

## 4

# The Dynamics of Pindar's Music: Ninth Nemean and Third Olympian

LIONEL PEARSON

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.<sup>1</sup> I cannot

<sup>1</sup> "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<sup>2</sup> (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<sup>3</sup> (they need not be the same in each strophe). When, for example, a dactylic figure ends in this fashion:

— ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪

or this:

— ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ —,

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:

♩ ♩ ♩ | ♩ ♩ ♩ | ♩ ♩ ♩ | ♩ ♩ . . .

and a *longum* in the second

♩ ♩ ♩ | ♩ ♩ ♩ | ♩ — | ♩ ♩ . . .

---

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.

<sup>2</sup> 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, *Griechische 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.”

<sup>3</sup> 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 ἐστὶ χρόνος ἄνευ φθόγγου πρὸς ἀναπλήρωσιν τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ, λείμμα δὲ ἐν ῥυθμῷ χρόνος κενός ἐλάχιστος, πρόσθεσις δὲ χρόνος κενός μακρὸς ἐλάχιστου διπλασίων*. 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

— ◡ — — — ◡ — ◡

or

— ◡ — — — ◡ — ,

this will often mean

♩♩♩ | ♩♩♩ † |

or

♩♩♩ | ♩♩♩ — |

In more formal and general terms, the so-called catalectic metron, whether dactylic hemiepes or epitrite dipody,

— ◡◡ — ◡◡ — or — ◡ — — — ◡ — ,

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).<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

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 ἴσος λόγος) and epitrite movement (7-time, which is a

<sup>4</sup> Cf. my remarks in *GRBS*, 15 (1974) p. 176, note 13.

<sup>5</sup> 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 ἴσος λόγος and the διπλάσιος λόγος).<sup>6</sup>

Str. 1 Κωμάσομεν παρ' Ἀπόλλω-  
 νος Σεκκυνώθε, Μοῖσαι,  
 τὰν νεοκτίσταν ἐς Αἴτναν,  
 ἔνθ' ἀναπεπταμένοι ξεί-  
 5 νων νενίκανται θύραι,  
 ὄλβιον ἐς Χρομίον δῶμ'.  
 Ἄλλ' ἐπέων γλυκὴν ὕμνον πρᾶσσετε.  
 Τὸ κρατήσιππον γὰρ ἐς ἄρμ' ἀναβαίνων  
 ματέρι καὶ διδύμοις παί-  
 10 δεσσιω αὐδὰν μανύει Πυ-  
 θῶνος αἰπεινᾶς ὁμοκλάρους ἐπόπταις.<sup>7</sup>

— ∪ — ∪ — —  
 — ∪ — ∪ — —  
 — ∪ — — — ∪ — —  
 — ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — —  
 5 — ∪ — — — ∪ ∪  
 — ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — — — ∪ ∪  
 — ∪ — — — ∪ ∪ — — — ∪ ∪ — —  
 — ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — —  
 10 — ∪ — — — ∪ — —  
 — ∪ — — — ∪ — — — ∪ — ∪

Lines 5 and 7 end catalectically, 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 ∪ ∪ ∪ † —, instead of ∪ ∪ ∪ —, just as at the end of the strophe there will be alternation between ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ and ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ †.

<sup>6</sup> I prefer to use the language of Aristoxenus rather than break up the verse into “metrical units” in the manner of the current metrical school. The difficulty is that Aristoxenus 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 (*epitritus*), 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 4-time and 7-time or between 4-time and 3-time.

<sup>7</sup> In subsequent references to *Nem.* 9 this arrangement and numbering of lines will be followed. A reference, for example, to *Σκαμάνδρον χεύμασιν* (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.<sup>8</sup> If a singer is to observe hiatus strictly, without any kind of crasis, 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.<sup>9</sup> Hiatus occurs in this ode in strophes 9 and 10 before the final syllable of line 10, *ἀμέρα. ἴστω, γίνεται. ἐγκρινάτω*, corresponding to *μανύει Πυθῶνος* in strophe 1.<sup>10</sup> 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

— — ∪ —      — — ∪ —      — — ∪ —      —

This means changing the *schema* of the epitrite foot from — ∪ — — to — — ∪ —, a form of rhythmical *metabole* which Aristoxenus recognized,<sup>11</sup> 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

<sup>8</sup> In Aristot. *Prob.*, 19.15 we are told that the antistrophic odes of earlier days were performed by οἱ ἐλεύθεροι αὐτοί, who could not be expected to be as proficient as the ἀγωνισταί, and therefore ἀπλούστερα ἐποίουν αὐτοῖς τὰ μέλη. ἢ δὲ ἀντίστροφος ἀπλοῦν. εἰς ῥυθμὸς γὰρ ἔστι καὶ ἐνὶ μετρεῖται.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> It is possible that the choir sang *ἀμέρα. ἴστω*, 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 ἰεγκρινάτω*, when the period marks a clear break.

<sup>11</sup> *El. Rhythm.*, 300 (M), p. 24 (Pighi): σχήματι δὲ διαφέρουσιν (sc. οἱ πόδες) ἀλλήλων, ὅταν τὰ αὐτὰ μέρη τοῦ αὐτοῦ μεγέθους μὴ ὡσαύτως ᾗ διηρημένα (v. l. τεταγμένα).

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

— υ — —      — υ — —      — υ — — 12

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?

- |    | μανύει | Πυθῶνος | αἰπεινᾶς | ὀμοκλάρους | ἐπόπταις |
|----|--------|---------|----------|------------|----------|
| 1. | ♩      | ♩       | ♩        | ♩          | ♩        |
| 2. | ♩      | ♩       | ♩        | ♩          | ♩        |
| 3. | ♩      | ♩       | ♩        | ♩          | ♩        |
| 4. | ♩      | ♩       | ♩        | ♩          | ♩        |

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—*εἰς ῥυθμὸς γὰρ ἔστι καὶ ἐνὶ μετρῆται*—<sup>13</sup> 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 *Πυθῶνος* (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.<sup>14</sup>

In strophes 6 and 8 we have *εὐνομον αἰτέω* and *χεύμασιν ἀγχοῦ* corresponding to *μανύει Πυθῶνος*, that is — υ υ — instead of — υ — —, a

<sup>12</sup> 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:

— υ — —      — υ — —

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

— υ — —      — υ — —

<sup>13</sup> See note 8 above.

<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> But in this instance a short syllable instead of a long gives the singer a rest in which to take breath— $\text{♩} \text{♩} \text{♩} \text{♩}$ . 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  $\text{♩} \text{♩} \text{♩}' \text{♩}$ . 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 *ἐγώ* 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 *Μοῖσαι* (2) or *Αἴτναν* (3), but in strophe 2 the second alternative, after *καλύψαι*, is better. Another breathing point in strophe 1 might be after *ἀναβαίνων* (8), but in strophe 2 a better place is after *κορυφάν* (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 *ὄλβιον ἐς Χρομίου δῶμ'* (6), and *τὸ κρατήσιππον γὰρ ἐς ἄρμ'* (8), and in strophe 2 *ἀλλ' ἀνὰ μὲν βρομίαν φόρμιγγ'*, and *ἱππίων ἀέθλων κορυφάν*. 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.<sup>16</sup> 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

<sup>15</sup> Cf. C. M. Bowra, "An alleged anomaly in Pindar's metric," *CQ*, 24 (1930) 174-182.

<sup>16</sup> Very similar technique can be seen in the opening strophe of *Nem.* 1, which is also in honour of Chromius:

<i>Δάλου κασιγνήτα, σέθεν ἀδνεπής</i>	— — — — —	— — — — —
<i>ἕμνος ὀρμάται θέμεν</i>	— — — — —	— — —
<i>αἶνον ἀελοπόδων μέγαν ἵππων,</i>	— — — — —	— — — — —
<i>Ζηρός Αἰτναίου χάριν</i>	— — — — —	— — —
<i>ἄρμα δ' ὀτρύνει Χρομίου Νεμέα θ'</i>	— — — — —	— — — — —

The key words *ἕμνος*, *αἶνον*, *ἄρμα*, all come after a *catalexis*, and thus receive special emphasis; and in antistrophe 1 *Μοῖρα* corresponds to *ἕμνος* and *Ζεὺς* to *ἄρμα*. Cf. also in the first strophe of *Py.* 9: *ἐκ Παλίου κόλπων ποτὲ Λατοῖδας ἄρπασ'*. There is no counterpart to *ἄρπασ'* in the antistrophe, but strophe 2 has *θαύμασον*.

accents fall, *Χρομίον δῶμ'* corresponding exactly with *βρομίαν φόρμιγγ'*, and *γὰρ ἔς ἄρμ'* *ἀναβαίνων* with *κορυφάν*, *ἄ τε Φοῖβω* (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 *Πυθῶνος*, and likewise on *μουσθεῖς*.<sup>17</sup>

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:

*ἄμφαινε κυδαίων πόλιν,  
ἦσαν μέγιστοι <λαγέται>*

(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 θύραι,  
καύχας αἰοῖδ' ἀ 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,<sup>18</sup> 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 στάσιν πατρίων οἴκων ἀπὸ τ'* "Ἄργεος and *ἀνδρῶν αἰσιᾶν οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν*.

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

<sup>17</sup> One cannot overlook the difference between perispomenon (rise and fall) and oxy (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 Responion 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 Paean 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 oxy or unaccented, *Φοιοῖβον, γᾶαν, ταούρων, ταάνδε, κλειεῖτύν, ὕμνων*. Cf. J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, pp. 146-148, 154-159.

The correspondence in sound between *Χρομίον δῶμ'* 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, *ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, θεμιστεῖον ὅς* (ant. 1), *χάρις δ' ἄπερ* (str. 2). For fuller illustrations see C. J. Brennan, "A peculiarity of choric response," *CR*, 20 (1906) 386-92.

<sup>18</sup> Unless the lost word was oxytone. Note also the tonic correspondence between *γλαφυροῖς* and *Δαναῶν*, as compared with *ἀναπεπταμένα, ἐπέων*, in strophes 1 and 2.

ὀρνίχων ὁδόν and οἴκων ἀπό 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 κρέσσων and στείχειν seem to be in contrast with Πυθῶνος and μνασθείς 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 ἐν δαιμονίοισι φόβοις, 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 *catalexis* in strophe 6 comes at the end of a sentence: φεύγοντι καὶ παῖδες θεῶν (as in the earlier strophes), but this is not the case in 5, 7, and 8. In strophe 5 Ἴσμηροῦ δ' ἐπ' ὄχθαισι γλυκὴν νόστον ἐρεισάμενοι the break comes after the adjective γλυκὴν, which results in a heavy emphasis on νόστον, underlining the failure to return. The technique is like that at the second *catalexis* in strophe 4 αἰσιᾶν οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν, 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 *catalexis* between Φοινικοστόλων and ἐγγέων, but an even better parallel is in strophe 7, where ἄνδρες comes after the break at the second *catalexis*, following the adjectival phrase κτεάνων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κρέσσονας.<sup>19</sup>

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 ἄνδρες, corresponding to νόστον, and ἃ φέρει δόξαν to ἐπὶ γὰρ δαΐσαντο.<sup>20</sup> And in the closing line ἔκρινας ἄν matches Ζεὺς τὰν βαθύ . . . More remarkable correspondence can be seen in the closing lines of strophes 6 and 8:

ζω-  
 ἄς ἀναβάλλομαι ὡς πόρ-  
 σιστα, μοῖραν δ' εὐνομον  
 αἰτέω σε παισὶν δαρὸν Αἰτναίων ὀπάζειν,  
 Ἔκτορι μὲν κλέος ἀνθη-  
 σαι Σκαμάνδρου χεῦμασιν  
 ἀγχοῦ, βαθυκρήμνοισι δ' ἄμφ' ἀκταῖς Ἐλώρου.

<sup>19</sup> For this break between adjective and noun at a *catalexis* cf. *Nem.* 1 ἀδυσπῆς ὕμνος (str. 1), Ὀλύμπου δεσπότης Ζεὺς (ant. 1).

<sup>20</sup> One may reasonably suppose that the accents on ἃ and γὰρ 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 Chromius with Hector in strophe 8. A strong note must be intended on the tonic accent at ζωᾶς and Ἔκτορι, with a diminuendo down to εὐνομον and χεύμασιν, where (in contrast to earlier strophes) we have a proparoxytone word dying down to a short syllable, a *tertia brevis*, before the breathing point.<sup>21</sup> 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 κονίᾳ—Ἑσυχία δὲ φιλεῖ  
Ἐκ πόνων—μαλθακᾶ  
σύν 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 ἀργυρέαισι 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 φιάλαισι in the second part of the dactylic figure. The voices will rise to βιατάν as never before at this point in the strophe, and never before have the epitrites, ἀμπέλου παιδ', ἄς ποθ' ἵπποι, been so neatly set off and divided. Then after the first *catalexis* there follows:

Λατοῖδα στεφάνοις ἐκ  
τᾶς ἱερᾶς Σεκυῶνος. Ζεῦ πάτερ,  
εὐχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδῆσαι

The divine word Λατοῖδα receives proper emphasis as it starts the dactylic figure, and at Ζεῦ πάτερ before the second *catalexis* the break before εὐχομαι 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*,<sup>22</sup> before εὐχομαι. Then in the final phrase the climactic note will be on νίκαν. The tonic accents, on νίκαν and on the final note, Μοισᾶν, are as in strophe 3.

The *Third Olympian* yields equally interesting results if subjected to the

<sup>21</sup> Cf. p. 57 above.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. note 3 above.

same kind of analysis. The metrical scheme of the strophe may be presented as follows:

Τυνδαρίδαις τε φιλοξείνοις ἀδεῖν καλλιπλοκάμῳ θ' Ἑλένα κλει-  
νὰν Ἀκράγατα γεραίρων εὐχομαι, Θήρ-  
ωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ἕμνον ὀρθώσαις, ἀκαμαντοπόδων ἵππ-  
ων ἄωτον. Μοῖσα δ' οὕτω ποι παρέστα  
5 μοι νεοσίγαλον εὐρόντι τρόπον  
Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ

— υ — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — υ — υ — —  
— υ — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — υ — υ — —  
— υ — — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — υ — υ — —  
— υ — υ — υ — — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — — —  
— υ — — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — — — υ — — —  
(Catalexis)

From a text with this line-division one can see how the flow of song continues unbroken until ἄωτον, and there is no *catalexis* until τρόπον 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 Ἑλένα, εὐχομαι, and ὀρθώσαις (none of them oxytone 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 εὐχομαι, Θήρωνος, we find πανδόκῳ ἄλσει, Ἀλφειῷ· ἀλλ', 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 ἀκαμαντοπόδων, this is certainly the right place in antistrophe 1, after ἐπέων τε θέσιν, where there is a convenient short final syllable, a *prima brevis* in dactylic metre,

— υ — υ — υ — υ —

which seems to mean

♩ ♩ | ♩ ♩ | ♩ ♩ |<sup>23</sup>

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

<sup>23</sup> I use the term *prima brevis* for a short syllable when it takes the place of a long at the start of a τετράσημος πούς (in practice υ — instead of — —). At a *catalexis* (or, as Maas would say, “at a pause,” §66), it hardly calls for comment, ♩|— instead of ♩— . 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, ♩ ♩ instead of ♩ ♩.



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:

Strophe	Antistrophe
Τυνδαρίδαις	ἀγλαόκωμον
φιλοξένοις	χαίταισι
Ἐλένα	στέφανοι
Θήρωνος	φόρμιγγα
ἀκαμαντοπόδων	ἐπέων τε θέσιν
παρέστα	πρεπόντως
ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλω	ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους αἰοδαί

The rising note on the fourth syllable, *Τυνδαρίδαις*, is repeated in every strophe and antistrophe except strophe 2, and even here there may be a secondary accent on *δάμων Ὑπέρβορέων* as on *ἀκάμαντοπόδων* corresponding to *ἐπέων τε θέσιν*. Corresponding to *φιλοξένοις* we have *πέισαις* and *κείαν* in strophes 2 and 3; *αἴτει* and *θάμβαινε* in strophes 2 and 3 match *γεραιρων* 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 *Δωρίω* occurs again in epode 3, as well as strophe 2 and antistrophes 2 and 3, the accent on *ἐναρμόξαι* in epodes 1 and 2, as well as antistrophe 1 and strophe 2. And the accent on the final word *πεδίλω* reappears in strophes 2 and 3, antistrophes 2 and 3, and epodes 1 and 3, *ἄέθλων, εἴην*.<sup>27</sup>

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

<sup>27</sup> 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, *μελιφθόγγοις αἰοδαίς*, str. 1, *Μοίρας ἐφετμαῖς* ant. 1, *βαρυνφθόγγοιο νευρᾶς* str. 2, but only once again, in ant. 3, *φράζων παρανεῖ*. In *Isth.* 1 the accentuation of the closing words of the strophe, *ζεύξω 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 *ἀλκτῆρα νούσων*, followed by *μιχθεῖσα Φοῖβω* 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, ἤδη γὰρ αὐτῶ, 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—*ἑσπέρας ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντέφλεξε Μῆνα*, and his determination to set forth on his journey to the Ister, with the climactic word postponed until the start of the epode: *δὴ τότ' ἐς γαίαν πορεύεν θυμὸς ὄρμα Ἰστρίαν νιν*. 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 νιν*.

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

*πιστὰ φρονέων Διὸς αἴτει,  
θῆκε ζαθέοις ἐπὶ κρημοῖς.*

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

*ἀνθρώποις—ἐν βάσσαις  
ἤδη—τούτων  
πατρί—γυμνός  
βωμῶν ἀγισθέντων—κάπος ὀξείαις  
ἑσπέρας—δὴ τότ' ἐς.*

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; *Ὀλύμπονδ' ἰών* matches *ἶδε καὶ κείναν 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 φυτεύσαι*, *Θήρωνι τ' ἔλθειν κῦδος*—recall the corresponding triumphant words of the first triad—*ἵππων ἄωτον*, *Αἰνησιδάμου 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 *catalexeis*:

ὦ τινι κραίνων ἔφετμάς Ἡρακλέος προτέρας  
 ἀτρεκῆς Ἑλλανοδίκας γλεφάρων Αἰ-  
 τωλὸς ἀνὴρ ὑψόθεν  
 ἀμφὶ κόμαισι βάλῃ γλαυ-  
 κόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας, τάν ποτε  
 Ἴστρου ἀπὸ σκιαρῶν παγῶν ἔνεικεν  
 Ἀμφιτρωνιάδας  
 μνᾶμα τῶν Ὀλυμπιά<sup>28</sup> κάλλιστον ἀέθλων.

— ∪ — — — — ∪ — — — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — (catalexis 1)

— ∪ — — — — ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — — —

— ∪ — — — — ∪ ∪ — (catalexis 2)

— ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — — —

— ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — — — — ∪ ∪ — (catalexis 3)

— ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — — — — ∪ — — —

— ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — — — (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*

— ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — — — — ∪ ∪ — ,

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: τᾶς ἱερᾶς Σεκυῶνος. Ζεῦ πάτερ. Thus in the *Third Olympian*:

γλαυ—κόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας τάν ποτε, (epode 1),  
 Εὐρ—υσθέος ἔντ' ἀνάγκα πατρόθεν, (epode 2),  
 Θήρ—ων ἀρεταῖσιν ἰκάνων ἄπτεται (epode 3).

<sup>28</sup> For the disputed reading Ὀλυμπία see note 25 above. In epode 2 the manuscript reading Ὀρθωσία presents an awkward hiatus, and some editors adopt the easy emendation Ὀρθωσίας. There is also a good case for emendation in the final epitrite figure of strophe 3, where the alternative readings διδύμοις and διδύμοισι 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*: ἄ τε Πίσσα με γεγωνεῖν τᾶς ἄπο. 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) Ἴστρου ἀπὸ σκιαρᾶν παγᾶν ἔνεικεν  
Ἄμφιτρυωνιάδας  
μνᾶμα τᾶν Ὀλυμπία κάλλιτον ἀέθλων.
- (2) χρυσόκερων ἔλαφον θήλειαν ἄξονθ',  
ἂν ποτε Ταῦγέτα  
ἀντιθεῖσ' Ὀρθωσία ἔγραψεν ἱεράν.
- (3) οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν. τὸ πόρσω δ'  
ἐστὶ σοφοῖς ἄβατον  
κάσφοις. οὐ νιν διώξω. 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, οὐ νιν διώξω. κεινὸς εἶην.

Stanford University