Writing for one of his own townsmen, probably in the tense period following 480, Pindar seizes the opportunity to contrast right and wrong. Wrong is illustrated by the myth, which begins and ends in bloodshed (φονευουμένου, v. 17; φονειας, v. 37). Two sisters - their names occur in the first lines of the second and third strophes, almost in metrically corresponding positions - two adulteresses, show the dire social consequences of moral irresponsibility.

With these two sisters are juxtaposed their two brothers, Castor and Polydeuce, whose selfless generosity leads them turn and turn about to Therapne and Olympus (vv. 61-64). It is with the majestic and suggestive Ὀλύμποι that the poem ends.

Pindar very carefully spells out that his myth has relevance to the message of his poem by repetition of vocabulary between the one and the other: πολίται, δίλος, φθόνον (vv. 28-29) are picked up by πόλιν, δίλος, φθονεροί in vv. 52-54. Some of this vocabulary is akin to language used in his political poetry by Solon. Like Pindar later, Solon warns against an anti-social ὁβρις (fr. 4.8 and 34 Bergk / West: cf. P. 11.55, where the antithesis ἡσυχία/ὁβριν anticipates P. 8.1 and 12). He too abominates tyranny (34.7), and for the Pindaric reason that it makes life impossible for the tyrant's progeny (33.7: cf. 13.32 and P. 11.57-58). Since ill-gotten gains cannot last (13.16ff.: cf. P. 11.52-53; P. 3.105-06 with Turyn's note), the correct attitude for a citizen is not restless ambition, but to abide by the conventions of the banquet, the symbol of orderly social life (4.10
euvropouνας κοσμεῖν δαιτὸς ἐν ἥσυχῃ: cf. P. 11.45 ἑὐφροσύνα). For both authors, ἥσυχα is a positive ideal (Solon fr. 4c. 1 ἥσυχάσαντες: cf. P. 11.55 ἥσυχα). 4)

Verses 36-58 of Pindar's ode share these and other parallels with Solon. They are most conveniently exhibited by a list:

v. 36 χρονίῳ (cf. χρόνῳ, v. 32): Solon 4.16 (cf. 13.8)
v. 45 εὐφροσύνα: Solon 4.10
v. 45 δόξα: Solon 13.4
v. 51 ἀλλικά: Solon 4.20
v. 52 πόλιν: Solon 4.1, 5, 17 and 31
v. 52 τὰ μέσα: cf. τῶν μέσων, Aristotle, Ἀθ.πολ. 5.3;
Politics 1296a18: ἐν μετροσι, Solon 4c.
3; ἐν μεταυχικάς, Solon 37.9
v. 53 δλβψ: Solon 6.3; 13.3; 34.2
v. 53 αἰςαν: Solon 4.2
v. 53 τυραννίδων: Solon 32.2; 34.7: cf. 9.3; 33.6
v. 55 ἄτα(ι): Solon 4.35; 13.13, 68, 75
v. 55 ἥσυχά: Solon 4.10: cf. 4c. 1
v. 55 ὤβριν: Solon 4.8 and 34; 6.3; 13.11 and 16
v. 57 γενεῖ: Solon 27.10: cf. γένος 13.32; 33.7
v. 58 κτεάνων: Solon 4.12

But, although Solon's doctrine of moderation is so close to Pindar's, we do not in fact find φθόνος or its congeners in the extant poetic fragments. Solon believes that Athens' problems are caused by the greed of the rich. He speaks of διχοστασία and ξρίς between the orders (4.37-38). Amid these genuine grievances, there is hardly room for the assertion that trouble-makers are sowing discord simply out of jealousy.

And yet Herodotus has no qualms about attributing to Solon a doctrine concerning φθόνος which is of key importance in the understanding of his entire History: 5) ἐπιστάμενον με τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἐδώ φθονερόν τε καὶ ταραχῆς ἐπειρωτᾶς ἄνθρωπῶν προηγμάτων ήδη. The man who recognizes this truth about the divine nature avoids any premature claim to be δλβως, and is protected by his ἥσυχη from ἁτη (I.32).

Pindar is familiar with the notion of divine jealousy (P. 10.20; I. 7.39). But the majority of the 19 examples of his use of φθονερός, φθονέω, φθόνος listed by Slater refer to human jealousy: φθονερῶν γειτῶν (O. 1.47); φθόνον δὲ λόγοι φθονεροίσι (N. 8.21): κρῆ νυν (probably ἄρετάν) ... μὴ φθονεραίσι φέρειν γνώμαις (I. 1.44); παντὶ δ' ἐπὶ φθόνος ἀνδρὶ κεῖται ἄρετὰς (Parth. 1.8); κενεοφρόνων ἐταῖρον ἀνδρῶν [sc.
The existence of these two types of φθόνος, divine and human, is attested in the same context by Thucydides. In words of unbearable poignancy Nicias attempts to console his men at the end: ἵκανα γὰρ τοῖς τε πολεμοῖς ηὐτοχταί, καὶ εἰ τῷ θεῶν ἐπιφθόνοι ἐστρατεύσαμεν, ἀποχρώντως ἥδη τετιμωρημένα (VII.77.3). It is evident that his religious outlook (VII.50.4) is inspiring him to look for an old argument. Yet even here one can observe the new civic concept of φθόνος: καίτοι πολλὰ μὲν ἐς θεοὺς νόμιμα δεσιμήσαι, πολλὰ δὲ ἐς ἀνθρώπους δίκαια καὶ ἄνεπιφθόνα (VII.77.2). His many just acts towards men, antithetically set against his behavior towards the gods, are evinced by the absence of φθόνος. He has indeed behaved rather like the Peisistratids: cf. τὴν... ἀρχὴν... ἄνεπιφθόνως κατεστήσατο τοῦ Ηιππαρχοῦ, καὶ ἐπετήθευσαν ἐπὶ πλείστον ὁ δὲ τύραννος οὗτοι ἄρετὴν... (VI.54.5) and διὰ τὴν πάσην ἐς ἀρετὴν νενομισμένην ἐπιτήθευσιν τοῦ Νικίας (VII.86.5).6

Because civic φθόνος was such a well known phenomenon in the life of the πόλις, Aristotle analyzes its causes and objects in book II of the Rhetoric (1387b22ff.). It was in Pindar's lifetime that increasing social awareness led to increasing φθόνος, as expectations rose.7 People are jealous of their peers, says Aristotle. And, when more came to think of their neighbors as "no better than themselves," there was more scope for jealousy.

Aristotle points out that jealousy is readily found in families. Herodotus offers a fine example, relevant to Pindar. When his son Lycophron harbored a grudge over the death of his mother, fostered by his uncle, who was tyrant of Epidaurus, Periander drove him out of house and home. The young man was reduced to dire straits, and eventually his father invited him to learn (μαθῶν: cf. P. 2.25 and 72) δοῦνον ἐστέκομεν ἐστὶ ἡ οἰκῖα ῥεδοσαί (Her. III.52.5). The implication is that the deeds of tyrants have to be tolerated, with all their φθόνος, if one wishes to enjoy their rewards.

H. Fränkel has rightly suggested8 that this apophthegm had its origins as a political slogan. Pindar had earlier said to the tyrant Hiero: "If one speaks to the point,
drawing together in brief compass the strands of many themes, less blame follows from men; for weary satiety blunts their eager hopes, and what the citizens hear most vexes their mind in secret at others' successes. Still, since it is better to be envied than pitied (v. 85: κρέσσον γάρ οίκτισμοῖ φθόνος), you must not give up your nobility...." (P. 1. 81ff.: cf. μὴ παρέει καλᾶ, v. 86 with μὴ δῶξτά σεωτοῦ ἀγαθὰ ἄλλοις, Her. III.53.4). Καλᾶ is a code word in this value-system.9) Like Pericles (Thuc. II.35.2), Pindar knows that too much praise for too much success produces φθόνος. The situation of the tyrant Periander in Corinth has in fifth-century Syracuse expanded to include no longer an uncle but the ἄστοι (v. 84) in general.

It seems necessary therefore, in assessing Pindar's use of φθόνος, to take account of political developments in his lifetime.10) Civic jealousy was becoming more widespread. An Alcmaeonid driven into exile could find solace in this reflection (P. 7.19: Megacles, ostracized in 486). The second Pythian with its themes of gratitude and ingratitude, shows that not even considerations of the mutability of human fortune can soften the attitude of the king's political enemies, who of course existed: ἄλλ' οὖστ' ταῦτα νόσον (αἴνει φθονερῶν (89-90). Xenocrates of Acragas, a member of the ruling house of the Emmenidae, is advised not to keep silent about his father's excellence, in spite of jealousy (I. 2.43). But did the Emmenidae not have enemies (Empedocles)?

Φθόνος seems to play some part in the odes written by Pindar for Aeginetan patrons (O. 8.55; N. 4.39; N. 8.21; I. 5.24: cf. Bacchylides 13.200, also for a son of Lampon).11) No one will now believe that Nemean 4.39 refers to problems experienced by the poet with Simonides, as suggested by the scholars. Olympian 8.55 ("Let not Jealousy pelt me with a jagged stone") adapts a religious motif to popular "rough justice," the λέοντις θηκη of the tragedians,12) which was alleged to have been carried out by the Athenian commons in Pindar's lifetime on Lycides or Cyrsilus (Her. IX.5.2: Dem. XVIII.204). Pindar knew the Aeginetans well, and he presumably also knew the tense rivalries which could prevail there, as in any Greek society.13)
He knew even better his own city of Thebes. In the first Partheneion the Theban Aeolidae are told that, because there are distinctions of honor among mortals, every man must endure φόνος on account of his ἀρετή (vv. 6-9). The son of Aeolidas, Pagondas, mentioned in the second Partheneion (v. 10) probably commanded the Theban army at Delium. He had tactical ideas which made him an Epaminondas avant la lettre. Such aristocrats must surely have known what real φόνος was like.

Similarly, Pindar urges that we should not cheat, through jealousy, his countryman Herodotus of his share of praise (I. 1.44). The identification of the victor's father Asopodorus (v. 34) with the Asopodorus who wrought such havoc while fighting for the Persians at Plataea (Her. IX.69), and who was presumably afterwards punished for backing the losers, has been disputed. Pindar's Asopodorus had certainly been in trouble, described in terms (νουκνίας, v. 36) appropriate to a debacle in public affairs. There certainly were political troubles at Thebes after Plataea (Her. IX.86-88). Two distinguished Asopodori, both ruined at the same period in the same city? Or one, now happily enjoying a period of calm (εὐσεβίας, v. 40), but still fearful of φόνευρα τύνωμαι?

The eleventh Pythian was written for another aristocratic Theban victor. In its myth, the Atridae are the objects of malicious gossip on the part of their fellow citizens. The anachronism, like that in Aeschylus' Agamemnon, written for democratic Athens, is colored by Pindar's knowledge of his own time and city. Later, the poet applies this lesson, using the device of the "preacher's I," to Thrasydaeus and the family and class he represents. In urging moderation, he uses the Solonian language he had obviously heard during his student days in Athens. But to it he adds the concept of civic jealousy, which, so far as we know, had not been employed by Solon. In warning against tyranny he could have remembered the disaster which a tyrannical government (Thuc. III. 62.3) and its medizing policy had lately wrought.

The similarities to Solon's language in this ode suggest that άτα(ι) must be retained at v. 55. Pindar is worried by the threat of άτη at Syracuse in Pythian 2, where we also find the φόνευροι at work (vv. 28, 82 άτα; 90 φόνευροί).
expands Solon's concept to suggest that no longer so much the greed of the rich as the licence of the small-minded can destroy the community. The interrogative τίς at the start of the next sentence need not expect a negative answer. "Who has avoided dread insolence?" (i.e. "Who has avoided displaying an insolent attitude?") may simply be a religious / rhetorical call for information. 18

'Αταί, dramatically placed at the beginning of its line, in metrical correspondence with χειρόν, σφαχέτσα and Τρόων in the myth, is too good to be surrendered for the vacuous Ἀλλ' εἰ. The parallel with Ἀντίγονη 533, τρέώσων δό' ἄτα κάπανατάσεις θρόνων, is attractive: cf. Αγα. 1230 ἄτης λαδραίου of Clytaemnestra (so Fraenkel). Φθονεροί may be retained as a noun in its own right ("the opposition"), shortly to be modified by the powerful personification Ἀταί. With one small change, this is the text preferred by Alexander Turyn.
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NOTES


2) There are some parallels with Ixion's behavior at π.2.30ff. His two sins are adultery and civil bloodshed. This is another political ode which shows affinity with both the eleventh Pythian and with Solon: e.g. δαβως, θρόος, ἄτη, vv. 26, 28; ἔλικος, v. 91 and Solon 4.17 (Bergk / West).


4) B. Forssman, Untersuchungen zur Sprache Πίνδαρος (Wiesbaden 1966), p. 51, note 2, proposes to retain the ms. reading here (against Hermann / Mommsen's correction ημουξῆς: cf. Ρ4.296). It is a symposion-motif (v. 9.48), raised to the political level by both Solon and Pindar.

5) Aristotle refutes the notion that god can be jealous by using a Solonian quotation to turn the tables (fr. 29 = Met. A 983a2: πολλὰ ψεύδονται ἀδιάδοι). The history of this type of conventional σύγκρισις βίων is investigated by F. Focke, Ημερεί 58 (1923), p. 330, but it is admitted by M. Miller, "The Herodotean Croesus," Κλίο 41 (1963), p. 91 that Herodotus' account contains "authentic Solonian material." The same author has dated Solon's archonship and reforms to 573-71: "The accepted date for Solon: precise, but wrong?" Arethusa 2 (1969), pp. 62-86; "Solon's

6) Theopompus seems to have represented Nicias as somewhat undemocratic at heart (apud Plutarch, Vit. Nic. 5 and 11); cf. Xen. Hell. II.3.39: G. Busolt, Grieohische Geschichte III.2 (Gotha 1904), p. 1000.


9) Fränkel translates P. 1.86: "gib trotz dem Neid dein stolzes Amt nicht preis" (loc. cit.). This alerts us to the sense of θέσις ἐραίος καλῶς at P. 11.50. Έν ἀληθίνῳ at v. 51 here is to be compared with τῶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ γυναικῶν at Plato, Rep. V. 461b5. The poet is thinking of the victor, not of himself.

10) Hence a literary approach to the concept, which would find in it merely some sort of "Lobverzierungsmotiv," is bound to be one-sided. The weakness of such an approach is seen in E. Thummer's Pindar: die iatrichischen Gedichte I (Heidelberg 1968), p. 67 and note 40, where the injunction μημᾶτε ζεῦς γενόσθαι (I. 5.14) is treated as simply a glorification of the victory gained: contrast the remarks of O. Weinreich on the same passage, Menekrates Zeus und Salomones (Stuttgart 1933), pp. 82-83. We need to consider the "objective" as well as the "subjective" unity of the odes (Boeckh).

11) Although Bacchylides makes remarkably little use of the word φθόνος: only four examples in Snell-Maehler's Index Vocabulorum, and none of φθονέω or φθονερός. Cf. P. Walcot, Emv and the Greeks (Warminster 1978) 40f.


14) A. W. Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydidcs, III (Oxford 1956) p. 560, regards it as certain that he was at least of the same family.

15) By E. L. Bundy, for example: see Thummer, op. cit. II (Heidelberg 1969), p. 8, note 3. Adkins however (op. cit. p. 76, note 1) seems to favor the identification. Turyn (Pindari Carmina, p. 194) is in no doubt.

16) Fraenkel on Aga. 1030: contrast μέγα δὲ βρέμει, Ὀλυμπίς αἰεῖ, Eiresione 2. See further Bowra, Pindar, p. 296 with note 2, though whether these parallels prove that Pindar was thinking of the Orestea is another question, like that concerning the relationship of P. 1.21ff. and Prometheus Vinctus 367-72.

17) "Ad suam personam quae aliis dicit revocat, ut... Pyth. XI.50:" L. Dissen, Pindarí Carmina I (Gothae et Erfordiae 1830), p. XXX.

18) The many conjectures with which scholars have assailed this passage are listed by D. Gerber, Emendationes in Pindar 1513-1972 (Amsterdam 1976), pp. 94-95. Here I follow B. A. van Groningen, "Ad Pindarí Pyth. XI VS. 55," Mnemoseyne ser. 3.13 (1947), pp. 230-33. To his "open" religious questions (p. 231) may be added τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φθόνιμος κτλ., Luke 12.42. With φθονερό... ἀταί may be compared διαβολικὰ ὑποφάτες... τίκελοι in a similar passage of political abuse, P. 2.76-77.