

Pindar, *Nemean* 7.64–67

Glenn W. Most

SNELL AND MAEHLER print *Nemean* 7.64–67 as follows:¹

64 ἐὼν δ' ἐγγυὺς Ἀχαιὸς οὐ μέμψεται μ' ἀνὴρ
65 Ἴονίας ὑπὲρ ἀλλὸς οἰ-
 κῆων, καὶ προξενία πέποιθ', ἔν τε δαμόταις
66 ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν, οὐχ ὑπερβαλῶν,
67 βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσαις·

With regard to the constitution of the text, this passage is quite straightforward.² 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* I⁵ *Epinicia* and II⁴ *Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1971, 1975); where necessary I indicate and explain my divergences from this text.

² The metrical correction of the transmitted ὑπερβάλλων 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 choriambes (of which the first element of the second is, here as always in the poem, resolved into two shorts) followed by a hipponactem 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 οἰκῆων is to yield a spondee, and (2) the resulting long in the first element of the hipponactem (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,” *Jahresb.d.Phil.Ver.zu Berl.* 39 [1913] 289–320, esp. 301: the minor metrical license of ἔμμεν seems far preferable to the considerable morphological singularity of ἔμμεν, 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 καί, and Mommsen the first syllable of προξενία; as a twin result of either step, οἰκῆων yields a cretic and the first element of the hipponactem is short. But synizesis in οἰκῆων occurs elsewhere in Pindar at *Isthm.* 1.31 and 4.19, and in other -έων participles at *Ol.* 9.110 (θαρσέων), *Ol.* 12.19 (ὄμλέων), and *Pae.* 2.31 (ἀρκέων; 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 acephalic aeolics), which are on principle anceps, are not consistently long or short throughout 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 acephalic hipponactem (which forms the second half of the eighth verse of the strophe) is short throughout, 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.

Ἀχαιὸς ἀνήρ; (2) the function of the particles καί and τε; (3) the nature of the προξενία; and (4) the identity of the δαμόται. Finally, in summarizing our conclusions we shall offer a slightly revised text with translation.

1. Ἀχαιὸς ἀνήρ Ἴονίας 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 Ἴονίας 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 ὑπέρ, for the various interpretations of the sentence turn upon the meaning we give it.

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

(a) With verbs of *motion*, ὑπέρ 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 ὑπέρ can appear in the genitive or in the accusative, without any perceptible difference in meaning. This is the construction in *Pyth.* 2.68,⁴ 80,⁵ 4.26,⁶ and 9.52;⁷ 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*, ὑπέρ 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, ὑπέρ 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.

⁴ Cf. *Pyth.* 2.3ff, and A. B. Drachmann, ed., *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig 1903–27, cited hereafter by lemma number) ad *Pyth.* 2.125b.

⁵ Accepting Wilamowitz's unavoidable εἶμι for the transmitted εἰμί (*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 Vitruvius *De arch.* 2.6). H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*³ (Munich 1976) 522 and n.28 (followed by Slater [*supra* n.3] s.v. ἀλιερκῆς, ὄχθα, ὑπέρ 1.b.β), objects that ἀλιερκέες 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 ὑπέρ an impossible meaning.

8.9,⁹ and *Pae.* 8.70. In one passage the verb is not transmitted but may be conjectured to have been some form of *ναίω*: fr.140b.6. To these may be added two other passages in which *ὑπέρ* has the same meaning but is used adverbially: *Ol.* 1.57, fr.51a.3.¹⁰

In view of these passages, we may reject the proposal that Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς 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:

ἄοιδ[ὰν κ]αὶ ἀρμονίαν
 ἀὺλ[οῖς ἐ]πεφράσ[ατο
 τῶ[ν τε Λο]κρῶν τις, οἱ τ' ἀργίλοφον
 πὰρ' Ζεφυρίου κολώναν
 ν[. . . : νόουσ' Grenfell-Hunt, ναίουθ' Schroeder, ὑπέ]ρ
 Αὺσονία[ς ἀλὸς Wilamowitz].¹²

Here, too, there is apparent reference to people who dwell *ὑπέρ* a sea. What, then, was the spatial relationship between Locri Epizephyrii and the Ausonian Sea? From Strabo we learn that Ἀυσόνιον 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, *ὑπέρ* 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*³ II.1 (Hannover/Leipzig 1898 [hereafter 'KG']) 527.

¹¹ So e.g. E. Friese, *Pindarica* (Berlin 1872) 24f; C. O. Pavese, “La settima Nemea di Pindaro,” in E. Livrea and G. A. Privitera, ed., *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardigzoni* II (Rome 1978) esp. 674f; Slater (*supra* n.3) s.v. *ὑπέρ* (but cf. s.v. Ἀχαιοὺς and Ἴόνιος); E. Thummer, ed., *Pindar: Die isthmischen Gedichte* I (Heidelberg 1968) 97 n.82; and O. Werner, ed., *Pindar: Siegesgesänge und Fragmente* (Munich 1967) 261. Others, e.g. B. L. Gildersleeve, “The Seventh Nemean Revisited,” *AJP* 31 (1910) 125–53, esp. 138f, and G. M. Kirkwood, “Nemean 7 and the Theme of Vicissitude in Pindar,” in *Poetry and Poetics from Ancient Greece to the Renaissance: Studies in Honor of James Hutton*, ed. G. M. Kirkwood (Ithaca 1975) esp. 85f, try to combine both interpretations by translating “beyond the Ionian Sea” while understanding an Epirote; but this is both linguistically and geographically dubious. Among those who have understood the preposition along the lines proposed here, cf. especially A. Puech, ed., *Pindare. III: Néméennes*³ (Paris 1958) *ad loc.*; Rumpel (*supra* n.3) s.v.; and J. Sandys, ed., *The Odes of Pindar*³ (London 1937) *ad loc.*

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 referring 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;¹³ 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 Dodona 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).¹⁴ It appears that for Pindar these were simply non-Greek regions in which he seems to have had no particular interest or familiarity.¹⁵

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

¹³ H. Treidler, “Das Ionische Meer im Altertum,” *Klio* 22 (1929) 86–94, esp. 86f; cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* Ia 337f ad 1F90–108, 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 Oertlichkeiten 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* [Oxford 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 Il.* 5.126) and was certainly narrated by Ibycus (*PMG* 294) and Pherecydes (*FGrHist* 3F97).

¹⁵ Greeks of this period certainly had some degree of familiarity with the upper Adriatic (cf. Beaumont [*supra* n.14] 159ff), but Pindar generally prefers the moral or legendary aspects of distant geography to the actual facts. He declares it impossible, for example, to sail beyond the pillars of Heracles (*Ol.* 3.44, *Nem.* 3.21, *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*.

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):

Νεοπτόλεμος δ' ἀπείρω διαπρυσίᾳ (scil. κρατεί),
 βουβόται τόθι πρῶνες ἔξοχοι κατάκεινται
 Δωδῶναθεν ἀρχόμενοι πρὸς Ἴόνιον 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.¹⁶ 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 Hecataeus¹⁷—as well as the later Hellanicus¹⁸ and Herodotus¹⁹—mention more northerly, and Pherecydes²⁰ 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* 836–41.²¹

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 *ἔξοχοι 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'.²² 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 ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἰκέων*.²³

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 *Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ ἀλὸς οἰκέων* could be understood to denote an Achaean dwelling at any

²² For *πρῶν* in the sense of mountainous promontories, rather than mere forelands, cf. *Il.* 8.557, 12.282, 16.299, 17.747; *Hymn.Hom.Ap.* 22, 144; Hes. *Sc.* 437; for the altitude of Dodona cf. also *PV* 829ff. On the geography of the coast of Epirus cf. N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford 1967) 8–14, and A. Philippson *et al.*, *Die griechischen Landschaften* II.1 (Frankfurt a.M. 1956) 21ff.

²³ Thuc. 1.46.4, *ἔστι δὲ λιμὴν, καὶ πόλις ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ κείται . . . Ἐφύρη*; Strab. 7.7.5, *ὑπέρκειται δὲ τούτου μὲν τοῦ κόλπου Κίχυρος, ἢ πρότερον Ἐφύρα . . . ἐγγὺς δὲ τῆς Κίχυρου πολίχριον Βουχέτιον Κασσωπαίων, μικρὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς θαλάττης ὄν*; 7.7.8, *Ἡπειρώται δ' εἰσὶ καὶ Ἀμφίλοχοι καὶ οἱ ὑπερκείμενοι καὶ συνάπτοντες τοῖς Ἰλλυρικοῖς ὄρεσι, τραχεῖαν οἰκοῦντες χώραν, Μολοττοὶ . . . ἀναμεμίκται δὲ τούτοις τὰ πρὸς τῷ νοτίῳ μέρει τῆς ὄρεινῆς καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰονίου κόλπου . . . εἴτ' ἐπικρατούντων αἰετινων κατέστρεψεν ἅπαντα εἰς τὴν Μακεδόνων ἀρχήν, πλην ὀλίγων τῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰονίου κόλπου*. 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 *ὑπὲρ 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.* *ὑπέρ*, I.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. Coockesley, ed., *Pindari Carmina* [Eton 1842–51] 145f *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 θαλάττῃ* (*KG* 1.464 cite Xen. *An.* 4.8.22), *ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ* (*KG* 1.499 cite Hdt. 7.89), *παρὰ θαλάττῃ* (*KG* 1.511 cite Xen. *An.* 7.2.25). *ὑπὲρ θαλάττης* 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, *ὑπέρ* 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 θαλάττης*, 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 ὑπέρ apud Pausaniam periegetam usu locali* (diss.Freiburg i.B. 1891) 25ff.

point along the rocky eastern coast of the Ionian Sea: in Elis,²⁴ 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 hypothesis 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 members 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 Siegertotenlied," *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 general, under normal circumstances, strict limits were set to the spontaneous mobility of heroes after their death (*cf.* W. Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* [Stuttgart/Berlin 1977] 316; M. P. Nilsson, *GGR* I 189, 715f; and E. Rohde, *Psyche*² I [Freiburg i.B./Leipzig/Tübingen 1898] 159ff).

²⁶ Woodbury's objection, that the Epirotans of this period seem to have been barbarians (*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 Ἠπειρωτῶν δὲ Μολοττοὶ ὑπὸ Πύρρῳ τῷ Νεοπτολέμου τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως καὶ τοῖς ἀπογόνους αὐτοῦ Θετταλοῖς οὖσι γεγονότες), and there is no adequate reason to reject his testimony. 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 *Telegony* (Procl. 109.18ff Allen; *cf.* Apollod. *Epit.* 7.34f). The later increase in the hellenization of the Molossians (*cf.* Hammond [*supra* n.22] 507f; 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 hypothesis: 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 δαμόταις*: however they may disagree about the precise denotation of Ἄχαιὸς ἀνὴρ, of Ἰονίας ὑπὲρ 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: ἄ τε τὸν Ἴφικλείδαν / διαφέρει Ἴολαον / ὑμνητὸν ἐόντα, καὶ Καστορος βίαν, / σέ τε, ἀναξ Πολύδευκες, υἱοὶ θεῶν, / τὸ μὲν παρ' ἄμαρ ἔδραισι Θεράπνας, / τὸ δ' οἰκέοντας ἔνδον Ὀλύμπου. 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: τό μοι θέμεν Κρονίδα τε Διὶ καὶ Νεμέα / Τιμασάρχου τε πάλα / ὕμνον προκώμιον εἶη. 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: ὕπατ' εὐρὺ ἀνάσσων / Ὀλυμπίας, ἀφθόνητος ἔπεσιν / γένοιο χρόνον ἅπαντα, Ζεῦ πάτερ, / καὶ τόνδε λαὸν ἀβλαβῆ νέμων / Ξενοφῶντος εὔθυνη δαίμονος οὐρον, / δέξαι τε²⁹ οἱ στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον / τεθμόν, τὸν ἄγει πεδίων ἐκ Πίσας, / πενταέθλω ἅμα σταδίου / νικῶν δρόμον. 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 Xenophon 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*² (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 δέ instead of τε: modern editors accept the latter reading but punctuate as though they read the former.

2. *Pyth.* 3.93–95: *καὶ θεοὶ δαΐσαντο παρ' ἀμφοτέροις, / καὶ Κρόνον παῖδας βασιλῆας ἴδον χρυ- / σείαις ἐν ἔδραις, ἔδνα τε / δέξαντο.* First the general situation is described from the perspective of the gods, who are the grammatical subject; then two concrete particulars are depicted from the perspective of the mortals, who are the subjects of the last two verbs (*cf.* Σ *ad Pyth.* 3.165, first clause; 166, second two).

3. *Rae.* 5.35–42: *Εὐ- / βοίαν ἔλον καὶ ἔνασσαν· / ἰήϊε Δάλι' Ἄπολλον· / καὶ σποράδας φερεμήλους / ἔκτισαν νάσους ἐρικυδέα τ' ἔσχον / Δᾶλον, ἐπεὶ σφιν Ἀπόλλων / δῶκεν ὁ χρυσοκόμας / Ἄστερίας δέμας οἰκέιν.* 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 *πέποιθα*; 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

³⁰ On the relation between perfect and present *cf.* P. Chantraine, *Histoire du parfait grec* (Paris 1927) 16–20, 146f.

³¹ Among the exceptions, E. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica II: The First Isthmian Ode* (CPCP 18 [Berkeley/Los Angeles 1962] 35–92, esp. 89 n.122; F. Gschnitzer, *RE Suppl.* 13 (1973) 633 s.v. “Proxenos”; Pavese (*supra* n.11) 677; C. A. P. Ruck, “Marginalia Pindarica IV–VI,” *Hermes* 100 (1972) 143–69, esp. 151; A. Setti, “Persona e ‘poetica’ nella VII Nemea,” in *Studia florentina Alexandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata*

have mistakenly connected the words (καὶ) προξενία πέποιθα 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 πρόξενος 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 πρόξενος and προξενία will show that a technical understanding of this term must also be rejected.

The first literary author³³ to use the term πρόξενος as a regular designation of this quasi-ambassadorship is Herodotus, who speaks of the Macedonian πρόξενος for Athens (8.136.1, 143.1) and the Plataean πρόξενος 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 πρόξενος 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: προξενία³⁴ δ' ἀρετᾶ τ' ἦλθον / τιμάορος Ἴσθμίοισι Λαμπρομάχου / μίτραϊς, ὅτ' ἀμφότεροι κράτησαν / μίαν ἔργον ἀν' ἀμέραν.³⁵ The

(Rome 1970) 405–29, esp. 421 and n.45; Slater (*supra* n.3) s.v. πρόξενος; Woodbury (*supra* n.25) 126 and n.137. Lloyd-Jones (*supra* n.23: 135) adopts the non-technical meaning of πρόξενος but sees the relationship as one obtaining between Pindar and the Achaeans who dwell above the Ionian Sea. For the technical meaning cf. Gschnitzer 629ff; P. Monceaux, *Les proxénies grecques* (Paris 1885) 3ff; and M. B. Wallace, “Early Greek Proxenoï,” *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 189–208, esp. 189ff.

³² So e.g. Wilamowitz, “Pindars siebentes nemeisches Gedicht,” *SitzBerlin* 15 (1908) 328–52 (cited from W. M. Calder III and J. Stern, edd., *Pindaros und Bakchylides* [Darmstadt 1970] 127–58, esp. 141) and *Pindaros* (*supra* n.5) 167f.

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 -ία, 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

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 *ἀρεταῖσιν* from line 16 and *ἔργοισιν* 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);³⁶ parallels for the latter appear not only in Pindar's reference to the city of Opus as *φίλαν 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: τοῖ μὲν ὦν Θήβαισι τιμάντες ἀρχᾶθεν λέγονται / πρόξενοί τ' ἀμφικτιόνων κελαδεννάς τ' ὀρφανοί / ὕβριος. 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 *πρόξενοι* would be at variance with the generality and abstractness of the other two attributes of the Cleonymids; moreover, the word *ἀρχᾶθεν* 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 ἦλυθον ἐς χορόν / ἐσλοῖς τε γονεῦσιν / ἀμφὶ προξενίαισι τί- / μαθεν γὰρ τὰ πάλαι τὰ νῦν / τ' ἀμφικτιόνεσσιν / ἵππων τ' ὠκυπόδων προ[λυ- / γνώτοις ἐπὶ νίκαις 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 *πρόξενος* in Attic tragedy. In Aeschylus' *Supplikes* 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

φιλία. Most modern scholars follow the former, e.g. L. R. Farnell, ed., *The Works of Pindar* (London 1930), Fennell (*supra* n.23), B. L. Gildersleeve, ed., *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*² (New York 1890) *ad loc.*; cf. Wilamowitz (*supra* n.5) 349f.

³⁶ Cf. D. C. Young, *Pindar Isthmian 7. Myth and Exempla* (= *Mnemosyne Suppl.* 15 [Leiden 1971]) 19 n.61.

³⁷ Cf. Thummer (*supra* n.11) II 66 *ad* 25f.

³⁸ At *Suppl.* 920 Page (*OCT* [Oxford 1972]) daggers *προξένωι* 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, *οὐκ ὀρθῶς οὖν Εὐριπίδης ἐν Τηλέφῳ πρόξενον εἶρηκε τὸν ἰδιόξενον*. If the uncertainly transmitted *προξενίαν* 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) *ξείνός εἰμι* (61). Clearly the two words *ξείνός* (61) and *προξενία* (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 προσανεΐ Θώρα-
κος, ὅσπερ ἐμὰν ποιπνύων χάριν
τόδ' ἔξευξεν ἄρμα Πιερίδων τετράορον,
φιλέων φιλέοντ', ἄγων ἄγοντα προφρόνως.*⁴²

³⁹ Cf. Monceaux (*supra* n.31) 259ff; Gschnitzer (*supra* n.31) 636f is too skeptical here.

⁴⁰ But cf. D. L. Page, ed., *Euripides, Medea* (Oxford 1938) 99 *ad loc.*

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:⁴³ 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 δῆμος call one another δημότης and thereby mean not only 'member of a δῆμος' but also 'fellow member of the δῆμος to which I belong'.⁴⁴ In this usage, of course, the δῆμος 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.⁴⁵ This usage is familiar, for example, from Aristophanes⁴⁶ and the Attic orators.⁴⁷

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.⁴⁸ In Tyrtaeus the δημότας ἄνδρας are contrasted to the θεοτιμήτους βασιλῆας and the πρεσβυγενέας γέ-

⁴³ The few exceptions: Fennell¹ (*supra* n.23) 80 (retracted in ed.² 92); G. Fraccaroli, *Le Odi di Pindaro* (Verona 1894) 592 n.3; H. M. Lee, "The ΤΕΡΜΑ 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 1. 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 townsmen." 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*² (Berlin 1872) s.v. πρόξενος; I have been unable to trace his source.

⁴⁵ Cf. Hdt. 5.66–69, Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 21.

⁴⁶ *Ach.* 319, 328, 333 (ἐμός δ.), 349, 675; *Eccl.* 1023, 1115 (+ γείτονες); *Eq.* 320; *Lys.* 335 (ἐμαῖς δ.), 685; *Nub.* 210 (οὔμοι δ.), 1210, 1219, 1322 (ὦ γείτονες καὶ ξυγγενεῖς καὶ δ.); *Plut.* 254 (+ φίλοι), 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*² (Oxford 1951) 214ff, on the duties and relations among δημόται.

⁴⁷ E.g., [Dem.] 52.28; Dem. 57.24, 61, 62, 69, etc.

⁴⁸ Cf. W. Donlan, "Changes and Shifts in the Meaning of Demos in the Literature of the Archaic Period," *ParPass* 25 (1970) 381–95, esp. 381ff; V. Ehrenberg, "Der Damos im archaischen Sparta," *Hermes* 68 (1933) 288–305, esp. 289f; A. Forti Messina, "Δῆμος in alcuni lirici," in *ANTIDALPON Hugoni Henrico Paoli oblatum: Miscellanea philologica* (Genoa 1956) 227–41; G. Maddoli, "ΔΑΜΟΣ e ΒΑΣΙΛΗΣ. Contributo allo studio delle origine della polis," *SMEA* 12 (1970) 7–57, esp. 46ff. This is the usage recorded in LSJ s.v. as "one of the people, a commoner as opposed to a man of rank."

ροντας (4.3–5 West).⁴⁹ Susarion addresses the Icarian populace as ὦ δημόται 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.⁵⁰ 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, ἀνδρὶ δημότη. The same tendency is found in Euripides. In his famous λάθε βιώσας speech Ion says δημότης ἂν εὐτυχῆς / ζῆν ἂν θέλοιμι μᾶλλον ἢ τύραννος ὦν (*Ion* 625f); Menelaus reminds Agamemnon of his eagerness to find support for the Trojan expedition with the words, ὡς ταπεινὸς ἦσθα, πάσης δεξιᾶς προσθιγγάνων / καὶ θύρας ἔχων ἀκλήστους τῷ θέλοντι δημοτῶν / καὶ διδοῦς πρόσρησιν ἐξῆς πᾶσι (*IA* 339–41); in explaining Clytemnestra's failure to remarry, Electra claims that ψόγον τρέμουσα δημοτῶν ἐλείπετο (*El.* 643); and a fragment from the *Erechtheus* contrasts ἐξουσίᾳ ἐντυχῶν (the attainment of public office) with αἰσχροὺς ἔρωτας δημοτῶν διωκαθεῖν (fr.362.24f Nauck). The same usage is found in a frequently misunderstood passage in the *Alcestis*.⁵¹ 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 φοβούμαι μέμψιν, ἔκ τε δημοτῶν,
μή τίς μ' ἐλέγξῃ τὴν ἐμὴν εὐεργέτιν
προδόντ' ἐν ἄλλης δεμνίῳς πίτνειν 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*² (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 *δαμόται*.

The result may seem curious. After all, a *πολίτης* can be a member of the same *πόλις*, an *ἄστος* of the same *ἄστυ*, a *φυλήτης* 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 τοὺς οἰκοῦντας ἐν ἐκάστω τῶν δήμων, ἵνα μὴ πατρόθεν προσαγορεύοντες ἐξελέγχωσιν τοὺς νεοπολίτας, ἀλλὰ τῶν δήμων ἀναγορεύωσιν· ὅθεν καὶ καλοῦσιν Ἀθηναῖοι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς τῶν δήμων.*

⁵⁵ Cf. J. Chadwick, *The Mycenaean World* (Cambridge 1976) 76f; M. Lejeune, “Le ‘damos’ dans la société mycénienne,” *REG* 78 (1965) 1–22, esp. 1ff, 6; Maddoli (*supra* n.48) 17ff; L. R. Palmer, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts* (Oxford 1963) 85ff; M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*² (Cambridge 1973) 232f; K. Wundsam, *Die politische und soziale Struktur in den mykenischen Residenzen nach den Linear B Texten* (diss. Vienna 1967) 153–63.

Mycenaean administrative system; for in the archaic and classical periods, almost everywhere in Greece outside the Attic-Ionic sphere, the *δήμος* 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 *δημότης* 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 *δάμος* 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 *ἀστοῖς καὶ βασιλευσιν*); and in *Nem.* 10.23, the citizens of Argos in contrast to the victor Theaeus.⁵⁶ 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 *καί*, 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 Psaumis (so G. Hermann, "Ueber 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 re-punctuated text together with a translation:

ἔων δ' ἐγγύς Ἀχαιὸς οὐ μέμψεται μ' ἀνὴρ
 Ἴονίας ὑπὲρ ἄλῶς οἰ-
 κέων· καὶ προξενία πέποιθ', ἔν τε δαμόταις
 ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν, οὐχ ὑπερβαλῶν,
 βίαια πάντ' ἐκ ποδὸς ἐρύσαις.

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

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
 January, 1986

⁵⁷ Cf. *supra* n.34, Chapter 3. I am grateful to Professor Richard Kannicht for his comments on an earlier version of this paper.