

The Dating of Pindaric Odes by Comparison

Hans A. Pohlsander

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 *Nemean*s and *Isthmian*s, 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, *σωφροσύνη*. 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 Pindaric chronology was more fully explored by another scholar, to whom we shall turn presently.

Wilhelm von Christ⁵ 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

1. *Nem.* 3.21–22: οὐκέτι προτέρω / ἀβάταν ἄλα κιόνων ὑπὲρ Ἡρακλέος περᾶν εὐμαρές.

Ol. 3.43–45: Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν ἱκάνων ἄπτεται / οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος / σταλᾶν τὸ πόρσω δ’ ἔστι σοφοῖς ἄβατον / κάσόφοις.

2. *Nem.* 3.29: ἔπεται δὲ λόγῳ δίκας ἄωτος ἐσλὸς (γρ. ἐσλὸν) αἰνεῖν.

Nem. 9.6–7: ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων τετελεσμένον ἐσλὸν / μὴ χαμαὶ σιγᾷ καλύψαι.

3. *Nem.* 3.41–42: ὅς δὲ διδάκτ’ ἔχει, ψεφεννὸς ἀνὴρ ἄλλοτ’ ἄλλα πνέων οὐ ποτ’ ἀτρεκέϊ / κατέβα ποδί.

Ibid. 80–82: ἔστι δ’ αἰετὸς ὠκύς ἐν ποτανοῖς, / ὅς ἔλαβεν αἶψα, τηλόθε μεταμαϊόμενος, δαφαινὸν ἄγραν ποσίν / κραγέται δὲ κολιοὶ ταπεινὰ νέμονται.

Ol. 2.86–88: σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ· μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι / παγγλωσσία κόρακες ὡς ἄκραντα γαρύετον / Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον.

4. *Nem.* 3.65: Ζεῦ, τεὸν γὰρ αἶμα, σέο δ’ ἀγών, τὸν ὕμνος ἔβαλεν.

Ol. 2.89–90: ἔπεχε νῦν σκοπῷ τόξον ἄγε, θυμέ· τίνα βάλλομεν / ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὐτε φρενὸς εὐκλέας οἷστοὺς ἰέντες;

5. *Nem.* 3.76: τῶν οὐκ ἄπεσσι· χαῖρε, φίλος.⁷

Pyth. 2.65–67: βουλαὶ δὲ πρεσβύτεραι / . . . σὲ ποτὶ πάντα λόγον / ἐπαινεῖν παρέχοντι· χαῖρε.

6. *Nem.* 3.83–84: ἀεθλοφόρου λήματος ἔνεκεν / Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ’ ἀπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος.

Ol. 1.93–95: τὸ δὲ κλέος / τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν 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’s⁸ objection

⁵ 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 Gaspar¹⁰ 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 ἀνορέαις δ' ἐσχάταισιν / οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἄπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις, / καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν. Some similarity in thought, if not in diction, can be discerned also in *Nem.* 4.69–70: Γαδείρων τὸ πρὸς ζόφον οὐ περατόν· ἀπότηρεπε / αὖτις Εὐρώπαν ποτὶ χέρσον ἔντεα 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: τό γ' ἐν ξυνῶ πεπονημένον εὖ / μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἀλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω. *Nem.* 3.41–42, in Christ's third comparison, will be more complete if we include line 40: συγγενεὶ δέ τις εὐδοξία μέγα βρίθει.

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 φυᾷ κράτιστον ἅπαν· πολλοὶ δὲ διδακταῖς / ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταῖς κλέος / ὥρουσαν ἀρέσθαι· / ἄνευ δὲ θεοῦ σεσιγαμένον / οὐ σκαιότερον χρῆμ' ἕκαστον·

Ol. 13.13: ἄμαχον δὲ κρύψαι τὸ συγγενὲς ἦθος.

⁹ *Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig 1896) 249.

¹⁰ *Essai de chronologie Pindarique* (Brussels 1900) 104–107.

¹¹ *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 276.

¹² *Pindare, III^s: Néméennes* (Paris 1958) 39.

¹³ *The Works of Pindar, II* (London 1932) 254.

¹⁴ *Pindari Carmina* (Oxford 1952) 153.

¹⁵ *Pindari Carmina, I^s* (Leipzig 1959) 128.

¹⁶ All citations are from C. M. Bowra's *OCT*, 2nd ed.

Pyth. 8.44–45: *φυῶ τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει / ἐκ πατέρων παισὶ λῆμα.*

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 ἱερομηνία Νεμεάδι*

Ol. 3.19–20: *διχόμενις . . . / . . . Μήνα*

2. *Nem.* 3.2–3: *τὰν πολυξέναν . . . / . . . νᾶσον Αἴγιναν*

Ol. 1.93: *πολυξενωτάτῳ παρὰ βωμῶ*

πολύξενος occurs elsewhere in Pindar only in *Fr.* 107.1.

3. *Nem.* 3.5: *μαιόμενοι*, and *ibid.* 81: *μεταμαιόμενος*

Ol. 1.46: *μαιόμενοι*

Elsewhere in Pindar this verb occurs only in *Pyth.* 11.51 and *Ol.* 8.5.

4. *Nem.* 3.14: *παλαίφατον εἶραν (ἀγορὰν codd.)*

Ol. 2.39–40: *χρησθὲν / παλαίφατον*

παλαίφατος is found elsewhere in Pindar only in *Nem.* 2.16 and *ibid.* 6.31.

5. *Nem.* 3.41: *ἀτρεκεῖ / . . . ποδί*

Ol. 3.12: *ἀτρεκῆς Ἑλλανοδίκας*

ἀτρεκῆς elsewhere in Pindar is limited to *Nem.* 5.17 and *Pyth.* 8.7.

6. *Nem.* 3.44: *θαμινά*

Ol. 1.53: *θαμινά*

Pindar normally uses *θαμά*.

7. *Nem.* 3.84: *Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ' ἀπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος.*

This resembles not only *Ol.* 1.93–95 (see above), but also *Nem.* 9.41–42: *δέδορκεν / παιδὶ τοῦθ' Ἀγησιδάμου φέγγος*

Pindar uses *δέδορκα* 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: *ἐγὼ δὲ κείνων τέ νιν δάροις / λύρα τε κοινάσομαι.*

Pyth. 4.136–137: *πραῦν δ' Ἰάσων / . . . ποτιστάζων ὄαρον*

Pindar uses *ῥαρος* in only two other passages, *Pyth.* 1.98 and *Nem.* 7.69.

2. *Nem.* 3.15–16: ἐλεγχέεσσιν . . . / ἐμίανε

Pyth. 4.99–100: ψεύδεσιν / καταμιάναις

Neither *μιαίνω* nor *καταμιαίνω* is used elsewhere in Pindar.

3. *Nem.* 3.26–27: τίνα πρὸς ἄλλοδαπὰν / ἄκραν

Pyth. 4.50: ἄλλοδαπᾶν . . . γυναικῶν

Ibid. 254–255: ἐν ἄλλοδαπαῖς / . . . ἀρούραις

Elsewhere in Pindar *ἄλλοδαπός* 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 Χίρων τράφε λιθίνῳ / Ἰάσον' ἔνδον τέγει

Pyth. 4.102–103: ἀντρόθε γὰρ νέομαι / . . . , ἵνα Κενταύρου με κοῦραι
θρέψαν ἀγναί (scil. Jason).

6. *Nem.* 3.55: τὸν φαρμάκων δίδαξε μαλακόχειρα νόμον'

Pyth. 4.271: χρή μαλακὰν χέρα προσβάλλοντα τρώμαν ἔλκεος ἀμφιπολεῖν.

This bears a less pronounced resemblance to *Pyth.* 3.51: τοὺς μὲν μαλα-
καῖς ἐπαιδαῖς ἀμφέπων

7. *Nem.* 3.61–62: ἐγγεσφόροις ἐπιμείζας / Αἰθιόπεσσι χεῖρας

Pyth. 4.212–213: κελαινώπεσσι Κόλχοισιν βίαν / μείζαν

8. *Nem.* 3.63: ἀνειψιός

Pyth. 4.127: ἀνειψιόν

This word occurs nowhere else in Pindar.

9. *Nem.* 3.72: ἐν παισὶ νέοισι παῖς, ἐν ἀνδράσιν ἀνήρ

Pyth. 4.281–282: κείνος γὰρ ἐν παισὶν νέος / ἐν δὲ βουλαῖς πρέσβυς
ἐγκύρσαις ἑκατονταετεί βιοτᾷ

This resemblance was noticed by both Christ and Fraccaroli (see above).

My findings may be summarized quantitatively in the following table.

VERBAL PARALLELS IN *Nem.* 3

Ode	Length	Similarities Ad- duced by Christ	Additional Similarities	Total
<i>Ol.</i> 1	116	1	3	4
<i>Ol.</i> 2	100	2	1	3
<i>Ol.</i> 3	45	1	2	3
<i>Pyth.</i> 2	97	1	—	1
<i>Nem.</i> 9	55	1	1	2
Total	413	6	7	13 ^a
<i>Pyth.</i> 4	299	1	8	9

^a *Nem.* 3.84, δέδορκεν 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

Christ¹⁷ 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 ξενίου Διὸς ἀσκεῖται θέμις αἰενάοις / ἐν τραπέζαις.
Ol. 8.21–22: ἔνθα Σώτειρα Διὸς ξενίου / πάρεδρος ἀσκεῖται Θέμις.
(460 B.C.)
2. *Nem.* 11.28–29: ἀνδησάμενός τε κόμαν ἐν πορφυρέοις / ἔρνεσιν.
Isthm. 1.28–29: τῶν ἀθρόοις ἀνδησάμενοι θαμάκῃς / ἔρνεσιν χαίτας.
(ca 458 B.C.?)
3. *Nem.* 11.46: προμαθείας δ’ ἀπόκεινται ῥοαί.
Isthm. 1.40: ὁ πονήσας δὲ νόῳ καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει.
4. *Nem.* 11.37–42: ἀρχαῖαι δ’ ἀρεταὶ / ἀμφέροντ’ ἀλλασσόμεναι γενεαῖς
ἀνδρῶν σθένος / ἐν σχερῶ δ’ οὐτ’ ὦν μέλαιναι καρπὸν ἔδωκαν ἄρουραι, /
δένδρεά τ’ οὐκ ἐθέλει πάσαις ἐτέων περόδοις / ἄνθος εὐῶδες φέρειν πλούτῳ
ῖσον, / ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀμείβοντι.
Nem. 6.9–11: αἴτ’ ἀμειβόμεναι / τόκα μὲν ὦν βίον ἀνδράσιν ἐπηετανὸν ἐκ
πεδίων ἔδοσαν, / τόκα δ’ αἴτ’ ἀναπαυσάμεναι σθένος ἔμαρψαν. (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,¹⁸ for instance, repeatedly remarks that *Nem.* 11 is close in mood to *Pyth.* 8 and probably contemporary with it.

¹⁷ Sitz. München 1889, pp. 54–56.

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: δάφνα τε χρυσέα κόμας ἀναδήσαντες (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."

1. *Ol.* 13.13: ἄμαχον δὲ κρύψαι τὸ συγγενὲς ἦθος.

Ol. 11.19–20: τὸ γὰρ ἐμφυὲς οὐτ' . . . / οὐτ' . . . διαλλάξαιαντ' ἄν ἦθος.

2. *Ol.* 13.45–46b: ὥς μὲν σαφὲς / οὐκ ἂν εἰδείην λέγειν / ποντιῶν ψάφων ἀριθμόν.

Ol. 2.98: ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφενγεν (476)

3. *Ol.* 13.88: αἰθέρος . . . ἐρήμου

Ol. 1.6: ἐρήμας δι' αἰθέρος (476)

4. *Ol.* 13.93–95: ἐμὲ δ' εὐθὺν ἀκόντων / ἰέντα ῥόμβον παρὰ σκοπὸν οὐ χρῆ / τὰ πολλὰ βέλεα καρτύνειν χεροῖν.

Ol. 1.111–112: ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦν / Μοῖσα καρτερώτατον βέλος ἀλκᾷ τρέφει.

- Ol.* 2.83–85: πολλὰ μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη / ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας / φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν.

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: οὐκ ἀποδάμου Ἀπόλλωνος τυχόντος

Pyth. 10.37: Μοῖσα δ' οὐκ ἀποδαμεί (498)

Neither ἀποδαμέω nor ἀπόδαμος is encountered elsewhere in Pindar.

¹⁹ *Op.cit.* 76–77.

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: παισὶ τούτοι' ὄγδοον . . . μέρος Ἀρκεσίλας.
Pyth. 12.11: τρίτον . . . κασιγνητῶν μέρος (490)
3. *Pyth.* 4.76–77: ἐς εὐδείελον / χθόνα μόλη
Ol. 1.111: παρ' εὐδείελον ἐλθὼν Κρόνιον. (476)
εὐδείελος does not occur elsewhere in Pindar, while *εὐδία* is found only in *Pyth.* 5.10, *Ol.* 1.98, and *Isthm.* 7.38.
4. *Pyth.* 4.137: μαλθακᾶ φωνᾶ
Nem. 9.49: μαλθακᾶ . . . σὺν αἰοιδᾶ (after 476)
5. *Pyth.* 4.138: βάλλετο κρηπίδα σοφῶν ἐπέων.
Pyth. 7.3: κρηπίδ' αἰοιδᾶν . . . βαλέσθαι. (486)
6. *Pyth.* 4.232: ὥς ἄρ' αὐδάσαντος
Nem. 10.89: ὥς ἄρ' αὐδάσαντος (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 Gaspar²¹ 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: Ἔστι μοι θεῶν ἑκατι μυρία παντᾶ κέλευθος, / . . . / ὑμετέρας ἀρετὰς ὕμνω διώκειν.

Bacch. 5.31–33: τῶς νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ μυρία πάντα κέλευθος / ὑμετέραν ἀρετὰν / ὑμνεῖν.

Bacch. 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 Norwood²² that the near identity of the two phrases points to conscious borrowing. Otto Schroeder²³ and Sir John

²¹ *Op.cit.* 85.

²² *Pindar* (Berkeley 1945) 269–270, n.49.

²³ *PLG*⁵ I, pp. 71–72.

Sandys²⁴ thought that Bacchylides borrowed from Pindar. Schroeder later, apparently, reversed himself.²⁵ Farnell²⁶ 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,²⁷ who also approves of Gaspar's conclusions (see above). Before Farnell and Turyn, Wilamowitz²⁸ already had placed Bacch. 5 before *Isthm.* 4.

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

Bacch. 9(8).47–50: στείχει δι' εὐρείας κελεύθου / μυρία πάντα φάτις / σᾶς γενεᾶς λίπαρο- / ζώνων θυγατρῶν.

Bacch. 19(18).1–4: Πάρεστι μυρία κέλευθος / ἀμβροσίων μελέων, / ὅς ἂν παρὰ Πιερίδων λά- / χησι δῶρα Μουσᾶν.

Unless we wish to claim that Bacchylides thrice borrowed from Pindar, we must admit borrowing on the part of Pindar³⁰ and date *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.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

March, 1963

²⁴ *The Odes of Pindar* (London 1930) 455.

²⁵ *Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig 1930) viii and ix.

²⁶ *Op.cit.* 347.

²⁷ *Op.cit.* 203.

²⁸ *Op.cit.* 336f.

²⁹ *Loc.cit.*

³⁰ Norwood denied the authenticity of *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.