

B. L. Gildersleeve on Pindar *Nemean* 3.74–75

Ward W. Briggs, Jr

IN 1898 Charles Eliot Norton, the nation's foremost champion of Dante and a leading Northern literary critic who influenced a host of literary figures from Henry James to T. S. Eliot,¹ wrote to Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, the nation's most visible representative of German philological training and a man of considerable critical ability. Named emeritus at Harvard in November 1897, with his duties confined to teaching a small class in Dante, Norton was depressed at the thought of retirement,² and sought the advice of his Southern near-contemporary on the Greek view of the ages of man and its accompanying virtues, as described in Pindar *Nemean* 3.70–75. Gildersleeve's answer, one of his rare letters on purely philological matters, gives considerable insight into his critical method.

The poem in question is a hymn on the victory in the pancration by Aristocleides, an Aeginetan. It opens with a picture of the youths standing on the banks of the Asopus waiting for the Muse to arrive with their victory song (1–8). The Muse is to sing of Aegina, which the victor has ennobled by a triumph worthy of the Myrmidons, and he has thus figuratively passed the pillars of Heracles (9–26). The mention of Heracles leads Pindar to digress on the Aeacids, Peleus, Telamon (31–42), and the young Achilles (43–63). The song of these exploits beseems Aristocleides, for testing one's mettle proves one's abilities at all stages of life and Aristocleides has the four virtues necessary for victory (64–76). Though Pindar sends his poem late (76–79), the eagle nevertheless can strike upon his prey from afar (80–82) and the victor's glory ranges from Nemea to Epidaurus to Megara (83–84).

¹ On Norton's life (1827–1908) see *Letters of Charles Eliot Norton with a Biographical Comment by His Daughter Sara Norton and M. A. DeWolfe Howe* (Boston/New York 1913); K. Vanderbilt, *Charles Eliot Norton: Apostle of Culture in a Democracy* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1959).

² Vanderbilt (*supra* n.1) 140–41; 218–19, "In the last decade [of his life] he was despondent and reflective on old age."

The portion in question is this (74–75):³

ἐλαῖ δὲ καὶ τέσσαρας ἀρετὰς
<ὁ> θνατὸς αἰῶν, φρονεῖν δ' ἐνέπει τὸ παρκείμενον.

Gildersleeve was, as he remains today, one of the world's leading Pindarists.⁴ What other authorities on this poem might he have had to hand in 1898? Perhaps he had an old Heyne, possibly Beck; certainly Boeckh's various editions, if not Dissen's edition of 1830 or his old teacher Schneidewin's revision of that. T. Bergk's edition of the lyric poets would certainly have been available, as might two English editions based on Boeckh, Donaldson and Cookesley. He would consult J. A. Hartung's Leipzig edition of 1855–1856 and the texts of Tycho Mommsen and certainly W. Christ, whom he mentions.⁵ Gildersleeve had reviewed Mezger's important work, as well as Fennell's Cambridge edition, Fraccaroli's translation and commentary, and Bury's edition of the *Nemeans* and *Isthmians*.⁶

Let us look at his response to Norton.⁷

³ References to the text of Pindar come from B. Snell and H. Maehler, *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis* I (Leipzig 1971).

⁴ He had published *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York 1885, 1890²). In the words of David C. Young, "Gildersleeve was certainly the most independent of Pindar's scholars and in many ways the best . . . the small school text of the Olympians and Pythians . . . is one of the major works not only of exegetical value for individual passages but also for general interpretation, for the short introductions to the individual odes often contain a few observations about the meaning and art of the poem which indicate more understanding than almost all the pages of other scholars": "Pindaric Criticism," *The Minnesota Review* 4 (1964) 596 (= *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, edd. W. M. Calder III and J. Stern, *Wege der Forschung* 134 [Darmstadt 1970] 28). See now R. L. Fowler, "Gildersleeve's Pindaric Criticism," *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico 1984) 111–23.

⁵ C. G. Heyne, *Pindari carmina et fragmenta* (Göttingen 1773), enlarged ed. 1797–1799, repr. Oxford 1807–1809; rev. and enlarged ed. by G. H. Shaefer (Leipzig 1817, repr. London 1824); C. D. Beck, *Pindari carmina et fragmenta Graece* (Leipzig 1792–1795); A. Boeckh, *Pindari opera quae supersunt* (Leipzig 1811–1821); F. G. Schneidewin, *Pindari Carmina quae supersunt* (Göttingen 1843); T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* I (Leipzig 1843, 1853², 1866³, 1878⁴); J. W. Donaldson, *Pindar's Epinician or Triumphal Odes* (London 1841, 1868²); W. G. Cookesley, *Pindari carmina* II (Eton 1851); J. A. Hartung, *Pindars Werke* (Leipzig 1855–1856); T. Mommsen, *Pindari Carmina* (Berlin 1866); W. Christ, *Pindari carmina* (Leipzig 1869, repr. 1891).

⁶ F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig 1880), reviewed *AJP* 2 (1881) 497–501; C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge 1883); Gildersleeve had reviewed a new edition of Fennell's previous work on the *Olympians* and *Pythians* in *AJP* 14 (1893) 498–501; G. Fraccaroli, *Le odi di Pindaro* (Verona 1894), reviewed *AJP* 15 (1894) 495–96; J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (New York/London 1890), reviewed *AJP* 11 (1890) 528–29.

⁷ This letter is in the Houghton Library, Harvard University no. 1Ms Am 1088 (2684), and is reprinted by permission.

1002 N. Calvert St.
Baltimore May 22, 1898

Dear Mr. Norton:

As the greatest of Pindar's editors has declared that the dark saying of N. 3.74 became darker to him the more he studied it,⁸ the least of Pindar's worshippers might decline the problem without dishonour. But you are more than welcome to my view.

The first trouble is with the text. Are we to read *ὁ θνατὸς αἰών* or *ὁ μακρὸς αἰών*?⁹ The weighty authority of Aristarchus is in favour of *ὁ θνατὸς αἰών*¹⁰ but *ὁ μακρὸς αἰών* is so seductive that the latest editor of Pindar, Christ, a sensible man, has yielded to it.¹¹ The article of *ὁ μακρὸς αἰών* to which an English editor of some note objects¹² is just what we ought to find. *ὁ μακρὸς βίος* is used of *that* extreme old age,¹³ so longed for before it comes, so hateful after it comes and *ὁ μακρὸς αἰών* would give quite in Pindar's implicit manner the fourth stage.¹⁴ *ἐλᾶ* is not clear. Does it mean

⁸ The *explicationes* to the *Nemeans* (and *Isthmians*) in Boeckh's edition are by L. Dissen. In II 378 he says, "Et haec quidem Boeckhius, qui ultro fatetur sibi hunc locum, quo eum diutius consideret, eo obscuriorem fieri: nunc his accuratius expositis certe hoc effectum est, ut status controversiae liqueat." Gildersleeve called Boeckh "the greatest living master of Hellenic studies [of his time]": *Hellas and Hesperia* (New York 1909) 42. See also "Professorial Types," *The Hopkinsian* 1 (1893) 4-5.

⁹ The **B** (*Vaticanus*) tradition has *θνατὸς ἔων*, **DVXZ** *μακρὸς αἰών*, Mosch. (called diorth.¹ by Mommsen) *μακρὸς τοι αἰών*, Tricl. (Mommsen's diorth.²) *ὁ μακρὸς αἰών*. According to Turyn, Triclinius supplies the *ὁ*. E. Schmid first restored the line from Aristarchus via the scholia: *Πινδάρων περίοδος, hoc est Pindari lyricorum principis* (Wittenberg 1616). Beck was the first (1795) to print *θνατὸς*, and most editors since, including G. Hermann, Bergk, L. Schmidt, Mommsen, Mezger, Fennell, Bury, E. Hümmelich ("Die Pindar-Handschriften B und D," *Commentationes Philologicae* [Monaco 1891] 115-28), and Fraccaroli, have done so.

¹⁰ "There is a balance of evidence in favour of *θνατὸς* against *μακρὸς* which would hardly need the article" (Fennell 29). When G. Hermann added notes to Heyne's editions of 1798 and 1817, he said of this passage, "Etiam schol. legerat in suo *ὁ θνατὸς αἰών* et video nunc hoc magis lyricum decere."

¹¹ Gildersleeve prefers the old reading of Heyne, Boeckh/Dissen/Schneidewin, Donaldson, Cookesley, Hartung, and K. Kleanthes (*Πινδάρων τὰ σωζόμενα* III [Trieste 1886]; reviewed by him in *AJP* 11 [1890] 529), last printed by an editor (Christ) in 1896. For Gildersleeve on Christ see *AJP* 17 (1896) 517-18.

¹² He means Bury, who reports (60) R. Y. Tyrrell's view "that *μακρὸς* was introduced by some one who thought that the fourth virtue corresponded to a fourth age, attained only by those who lived long." For Gildersleeve pejoratively on Bury see *AJP* 11 (1890) 528; 13 (1892) 385; 15 (1894) 398.

¹³ *μακρὸς βίος* has this sense at Aesch. *PV* 449 (mankind's length of days in ignorance before Prometheus visited them) and Soph. *Aj.* 473, Eur. *Alc.* 715, *Herac.* 447, Ar. *Lys.* 257, *Anth.Gr.* 7.650.3 (Philaecus), 8.89.4, Pl. *Resp.* 407D4; cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 375 (echoed in parody by Ar. *Ran.* 931).

¹⁴ *δι' αἰῶνος μακροῦ* at Aesch. *Supp.* 582 is translated "throughout his long lifetime" by Friis Johansen and E. W. Whittle, *Aeschylus, The Suppliants* II (Copenhagen 1980) 467, and Eur. fr.575.3 N. has a similar meaning. L. Bornemann, "Jahresbericht über

‘drives’ as one one drives a team¹⁵ or ‘drives’ as one drives a furrow?¹⁶ Are we to think of the four virtues abreast in the *τέθριππον* with *φρόνησις* as the dominant mare (*ἀρετὰς*)¹⁷ or are we to think of the four virtues in succession, with *φρόνησις* as the last in the *τετράγωνον* of life¹⁸ (Od. 18,374)?¹⁹ I incline to the latter view—to the interpretation that makes *φρόνησις* the culminating, not the controlling element.²⁰ Plato’s four virtues are tempting²¹—all the more so because they doubtless go back to Pythagoras and

Pindar 1888–1890,” *JAW* 67 (1891) 16–17, suggests *ἔλοι . . . ὅς ἄκρος αἰών*, which he says “= aetas ejus extrema.”

¹⁵ *ἐλά* = *φέρει* (schol.), cf. *Isthm.* 5.38 and schol. J. Rumpel says it means ‘adigo, adducere’ both here and at *Nem.* 10.70 and lists no meaning close to ‘ploughing’: *Lexicon Pindaricum* (Leipzig 1883). W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin 1969) 163, translates ‘bring’. Heyne follows the scholia and translates (129) ‘admovet, adducit’ and says it means the same as *ἐπάγει*. Bury: “The metaphor . . . I think, is from driving, not from planting; so *Isthm.* V.38 *ἔλα πεδόθεν*.” Mezger: “es bringt aber noch . . . hervor . . . und (= indem es) gebietet das Vorliegende zu beachten” (390).

¹⁶ LSJ cite this instance as meaning ‘plant, produce’ (s.v. *ελαίνω* III.3). For driving a furrow see Hes. *Op.* 443, *Pind. Pyth.* 4.228. Gildersleeve may be thinking of Ar. *Ach.* 995 (*ὄρχον ἐλάσαι μακρόν*, “plant a long vine row”) or Pl. *Resp.* 433B where justice allows the other virtues to “take root” (*ἐγγενέσθαι, καὶ ἐγγενομένους*). Fennell may take it to mean ‘planting’ to judge by his translation, “forms a series of.” Fraccaroli translates “aggiungere suole.” Hartung reads *ἀμᾶ δρέπει* for *ἐλά δὲ καὶ*.

¹⁷ Fennell thinks the four divisions of life comprise two groups of two virtues apiece. Bury: “But life drives a team of four excellences, for it biddeth man to be wise in that which he findeth to do.”

¹⁸ Thus Donaldson, “that he assigns one virtue to each of the four ages of human life (on the same principle as that which Shakespeare has followed in his description of the seven ages) . . . That he is speaking of the virtues proper to each age is clear from v.71: *ὣν τις ἐξοχώτερος γένηται*” (30).

¹⁹ Odysseus answers the mocking offer of Eurymachus to work on a farm with the wish that they might compete with one another in ploughing the four-acre spread.

²⁰ The scholion is actually a combination of these views. It draws from Aristarchus this interpretation, in the words of Bury: “each of the three ages of man, childhood, early manhood, and elder age, has a proper excellence of its own; and besides these there is another excellence not confined to a particular time of life, namely wisdom” (42). This was generally the view of Heyne; Mezger, following Hermann, thinks the same (390) and that “eine allen Lebensaltern gemeinsame nennt: es ist die richtige Erkenntniss des Zeitgemässen.” Similarly Fraccaroli says the fourth virtue is “conveniente a tutte.” W. H. D. Rouse thinks the fourth virtue is the climax and that these parallel the division of the games according to age, with the fourth division being open to all *andres*: “Notes on the Nemeans of Pindar,” *PCPhS* 28–30 (1891) 16–18. Only Bury identifies the fourth virtue with wisdom. Christ calls it a “moderatio” which is the “cardo et medulla omnium quattuor virtutum.”

²¹ “It is doubtful whether Pindar’s *τέσσαρες ἀρεταί* (*Nem.* III 74) are to be interpreted as the cardinal virtues”: J. Adam, *The Republic of Plato*² I (Cambridge 1963) 224. The three virtues mentioned by Gildersleeve plus *φρόνησις* appear together at Pl. *Phd.* 69C and *Leg.* 631C. Less specific are the mentions of four virtues (with the possible addition of *δσιώτης*) in *Prt.* 329C, *Lach.* 199D, *Menex.* 78D, and *Grg.* 507B. Most complete is *Resp.* 427E, where the four virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice are mentioned. Justice is not the virtue of every part but must belong to every part. At 433B it is the virtue that lets the other virtues “take root” in the state.

Pindar was under Pythagorean influences.²² But we need not follow Plato closely. Pindar gives us the popular Dorism,²³ Plato an idealized Dorism.²⁴ *σωφροσύνη* is the virtue of boyhood²⁵—especially Doric boyhood beset as it was by lovers—*ἀνδρεία* the virtue of manhood²⁶—*δικαιοσύνη* for which Aegina was famous, Aeacus being a great judge²⁷—belongs to maturer years, the age of Shakespeare's justice²⁸ and *ὁ μαχρὸς αἰὼν* with its old experience brings *φρόνησις*²⁹ brings *σοφία*³⁰ brings resignation and Goethe's philosophy

Adam feels that in this passage of the *Republic*, from the “ready assent” of Adimantus “we may reasonably infer that the doctrine of four cardinal virtues was already a familiar tenet of the Platonic school.” Plato took the five ‘popular’ virtues and divided his ideal society into classes based on age and sex corresponding to the virtues. See F. M. Cornford, “Psychology and Social Structure in the *Republic* of Plato,” *CQ* 6 (1912) 246–57.

²² So Donaldson (210), “Pindar is speaking with reference to the Pythagorean division of virtue into four species.” On the Pythagorean origin of the four virtues see W. D. Geddes, *Platonis Phaedo*² (London 1885) 254–62.

²³ In the popular Dorism, *sophrosyne* would be the virtue of women and children, *andreia* of warriors, as may be assumed from Aesch. *Sept.* 610, Eur. fr.284 N., Anon. *Iambl.* 13–15. See Helen North, *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature* (Ithaca 1966) 25 (*cf.* 240 *infra*).

²⁴ In the early dialogues, *εὐσέβεια* or *ὀσιότης* occurs in place of *σοφία* or *φρόνησις*.

²⁵ “Whatever else it may become, *sophrosyne* throughout Greek literature is always the virtue proper to the young, and of course to women—i.e., to all those members of society of whom obedience is required” (North [*supra* n.23] 131 n.24). So Isoc. 9.22, where Evagoras lists *sophrosyne* (here “nothing more than obedience and orderly conduct,” North 147) along with physical strength and beauty as the virtues of Evagoras' childhood. *Cf.* Arist. *Eth.Nic.* 1095a, Diog. Laert. 2.32. Clearly the old-style education of Just Logic in Ar. *Nub.* shows the *sophrosyne* of youth (962, 1006, 1029), as Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.26 (Socrates taught Alcibiades and Critias *sophrosyne* in their youth when they otherwise might have been unrestrained) and *Cyr.* 1.2.8 (young boys learn *sophrosyne* from imitating their elders). But in Plato, it is first seen as necessary to all aspects of life (see North 173), taking the rôle of the fourth virtue in the present passage. *sophrosyne* is first linked to older men in Theognis 1325–26 and Democritus 68B294 D.-K. (“strength and beauty are the good things of youth, but *sophrosyne* is the flower of age”). Later it is a feature of Plato's *Laws*; see North 120, 191, 209.

²⁶ Particularly adult warriors (*ἀνὴρ* = warrior in Homer; *cf.* also Pind. *Ol.* 6.10 “in battles”), Pl. *Lach.* 190E, Arist. *Eth.Nic.* 1114a34ff, 1129b19ff. For courage as the virtue of early manhood and *boulai* of old age see Pind. *Pyth.* 2.63–65 (Fennell 29) and fr.199.

²⁷ On the justice of the Aeacidae see Pind. *Ol.* 8, *Pyth.* 8, *Nem.* 8, *Isthm.* 5, fr.1, but particularly *Nem.* 8.7–12 (*χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς ἄριστος*). At *Isthm.* 8.124 he is named as arbiter of the gods. Socrates lists Aeacus (along with Minos and Rhadamanthys, as at Dem. 18.127) as a judge in the Underworld (an Orphic, not a common, idea, see Burnet *ad loc.*) at Pl. *Ap.* 41A, *cf.* *Grg.* 523E (see also Isoc. 9.15, Hor. *Carm.* 2.13.22).

²⁸ The fifth age of seven, following the soldier's, “And then the justice, in fair round belly with good capon lin'd, with eyes severe and beard of formal cut, full of wise saws and modern instances”: *As You Like It* II.vii.153–56.

²⁹ *Phronesis* is ‘practical wisdom’ at Pl. *Resp.* 428B.

³⁰ According to Xenophon (*Mem.* 3.9.4), Socrates held *sophia* (indistinguishable to him from *sophrosyne*) to be common to all the virtues (North [*supra* n.23] 128).

of *die Forderung des Tages*³¹ (τὸ παρκείμενον).³² These four virtues make up the τετράγωνος ἀνὴρ³³ and each is brought to the test by trial διάπειρά τοι βροτῶν ἔλεγχος[.] (O 4.18)³⁴ Aristokleides has the potentialities of them all and by the grace of god he may like Damophilus show them all—P 4.281: κείνος γὰρ ἐν παισὶν νέος, / ἐν δὲ βουλαῖς πρέσβυς ἐγκύρσαις ἑκατονταετῆ βιοτᾶ. Surely ἑκατονταετῆ βιοτᾶ will satisfy the conditions of ὁ μακρὸς αἰών. As for the correspondence to the other fourfold state I am not certain that I can satisfy either of us. The genealogy is mixed as I have noted on O 13.10³⁵ to which add the remark in Herodotus 8.77: δία Δίκη σβέσσει κρατερὸν Κόρον, Ὑβριος υἷον. But it might be said that ὄλβος demands σωφροσύνη lest it beget κόρος—ἀνδρεία checks κόρος—δικαιοσύνη quells ὕβρις³⁶ and φρόνησις is the truest guard against ἄτη.

This is the way the passage looks to me now. Perhaps more reflection will make it seem still darker.

[The letter ends with personal regards to Norton.]

Gildersleeve's reading is certainly not that of the majority of Pindaric commentators before or since, either as regards (1) the reading ὁ μακρὸς αἰών or (2) the notion that Pindar is describing a series of four virtues. To what extent should a modern editor be guided by Gildersleeve's view of the passage?

(1) His reading, that of his old teacher Boeckh, μακρός, is read by only two commentators after 1855 (Kleanthes and Christ), while θνατός is read by seven editors from 1862 to 1896 and by the major editors (Sandys, Farnell, Puech, Schroeder, Bowra, Turyn, Snell) from 1898 to our day. The conflicting interpretations may be restated thus: either man's awareness of his mortality (θνατός) makes him aware from childhood that he must use his other virtues wisely (*i.e.* "four

³¹ "Was aber ist deine Pflicht? Die Forderung des Tages": *Maximen und Reflexionen*, 443.

³² "From this passage we get a clear definition of φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον, the fourth virtue characteristic of advanced age (proved to be so by the use of the verb ἐλᾶ), and have no mention of justice": Fennell 29. See Pind. *Pyth.* 2.65.

³³ For the ἀνὴρ τετράγωνος see Simonides *PMG* 542.3.

³⁴ In his note on *Ol.* 4.18 Gildersleeve (*supra* n.4: 162) refers to *Nem.* 3.71. Somewhat later (*AJP* 28 [1907] 480–81) he retracts the interpretation he gave in his commentary and which is clearly informing his view here. This was pointed out to me by Prof. Robert Fowler.

³⁵ At *Ol.* 13.6–10 Law, Justice, and Peace, the daughters of Themis, repel *hubris*, the κόρον ματέρα θρασύμυθον. "Theognis reverses the genealogy, v. 153: τίκτει τοι κόρος ὕβριν ὅταν κακῶ ὄλβος ἔπηται, but that makes little difference as, according to Greek custom, grandmother and granddaughter often bore the same name. It is a mere matter of Ὑβρις—Κόρος—Ὑβρις" (Gildersleeve [*supra* n.4] 229–30).

³⁶ Solon 5.9–10 Diehl: τίκτει γὰρ κόρος ὕβριν ὅταν πολὺς ὄλβος ἔπηται ἀνθρώποισιν ὅσοις μὴ νόος ἄρτιος ἦ. See also schol. Pind. *Ol.* 13.12, Diog. Laert. 8.22.153. For *eunomia* cancelling out *hubris* see also Solon 3.32–34 and Aesch. *Ag.* 168, 222, 769.

virtues abreast . . . with *φρόνησις* as the dominant mare”), or if one lives a long enough life (*μακρός*) then wisdom will come to him as a fourth and final virtue. The latter clearly appealed to the 67-year-old Gildersleeve, and we may examine some philological reasons why.

αἰών is a word specifically used of one’s allotted span of life. E. Fraenkel quotes Wilamowitz that, “*χρόνος* is absolute, *αἰών* relative, defined by the person or thing whose *αἰών* it is,”³⁷ and says of the occurrence at Aeschylus *Ag.* 107, “it gives us an idea which occurs several times in Aeschylus and Sophocles—the idea that a man’s lifetime is born, grows up, and ages with him.”³⁸

But can one say *ὁ μακρὸς αἰών* in the sense required, that is, to indicate the fourth and oldest age of mortal man? The phrase is used of long life at Aesch. *Supp.* 582 (*supra* n.14) and Eur. fr.575.3 N.; and at Theoc. *Id.* 16.43 the phrase refers to the generations of mortal life during which the shades lie in the Underworld. Soph. *OC* 152 (*μακραίων*), Aesch. *Pers.* 262 (*μακροβίωτος αἰών*), Soph. *OT* 518, Pl. *Resp.* 383B, quoting Aesch. fr.350 N., and *Epin.* 982A2 (*τινα μακραίωνα βίον*) and the occurrences of *μακρὸς βίος* in n.13 above all refer to long human life. But *μακρὸς αἰών* probably refers to the lifetime of the Muses at Eur. *Med.* 429 and to the remote ages of history in Plut. *Mor.* 93E. The adjective *μακραίων* is used of nymphs in Soph. *OT* 1099, of the Fates in *Ant.* 987, and the *δαίμονες* in Empedocles 31B115.5 D.-K. and Plut. *Mor.* 420D.

No instance of *μακρὸς αἰών* employs the definite article, and indeed the mss. have none; it was supplied by Triclinius (*supra* n.9). On the other hand, *θνατὸς αἰών* is unexampled elsewhere,³⁹ and on balance Gildersleeve seems right to be “seduced” along with Christ by the analogy with *ὁ μακρὸς βίος* and not to heed “the weighty authority of Aristarchus.”

(2) Although Gildersleeve says “we need not follow Plato closely,” he overlooks Pindar’s four virtues of the Aeacids in *Isthm.* 8.24–28 and Aesch. *Sept.* 610, which contain nearly the same virtues, in favor of the four virtues from Plato *Phd.* 69c and *Leg.* 631c.⁴⁰ We should first find the source of Gildersleeve’s interpretation.

Geddes’s Note K on Plato’s *Phaedo* deals with “The Platonic Division of the Virtues”⁴¹ and begins thus:

³⁷ *Aeschylus Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914) 170 n.3.

³⁸ *Aeschylus, Agamemnon* II (Oxford 1950) 62–63.

³⁹ Eur. *IT* 1122 τὸ δὲ μετ’ εὐτυχίας κακοῦσθαι θνατοῖς βαρὺς αἰών is not apposite.

⁴⁰ For other mentions of the virtues in Plato see *supra* n.21.

⁴¹ Geddes (*supra* n.22).

The ancient division of Virtue into four leading forms, known in modern times as the ‘cardinal virtues’, was probably of Pythagorean origin. Among the earliest traces of such a division is that which we find in the Pythagorean Pindar (*Nem.* III.76), who speaks of ‘Virtues Four’ in such a connection as to indicate their correspondence with the four ages or marked seasons of the life of Man. In this case they may be supposed to have been successively evolved in the life of the individual in the following order:—

Virtue of Youth (παῖς).	Self-control or Temperance (Σωφροσύνη).
Virtue of Early Manhood (ἀνήρ).	Bravery (Ἀνδρία).
Virtue of Mature Manhood (παλαιότερος).	Justice (Δικαιοσύνη).
Virtue of Old Age (ὁ μακρὸς αἰὼν).	Prudence (Φρόνησις).

Here is the contemporary source that agrees with Gildersleeve’s text, his belief that the virtues are a series based on age, and his application of the Platonic virtues to Pindar’s ‘Ages of Man’. Despite Gildersleeve’s warm review of the second edition of this commentary,⁴² it is still curious that he, having ostensibly eschewed the Platonic canon, should defer so completely to it in this case. However valuable Geddes’ work may be, few today would readily assign to Pindar the strictly canonized virtues of Plato, and Gildersleeve’s interpretation of *φρόνησις* as “the culminating, not the controlling element,” *i.e.* as the last in a series of four, goes against the scholia and most commentators who see it as a virtue common to the other three (*supra* n.20).

Helen North persuasively shows that in sixth-century elegy and fifth-century lyric the old heroic ideal was replaced with a new code of excellence that had four components, *arete*, *sophrosyne*, *agathos*, and *sophron*, and that

for Pindar, as for Theognis and Bacchylides, *sophrosyne* in the *polis* is allied with the other excellences—*arete* or *anorea*, *eunomia*, and *dike*—which by now have a well-established ‘class’ meaning in the old-fashioned Dorian world.⁴³

⁴² *AJP* 6 (1885) 495: “His range of illustrative reading is great, the conception of the dialogue is admirable, the appended notes are full of interest and suggestiveness, and he who reads the dialogue simply for its literary charm or philosophical meaning cannot fail to be grateful for Professor Geddes’ companionship.”

⁴³ North (*supra* n.23) 25, *cf.* 13 and n.47.

This tradition of four continued from Pindar through Isocrates:⁴⁴

Pindar	Aeschylus	Euripides	Gorgias	Xenophon	Isocrates
δίκας ἐπείραινε	δίκαιος	δίκαιος	πρέπον	δίκαιον	δικαιοσύνη
ἀνορέα	ἀγαθός	ἀγαθούς	ἀνδρεία	ἀνδρεία	ἀνδρία
σώφρονες	σώφρων	σώφρων	κοσμότης	σωφροσύνη	σωφροσύνη
πινυτοί τε θυμόν	εὐσεβής	σοφούς	εὐσεβές	εὐσεβές	σοφία

It thus appears to have been an ongoing tradition, rather than his “implicit manner,” that led Pindar to speak of four virtues (as at *Isthm.* 8.24–28) and to associate them with certain stages of a man’s life, as Gildersleeve (and Geddes) suggests. The pre-Platonic parallels that Gildersleeve does not adduce support his view that *φρονεῖν τὸ παρκείμενον* concludes a series.

No one should be held accountable for a letter that was never intended to be published, even one written on his special field to a colleague of Norton’s stature. Yet we know that Gildersleeve took great care in the composition of his letters, often writing several drafts of especially important ones. Gildersleeve’s informal discussion of this vexed passage not only gives us insight into his critical method, but makes us wish the more that he could have written a com-

⁴⁴ Pind. *Isthm.* 8.24–28; dated 478 B.C. See North (*supra* n.23) 25 and “Pindar, *Isthmian*, 8, 24–28,” *AJP* 69 (1948) 304–08.

Aesch. *Sept.* 610; produced in 467. In this passage *εὐσέβεια* is substituted for the *φρόνησις* that the seer Amphiaraus lacks. Wilamowitz once thought the line a later interpolation to introduce the Platonic virtues (*Aeschyli Tragoediae* [Berlin 1914] 105) but recanted in *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I (Berlin 1931) 15 n.1. For important discussions of this verse and its testimony for the cardinal virtues, see E. Wolff, *Plato’s Apologie* (NeuPhilUnters 6 [Berlin 1929]) 77; W. Jaeger, *Humanistische Reden und Vorträge*² (Berlin 1960) 145. I am grateful to Professor Friedrich Solmsen for these references.

Eur. fr.284.23–28. In this fragment of the satyr-play *Autolykos Satyrikos*, Euripides adds skill in speech (*μύθοις*) to the other four virtues; see North (*supra* n.23) 72.

Gorgias 82B6 D.-K.: the virtues held by dead heroes, from the *Epitaphios*; see North (*supra* n.23) 94.

Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.16; dated *ca* 385. Xenophon lists the virtues espoused by Socrates. He includes piety (*εὐσεβές*) but omits *σοφία*; see also the *Agésilas*, where he adds to the canon patriotism and “something akin to affability” (*τὸ εὐχάρη*, 8.1); North (*supra* n.23) 130. Adam considers *Mem.* 3.9.1–5 the “nearest approach to the doctrine before Plato” (*supra* n.21).

Isoc. *Evag.* 22f; dated 370–365. Isocrates here excludes Xenophon’s piety, which he had included in similar lists in *Helen* 31 and *On the Peace* 63.

panion commentary on the *Isthmians* and *Nemeans*⁴⁵ to match his work on the *Olympians* and the *Pythians*.⁴⁶

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
September, 1984

⁴⁵ “On account of the commercial failure of the *Olympians* and *Pythians*, the Harpers declined to undertake a companion volume containing the *Nemeans* and *Isthmians*, which indeed might have helped to precipitate the sad exit of the firm from the enterprise of publishing school books”: “Pindaric Notes,” *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, July 1916, 35.

⁴⁶ Professors William M. Calder III, Robert Fowler, and Friedrich Solmsen read earlier versions of this paper and made many helpful suggestions for which I am grateful. William M. Calder IV corrected two mistranscriptions of the original.