It is easy to say that we know nothing of Pindar’s music; but our ignorance does not give us the right to think that we can interpret his odes correctly while taking no account of his music. His words and his metrical structure, even if understood correctly, give us only one half of his art; his rhythm and his melody are not less important because we have no direct information about them. His odes were written to be sung by a choir, and persons who heard them sung as the composer intended were surely less likely to remember their logical structure or their moral message than their musical design, the musical relation between strophe, antistrophe, and epode, the way in which words were fitted to music rather than the words by themselves, and the variation between one strophe or epode and another. They were also likely to remember the climactic points, and whether they were the same in each triad; and, if they were singers, they would remember the technical difficulties and the passages which it gave them special pleasure to sing or to hear; these may not always be the passages that readers of the mere words admire most.

We cannot give life to Pindar’s music unless we can supply more than the patterns which metricians offer us. We may not want to trust our imagination to supply details that are missing, but refusal to use our imagination does not protect us from error. It is hard for me to sympathize with anyone who thinks that, because he cannot see round the corner, there cannot be anything of interest there. I have set forth elsewhere some of my views about the rhythm of Pindar’s dactylo-epitrite odes.¹ I cannot

¹ "Catalexis and Anceps in Pindar, A Search for Rhythmical Logic," *GRBS*, 15 (1974) 171-191. Some of the argument of that article and the main theses of the present article were first presented orally in papers to the Classical Section of the Philological Association
expect that many readers will accept all my solutions and I shall not repeat my arguments here. I propose, instead, to begin by stating quite dogmatically that in every strophe there must be one or more places where the singer is given time to take breath without disturbing the rhythm, where he has a rest (the equivalent of a longum or a breve, sometimes even longer), during which the instruments will not necessarily be silent or the dancers at a standstill; and generally it is not difficult to see where these rests are (they need not be the same in each strophe). When, for example, a dactylic figure ends in this fashion:

\[ \underline{\text{\text{-}} \quad \text{-} \quad \text{-} \quad \text{-}} \]

or this:

\[ \underline{\text{\text{-}} \quad \text{-} \quad \text{-} \quad \text{-} \quad \text{-}} \]

and is followed by an epitrite figure or a further dactylic passage, the phrasing can tell us whether these are appropriate places for the singer to take breath, with the rest of a breve in the first instance:

\[ \text{d} \ddot{\text{d}} \mid \text{d} \ddot{\text{d}} \mid \text{d} \dddot{\text{d}} \mid \text{d} \dddot{\text{d}} \mid \cdots \]

and a longum in the second

\[ \text{d} \dddot{\text{d}} \mid \text{d} \dddot{\text{d}} \mid \ddot{\text{d}} \mid \text{d} \dddot{\text{d}} \mid \cdots \]

of the Pacific Coast at Gonzaga University in November 1970 and to the Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, in February 1972. The present version represents a complete revision and, it is hoped, an improvement on the earlier versions.

2 One can hardly expect an entire Pindaric strophe to be sung without rest or pause for breath. Scholars who have concerned themselves with Greek lyric and with the restoration of Greek musical texts have shown themselves strangely indifferent to practical considerations of this kind. A notable example of such indifference is the musical version, in modern notation, of the First Delphic Paean, first presented by H. Weil and T. Reinach (BCH, 17 [1893] 569–610, 18 [1894] 345–389), and reprinted in numerous later publications, e.g., in J. U. Powell, Collectanea Alexandrina (Oxford, 1925) 146–159 (for other publications in which this text is reprinted and for recent bibliography see E. Pöhlmann, Grießische Musikfragmente, Erlanger Beiträge, 8 (Nürnberg, 1960) 80). The singer is apparently expected to continue without rest or break until he reaches the end of a long sentence. Although critics, in restoring the text, have considered difficulties of tonality (e.g. Pöhlmann, op. cit. 60–66), they seem prepared to treat the singers as having “lungs of bronze.”

3 The measured rest was perfectly familiar to Greek musicians. Cf. e.g. the clear statement of Aristides Quintilianus 1.18 (27J, 41M): κενός μὲν οὖν ἔστι χρόνος ἄνευ φθογγοῦ πρὸς ἀναπλήρωσιν τοῦ μυθοῦ, λείμμα δὲ ἐν μυθῷ χρόνος κενός ἐλάχιστος, πρόσθεσις δὲ χρόνος κενός μακρὸς ἐλάχιστος διπλασίως. Modern metricians seem content to ignore its existence. For example, Paul Maas, in his Greek Metre (English trans., Oxford, 1962), makes no distinction between a pause, denoted by the symbol ◯, which is a break in the rhythm, and a rest which is not. And his index of Greek words lists neither χρόνος nor κενός.
And if an epitrite figure ends
\[- \odot - \odot - \odot - \odot - \odot - \odot - \odot - \odot - \] 
or 
\[- \odot - \odot - \odot - \odot - \odot - \odot - \odot - \] 
this will often mean
\[dddd | dddd | dddd | \] 
or 
\[dddd | dddd | dddd | \] 

In more formal and general terms, the so-called catalectic metron, whether dactylic hemiepes or epitrite dipody,
\[- \odot - \odot - \odot - \] 
or 
\[- \odot - \odot - \odot - \] 
is an indication that a close is being reached (though handbooks on metre fail to point out that this is what the word catalectic means). Sometimes also when the final syllable of a noncatalectic metron is short, this is an indication that a short rest may be taken, but unless there is word division this is clearly impossible; and there are occasions when this short syllable does not coincide with the end of a word.

It is not the purpose of this article to quarrel with current metrical theory, but to examine two of Pindar’s dactylo-epitrite odes in an attempt to discover how they may have been performed, how the singers could perform them without becoming breathless, and what dynamic subtleties were called for, such as changes in tempo (accelerando-ritardando) and variation between forte and piano (crescendo-diminuendo), where the major and minor climaxes occur in each strophe and epode and what notes could or should receive stronger emphasis or accentuation than others, apart from the normal demands of the rhythm. The words must be our guide, and they will often tell us where a triumphant fortissimo is demanded and what are the climactic notes after which a diminuendo must begin.

The Ninth Nemean and Third Olympian have been chosen for examination, two odes which appear to offer fairly straightforward examples of dactylo-epitrite metre and contain very few metrical problems. The Ninth Nemean will be taken first. It is monostrophic, with the strophe repeated eleven times. A metrical scheme is set forth below with a line division which is meant to show the alternation between dactylic movement (4-time, the \(\iota\oslash\ \lambda\oslash\oslash\oslash\)) and epitrite movement (7-time, which is a

---

5 The musical texts discovered so far are not as helpful as one might have hoped.
regular alternation between 4-time and 3-time, between the ἰσος λόγος and the διπλάσιος λόγος).  

Str. 1 Κωμάσομεν παρ Ὄπολλωνος Σεκουνόθε, Μοῦσα, 

5 τὰν νεωκτίσταν ἐς Αἴτναν, ἔνθα ἀναπταμέναι ἔχει-


νων νεκίκαντα θύραν, ὃλβιον ἐς Χρομίου δωμί'.

"Ἀλλ' ἐπέων γλυκὺν ὄμων πράσατε. 

10 Τὸ κρατήσατον γὰρ ἐς ἄρμ' ἀναβαίνων ματέρι καὶ διδύμως σαί-

dεσαν αὐτὰν μανύει Πυ-

θώνος αἰπεινᾶς ὀμοκλάρος ἐπόττας.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lines 5 and 7 end cataleptically, and (as the words and punctuation of strophe 1 show quite clearly) a rest is intended here, where the singers can take breath. There is variation in the length of the last syllable before the rest, which means that the singer will sometimes sing Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ, instead of Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ, just as at the end of the strophe there will be alternation between Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ and Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ.  

6 I prefer to use the language of Aristoxenius rather than break up the verse into "metrical units" in the manner of the current metrical school. The difficulty is that Aristoxenius recognizes only 3-time, 4-time, and 5-time, the 2:1, 2:2, and 3:2 ratio, and declares that 7-time, the 4:3 ratio (epitrites), is irrational and rhythmically unacceptable, El. Rhythm., 35 (Westphal), 302 (Mor.), p. 25 (Pighi), though he seems to admit that the epitrite "does occur" (Psellus fr. 29, p. 26 Pighi). I have tried to explain this apparent contradiction in GRBS, 15 (see note 1 above). For present purposes it will not matter whether dactylo-epitrite is regarded as an alternation between Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ and Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ Ἰ.  

7 In subsequent references to Nem. 9 this arrangement and numbering of lines will be followed. A reference, for example, to Σαμαράνδου χεύμαν (39) will be to str. 8.10 (this will enable the reader to recognize at once at what point in the strophe a phrase occurs).
Hiatus poses no problem to a singer if it occurs at a catalexis, where there is a rest, as at line 7 in strophes 7 and 9. But at any other place in the strophe it will require some explanation. We should not suppose that Pindar was oblivious to technical difficulties, since we are told that his singers were amateurs, not highly trained professionals.\(^8\) If a singer is to observe hiatus strictly, without any kind of crisis, as he will want to do at comma, colon, or period, he will need plenty of time to take breath—more time than if there is no hiatus; and whenever hiatus occurs, in lyric or dramatic poetry, or in oratory, one must ask whether the occasion permits him time enough to take breath or not.\(^9\) Hiatus occurs in this ode in strophes 9 and 10 before the final syllable of line 10, ἀμέρα. ἔστω, γίνεται ἐγκιρνάτω, corresponding to μανύει Πυθώνος in strophe 1.\(^10\) One must ask, therefore, if there is not perhaps a rest at this point, particularly as there is word division here, at the same place, in every strophe; and in strophe 3, as well as strophes 9 and 10, it seems appropriate to punctuate with a period.

Modern editors generally try, so far as possible, to make line division correspond to word division, and it is customary to think of the line as ending with μανύει, so that the final phrase of the strophe takes the metrical form

\[ \underline{\text{—}} \quad \underline{\text{—}} \quad \underline{\text{—}} \quad \underline{\text{—}} \quad \underline{\text{—}} \quad \underline{\text{—}} \quad \underline{\text{—}} \quad \underline{\text{—}} \]

This means changing the schema of the epitrite foot from \(\text{—} \circ \text{—} \text{—} \text{—} \text{—} \), a form of rhythmical metabole which Aristoxenus recognized,\(^11\) and finishing with a hypermetric syllable. The only objection to this is that there is no clear example of Pindar finishing a strophe or epode with this

\(^8\) In Aristot. Prob., 19.15 we are told that the antistrophic odes of earlier days were performed by oi ἐλεύθεροι αὐτοί, who could not be expected to be as proficient as the ἀγωνισταί, and therefore ἀπολογίστηρα ἐποίουν αὐτοῖς τὰ μέλη, ἢ δὲ ἀντίστροφος ἀπλοῦν. εἰς ῥυθμὸς γὰρ ἑστὶ καὶ ἐνὶ μετρέται.

\(^9\) I have discussed the difficulties that hiatus creates for an orator, as well as its purposes, in “Hiatus and its purposes in Attic Oratory,” AJP, 96 (1975) 138–159. An orator does not as a rule take breath at hiatus, unless he is prepared to take plenty of time (as at the end of a sentence). Hiatus in the middle of a sentence makes heavy demands on a speaker’s powers of breath control—in any language, as readers can discover quickly for themselves.

\(^10\) It is possible that the choir sang ἀμέρα. ἔστω, that the digamma was pronounced even though no longer written. And, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus points out (Dem. 38), one way of handling hiatus is to insert a semivowel. But it may be doubted if choirmasters would permit their choirs to sing γίνεται ἐγκιρνάτω, when the period marks a clear break.

rhythmical figure, though he frequently finishes with a series of normal epitrites:

\[ - \circ - - - - \circ - - - \circ - - \]

Line division as adopted by modern editors has no musical meaning. What the singer would need to know (and no arrangement of the lines in a modern text will tell him this) is how Pindar wanted the closing sequence of the strophe to be sung—in which of the following ways?

\[ \mu a n \nu e i \ \Pi o \theta o \nu o s \ \alpha i t e \nu o s \ \omicron o k l \alpha r o i s \ \epsilon p \alpha \pi o t o i s \]

1. \[ 4 \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | \ d \ d \ d | d \ d \ d \ d \ | \]
2. \[ 4 \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | \ d \ d \ d | d \ d \ d \ d \ | \]
3. \[ 4 \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | \ 4 \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | d \ d \ d \ d \ | \]
4. \[ 4 \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | \ 4 \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | \ d \ d \ d \ d \ | d \ d \ d \ d \ | \]

The first version is undoubtedly the simplest rhythmically, and if we think that the author of the *Problems* means what he says about the simplicity of antistrophic song—ἐις πυθμός γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἐνι μετρεῖται—\(^{13}\) we may think we are bound to accept this version. There is indeed no serious reason for not adopting it, provided the singer can take a quick breath before Πυθμός (and the corresponding word in other strophes), even when there is hiatus, because he is surely expected to sing what follows all in one breath and quite loud.\(^{14}\)

In strophes 6 and 8 we have εὐνομὸν αἰτέω and χείμασιν ἀγχῶν corresponding to μανεὶ Πυθμός, that is \(- \circ - - - - \circ - - -\) instead of \(- \circ - - -\), a

\(^{12}\) As in the strophes of *Ol.* 3, *Ol.* 6, *Py.* 9, and elsewhere. In some editions of Pindar the epodes of *Ol.* 8, *Nem.* 5, and *Isthm.* 1 are printed in such a way that the closing rhythm appears to be:

\[ - \circ - - - - \circ - - - \]

But it is easy to rearrange the lines so as to give

\[ - \circ - - - - \circ - - - \]

\(^{13}\) See note 8 above.

\(^{14}\) A singer can be expected to manage three epitrites in one breath, but when Pindar wants four to be sung without a break, he provides breathing points that will not interrupt the rhythm.

One can hardly object that breathing may be a musical notion alien to Greek music, but I have found no previous study of breathing points in Pindar’s odes. J. Irigoin, *Recherches sur les mètres de la lyrique chorale grecque* (Paris, 1953) has examined word division in Pindar and other lyric poets, and tried to show how they avoided word endings at certain points, preferring caesura to diaeresis, in order to maintain rhythmic continuity; and his arguments have been criticized and improved by Laetitia Parker, “Some recent researches on the versification of Pindar and Bacchylides,” *BICS*, 5 (1958) 13–24. The statistics that they provide are not without interest, but neither of them is prepared to say when a division between words justifies a break or pause (except where it is obvious) or when it invites a singer to take breath.
tertia brevis in the epitrite. The occasional occurrence of this tertia brevis in Pindar has disturbed metricians and editors, and some effort has been made to abolish all occurrences by emendation.\textsuperscript{15} But in this instance a short syllable instead of a long gives the singer a rest in which to take breath—\(\d\d\d\d\d\d\). Far from causing difficulty, the so-called irregularity makes things easier for the singer. If he is following version 1, as proposed, in other strophes it must be assumed that he cuts the long syllable slightly short in order to take breath, so that the correct modern notation would be \(\d\d\d\d\d\d\d\) If it may be significant that this curtailed long syllable does not bear a tonic accent except in strophe 2—a very proper exception, one might think, since \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\) is not a word that calls for special emphasis.

The singers will take the opportunity to breathe whenever rhythm and phraseology permit, and the places will not necessarily be the same in each strophe. In strophe 1 there is an opportunity after Μοίσαν (2) or Αίτναν (3), but in strophe 2 the second alternative, after καλύψει, is better. Another breathing point in strophe 1 might be after ἀναθείων (8), but in strophe 2 a better place is after κορυφᾶν (7). In all these places, except the last, there is no tonic accent on the long note which is not sustained to its full length if breath is taken after it.

In strophe 2 as well as strophe 1 the final phrases declare in solemn style the intention of praise, and might acquire additional solemnity by a slight ritardando. But the choir's jubilant enthusiasm should first show itself very strongly in two earlier phrases, in strophe 1 ἀλβιον ἐς Χρομίου δῶμι' (6), and τὸ κρατῆσαιπάν γὰρ ἐς ἄρμι' (8), and in strophe 2 ἄλλ' ἀνὰ μὲν βρομίων φόρμιγγ', and ἵππιων ἁέθλων κορυφᾶν. At the same point in each strophe the choir calls for music in praise of Chromius, recalling his victory and his horses. Each phrase comes immediately after a catalexis, and the singers should have plenty of breath to sing fortissimo.\textsuperscript{16} Thus in each strophe there are two climactic phrases in the middle, with a solemn formal phrase at the close. And it is worth while to notice how the tonic

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. C. M. Bowra, "An alleged anomaly in Pindar's metric," \textit{CQ.} 24 (1930) 174–182.

\textsuperscript{16} Very similar technique can be seen in the opening strophe of \textit{Nem.} 1, which is also in honour of Chromius:

\begin{align*}
&\text{Δάλοι κασαγνήτα, σεθεν ἀδυνηῆς} & &\quad -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}}\quad -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}}\quad -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}} & -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}} & -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}} & -
\\&\text{ὅμοι ὀρμάται θέμεν} & &\quad -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}}\quad - & -
\\&\text{αλνον ἀκλοποδῶν μέγαν ἵππων}, & &\quad -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}}\quad -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}} & -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}} & -
\\&\text{Ζηνὸς Αίτναλοι χάρων} & &\quad -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}}\quad - & -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}}
\\&\text{ἄρμα δ' ὀρίνει Χρομίου Νεμέα θ' } & &\quad -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}}\quad -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}} & -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}} & -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}} & -\vphantom{\text{\scriptsize abc}}
\\
\end{align*}

The key words ὁμοι, ἀλνον, ἄρμα, all come after a catalexis, and thus receive special emphasis; and in antistrophe 1 Μοίρα corresponds to ὁμοι and Ζηνὸς to ἄρμα. Cf. also in the first strophe of \textit{Py.} 9: εἰ Παλλον κόλπων ποτὲ Λασοδας ἄρπαο'. There is no counterpart to ἄρπαο' in the antistrophe, but strophe 2 has θαύμασον.
accents fall, Χρομιόν δωμ' corresponding exactly with βρομίαν φόρμιγγ', and γάρ ἐσ ἀρμ' ἀναβαίνων with κορυφᾶς, κτι Φοίβω (almost as exactly). In the final phrase, in the first strophe, the voice must rise, as the accent seems to direct, to a strong high note on Πνθωνος, and likewise on μνασθείς.17

Like the first two strophes, strophes 3 and 4 show close correspondence with one another. The myth is now being told, and both strophes begin with a narrative sentence that closes with a formal statement:

\[ ἀμφανε κυδαιών πόλιν, \]
\[ ṣαον μέγιστοι λαγήται \]

(the final word is Bergk’s conjecture, but some noun of this metrical shape is needed to fill the lacuna). The resemblance in style and shape to the corresponding phrases in strophes 1 and 2 is unmistakable:

\[ ξείνων νενίκανται τόρα, \]
\[ καύξας αἰώνα πρόσφορος. \]

In all four strophes the same music would be appropriate; and on each occasion the first note is accented and the last note unaccented,18 so that the phrase ends quietly at the catalexis.

The second half of strophes 3 and 4 is full of gloom and foreboding, Adrastus’ exile from Argos and the ill-omened expedition of the Seven against Thebes. There is perfect balance between καὶ δεινὰν στᾶσαν πατρίων οἰκών ἀπὸ τ᾽ Ἀργεὸς and ἀνδρῶν αἰσίὰν οὐ κατ᾽ ὀρνύχων ὅδων.

The strong negative οὐ gains additional strength because it comes immediately after the rest at the catalexis, as does πατρίων οἰκών, and the fourth strophe helps the singer to see how the third should be sung, emphasizing the word πατρίων. The tonic correspondence between

17 One cannot overlook the difference between perispomenon (rise and fall) and oxys (rise), but for a singer the similarity (an initial rise) may be more important than the difference, except at a final close. Erik Wahlström, “Accentual Responsion in Greek strophic poetry,” Soc. Scient. Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 47 (1970) 21, says: “Perispomena and long oxytona less frequently occur on corresponding syllables in poetry than they do if accents are randomly distributed,” but his statistics are insufficient to support such a statement; indeed his discussion barely scratches the surface of the subject of tonic correspondence. The music of the Delphic Paenae shows not only that perispomenon vowel sounds were favoured for sustained high notes, but also that the division of long vowel or diphthong into two notes in a falling cadence is possible whether perispomenon or oxys or unaccented, Φοίβων, γάνα, ταυρών, ταῦδε, κλεείτιν, ἤμνων. Cf. J. U. Powell, Collectanea Alexandrina, pp. 146-148, 154-159.

The correspondence in sound between Χρομίον δωμ' and βρομίαν φόρμιγγ’ is as noteworthy as the tonic correspondence. Parallels are not difficult to find in Pindar, the most familiar being in Ol. 1, ὅριστον μὲν ὅθωρ, θεμιστείον δ's (ant. 1), χάρις δ' ἀπερ (str. 2). For fuller illustrations see C. J. Brennan, “A peculiarity of choric response,” CR, 20 (1906) 386-92.

18 Unless the lost word was oxytone. Note also the tonic correspondence between γλαφυροῖς and Δαναῶν, as compared with ἀναπεπταμέναι, ἐπέων, in strophes 1 and 2.
\( \text{άρνίχων} \ \text{όδόν} \ \text{and} \ \text{oίκων} \ \text{άπό} \) is also striking. The solemn closing statements are not joyful, as in strophes 1 and 2, but have a warning note; and the accents on \( \text{κρέσσων} \ \text{and} \ \text{στείχευν} \) seem to be in contrast with \( \Piυθώνος \ \text{and} \ \text{μνεσθεῖς} \) in the opening strophes.

The close correspondence between odd and even-numbered strophes does not continue. Neither breathing points nor phrases can be matched against each other in the next four strophes (5–8). The narrative ends in the middle of strophe 6, and after a brief comment that even heroes are helpless \( \text{ἐν} \ \text{δαμονίωσι} \ \text{φάβοις} \), the second part of the strophe is taken up with a prayer to Zeus to delay any conflict between Syracuse and the Carthaginians. The last thing that Pindar would want to suggest is any comparison of the present situation with the disaster of the Seven against Thebes, and it cannot be right to look for the kind of correspondence with strophe 5 that has been so evident in the earlier strophes.

The first \( \text{catalexis} \) in strophe 6 comes at the end of a sentence: \( \text{φεύγοντι} \ \text{kai} \ \text{παίδες} \ \text{θεῶν} \) (as in the earlier strophes), but this is not the case in 5, 7, and 8. In strophe 5 \( \text{Iσμηνοῦ} \ \text{δ}' \ \text{ἐπ}' \ \text{ὅχθαι} \ \text{γλυκῶν} \ \text{νόστον} \ \text{ἔρεισάμενοι} \) the break comes after the adjective \( \text{γλυκῶν} \), which results in a heavy emphasis on \( \text{νόστον} \), underlining the failure to return. The technique is like that at the second \( \text{catalexis} \) in strophe 4 \( \text{αἰσιῶν} \ \text{οὗ} \ \text{κατ}' \ \text{ορνίχων} \ \text{όδόν} \), where the break after the adjective draws attention to the noun that is to follow. In strophe 6 there is a similar break at the second \( \text{catalexis} \) between \( \text{Φοινικοστόλων} \ \text{and} \ \text{ἐγχέων} \), but an even better parallel is in strophe 7, where \( \text{ἀνδρεῖς} \) comes after the break at the second \( \text{catalexis} \), following the adjectival phrase \( \text{κτεάων} \ \text{ψυχώς} \ \text{έχοντες} \ \text{κρέσσονας} \).\textsuperscript{19}

There is no noticeable correspondence in tonic accent between strophes 5 and 6, but there are some good examples of it between 5 and 7, in the climactic \( \text{ἀνδρεῖς} \), corresponding to \( \text{νόστον} \), and \( \text{ἀ} \ \text{φέρει} \ \text{δόξαν} \ \text{τοῦ} \ \text{γὰρ} \ \text{δαίσαντο} \).\textsuperscript{20} And in the closing line \( \text{ἐκρνας} \ \text{ἀν} \ \text{matches} \ \text{Zeüs} \ \text{tὰν} \ \text{βαθύ} \ . . .} \textsuperscript{.}

More remarkable correspondence can be seen in the closing lines of strophes 6 and 8:

\[ \text{ζω-} \]
\[ \text{ός} \ \text{ἀναβάλλομαι} \ \text{ώς} \ \text{πόρ-} \]
\[ \text{σιστα,} \ \text{μοίραν} \ \text{δ}' \ \text{ἐνυμόου} \]
\[ \text{αιτέω σε} \ \text{παισίν} \ \text{δαρόν} \ \text{Λιτναίων} \ \text{οπάξειν},} \]
\[ "\text{Ἐκτορι μὲν κλέος} \ \text{ἀνθή-} \]
\[ \text{σοι} \ \text{Σκαμάνδρου} \ \text{χεύμασιν} \]
\[ \text{ἀγχοῦ,} \ \text{βαθυκρήμνοισι δ}' \ \text{άμφω} \ \text{άκταῖς} \ 'Ελώρου.} \]

\textsuperscript{19} For this break between adjective and noun at a \( \text{catalexis} \) cf. \( \text{Nem.} \ \text{I} \ \text{άδυνετής} \ \text{δύνος} \) (str. 1), \( \text{Oλύμπου} \ \text{δεσπότας} \ \text{Zeüs} \) (ant. 1).

\textsuperscript{20} One may reasonably suppose that the accents on \( \text{ά} \) and \( \text{γάρ} \) are relatively unimportant.
In both these strophes the climax is reserved for the closing line, the earnest prayer for peace in strophe 6 and the brave comparison of Chromiús with Hector in strophe 8. A strong note must be intended on the tonic accent at ξώς and Ἑκτορι, with a diminuendo down to ἐνύμον and χεύμασων, where (in contrast to earlier strophes) we have a proparoxytone word dying down to a short syllable, a tertia brevis, before the breathing point. Then the chorus comes back strongly in the final patriotic reference to the "men of Aetna” and the "cliffs of Helorus." The local Sicilian names are evidently meant to match one another.

Strophes 9 and 10 emphasize the proper contrast between the efforts of the contest and the more peaceful delights of the banquet and honoured old age. Words and phrases of contrary meaning are set at corresponding places in the two strophes:

πολλὰ μὲν ἐν κοίνᾳ—Ἡσυχίᾳ δὲ φιλεῖ
Ἰκ πόνων—μελακαθ
σὺν τε δίκᾳ—θαρσαλέα

There are no strong climaxes, as though the choir was showing restraint in preparation for the final triumphant strophe.

This final strophe offers many interesting details. The opening word ἄργυρεια is surely to be delivered with greater conviction and exultation than the opening word in any other strophe, and the rhythmic and tonic echo is seen in φιάλαι in the second part of the dactylic figure. The voices will rise to βιατῶν as never before at this point in the strophe, and never before have the epithrites, ἀμπέλου παιδ', ὁς ποθ' ἵππου, been so neatly set off and divided. Then after the first catalexis there follows:

Λατοῖδα στεφάνως ἐκ
τὰς ἱερᾶς Σεκυνών. Ζεῦ πάτερ,
ἐὐχόμαι ταῦταν ἀρετὰν κελαθήσαι

The divine word Λατοῖδα receives proper emphasis as it starts the dactylic figure, and at Ζεῦ πάτερ before the second catalexis the break before εὐχόμαι seems sharper than ever before at this point in the strophe. One might think that the dancers and marchers were meant to stop as the voices were silent for a moment, a leimma and a prosthesis, before εὐχόμαι. Then in the final phrase the climactic note will be on νίκαν. The tonic accents, on νίκαν and on the final note, Μουσῶν, are as in strophe 3.

The Third Olympian yields equally interesting results if subjected to the

21 Cf. p. 57 above.  22 Cf. note 3 above.
same kind of analysis. The metrical scheme of the strophe may be presented as follows:

\[ \text{Ttvndarídais \ te fíloxeínicos \ ãdeín kalλíplokámw \ ð' \ 'Ελένης klei-} \]
\[ \text{nán \ 'Akρáγαντα \ gēraírōn \ évχomai, \ Òhr-} \]
\[ \text{wos \ 'Oλυμπιανίκαν \ ὕμων \ Ïρθώσας, \ ìkαμαντoπόδων \ ìpπ-} \]
\[ \text{wv ãwtoν. \ Mósiā ð' \ oútw \ pon \ pàrësta} \]

\[ \text{5 \ ìmòi neosígalon \ évρόnti \ tròpòv} \]
\[ \text{Δωρίω φωνών \ énarmózai \ pëdīlw} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
  \underline{\text{— — — — — — — — — — — —}} \\
  \underline{\text{— — — — — — — — —}} \\
  \underline{\text{— — — — —}} \\
  \underline{\text{— — — — — —}} \\
  \underline{\text{— — — —}} \\
  \underline{\text{— — — — —}} \\
  \underline{\text{— — — — — (Catalexis)}} \\
  \underline{\text{— — — — — — — — — — —}}
\end{align*} \]

From a text with this line-division one can see how the flow of song continues unbroken until ãwtoν, and there is no catalexis until tròpòv in line 5. There are, however, various places in the sentence where a singer might take breath. One might recommend that it be taken at Ìλένης, évχomai, and Ïρθώσας (none of them oxyston words). This will not suit each subsequent strophe and antistrophe, because phrasing and word arrangement vary in each triad. In the second strophe and antistrophe, corresponding to évχomai, Òhrwos, we find πανδόκω \ Ïλασε, \ Ηλφεον· Ïλλ', with hiatus making it difficult, if not impossible, to take breath here. And although in the first strophe it would not be advisable to take breath after ìkαμαντoπόδων, this is certainly the right place in antistrophe 1, after ìpέων \ te ìēs, where there is a convenient short final syllable, a \textit{prima brevis} in dactylic metre,

\[ \begin{align*}
  \underline{\text{— — — — — — — —}}
\end{align*} \]

which seems to mean

\[ \text{d d d | d d d | d d d} \]

In strophe and antistrophe 2 this is clearly the right place to breathe, as the punctuation shows, but not in strophe 3, where there is hiatus after

23 I use the term \textit{prima brevis} for a short syllable when it takes the place of a long at the start of a πετράσμος ποις (in practice \textit{—} instead of \textit{---}). At a catalexis (or, as Maas would say, “at a pause,” §66), it hardly calls for comment, \textit{d} instead of \textit{---}. Here, whatever rule one may devise to explain it, it is easy to understand if, instead of making any rhythmic difficulty, it makes things easier for the singer, giving him a chance to breathe, \textit{d} instead \textit{---}.


τέρμα δρόμου, and it would be better to breathe after ἵμερος ἔσχεν, not necessarily pronouncing the final μν. 

As in the Ninth Nemean, this long opening sentence of the first strophe calls for song in celebration of the victory and praises the horses; and there are climactic points in the middle of the strophe, Ὄλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον, ἰππῶν ἄστον. Μοίσα, and at the end Δωρίῳ φωνάν. The victory and the music that celebrates it are mentioned side by side. In the corresponding antistrophe the sentence is longer, continuing without break to the catalexis, with φόρμιγγα τε ποικιλόγαρων corresponding to Θήρων Ὄλυμπιονίκαν at the first climax, and Αἴνησιδάμου παιδί to ἰππῶν ἄστον. Μοίσα. The victory and the place of victory, the victor and his horses and his city, the music and the choir usually have their places in the first triad of a Pindaric ode; here the places of honour, at the climactic points, are held by the victory and the joyous music, the victor and his father and his horses. And at the end of strophe and antistrophe alike attention is drawn to the music and its association with Olympia in the solemn epitrite statement at the close after the catalexis:

Δωρίῳ φωνάν ἑναρμόζαι πεδίλῳ,
θεόμοροι νίσοντ’ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους ἄοιδαί.

24 I cannot understand what Maas means by saying that hiatus is permitted “only at a pause” (§66). He surely cannot think that there is a “pause” after δρόμου.

25 — — instead of — — at the close of a dactylic figure (the so-called brevis in longo) is very common and there is no difficulty or cause for comment if the word ends at that point and a rest is appropriate, as here,

ἔσχε δωδεκάγαμπτον, ὃ ἔσχε δωδεκάγαμπτον, ὃ ἔσχε δωδεκάγαμπτον, ὃ ἔσχε δωδεκάγαμπτον, ὃ ἔσχε δωδεκάγαμπτον.

Likewise with — — instead of — — — at the close of an epitrite figure. In epode 1 παγάν ἑνεικεν Ἀμφιτρυωνίδας, — — — the short syllable gives the singer a rest and an opportunity to breathe before Ἀμφιτρυωνίδας. And in epode 2 Ἁιστρίαν μν’ ἑνθα Λατοῦς, — — — — —
the final short syllable, at a colon, creates a needed breathing point at the end of a sustained statement.

Snell and Maehler (Teubner, ed., 1971) refuse to recognize these short syllables: “Ancipitia hoc in carmine P. admissis non videtur, nam v. 14 ἑνεικεν et v. 26 μν’ positio littera ν’ effecta agnosco potest.” Their use of the verb “admisisse” betrays the metrician’s attitude, as though the poet is taking advantage of a metrical licence, not seeking to write music that can be sung.

In epode 1 where the codices read μνάμα τῶν Ὅλυμπία — — — — — — they prefer to follow Bergk and Gildersleeve in reading Ὅλυμπία. There is no advantage for the singer in having a short syllable here, and a different musical explanation must be sought. Cf. GRBS, 15 (1974) pp. 187–191.

26 As denoted by words like νίκη, κράτος, ἰπποί, ὕμνος, μέλος, ἄοιδα, Μοίσα, κάμος. Cf., e.g., Ol. 1, 4, 6, 10, 11, Py. 2, 4, 6, 7.
The correspondence between strophe and antistrophe is further reinforced by words that match one another in metrical form, in tonic accent, and often in sound as well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strophe</th>
<th>Antistrophe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τυνδαρίδας</td>
<td>ἀγλαόκωμον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλοξείνοις</td>
<td>χαίταις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐλείνα</td>
<td>στέφανοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θήρωνος</td>
<td>φόρμιγγα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκαμαντοπόδων</td>
<td>ἐπέων τε θέσων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρέστα</td>
<td>πρεπόντως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐναρμόζει πεδίλῳ</td>
<td>ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπους άοιδαί</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rising note on the fourth syllable, Τυνδαρίδας, is repeated in every strophe and antistrophe except strophe 2, and even here there may be a secondary accent on δάμον Ὑπερβορέων as on ἀκαμαντοπόδων corresponding to ἐπέων τε θέσων. Corresponding to φιλοξείνοις we have πείδαις and κεύων in strophes 2 and 3; αἴτει and θάμβανε in strophes 2 and 3 match γεραίρων in strophe 1 in sound if not precisely in tonic accent; and the accent on Θήρωνος also reappears in strophes 2 and 3. The epode closes with the same epitrite figure as the strophe, and the accent on Δωρίῳ occurs again in epode 3, as well as strophe 2 and antistrophes 2 and 3, the accent on ἐναρμόζει in epodes 1 and 2, as well as antistrophe 1 and strophe 2. And the accent on the final word πεδίλῳ reappears in strophes 2 and 3, antistrophes 2 and 3, and epodes 1 and 3, ἀέθλων, εἰη. 27

The second strophe and antistrophe are much quieter than the first, as the tale of Heracles and the trees is told. The strophe tells how he asks Apollo’s people for the trees, since he has seen the need for them now that the altars to Zeus are consecrated; the antistrophe tells of the lack of trees, though the festival is already arranged, and his decision to seek them in the far North. The topics are the same in strophe and antistrophe, but taken in reverse order. Even if the musical notes are the same as in the first triad, the dynamic subtleties may be different. Where the first strophe and antistrophe have the triumphant words ἵππων ἄωτον and Αἰνησιδάμου at mid-point, here

27 Comparison with other odes where the strophe ends in a similar epitrite figure shows a comparable rate of tonic correspondence, sometimes only in the first and second triad, after which it seems to be abandoned, as in Isth. 6, μελοθόγγυς άοιδαίς, str. 1, Μοῖρας ἐφετμαῖς ant. 1, βαρυφθόγγυς νευρᾶς str. 2, but only once again, in ant. 3, φράζων παρανεί. In Isth. 1 the accentuation of the closing words of the strophe, ζεύξῳ τέλος, is repeated in ant. 1, str. and ant. 2, but not again till ant. 4 (the final triad). And in Py. 3 the first strophe ends with ἀλκτήρα νοῦσων, followed by μικβεία Φοῖβῳ in ant. 1, but there is no further correspondence till str. 5.
we have only the phrases that mark the transition from one topic to the other, ἦδη γὰρ αὐτῷ, τούτων ἔδοξεν, and they do not demand the same kind of climactic emphasis. If the same musical phrase that was used to convey the triumph of Theron’s victory must convey the concern or distress of Heracles, a different tone will be needed. But both strophe and antistrophe lead up to a climax at the end—the moon flashing in the face of Heracles—a splendid moment and a marvellous Greek phrase—ἐσπέρας ὑφαλμῶν ἀντέφλεξε Μήνα, and his determination to set forth on his journey to the Ister, with the climactic word postponed until the start of the epode: δὴ τὸν ἵσαν πορεύεται θυμὸς ἅρμα Ἰστρίαν νῦν. We might have suspected from the first triad that there is no pause or rest between antistrophe and epode; now we know that there cannot be, neither here nor in the third triad, and here there is hiatus as though to warn the singer that he cannot take breath until after Ἰστρίαν νῦν.

Strophe corresponds to antistrophe at many points in word arrangement, most notably in

πιστὰ φρονέων Δίὸς αἴτει,
θῆκε ξαθεώς ἐπὶ κρημνοῖς.

And the tonic correspondences are numerous, often bearing no relation to those between first strophe and antistrophe:

ἀνθρώποις—ἐν βάσσαις
ηδη—τούτων
πατρί—γυμνός
βαμμῶν ἁγιαθέντων—κάπος ἄξειας
ἐσπέρας—δὴ τὸν ἵσαν.

In the third strophe the tone is joyous again, as Heracles reaches the Hyperborean land and stands in amazement at the trees, full of delight at the prospect of planting them where the horses will make their turn. The climax of the strophe is reached here; the close is solemn but peaceful, the presence of Heracles at the festival with the Dioscuri. There is good correspondence between strophe and antistrophe; Οὐλυμπὸν δ’ ἱών matches ἵνα καὶ κεῖναν χθόνα, the return to Olympia after the journey to the North, and the song in honour of Theron’s victory is paired with the achievement of Heracles, the planting of the trees, so that the phrases which occur at mid-point—ἵππων φυτεύσαν, Θῆρων τ’ ἔλθεν κύδος—recall the corresponding triumphant words of the first triad—ἵππων ἄωτον, Λυμησίδαμον παιδί. The correspondence in word-arrangement and tonic accent must be left for the reader to seek for himself; it is as noteworthy as in the preceding triads.
In the epode, unlike the strophe, there are four clear catalexis:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἐπιδραύατης Ίλιανδρίκας γλεφάρων Λιθωλός άνήρ υψόθεν} \\
\text{άμφι κόμασι βάλη γλαυ-} \\
\text{κόχραν κόσμον ἐλαίας, τάν ποτε} \\
\text{Ἰστρον ἀπὸ σκιαρῶν παγάν ἐνεικεν} \\
\text{Ἀμφιτρωνιάδας} \\
\text{μνάμα τῶν Ὀλυμπίδων κάλλιστον ἄέθλων.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{(catalexis 1)}\]

\[\text{(catalexis 2)}\]

\[\text{(catalexis 3)}\]

\[\text{(catalexis 4)}\]

The first epode makes the transition from Theron’s victory to the myth by mentioning “the wreath of olive, which in time past from the sources of the Ister Heracles brought,” and this central part of the epode, before the third catalexis, is used as a turning-point in epodes 2 and 3 also. In the second epode the transition is made here from Heracles’ second journey to the North, in search of trees, to his first journey when “the stern necessity of Eurystheus sent him to fetch the hind with the golden horns.” And in the third epode it marks the link between Theron and Heracles, since Theron now has reached the limit of human achievement and “touches the pillars of Heracles.”

The correspondence in word-arrangement, rhythm, and tonic accentuation is as remarkable as the thematic correspondence. The third catalexis is approached with the same metrical figure as in the Ninth Nemean

\[\text{(Ninth Nemean)}\]

and each time with a word-arrangement exactly like that in the last strophe of the Ninth Nemean, which achieves a special solemnity by the break before the invocation of Zeus: τὰς ιέρας Σεκνών Ζεῦ πάτερ. Thus in the Third Olympian:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{γλαυ—κόχραν κόσμον ἐλαίας τάν ποτε, (epode 1),} \\
\text{Ἕν—υφθεῖος ἄντυ’ ἀνάγκα πατρόθεν, (epode 2),} \\
\text{Θήρ—ων ἀρεταῖον ἰκάνων ἀπτέται (epode 3).}
\end{align*}\]

For the disputed reading Ὀλυμπίς see note 25 above. In epode 2 the manuscript reading Ὄρθωτοια presents an awkward hiatus, and some editors adopt the easy emendation Ὁρθωτοια. There is also a good case for emendation in the final epitrite figure of strophe 3, where the alternative readings διδύμως and διδύμοις offer a choice of difficulties.
This is a solemn moment in each epode. Pindar uses a similar word-arrangement in the first antistrophe, before the *catalexis*: ἂ τε Πίσα μὲ γεγονεῖν τὰς ἀπο. But it has no parallel in any other strophe or antistrophe.

In each of the three epodes the development that follows this solemn moment at the third *catalexis* is treated in similar style, with insistence on three details:

(1) The olive, from the North—Heracles brought it—as a trophy for victors at Olympia.

(2) Eurystheus, at Zeus’ order, called for the golden hind—which Taygeta dedicated—to Artemis Orthia.

(3) Theron, by his achievements—touches the pillars of Heracles—no man can go further—it would be folly to try.

Comparison of the wording in each epode shows how perfect the correspondence is:

(1) "Ἰστρον ἀπὸ σκιαρὰν παγὰν ἐνεικεν
 Ἀμφιτριωνιάδας
 μνάμα τῶν Ὀλυμπίας κάλλιστον ἄθλων.

(2) χρυσόκερων ἔλαφον ἤθελαν ἄξονθ',
 ἂν ποτε Ταύγέτα
 ἀντίδειο' Ὀρθωσία ἔγραψεν ἱεράν.

(3) σικοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλάν. τὸ πόρος δ’
 ἐστί σοφοὶς ἢβατον
 κάσαρος. οὗ νῦν διώξεω. κεινὸς εἶην.

A change comes with the closing words of the third epode, where both word division and tonic accentuation are different. Pindar returns to a statement about himself in the first person, like that which closed the first strophe. Perhaps the music was fashioned so as to recall the closing cadence of the first strophe. These three epodes are examples of Pindar’s technical artistry in its most exquisite form, and if we had his music we should understand it more completely. But as things are, οὗ νῦν διώξεω. κεινὸς εἶην.