldier from the viewpoint of the king and commander; at Antigone 690, Haemon describes the terrifying power of the king with respect to the ordinary citizen, ἄνδρε θημότης. The same tendency is found in Euripides. In his famous λάθε βῶσας speech Ion says δημό­της ἄν εὑνχής / ἔγν ἄν θέλομι μᾶλλον η τύραννος ὄν (Ion 625f); Menelaus reminds Agamemnon of his eagerness to find support for the Trojan expedition with the words, ὡς ταπευνός ἡσθα, πάσης δεξιάς προσνυγάνων / καὶ θύρας ἔχων ἀκλήστους τὸ θέλοντι δημο­τών / καὶ διδοὺς πρόσφησιν ἔξης πάσι (IA 339–41); in explaining Clytemnestra’s failure to remarry, Electra claims that ψόγον τρέ­μοντα δημοτῶν ἐλείπετο (El. 643); and a fragment from the Erech­theus contrasts ἐξοσιά ἐνυχών (the attainment of public office) with αὐχροδίς ἔρωτας δημοτῶν διωκαθεῖν (fr.362.24f Nauck). The same usage is found in a frequently misunderstood passage in the Alcestis: hesitating to accept Heracles’ request that an apparently unknown woman be lodged in the palace, which is still mourning the queen’s death, Admetus says (1057–60):

διπλῆν φοβοῦμαι μέμψιν, ἐκ τε δημοτῶν, μή τίς μ’ ἐλέγχη τὴν ἐμήν εὐεργέτων προδότι ἐν ἄλλης δεμνίοις πίνειν νέας, καὶ τῆς θανούσης. . .

49 Cf. C. Prato, ed., Tyrtaeus (Rome 1968) 73 ad loc.
50 This is misunderstood by A. Pickard-Cambridge and T. B. L. Webster, Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy (Oxford 1962) 185, and by M. L. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (Berlin/New York 1974) 32. The Parian Marble dates Susarion between 581/0 and 562/1—at least half a century before Cleisthenes’ reforms.
51 E.g. LSJ s.v. δημότης II (cited as the only parallel for Nem. 7.65); Ehrenberg (supra n.46) 215 (but cf. 82 n.2).
Admetus fears reproaches both from within the royal house (from the dead Alcestis) and from without (from the citizenry): but Admetus is a king, and the citizens are his subjects, not his fellow citizens.\(^{52}\) Indeed, there are only two passages in all Attic tragedy where, with some degree of plausibility, the Attic meaning of δημότης might be claimed: Soph. *OC* 77–79 (but here the words may mean, not ‘my fellow demesmen’, but rather ‘those members of the populace who live outside the town’\(^{53}\) and in any event the scene of the action is Attica, in the deme of Colonus, so that an Atticism might seem less anomalous), and Eur. *Supp.* 890–95 (where the phrase δημότης τε καὶ ξένος does suggest the meaning ‘fellow citizen’ for the former word, unless the passage is to be interpreted as contrasting—from the viewpoint of Adrastus—members of the non-royal populace with resident foreigners). But neither of these latter passages can offer any serious support for the notion that in *Nemean* 7 Pindar could be referring to his fellow citizens as δημόται.

The result may seem curious. After all, a πολίτης can be a member of the same πᾶλις, an ἀστός of the same ἄστον, a φυλής of the same φυλή; in Latin both ciuis and popularis can be used as reciprocal terms. Why should such an exception be made for δημότης? The answer is simple. Such reciprocity belongs exclusively to terms drawn from the sphere of political organization: established political divisions create classes, all of whose members have the same reciprocal relation to one another of belonging to the same group.\(^{54}\) Outside the terminology of political administration, on the other hand, such an attitude has no foundation. The Mycenaean *damo* may well have been a local administrative unit bound to the land and occupied in agriculture, subordinated to the central power but at the same time enjoying some as yet undetermined degree of autonomy.\(^{55}\) But this function seems not to have survived the general collapse of the

\(^{52}\) Any notion that Admetus might have an other than royal attitude towards his subjects is precluded by lines 425f, 507f, 510, and 1154f.

\(^{53}\) Cf. R. C. Jebb, ed., *Sophocles, Oedipus Coloneus* (Cambridge 1900) 24f *ad loc*.

\(^{54}\) The dependence of this linguistic reciprocity upon structures of political organization is illustrated perfectly by Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 21.4: καὶ δημότας ἐποίησεν ἀλλήλων τῶν οἰκοίντας ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῶν δήμων, ἦν μὴ πατρόμεν προσαγορεύουτες ἐξελέγχουσιν τοὺς νεοπολίτας, ἄλλα τῶν δήμων ἀναγορεύοντες ὅθεν καὶ καλοῦσιν ἀθηναίοις σφός αὐτοῖς τῶν δήμων.

Mycenaean administrative system; for in the archaic and classical periods, almost everywhere in Greece outside the Attic-Ionic sphere, the δημος was never a unit of municipal administration but denoted instead the free citizenry in its relation to the land. Hence only in Athens, and only after Cleisthenes’ innovation, could δημοτης become a reciprocal term.

We must, then, discard the notion that Pindar might be referring to his fellow Thebans with the words ἐν τε δαμόταις; but if not to them, then to whom is he referring? Pindar’s usage of the word δαμος provides the answer. In two passages the word describes the members of the population of the victor’s city in contrast to the victor himself: in Pyth. 1.70, the Aetnaeans in contrast to Hieron and Deinomenes (cf. 68 ἀστόις καὶ βασιλεύνῳ); and in Nem. 10.23, the citizens of Argos in contrast to the victor Theaeus. Such usage is thoroughly consistent with the passages discussed above: the contrast between victor and populace may be regarded as the epinician equivalent of that between king or prominent citizen and populace. It seems inevitable that with the words ἐν τε δαμόταις Pindar is contrasting the ordinary citizens of Aegina to the family of the Aeginetan victor Sogenes, son of Thearion, particularly as the immediately preceding words, καὶ προξενία πέποιθα, had alluded to this very family.

5. Conclusion

We have obtained the following results for the four problems with which we began:
1. Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἰκέων means “dwelling on the hills overlooking the Ionian Sea,” and the Achaean man of line 64 is consequently in all probability a Molossian to whom the honor of Neoptolemus is a matter of some concern;
2. the primary division of thought precedes the word καὶ, which adds to the preceding sentence the complex unit formed by the two phrases linked together by τέ;
3. προξενία is not a terminus technicus here but instead describes the friendly and protective hospitality offered to Pindar by the family of Thearion;
4. the δαμόται are not Pindar’s fellow Thebans, but rather the members of the populace of Aegina other than the family of Thearion.

56 In Ol. 3.16, the reference is to the populace of the Hyperboreans as a whole; Pae. 7c.c.4 is too fragmentary to be securely interpreted; in the spurious Ol. 5.14 it is uncertain whether the citizens of Camarina are being contrasted with the victor Psamis (so G. Hermann, “Über Pindars fünfte olympische Ode,” Opuscula VIII [Leipzig 1877] 99–110, esp. 100) or with the river Hipparis (so Σ ad Ol. 5.27, 29, followed by most modern scholars).
These results may be correlated in the form of the following repunctuated text together with a translation:

εὖν δ' ἐγγὺς Ἀχαιῶς οὐ μέμψεται μ' ἀνήρ
Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ ἄλος οἱ-
κέων καὶ προξενία πέποιθ', ἐν τε δαμόταις
ὀμματὶ δέρκομαι λαμπρόν, οὐχ ὑπερβαλῶν,
βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσας.

If any Achaean man who dwells on the hills overlooking the Ionian Sea [i.e., any Molossian to whom the honors due Neoptolemus are important] should happen to be near, he will not blame me; and [as for the Aeginetans,] I have confidence in the hospitality [of Thearion] and among the other citizens [of Aegina] I can look with brightness in my eye, for I avoid excess and keep all violence far from myself.

That is, Pindar divides his audience into two groups, Molossians and Aeginetans; then he subdivides the latter into two sub-groups, the family of the victor and the remaining populace. The two larger audiences correspond to the two primary topics that Pindar has discussed in the course of the poem: the Molossians represent the myth of Neoptolemus, the Aeginetans the epinician occasion of Sogenes’ victory. In claiming with these words that neither audience will find fault with him, Pindar is stating, in effect, that he has so far dealt successfully with both topics. To what degree he has in fact done so, I have examined in some detail elsewhere.57
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57 Cf. supra n.34, Chapter 3. I am grateful to Professor Richard Kannicht for his comments on an earlier version of this paper.