

The Performance of Pindar, *Pythian* 8.55–70

Edwin D. Floyd

PYTHIAN 8, one of Pindar's last poems, celebrates the victory of the Aiginetan youth Aristomenes in the wrestling contest at Delphi.¹ The myth in this poem, uniquely in Pindar's odes for victors from Aigina, does not deal with Aiakos and the other local Aiginetan heroes. Rather, it is the story of the Epigonoι, told in the form of a prophecy delivered by the seer Amphiaraos. In this prophecy, which is presented in *Pyth.* 8 as a direct quotation, Amphiaraos foretells the success of Adrastos and his army in their attack on Thebes, and in lines 45–47 he mentions especially his own son Alkmaion, "foremost in the gates of Kadmos, wielding the spotted dragon upon his shining shield."² Then, just after Amphiaraos' prophecy, there occurs a first person passage, in which the speaker says that he too honors Alkmaion, who is his neighbor and the guardian of his possessions (lines 55–60):

τοιαῦτα μὲν

ἐφθέγγεσθ' Ἀμφιάργηος. χαίρων δὲ καὶ αὐτός
'Αλκμᾶνα στεφάνοισι βάλλω, ραίνω δὲ καὶ ὕμνω,
γείτων ὅτι μοι καὶ κτεάνων φύλαξ ἐμῶν
ὑπάντασεν ἰόντι γᾶς ὀμφαλὸν παρ' αἰοίδιμον,
μαντευμάτων τ' ἐφάψατο συγγόνοισι τέχνης.

"Such things said Amphiaraos; and even I, rejoicing, throw crowns about Alkmaion, and drench him with song, because

¹ This article incorporates material from my unpublished doctoral dissertation ("Pindaric Persona: The Roles of Chorus and Koryphaios in the *Epinikia*," Princeton, 1964; cf. abstract in *DA* 25 [1965] p. 7252). I should like to thank all who have helped me in my work on Pindar. I am especially grateful to my dissertation adviser, A. E. Raubitschek, now of Stanford University, to whose suggestions this article owes much. Of course, I alone am to be held responsible for the specific interpretations which are presented here.

² The translations from Pindar in this article are my own. The texts which I have followed are B. Snell's Teubner text (*Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, pt. 1 [Leipzig 1959]) and, for the scholia, A. B. Drachmann's edition (*Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, 3 vols. [Leipzig 1903–1927]).

as my neighbour, and the guardian of my possessions, he met me going to the renowned navel of earth, and applied himself to in-born arts of prophecy.”

The general interpretation of these lines is not difficult. There must have been, it would seem, a shrine of the hero Alkmaion near the speaker's dwelling-place; furthermore, on a journey to Delphi, Alkmaion somehow appeared to him and made a prophecy. So much seems clear. There is, however, some question as to the identity of the speaker. According to the view generally accepted by modern scholars, he is Pindar, since the first person in the *Epinikia* must always refer to the poet himself.³ Some scholars, however, have held that the first person reference in this passage must be to the chorus rather than to Pindar.⁴ Finally, if we turn from modern discussions to an examination of the ancient scholia, we find still a third explanation, that this passage is sung in the person of the victor Aristomenes.

In this article, I wish to consider primarily the last of the interpretations enumerated above. The most ancient of the three, it is stated most clearly in scholion 78a to *Pyth.* 8: *τοιαῦτα μὲν ἐφθέγγεσθαι Ἀμφίαρχος ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ τὸ πρόσωπον μιμουμένου τοῦ νενικηκότος. ταῦτα δὲ εἶρηκεν ὡς ὑπάρχοντος ἡρώου καὶ γειτυνῶντος τῇ τοῦ νικηφόρου οἰκίᾳ, προσυποτίθεται δὲ ὅτι καὶ ὑπήντησε πορευομένῳ εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τῆς μαντείας ἐφήψατο καὶ αὐτὸς ὢν μάντις. ἐμφαίνει δὲ διὰ τούτων, ὅτι ἐγεγόνει τις μαντεία περὶ τῆς νίκης αὐτοῦ.*

In addition to this scholion, there are four other ancient comments

³ For the view that Pindar is the speaker in *Pyth.* 8.55ff, see especially A. Boeckh, *Pindari Opera* II.2 (Leipzig 1811–1821) 314; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 441; L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* II (London 1930–1932) 195–196; R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford 1962) 182–183. Cf. M. R. Lefkowitz, “*Τῶ καὶ ἐγώ*: The First Person in Pindar,” *HSCP* 67 (1963) 232–233. Most modern scholars believe that it was a convention of the epinikion form that the chorus should sing throughout each poem in the person of the poet. For a general discussion of this convention, see A. Croiset, *La poésie de Pindare* (Paris 1895) 99–101; W. Christ, *Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig 1896) xcvi; E. Reisch, s.v. CHOR, *RE* III (1899) cols. 2377–2378; W. Schmid and O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* I.1 (Munich 1929) 456–457 and 576; and Lefkowitz, *op.cit.* 225–237.

⁴ For the view that the chorus is the speaker in *Pyth.* 8.55ff, see F. Studniczka, *Kyrene, eine altgriechische Göttin* (Leipzig 1890) 79; I. Mueller, *Quomodo Pindarus chori persona usus sit* (Darmstadt 1914) 40–41; F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil* (Berlin 1921) 84; E. Thummer, *Die Religiosität Pindars* (Innsbruck 1957) 32; E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* II [Univ. of Cal. Publ. in Classical Philology 18.2] (Berkeley 1962) 69–70 (esp. n.84). Cf. H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (Munich 1962) 485 n.2; Fränkel regards another passage in *Pyth.* 8, line 98, as a specifically choral passage, but he does not mention lines 55ff in this connection.

on this passage, viz. scholia 78b, 82, 83a, and 83b. Two of these, scholia 78b and 83b, do not contain any specific interpretation concerning the speaker or manner of performance. Scholion 82, however, connects the passage with Aristomenes in a way which indicates that he should be regarded as the speaker: *γείτων ὅτι μοι τῆ Ἀριστομένους οἰκία παρίδρυτο Ἀλκμάονος ἠρώων, ἴσως δὲ καὶ τῆ αὐτοῦ μαντεία χρησάμενος ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐπορεύθη καὶ ἐνίκησεν.* Scholion 83a, on the other hand, explains why the chorus sings the first person passage in line 58; according to this scholion, this is appropriate, because the chorus is composed of Aiginetans: *κτεάνων φύλαξ ἐμῶν· ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ Αἰγινήται εἰσιν.* Scholia 82 and 83a therefore both indicate the same sort of explanation as is given by scholion 78a, and though they are less detailed, they are fully consistent with the explanation presented there. In particular, it is noteworthy that there is nothing in any of the ancient comments which would support the view that the speaker in lines 55ff is Pindar himself.

Yet, despite the unanimity of the Scholiasts on this point, most modern scholars have rejected their interpretation. The principal reason for this is the fact that one other passage in *Pyth.* 8 appears to contain first person statements which must refer to Pindar rather than to the chorus or the victor. This passage (lines 29–34) runs as follows:

εἰμι δ' ἄσχολος ἀναθέμεν
 πᾶσαν μακραγορίαν
 λύρα τε καὶ φθέγματι μαλθακῶ,
 μὴ κόρος ἐλθὼν κνίσῃ. τὸ δ' ἐν ποσὶ μοι τράχον
 ἴτω τεὸν χρέος, ὦ παῖ, νεώτατον καλῶν,
 ἐμᾶ ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανᾶ.

“But I am without leisure to dedicate prolixity of telling to the lyre and soft voice, lest satiety, coming, chafe. But, O child, let the task at my feet, the newest of fair accomplishments, run winged by my art.”

The analysis of these lines as containing statements appropriate only to Pindar is undoubtedly correct. Only the poet could refer to himself as dedicating the victor's accomplishments to the lyre, and only he

could properly speak of giving the victor wings through his art.⁵ There is no sufficient reason, however, why such a first person statement in lines 29-34 should preclude the scholiasts' interpretation of lines 55ff, although modern scholars have thought so. This belief that the first person reference must remain the same throughout *Pyth.* 8 does, to be sure, seem reasonable. In particular, it would appear that without a consistent reference of the first person, the audience which heard the poem could never be sure whether the poet or the chorus or the victor should be regarded as the speaker at any particular point.

Nevertheless, there is one way of explaining *Pyth.* 8 in terms of a shifting first person reference without any resulting lack of clarity. This manner of explanation (at least for the *Epinikia* in general, though not specifically for *Pyth.* 8) has now been known for nearly a century and a half, for it was presented in detail by Friedrich Thiersch in his edition of Pindar in 1820. According to Thiersch, there was a division of parts in the performance of Pindar's poems, with some passages being sung by the entire chorus, some by a portion of the chorus, and some by the chorus-leader alone. Such a division in the performance is a natural and effective way of achieving variety, and is quite likely to have existed in Greek choral poetry. Furthermore, it may in some instances have been important for understanding the poet's meaning. According to Thiersch, *Pindar used solo parts for passages in which he speaks specifically in his own person, and choral parts for specific first person statements by the chorus.*⁶ For the performance of

⁵ For the interpretation of lines 29-34 as a statement specifically by Pindar, see Boeckh (*supra* n.3) II.2, 314; and Wilamowitz (*supra* n.3) 441. (Boeckh, besides pointing out the first person reference to Pindar in lines 29ff, also mentions the fact that the victor is addressed or referred to in the second person in lines 33ff, 38, and 78ff, and that in line 72, the second person plural form *ὑμετέρας* is used to refer to the victor's father Xenarkes.)

⁶ F. Thiersch, *Pindarus Werke* (Leipzig 1820) vol. 1, "Einleitung in die pindarischen Gesänge," pp. 143-151. (In vol. 1, there are two sets of page numbers: 1-166 in the introduction, and 1-343 in the commentary on the *Olympian* and *Pythian Odes*, which is contained in the same volume.) In his discussion, Thiersch considers six passages as illustrations of a division of parts or of a choral first person: *Pyth.* 1.1-5; *Pyth.* 11 (entire poem); *Nem.* 1.19-24; *Nem.* 7.85; *Pyth.* 9.97-103; and *Pyth.* 5.72ff. In general, Thiersch's discussion of these passages is somewhat cursory, and his first two examples seem to me to be ill-chosen. In the case of *Pyth.* 1.1-5, Thiersch's division between speakers is based on A. Kircher's musical notation, which may well not go back to Pindar himself; in his second example, *Pyth.* 11, Thiersch's analysis is purely hypothetical, and is not based on any definite evidence either from the scholia or from within the poem itself. Possibly because of his own somewhat inadequate treatment of his material, Thiersch's work has not had the effect on subsequent scholars it deserves. In a fairly extensive search through Pindaric scholarship, I have found only eight references to Thiersch's work in this regard: Boeckh (*supra* n.3) II.2, 10-11;

some of the poems, the chorus-leader or koryphaios may have been Pindar himself. In such instances, it would be most natural for him to sing in his own person in solo rôles, while the sections sung by the entire chorus would appropriately refer to all of the chorus-members and not just the poet alone. Often, though, Pindar would be unable to be present for the performance, or would choose not to lead the chorus in person. In these cases it would be an easily understood convention for the koryphaios to sing in the person of the poet, since the effect of an individual singing for the poet would be much more natural than that of the entire chorus singing for him.

There are several otherwise difficult passages in Pindar's poems which may be easily explained in terms of such a division of parts between chorus and koryphaios. To cite just one example, the famous crux in *Pyth.* 5.72ff suggests such a manner of performance. In this passage, the speaker refers to his ancestors as the Aigeidai, who founded Cyrene. This would more naturally be spoken by the Cyrenaean chorus than by Pindar, but the conclusion of most scholars has nevertheless been that this first person statement must refer to the poet, since *Pyth.* 5 contains other first person references which must certainly be to him rather than to the chorus. According to Thiersch, however, a division of parts would make it possible for the first person in *Pyth.* 5.72ff to be unambiguously choral in reference, *i.e.* these lines would be sung by the entire chorus, while the passages

Tycho Mommsen, *Pindaros: Zur Geschichte des Dichters und der Parteikämpfe seiner Zeit* (Kiel 1845) 10; G. Hermann, "Ueber die Aegiden, von denen Pindar abstammte," *Opuscula* VIII (Leipzig 1877) 94; Studniczka (*supra* n.4) 78; Croiset (*supra* n.3) 92 n.1; Mueller (*supra* n.4) 7; Wilamowitz (*supra* n.3) 7; Lefkowitz (*supra* n.3) 252 n.117. Of these, only Boeckh's discussion (in the introduction to his commentary) is at all favorable to the idea of any alternation of speakers in the *Epinikia*; however, in his discussion of individual poems in his commentary, Boeckh nowhere accepts this interpretation. Otherwise, this idea has simply been rejected by subsequent scholars, without any adequate discussion. Mommsen refers only to the relatively limited discussion of *Pyth.* 5.72ff which Thiersch makes in his commentary, and he does not mention the much fuller account of his views which Thiersch presents in his introduction. Hermann, Studniczka, Croiset, Mueller, and Wilamowitz all dismiss Thiersch's work in no more than a sentence or two. Likewise, Lefkowitz, p. 252, makes merely passing mention of Thiersch, and she does not discuss in detail his views concerning the performance of the *Epinikia*. Elsewhere in her article, pp. 183-195, she discusses at some length the possibility of there being more than one speaker in any one poem, but she does not mention Thiersch there. I believe that Thiersch's work is basically sound, however, and in this article I hope to show that his ideas concerning the performance of the *Epinikia* deserve fuller consideration than they have yet received.

in which Pindar speaks in his own person would be sung by a solo voice.⁷

Thiersch does not discuss *Pyth.* 8 in connection with his theory of the performance of the *Epinikia*.⁸ This seems somewhat surprising, since the scholiasts present more extensive evidence for a division of parts in this poem than for any other.⁹ It should be noted, however, that scholion 78a interprets lines 55ff as being sung by the chorus, not in their own person but "imitating the person of the victor." Since Thiersch's emphasis throughout his discussion is on specifically choral first person passages, he may for this reason have disregarded the idea of any first person reference to the victor. Also, he may have felt that the explanation given in scholion 78a is improbable, since the other scholia to Pindar do not contain any exact parallel for the chorus' singing in the person of the victor.

Yet, although scholion 78a to *Pyth.* 8 is not specifically paralleled elsewhere, I believe that it provides some of the clearest evidence available for interpreting any of Pindar's poems in terms of a division of parts between chorus and koryphaios. In this scholion we may distinguish two quite separate elements in the explanation which is given for lines 55-60 of the poem: (1) the passage is ἀπὸ τοῦ χοροῦ, which must mean that it is sung by the chorus, and (2) the chorus is not singing in its own person, but is here imitating the person of the victor. This particular combination of ideas would be unnecessarily complicated unless the scholiast had some specific reason for mentioning the choral performance of the passage. If the entire poem were sung by the chorus, he could more simply have identified lines 55ff

⁷ Thiersch (*supra* n.6), "Einleitung . . .," pp. 149-151. Cf. Thiersch, I, commentary, pp. 260-262. Nearly every scholar, in commenting on this passage (*Pyth.* 5.72ff), has raised the question of a possible first person reference to the chorus, but most have rejected this possibility; see Wilamowitz (*supra* n.3), 479; Farnell (*supra* n.3) II, 177-179; Lefkowitz (*supra* n.3) 177-178; Burton (*supra* n.3) 146-147. On the other hand, for a concise and forceful statement of the reasons for taking the chorus as the speaker in this passage, see Fränkel (*supra* n.4) 485 n.2; Fränkel, however, does not discuss *Pyth.* 5 in terms of a specific division of parts between choral and solo sections.

⁸ In fact, Thiersch (*supra* n.6) I, commentary, pp. 288-289, specifically refers the first person forms in *Pyth.* 8.55ff to Pindar.

⁹ There are three scholia to *Pyth.* 8 (78a, 99a, and 140c) indicating a first person reference which is not to Pindar. For one other poem, *Pyth.* 9, there are similarly three scholia indicating a reference to the victor or the chorus (156b, 161, and 172). However, the evidence from the scholia for a specific division of parts seems to me to be much clearer in the case of *Pyth.* 8 than in the case of *Pyth.* 9. Besides these two poems, the other scholia references to a choral first person or to specifically choral presentation are as follows: *Ol.* 8.66; *Pyth.* 2.6b, 5.96a, 6.1a, 1e; *Nem.* 1.29a, 7.123a, 9.1a, *Isth.* 7.51a. Cf. *Isth.* 7, scholion 55b, which refers a first person passage to the victor.

as being in the person of the victor, without any specific mention of the chorus. Emphasis on the choral performance of lines 55ff may easily be explained, however, if the scholiast wished to contrast this passage with some other section or sections of the poem in which the performance was not by the chorus. Such other sections in the poem could scarcely be anything except passages sung by a part of the chorus or by a solo voice rather than by the entire chorus.

An interpretation of *Pyth.* 8 in terms of a division between choral and solo performance is also indicated by two other scholia, 95a and 99a. In scholion 95a the prayer to Apollo in lines 67–69 is interpreted as a request to watch over whatever the speaker writes: *ἐκόντι δ' εὔχομαι νόῳ· σοὶ δὲ, ὦ Ἄπολλον, εὔχομαι ἐφορᾶν σε ἕκαστον τῶν ποιημάτων, ὅσα κατὰ τινα ἄρμονίαν ἐπέρχομαι καὶ γράφω*. Here the reference to the speaker's poems clearly indicates that the scholiast regarded the first person as referring to the poet Pindar rather than to the chorus. In scholion 99a, on the other hand, there is an equally clear first person reference to the chorus: *κώμῳ μὲν ἀδυμελεῖ τῷ μὲν χορῷ ἡμῶν δικαιοσύνη παρέστηκε, τουτέστιν οὐ ψευδόμεθα οἷς λέγομεν περὶ τοῦ Ἀριστομένους*.

Obviously, if we take scholia 78a, 95a, and 99a together, there must be an alternation of various speakers in this section of *Pyth.* 8. Before discussing in detail the division of parts which these scholia indicate, we ought perhaps to consider another possible analysis. This is that each of these three scholia represents the view of a different ancient scholar, and that therefore they should not be taken together, or at least do not reflect any one ancient interpretation of this section of *Pyth.* 8. This possibility can probably not be definitely disproved. We have already noted, however, that the emphasis on choral performance in scholion 78a suggests an explanation of the poem in terms of a division of parts. Also, the form of expression which appears in scholion 99a suggests this same explanation. In particular, the appearance of first person references to the chorus (*χορῷ ἡμῶν* and *οὐ ψευδόμεθα*) in this scholion is noteworthy, since the text on which it comments (lines 70–71; *κώμῳ μὲν ἀδυμελεῖ Δίκη παρέστακε*) does not contain any first person form.¹⁰ The scholiast's use of first person forms in his comment would therefore seem to indicate that he wished

¹⁰ There is a first person singular form in the immediately following passage in the text (*αἰτέω*, line 72), but scholion 99a does not discuss this.

to stress that the chorus sang at this particular point in the poem. Just as in the case of scholion 78a, this fact suggests a contrast of this particular passage with other passages in *Pyth.* 8 which are not sung by the chorus. Consequently, it seems most probable that these two scholia and scholion 95a, which interprets the first person in lines 67–69 as referring to Pindar, do in fact belong together and should be taken as indicating an ancient interpretation of this section of *Pyth.* 8 in terms of a division of parts. Taken together, these three scholia do not explicitly state where the changes from one manner of performance to another occur, but they suggest the following division of parts for this section:

-55	koryphaios
55–66	chorus (<i>in persona victoris</i>)
67–69	koryphaios
70–	chorus (<i>in propria persona</i>)

This analysis of lines 55–70 presents a more complicated pattern than appears anywhere in Thiersch's discussion of the *Epinikia*. Thiersch considers only an alternation between solo passages, sung in Pindar's person, and choral passages, sung in the person of the chorus. According to our interpretation of the scholia, the chorus in *Pyth.* 8 sometimes sings in the person of the victor and at other times in its own person. In the actual performance of the poem, this dual rôle of the chorus would be easily understood. To be sure, any imitation of the victor must undoubtedly be regarded as an unusual feature in an epinikion poem. Nevertheless, the audience for whom the poem was originally intended would have known, at least in a general way, of Aristomenes' connection with Alkmaion. This audience, moreover, composed principally of the victor's fellow-citizens, would have known that there was a shrine of the hero near Aristomenes' house, and probably they would also have known of the prophecy concerning his victory at Delphi. Therefore, they could not miss the meaning of lines 55ff, and they would readily understand the first person forms in this passage as referring to Aristomenes himself.¹¹

¹¹ It would of course be easier for the audience to make the proper interpretation of lines 55ff if this passage appeared as a distinct unit in the performance of the poem, i.e., if there were a change in the manner of performance at the beginning of this section. Therefore, although the scholiasts do not indicate this specifically, we may conjecture that this particular choral section begins with the word *τοιαῦτα* in line 55, immediately following Amphiaraios' prophecy (which would quite appropriately be sung by a solo voice.)

In all probability, this choral section imitating the person of the victor extends from line 55 through line 66. The scholiasts do not, it must be admitted, specifically discuss the performance of the second half of this section. There are three ancient comments on this second half, scholia 88, 91, and 94, but none of these discusses the manner of performance. The particular form of expression which appears in the description of Aristomenes' victories is most easily explained in terms of a continuation of the chorus' imitation of the victor through line 66. This passage concerning Aristomenes' victories (lines 61–66) runs as follows:

τὸ δ', Ἐκαταβόλε, πάνδοκον
 ναὸν εὐκλέα διανέμων
 Πυθῶνος ἐν γυάλοις,
 τὸ μὲν μέγιστον τόθι χαρμάτων
 ὤπασας, οἴκοι δὲ πρόσθεν ἄρπαλέαν δόσιν
 πενταεθλίου σὺν ἑορταῖς ὑμαῖς ἐπάγαγες·

“And you, Far-darter, who govern the all-receiving, well-famed temple in Pytho's vales, there granted the greatest of delights, while before, at home, you brought with your festivals the eagerly seized gift of the pentathlon.”

In his discussion of these lines, Wilamowitz has pointed out a remarkable feature, which is difficult to explain unless Aristomenes is regarded as the speaker (a conclusion, however, which Wilamowitz himself does not draw): namely, the fact that Aristomenes is not specifically mentioned anywhere in this account of his victories.¹² Of course, we need not expect to find him referred to specifically by name, but we should expect some definite reference to him, or at least a pronoun such as *κεῖνος*, which appears in *Ol.* 1.101 in a passage referring to the Syracusan victor Hieron. Instead, there is no reference whatever to Aristomenes. The difficulty exists only if we hold to the usual view that Pindar must be the speaker throughout the entire poem. If we follow the type of interpretation which scholion 78a gives, the difficulty vanishes, since the entire passage from line 55 to

¹² Wilamowitz (*supra* n.3) 441; “. . . Aristomenes, der auffälligerweise nicht genannt ist. . . .” This particular remark by Wilamowitz has apparently gone unnoticed by subsequent scholars. For example, there is no mention of this by either Farnell (*supra* n.3) II, 196, or Burton (*supra* n.3) 184, in their discussions of this passage in *Pyth.* 8. Nevertheless, Wilamowitz' observation that the omission of any mention of Aristomenes in lines 61–66 is remarkable appears to me to be valid.

line 66 would, being sung in Aristomenes' person, constitute a natural and full account of his victories at Delphi and at home in the Aiginetan games. The reference to the victor would of course be clearer with a first person verb or pronoun form somewhere in lines 61-66. But such a first person form is by no means necessary, for if lines 55-66 were performed as a distinct choral unit, the audience would naturally take everything in this passage together, and they would assume that the speaker in lines 61-66, just as in lines 55-60, is Aristomenes himself.

Immediately following this imitation of the victor, there is a brief passage, lines 67-69, which according to scholion 95a is sung in Pindar's own person. In the performance of the poem, it would be most confusing if the chorus-members were to change their *persona* in the middle of any particular choral passage. The transition from one type of choral passage to another would be relatively easy, however, if there were an intervening solo passage. This would appear to be one of the principal functions of lines 67-69 in the overall structure of *Pyth.* 8. At least, these three lines, forming a brief prayer to Apollo, would serve admirably as a transitional or 'buffer' passage between lines 55-66, in which the chorus sings in the victor's person, and lines 70ff, in which the chorus-members sing in their own person and thereby resume their proper rôle in the poem.

From the foregoing analysis of *Pyth.* 8.55-70, it appears that the division of parts indicated by the scholiasts gives a fully satisfactory explanation for this section of the poem. In particular, this division well explains the lack of any specific mention of Aristomenes in connection with the victory list in lines 61-66, and it also gives a specific point to the prayer to Apollo in lines 67-69. It therefore seems likely that this was the original manner of performance for this passage.

It is difficult to determine just how the scholiasts arrived at this interpretation. Possibly the scholiasts may have had available the original musical notation, which would show precisely how each section of the poem was performed.¹³ On the other hand, they may have known of some shrine of Alkmaion in Aigina, and have based their analysis of the passage solely on this knowledge rather than on

¹³ Little or nothing is known concerning the time at which Pindar's music was finally lost. (Cf. Wilamowitz [*supra* n.3] 92.) However, it is at least possible that the original musical notation was still available to scholars when our present scholia or their sources were compiled.

any information concerning the specific manner of performance.¹⁴ Or they may have had no more direct information concerning this particular passage than is available today, and their interpretation may be simply an informed conjecture, based perhaps on the knowledge of some similar use of a division of parts in other choral lyric poems.

Even though the exact source for these scholia to *Pyth.* 8 must thus remain problematical, this fact by itself is no sufficient reason for rejecting them. Another objection which might well be raised is that the scholiasts' interpretation is somehow inconsistent with Pindar's style as a whole. All of the *Epinikia* together contain very few passages for which it appears that the first person should refer specifically to the chorus or the victor rather than to Pindar.¹⁵ To be sure, there are a number of passages which would be fully appropriate to either the chorus or the poet. In fact, lines 70ff of *Pyth.* 8, which scholion 99a assigns to the chorus, exemplify such a passage, since neither the reference to the *κῶμος* in line 70 nor the address to the victor's father Xenarkes in lines 71–72 contains any form of statement which would be inappropriate to the chorus or to Pindar. On the other hand, the fully dramatic rôle which scholion 78a indicates for the chorus in lines 55ff must be admitted to be rare. We ought therefore to inquire whether there is any reason for the particular treatment of material which we seem to find there. The explanation may be simply Pindar's poetic fancy, *i.e.* at this point in the poem he may have chosen to diverge from his usual practice without any conscious reason for doing so. I suggest, however, that Pindar's motive for handling his material in a specifically dramatic way in *Pyth.* 8 lies in his feeling as a Theban toward the hero Alkmaion. It is instructive to refer again to the problems which Wilamowitz raises in his discussion of the poem.

¹⁴ There are very few sites for which any hero-cult of Alkmaion is attested. Except for this passage in *Pyth.* 8, the only other references are Pausanias 8.24.7, who mentions the grave of Alkmaion at Psophis in Arcadia, and Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1.21.134,4, who refers to Alkmaion as a prophet in Akarnania. (Cf. E. Bethe, *s.v.* ALKMAION, *RE* I (1894) col. 1551.) However, the scholiasts may have had some direct evidence, now no longer available, for a shrine of Alkmaion in Aigina.

¹⁵ Two such passages are *Pyth.* 5.72ff, where the first person forms *ἐμὸν*, etc., would more naturally refer to the Cyrenean chorus (see *supra* p. 191 and n.7), and *Nem.* 7.85, where the first person form *ἐμῆ*, given by the manuscripts, would more naturally refer to the Aiginean chorus. However, the view of most scholars has been that in the *Epinikia* as a whole, the great preponderance of first person passages referring specifically to Pindar indicates that the first person should be so taken in all instances. Cf. the references cited *supra* n.3 and also Mommsen (*supra* n.6) 10–13.

According to Wilamowitz, it is most unlikely that the heroön alluded to in lines 55ff was at Thebes. Shrines of the matricide Alkmaion are rare, as one might expect, and his cult is definitely attested only at Psophis in Arcadia. At Thebes in particular, it would be most unusual if Alkmaion were to be held in honor, since this was the city which he sacked.¹⁶ Wilamowitz nevertheless maintains that the first person reference must be to the poet in *Pyth.* 8, and he therefore concludes that Pindar may have been living away from his native city at the time. Since this is a poem from late in Pindar's life and since there is an ancient tradition that he died at Argos, Wilamowitz suggests that the shrine of Alkmaion may have been in that city, where, he conjectures, Pindar spent his last years. Wilamowitz seems dissatisfied with his interpretation of the passage as a whole, however, and he concludes that we can never know exactly what significance to attach to it: "*So wird diese Stelle wohl immer unverstanden bleiben.*"

Thummer, in commenting on Wilamowitz' analysis of *Pyth.* 8, points out that one of the difficulties, hinted at but not fully developed by Wilamowitz, is any connection whatever of Pindar with Alkmaion. Even if Pindar had been living away from Thebes when he wrote this poem, he would still have felt as a Theban, and the form of expression in lines 55ff, in which Alkmaion is praised and described as the speaker's neighbor, is therefore inappropriate to him:¹⁷

"Die Vermutung, Pindar habe zur Zeit, da er das Lied verfasste, im Ausland geweilt und, während er verreist war, sein Gut in einem Alkmantempel hinterlegt, verschiebe nur die Sache, denn—so darf man wohl zwischen den Zeilen lesen—*Pindar würde sich wohl auch im Ausland als Thebaner gefühlt haben.*" [Emphasis mine]

This observation by Thummer concerning Pindar's feeling toward Alkmaion would well account for the specific form of presentation which we find in *Pyth.* 8.55ff. On the one hand, it appears that it was necessary for Pindar to include in this poem a section concerning Aristomenes' meeting with Alkmaion. Whatever it was—whether a

¹⁶ Wilamowitz (*supra* n.3) 441. Most scholars, however, have not noted any incongruity in the presence of a shrine of Alkmaion at Thebes. See for example Bethe (*supra* n.14) col. 1551; Farnell (*supra* n.3) II, 196 and *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford 1921) 408 n.61.

¹⁷ Thummer (*supra* n.4) 32. Thummer accordingly holds that the first person reference in this passage is to the chorus, rather than to Pindar but he does not specifically discuss the scholiast's interpretation of the passage as an imitation of the victor.

vision or a dream—this encounter with Alkmaion, along with the prophecy concerning his forthcoming victory at Delphi, would undoubtedly have made a great impression on the Aiginetan youth. It may have given him renewed hope as he made ready for the games, and we may infer that Aristomenes had asked Pindar to give a prominent place to Alkmaion in the poem, as a way of expressing gratitude to the hero for his timely prophecy. In writing the poem, Pindar would naturally follow the victor's wishes in this regard.¹⁸ For the performance of the poem, however, he could easily arrange for the praise of Alkmaion to be presented in a choral section sung in Aristomenes' person. This choral section would thus be dramatically quite independent of the rest of the poem. In this way, Pindar could dissociate himself from any direct connection with Alkmaion, the destroyer of Thebes, while at the same time the section concerning Alkmaion would be presented in a fully effective manner. In fact, the expression of gratitude in lines 55ff is livelier and more vivid, being sung in the victor's person, than it would be otherwise. We may therefore conclude that Pindar made a virtue of necessity—if indeed he felt himself thus constrained to present the praise of Alkmaion in a specifically dramatic section.

From the analysis of *Pyth.* 8 presented in this article, it appears that there was an unusual combination of circumstances, Alkmaion's prophecy concerning Aristomenes' victory and Pindar's reluctance to associate himself directly with this ill-famed hero, which led to a correspondingly unusual use of the division of parts in the poem. The resulting imitation of the victor by the chorus was important for a proper understanding of lines 55ff, and the scholiasts therefore commented on it in some detail. For the rest of the poem the manner of performance was not essential for interpreting Pindar's text and therefore did not receive extensive consideration by the scholiasts.¹⁹

¹⁸ For a general discussion of the negotiations with the victor, or with the victor's family, which would precede Pindar's actual composition of a poem, see Schmid-Stählin (*supra* n.3) 503. We cannot be sure of all the details, but the interpretation of *Pyth.* 8.55ff as an expression of gratitude to Alkmaion seems clear. The passage is essentially joyous (*cf.* especially the participle *χαίρων*, "rejoicing," in line 56), and the words *ραίνω . . . ὕμνω*, "I drench with song," in line 57 would seem to indicate that the victory poem itself is in a sense dedicated to Alkmaion. *Cf.* Bundy (*supra* n.4) 69–70 for the idea that this passage is specifically a thank-offering to Alkmaion.

¹⁹ In addition to the scholia to lines 55–70, there is one other ancient comment concerning choral performance in *Pyth.* 8, scholion 140c. This scholion (referring to lines 98ff) runs as follows: *ἢ οὕτω τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ χοροῦ λέγοιτο ἄν, ὥστε τὴν Αἴγιναν μητέρα τῶν χορευόντων λέγεσθαι*. The potential optative *λέγοιτο ἄν* indicates conjecture on the scholiast's part, and

Nevertheless, if their interpretation of lines 55-70 is correct, we must conclude that the alternation between choral and solo passages, which they indicate for this one section of *Pyth.* 8, originally extended throughout the entire poem. By following the lead which they give at this point, it might perhaps be possible to identify the manner of performance for each particular section of *Pyth.* 8 through a close analysis of the natural divisions which occur in the text of the poem. Such an undertaking, however, would go far beyond the relatively limited evidence which the scholiasts present.

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

July, 1965

this is quite in contrast to scholia 78a, 95a, and 99a, where the interpretation of the speaker in each particular passage—whether Aristomenes, Pindar, or the chorus—is presented without any reservation. Even so, the attribution by scholion 140c of line 98 to the chorus is most probably correct. For support of the scholiast's view that the phrase *Αἴγινα φίλα μᾶτερ* indicates a distinctively choral passage, see Studniczka (*supra* n.4) 79; Mueller (*supra* n.4) 37; and Fränkel (*supra* n.4) 485 n.2. On the other hand, cf. Dornseiff (*supra* n.4) 83, who holds that there may be an intentional ambiguity in the first person reference in this passage; and H. Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* (Frankfurt-am-Main 1935) 33, who holds that although Pindar here identifies himself with the chorus, the first person reference is still basically to him, rather than to the chorus.