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Abstract
The aim of this thesis is to explore Hellenistic scholarship on Pindar in the period between Aristarchus and Didymus. Although no ancient scholarly work on Pindar survives in its entirety, the Pindar scholia and other indirect sources show that about a dozen scholars known by name worked on Pindar in the period studied.
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Part II contains the actual collection of fragments of named and known Pindarists contemporary with or active between Aristarchus and Didymus. It is accompanied by an English translation along with a commentary on details of language, transmission and content.
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Unless stated otherwise I follow the text of Pindar in the edition by Maehler and Snell (1987) for the Victory Odes and Maehler (1989) for the fragments. The text of scholia on Pindar not belonging to the present fragment collection is that of Drachmann (1903–1927). For other texts, I generally follow the most recent Teubner edition, when available. In other cases, the name of the editor is given either by name and year of the author or according to the abbreviated name forms below. Greek authors and titles are given either in unabbreviated form or according to the conventions given in the OCD. For Pindar the shorter forms O. = Olympians, P. = Pythians, N. = Nemeans and I. = Isthmians are used in alternation with the unabbreviated forms. Σ is used to abbreviate scholion/scholia. In the case of scholia on the Iliad, the type and source of the scholion is given according to the sigla used in the edition by Erbse (1969–1988). Unless otherwise stated, the text of scholia on the Iliad is that of Erbse.

A number of frequently quoted abbreviations of standard works and editions is given below.


Abbreviations of Standard Reference Works and Conventions


Abbreviations of Standard Reference Works and Conventions

Guhl

Heyne

Hilgard

Holwerda

Hordern

Horn

IEG

IG
Kirchoff, A. et al., eds. (1873–). Inscriptiones Graecae. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Keaney

Koster

Koster

LBG

Lentz
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LGPN

LSJ

M-W
Abbreviations of Standard Reference Works and Conventions

Maehler

Martano
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PCG
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PMG
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Scheer
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The Teubner edition of Pindar by Maehler and Snell (1987) gives the following description of the winning contestants at the first Olympic games as narrated in *Olympia* 10.67–70:

Δόρυκλος δ’ ἔφερε πυγμᾶς τέλος,
Τίρυνθα ναίων πόλιν·
ἀν’ ἵπποισι δέ τέτρασιν
ἀπὸ Μαντινέας Σάμος ὁ Ἀλιροθίου·

Doryclus won the prize in boxing,
who lived in the city of Tiryns,
and in the four-horse chariot race
it was Samus of Mantinea, son of Halirothius.¹

Ever since Boeckh’s 1811 edition, all editors of Pindar give the winner of the four-horse chariot race in l. 70 as Σάμος (ὁ) Ἀλιροθίου, “Samus, son of Halirothius”. Yet the text of the medieval manuscripts reads σᾶμ’ Ἀλιροθίου, “the mark of Halirothius”. The source of the now universally accepted variant is the scholia on Pindar, which attribute it to the scholar Aristodemus (Σ O. 10.83b = Aristodemus Fr. 3), a student of Aristarchus of Samothrace and active in the second century BCE. In the scholia on *Nemean* 7 (Σ N. 7.150a = Aristodemus Fr. 8), the same Aristodemus interprets the words τὸ δ’ ἐμὸν οὔ ποτε φάσει κέαρ ἀτρόποισι Νεοπτόλεμον ἑλκῦσαι ἔπεισι, “My heart will never say that it has dragged Neoptolemus in unfitting words” (N. 7.103–105), as Pindar’s defence against accusations of having spoken badly of Neoptolemus in the *Paeans*. Due to the loss of the *Paeans* in the medieval manuscript tradition, the reference of Aristodemus’ statement was for a long time unknown to modern scholars. Only in 1906, the discovery of *POxy* 841, containing Pindar’s *Paeans*, confirmed that Pindar had mentioned Neoptolemus and his death at Delphi in

¹For all longer quotations of Pindar I have adapted the Loeb translation by William H. Race (1997a; 1997b). In the case of individual words and phrases quoted by the scholia, I have made my own translations.
the poem now referred to as \textit{Paean 6}. These two fragments of Aristodemus provide proof of the value of ancient scholarship in understanding Pindar. This fact has been acknowledged for centuries, but less acknowledged is the value of such fragments as evidence for the development of Pindaric studies. The two most famous ancient scholars who devoted studies to Pindar were Aristarchus of Samothrace (c.216—144 BCE) and Didymus (late first century BCE), both active during the Hellenistic period. The former was head librarian at the library of Alexandria and wrote a commentary on Pindar of which some 70 fragments still exist. As a prolific scholar and teacher, Aristarchus had a lasting influence on Hellenistic scholarship, secured by his many writings and students. Didymus, on the other hand, was a relatively late Pindarist. He was active during the reign of the emperor Augustus (27 BCE – 14 CE) and at least 68 fragments still exist of his commentary on Pindar, which covered at least the four books of victory odes and the \textit{Paeans}. The careers of Aristarchus and Didymus mark the beginning and end in the peak of Hellenistic philological work on Pindar. Earlier scholars such as Aristophanes of Byzantium (c.257—180 BCE) collected and classified Pindar’s text and established a vulgate text of lasting importance. Yet Aristarchus was the first scholar to write a continuous commentary on Pindar. After Didymus’ monumental work on Pindar, we only have few and scattered references to scholars working on Pindar before the Comnenian renaissance of the twelfth century with the works of the Tzetzes brothers and Eustathius of Thessalonica. The aim of this thesis is to explore the scholarship on Pindar performed by the contemporaries of and the scholars active between Aristarchus and Didymus, the two most prominent ancient Pindarists. The surviving evidence bears proof of the continuous interest in the Theban poet in the century and a half between these scholars. With some probability we can attribute work on Pindar to at least a dozen named scholars during this period, yet no study has been dedicated to this topic. So this thesis aims at two main contributions: Part I serves the function of contextualizing and analysing the studied fragments within their own time and cultural environment, as well as to shed more light on the development of scholarship on Pindar in the Hellenistic period. Part II offers a collection of the fragments of the named scholars working on Pindar between Aristarchus and Didymus, with translation and commentary.

\section*{1.2 Objectives and Methodology}

Previous research has not studied the contributions to Pindaric philology by scholars active between Aristarchus and Didymus sufficiently, and no study has been dedicated to the period exclusively. The main contributions to our understanding of the period are H. T. Deas’ (1931) article on the Pindar scholia.
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as well as some chapters of Irigoin’s (1952) monograph on the textual history of Pindar. Both studies offer good introductions to the subject, yet neither of them gives a deeper analysis of individual fragments or of the period in general. Although the entries on ancient scholars in LGGA have made many of the ancient Pindarists more accessible, they do not consistently evaluate the individual fragments or their specific contribution to Pindaric scholarship. The present thesis therefore aims to improve our understanding of this phase of Pindaric scholarship in answering the following questions:

1. What parts of our textual record from Graeco-Roman antiquity can be attributed to specific scholars working on Pindar, who were either contemporary with or active between Aristarchus and Didymus?

2. (a) What kind of questions did these scholars ask when working on Pindar?
   (b) What guiding principles did they apply in answering these questions?

A survey of the extant textual record is offered in answer to the first question and in order to identify fragments of scholarly work on Pindar connected to named individuals of the period studied. The criteria for what constitutes such a fragment are defined in section 1.2.1 and the relevant sources are discussed in chapter 6. The results are presented in the form of a fragment collection in chapter 8. This collection is a necessary tool for a detailed analysis of the material in order to answer research questions 2a–2b.

1.2.1 Defining the Material

Fragments of named scholars’ work on Pindar are found in several sources. The most important is the corpus of scholia on Pindar.\(^1\) Other sources include marginal annotations in Pindaric papyri, papyrus fragments of ancient commentaries on Pindar, scholia on other authors, and other kinds of erudite and encyclopaedic literature. Within the Pindar scholia there are countless references to ancient authorities. Most common are references to Pindar himself, to Homer, and to other poets, but there are also many references to ancient philosophers, historians and grammarians. In the context of this thesis, it is necessary to decide if such an ancient authority originally discussed Pindar or if the attributed remarks originally derived from a context outside of Pindaric scholarship. In order to make a consistent selection among the ancient authorities referred to in the Pindar scholia, the following criteria have been established:

\(^1\)For a description cf. section 6.1.
1.2. Objectives and Methodology

1. This thesis aims to collect the fragments of scholars active in the period ranging from Aristarchus to Didymus, including their contemporaries, such as Callistratus and Crates (contemporaries of Aristarchus) and Theon and Aristonicus (contemporaries of Didymus). In some cases, we do not know with certainty when a scholar was active. Yet when, due to reasons such as content and style of the transmitted fragment, it is reasonable to assume that the scholars were active within this period, they have been included, as in the case of Apollonius. The question of dating the *floruit* of each scholar will be discussed in the section dedicated to him.

2. The fragment collection only includes scholars who can be proven to have worked directly on Pindar at least on one occasion. Within this study “direct work” on Pindar refers to fragments that discuss Pindar or passages from his poetry directly. The decision on what constitutes direct work is not always self-evident and will be discussed in the sections of each scholar when necessary. If a named scholar can on a given occasion be convincingly shown to have worked directly on Pindar, other fragments from the Pindar scholia attributed to the same authority will be included even if the evidence that these originated in Pindaric scholarship is inconclusive, provided that a non-Pindaric context cannot otherwise be proven.

3. Regarding other sources than the Pindar scholia, I have included material which ancient sources explicitly state to be scholarship on Pindar, such as references to titles in Aristodemus Fr. 12 and Theon Fr. 2, or where variant readings or discussions of Pindar’s poetry are attributed to identifiable scholars in papyri of Pindar, such as Aristonicus Fr. 6–8.

In cases where a fragment corresponds to these criteria but an origin in a Pindaric context or the identification of its author is uncertain or debatable, the fragment will be marked as dubious in the edition.

In Table 1.1, the selection of scholars within this collection is compared to the descriptions of ancient Pindarists in Deas (1931, pp. 11–19) and Irigoin (1952, pp. 57–66).

The scholars above are included in the collection since we can attribute at least some form of scholarly work on Pindar to them. I include Apollonius in this collection, although his identity and chronology is problematic. Irigoin identifies him as the son of Chaeris while Deas suggests that he is identical with Apollonius the “Eidographer” who was active in the early second century BCE.¹ The following scholars mentioned by Deas and/or Irigoin in Table 1.2 have not been included in the collection.

¹Cf. section 3.6 for a discussion of these figures and the identification.
### Table 1.1: Hellenistic scholars included in edition and their status according to Deas and Irigoin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Deas</th>
<th>Irigoin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agestratus</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
<td>Not mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonius</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonius</td>
<td>Not mentioned.</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristodemus</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristonicus</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
<td>Possibly author of commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepiades</td>
<td>Possibly Asclepiades of Myrlea. Author of commentary.</td>
<td>Identical with Asclepiades of Myrlea. Author of commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemon</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
<td>Author of commentary on the Sicilian odes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaeris</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
<td>Author of commentary on P. 4 and suggramma on unspecified topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysippus</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius son of Charmides</td>
<td>Described as obscure grammarian</td>
<td>Possibly author of commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius Phaselites</td>
<td>Possibly author of work on Pindar.</td>
<td>Discussed Pindar in Peri Poieton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius Sidonius</td>
<td>Activities on Pindar.</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callistratus</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
<td>Possibly author of commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crates</td>
<td>Author of commentary.</td>
<td>Probably not author of commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leptines</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menecrates</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theon</td>
<td>Compiler of Didymus and other late commentaries. Source of our scholia.</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.2. Objectives and Methodology

Table 1.2: Hellenistic scholars not included in edition and their status according to Deas and Irigoin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Deas</th>
<th>Irigoin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aristocles</td>
<td>Wrote on Pindar slightly before Didymus</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius of Argus</td>
<td>Described as unknown historian.</td>
<td>Not mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius the Cyclographer</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
<td>Not seen as working on Pindar directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemaeus Epithetes</td>
<td>Mentioned but type of work not discussed.</td>
<td>Not mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemaeus Pindarion</td>
<td>Not mentioned.</td>
<td>Epithet due to his works on Pindar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aristocles, possibly identical with the grammarian who was a contemporary of Strabo (14.2.13) and who, according to Jacoby, was the author of a work on the sanctuaries of Hermione (FGrH 33 Fr. 4),[^1] is mentioned in Σ. O. 7.66a and 7.66b regarding Athena’s birth. In O. 7.66a, Aristocles is quoted together with Sosibius (FGrH 595 Fr. 22) who appears to have primarily written on Laconian geography. Because Aristocles is not quoted as directly commenting on Pindar, but rather as a mythographical source, he is excluded from this collection. Dionysius of Argus (FGrH 308 Fr. 2) is mentioned in Σ. N. 2.1d as the source of a discussion on the etymology of the word ῥαψῳδός. Since this was a much discussed etymology, not restricted to Pindaric scholarship, it is not necessary to assume that his fragment originally concerned Pindar. This is seen by the fact that he is quoted next to the ancient historians Philochorus (FGrH 328 Fr. 212) and Nicocles – emended by Jacoby to Nicocrates (FGrH 367 Fr. 8) – as well as Menaechmus (FGrH 131 Fr. 9), who most probably did not discuss Pindar. Dionysius the Cyclographer (FGrH 15 Fr. 2) is quoted once in the Pindar scholia with the specific reference to the first book of his Κυκλος “ἐν προτῷ Κύκλων” (Σ. I. 4.104g). This was a mythographical work and the reference to the named Dionysius in the Pindar scholia does not indicate that the work commented on Pindar. The relevant scholion discusses the number and names of Hercules’ and Megara’s children. The additional ancient authorities quoted, including Euripides (Fr. 1016 Kannicht) and the mythographer Pherecydes (FGrH 3 Fr. 14), give differing accounts of Hercules’ children. Since these
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I have excluded Ptolemaeus Epithetes, who is mentioned by the Pindar scholia on one occasion (Σ. O. 5.44c = Fr. 5 Montanari). This example is typical of the difficulties in deciding the original context of a fragment:

Λυδίοις ἀπύων Λυδιστὶ ἑρμοσμένοις. Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ ᾿Επιθέτης τοὺς ἐν Λυδίᾳ αὐλοὺς φησὶ πρωτεύειν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ.

Sounding with Lydian [auloi]: Tuned in the Lydian mode. Ptolemaeus Epithetes says that the auloi of Lydia were the first in its art.

Ptolemaeus Epithetes was a Hellenistic scholar working on literature and corresponds therefore to the chronological criteria of this collection (Montanari, Blank, and Dyck, 1988, pp. 78–87). Yet the scholion does not give any explicit information on the original context of the comment on Lydian auloi. Therefore it is not possible for us to know whether Ptolemaeus commented on Pindar or just mentioned this in a work on music. The fact that Ptolemaeus is quoted in the Pindar scholia only shows that a later commentator noted the value of this statement and included it in his own commentary on Pindar.

Ptolemaeus son of Oroandes, a pupil of Aristarchus and active in Alexandria, is referred to as Pindarion (Πινδαρίων) by the Suda π 3034 (ed. Adler). Irigoin believed that he received the epithet for his interest in Pindar, but Boatti (2002) has remarked that the epithet might rather have a negative connotation due to the diminutive ending -ίων. Since we have no fragments of this scholar’s work on Pindar, we can draw no conclusions on his hypothetical scholarship on Pindar.

1.3 Previous Research

The contributions of Hellenistic scholarship to our understanding of Greek literature and the development of classical philology have long been recognized. Although few works survive in complete form, a significant number of fragments is transmitted in the scholia of medieval manuscripts. Byzantine scholars, such as John Tzetzes and Eustathius of Thessalonica often referred to the ancient scholia and scholars as authoritative sources, as did early modern scholars. A change from seeing the ancient authorities as simple explanatory

---

1 A connection to Pindar would probably rather be expressed by the epithet ὁ Πινδαρικός, just as Ὁμηρικὸς is used to express the Homeric interests of Crates of Mallus in Suda (κ 2342 ed. Adler = T 1 Broggiato).
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tools in understanding Greek literature, to an interest in the scholars themselves emerges in the late 18th century in works such as Prolegomena ad Homerum by Wolf (1795), who noted the importance of scholars such as Zenodotus, Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus for the transmitted text and form of Homer’s works. Wolf saw them as role-models for the development of classical philology in his own time.

New interests in ancient literary criticism and textual transmission have since the 19th century increased the interest in ancient scholars per se, their methods and their theories. A major breakthrough in this paradigm was Rudolf Pfeiffer’s History of Classical Scholarship (1968) which remains a standard work for understanding scholarship in antiquity. Research continually develops within the field of ancient scholarship. Works used extensively within this study include: Nünlist’s The Ancient Critic at Work (2009), which identifies aspects of ancient literary criticism as reflected in the surviving scholia and offers a useful glossary of technical terminology; Schironi’s The Best of the Grammarians (2018), which defines aspects of Aristarchus’ Homeric scholarship that are often also applicable to Pindaric scholarship; and Eleanor Dickey’s Ancient Greek scholarship (2007), which offers a valuable overview of ancient scholarship including a useful glossary of technical terminology and discussions of the scholiastic language.

One of the first scholars to discuss the contributions of the ancient scholars to Pindaric scholarship was August Boeckh, who in the prolegomena to his edition of the Pindar scholia (Boeckh, 1819) gives an overview of the ancient Pindarists and attempts to contextualize their work. Karl Lehrs published a monograph Die Pindar-scholien in 1849. Editorial interest in the Pindar scholia continued during the 19th and 20th centuries in the form of Abel’s edition of the ancient scholia on the Nemeans and Isthmians Abel (1884), and also in the the complete edition of the ancient scholia in three volumes by Drachmann (1903–1927). The two most important works in understanding ancient scholarship on Pindar and the textual history of the Pindar scholia to date are Deas (1931) and Irigoin (1952). Regarding the ancient Pindarists, Wilamowicz-Moellendorff (1922, p. 3) stated that “wir wissen nur zu wenig über die Arbeiten der Grammatiker; man kann auf ein paar Anführungen kein Urteil gründen” but Deas and Irigoin attempted to specify the characteristics of the period between Aristarchus and Didymus. Both agree that it was characterized by the introduction of historical interest in Pindar. According to Deas (1931, pp. 8–11), Aristarchus’ interpretation of Pindar had been a-historical, not considering historical sources or attempting to understand Pindar as a historical text. It was only due to influence from scholars active in Pergamum, such as Crates of Mallus and Artemon of Pergamum, that Pindar came to be studied as a historical text. Irigoin (1952, p. 55) followed Deas and attributed this
a-historicity to Aristarchus’ principle of understanding an author by means of himself: “veut expliquer le texte par le texte et non à l’aide d’autres sources, Ὄμηρον ἐξ Ὅμηρου σαφηνίζειν; cette méthode ne vaut rien pour les allusions historiques”. According to Irigoin, the historical interpretation was developed by Aristarchus’ successors and resulted in the fundamentally historical work of Didymus:

Son commentaire de Pindare repose sur un fondement historique; il va donc à l’opposé de l’exégèse d’Aristarque. L’évolution qui s’esuissait déjà chez plusieurs des élèves ou des adversaires d’Aristarque : Aristodème, Asclépiade de Myrlea, etc., arrive à son terme avec Didyme (Irigoin, 1952, p. 71).

Didymus’ contributions to Pindaric scholarship have been well studied by Braswell (2013) in his edition of Didymus’ commentary on Pindar. Aristarchus’ Pindaric scholarship is less well studied. The fragments of his work on Pindar were edited twice in 1883 by Horn (1883) and Feine (1883), but these dissertations, both written in Latin, are now severely outdated. To the best of my knowledge, the only modern study which focuses on Aristarchus as a Pindarist is that of Vassilaki (2009), who argues against Deas’ and Irigoin’s view of Aristarchus as an a-historical scholar. With a few exceptions, such as Crates of Mallus, the scholars studied within this dissertation have received little scholarly interest. However, the *Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity = LGGA* has in the recent years resulted in fragment collections of many ancient grammarians, including several of the scholars discussed in this dissertation. These entries offer valuable biographical essays and updated bibliographies but they do not discuss individual fragments nor do they critically evaluate the text of the fragments, which is typically copied from older editions. The following list gives a selection of editions and studies on the scholars within the present fragment collection.

**Agestratus** The one fragment of Agestratus has currently not been edited as a separate text.

**Ammonius** All fragments attributed to the Hellenistic Ammonius from Alexandria have been collected in the *LGGA* entry by Montana (2006a). The text is that of Drachmann. D’Alessandros’ *Ammonio di Alessandria: Frammenti* (2020) was published at too late a stage to be consistently incorporated into the present thesis.

---

1 Cf. sections 2.2 and 4.2.1 for Aristarchus’ approach to literature.
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**Apollonius**  The identity of the Apollonius mentioned in Σ P. 1.3b is uncertain. Presumably for this reason he is not included in any existing fragment collections of scholars named Apollonius, such as Apollonius “Eidographer” or Apollonius, son of Chaeris.

**Aristodemus**  There are some doubts about the identification of references to the ancient grammarian Aristodemus. A collection of fragments attributed to Aristodemus, including most of the references to the name Aristodemus in the Pindar scholia, can be found in the LGGA entry by Novembri (2010). Four fragments attributed by the editor to the περὶ Πινδάρου of Aristodemus were collected and discussed by Poerio (2014). A selection of fragments of historical nature was collected and discussed by Jacoby (FGrH 383) and again in BNJ 383 by Angela Ganter and Christian Zgoll.

**Aristonicus**  Text and discussion of the fragments of Aristonicus in the Pindar scholia can be found in Razzetti (2000). It does not include the possible references to Aristonicus in the papyri of Pindar’s Paeans.

**Artemon**  Despite the few surviving remains of his work, Artemon has received surprisingly much scholarly interest. The fragments were collected by Jacoby as FGrH 569 and are also found in BNJ 569 in the entry by Pitcher (2007). The fragments of Artemon can also be found in the LGGA entry by Pagani (2004a) and in the chapter on Artemon in the study on philology in Pergamum by Broggiato (2014, pp. 9–47).

**Asclepiades**  The identification of the Asclepiades referred to in the Pindar scholia has been much debated and the contents of different editions reflect the stance of the editors. A selection of fragments attributed to Asclepiades is discussed by Lehrs (1848, pp. 428–48). A collection of all fragments attributed to Asclepiades of Myrlea can be found in the LGGA entry by Pagani (2006). Some fragments from the Pindar scholia are also included in the edition of Asclepiades of Tragilus by Villagra Hidalgo (2014).

**Chaeris**  All the fragments of Chaeris were edited by Berndt (1902). This work contains an important discussion about the confusion of the names of Chaeris and Chares in the textual tradition. Unfortunately, the edition, which predates Drachmann’s edition of the ancient scholia on Pindar, is partly based on incorrect readings of the manuscripts. The most recent collection of all fragments of Chaeris is the LGGA entry by Montana (2015) which is based on Drachmann’s text in the case of fragments from the Pindar scholia. A brief
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survey of the fragments of Chaeris’ work on Pindar has been published by Calvani (2012).

**Chrysippus** An edition of the fragments of Chrysippus, based on Drachmann’s text with accompanying commentary, was made by Braswell (2015). Stefano Vecchiato has recently published two articles on the grammarian (Vecchiato 2018a; 2018b) and authored an *LGGA* entry (Vecchiato, 2020).

**Diodorus Aristophaneus** There is no collection of fragments of Diodorus available.

**Dionysius son of Charmides** At the moment there is no collection of fragments of Dionysius available.

**Dionysius Phaselites** The fragments of Dionysius Phaselites are found in the *LGGA* entry by Ascheri (2018). Ascheri’s collection also includes the Dionysius mentioned in Σ O. 10.55b, which this thesis attributes to Dionysius Sidonius.

**Dionysius Sidonius** The fragments of the works by Dionysius Sidonius are collected in the *LGGA* entry by Meliadò (2018a). Meliadò identifies the Dionysius of Σ O. 10.55b as Sidonius and also includes the Dionysius of Σ P. 1.109 who is not included in this collection.¹

**Callistratus** A collection of the fragments of Callistratus can be found in the *LGGA* entry by Montana (2007). An edition and commentary of Callistratus’ work on Homer is found in Barth (1984).

**Crates** A collection of the fragments of Crates with commentary and an introductory discussion concerning his life and works is found in Broggiato (2001). This work does not include Σ P. 3.1021–b (=Crates Fr. 1), which Broggiato attributes to Socrates from Argus.

**Leptines** The fragments of Leptines’ works, including the one reference to him in the Pindar scholia, are found in the *LGGA* entry by Meliadò (2018b).

**Menecrates** A collection of some fragments considered by the editor to refer to Menecrates of Nyza, including the two references to Menecrates in the Pindar scholia, is found in the *LGGA* entry by Pagani (2005).

¹Cf. 1.2.1 for this thesis’ principles in attributing fragments.
Theon  Through the discovery of Theon’s name in the marginalia of *POxy* 841 and his hypomnēma on the *Pythians* in *POxy* 2536, our knowledge of Theon’s work on Pindar has greatly improved. The two fragment collections in the form of monographs, by Giese (1867) and Guhl (1969), are now partly obsolete concerning Theon’s activities on Pindar. Giese’s work was published half a century before *POxy* 841 containing marginal annotations attributed to Theon on Pindar’s *Paeans* was published. Guhl was unable to fully incorporate *POxy* 2536 in his collection since it was published in the same year as his dissertation. All fragments of Theon are collected in the *LGGA* entry by Meliadò (2008). A recent study on Theon and his contributions to Pindaric scholarships is that of Merro (2019).

1.4 Content of the Thesis

The thesis consists of two parts. Part I tries more generally to contextualize the fragments. Chapter 2 gives the historical background and context of the studied material. It explores the development of Pindaric scholarship and the early transmission of Pindar’s text, with special focus on the contributions by Aristarchus and Didymus. Chapter 3 identifies the individual Pindarists that were contemporary with or active between Aristarchus and Didymus. They are analysed in separate sections with a focus on defining their identity, floruit and the nature of their scholarly engagement with Pindar. The fourth chapter of part I aims at describing the Pindar philology of the period by exploring key issues in the studied material. Part II contains the actual fragment collection with translation and commentary. Chapter 6 describes our primary sources of Pindar scholarship, and chapter 7 explains the editorial principles behind this fragment collection and its relationship to earlier editions. Chapter 8 offers the text with a critical apparatus and a facing English translation. Commentaries on the individual fragments are found in chapter 9.
Part I
2. History of Scholarship on Pindar

In order to understand these fragments, it is necessary to consider their historical background. The aim of this chapter is to situate the fragment collection within the context of ancient scholarship on Pindar in general as well as of the Hellenistic world, beginning with early scholarship on Pindar; later sections discuss Aristarchus’ and Didymus’ works on Pindar specifically.

2.1 Early Scholarship on Pindar in the Hellenistic Context

Although Pindar’s choral lyric was written for specific occasions, the Alexandrian scholars were centuries later still able to collect seventeen books of lyric that they attributed to him.\(^1\) Pindaric poetry must therefore have been preserved in some form in the period between its original performance and the editorial work of Hellenistic scholars.

Our information about the textual transmission of Pindar before the Hellenistic period is very limited. Some transmission of Pindar’s works may have been purely oral, especially of his gnomic sayings which often became proverbs in their own right.\(^2\) Nonetheless, writing was an important aspect of Greek culture already in Pindar’s lifetime, and it is probable that the re-performance of his poetry depended on written texts (Phillips, 2016, p. 3). A few references to the storage of Pindaric poetry in written form in temples are found. According to the historian Gorgon from Rhodes (\(\Sigma\) O. 7 inscr. a = \(FGrH\) 515 Fr. 18) Olympian 7 was dedicated in the temple of Athena Lindia on Rhodes, written in golden letters. The fragment does not indicate if the dedication was celebrated in connection to the original performance of the ode, as suggested by Jacoby and Carey (2007, p. 201), or at a later period, as suggested by Young (1968, pp.

---

\(^1\)Vita Thomana (ed. Drachmann, vol. 1, pp. 4–8), Vita Ambrosiana (ed. Drachmann, vol. 1, pp. 1–3) and the biography in \(POxy\) 2438 all agree that Pindar’s oeuvre consisted of 17 books, although they differ on the exact genres. Cf. De Kreij (2017) for a discussion of the papyrus and the relationship between the lists.

\(^2\)It is not surprising that Herodotus 3.38, the oldest source of an explicit Pindaric quotation, quotes the proverbial saying that nomos is king of all (= Fr. 169a Maehler). Cf. also Opelt (1967, p. 287), for an example of the transmission of independent Pindaric gnomai in late antiquity.
Chapter 2. History of Scholarship on Pindar

Pausanias (9.16.1) tells us that Pindar’s *Hymn to Zeus Ammon* (Fr. 36 Maehler) was engraved on the side of an altar to Ammon in Thebes erected by Ptolemaeus I (r. 305/4–282 BCE), i.e. long after its original performance. Since *Paeans* by authors from the fourth century BCE were inscribed in stone at Delphi (Philodamus’ *Paean to Dionysus*) and Epidaurus (Isyllus’ *Paean*), it is reasonable to assume that those of Pindar were also kept in some form in sanctuaries. Despite the absence of explicit evidence, it is commonly believed that Pindar’s poems were preserved in written form by the recipients’ families in order to commemorate an ode’s importance to the family (LeVen, 2014, pp. 255–256), and to enable future re-performance (Currie, 2004, pp. 55–56). Due to the physical restrictions of archival preservation of poetry, this will have played a minor role in the circulation of these texts in the Greek world (Hadjimichael, 2019, p. 204). Pindar’s poetry must have been spread through the Greek world by re-performance and/or in books. Re-performance appears to be intended in some victory odes, and some references to lyric poetry in Aristophanes suggest re-performance of lyric poetry at informal occasions or symposia. Such informal performances contributed to the circulation of Pindaric poetry but would tend to be limited to shorter excerpts rather than full songs (Currie, 2004, pp. 53–55).

From the late fifth century BCE we have several quotations of Pindar in Attic authors. Aristophanes directly quotes Pindar’s *Hyporchēma for Hiero* (Fr. 105 Maehler) in *Aves* 926–930 and 941–945. As shown by Hadjimichael (2019, pp. 59–94), Aristophanes’ treatment of Pindar suggests that his audience, i.e. the general public, were not necessarily aware of the Pindaric origin of these lines but were able to recognize them as high melic poetry. In the fourth century BCE, Plato’s engagement with Pindar and lyric poetry in general suggests that he worked with written texts (Irigoin, 1952, pp. 11–26). It is thus probable that at this time at least some of Pindar’s poetry was found in book form in Athens, although these texts would probably only circulate in a small part of the educated population.

Beginning in the late fourth century BCE, the

1. Plutarch explicitly states that Pindar’s *Paeans* were not inscribed in the temple of Pythian Apollo (De Guruditate 511b), but this is said humorously to show the preference of the Amphictyons’ for compact sayings such as “know thyself” over the grand style of Pindar and Homer (Tsatsi, 2020, p. 27). It must not necessarily be understood as a historical source and does not rule out the possibility that Pindar’s *Paeans* were kept in some form within the sanctuary. Cf. Rutherford (2001, p. 144) for early publication on stone of *Paeans* in general.

2. I.e. in portable written form.

3. An explicit example of such a reference is *N*. 4.13–16, which mentions that the laudandus’ deceased father would regularly sing the song in praise of his son if still alive.

4. Thus in *Nub*. 1354–1356, Strepsiades asks his son to recite a victory ode of Simonides after a dinner.

5. A fragment of Eupolis, the poet of Old Comedy, states that Pindar’s poetry was no longer read or taught because of the common people’s ἀφιλοκαλία, “lack of love for beauty” (*PCG* 34).
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Peripatetics had an important influence on the transmission and study of lyric poetry. One aim of the Peripatos was to register, memorialise, and study Greek culture by accumulating written records and creating learned treatises, including biographies on the lyric poets (Hadjimichael, 2019, pp. 134–135). Aristotle’s surviving works occasionally quote Pindar, but the Peripatetic interest in the lyric poets is better attested among his immediate disciples. Dicaearchus of Messana wrote a monograph on Alcaeus (Fr. 105–111 Mirhady), which may have dealt with cultural phenomena in Alcaeus’ poetry (Verhasselt, 2016). Chamaeleon of Heraclea wrote monographs on lyric poets such as Pindar, Sappho, Stesichorus, Lasus, Simonides, and Anacreon, which appear to have focused on artistic innovations and character traits of the poets (Bouchard, 2019, p. 190). They may, at least occasionally, also have discussed authenticity and authorship (Hadjimichael, 2019, pp. 167–168).

Chamaeleon’s *Peri Pindarou* is also the first known work on Pindar, although only two fragments survive (Fr. 34–35 Martano). Fr. 35 Martano is found in Athenaeus (13.573c-574b) in a discussion on courtesans where it is quoted regarding a Corinthian custom of including prostitutes in prayers to Aphrodite. Xenophon of Corinth, the *laudandus* of *Olympian* 13, vowed to dedicate a large number of prostitutes to Aphrodite if victorious at the Olympics. In this context, Chamaeleon quotes a major part of a *skolion* by Pindar (Fr. 122 Maehler), and presents it as written to Xenophon concerning the prostitutes. Chamaeleon clearly engaged with Pindar’s poetry, although different interpretations have been proposed. According to Schorn (2012, p. 434), Chamaeleon’s aim was to defend Pindar from accusations of writing on inappropriate matters, whereas Hadjimichael (2019, pp. 158–161) argues that Chamaeleon interpreted the poems historically and attempted to educe information on customs.

The other extant fragment of Chamaeleon’s *Peri Pindarou*, Fr. 34a–c Martano, relates the story of Pindar’s *Dichterweihe* with a bee putting honeycombs in Pindar’s mouth on Mount Helicon. This fragment could be an example of the method of Chamaeleon, reconstructing the life of authors from their works, that is, if it was derived from Pindar Fr. 152 Maehler, μελισσοτεύκτων κηρίων ἐμὰ γλυκερότερος ὁμφά, “my voice is sweeter than bee-built honeycombs”. A possible source might also have been an actual description by Pindar of his *Dichterweihe*, a common topos in ancient literature known from Hesiod and Archilochus.

---

1. E.g. *Rh.* 1401a (Pindar Fr. 96 Maehler) as an example of false enthymeme.
2. The fragment is found in three variants (*POxy* 2451 B Fr. 1, *Vita Ambrosiana* (ed. Drachmann, vol. 1, pp. 1–3), Eustathius *Prooem. ad Pind.* 27 Kambylis). A slightly different version of the same motif is also found in Philostratus’ *Imagines* 2.12 who does not mention Chamaeleon.
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Early interest in Pindar is found in historians writing on the Greek West, for whom the poet appears to have been an authoritative historical source (Baron, 2012, p. 208). The most famous historian of the West, Timaeus of Tauromedion c. 350–260 BCE), used Pindar’s odes as a source on the Sicilian tyrant Theron’s ancestry (FGrH 566 Fr. 92) and on the spring Arethousa in Syracuse (FGrH 566 Fr. 41). Although Timaeus’ interests did not primarily concern Pindar’s poetry, he must have referred to individual songs of Pindar, since two variant classifications of the Pindaric odes are attributed to him. The scholia on Nemean 1 (Σ N. 1. inscr., 25a = Timaeus FGrH 566 Fr. 142a-b) mention that Timaeus believed the ode to be written for an Olympian victory.\(^1\) As reported in the scholia’s record of the ancients’ disagreement on classifications of Pythian 2, Timaeus (FGrH 566 Fr. 20) did not refer to the ode as a victory ode. Instead he called it a θυσιαστική, “a sacrificial ode”\(^2\).

Our knowledge of Pindaric scholarship greatly improves in the Hellenistic period, traditionally defined as Mediterranean history from Alexander the Great’s death in 323 BCE to the Battle of Actium in 31 BCE, the final end of the Ptolemaic kingdom. This period was characterized by strong monarchies of the Diadochic kingdoms who saw the preservation of literature as a means of gaining power in the Mediterranean.

2.1.1 Alexandria

The foremost centre of learning in the Hellenistic period was Alexandria in Egypt. The city was founded by Alexander the Great in 331 BCE and was later the capital and cultural centre of the Ptolemaic kingdom of Egypt. The first king, Ptolemaeus I Soter, wished to position his kingdom as a cultural power based at least in part on Peripatetic learning. He invited several Peripatetic philosophers to settle in the capital city, including Demetrius of Phaleron, who played an instrumental role in the development of Alexandria and its cultural institutions (Fraser, 1972, pp. 306–307). These included the Mouseion, where scholars were employed to devote themselves to literary and scientific studies, and the adjacent Royal Library, probably founded by Soter’s son and successor Ptolemaeus II Philadelphus. The scholars of the Mouseion devoted themselves to the study of all forms of Greek literature and the Royal Library had the aim to contain all works ever written. It is probable that through this distinctly pan-Hellenic interest the Ptolemaic dynasty “aimed at leadership (or monopoly)

---

\(^{1}\)According to the scholia the reason for Timaeus’ classification were the references to Olympic wreaths in the ode.

\(^{2}\)Lowe (2007, pp. 171–172) suggests that the term θυσιαστική is an older (pre-Callimachean) classification which fell out of use after the arrangement according to occasion of victory was standardized in Callimachus’ Pinakes.
of Greek culture as a means of displaying their (claimed) political leadership over the Hellenized world” (Montana, 2015, p. 81).

According to Strabo 13.1.54, Aristotle taught the kings of Egypt to arrange libraries. Since Aristotle died in 322 BCE and Ptolemaeus I became satrap of Egypt in 323 BCE, proclaiming himself pharaoh only in 305 BCE, this is doubtful on chronological grounds (Dix, 2004, p. 64). Rather, it implies that the Alexandrian library was modelled on Aristotle’s library and testifies to the influence of the Peripatos (Hadjimichael, 2019, pp. 216–217). These ties are further stressed in the fictional *Letter of Aristeas* 9, according to which Demetrius of Phaleron was the library’s first librarian. Tzetzes’ *Prolegomena de Comoedia Aristophanis* 2.4–8 (ed. Koster) also states that Demetrius took part in collecting books for Alexandria.

While Pfeiffer argued against a strong Peripatetic influence on early Alexandrian scholarship and saw anti-Aristotelian tendencies in Callimachus’ literary criticism (Pfeiffer, 1968, pp. 95, 136), Schironi (2018), by a comparison of Aristotle’s *Rhetorica* and *Poetica* with ancient scholia of Aristarchean origin, has shown that Aristarchus “used Aristotelian categories and critical concepts in his work on Homer, especially when dealing with *athetesis* or arguing against Zenodotus’ readings” (Schironi, 2018, p. 441). Thus Aristarchus tends to put Homeric lines in *athetesis* not because they are impossible, but because they are not probable according to the plot, exemplified by the word-pair πιθανος/απιθανος.1 Aristarchus also tries to avoid internal contradictions within Homer’s work, exemplified in the word-pair συμφωνως/ασυμφωνως, similar to Aristotle’s avoidance of what is ὑπενάντιον.2 Although we have less evidence for Aristarchus’ predecessors at Alexandria, the Peripatetic influence was most probably important for them as well, and Nickau (1977, pp. 133–183) shows that Aristotle’s views on avoiding irregularity were important for Zenodotus’ textual decisions.

The library of Alexandria was headed by a chief-librarian, a position held by many of the foremost Hellenistic scholars. Zenodotus of Ephesus (c.325–c.270 BCE) was probably the first head librarian. He was followed by Apollonius Rhodius (c.295–c.215 BCE), the author of the *Argonautica*. Apollonius’ teacher Callimachus (c.305–c.240 BCE) was active at the library but probably not its head. Apollonius was followed by Eratosthenes of Cyrene (c.280–c.194 BCE) and Aristophanes of Byzantium (c.257–c.180 BCE).

During this early phase of Alexandrian scholarship, a large number of texts was collected, catalogued and edited (Montana, 2015, pp. 93–94). According to Tzetzes’ *Prolegomena de Comoedia Aristophanis* 1.1–5, the *diorthosis* or textual criticism on the lyric poets and Homer was assigned to Zenodotus while

---

Lycophron of Calchis and Alexander of Aetolia dealt with the dramatic poets. This early work included Pindar, whose poems were collected and arranged into seventeen books according to genre, and most probably an authoritative edition by Aristophanes of Byzantium (Negri, 2004). This comes as no surprise, as Pindar played an important role within Ptolemaic literature and was the foremost model for laudatory poetry. Allusions to Pindar are common in Callimachus’ elegies celebrating victories at the Nemean games by the Ptolemaic Queen Berenice (Fr. 383 Pfeiffer) and the Ptolemaic statesman Sosibius (Fr. 384 Pfeiffer); his influence is also manifest in non-laudatory poetry, such as Theocritus’ *Idylls* and Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica* (Kampakoglou, 2019).

In the case of Homer, several pre-Alexandrian texts are known by name, and in the case of Attic drama the Alexandrians could have made use of the official texts mentioned in Lycurgus’ laws (Ps-Plutarch *Vitae Decem Oratorum* 841f), but we do not know in what form, or from where Pindar’s poetry reached Alexandria (Hadjimichael, 2019, p. 240). Possibly, some clues might be derived from the *edaphia* referred to in the scholia on *Olympian* 5 (Σ O. 5. inscr.a):

\begin{quote}
Αὕτη ἡ ᾠδὴ ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἐδαφίοις οὐκ ἦν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς Διδύμου ὑπομνήμασιν ἐλέγετο Πινδάρου.
\end{quote}

This ode is not found in the *edaphia*, but it is said to be by Pindar in Didymus’ commentaries.

The *edaphia* have been acknowledged to refer to a collection made by Aristophanes of Byzantium (Ruffa, 2001), Zenodotus (Irigoin, 1952, p. 33) or perhaps even a pre-Alexandrian collection (Gentili et al., 1995, p. lxxv). Since this is the only Pindaric poem where the authenticity is questioned by the scholia, Hadjimichael (2019, pp. 241–245) suggests that the rest of the Pindaric corpus had arrived in Alexandria in one collection, while *Olympian* 5 reached Alexandria as an individual poem. This interesting hypothesis unfortunately does not help us find the origin of the Pindaric corpus. Since we know of Peripatetic work on Pindar, it is possible that such a corpus came from Athens, although we lack any explicit evidence.

The first Alexandrian scholar known to have worked on Pindar is Zenodotus of Ephesus. The variant ἀκροθινία for the transmitted ἀκρόθινα in O. 2.4 is attributed to him by the scholia (Σ O.2.7a). The scholia also mention that Zenodotus recorded a variant reading of *Olympian* 6.55 βεβρεγμένος, although the reading itself has not been transmitted (Σ O. 6.92b).1 Irigoin (1952, p. 32) and Pfeiffer (1968, p. 118) resolve the abbreviation ΖΗ found in the *POxy* 841 and 2442 of Pindar’s *Paeans* as Ζηνόδοτος but Lobel (1961), later supported

---

1Σ Ο. 3.29 mentions Zenodotus’ variant ἐροέσσης for κεροέσσης in Anacreon Fr. 408 PMG.
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by Ferrari (1992), has shown that the abbreviation should rather be resolved as \( \zeta \eta(tτ\alpha\tau) \), “it is inquired, it is discussed”.

Hadjimichael (2019, p. 233) suggests that Zenodotus made the first critical edition of Pindar, which fits well with the information given by Tzetzes, and also with the fact that all surviving fragments of Zenodotus’ work on Pindar concern textual readings. As noted by Phillips (2016, p. 54), these readings could also derive from other sources, such as a lexicographical work.

As mentioned above, Pindar was an important literary model for the poet and scholar Callimachus, who seems to have played a role in the development of the structure of the Alexandrian edition of Pindar. The scholia on Pythian 2 (\( \Sigma . P. 2 \) inscr.) state that Callimachus classified this ode as Nemean.\(^1\) It is probable that this information derives from his Pinakes, a catalogue of the collections of the Royal Library in 120 books. Callimachus’ classification of Pythian 2 does not necessarily mean that Callimachus believed the ode to be written for a Nemean victory, but rather that it was of an unknown provenance or written for victories at minor games (D’Alessio, 1997, p. 53). This practice is again seen in the case of N. 9, 10 and 11, none written for victories at the Nemean games, and may well have been a convention devised by Callimachus. A student of Callimachus, Istrus (FGrH 334 Fr. 77), wrote on Pindar’s life and is quoted next to Chamaeleon as the source for the story of Pindar’s Dichterweihe on Mt. Helicon in the Vita Ambrosiana. In the next generation, Aristophanes of Byzantium made an authoritative edition of Pindaric poems in 17 books ordered according to genre. The Vita Thomana (Drachmann, vol. 1, p. 4-7), an anonymous biography of Pindar found in medieval manuscripts, states that Aristophanes arranged the Pindaric corpus and put Olympian 1 at the head of the collection. The fragmentary biography on Pindar in POxy 2438 also supports this, if we accept Lobel’s supplement in lines 35–36.

\[ \delta\iota\nu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\iota\kappa \varepsilon \delta \varphi\upsilon\zeta(o)\upsilon \iota \varepsilon \lambda \rho\varepsilon\mu\mu\mu\alpha\tau \iota \varepsilon \Lambda\iota\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\tau\omicron\varphi\alpha\nu\zeta \varepsilon \varsigma \beta\omicron\omicron\lambda\iota\alpha \iota \varsigma \]

His poems were divided into seventeen books by Aristophanes

Further information about Aristophanes’ work on Pindar is found in the scholia on Olympian 2 which state that he rejected the line \( \varphi\iota\lambda\varepsilon\omicron\nu\tau\iota \delta \varepsilon \mathrm{Moi}\omicron\sigma\alpha \) (O. 2.27a) on metrical grounds (\( \Sigma . O. 2.48c \)). Despite the athetesis, the line continued to be transmitted in the manuscript tradition. Since Aristophanes apparently took notice of Pindar’s metre in his editorial work and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Comp. 22.106) mentions that Aristophanes divided lyric poetry into smaller metrical units, it is commonly assumed that Aristophanes made

\(^1\)Callimachus also classified choral lyric by Bacchylides (POxy 2387) and Simonides (Callimachus Fr. 441 Pfeiffer).
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A colometric edition of Pindar (Phillips, 2016, pp. 55–60). Aristophanes was probably followed by Apollonius the “Eidographer”. Little is known about him, but according to the Etymologicum Magnum (s. v. Εἰδογράφος) he classified the lyric poetry by musical criteria. This classificatory work also included Pindar, since the scholia on Pythian 2 (Σ. P. 2. inscr.) record that he classified the ode as a Pythian.¹

Aristarchus of Samothrace (c.216–c.145 BCE) was perhaps the greatest of all ancient scholars. The large number of surviving fragments of his scholarly works permits us to reconstruct his work to some degree.² Aristarchus is known for editorial and exegetical work on a significant number of archaic and classical texts. His primary field of interest was Homer, but his work is attested also for lyric poetry, drama, and even prose such as Herodotus.³

Towards the end of Aristarchus’ life, Alexandria as a cultural centre went through a major crisis under persecutions by Ptolemaeus VIII in 145 BCE. Several scholars, such as Dionysius Thrax and Apollonius of Athens, are said to have left the city. Although this must have had a negative impact on the scholarly milieu and the Royal Library, scholarly work appears to have continued. We know that during the late first century BCE scholars such as Didymus and Theon were still active in the city and that the latter was the head of an Alexandrian school of grammarians (Matthaios, 2015, pp. 213–214).

2.1.2 Pergamum

The city of Pergamum gained its independence from the Seleucid Empire in the first half of the third century BCE and was proclaimed a kingdom by its ruler Attalus I Soter in 237 BCE. By this time, Pergamum had become an important power in Asia Minor and its position as a political and cultural power was in part due to generous investments in monuments. One of these monuments was the Library, founded during the reign of the king Eumenes II (r. 197–159 BCE) (Casson, 2001, pp. 48–53). Like the Ptolemies in Egypt, Eumenes attempted to assemble important scholars at the library, the most prominent of whom was Crates of Mallus. According to his entry in the Byzantine encyclopedia Suda (x 2342 ed. Adler = T 1 Broggiato), Crates was a Stoic philosopher and contemporary with Aristarchus. Although Porter (1992, pp. 85–87) has questioned the notion of Crates being an active Stoic, the fragments of his work show that he followed several principles of the Stoics, such as the value of allegorical meaning and the position of euphony as the primary criterion in evaluating poetry (Schironi, 2009, pp. 305–307).

¹No references to musical criteria survive.
²The most recent monograph on Aristarchus’ work on Homer is found in Schironi (2018).
³Aristarchus’ work on Pindar is discussed in section 2.2.
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Crates referred to himself as a κριτικός, “critic”, to affirm his work as a deeper critical and philosophical study of literature in contrast to the textual scholarship of the Alexandrian scholars, the γραμματικοί, “grammarians” (Montana, 2015, p. 149). The philological activity at Pergamum is less known than that in Alexandria, but there appears to have been a viable environment of students of Crates present in Pergamum. Broggiato (2014, pp. 1-7) includes Artemon of Pergamum, Herodicus of Babylon, Zenodotus of Mallus, Hermias, and Tauriscus in “la scuola di Cratete”, a group of authors of grammatical, philosophical, and historical writings that appear to be related in methodology to Crates of Mallus.

Texts of the lyric poets were present in Pergamum and studied by the scholars active there (Hadjimichael, 2019, p. 269). The fragments of Crates of Mallus show that he worked on Stesichorus and Alcman. Also Alexander Polyhistor (FGrH 273), whom the Suda α 1129 (ed. Adler) describes as a grammarian among Crates’ students wrote on toponyms in Alcman (FGrH 273 Fr. 95) and a commentary on Corinna (FGrH 273 Fr. 97). Interest in Pindar is specifically attested for Crates, as well as for Artemon of Pergamum. For other Pergamene scholars we have no explicit evidence of Pindaric studies.  

2.1.3 Other Centres

Several additional cultural centres existed in the Mediterranean world, although not as influential as those in Alexandria and Pergamum, including the islands Cos, where Zenodotus’ teacher Philitas had been active, and Rhodes (Montana, 2015, pp. 70–76). It is also probable that projects similar to the Library of Alexandria existed in the Antigonid and Seleucid kingdoms. According to the surviving biographies of Aratus of Soli, he was active at the Antigonid court in Pella under Antigonus Gonatas (c. 277/6—239 BCE), and he visited the Seleucid king Antiochus I Soter (281–261 BCE). There Aratus made a diorthōsis, i.e. some form of textual critical/editorial work on the Odyssey and Iliad. A library existed in the Seleucid capital of Antioch under the reign of Antiochus III (r. 222–187 BCE) where the poet and grammarian Euphronion of Chalcis was the director (Suda ε 3801 ed. Adler), but we have no further information about this library (Casson, 2001, p. 47). The influence of these centres in the development of Pindaric scholarship cannot be evaluated due to the lack of evidence.

---

1 Cf. section 3.2 for a discussion of Crates’ work on Pindar and section 3.7 for that of Artemon.
2 Whether Asclepiades of Myrlea was active at Pergamum or not is not fully known. Cf. section 3.9.
3 Suda α 3745 (ed. Adler).
4 Cf. section 4.4.1 for this term.
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The expulsions of Alexandrian scholars in 145 BCE led to the spread of Alexandrian scholarship throughout the Greek world. Ps-Scymnus’ *Orbis Descriptio* 16–49 (ed. Müller) and *Suda* δ 430 (ed. Adler) suggest that Aristarchus’ students Apollodorus of Athens and Demetrius Ixion relocated to Pergamum, and several sources state that Aristarchus’ student Dionysius Thrax taught in Rhodes.\(^1\) Since Pergamum and Rhodes may have been Stoic centres, it has been suggested that this period led to an integration of Alexandrian and Pergamene-Stoic ideas, especially in the field of linguistics (Matthaios, 2002, pp. 191–192). A grammatical school following Aristophanes of Byzantium’s teachings may have existed in Tarsus in Asia Minor. This was the home town of the scholars Artemidorus, commentator on Theocritus and Bucolic poetry in general, and Diodorus, commentator on Homer and Pindar,\(^2\) both designated as *Aristophaneioi* (Cohn, 1903).

As Rome became the foremost political power in the Mediterranean, it also gained importance as a scholarly centre during the second and first centuries BCE. According to Suetonius *Gram. et Rhet.* 2 (= T. 3 Broggiato), Crates of Mallus had visited the city on a diplomatic mission in the first half of the second century BCE. During this stay, he gave lectures on textual criticism and interpretation of literature. Several scholars were active in the city during the first century BCE, such as Seleucus and Philoxenus who both worked on Homer (West, 2001, pp. 47–50). Greek lyric was known in Rome at least from the second century BCE and surviving Roman lyricists from the following centuries are heavily influenced by it (Barchiesi, 2009). Among the Romans Pindar was the most celebrated of the lyric poets, the *longe princeps novem lyricorum* (Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.61), and some scholars working on Pindar appear to have been active in Rome during at least parts of their careers, including Aristonicus,\(^3\) and possibly Asclepiades of Myrlea.\(^4\)

2.2 Aristarchus

The previous section established that Chamaeleon wrote a monograph on Pindar and that Aristophanes of Byzantium probably arranged and produced an important edition on Pindar, but Aristarchus of Samothrace (c.216–c.145 BCE) was the first to compose a continuous and systematic commentary on Pindar. About 70 fragments of Aristarchus’ work on Pindar still exist. The source of these fragments is nowhere explicitly referred to as a commentary, but their nature,

---

\(^1\)Strabo 14.665 and Athenaeus *Deipnosophistae* 11.489a-b.

\(^2\)Cf. section 3.17.

\(^3\)Cf. section 3.15.

\(^4\)Cf. section 3.9. Körte (1900) suggested that Chrysippus was Cicero’s slave in Rome but this is very speculative.
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as well as their even distribution among all the four surviving books of Pindar’s poetry, strongly suggest that they derive from commentaries on the Victory Odes. We have no indisputable fragments on other books, but nothing tells against Aristarchus’ work also encompassing Pindar’s non-epinician poetry,\(^1\) Since Aristarchus wrote commentaries on other authors, including the lyric poets Anacreon, Archilochus and Alcman (Hadjimichael, 2019, pp. 234–235), it is reasonable to assume that the fragments derive from a commentary on Pindar. Aristarchus’ fragments contain several variant readings,\(^2\) and \(\Sigma I. 5.47\) (= Fr. 82 Horn) tells us that he had marked up Pindar’s text using a critical sign, presumably the \(\chi\). It is hence probable that he established some form of a critical text linked to a commentary with critical signs.\(^3\) The surviving fragments concern diverse aspects of Pindar’s poetry and range from syntactical explanations of grammatical constructions (\(\Sigma N. 2.9a = Fr. 59\) Horn), discussions of the meaning of individual words (\(\Sigma O. 3.66b = Fr. 16\) Horn, \(\Sigma N. 1.38 = Fr. 57\) Horn, \(\Sigma I. 7.55a = Fr. 85\) Horn, \(\Sigma P. 6.5a = Fr. 53\) Horn), and paraphrases of full lines of Pindar (\(O. 8.5b = Fr. 30\) Hor, \(N. 1.34b = Fr. 56\) Horn), to literary parallels (e.g. \(\Sigma P. 4.14 = Fr. 44\) Horn cites Homer, \(N. 7.127c = Fr. 73\) Horn cites Hesiod), as well as discussions on history, mythology and geography (e.g. \(\Sigma I. 2.\text{inscr}.a = Fr. 80\) Horn on the relationship between Xenocrates of Acragas and Thrasybulus, \(\Sigma O. 6.23a = \text{Aristarchus Fr. 20 Horn}\) on the number of funeral pyres raised for the Seven Against Thebes, and \(\Sigma O. 6.158b = Fr. 24\) Horn which offers a brief description of the island of Ortygia).

The communis opinio recognizes Aristarchus’ competence in textual questions, yet most modern scholars criticize his lack of understanding of the historical context of Pindar’s poetry. This view goes back at least to Eugen Horn who in 1883 in his De Aristarchi Studiis Pindaricis concluded that Aristarchus did not investigate historical matters, nor made use of historical sources in his Pindaric studies.\(^4\) Horn further attributed Aristarchus’ lack of interest in historical matters to the unimportance of history in the study of Homer.\(^5\)

Horn’s opinion was repeated by Deas (1931, p. 8), according to whom:

\[\text{1}\] It is possible that some abbreviations in on Pindar’s Paeans refer to him (Irigoin, 1952, p. 55). Horn’s collection of Aristarchus’ fragments also contains a possible fragment of a commentary on a Dithyramb (Fr. 97 Horn).

\[\text{2}\] E.g. \(\Sigma O. 2.140a\) tells us that Aristarchus Fr. 9 Horn wrote \(\pi\sigma\sigma\alpha\) instead of \(\pi\sigma\sigma\zeta\) in \(O. 2.77\).

\[\text{3}\] Cf. section 4.1 for the use of critical signs.

\[\text{4}\] “In primis [Aristarchus] tam procul habet quodvis veritatis ac fidei historicae studium, ut ad absurdissima commenta delapsus sit. Neque enim, ubi opus erat, fundamenta historica quaeam rebus subessent, disquirebat neque autores historicos consulendos duceret. Immo suam propriam sententiam conformabat, id studens, ut rei ipsi expedienda succurreret” (Horn, pp. 9–10).

\[\text{5}\] “Nimirum haud aliter in Homero iudicavit. At in poeta mythico non erat cur historica fundamenta examinare deberet: quo magis hic animum obvertas necesse est in Pindaro, qui poeta historicis temporibus, non mythicis vixerit” (Horn, p. 10).
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it is where matters of fact and questions of history or mythology, deserving and requiring special investigation, are involved, that Aristarchus shows in the worst light. Nearly always when his commentary is cited on points of this nature, he seems to be at fault.

Irigoin (1952, p 56), too, agrees with Horn and Deas, but attributes the lack of interest in history to Aristarchus’ textually internal method of interpretation.1 According to the French scholar, Aristarchus consciously avoided historical sources, and preferred to explain Pindar from his own poetry. This view has recently been supported by Broggiato (2011),2 and Tissoni (2014).3 The sole opponent to this idea of Aristarchus’ work is Vassilaki (2009), who argues that Aristarchus did make use of textually external historical information in his work. Among Vassilaki’s examples may be mentioned Aristarchus’ explanation of the invocation of the Tyndaridae in the preamble of Olympian 3.

$\Sigma$ O. 3.1a Τυνδαρίδαις: ζητεῖται τί δῆποτε ο Πίνδαρος Ολυμπικὸν ἔμοιν γράφον εὐχέται τοῖς Διοσκούροις προσηνεῖς τῇ ᾠδῇ γενέσθαι· ἐχρῆν γὰρ, εἴπερ ἄρα, Ἡρακλέα τὸν διθέντα τὸν ἀγώνα κατακλεῖσθαι. Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 12 Horn) μὲν οὖν τὴν ἀπορίαν διαλύων τοὺς θεοὺς τούτους σφόδρα ἐν ᾿Ακράγαντι φησὶ τιμᾶσθαι.

Sons of Tyndareus: The question is why Pindar writing an Olympic hymn prays that through the ode they should delight the Dioscuri. Rather he should, if at all, call on Heracles, who founded the games. In his solution of the problem Aristarchus therefore says that these Gods are much honoured in Acragas.

$\Sigma$ O. 3.1c ο δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 12 Horn) φησι παρὰ τοῖς ᾿Ακράγαντοις διὰ τιμῆς εἶναι τοὺς Διοσκούρους, καὶ πατρίῳ ἔθει καὶ νῦν αὐτοὺς χρῆσθαι.

Aristarchus says that the Dioscuri are held in honour by the Acragans and that they even now use the ancestral custom.

1 Cf. section 4.2.1.
2 “The principle of ‘explaining Homer by Homer’ that Aristarchus so successfully applied to the epics shows his limitations when used to interpret a text, such as Pindar’s, so closely associated with contemporary events and with the towns and family circles of the poet’s patrons” (Broggiato, 2011, p. 552).
3 “The goal of Aristarchus was to clarify the meaning of the text, which he explained by adducing other passages from the same poet. But though this approach may have worked with Homer, it was less well suited to Pindar, an adequate account of whose mythological, historical, and geographical references would have required wider research drawing on external sources” (Tissoni, 2014, p. 7).
2.2. Aristarchus

Aristarchus here clearly attempts to explain Pindar historically. We can not, however, know if his suggestion was deduced only from the text of Pindar, or if Aristarchus here relied on external evidence for a cult of the Dioscuri at Acragas. The temporal adverb νῦν in the parenthetic reference to the hereditary custom might suggest that Aristarchus says that the custom was still found in Acragas during Aristarchus’ own lifetime, which would suggest the incorporation of external knowledge, as implied by Fränkel (1961, p. 395). The adverb might, however, also refer to the context of the poem and be understood as a reference to the use of the ancestral practice by Pindar.¹

Another example given by Vassilaki is Aristarchus’ explanation of O. 5.12-13:

καὶ σεμνοὺς ὀχετούς, Ἱππαρις οἷσιν ἄρδει στρατόν
κολλᾷ τε σταδίων θαλάμων ταχέως ὑψίγυιον ἄλσος

[he sings of] the sacred canals, through which the Hipparis waters
the people
and quickly welds a towering grove of sturdy dwellings.³

Aristarchus argued (Σ O. 5.20e, 27b, 29e = Fr. 17 Horn) that the Hipparis supplied the city of Camarina with clay from which houses were built, and compares this to the supply of mud by the Nile and the Acheulous. There is no reason to assume that Aristarchus made use of historical sources on Camarina’s geography, but he clearly incorporates textually external knowledge by comparing Pindar’s description of the Hipparis, and his own suggested explanation, with the Nile and Acheulous.

To summarize, the surviving fragments of Aristarchus do not show that he actively avoided textually external sources. He often refers to other authors than Pindar, and Homer especially is often present in Aristarchus’ work on Pindar. Questions of language and style are illustrated by Homeric parallels and several of Aristarchus’ textual corrections aim to make Pindar’s mythological narrative harmonize with Homer. ⁴ Aristarchus also suggested emendations due

¹Vassilaki (2009) argues that the “ancestral custom” refers to Acragans continuing to celebrate the Dioscuri as did the ancestors of Theron in Argus.
²Snell-Maehler insert a comma here, ἔρειε στρατόν, κολλᾷ ... but Aristarchus must have also understood the clause begun by κολλᾷ as part of the relative clause.
³Race (1997b) translates “and he quickly”, but Aristarchus understood the subject of κολλᾷ, “welds” to be the Hipparis.
⁴In Σ P. 4.14 Aristarchus Fr. 44 Horn says that Pindar’s ἀφείγωντι μαστῷ (P. 4.8), said of Cyrene, is an adaption of the Homeric οὖθαρ ἀρούρης (Il. 9.141). According to Σ P. 3.75 Aristarchus Fr. 42 Horn wrote βάματι δ’ ἐν τριτάτῳ instead of βάματι δ’ ἐν πρώτῳ in P. 3.42 because of the Homeric τρὶς μὲν ὀρέξατ’ ἱών (Il. 13.20).
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to Pindaric clashes with other mythological texts, such as the *Cypria*. He also incorporated his knowledge of the world in general when explaining Pindar, as can be seen in the scholia on *O. 5.12–13*. Although Aristarchus did not restrict himself to exclusively interpreting Pindar by Pindar, it is true that references to historical sources are commonly lacking, especially in comparison to Didymus, and the number of non-literary sources quoted is limited.

2.3 Didymus

Together with Aristarchus, Didymus is the ancient Pindarist who has left the largest number of surviving fragments to posterity. Braswell (2013), the latest editor of Didymus’ work on Pindar, counts 68 fragments – as well as some dubious fragments – which go back to commentaries on, at least, the *Victory Odes* and the *Paeans*.

According to his entry in the *Suda* (δ 872 = T 1 Braswell), Didymus lived in Alexandria in the late first century BCE and was called Χαλκέντερος, “Bronzeguts”, due to his enormous productivity of more than 3500 books. Didymus’ work covered most aspects of ancient literary scholarship and ranged from grammatical and lexicographical work to commentaries on most Greek authors writing in verse as well as the Attic orators (Harding, 2006, p. 2–3). Didymus had an important role within Pindaric scholarship, both as a contributor to the interpretation of the poet’s work and as a compiler of older works. Since Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1889, p. 184), most studies argue that Didymus’s work itself was the source of the Pindar scholia, by means of a compilation made in the second century BCE.

Braswell (2013, pp. 123–125) emphasizes a number of features of Didymus’ commentary, including his frequent use of historians, quotations of earlier poets, textual criticism, discussions of the relevance of myths in Pindar’s odes, explanations in terms of cause and accident, the authenticity of odes, as well as the lack of aesthetic criticism. Some of these features, such as textual criticism, relevance of myth, and quotation of earlier poets, are typical for most Pindarists. The outstanding

---

1 E.g. in *Σ N. 10.114a*, Aristarchus Fr. 75 Horn preferred to read ἤμενον instead of the transmitted ἤμενος in *N. 10.61* “following the *Cypria*”, ἄκολούθως τῇ ἐν τοῖς Κυπρίοις λεγομένη ἱστορίᾳ.

2 Possible examples include *Σ N. 1.49c* = Fr. 58 Horn where Aristarchus appears to refer to earlier scholars’ explanations of the inclusion of the Heracles myth in *Nemean 1* and *Σ N. 1.3* = Aristarchus Fr. 55 Horn where he mentions that according to “some” (*ἐννοοῦ*), Ortygia is the birth-place of Aphrodite.

3 This number is very high but may not be impossible if we suppose that each of these volumes refers to a commentary on the individual books of the Homeric epics or even of individual Pindaric odes. Cf. Harding (2006, pp. 1–4) and Braswell (2013, p. 29).

4 Cf. section 6.1 for a discussion of the origin of the scholia.
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feature in Didymus’ commentary is instead his use of historians. The wide array of historical authors cited by Didymus is striking and ranges from the well known author Timaeus of Tauromenion to local historians such as Theotimus (FGrH 470 Fr. 1, Σ P. 5.34 = Fr. 28 Braswell), who wrote on Cyrene, and Pythaenetus (FGrH 299 Fr. 2a, N. 6.53a = Fr. 63 Braswell) who wrote on Aegina. Related to this frequent use of secondary sources is also Didymus’ use of older commentaries. According to Deas (1931, p. 19), Didymus’ commentary was a variorum commentary, in principle a compilation of older commentaries. Furthermore, he believed Didymus to be our actual source for the fragments of all earlier scholars.¹ Although the transmission of early Pindaric scholarship might have been more complex than this,² it does appear probable that Didymus himself is the source of many fragments of pre-Didymean scholars. Although Didymus generally does not quote other Pindarists directly, his fragments are found next to those of other Pindarists in a doxographic fashion about 50 times in the Pindar scholia. That Didymus is often the youngest scholar and placed at the end of the list of opinions strongly suggests that his work was the source and that the first person statements of his commentary were simply replaced by the name Didymus by later compilers (Prodi, 2021). Most commonly, he is quoted next to Aristarchus, but his fragments are also found next to several Pindarists active after Aristarchus.³

2.4 After Didymus

Rudolf Pfeiffer (1968, pp. 274–279) concludes the first volume of his History of Classical Scholarship with a discussion of Didymus. Didymus was by no means the last scholar active in antiquity, nor even in Alexandria, which continued to be an influential centre of philological education until the sixth century CE (Matthaios, 2015, p. 206). Yet, in the case of Pindar, Didymus does mark the end of an era. Didymus’ contemporaries Aristonicus and Theon studied Pindar,⁴ as did the grammarian Tryphon (late first century BCE), who according to the

¹The supreme importance of Didymus as the chief, if not the sole, intermediary between his predecessors and his successors has long been recognised; and there can be no dispute that, roughly speaking, we know of his predecessors only what later compilers chose to extract from his great commentary” (Deas, 1931, p. 19).
²Cf. Ucciardello (2012), Merro (2019), and Prodi (2021) for a discussion of Didymus’ relationship to the scholia.
³Aristonicus (Frs. 1 and 3 = Didymus Frs. 1 and 13 Braswell), Chaeris (Frs. 8 and 10 = Didymus Frs. 26 and 40 Braswell), Ammonius (Fr. 3 and 6 = Didymus Frs. 25 and 43 Braswell), Aristodemus (Frs. 2b, 3, 5, and 6 = Didymus Frs. 20, 21, 54 and 56 Braswell), Chrysippus (Frs. 2 and 4 = Didymus Frs. 40 and 66 Braswell), Asclepiades (Fr. 10 = Fr. 41 Braswell), Callistratus (Frs. 2 and 5 = Didymus Fr. 42 Braswell) and Dionysius Phaselites (Fr. 2 = Fr. 62 Braswell).
⁴Cf. sections 3.15 and 3.16.
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*Suda* τ 1115 (ed. Adler) wrote a work on the dialects of Homer, Simonides, Pindar and the other lyricists. As noted by Ippolito (2008), it is very possible that this was in fact two works, one on Homer and one on the Doric language of choral lyric. Unfortunately no fragments of this work survive.¹ Nonetheless, very few Pindarists younger than Didymus are known by name. Scholarly figures who may have worked on Pindar include Didymus’ student Apion, whose work on other lyric poets such as Alcaeus and Simonides is referred to in several papyrus fragments.² He may very well also have studied Pindar, although no evidence survives.³ Evidence of continued scholarship on Pindar is also found in other sources. On the one hand, Eustathius refers to a biography on Pindar by Plutarch (first century CE) (*Prooem. ad Pind. 25 Kambylis*) and on the other hand, marginalia in the *Paeans* papyri *P*Oxy 841 and 2442 probably contain references to Nicanor who was active in the second century CE (Montana, 2006b). According to the *Suda* π 43 (ed. Adler), a certain Palamedes of Elea wrote a *hypomnêma* on Pindar. If this scholar is identical with the lexicographer and character of the same name in Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae*, his *floruit* should be placed around the year 200 CE (Deas, 1931, p. 44–45).⁴ These scattered references show that Pindar’s works did not cease to be read or studied in the centuries following Didymus, but the scholarly work performed in this period did not attain as authoritative a status as that of the Hellenistic grammarians. Perhaps the foremost contribution to Pindaric scholarship in this period was precisely the transmission of the older commentaries and the compilation of the Pindar scholia, a process which probably began in the late second century CE.⁵

---

¹Three fragments of Tryphon do mention Pindar, although with no reference to his dialect.  
²Cf. Bremmer (2005, p. 322) for a list of papyri and other sources to Apion’s work on lyric poets.  
³Later sources mentioned in the Pindar scholia include Amyntianus in *Σ. O. 3.52*, who is possibly identical to the Amyntianus who dedicated a work to the emperor Marcus Aurelius (121–180 CE, r. 161–180) mentioned by Phot.*Bibl.* 131.97a; Aelius Herodian in *Σ. O. 1.18a* and *P. 3.65*, whose date is known from *Suda* τ 546 (ed. Adler); and Hephaestion in *Σ. I. 5.inscr. a*, who may be identical with the teacher of Aurelius’ brother Lucius Verus (Deas, 1931, p. 29).  
⁴Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1889, p. 186) suggested that this work was identical to the second century epitome of earlier commentaries from which the medieval scholia originate.  
⁵This mostly anonymous process is explored in more detail in chapter 6.1.
3. Between Aristarchus and Didymus

This section offers introductions to the lives and works of the individual scholars in the fragment collection, including an assessment of the nature of their Pindaric scholarship. Each entry discusses the identity of the scholar, his floruit, and, if relevant, works on other texts, before proceeding to a description of their work on Pindar.

3.1 Callistratus

The name Callistratus is mentioned six times in the Pindar scholia. This scholar is probably to be identified with Callistratus, a student of Aristophanes of Byzantium, contemporary with Aristarchus and possibly his rival. We may infer that Callistratus was a student of Aristophanes of Byzantium, since he is referred to as Aristophaneios by Athenaeus. Σ Ar. Thesm. 917 (ed. Regtuit) also refers to Callistratus as a student of Aristophanes (Montana, 2008, pp. 78–79). If this identification is correct, Callistratus’ floruit should be put in the first half of the second century BCE, making him contemporary with Aristarchus.

In addition to his scholarly work on Pindar, fragments from other scholiastic corpora give proof that he also worked on Homer, Hesiod, tragedy, and comedy. Particularly many references to his work are found in the scholia on Aristophanes, where he is quoted about 30 times (Montana, 2015, p. 128).

A recurring feature of Callistratus’ Pindaric fragments is his interest in the classification of odes and in their contexts and historical background. In Fr. 1 we are told that he classified Pythian 2 as an Olympian, and several fragments point to an interest in the persons celebrated in Pindar’s odes, as well as in their connection to Pindar and within the contexts of his poetry. In

1 Σ P. 2. inscr., Σ N. 3.1.c, Σ N. 7.150a, Σ I. 2. inscr. a, Σ I. 2.19a, Σ I. 5. inscr. c.
2 Due to Athenaeus’ anecdote regarding Callistratus’ critique of Aristarchus for not dressing neatly (Deipn. 1.21c.), modern scholarship tends to see a rivalry between the two scholars, cf. Montana (2015, p. 127).
3 Athenaeus Deipnosophistae 1.21c, 6.263e–f.
4 Aristophaneios is also used of later scholars, cf. section 3.17.
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Frs. 4–5 Callistratus comments on *Isthmian* 2 that Xenocrates, the father of the *laudandus* Thrasybulus, did not give Pindar the agreed payment, and Fr. 6, identifies the *laudandus* of *Isthmian* 5 as Phylacidas. This interest in the historical individuals mentioned in Pindar’s odes is paralleled by his interest in the identification of subjects of satires in his commentaries on Aristophanes (Montana, 2007).

Most of Callistratus’ conclusions may well be derived from Pindar’s text and mere guesswork. Yet an exception is found in Fr. 2 where Callistratus appears to show knowledge of the geography of Aegina not derived from Pindar’s odes. Callistratus is here quoted with an explanation as to why Pindar calls for the Muses to go to Aegina while simultaneously saying that the choir is waiting at “the water of Asopus” (ὕδατι ἀσωπιῷ) in *N*. 3.3–4. The request for the Muses to come to Aegina was deemed problematic by ancient scholars who identified the waters with the river Asopus in mainland Greece. Callistratus’ solution was instead to identify the water with the spring Asopis in Aegina. Although this could be pure speculation on Callistratus’ part, there are several indications that Callistratus’ theory is correct.¹ Hence, Callistratus also incorporated textually external knowledge in his Pindaric studies.

3.2 Crates of Mallus

Crates is quoted on two occasions in the Pindar scholia.² This scholar is identical with Crates of Mallus, who was mentioned above as the primary scholarly figure in Pergamum.³ The manuscript C, attributes Fr. 1 to Socrates, possibly of Argus (*FGrH* 340), which is why Broggiato (2001, p. xxiv) argues that the attribution of Fr. 1 to Crates is incorrect. As shown in the commentary on Fr. 1, it is not necessary to follow the reading of C, which may be a scribal error due to other references to the name Socrates in the scholia on the same ode.

Crates was active in the first half of the second century. Suetonius (*Gram. et Rhet.* 2 = T 3 Broggiato) says that Crates visited Rome close to the death of Ennius, which puts his visit around 169 BCE.⁴ Suetonius further tells us that Crates was Aristarchus’ contemporary, a piece of information supported also by the biography in the *Suda* x 2342 (ed. Adler = T 1 Broggiato) and Strabo 13.1.55 (= T 6 Broggiato)

¹ Cf. commentary on fragment 2 for further discussion.
² ¹Σ P. 3.102 = Fr. 1, *N*. 2.17c = Fr. 2 (=Fr. 84 Broggiato).
³ Cf. section 2.1.2.
⁴ Ciceron *Brut.* 78 puts Ennius’ death in the consulship of Quintus Marcius and Gnaeus Servilius (169 BCE). For Crates’ visit to Rome, cf. section 2.1.3.
3.3. Ammonius

Crates is best known for his work on Homer, where his hermeneutical approach was characterized by allegoresis. His studies did, however, also extend to Hesiod and several lyric poets besides Pindar, such as Alcman (= Crates Fr. 82 Broggiato) and Stesichorus (= Crates Fr. 83 Broggiato).

A variant reading of N. 2.11 by Crates is referred to in Σ. N. 2.17c (Fr. 2 = Fr. 84 Broggiato). The scholion reports that Crates read θερεῖαι Πελειάδων, “Pleiades of the summer”, where the paradosis has ὀρειάν Πελειάδων, “Pleiades of the mountains”. Crates’ motivation is stated to be that the cluster Pleiades rises in summer. It is possible that this conjecture was motivated by Crates’ intention to show Pindar’s knowledge of the physical world, similar to his approach to Homer, but it might also be caused by misreading of round uncials, as suggested by Young (1965, p. 249).

The two references show that Crates took an interest in Pindar’s poetry but due to the lack of context it is not possible to determine whether Crates’ opinions derive from a commentary on Pindar or from external works.

3.3 Ammonius

The name Ammonius is found on seven occasions in the Pindar scholia. These references most probably go back to Ammonius, son of Ammonius, an Aristarchean scholar from Alexandria mentioned in the Suda α 1640 (ed. Adler) and in numerous scholia and other paraliterary texts. Daude et al. (2013) mention the possibility that Fr. 1 (Σ O. 1.122c) derives from the grammarian with the same name active in Alexandria in the fourth century CE. Although an interesting hypothesis, this suggestion is less probable as there are very few references to ancient authorities later than Didymus in the Pindar scholia (Irigoin, 1952, pp. 74–75).

Ammonius’ entry in the Suda puts him in the second century BCE. According to it and the scholia on the Iliad, Ammonius “took over” (διαδέχεσθαι) the school of Aristarchus. The simple interpretation of this expression is that Ammonius succeeded Aristarchus as the leader of the school. The Suda further states that Ammonius was active before Didymus and Augustus. Blau

---

1Cf. section 4.2.2.
2Cf. section 4.2.2 for Crates’ approach to literature.
3Broggiato (2001, p. xxiv) argues that the fragment does not derive from a work on Pindar but from his work on Homer since Crates also discusses the Pleiades in a comment on Homer Od. 12.62–3 (= Crates Fr. 59 Broggiato).
4Σ O. 1.122c, Σ P. 2.inscr., Σ P. 4.44b, 93b, 313a, Σ N. 3.16b, Σ N. 4.53b.
5Cf. below.
6Cf. also the commentary below on the fragment.
7Suda α 1640 (ed. Adler), Σ II. 10.397–99a (Λ).
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(1883, pp. 6–7) thought it likely that Ammonius was a pupil of Aristarchus and probably his direct successor as head of the school. Ammonius is also referred to as Ἄριστάρχειος in Σ II. 10.397–9b (A), which may indicate that he was Aristarchus’ student. Another indication that Ammonius was a student of Aristarchus is the fact that he engaged very intensely with Aristarchus’ work, as is seen in surviving titles such as the Περὶ τοῦ μὴ γεγονέναι πλείονας ἐκδόσεις τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως, “On the fact there were no multiple editions of Aristarchus’ recension”, mentioned in Σ II. 10.397–399a (A) and the Περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως, “On the Re-edited Recension (i.e. of Aristarchus)” mentioned in Σ II. 19.365–8a1 (A). These titles have been the subject of intense debate. Schironi (2018, pp. 336-38) argues that the surviving titles show that Ammonius was not Aristarchus’ direct student, since debate on Aristarchus’ editions could not have been raised while his own pupils were still living. However, as noted by D’Alessandro (2020, p. 19), it is possible that a debate regarding the nature of Aristarchus’ work began already at his departure from Alexandria in 145 BCE or after his death in 144 BCE. To this it should be added that Ammonius’ work would not have been directed to other personal acquaintances of Aristarchus, who supposedly had some knowledge about the nature of the edition, but to those who did not have Ammonius’ precise knowledge of the nature of Aristarchus’ sources. If these works were written late in Ammonius’ life, perhaps 30 or 40 years after Aristarchus’ death, it will come as no surprise if the nature of Aristarchus’ editions was debated.

McNamee (2007, p. 38) and Montana (2015, p. 156) understand Ammonius’ succession after Aristarchus as the head of the school as an indication that he also succeeded Aristarchus as the head of the Royal Library. This view is complicated by the list of librarians preserved on POxy 1241 where Aristarchus’ direct successor is named as Cydas, although Ammonius could be identical to the grammarian Ammonius mentioned in the papyrus as active during the reign of Ptolemaeus IX Lathyrus (116–107 and 88–81 BCE). Since no mention of the library is made in the Suda or the Homer scholia we may however be content to accept that Ammonius was a leader among Aristarchus’ followers and should not also attribute to him the librarianship. To summarize, there is no need to

1 The adjective is also used of later scholars, such as Didymus, to describe them as belonging to the Aristarchean scholarly tradition (Braswell, 2013, p. 106).
2 Cf. Schironi (2018, pp. 36–38) for a discussion of earlier research. Schironi herself plausibly suggests that Ammonius in these works argued that Aristarchus only published one edition himself and that there was some debate on the subject, due to the existence of a “Re-edited Recension” connected to Aristarchus, perhaps a set of annotations or an edition by his pupils.
3 “His work on the editions of Aristarchus can be understood only if these editions were almost forgotten and if Aristarchus’ direct disciples were no longer living” (Schironi, 2018, p. 38).
4 For a critical assessment of the historical value of this papyrus cf. Murray (2012).
disregard the information in Ammonius’ biography in the *Suda*. He appears to have been a prominent follower of Aristarchus who dedicated himself not only to the study of Homer and Pindar but also to understanding, explaining and defending Aristarchus’ work on Homer. His *floruit* is to be placed in the second half of the second century BCE. In addition to his work on Homer and Pindar, Ammonius also wrote on comedy and is cited next to Chaeris in *POxy* 2811, a commentary on a comic *adespoton*.

Ammonius’ work on Pindar was probably a commentary, as is suggested by the distribution of the fragments within the *Victory Odes* and their contents. The seven surviving fragments contain one metaphorical interpretation (Fr. 1), comments on myth (Fr. 3, Fr. 5, Fr. 6) and geography (Fr. 4), historical interpretation (Fr. 7), and the classification of an ode (Fr. 2). Ammonius’ fragments thus cover a wide range of topics that point to an interest in myth, history and geography. No textual variants are explicitly attributed to Ammonius by the scholia, although Fr. 6 presupposes a text differing from that of modern editions. Ammonius is however not the source of the variant, which was already accepted by Aristarchus. Lehrs (1873, p. 10) suggested that the surprising interpretation in Fr. 1 of Pindar’s *ἔγχος Οἰνομάου*, “Oenomaus’ spear” (*O. 1.76*), as referring to Oenomaus’ chariot depends on a variant reading *ἔντος Οἰνομάου*, “Oenomaeus’ gear”, which he suggests was Ammonius’ conjecture. This is less probable than Ammonius simply interpreting the passage metaphorically.

Some of Ammonius’ fragments on Pindar suggest that he made use of Aristarchus’ textually internal methods and attempted to understand Pindar in a way that enabled internal consistency within the Pindaric corpus. This can be seen in Fr. 5 on *P. 4.176* where Pindar refers to Orpheus as being *ἐξ’Απόλλωνος* “from Apollo”. Noticing that the literal interpretation “son of Apollo” would result in an inconsistency within the Pindaric corpus, Ammonius interpreted the phrase metaphorically, taking it as a reference to Orpheus’ musical talent. Ammonius supports his interpretation with an example from Hesiod. As noted above, Ammonius devoted himself to the understanding of his master’s work on Homer. Also in his Pindaric scholarship, Ammonius *grosso modo* follows his master’s views in Fr. 6 and, with minor variations, Fr. 7.

In Fr. 4 Ammonius applies knowledge of Libyan geography when explaining Pindar’s reference to Cyrene as *κελαινέφης*, “dark-clouded”, in *P. 4.52* from the fact that it only rains there in the whole of Libya. Ammonius’ method was thus not limited to textually internal interpretation, but included external knowledge when necessary in understanding Pindar.

---

1 Fr. 128c Maehler names Oeagrus as Orpheus’ son, cf. commentary on Ammonius Fr. 5.
2 This is obviously not an example of textually internal interpretation, but, as shown by Nünlist (2015), the use of literary parallels was common already in Aristarchus.
3.4 Aristodemus

There are ancient authorities named Aristodemus referred to on 12 occasions in the Pindar scholia. Also, Athenaeus refers to a work *Peri Pindarou* by Aristodemus in at least three books (*Deipnosophistae* 11.495e–496a).

Since Harpocration (*Lexeis of the Ten Orators s. ν. ε 39 ed. Keaney*) attributes the content of ΣO 3.21b-22a to a certain Aristodemus of Elis (*FGrH* 414 Fr. 2a–b), Boeckh (1819, p. xiv) originally attributed all the 12 fragments to him. This identification was rightly called into question by Schwartz (1895a), since Aristodemus of Elis, a historian of uncertain date whose fragments appear to derive from local history of Elis or a list of Olympic victors, hardly can be the Pindarist Aristodemus, who is described as Ἀλέξανδρευς (Fr. 9) and ὁ Ἀριστάρχου μαθητὴς (Fr. 5) by the Pindar scholia.

An Aristodemus with the epithet Θῆβαιος, “Theban”, probably identical with the author of the *Thebaika Epigrammata*, a history on Thebes, is mentioned next to a fragment of Pindar’s *Hyporchêmata* (= Fr. 113 Maehler) in the scholia on Theocr. 7.103a. Schwartz (1895b) suggested that Aristodemus of Thebes had commented on the *Hyporchêmata* and was identical to the scholar quoted in the Pindar scholia. He further argued that this was an Alexandrian scholar and writer on Theban history who relocated to Thebes after the expulsions of Aristarchean scholars by Ptolemaeus Euergetes II and gained the citizenship there. Jacoby accepted Schwartz’ equation of the Alexandrian and Theban Aristodemus but only included seven references to Aristodemus from the Pindar scholia under the entry *FGrH* 383.

In her recent survey of Frs. 5, 7, 8 and 11, Poerio (2014, pp. 99–100) argues that “lo storico tebano e il filologo alessandrino sono la stessa persona, dal momento che sia i Θῆβαιακά ἐπιγράμματα sia il Περὶ Πινδάρου documentano il medesimo metodo di lavoro e l’utilizzo di materiale epigrafico e tradizioni letterarie come fonti documentarie”. Poerio’s observations on the methods used by Aristodemus the Pindarist are most certainly correct but her study does not give any conclusive evidence for identifying the two persons as one and the same. Poerio builds several arguments based on the methods used by the author(s) of the fragments, but these are inconclusive. According to her both scholars used literary sources to reconstruct the historical contexts of Pindar’s

---

1 ΣO 3.21b-22a, ΣO 6.23a, ΣO 10.55b, ΣO 10.55c, ΣO 10.83b, ΣP 3.137b, ΣN 7.1a, ΣN 7.56a, ΣN 7.70, ΣN 7.150a, ΣI 1.11c, ΣI 1.85b. The Spartan warrior Aristodemus is additionally referred to in ΣP 5.92, 5.105b, ΣI 2.15c, 2.17, 2.18a-b and ΣI 7.18a, and a son of Hercules with the same name in ΣI 4.104g.


3 *Deipnosophistae* 11.495e–496a, ΣO 3.21b-22a, O. 6.23a, O. 10.55c, O. 10.83b, P. 3.137b, N. 7.56a, I. 1.11c, 79c.
3.4. Aristodemus

ode. Since the use of external sources is not unheard of among Pindarists,\(^1\) Aristodemus’ reference to Simonides to defend his stance in Fr. 7 is thus not sufficient evidence for identifying him as the Theban homonym. Poerio further suggests that the metaphorical interpretation of Pindar’s use of ἕλκω, “tear”, in Fr. 8 goes back to Theban myths on canines, but this is far-fetched since canines are not typical in Boeotian myths. She also argues that Aristodemus’ interest in *Nemean* 7 (Frs. 5–8) goes back to the special relationship between Pindar and Aegina, the home of the ode’s laudandus, as well as between Thebes and Aegina. *Nemean* 7, was however the subject of much debate from Callistratus and Aristarchus and onwards, as described by Heath (1993). That Aristodemus takes part in the interpretation of the ode suggests an scholarly interest in Pindar rather than in Thebes, since no explicit Theban connotations are present in the surviving fragments.

All in all, the most economical and consistent solution is to accept that all the references to Aristodemus from the Pindar scholia, except \(\Sigma\) O. 3.21b-22a where we have external evidence speaking against the attribution, derive from an ancient Pindarist from Alexandria belonging to the school of Aristarchus. This individual may be identical with Aristodemus of Thebes, but this is speculative since explicit evidence is missing. The interest in Theban matters attested in the fragments is always relevant to the study of Pindar and must not be attributed to a historical work on Thebes specifically.\(^2\) Although we should not rule out the possibility that both scholars named Aristodemus are the same, the evidence is limited. Since the name Aristodemus is common and we do have some evidence speaking against an identification, such as the different epithets used, the identification of the scholars is problematic. Aristodemus is furthermore, together with Theon, the only scholar active between Aristarchus and Didymus to whom extant sources directly attribute a work on Pindar. To understand the author of the *Peri Pindarou* as primarily interested in Thebes would probably give an incorrect impression of his scholarship, the focus of which was clearly Pindar. Given then, that Aristodemus was Aristarchus’ student (Fr. 5), his *floruit* was in the second century BCE. There are no explicit references to an Alexandrian scholar by the name of Aristodemus in scholia on other authors than Pindar. Probable references to the Theban Aristodemus, are found in the scholia on Apollonius Rhodius (\(\Sigma\) *Argon*. 2.904/10a = \(FGrH\) 383 Fr. 1) Euripides, \(\Sigma\) *Phoen*. 159, 1113, 1119, 1156 ed. Dindorf = \(FGrH\) 383 Frs. 2–4, 5a, 6), Theocritus (\(\Sigma\) Theocr. 7.103a = \(FGrH\) 383 Fr. 5a) and Homer (\(\Sigma\) *Il*. 13.1d (bT) = \(FGrH\) 383 Fr. 7), these always on historical and mythological

---

1. Cf. sections 4.2.3 and 4.6.1.

2. This might, however, be the result of the scholiast’s use of Aristodemus’ work – if Aristodemus wrote on Thebes, a commentator on Pindar would tend to cite those parts which are relevant in interpreting Pindar.
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matters, generally with a connection to Thebes.

The fragments from the Pindar scholia and Athenaeus show that Aristodemus had a wide range of research interests. Variant readings, possibly conjectures, are attributed to him in Fr. 2 and Fr. 3, and an orthographical decision is recorded in Fr. 9. The fragments on Nemean 7 (Frs. 5–8) instead show a close engagement with the ode and must either derive from an extensive discussion of it or from a commentary: Aristodemus discusses the reason for Pindar’s address of the Eleithyia, the goddess of child-birth (Fr. 5) and the relevance of the mythological digression on Neoptolemus for the ode (Fr. 6). In another fragment on Nemean 7 (Fr. 8), Aristodemus explains a line as Pindar’s apology for alleged critical treatment of Neoptolemos in Paean 6, thereby possibly showing an example of the Aristarchean method of explaining an author by reference to himself. But on other occasions he supports his interpretations by reference to other authors, such as Simonides in Fr. 5, where Aristodemus quotes the lyric poet as a historical source.

Aristodemus is the only scholar in this collection to show explicit knowledge of the metrical structure of Pindar’s odes. Fr. 7 interprets τρία ἔπεα (N. 7.48) as a reference to the triadic structure of the ode. Aristodemus again refers to the triadic structure in Fr. 10 on Isthmian 1.60-63, which also suggests some metrical knowledge. Another feature of Aristodemus’ fragments is the interest in the biography of Pindar and his laudandi, as well as historical circumstances of his poetry in general. In Fr. 4, Aristodemus reports that Pindar, while teaching a certain Olympichus the art of aulos-playing, first saw a flame and thereafter a stone statue of the Mother of gods in front of him. Lefkowitz (2012, p. 63–64) argues that Aristodemus derived this anecdote from an original hymn on Pan which included an epiphany of the Cybele.1 If correct, this suggests that Aristodemus was using the method of Chamaeleon (Poerio, 2017, pp. 135–136). Fr. 12 discusses the nature of the race of the Òschophoroi, “wine-branch carriers” at the Athenian festival Oschophoria/Scira.2 The fragment probably derives from a discussion of an Òschophorikon melos by Pindar, sung for a victor of the race. Although the fragment does not mention Pindar directly, its provenance from the Peri Pindarou, as well as the similarities to a papyrus commentary on the Òschophorikon melos in POxy 2451 B Fr. 17 (=Maehler Fr. 6c), suggest that it derives from a discussion about a specimen of this genre.3 As has already been mentioned, some of Aristodemus’ fragments show an interest in topics related to Thebes. In the case of Olympian 6, Aristodemus took part in

1 Cf. the commentary on the fragment below for other possible origins of the anecdote.
2 The former name of the festival is most certainly correct, but Aristodemus has Scira, possible a confusion on his side. Cf. the commentary on the fragment.
3 Cf. the commentary on the fragment below for further discussion on the original context of Aristodemus’ fragment.
3.5. Chaeris

The Pindar scholia cite Chaeris on ten occasions. Although the name of the scholar in some fragments has been confused with Chares or forms of the noun χάρις and verb χαίρω, the identification is secure.

We know nearly nothing concerning Chaeris’ life except that he was contemporary with or lived after Aristarchus, whose textual decisions on Homer he occasionally supported, and that he was active before Didymus. He is probably the father of Apollonius, referred to as son of Chaeris’ in the scholia on Homer and Aristophanes. His definition of grammar also appears to be a reaction to the definition of Dionysius Thrax (c. 170–90 BCE), which suggests a floruit not earlier than the second half of the second century BCE. His ante quem is Didymus, who refers to Chaeris in the scholia on Homer (West, 2001, p. 77). Although the exact relationship between Chaeris and Aristarchus cannot be determined, modern scholars tend to see him as a student of Aristarchus (Blau 1883, p. 57; Irigoin 1952, p. 58–59; West 2001, p. 81), possibly due to the information that Chaeris supported (βοήθων) an Aristarchean reading (Π. Il. 9.605b (A)). Berndt, editor of a collection of Chaeris’ fragments, instead argued that Chaeris lived in the first century BCE without giving any evidence (Berndt, 1902, p. 48).

---

1 Cf. section 4.1 for works περὶ τοῦ δείνα.
2 Σ. P. 4.18, Σ. P. 4.61, Σ. P. 4.156b, Σ. P. 4.188b, Σ. P. 4.195a, Σ. P. 4.258b, Σ. P. 4.313a, Σ. P. 4.446, Σ. P. 4.459a, Σ. N. 1.49c.
3 Χαῖρις in Σ. P. 4.61 = Fr. 2 is in fact probably an emendation by the 16th-century editor Callierges, the manuscripts having χάρις or Χάρις. Similarly in Σ. N. 1.49c = Fr. 10, manuscript D has Χαῖρις.
4 This scholar is probably also identical with the Apollonius referred to in the Pindar scholia. Cf. section 3.6.
5 Cf. Wouters and Swiggers (2015, pp. 532) for a discussion on the chronology of early definitions of grammar.
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References to Chaeris are also found in the scholia on Homer and Aristophanes.1 He is also cited next to Ammonius in POxy 2811, a commentary on a comic adespoton.

According to Sextus Empiricus’ Adversus Mathematicos 1.76 and the scholia on Dionysius Thrax (Σ Dion. Thrax 118.10 ed. Hilgard), Chaeris wrote a work on grammar (Peri Grammatikēs), which included his own definition of the art.2 This definition states that grammar

εξίν εἶναι ἀπὸ τέχνης <καὶ ἱστορίας> διαγνωστικὴν τῶν παρ’ Ἰλλησα λεκτῶν καὶ νοητῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκριβέστατον, πλὴν τῶν ὑπ’ άλλας τέχναις, τὸ τελευταῖον προσθεὶς οὐ παρέργως.

is a skill which diagnoses from expertise <and research> the things said and thought by the Greeks as accurately as possible, except those things which come under other kinds of expertise.3

From this definition it appears that for Chaeris, the skill (hexis) of grammar was a restrictive art, limited to an understanding of language, rather than literary criticism and exegesis (Blank, 1998, p. 140). Since all but one of Chaeris’ fragments concern Pythian 4, Irigoin (1952) suggested that Chaeris wrote a commentary on this ode only and that Fr. 10 on Nemean 1 derives from a monograph. Although the survival of so many fragments on Pythian 4 is conspicuous, we must not forget the exiguous state of our knowledge of ancient scholarship and the effects of compilation and pure chance on the surviving textual record, which force us to be cautious in drawing conclusions from negative evidence.4 The surviving sources do not mention if Chaeris was Aristarchus’ student, but the latter’s textually internal method is prevalent in Chaeris’ fragments, best seen in Fr. 9 on P 4.258–9. The manuscripts have the reading ἀν ποτε Κάλλισταν ἀπῴκησαν χρόνῳ νᾶσον but Chaeris preferred a reading ἐν ποτε, for all we know his own conjecture, “in accordance with Pindar’s usage” (κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Πινδάρου συνήθειαν). It appears that Chaeris here refers to the use of the preposition ἐν with accusative (ἐν . . . Καλλίσταν) a Doric trait of Pindaric language found on a few occasions. Chaeris apparently

---

1 Σ Il. 2.311 (A), 2.865 (A), 6.4b (A), 6.71a1 (A), 9.605b (A), 13.103c (A), 18.191a (A), Σ Od. 1.58a, 7.80b. The Chares (Χάρης) mentioned in Σ Aratus Phaen. 254–255 (ed. Martin) for his work on the Odyssey may possibly be a scribal error for Chaeris. Σ Ar. Vesp. 674 (ed. Koster), Σ Ran. 1028b (ed. Chantry).
2 Sextus Empiricus’ text has the reading Χάρης, but most scholars agree that Chaeris is the correct attribution, cf. Wouters and Swiggers (2015, pp. 530–531).
3 Translation by Blank (1998).
4 Similarly surprising distributions of fragments are found in the case of Callistratus, who is never cited on the Olympians, and Chrysippus who is quoted only once for the Olympians and Nemeans but about 20 times for the four first Isthmians (Deas, 1931, p. 13–14).
saw a problematic reading in his text and emended it with an alternative which he found attested in other Pindaric passages. Similar tendencies are found in his work on Homer, where he refers to specific Homeric expressions (Σ Il. 6.71a (A)), and in his work on Aristophanes (Σ Ar. Ran. 1028b alpha ed. Chantry), where Chaeris refers to an alleged common poetic usage of substituting a person’s name for that of their father to defend his interpretation that the mentioning of Darius in Ar. Ran. 1028–1029 actually refers to his son Xerxes.

As suggested by his definition of grammar, Chaeris was interested in linguistic questions, as in Fr. 9 discussed above. Some of Chaeris’ fragments on Pindar (Frs. 5 and 8) concern questions about orthography and accentuation. This interest is also seen in his work on Homer. Possibly, Chaeris’ restrictive views about the tasks of a grammarian may explain his preference for literal interpretation of Pindaric expressions in contrast to the metaphorical approach exemplified by other Pindaric scholars. For instance, in Fr. 1 on P. 4.11 Chaeris argues that ἀθανάτου στόματος, “immortal mouth”, said of Medea, is an example of pars pro toto (ἐκ μέρους) in which Pindar refers to Medea as a goddess by calling her mouth immortal. Chaeris here follows a slightly altered terminology of Aristarchus, who on several occasions explains Homer as referring to τὸ ὅλον ἀπὸ μέρους, “the whole by the part” (Schironi, 2018, pp. 142-144). In contrast to Asclepiades Fr. 7, according to whom Medea’s immortal mouth refers to her prophetic powers, Chaeris seems to see the adjective ἀθανάτος as used in its common sense to refer to the fact that Medea is immortal, because she is a goddess, which he supports with a reference to Hesiod’s Theogony. This preference for literal interpretation of ambiguous passages in Pindar is also found in Fr. 7, where Chaeris states that Pindar’s reference to Orpheus as being “from Apollo” is not metaphorical. Chaeris supports his views by referring to Hesiod and the historian Menaechmus (FGrH 131 Fr. 2).

3.6 Apollonius

A certain Apollonius without identifying epithets is referred to on one occasion in the Pindar scholia.1 Irigoin (1952, p. 52) identified him with the son of Chaeris, mentioned in scholia on Aristophanes and Homer, but an identification with Apollonius the “Eidographer”, who was active before Aristarchus,2 is also possible, since Σ P. 2. inscr. shows that he classified Pythian 2 as a Pythian and thus must have studied Pindar. Yet the paraphrase of the Apollonius in our

---

1 Σ Il. 2.311 (A), 13.103c (A), 18.191a (A).
2 Σ P. 3a.
collection is more typical of later post-Aristarchean scholarship on the poet than the earlier generations of Pindaric scholars, who, to the best of our knowledge, devoted themselves to questions about classification and textual criticism.\(^1\)

If the identification with Chaeris’ son is correct, and if this Chaeris is the Pindaric scholar, we may place Apollonius’ *floruit* in the late second and early first centuries BCE. If he is to be identified with Apollonius the “Eidographer”, his *floruit* is in the early second century BCE.\(^2\)

Apollonius, the son of Chaeris, is mentioned in the scholia on Aristophanes (Σ Vesp. 1238a) and Homer (Σ II. 3.448a (A)). The Aristophanes scholion concerns a biographical note on the lyric poet Cleitagora, whereas that on Homer concerns the meaning of the adjective τρήτος, “perforated”.

The only fragment of Apollonius’ work on Pindar consists of a paraphrase σύνδικος, “harmonious”, which he believed to mean “in a common (shared) manner” and adduces Homeric parallels in favour of his view. We may see similarities to his interest in explaining problematic adjectives in the Homer scholia, although the evidence is limited.

### 3.7 Artemon of Pergamum

Six fragments of Artemon (*FGrH* 569) are found in the Pindar scholia.\(^3\) The scholia on Pindar are our only primary source for his life and works. John Tzetzes refers to Artemon and cites Fr. 4 in his commentary on Lycophron’s *Alexandra* (Σ 886 ed. Scheer), but he gives no independent information and seems to know Artemon only from the Pindar scholia in a version very close to that transmitted to us. There is no reason to believe that Tzetzes had access to otherwise unknown sources on Artemon.

Provided that Menecrates’ criticism of Artemon Fr. 1 is authentic, Artemon must have been active not later than in the second century BCE.\(^4\) A post quem is more difficult to establish. Broggiato (2011, pp. 548–550) argues that Artemon’s statement in Fr. 2 that all waters derive form the Ocean depends on Crates’ work on Homer (Fr. 29 Broggiato = Σ II. 21.195b (Ge)), which would put Artemon in the second century BCE. The geographical attribute ὁ ἀπὸ Περγάμου found in Fr. 1 shows that he was active in Pergamum, making the second century BCE, in which the Attalid library had been established, a plausible date.\(^5\)

---

\(^{1}\) Cf. section 2.1 for early Pindaric scholarship.

\(^{2}\) Cf. Ippolito (2019) for a discussion of Apollonius the “Eidographer”, his works and chronology.

\(^{3}\) Σ O. 16b, Σ O. 5.1b, Σ P. 1. inscr. a, Σ P. 1.31c, Σ P. 3.52b, Σ I. 2.inscr. a.

\(^{4}\) Cf. section 3.8 for Menecrates’ chronology.

\(^{5}\) Cf. section 2.1.2 for the development of Pergamum as a scholarly centre.
3.7. Artemon of Pergamum

The Pindar scholia explicitly refer to Artemon as ἱστορικός (Frs. 4 and 5). The meaning of this term is controversial and this uncertainty has led to much discussion concerning the nature of Artemon’s work. Since Fr. 6 describes Artemon as σφόδρα τὰ περὶ τοὺς Σικελίωτας πεπολυπραγμονηκώς, “who inquired closely into the Sicilians”, Jacoby, in the introduction to his entry on Artemon (FGrH 569), argued that Artemon was not a commentator. Rather, he wrote on Sicilian names, similar to Alexander Polyhistor’s Περὶ τῶν παρ’ Ἀλκμάνι τοπικῶς εἰρημένων (FGrH 273 Frs. 95–96). Deas suggested that Artemon “first fully recognized Pindar as a historical author, deserving of careful explanation and illustration on the historical side” (Deas, 1931, p. 12). Artemon’s interests in historical matters are obvious; in Fr. 1 Artemon explains ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἴκημα as referring to Gela rather than Acragas and Fr. 5 offers a genealogical note on the relationship between Xenocrates and Thrasybulos in Isthmian 2. Broggiato (2014, p. 13) states that “rimane incerto in ogni caso se il testo di Pindaro fosse oggetto diretto dell’interesse di Artemone o se il poeta fosse usato piuttosto come una fonte storica per ricostruire le vicende delle città greche in Sicilia.” This is in fact a too moderate statement. Although it cannot be ruled out that Artemon wrote a primarily historical work on Sicilians, there is, as Pitcher (2007) has noted, no direct connection between Sicily and the myth of Ischys and Coronis which Artemon discusses in Fr. 5, except that it is found in an ode written to a Sicilian laudandus. Artemon must have studied the Pindaric text extensively, possibly in all odes written to the Sicilian victors. In fact, Artemon even praised (ἐπαίνων) Pindar for his treatment of the myth, offering one of the relatively few aesthetic-moral judgements attributed to ancient Pindarists.¹ Although it may be possible that Artemon commented on Pindar’s use of the myth in a historical work on Hiero, the laudandus of the ode, it is apparent that Artemon closely examined the text of Pindar, and in our study of his work it is reasonable to see Pindar’s texts as his primary interest. Possible exceptions are Frs. 4 and 6, which do not mention Pindar explicitly, although they may very well still derive from a commentary on Pindar. I would like to suggest that ἱστορικός does not necessarily refer to the genre of Artemon’s writings, but rather to his method of taking external historical-mythological information into consideration. A parallel to this usage is found in Didymus Fr. 5b Braswell, which explains the address of the Dioscuri in Olympian 3 by reference to Theron’s ancestral origins in Argus, where the Dioscuri were worshipped. This is said in contrast to Aristarchus Fr. 12 Horn who explained the address by stating that the Dioscuri were worshipped in Acragas. The scholiast calls Didymus’ explanation ἱστορικότερον. Didymus explains the passage by taking external and historical information into consideration rather

¹Cf. section 4.3.2.
than Aristarchus, whose interpretation might be based on this ode only.¹

A similar use of ἱστορικότερον is found in Σ 1.3 where the term is
used in contrast to an anonymous explanation of Pindar’s reference to Ortygia
as δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος, “couch of Artemis”, in the ode as an example of a
tendency in Pindar to connect stories of homonymous places. The scholia offer
in contrast an anonymous “ἱστορικότερον” explanation of the reference to
Ortygia as Aphroditean by the myth of Alpheius having chased Aphrodite to
Arethousa. Here, ἱστορικότερον cannot refer to a historical study in our sense,
but rather to taking mythological information into consideration.²

Although no ancient sources explicitly connect Crates and Artemon, Broggiato (2011) convincingly argues that Artemon’s work on Pindar depends on
Crates’ approach to literature.³ Broggiatio shows that Artemon’s unorthodox
equation of Ὄκεανου θύγατερ, “Oceanus’ daughter”, in Fr. 2 with the spring
of Arethousa should be understood through Crates’ assumption that the ancient
poets had thorough scientific knowledge of the physical world and that this
could be recovered through allegory and etymology. In following this thesis,
Artemon argued that Pindar knew of the pre-Socratic idea that all waters derive
from the Ocean, and thus Pindar’s statement Ὄκεανου θύγατερ needed to refer
to a source of water, Arethousa, rather than the victor’s hometown Camarina,
as Aristarchus (Fr. 16 Horn) argued (Broggiato, 2011, pp. 548–549).

Broggiato sees Crates’ influence also in Fr. 4 on P 1.13–19, where Pindar
tells how Typho extends from Cumae to Sicily, where he belches forth fires
through Aetna. Artemon further states that the Typho myth is not to be under-
stood literally, but as a symbol for volcanic activity in general (Broggiato, 2011,
p. 551). Artemon supports his view by etymology, in deriving Typho’s name
from the verb τύφω, “burn”.⁴ Artemon’s explanation follows the footsteps of
Crates in seeking the hidden truths of myths through allegory and etymology.⁵

As mentioned above, Artemon Fr. 5 praises Pindar for his treatment of
the myth of Ischys and Coronis in Pythian 1. In Pindar’s version Apollo was
made aware of the affair between his lover Coronis and Ischys through his
own omniscience. This differs from another version, known from Hesiod (Fr.
60 M-W), where a raven informs Apollo about Coronis’ adultery. According
to Artemon, the Pindaric version is preferable, since it avoids the παράλογος,
“unreasonable” Hesiodic variant, where Apollo, the god of prophecy, is un-
aware of what has happened to him. Broggiato (2014, p. 37) speculates that

¹ Cf. section 2.2.
² For the range of meanings connected to ἱστορία in the Pindar scholia cf. Galvani (2006).
³ Cf. section 4.2.
⁴ τύφειν γὰρ τὸ καίειν (Σ P 1.31b).
⁵ “Allegory and etymology were the interpretative means that the Stoics used to recover
the ancients’ correct intuitions about the nature of the world; these intuitions, not surprisingly,
happened to coincide with the teachings of the Stoic school” (Broggiato, 2011, p. 551)
3.8. Menecrates

Artemon’s use of the term might be an example of Alexandrian influence on terminology and method in Pergamum. Although the adjective παράλογος and the adverb παραλόγως are used in the Homer scholia on several occasions, they are primarily found in the scholia deriving from Herodian who wrote on Homeric prosody in the second century CE. In the Homer scholia they refer to incorrect readings, especially regarding Greek accents. A stronger case for possible Aristarchean influence might be seen if we suggest that Artemon’s praise of Pindar was based on his avoidance of that which was παράλογος in order to make the myth probable. We might however also see an example of apologetic allegoresis in Artemon as he praises Pindar because he gives a more favourable account of Apollo than Hesiod. Although both interpretations are possible, the cumulative evidence under consideration gives some support to the latter interpretation.

3.8 Menecrates

The name Menecrates appears on two occasions in the Pindar scholia. Due to his support of Aristarchus and apparent aversion against Pergamene scholars, the most probable identification is Menecrates of Nysa in western Asia Minor, a pupil of Aristarchus mentioned by Strabo 14.1.48. In his biography of Theseus, Plutarch quotes an author of a history of Nicaea with the name Menecrates for the myth of Theseus’ foundation of the Bithynian city Pythopolis (Plut. Thes. 26.3 = FGrH 701 Fr. 1). Tzetzes ascribes the content of Menecrates Fr. 2 to Μενεκράτης ... ὁ περὶ Νικαίας συγγραφὼς, “Menecrates ... who has written about Nicaea”, but this information about Menecrates is probably Tzetzes’ own invention, by combining information from the Pindar scholia and Plutarch. Nonetheless, it is possible that Menecrates of Nysa also wrote the history on Nicaea, as suggested by Trachsel (2016). If the identification with Menecrates of Nysa is correct, the scholar mentioned in the Pindar scholia was active in the second century BCE.

References to a scholar by the name of Menecrates are found in the scholia on Sophocles (Σ Trach. 354 ed. Xenis) and in Servius’ commentary on Aen. 6.15. In both cases, he is quoted as a mythographical source.

The interest in mythology attested in other works is also present in Menecrates’ Pindaric fragments. Both of these comments comment on mythological/historical questions: where the Eumenidae settled on Sicily (Fr. 1) and the names of Hercules and the Heraclidae (Fr. 2). Despite this interest in

---

1 Σ O. 2.16c, Σ I. 4.104g.
2 Cf. commentary on Menecrates Fr. 2 for a discussion of Tzetzes’ use of his sources to Menecrates.
mythical history, the fragment engages closely with Pindar’s text in Fr. 1, and concerns the identification of the phrase ἱερὸν οἶκημα ποτάμου, “sacred home by the river” (O. 2.9) with Gela. It is therefore justifiable to see this fragment as a comment on Pindar, rather than a general comment on the history of the Emmenidae.

3.9 Asclepiades (of Myrlea?)

The Pindar scholia refer to the name Asclepiades sixteen times.¹ These references derive from at least two different scholars. Three references (Σ P. 2.40b, Σ P. 4.313a, Σ N. 7.62b) are explicitly attributed to the Tragodoumena by the scholia and must belong to the mythographer Asclepiades of Tragilus (FGrH 12), probably active in the fourth century BCE (Asirvatham, 2014). These fragments do not directly comment on Pindar, but they are quoted by the anonymous scholiast for mythological information. More important is the question of the identity of the remaining 13 references as many of these concern Pindar’s poetry directly; they offer variant readings, interpret passages or discuss the context of an ode and they must derive from a scholarly treatment of Pindar.

Boeckh (1819, pp. xvi–xvi) attributed all the fragments to the mythographer from Tragilus and Lehrs (1848, p. 447) was sceptical to attribute the thirteen fragments to Asclepiades of Myrlea known from the fragments of his treatise on the Nestor’s cup (Il. 11.352),² because of the absence of allegoresis, which is a common interpretational method in Myrleanus’ treatise on Nestor’s cup. Adler (1914, pp. 43–46), however, attributed the thirteen fragments to this Myrleanus, stating that fragments of this scholar which are not from the treatise on Nestor’s cup do very well show the straight-forward exegesis known from the Pindar scholia. Later, her view was accepted by Deas (1931, p. 16) and Irigoin (1952, pp. 62–63). Würth (1938, pp. 64–73) questioned these views and argued that there is no positive evidence for identifying the Asclepiades of the Pindar scholia with the Myrleanus. He further stated that some of the fragments on Pindar (Frs. 3, 6, 8) do not directly engage with Pindar’s text, but they are quoted in a similar way as the Tragodoumena. Therefore, they could potentially derive from Asclepiades of Tragilus. Pagani (2007, pp. 24–27), finally, in a more recent study on Asclepiades of Myrlea’s work on Homer, accepted the attribution of

¹Σ. O. 3.22a, Σ. O. 6.26, Σ. O. 7.24d, Σ. O. 8.10e, Σ O. 8.10i, Σ O. 8.29a, Σ P. 2.40b, Σ P. 3.14 Σ P. 4.18, Σ P. 4.36, Σ P. 4.61, Σ P. 4.313a, Σ N. 2.19, Σ N. 6.inscr., Σ N. 7.62b, Σ l. 2.inscr. a. The name Asclepiades is also mentioned as an example of a patronymicon in Σ P. 6.5a, Σ N. 3.147 mentions that the Asclepiadai, descendants of the healing god Asclepius, founded games in honour of their ancestor in Epidaurus.

²Athenaeus preserve significant fragments that interpret the cup allegorically as a depiction of the world. They are found in the edition by Pagani (2004b).
the fragments on Pindar to the Myrlean and stresses that a feature recurrent in both textual corpora is the search for literary sources. To summarize, Adler’s arguments strongly favour an identification of the Asclepiades mentioned in the Pindar scholia with Asclepiades of Myrlea. The fragments of the latter on Theocritus, concern questions on prosody (Σ. Theocr. 1.7d) and variant readings (Σ. Theocr. 2.118c, 5.94/95b), with interpretations of specific passages showing no trace of allegoresis (Σ. Theocr. 2.88a, 5.21/22e, 5.102/103a). There is therefore no negative evidence against attributing the fragments on Pindar to Asclepiades of Myrlea. The confused biography found in the Suda (α 4173 ed. Adler = T 1 Pagani) states that Asclepiades was born in Myrlea in Bithynia, studied under a certain Apollonius, was active during the reigns of kings Attalus (r. 241–197 BCE) and Eumenes (r. 197–159 BCE) in Pergamum and was in Alexandria in his youth during the reign of Ptolemaeus IV (r. 221–204 BCE). At the same time the biography gives the incompatible information that he taught in Rome during the era of Ptolemy (106–48 BCE). It appears that the incompatible data is due to the conflation of two originally independent biographies of two different Asclepiadeses, the first born in the third century BCE and the second one active in Rome in the first half of the first century BCE. The Asclepiades of our Pindar scholia must due to chronological reasons have been the latter, which suggests that he was active in Rome. Due to the presence of allegoresis in his work on Nestor’s cup, some scholars, including Deas (1931, pp. 15–16), have argued that Asclepiades was a student of Crates. Yet there is no direct evidence that Crates was his teacher (Pagani, 2007, pp. 14–15).

The post quem of Asclepiades of Myrlea is supplied by his references to the definition of grammar by Dionysius Thrax (c. 170–90 BCE). An ante quem is found in Strabo (3.4.3 = T 5 Pagani) who mentions a certain Asclepiades from Myrlea active in Trudetania in southern Spain. We may therefore put Asclepiades’ floruit somewhere in the later half of the second or in the first century BCE.

Asclepiades of Myrlea’s production encompassed works on Homer and Pindar, but also on the Hellenistic poets Apollonius of Rhodius and Theocritus, as well as a work on grammar, Peri Grammatikēs, in which he may have evaluated and criticized the grammar of Dionysius Thrax (Wouters and Swiggers, 2015, pp. 536–537). According to Sextus Empiricus Adv. Math. 1.73–74, Asclepiades criticized Dionysius Thrax’ definition of grammar and defined it himself as τέχνη τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῦσι λεγομένων, “an expertise in what is said in poets and writers”.

---

1 Explicitly identified with the Myrleanus in Σ. Theocr. 1.118c).
Factors, such as the close engagement with Pindar’s text and the even distribution of fragments among the surviving odes, suggest that Asclepiades wrote commentaries on at least Pindar’s *Victory Odes*.

Asclepiades’ work on Pindar is characterized by an interest in mythology (Frs. 1, 6, 7, 8, and 9) as well as in questions about the identity and historical background of a poem’s *laudandus* (Frs. 10, 11 and 12). In Fr. 12 Asclepiades argues that *Isthmian* 1 was written after the *laudandus*’ death because of the use of past tenses in the ode, which shows that he at least occasionally reconstructed the ode’s background from its text and not from external sources. Asclepiades commonly adduces literary parallels as a part of his argumentation (Fr. 2, 6, and 8), a feature common among Pindaric scholars in general, but Fr. 2 stands out as it identifies Pindar’s literary model as the *Thebais* Fr. 10 *PEG*.\(^1\) Asclepiades did however also make use of external historical sources, since Fr. 11 suggests that he grounded his opinion on a list of victories at the Nemean games. Asclepiades Fr. 4a-b contains a variant ἄνεται δὲ πρὸς χάριν λιταῖ for the transmitted ἄνεται δὲ πρὸς χάριν λιται (O. 8.8). It is worth noting that this reading results in a plural noun being the subject of a singular verb, a construction referred to by the ancient grammarians as *schema Pindarikon*.\(^2\)

### 3.10 Chrysippus

Chrysippus, who is referred to on 23 occasions in the Pindar scholia and once in the marginalia on the *Paeans* in *POxy* 841, has not been securely identified with any scholar known from other sources.\(^3\) Boeckh (1819, pp. xii–xiii) identified him with the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus of Soli (c. 280–207 BCE) whose περὶ παροιμιῶν is explicitly referred to in Σ. I. 2.17 (*De Proverbiis* Fr. 2 *SVF*). The first to question this view was Körte (1900) who argued that the nature of the fragments of Chrysippus’ work was such that they must come from a line-by-line commentary of the Aristarchean type, which would make an identification with the philosopher impossible on chronological grounds.\(^4\) This is especially the case for *Isthmians* 1 and 4 where fragments commenting on subsequent lines survive. Such a commentary would presuppose a standardized text of Pindar, which did not exist before Aristophanes of Byzantium. Körte further offers negative evidence – there are no Stoic ideas in the fragments

---

\(^{1}\) Cf. section 4.2.3.  
\(^{2}\) Cf. commentary on Fr. 4.  
\(^{3}\) Σ. O 2.104b, Σ. N. 1.49c, Σ. I. 1.56, Σ. I. 1.67, Σ. I. 1.76a, Σ. I. 1.81d, Σ. I. 1.96c, Σ. I. 2. 85b, Σ. I. 4.11c, Σ. I. 4.18c,Σ. I. 4.21c, Σ. I. 4.25a, Σ. I. 4.29b, Σ. I. 4.42c, Σ. I. 4.47c, Σ. I. 4.58d, Σ. I. 4.58e, Σ. I. 4.63a, Σ. I. 4.68c, Σ. I. 4.87c, Σ. I. 4.104b, Σ. I. 4.104d. Other individuals with the same name are mentioned on numerous occasions.  
\(^{4}\) Cf. section 4.1.2 for the Aristarchean type of commentary.
and no work mentioned in the bibliography of Chrysippus’ works by Diogenes Laërtius (7.189–202) could possibly be identified as a commentary on Pindar. Having ruled out Chrysippus of Soli, Körte (1900, pp. 1137–138) suggested that the fragments belong to a freedman of Cicero, whom the latter held in esteem for his knowledge of literature (Att. 7.2.8). Unfortunately, this is only speculation and the identity of Chrysippus must remain an open question.

Chrysippus’ post quem is Aristarchus, since the former’s work depends on the work on Pindar’s text by Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus. Chrysippus’ commentary is an example of the type of commentary developed by Aristarchus, and in Fr. 15 Chrysippus mentions critical signs in an already existing edition. Körte (1900, p. 194) suggests that this is Aristarchus’ edition, which cannot be proven since the sign could also derive from another edition, but this would at any rate not predate the edition of Pindar by Aristophanes of Byzantium.\(^1\) Braswell (2015, p. 130) states that Chrysippus was active between Chaeris and Didymus, unfortunately without stating his evidence. It is probable that Braswell, like Vecchiato (2020), derived this information from the sequence of authors quoted in Chrysippus Fr. 2. Chrysippus is here quoted after Aristarchus and Chaeris but before Didymus. Because of Didymus’ frequent quotation of older sources,\(^2\) it is probable that he is the source for the three preceding scholars, but although Aristarchus was probably older than Chrysippus, the sequence of Chaeris and Chrysippus was not necessarily based on chronology.

Körte (1900, p. 138) suggested that the two references to variant readings by a certain Chrysippus in the scholia on Homer derive from the Pindarist by the same name.\(^3\) Braswell (2015, pp. 146–148), on the other hand, argues that these fragments should rather be assigned to the philosopher from Soli, as the Pindarist rarely alters the text of Pindar.\(^4\)

The surviving fragments of Chrysippus are generally of an exegetical nature. Already Irigoin (1952, p. 64) noted that many fragments consist of paraphrases which render Pindaric passages in more lucid Greek (Frs. 8, 10,12,13,14,17,19,21 and 23). Chrysippus also comments directly on Pindar’s language explaining the use of an infinitive for an imperative in Fr. 9 as well as Pindar’s use of tropes in Fr. 22. Other fragments offer Chrysippus’ interpretation of the meaning of Pindaric passages (Frs. 1, 3, and 4) or the reasons for the inclusion of specific places and names (Frs. 5 and 6). Several fragments

---

\(^1\) Cf. section 2 for a discussion of Aristophanes of Byzantium and his role in establishing an authoritative text on Pindar.

\(^2\) Cf. section 2.3.

\(^3\) Σ ΙΙ. 8.441b1 (A) = Fr. 24 (Dubium) Braswell, Σ ΙΙ. 15.241 (T) = Fr. 25 (Dubium) Braswell.

\(^4\) A possible conjecture is found in Fr. 7.
concern Chrysippus’ thoughts on mythological passages within the *Victory Odes* such as the reasons for Pindar’s inclusion of the myth of Hercules in *Nemean* 1, and on the meaning of the references to Ajax and Odysseus and of Pindar’s mentioning of Homer in *Isthmian* 4 (Frs. 16 and 18). Chrysippus also comments on Pindar’s use of epithets (Frs. 9, 20). In his explanation of the eschatological passage in *Olympian* 2, Chrysippus mentions tragedy in general and Aeschylus’ *Choephoroi* specifically as examples of literature where the dead are invoked to punish the living. The evidence for textual criticism is limited to Fr. 7 offering a variant reading by Chrysippus, which could derive from a misreading or be a conjecture. As noted above, Chrysippus also discussed the reasons for a critical sign in Pindar’s text in Fr. 15. Due to the many cases of paraphrases in Chrysippus, we may consider the possibility that he wrote a commentary on a lower level, perhaps intended for educational use. As noted by Vecchiato (2020), the higher prevalence of surviving fragments on the *Isthmiams* compared with the other books, is not evidence that Chrysippus’ work was primarily on the *Isthmiams*, but could just as well be due to the stages of epitomization through which the scholia have passed.

### 3.11 Dionysius Phaselites

Dionysius of Phaselis is mentioned twice in the Pindar scholia with the distinct ethnic eponym Phaselites. Dionysius was probably younger than Aristarchus, since he follows his opinion in the classification of Bacchylides’ *Cassandra* in POxy 2368. His *post quem* is Didymus who accepts Dionysius’ classification of *Nemean* 11 in Fr. 2. Cameron (1995, pp. 206–207) believed that Dionysius lived after Aristodemus and that his *floruit* should be put in the first half of the first century BCE. Although this date may be correct, Cameron’s arguments are based on several uncertain or incorrect assumptions. The identification of the Dionysius mentioned in Σ Ω. 10.55c with Phaselites is less probable than with Dionysius Sidonius. Also, Cameron’s argument that Dionysius must have been younger than Aristodemus because he is mentioned after him in the scholion is insufficient, as the order of names in the Pindar scholia does not necessarily represent their chronological relationship (D’Alessio, 1997, p. 54). To summarize, we may put Dionysius’ *floruit* in the second half of the second century BCE or in the first half of the first century BCE.

The Medieval *vita* (ed. Crugnola, 1971, p. 33) of the Hellenistic poet Nicander (second century BCE) mentions that Dionysius discussed the poet’s

---

121 fragments survive from the *Isthmiams*, 1 each on the *Olympians* and *Nemeans*, and possibly one on the book of *Paeans*. No fragments survive for the *Pythians*.

2Σ P. 2.inscr., Σ N. 11.inscr a.

3Cf. section 3.13.
3.12. Dionysius, son of Charmides

ancestry and origins in his works On the poetry of Antimachus and On poets. Cameron (1995, pp. 206–208) argues that the former work was in fact a chapter in the second one and sees a parallel to Dionysius’ Halicarnassus On the Attic orators, in which individual books are dedicated to the orators.

Dionysius’ fragments on Pindar concern the classification of odes; in Fr. 1 he classifies Pythian 2 as an ode written for a victory at the Panathenaea festival in Athens; in Fr. 2 he argues that Nemean 11 is not a victory ode at all, but a Paroinion. Due to Dionysius’ research interests, the theory offered by Meliadò (2019, p. 204) that Dionysius “more than being a Pindaric scholar, should have especially studied the classification of the odes of the Theban poet, according to their genre”, may hence well be true. It may also be noted that Dionysius proposed an emendation of P. 2.3 τάν λιπαρὰν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν into τάν λιπαρὰν ἀπ᾿ Ἀθηνᾶ in order to make Pindar’s style coherent. According to the scholia, Dionysius argued that Pindar did not use the adjective λιπαρός, “shining”, for Thebes but only for Athens. This is probably an example of the Aristarchean method of interpreting an author from his own text.

3.12 Dionysius, son of Charmides

Dionysius, son of Charmides, is referred to on one occasion in the Pindar scholia. This scholion is the only secure source of fragments of Dionysius. If the supplement of Meliadò (2018c, pp. 59–60) in POxy 4452 is correct, Dionysius was contemporary with or younger than Callistratus, which would put his floruit in the first half of the second century BCE at the earliest. We have no terminus ante quem.

Dionysius is likely the scholar mentioned in the Homer commentary POxy 4452. Lines 19–20 of the fragmentary papyrus read Καλλ. ίσ. τρατο. ν. Here supplies τοῦ Χαλλιστρατου. The testimony would also suggest that Dionysius at least occasionally was critical of Callistratus’ work on Homer.

The surviving fragment concerns N. 7. 24–25, εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἑὰν ἀλάθειαν ιδέμεν. The medieval paradosis reads εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἐὰν ἀλάθειαν ιδέμεν but Dionysius preferred the variant ἐὰν, which he possibly understood as a form of the Homeric ἔός, “good, brave”.

1Cf. the commentary on Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 2 for a discussion of this genre.
2Cf. section 4.2.1.
3Σ N. 7.35a
4Since we do not know the name of the father of Dionysius Phaselites and Dionysius Sidonius we cannot rule out that he is identical to one of them.
5In fact, πρ[ὸ]ς Καλλ. ί.σ. τρατο. ν. appears to be a book-title directed against Callistratus.
3.13 Dionysius Sidonius

Dionysius Sidonius is only referred to on one occasion in the Pindar scholia by his ethnic epithet. Moreover, Sidonius is the more probable, though not certain, identification of the Dionysius mentioned in Σ O. 10.55b, Fr. 1 (Dubium) in the present fragment collection. Here a certain Dionysius, together with Aristodemus and the obscure Leptines, is quoted as an authority for the reading Ἀλτίν. This Dionysius has been identified with several other ancient individuals but the interest in textual criticism suggests that Sidonius, rather than any other Dionysius, is the source (Meliadò, 2019, pp. 202–204).

Due to the fact that Sidonius criticizes Aristarchus, and that he is quoted by Didymus in the scholia on Homer, e.g. in Σ II. 17.155a (T), we may conclude that his floruit was in the second or first centuries BCE.

Dionysius Sidonius appears to have been an important Homeric scholar and he is frequently quoted in the scholia on the Iliad and other paraliterary texts on Homer. Sidonius’ work on Homer concerns questions about athetesis, textual and linguistic problems, but also about Homer’s narrative technique. Besides Homer and Pindar, Sidonius probably also worked on Alcman (Meliadò, 2019, pp. 205–210).

Fr. 1 (Dubium) of Dionysius’ work on Pindar concerns the correct reading of Ἀλτίν/Ἀλιν in O. 10.45, while Fr. 2 explains the ἀμφοτέροισι of πολλοὶ μάρτυρες ἀμφοτέροισι (P. 1.87–88) as referring to Hiero and his subjects. Sidonius often disagrees with Aristarchus in the Homer scholia, although this tendency is not visible in the Pindar scholia.

3.14 Leptines

A certain Leptines is mentioned alongside Aristodemus and Dionysius in Σ O. 10.55c. Like the two other grammarians Leptines preferred Ἀλτίν instead of Ἀλιν in O. 10.45. Since he is quoted alongside Aristodemus, probably a student of Aristarchus, he was presumably active after Aristarchus. Since Herodian (second century CE) quotes him in the Iliad scholia (Σ II. 23.731a1

---

1 Σ P. 1.172.
2 Σ II. 3.128a tells us that Sidonius “criticizes” (μέμφεται) Aristarchus because of his accentuation of ἐθέν, the genitive of the personal pronoun, in II. 5.56.
3 Erbse’s index-entry Σιδώνιος, ὁ gives 24 references to Sidonius in the scholia on Homer, including testimonies from other texts (Erbse, vol. 6, p. 12).
4 The latter is seen in POxy 221 where Dionysius says that Homer falls into the style of narrator within the direct speech of Scamander’s plead to Achilles in II. 21.218. Cf. Meliadò (2019, pp. 200–201) and Nünlist (2009, pp. 201–203).
5 Meliadò (2019, p. 204) appears to see a disagreement between Aristarchus and Sidonius in Fr. 1 (Dubium), but Meliadò’s attribution of the reading Ἀλιν to Aristarchus lacks any authority.
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(A), 23.731a2 (T)) Leptines’ *post quem* must be the second century CE. No doubt, he was active before Didymus, since the latter differs from Leptines’ reading Ἀλίνιν in Fr. 1 of the present fragment collection.

In Σ II. 23.731a1–2 Leptines is quoted by Herodian on aspiration of ἐν ἕν and the exegetical scholia in the Townley Homer criticize his interpretation of *Iliad* 22.396 ἐκ πτέρνης, “from the heel [of Hector]” as referring to the back of the chariot (Σ II. 22.396–397 (T)). Leptines is also mentioned concerning Doric accentuation in a scholion on Theocritus (Σ Theocr. 1.112 ed. Wendel) (Meliadò, 2018b).

### 3.15 Aristonicus

Aristonicus is mentioned on five occasions in the Pindar scholia.\(^1\) Three further references to Aristonicus are probably found in *POxy* 841 containing Pindar’s *Paeans*, where the abbreviations ΑΡ and ΑΝ appear in interlinear and marginal annotations. We may thus be quite certain that in Frs. 7 and 8 the abbreviation ΑΡ should be resolved as Ἄρ(στο)ν(κος). Fr. 6 (Dubium) is less certain, since the first letter is a lacuna and Νι(κάνωρ) is a possible alternative.\(^2\) Aristonicus was originally from Alexandria but appears to have relocated to Rome where he is said to have been teaching (*Suda* π 3036 ed. Adler).

He must have been active during the late first century BCE, since Strabo 1.2.31 refers to him as a contemporary. Aristonicus was therefore probably contemporary with Didymus.

Aristonicus is well known from the Homer scholia because of his περί σημείων τῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας, “On the critical signs of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*”. This work was one of the main sources of the *Viermännernkommentar* on which the scholia in Venetus A, the foremost manuscript of scholia on the *Iliad*, were based (Erbse, vol. 1, pp. LII–LVI). According to his entry in the *Suda* (α 3924 ed. Adler) he also wrote a work on Aristarchus’ critical signs in Hesiod’s *Theogony*.\(^3\)

In addition to his work on Aristarchus, Aristonicus is also known to have written monographs on Homer such as *The Wanderings of Menelaus* (Strabo 1.2). Papyri of Alcman, Sophocles and Stesichorus probably contain references to Aristonicus in marginal annotations (McNamee, 2007, p. 39).

Aristonicus’ work on Pindar is only known from the fragments transmitted in the Pindar scholia and the papyri of *Paeans*. Some of these fragments could

---

\(^1\) Σ O. 1.35c, Σ O. 3.31a, Σ O. 7.154a, Σ N. 1. inscr. b, and Σ N. 1.37.

\(^2\) Cf. section 6.2 for the identification of the abbreviations in *POxy* 841

\(^3\) Aristonicus possibly also wrote similar work also on Hesiod’s *Works and Days* (Montanari, 2009, p. 339).
possibly derive from works not on Pindar, but Frs. 1, 2 and 5 show that he engaged with the text directly and that might suggest that they derive from a commentary. Fr. 1 is a defence of the paradosis of O. 1.23 against suggested conjecture. Fr. 2 defends Pindar’s description of Altis as an ἄλσος, “grove” at the time of the bringing of the first tree to the precinct by saying that Pindar utters this in anticipation of future events (προληπτικώς). Fr. 5 is a paraphrase of N. 1.25.

In Frs. 3 and 4, Aristonicus is quoted on mythological and geographical matters relating to Pindar’s text but it is not explicitly stated that he commented on Pindar. In Fr. 3 Aristonicus recounts the local games at Thebes. It is probable that he mentioned this as an explanation of O. 7.83–85 where games at Thebes and in Boeotia are mentioned. In Fr. 4 Aristonicus recounts that there was a certain Ortygia in Ephesus where Artemis was said to have been born.

Fr. 7 attributes the variant ὅσσα instead of ὅσα to Aristonicus. Fr. 8 probably also refers to a variant reading by Aristonicus, unfortunately lost. It is unclear what kind of comment Fr. 6 (Dubium) was.

3.16 Theon

Theon is one of the better known Pindaric scholars and an example of the limitations of the Pindar scholia as a source for our knowledge of ancient Pindaric scholarship. For a long time the only possible reference to Theon’s work on Pindar was Fr. 1, but the discovery of POxy 841 of Pindar’s Paeans, where Theon is referred to in annotations (Fr. 3), confirmed Theon’s interest in Pindar. Eventually in 1961, the publication POxy 2536 containing Theon’s hypomnēma on Pindar’s Pyhians (Fr. 2) showed that Theon wrote an extensive line-by-line commentary on at least the Pythians. His scholarly activity on Pindar probably also extended to other odes, as the references from the Olympians in Fr. 1 and Paeans in Fr. 3 suggest.

Theon was the son of Artemidorus of Tarsus, who was active between the mid-second century BCE and 60 BCE.1 We should therefore assign his floruit to the mid-late first century BCE, making him contemporary with Didymus. Theon worked extensively on the Hellenistic poets, especially Theocritus and Apollonius Rhodius, as well as on Homer.2

Theon’s impact on the Pindar scholia has been suggested to exceed that of other scholars within this collection. Deas (1931) first suggested that Theon was a missing link between Didymus’ composite commentary and the scholia in

---

1 According to Caelius Aurelianus Chronicae Passiones 1.151 (ed. Bendz), he had an encounter with a crocodile before 60 BCE. Cf. Keeline (2017) for a discussion of the date Artemidorus’ and Theon’s dates.
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their present form. This view was recently repeated by Merro (2019). Merro’s primary evidence are the lemmata of POxy 2536. In fact, several of the lemmata of Theon’s hypomnēma also are found in the Pindar scholia. It is an intriguing thought that Theon was the main compiler of Hellenistic scholarship on Pindar, but several problems remain. First of all, Theon’s commentary is not found in an original version. The original commentary was excerpted and new material was added from other exegetical traditions on Pindar (Ucciardello, 2012, p. 139). Secondly, other anonymous commentaries on Pindar also show similar lemmata as the Pindar scholia.1 If we do not suggest that these commentaries also derive from Theon, similar lemmata are thus not conclusive evidence of a common origin. What stands out in Theon’s hypomnēma is not necessarily its similarities to the scholia but the fact that it is relatively well preserved and attributed to an ancient scholar. That Theon was the epitomizer of Didymus is a possibility but cannot be conclusively proven. What we do know is that Theon in the first century BCE wrote commentaries on Pindar.

The comments found in POxy 2536 cover a wide range of topics. The discussions have a certain focus on mythology but also contain literary parallels and textual readings. Fr. 1 likewise is on a mythological-geographical topic while Fr. 3 appears to be a textual reading.

Theon Fr. 2 quotes ἕνιοι, “some”. This shows that he quoted other ancient scholars, although their names cannot be retrieved. The use of such generic references is typical of the medieval scholia but unfortunately we do not know if the phrasing goes back to Theon or if explicit references to ancient authorities were “dumbed down” during transmission before the writing of this copy.

3.17 Diodorus Aristophaneus

The attribute Aristophaneios in Fr. 1 allows us to identify this author with some certainty as the Diodorus Aristophaneus mentioned by Athenaeus Deipnosophistae 5.180e.2

The designation does not imply that Diodorus was an actual student of Aristophanes of Byzantium. It rather suggests that Diodorus who, like Theon’s father Artemidorus, who was also referred to as Aristophaneios, came from Tarsus and had attended a grammatical school there named after Aristophanes (Cohn, 1903). The cultural milieu in Tarsus is mentioned by Strabo who refers to Diodorus’ works as still extant (14.5.13–15), and thus Diodorus must have been active before Didymus who quotes him in Σ Il. 2.865 (West, 2001, p. 79).

---

1 Cf. e.g. the case of PVinod. G 29817 discussed by McNamee (1994).
2 The manuscripts (B and D) give the name of the scholar as Διόδοτος, but the specific attribute makes Boeckh’s emendation secure.
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A *floruit* in the first half of the last century BCE appears probable (Cohn, 1903).

Diodorus’ work is attested for Homer, where he is the source of several variant readings, as well as for a collection of Italic glosses (Montana, 2015, p. 166).

Since only one fragment of his work on Pindar survives we can only make very limited assumptions concerning its nature. The surviving fragment classifies *Isthmian 2* as a *thrēnos*. He appears to have based this on Pindar’s use of the imperfect when referring to Xenocrates.

3.18 Agestratus

Agestratus is mentioned on one occasion in the Pindar scholia.\(^1\) The name is not found in any other scholiastic corpora.\(^2\) A significant part of the epigraphic occurrences of the name is from Rhodes.\(^3\) Since Rhodes was an important scholarly centre, where Dionysius Thrax was teaching,\(^4\) the Pindar scholar may well have been born and educated there.

Due to the lack of context, Agestratus’ *floruit* cannot be securely established. An indication of a date contemporary with or after Aristarchus is found in the close engagement with Pindar’s text in the surviving fragment. This identifies the choir of “Ephyraeans” in *P. 10.55–56* with Corinth and identifies an implied wish for a victory at the Isthmian games. Such an interpretation of individual Pindaric passages is not attested for earlier scholars, such as Zenodotus and Aristophanes of Byzantium, but is very typical of the period between Aristarchus and Didymus. This argument naturally is of limited value as it depends on negative evidence, and even if correct, it does not rule out a date later than Didymus. At any rate, Agestratus’ comment on Pindar definitely originates in a discussion about Pindar’s *Pythian 10*, but whether it was part of a commentary or some other form of work cannot be proven.

3.19 Conclusion

This chapter has identified 18 scholars who mostly studied Pindar in the second and first centuries BCE. In some cases, such as Crates of Mallus, Callistratus and Aristonicus, we have external evidence that permits us to situate them rather precisely in time and space, most scholars being active for at least parts

\(^1\)Σ *P. 10.85a.*
\(^2\)The name is found in Quint. Smyr. *Posthomerica* 3.230 describing a Trojan warrior.
\(^3\)A query at the online database of the *LGPN* at [http://clas-lgpn2.classics.ox.ac.uk](http://clas-lgpn2.classics.ox.ac.uk) for the name returned 49 results, of which at least 25 are from the island of Rhodes.
\(^4\)Cf. section 2.1.3.
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of their career in Pergamum, Alexandria or Rome. In the case of other figures, such as Chaeris and Chrysippus, our evidence is less explicit. Nonetheless, by examining the nature of their fragments and cross-references to other scholars we are able to safely situate them within the period studied.

The identity and date of some of the authors studied has been much debated in previous research. This chapter has contributed to the debate in the following ways: it is shown that there is no reason to doubt the information in the *Suda* that Ammonius was the direct successor of Aristarchus as the head of the latter’s school; and we argue in favour of an identification of the Pindar Asclepiades as the Myrlean in most occurrences of the name and we question the common idea of the Pindar Aristodemus from Alexandria as identical with the scholar from Thebes. Also, it is shown that Artemon commented on Pindar directly, rather than writing a historical work on Sicily and we suggest that the term *historikos* applied to Artemon refers specifically to his method.

Due to the lack of context, the exact *floruit* and identity of figures such as Leptines, Agestratus and Apollonius remain an open question. While some authors offer too few fragments to enable a reconstruction of their Pindaric scholarship, in other cases we have been able to point to particular research interests and methodologies. This is perhaps most apparent in the case of Chaeris’ preference for literal interpretation and his interest in textual and grammatical questions. However, certain tendencies may also be noted in other authors, such as Callistratus’ interest in the background and context of Pindar’s odes and Artemon’s interest in history, allegory and etymology, as well as the many cases of paraphrase in Chrysippus’ fragments.
4. Scholars at work

This chapter investigates the nature of Pindaric scholarship in the Hellenistic period, identifies its typical traits and situates these within the wider field of ancient Greek scholarship. The first section explores the types of scholarly texts in the Hellenistic period from which the surviving fragments may derive. Remaining sections identify categories of interpretation present in the fragments studied. These categories, of course, are not absolute and individual fragments may belong to several categories or may be of a unique character. The aim of this chapter is thus not to assign each fragment to a certain type of interpretation, but to identify the typical traits of Pindaric scholarship and to use these as starting points for further discussion.

4.1 Types of Scholarly Texts

According to Rudolf Pfeiffer (1968, p. 102), the book in the sense of a portable written text was one of the main characteristics of the Hellenistic world, and the main task of scholarship in Alexandria and Pergamum was to collect and preserve Greek literature in written form for long-term preservation. The book was also an important tool for philological work on literature, as it enabled not only preservation but also the circulation of scholarly opinions, as can be seen in the references in papyri from Egypt to scholars active in Rome, such as Aristonicus.¹ Some fragments of Hellenistic scholarship may originally derive from lectures and other forms of oral communication,² yet all the surviving fragments of ancient scholarship were at some point written down. The following sections discuss three general types of scholarly texts and their role within ancient Pindaric scholarship: the edition or ekdosis, the commentary or hypomnēma, and the monograph (syggrammata/περὶ-τοῦ-δεῖνα-lit.).

¹Cf. Ucciardello (2012, pp 107-108) for the cultural relationship between Rome and Egypt and further references.
²As Pfeiffer (1968, p. 108) believed was the case for Zenodotus’ interpretations of Homer.
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4.1.1 Editions

Surviving testimonies to the activities of early Alexandrians suggest that the first generations of scholars in Alexandria – Zenodotus, Callimachus, Aristophanes – primarily engaged in collecting, cataloguing and improving texts. The result of this critical work, the \textit{diorth\theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha\delta\iota\sigma\omicron\nu\omicron}\iota\sigma\iota or “revision”, was the \textit{ekdosis}, “edition”. The \textit{ekdosis} was based on an already existing text which the editor marked out with critical signs, marginal variants and brief comments (Pfeiffer 1968, p. 110; Most 2016, p. 172; Montanari 2015b, pp. 253–257).

The critical signs (\textit{s\‘emeia}) were a fundamental part of Alexandrian critical work and had the function of marking points of interest in the text. The system originated within the study of Homer, but was with some modifications used for other texts (Schironi, 2018, p. 49). The Homeric system of critical signs was initiated with Zenodotus’ invention of the \textit{obelos}, (—), for marking out lines that were spurious to him. Other Homeric critical signs include Aristophanes’ \textit{asteriskos}, (abbix), to mark duplicated lines, and Aristarchus’ \textit{diple}, (˃), a sign signifying a passage that was further explained in an external commentary (Dubischar, 2015, pp. 551–552).

In papyri of Pindar, the most common sign is instead \textit{chi} (χ), which is rarely found in Homeric contexts (Pontani, 2019, pp. 53–54). This sign was a \textit{note bene} in marking out passages, similarly to the \textit{diple}.\footnote{It is in fact even possible that Aristophanes had used \textit{chi} with a similar meaning as the Aristarchean \textit{diple} before Aristarchus since it is attributed to him in a scholion on \textit{Od.} 6.297c (ed. Pontani). The topic is discussed by Pontani (2019, pp. 53–58).} In \textit{POxy} 841 several verses of Pindar’s \textit{Paeans} 2 and 6 are marked in the margin by \textit{diple} or \textit{chi} (Radt, 1958, pp. 6–7). Also in the Pindar scholia \textit{chi} is the commonly used sign, although it is sometimes not called \textit{chi}, but only \textit{τὸ σημεῖον}, “the sign” or similar. This sign is mentioned in discussions of a wide variety of subjects including vocabulary and phraseology, the use of rhetorical figures, syntactical points, matters of fact, borrowings, and points of mythology (Deas, 1931, pp. 73).

Chrysippus Fr. 15 explains why a specific passage has been marked, i. e. in an edition of Pindar. A similar case is found in \textit{Σ I.} 6.47e where anonymous sources are quoted on the reasons why Aristarchus had marked \textit{I.} 6.33 with a critical sign.

4.1.2 Commentaries

Aristarchus of Samothrace is the first scholar about whom we have ample evidence to connect the \textit{ekdosis} with a commentary, or \textit{hypomnēma}, but the genre soon became a benchmark of Alexandrian scholarship (Dubischar, 2015, p. 556). The Alexandrian \textit{hypomnēma} followed a primary text and marked the
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explicanda by lemmata, i.e. brief quotations from the commented passages, and by repetition of critical signs from the corresponding primary text (Schironi, 2018, pp. 52–55). Occasionally, the integral primary text is included in the lemmata, making a reconstruction of the text possible and a separate text unnecessary (Schironi, 2012, p. 410). Surviving papyrus fragments show that hypomnēmata could discuss a wide range of topics relating to the text commented upon, including simple paraphrases of difficult words and expressions, exegesis on mythological, historical and geographical questions, textual problems and alternative readings, the authenticity of lines and stylistic questions, etc. (Schironi, 2012, pp. 412–429). Numerous fragments of commentaries on Pindar survive and attest to this variety. Commentaries such as POxy 5201 on Olympians focus on paraphrase and possibly derive from a school environment. Theon’s (Fr. 2) commentary on Pythians in POxy 2536 instead derives from a scholarly context, although it may be the result of a compilation rather than Theon’s ipsisima verba. The surviving parts cover a wider range of topics and combine discussions of mythology and paraphrase with variant readings, literary parallels and stylistic comments on Pindar. It is commonly believed that during the first centuries BCE and CE, when a substantial number of commentaries had already been written, scholars such as Didymus compiled and discussed excerpts of these in composite commentaries (Dickey, 2007, p. 7). The value of such commentaries arguably “lies less in this scholar’s own intellectual contributions and more in the fact that his works contain much invaluable information about earlier literary scholarship at Alexandria” (Dubischar, 2015, p. 561). In the case of Pindar, Didymus’ work appears to fall in this category, since he quotes a large number of earlier Pindarists and other scholarly sources, although Braswell (2013, pp. 123–126) argues that his work was, at least in the case of Pindar, more innovative than discussions of his work often assume. The surviving fragments of the work on Pindar by Didymus’ contemporaries Aristonicus and Theon do not give compelling evidence that these wrote composite commentaries.

4.1.3 Monographs

Scholarly questions were not exclusively discussed in hypomnēmata, but specific questions were also addressed in monographs or syggrammata. The titles of

---

1It is apparent from the Derveni Papyrus, a text discussing an Orphic poem dated to the fourth century BCE, that some traits of the Hellenistic hypomnēmata such as the use of lemmata to refer to the primary text and much of the technical vocabulary goes back to pre-Alexandrian times (Betegh, 2004, pp. 94–95). We know very little about Peripatetic commentaries but they could very well have shown similar traits. Cf. the discussion of Chamaeleon’s works below.

2Cf. section 6.1.

3Cf. commentary on the fragment for further discussion.
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several treatises on Homer are known, such as Aristarchus’ Περὶ τοῦ ναυστάθμου, “On the camp”,¹ on the Achaeans’ camp at Troy and Ammonius’ Περὶ τοῦ μή γεγονέναι πλείονας ἔκδοσες τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως, “On the Fact That There Were No Multiple Editions of Aristarchus’ Recension” on the number of Aristarchean editions on Homer.² A much discussed form of monograph is that of works περὶ τοῦ δείνα which is in this context typically associated with Chamaeleon’s works on ancient authors including Pindar.³ Friedrich Leo (1901) suggested that these were not biographies but rather literary-historical works explaining the literary work of an author, while including biographical material. According to Leo, such texts were in principle commentaries, connected to primary texts by lemmata but containing more biographical and historical material than the hypomnēmata, which he believed to be a later development of this genre. Leo has been criticized by Stefan Schorn (2012, pp. 416–418) who argues that some works περὶ τοῦ δείνα are indeed commentaries, but that other works of this title, and perhaps especially those of Chamaeleon, are primarily biographies, which, however, make extensive use of the author’s poetry. Surviving evidence about monographs on Pindaric topics include the works by Chamaeleon’s and Istrus’ works, as well as several anonymous biographies.⁴ Athenaeus refers to the Aristarchean Aristodemus’ work on Pindar with the title περὶ Πινδάρου. Since this work combined biographical notes on Pindar with textual criticism, it corresponds well to Leo’s understanding of works περὶ τοῦ δείνα.⁵ It is possible that Dionysius Phaselites’ work on Pindar in fact derives from a chapter in a monograph on poets with focus on questions of classification.⁶ The grammarian Tryphon active in the second half of the first century BCE wrote a work on the dialect of Pindar and other lyric poets, but unfortunately no fragments of this work survive.⁷

---

¹Mentioned in Σ Η. 12.258a and 12.258b (A).
²Cf. section 3.3 for a discussion of the meaning of this work.
³Cf. section 2.1.
⁴The oldest surviving biography is that of POxy 2438. The medieval manuscript tradition also preserves biographies from late antiquity, the Vita Ambrosiana (ed. Drachmann, vol. 1, pp. 1–3), Vita Thomana (ed. Drachmann, vol. 1, pp. 4–8) and the Vita Metrica (ed. Drachmann, vol. 1, pp. 8–9). A biography of Pindar is also found in Suda π 1617 (ed. Adler) and Eustathius Prooem. ad Pind., especially sections 25-30 (ed. Kambylis), contain much biographical material on the poet. For the works of Chamaeleon and Istrus on Pindar cf. section 2.1.
⁵Cf. section 3.4.
⁶Cf. section 3.11.
⁷Cf. section 2.4.
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This section explores two much-debated approaches to the interpretation of literature: Aristarchus’ textually internal principle of understanding an author by means of himself, and allegoresis, a common form of interpretation in early scholarship on Homer, which was adopted by Crates of Mallus and Artemon of Pergamum. In addition, the section will also explore the use of other sources to understand Pindar.

4.2.1 Interpreting Pindar by Pindar

In his scholarly work, Aristarchus made use of textually internal criteria such as the avoidance of inappropriate or inconsistent passages in texts and traits atypical of a particular author’s style (Montana, 2015, pp. 91–92). These ideas are summarized in the “Aristarchean” maxim Ὄμηρον ἐξ Ὅμηρου σαφηνίζειν, “clarify Homer by way of Homer”.¹ The maxim is nowhere explicitly attributed to Aristarchus, but derives from Porphyry (third century CE) who uses it to describe his own approach when studying Homer.² Nonetheless, it reflects the methodological basis upon which Aristarchus and his followers based their critical work (Porter 1992, pp. 70–74; Schironi 2018, pp. 736–737).

According to Montana’s explanation (2015, p. 134) “an author’s distinctive literary usus (συνήθεια), drawn from his work(s), was selected as an internal criterion of an analogic type applied to philological analysis and to emendation on the level of language, style and content of the work itself”. The scholia on Pindar preserve many examples of this practice. Some cases are attempts to maintain consistency within the Pindaric corpus, such as Ammonius Fr. 5 on Pindar’s reference to Orpheus as Apollo’s son in Pythian 4 being incompatible with information from other Pindaric texts, and Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 1 argues that λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν in Pythian 2.3 could not be correct since Pindar refers to Athens as λιπαρός, “shining”. Chaeris Fr. 9 defends a reading by stating that it is in accordance with Pindar’s usage (συνήθεια).

In their judgement of Aristarchus’ Pindaric scholarship, Deas (1931, pp. 8–11) and Irigoin (1952, p. 55) argued that Aristarchus refrained from the use of textually external information and understood the Pindaric corpus as a self-contained system, where he believed the historical context to be irrelevant.³

This view of Aristarchus shows similarities to representatives of the movement of New Criticism in the mid-decades of the 20th century in America, such as John Crowe Ransom, whose The World’s Body (1938) presents poems

---

¹ The translation is that of Nagy (2004, p. x).
² Porph. Homeric Questions 297.16 (Schrader).
³ Cf. sections 1.3 and 2.2.
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as a self-contained object removed from history.¹ Yet, as has been shown in section 2.2, it is not necessarily true that Aristarchus refrained from the use of external sources, or neglected the historical context, when interpreting Pindar. On the basis of examples of Aristarchus’ Homeric scholarship, Nünlist (2015) shows that the scholar’s implementation of the maxim was not dogmatic or free from exceptions, since he frequently adduces literary parallels from other authors in his argumentation and does not consistently emend passages that deviate from standard Homeric usage. This tendency is also observable among the Pindarists, where the principle of textually internal interpretation may be overruled by other concerns. A clarifying example is Chaeris Fr. 7 who argues that in P. 4.176–177 Pindar says that Orpheus is Apollo’s son, despite the inconsistency with Pindar Fr. 128c Maehler, possibly due to a preference for literary over metaphorical interpretation.

4.2.2 Allegoresis

Allegoresis, “a technique of interpretation that brings to light the hidden (i.e., ‘allegorical’) meaning of a poem” (Domaradzki, 2017, p. 303), developed in early scholarship on Homer, ² and remained common throughout the following centuries, being taken up by the Stoics in particular (West, 2001, p. 24).³

The use of allegoresis was a major point of difference between Aristarchus and Alexandrian scholarship, on the one hand, and Crates and his followers in Pergamum, on the other. While the primary aim of Aristarchus and the Alexandrians was to establish the superior text of Homer and other classical texts by editing and, at least from Aristarchus on, commenting on it, Crates was more interested in philosophical aspects of texts and their hidden meaning (Schironi, 2009, p. 312–313). One of the fundamental ideas in Crates’ understanding of the Homeric Epics was that of polymatheia, the idea that Homer, as well as other archaic authors, possessed a thorough knowledge of the physical world, which they did not always express in explicit language. The interpreter of literature instead had to retrieve the hyponoia, “sub-sense”, through interpretative techniques such as allegory and etymology.⁴ Typical examples of allegoresis from Homeric scholarship are Crates Fr. 12 Brogiatto

²Porph. (Quaestiones Homericae 297.16 Schrader) tells that Theagenes of Rheidon (floruit c. 525 BCE) understood the battle of the gods in books 20 and 21 of the Iliad as a battle of the elements.
³Zeno, the Stoic, wrote five books of Homeric Problems and commentaries on the Iliad, the Odyssey, the now lost Homeric epic Marginotes and Hesiod’s Theogony. Zeno identified the gods with the physical elements, while his student Cleanthes and the latter’s student Chrysippus of Soli likewise attempted to harmonize the poetic descriptions of gods with Stoic explanations of the gods’ physical nature (Most, 2010, pp. 29–32).
⁴Glenn Most goes so far as to state that Crates “is best seen as a Stoic philosopher applying
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in Σ Il. 11.40b (T) which states that Agamemnon’s shield in Il. 11.32–40 is a representation of the Universe, and Crates Fr. 131 Broggiato, where Zeus is identified with different aspects of nature (Broggiato 2001, pp. lx–lxiii).

In the case of the ancient scholarship on Pindar, allegoresis is found in the fragments of Artemon of Pergamum whose methods show similarities with those of Crates. In Fr. 2 Artemon of Pergamum argues that Pindar refers to the spring of Arethousa when he addresses Oceanus’ daughter, probably because he was aware of the pre-Socratic idea that all fresh water comes from the world-encompassing Oceanus.¹

Whereas for Aristarchus etymology was a linguistic tool that could be used to analyse Homeric words and make decisions on textual questions, Crates made use of etymological interpretation to retrieve knowledge of the physical world in archaic poets (Schironi, 2018, pp. 365–370). In the context of scholarship of Pindar, this is seen in Artemon of Pergamum Fr. 4, who interprets Typho as a symbol for volcanic activity due to the etymology from τύφω, “to burn”.²

Although Aristarchus and his followers acknowledged figurative language and understood the necessity of interpreting figurative speech, they did not search for hidden truth or meaning in clear language. The locus classicus upon which the idea of Aristarchus’ anti-allegorical position is Σ Il. 5.385 (D, ed. Thiel):

῾Αρίσταρχος ἀξιοῖ τὰ φραζόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ μυθικώτερον ἐκδέχεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ποιητικὴν ἐξουσίαν, μηδὲν ἔξω τῶν φραζομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ περιεργαζομένους.³

Aristarchus thinks that what is said by the poet in a more mythical way should be understood in accordance with poetic licence, without investigating anything outside of what is said by the poet.

The scholion does not mention allegory directly, although Eustathius (Comm. Il. 2.101.13-15 ed. van der Valk), on Il. 5.385) understands it as directed against allegoresis. It is difficult to understand this scholion in any other way than as Aristarchus dissuading from interpreting mythical passages in a non-literary way.

This standard view of the differences between Aristarchus’ and Crates’ approach to literary interpretation as represented by Schironi (2018, p. 140), was

¹ Cf. commentary on Artemon Fr. 2 for further discussion and references to secondary sources.
² Cf. section 3.7 for further discussion on Crates’ influence on Artemon.
³ Text is that of Thiel with removed quotation marks.
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criticized by Nünlist (2011) who argues that the dichotomy between Aristarchus and Crates only goes back to F. A. Wolf and his *Prolegomena ad Homerum* from 1795.\(^1\) It must however be noted that Aristarchus’ aversion to allegory was noted already by Eustathius in the twelfth century. In the case of Pindar, no cases of allegoresis can be attributed to scholars in the Alexandrian tradition, although several fragments accept and discuss the use of figurative language.\(^2\)

4.2.3 Interpreting Pindar from other Sources

Ancient commentators frequently quote writers distinct from the authors of the text they comment upon. Montanari (2016, pp. 73–74) differentiates between three categories of citations as follows. The quoted text may be useful for interpreting a text; or it may be used within a scholar’s argumentation for his interpretation; it may be quoted as information of general or antiquarian interest not necessarily relevant to the text commented on. In practice it is difficult to differentiate between the two former types, as a scholar would generally tend to cite literary parallels both in explaining Pindar and in order to corroborate his own opinion.

The antiquarian use of literary parallels is not directly attested in the fragments of named Pindaric scholars, although it is common in the anonymous scholia on Pindar.\(^3\) The absence of such quotations does not necessarily suggest that these Pindarists did not quote other sources for antiquarian information; some of our Pindarists may possible themselves be quoted as sources of mythological information which is not directly relevant for understanding Pindar’s poetry,\(^4\) and may have adduced literary parallels for this information. Rather, this may be the result of the processes of compilation that all fragments have gone through. The two former categories, which I here treat as one, are common in the fragments. Literary parallels are frequently adduced by a scholar for their historical and mythological information, which he may use in support of his interpretation of Pindar. A typical example is that of Aristodemus Fr. 3 that quotes the iambist Diphilus (Fr. 1 *IEG*\(^2\)) about Samus being victorious as a charioteer in support of the reading Σᾶμος in *O.* 10.70.\(^5\) Citations were not restricted to poetry, but could also be drawn from historical sources, such as

---

\(^1\) Cf. e.g. “Illis [Stoicis philosophis] autem se opposuit Aristarchus, verbis poëtae ubique fideliter inhaerendum, et istam doctrinam meras nugas esse putans” (Wolf, 1795, p. CLXV)

\(^2\) Cf. section 4.3.3

\(^3\) Cf. the large number of references to historians and mythographers in (the anonymous part of) Σ 1. 4.104g.

\(^4\) Cf. Aristodemus Fr. 10 (Dubium) and Aristonicus Fr. 4.

\(^5\) Cf. also Chrysippus Fr. 1 who defends his interpretation that the living are judged by the dead in *O.* 2 with a reference to invocations of the dead in Attic tragedy and Chaeris Fr. 1 who cites Hesiod’s *Theogony* to defend Pindar’s reference to Medea’s immortality.
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victory lists in Asclepiades Fr. 11 and Menaechmus’ Pythikos (FGrH 131 Fr. 2) in Chaeris Fr. 7.

4.3 Literary Criticism and Rhetoric

This section categorizes a variety of comments in the scholia that analyse and evaluate the style of Pindar’s poetry.

4.3.1 Function of Myth

A striking feature of Pindar’s surviving victory odes is the myth, usually of an ancient hero or god, which appears in most of the odes. The myth stands out as a “narrative section within the largely non-narrative Pindaric ode” (Nünlist, 2009, p. 65). Its function within the Pindaric ode was debated in antiquity and remains a common topic of discussion since the beginning of modern Pindaric criticism (Köhnen, 1971, pp. 1–19). Ancient scholars commonly referred to the mythological element as the parekbasis, “digression”, a term used in ancient scholarship in general for passages that in some way lead away from the main subject-matter (Nünlist, 2009, p. 65). Despite the term, the Hellenistic Pindaric scholars generally considered the mythical sections of Pindar’s odes as an integral part of the ode with a specific function. Thus Chaeris Fr. 10 states that the myth of baby Hercules’ slaying the snakes sent by Hera is added to Nemean 1 because the laudandus Chromius had suffered greatly at the beginning of his career before gaining success later, thus seeing in the mythical digression a form of analogy between the life of the laudandus and Hercules’ life. According to Aristodemus Fr. 6 the digression about Neoptolemus in Nemean 7 was added as an homage to the trainer of the laudandus, who, says the scholar, was also named Neoptolemus. It appears that according to the ancient Pindarists, the mythical excursions had the function of praising the laudandus and those around him.

4.3.2 Aesthetic Criticism

According to Dionysius Thrax’ Ars Grammatica 1.1, the highest art of ancient grammar was the “judgement” (krisis) of literature. The meaning of the phrase is, however, not quite clear and the scholia on Dionysius Thrax (e. g. Σ 15.26–29 and Σ 304.3—4 ed. Hilgard) differ as to whether this refers to literary-aesthetic judgement, textual criticism or opinions on whether specific lines in a work are authentic (Wouters and Swiggers, 2015, p. 528).1

1Both views have support among modern scholars. Schironi (2018, pp. 498–499) concludes that the judgement “mainly consisted in deciding the authenticity of lines, especially for an
According to Schironi (2018, pp. 498–499), aesthetic judgment played only a minor role for Aristarchus, who was active before Dionysius. Crates, on the other hand, appears to be more interested in evaluative judgements on literary qualities. According to book 5 of Philodemus’ *On Poems*, Crates believed that a poem’s quality depended on its sound – euphony – rather than its composition (Asmis, 1992, p. 144).

The scholia on Pindar contain some instances of aesthetic criticism, especially in the anonymous scholia. These occasionally criticize Pindar’s mythical digressions for being unmotivated within the ode (Cannatà Fera, 2019, p. 236–239).¹

Two non-anonymous statements also mention Pindar’s lack of propriety. Thus Didymus Fr. 35 Braswell in Σ* P.* 10.51b comments upon Pindar’s *P.* 10.35–36 μάλιστ᾿ Ἀπόλλων χαίρει, γελᾷ θ᾿ ὁρῶν ὕβριν ὀρθίαν κνωδάλων, “Apollo ever finds greatest delight and laughs to see the beasts’ standing lewdness”.² According to Didymus it is ridiculous (μετὰ τοῦ γελοίου) and undignified (ἀσεμνα) by Pindar to have Apollo delighted at the sight of asses with erections, as he interprets the phrase. Another case of negative criticism is found in Chaeris Fr. 3, who criticizes Pindar for comparing Jason to Otus and Ephialtes in *Pythian* 4.87–92, which he deems unfitting due to the monstrous nature of the two giant brothers. Positive evaluation of Pindar is found in Artemon Fr. 5 who praises Pindar for his treatment of the myth of Apollo and Coronis. Whereas other traditions have a raven inform the god of Ischys’ and Coronis’ affair, Pindar has Apollo understand it through his own prophetic power. According to Artemon, it would be unreasonable for the god of prophecy to need the raven to inform him about the affair.

### 4.3.3 Tropes and Figurative Language

The figurative language of poetic texts could cause ambiguities in wording; therefore their correct decoding was an important task in ancient scholarship (Schironi, 2018, p. 125). Differences between poetic and prosaic or standard use of words are noted by Aristotle in the 4th century BCE, e.g. in the famous definition of the metaphor in *Poet.* 1457b7–9, but the concept of figurative language as well as the terminology of and difference between specific tropes and figures remained debated throughout the Hellenistic period (Novokhatko, 2014).

¹ Cf. however also section 4.3.1 on the named scholars’ general appreciation of the myth within the ode.

² The translation of Race has here been altered to convey the sense of the passage as Didymus understood it.
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The anonymous Pindar scholia often comment that Pindar is speaking figuratively, which they commonly refer to using the words ἀλληγορεῖ, “he speaks figuratively”, (Σ I. 4.29a) and ἀλληγορικῶτερον, “rather/more figuratively” (Σ I. 2.58b), which are generally not used in the sense of allegoresis. A similar expression used of figurative language in a general sense is ἄκυρος, “improper”. This adjective is found in Chrysippus Fr. 20 who says that Pindar is speaking improperly (ἀκυρότερον) when calling the whole of Libya “corn-bearing”, despite much of it being infertile desert. Theon Fr. 2 uses the same adjective to describe the combination of the verb ναίω, “dwell in, inhabit”, typically used of animate subjects, and δόνακες, “reeds” in the expression δόνακων, τοὶ ... ναίοισι, “reeds which ... grow by” in P. 12.25–26. Specific tropes are also mentioned by Chaeris Fr. 1 who explains that Pindar’s reference to Medea’s mouth as immortal suggests that Medea is immortal, since it is said ἐκ μέρους, “by the part”, while Chrysippus Fr. 22 explains στεφανώματα βωμῶν, “circles of altars” (I. 4.62) as an example of circumlocution.

4.4 Philological

The following sections concern the most fundamental tasks of Hellenistic scholarship, the establishing of a genuine text through textual criticism, and the classification of poetry. Within this section comments on metre will also be discussed.

4.4.1 Textual Criticism

One of the most fundamental tasks of Hellenistic scholarship and particularly among Aristarchus’ followers was to correct the ancients texts. This task, commonly referred to as diorthōsis, “revision”, consisted in correcting faults of all sorts, e.g. by marking verses which were deemed spurious with critical signs or by suggesting alternative readings, in order to reach a superior text. Several aspects of the methodology of this revision, or diorthōsis, are still subject to debate, including whether texts were collated or not. According to Pfeiffer (1968, p. 110) Zenodotus in his editorial work selected an existing text of Homer which he corrected either through inserting readings found in other manuscripts or by his own conjectures. That the scholia on Homer mention variant readings of several pre-Alexandrian Homeric texts such as regional texts (kata poleis) or texts of certain individuals (kat’ andra) suggests that some form of collation did take place. West (2001, pp. 36–37) argues that early scholars

1We have less knowledge of textual criticism in Pergamum. For instance, it is not known whether variant readings attributed to Crates of Mallus derive from an edition, as assumed by Nagy (1998, pp. 215–223) or not, as Broggiato (2001, p. xxi) believes.
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such as Zenodotus and Aristarchus did not collate different manuscripts and that the many references to variant readings derive from Didymus. Yet some scholia, such as Σ II. 9.222b1 (A), explicitly mention that Aristarchus considered several textual witnesses. Although West argues that this is not evidence for systematic collation of textual witnesses, it appears that Aristarchus and presumably also his followers at least to some degree based their editorial work not only on conjectures to a specific textual witness, but also by collecting variants from other textual witnesses (Montanari, 2015a).¹ Schironi in her study on Aristarchus reaches the conclusion that Aristarchus inspected several manuscripts, especially while establishing his working-text, but that his primary textual criteria were internal reasons, rather than a specific reading’s attestations in manuscripts (Schironi, 2018, pp. 63–75). The Pindar scholia give ample evidence of variant readings, e.g. in a number of Chaeris’ fragments.² The scholia commonly refer to textual readings by forms of γράφω, “write”. Readings of a certain scholar’s text are thus referred to as Χ γράφει, “X writes” and readings without attribution using the passive γράφεται, “is written”. Archaic texts were written in lines without word-division (scriptio continua) without diaritical signs, accents or breathings (Schironi, 2018, p. 102). Before the general adaptation of the east-Ionic script in the late fifth century BCE, there existed a plethora of epichoric scripts in the Greek world. These differed from each other in several important aspects, such as the distinguishing between long and short vowels or not. Thus, the old Attic alphabet used the letter Ο for both Ο, Ω, and OY, and Ε for Ε, the monophthong ΕΙ and Η (West, 2001, pp. 21–23). The ancient scholars were well aware of the fact that they were forced to make their own decisions in these matters when working on a text due to the effects of the older scripts. According to Nagy (1996, pp. 125–128) questions of accentuation and orthography were not a part of the diorthōsis by Aristarchus, but were seen as an exegetical matter and treated primarily in hypomnēmata and similar texts. Schironi (2018, p. 102) agrees that such matters were discussed by Aristarchus in his commentaries but acknowledges that his decisions were probably marked in his ekdosis. This is supported by the use of accents and rough breathings in papyri. Thus the reading εν of Aristonicus Fr. 6 (Dubium) in Pae. 2.75 in POxy 841 is contrasted with an alternative ἑν with rough breathing in the margin. This papyrus is obviously not Aristonicus’ own copy of the text but shows that decisions on breathings and accentuations had to be added to avoid ambiguity. Schironi (2018, pp. 101–123) connects Aristarchus’ work on accentuation,

¹Evidence for early collation is also found in several papyri of Homer from before 150 BCE that show traces of having been compared with other exemplars. Although without explicit connection to Alexandrians, they suggest that the act of comparing textual witnesses was not foreign to early book-producers (Haslam, 1997, pp. 65–66).
²Chaeris Frs. 2,4,6, and 9 .
word-division, breathings and punctuation with the task of reading aloud. We may also note that in the Pindar scholia, the terminology used in questions regarding accentuation, breathings and word-division differs from that used for variant textual readings. Thus γράφω is never used when describing an accent, but rather ἀναγιγνώσκω, “read”, together with more specific terminology such as προπαροξύνω, “pronounce with acute accent on the penultimate syllable” and περισπάω, “pronounce with the circumflex”. This can also be seen in cases of aspiration and word-division. Several fragments of Chaeris records varying accents (Fr. 5) and word-divisions (Frs. 4, 8) as does Aristodemus Fr. 9.

The Alexandrians were aware of the possible effects of different alphabets on the writing of long vowels. A well known example is found in Σ. II. 11.104a1 (A), probably deriving from Aristarchus,\(^1\) which explains a faulty reading by Zenodotus: μήποτε δὲ πεπλάνηται, γεγραμμένου τοῦ ο ὑπ’ ἀρχαίας σημασίας ἀντὶ τοῦ ω “perhaps he has been mislead since the old alphabet writes Ω instead of Ο.”. A similar passage is also found in the Pindar scholia in Σ N. 1.34 where Aristarchus Fr. 55 Horn in N. 1.24–25, λέλογχε δὲ μεφομένοις ἐσλοὺς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀτίον, “It is his lot to bring good men against his detractors as water against smoke.” reads ἐσλούς, an accusative plural and the reading of surviving manuscripts, although “ἐσλός remains in the ancient script” (καταλείπεται δὲ τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ σημασίᾳ τὸ ἐσλός). This suggests that the text available to Aristarchus read ἐσλός and was corrected by him due to his knowledge of the older scripts. Although this is not as explicit as the Aristarchean fragment, several other discussions in the Pindar scholia concern passages that may have been affected by the transcriptions from older alphabets (metacharacterismos). Thus the information in Aristonicus Fr. 1 that anonymous sources read Συρακοσίων ἱπποχαρμᾶν βασιλῆα for Συρακόσιον ἱπποχάρμαν βασιλῆα in Σ O. 1.35c, and Chaeris’ Fr. 2 variant προτυχόν (for προτυχών) in Σ P. 4.61a suggest knowledge of the possible effects of archaic alphabets and that the ancient scholars made conjectures of the text available to them in accordance with this knowledge.

4.4.2 Classification

The task of classifying lyric poetry into genres is attested at least from Callimachus’ Pinakes and onwards.\(^2\) The Alexandrian editions of melic poetry were ordered into books according to criteria which included metre, as was the case in a part of the Alexandrian edition of Sappho, and genre, as was the case in Pindar, Simonides and Bacchylides (Prodi, 2017). The Alexandrian edition of Pindar was divided into seventeen books ordered according to genre

---

\(^1\) Cf. Schironi (2018, pp. 571–572)

\(^2\) Cf. section 2.
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by Aristophanes of Byzantium; when more than one book existed of a genre these were divided according to other criteria, such as the specific games in the four books of Pindar’s *Victory Odes*. The classification of songs into genres followed a system fully developed first in the Hellenistic period and this classification did not necessarily always correspond to formal differences applied by the archaic lyricists at the time of production (Harvey, 1955, pp. 157–164). This task was thus necessarily subjective at times, and despite the standardized division of Pindar’s poetry into seventeen books by Aristophanes, scholarly debate persisted in the case of some odes. Perhaps the most exciting example is the third triad of *Paean* 6 of POxy 841 which appears to have been transmitted independently as a *Prosodion* (=Fr. 5 Prodi) with a different colometry in POxy 1792.\(^1\) Discussions in the scholia show that the classification of individual poems continued to be debated throughout antiquity. In the case of *Nemean* 11, Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 2 challenged its status as a victory ode and said that it was a *paroinion*, “drinking song”.\(^2\) Diodorus Aristophaneus Fr. 1 also argued that *Isthmian* 2 must have been a *thrēnos*, “dirge”, due to the use of historical tempora in reference to the ode’s *laudandus*. In the case of *Pythian* 2, several different classifications of the ode are suggested by named scholars, at least three of which, Ammonius Fr. 2, Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 1 and Apollonius the “Eidographer”, post-date the editorial work by Aristophanes of Byzantium. The two former scholars accepted the ode as a victory ode but suggested that it was an *Olympian*, whereas Apollonius the “Eidographer” defended the standard classification by Aristophanes. Although the classification of poems into genres continued, it does not appear to have altered the standard classification of Aristophanes’ edition. This parallels the situation of variant readings, discussed in section 4.4.1, and attest to the authority of this edition.

4.4.3 Metrical analysis

Comments on metre are rare in the non-metrical Pindar scholia. Among the scholars within this collection Aristodemus stands out, since Frs. 7 and 11 mention the triadic structure of the Pindaric odes. Aristonicus Fr. 7 even offers an unmetrical variant reading, although in other cases variants proposed by the mentioned scholars are metrically equal or even preferable, such as in Aristonicus Fr. 1. Metrical correctness is however only rarely a part of the arguments in favour or against a variant reading. No such comment is found among our named scholars, but in Σ N. 2.17c containing Crates Fr. 2, the latter’s reading is stated to be opposed by the antistrophe. This shows

\(^1\)The question of the relationship between *Paean* 6 and the *Prosodion*, Fr. 5 in his edition, is extensively discussed by Enrico Prodi (2013, pp. 227–244).

\(^2\)Cf. 3.11 for further discussion of Dionysius’ classifications.
the anonymous scholiast’s awareness of the metrical correspondence between strophes in Pindar, although according to the modern analysis of Pindar’s metre, Crates’ reading would not be metrically incorrect. In the anonymous Σ O. 1.28a the scholiast similarly argues that the iota of Πίσα must be short due to metrical correspondence.

4.5 Grammar

This section discusses fragments that attempt to explain the language of Pindar, either by paraphrasing it, or by identifying grammatical forms of Pindar’s language which differ from the Greek of the Hellenistic period.

4.5.1 Paraphrase and Glosses

The archaic Kunstsprache of ancient authors such as Homer and Pindar posed many difficulties for Greek speakers in later periods. One of the basic tasks of Hellenistic scholarship was thus the rendering of poetic words and phrases into a form more easily understood by readers accustomed to koiné. The correct interpretation of Homeric words interested scholars such as Philitas of Cos, Zenodotus, Aristophanes and Aristarchus (Montana, 2015, p. 140). The activity was not restricted to the highest learning but was also an important pedagogical tool for elementary education. Its widespread use is seen in the many papyrus fragments of Scholia Minora, glossaries or word by word translations of Homer into koiné, which often appear to belong to educational contexts (Cribiore, 2001, p. 207).

For such “intralingual translations”,¹ we may make a distinction between translations of individual words - glossai - such as μάχη, a common gloss of the Homeric noun ὑσμίνη, “battle”, and paraphrases of longer utterances. Schironi (2018, p. 81) also distinguishes between “close” and “loose” paraphrases. Whereas the former translates a phrase word-by-word with focus on linguistic analysis, the latter instead renders the general sense of a phrase, focusing on clarifying its content.

As in the case of Homer, intralingual translations were a necessary tool when studying Pindar’s poetry, due to its dialect and obscure style. Evidence for paraphrases and glosses is found both in surviving papyrus commentaries and in the scholia. The Pindar scholia contain numerous glosses, often introduced by the phrase ἀντὶ τοῦ, “instead of”, e. g. Σ O. 2.63a where νεμῶν, “dwell” is said to be used “instead of ὡν, ‘inhabit, live in’”. Many examples of close paraphrase can be found in the anonymous commentary on Pindar’s Olympians

¹The technical term adopted by Roman Jakobson (1959, p. 233).
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in POxy 5201. This papyrus appears to contain the integral text of Olympian 1 in the lemmata, typically explained in a close paraphrase of the lemma such as in col. i 23–27:

| λάμπει δὲ οἱ κλέος  
| ἐν εὐάνωρ Λυδοῦ Πέλοπ(ος) ἀποικίαι: |
| λάμπει δὲ [τοῦ Ἱέρου]ο[ς] τὸ κλέος ἐν |
| τῆι τοῦ Λυδο[ῦ] Πέλοπ(ος) εὐάνδροι ἀποικ-
| ξίαι]:

Fame shines for him in the colony of brave men founded by Lydian Pelops:
The fame of Hiero shines in the Lydian Pelops’ colony of brave men

The running paraphrase replaces archaic and poetic forms with more prosaic variants, e. g. rendering the archaic enclitic dative οἱ, “him”, by the genitive τοῦ ῾Ιέρωος, and the Doric εὐάνωρ, “of brave men”, by εὔανδρος. This kind of paraphrase is less common in fragments explicitly attributed to named ancient Pindarists, although one example is found in Theon’s hypomnēma on the Pythians where, in the margin of the papyrus, we find the item ἐρικλάγκταν· μεγαλοκλάγκτην, “deep-sounding: loud-sounding” where the form and meaning of the Pindaric ἐρικλάγκταν (Pythian 12.21) is rendered into koinē.2

Another example is found in Asclepiades Fr. 5 where Pindar’s Δίος ξένιον πάρεδρος ἀσκεῖται Θέμις, “Themis, enthroned beside Zeus of hospitality, is venerated” (O. 8.21–22) is rendered as ἀντὶ τοῦ τιμᾶται πρὸς τοῦ ξενίου Δίος, “is honoured at the side of Zeus of hospitality” explaining the unusual meaning of ἀσκεῖται, which usually means “practice”. More common is the loose paraphrase where a scholar explains the contents of a phrase, rather than the individual words. Aristonicus’ Fr. 5 paraphrase of Ν. 1. 25–26 χρὴ δ᾿ ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα μάρνασθαι φυᾷ, “one must travel in straight paths and strive by means of natural talent” not only translates the phrase but also includes an element common in Pindar but not explicitly mentioned in the passage in the paraphrase: φθόνος, “envy”.3 The loose paraphrase is thus not only a simple translation but a more powerful exegetical tool, where the scholar is able to include additional layers of interpretation.

1 The text of the commentary is that of Barrett and Obbink (2014). The translation of the lemma is that of Race (1997b), that of the commentary is my own.
2 According to Ucciardello (2012, pp. 122–123) the position and nature of this item might suggest that it was incorporated into the papyrus not from Theon’s commentary but from another piece of exegesis.
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4.5.2 Grammatical Analysis

In addition to the paraphrases of archaic poetry into koinē, the Hellenistic scholars also offered more direct analysis of the poetic language. Poetic and dialectal language was occasionally incorrect from a Hellenistic point of view. Rather than resorting to conjecture, Aristarchus was open to accepting linguistic variation. Two important notions to Aristarchus as well as to later scholars working on Pindar are interchangeability and redundancy, expressed respectively by words such as ἐναλλαγή, “interchange” or ἐναλάσσω, “exchange, cross over” and by περισσός, “redundant”. The later notion was especially important in Aristarchus’ analysis of Homeric style and syntax. A prefix was redundant when it did not add anything to the meaning of the compound (Schironi, 2018, p. 76). We find examples of interchangeability in Chrysippus Fr. 11, who comments upon the use of an infinitive instead of an imperative in I. 4.13.¹ Also Aristarchus’ follower Ammonius in Fr. 5 comments that the case has been changed (ἦλλακται) when Pindar uses a possessive dative instead of a genitive in N. 3.10. Asclepiades Fr. 4a-b apparently accepts a case of schema Pindarikon, i.e. a plural noun with a singular verb. Chaeris in Fr. 9, concerning his own conjecture of ἄν into ἐν in P. 4.258, comments that the use of ἐν, “in”, with accusative to express motion, is peculiar to Pindar. The same scholar in Fr. 8 argued that Πελιαοφόνος (P. 4.250) was not a compound, probably because of the shape of the former word which suggested that it was a genitive. In the case of the surviving fragments of named scholars working on Pindar, the interest is not primarily in the language itself but in interpreting Pindar. Yet Suda (ed. Adler) τ 1115 mentions a work by Tryphon, a grammarian active in Alexandria during the late first century BCE, on the dialect of Homer, Pindar and other lyric poets.²

4.6 Historical and Mythological Interpretation

This section discusses fragments which attempt to explain the historical and mythological background of Pindar’s poetry.

4.6.1 Historical

Pindar’s Victory Odes were written in reaction to specific historical circumstances, typically a victory at a Pan-Hellenic game, and reconstructing the

¹He follows here the example of Aristarchus. Although it is not certain that he had a concept of verbal moods, Aristarchus often notes that Homer uses the infinitive for the imperative (Schironi, 2018, p. 197)

²Unfortunately, no fragments survive. Cf. section 2.4.
original context of an was an important task for Hellenistic scholars. Problems included the identification of the laudandus and his family as well as the victory celebrated. Information on victories could be derived from victory lists, which were available for all the Pan-Hellenic games in the Hellenistic period, although the lists on the Nemean and Isthmian games were incomplete (Christesen, 2007, pp. 108–111). Asclepiades Fr. 11 most probably based his identification of the laudandus on such a list of winners at the Nemean games. At least in the case of more famous winners, such as the Sicilian Tyrants, external historical sources were also used, such as Timaeus. The ancient scholars also made use of other epinician poetry, such as that of Simonides and Bacchylides to reconstruct the lives and victories of the laudandi, as does Aristodemos Fr. 5 when reconstructing the life of Sogenes, the victor celebrated in Nemean 7 using information in an unknown poem by Simonides. See also Σ f. 2. inscr. a (=Artemon Fr. 6, Asclepiades Fr. 12, Callistratus Fr. 4) where the anonymous scholiast quotes Aristotles’ list of victories at the Pythian games and states that Simonides had mentioned two victories by Xenocrates in order to show that Xenocrates had won victories both at the Isthmian and Pythian games.

An uncontested feature of ancient biography on poets is the so-called “Method of Chamaeleon”, the practice of reconstructing authors’ lives on the basis of passages in their works (Leo, 1901, p. 106). This approach appears to have been a standard tool within ancient biographies of poets where primary sources would often have been absent (Lefkowitz, 2012).

The historical circumstances of the ode were also important for the interpretation of passages in Pindar’s poetry. Ancient literature in general was prone to see allusions to historical facts in the literature studied (Tischer, 2006), and this is particularly common in the Pindar scholia (Bitto, 2012, pp. 88–97). Because Pindar’s Victory Odes were written for specific occasions, the ancient Pindarists often sought to explain problematic passages as alluding about a specific historical circumstance. This was a bi-directional process where ancient scholars explained passages from their knowledge of the historical context and simultaneously created a historical context out of Pindaric passages, proposing allusions generally built on guess-work.

This may be seen in the problem of Pindar addressing Thrasybulus instead of his father Xenocrates, the actual laudandus, in Isthmian 2. Callistratus Fr. 4–5 states that Pindar addressed Thrasybulus, rather than his father Xenocrates because the latter had not given him sufficient payment for the ode. He gets the idea from the references to the mercenary muse and money in the same ode. A different, and according to modern standards probably more persuasive, solution was offered by Asclepiades Fr. 12 and Diodorus Aristophaneus Fr. 1.

---

1Leo did not attribute the invention of the method to Chamaeleon but saw him as the first ancient scholar who applied it on a large scale in his works.
who argued that Xenocrates was already dead, due to the use of historic tempora in reference to Xenocrates in the ode.

The rhetorical Abbruchformeln following Pindar’s mythical digressions were often interpreted literally and situated in a historical context. Thus in the scholia on *Nemean* 4 Aristarchus Fr. 67 Horn and Ammonius Fr. 7 are quoted for their views on Pindar’s use of the word τεθμός, “law”, in the Abbruchformel τὰ μακρὰ δ’ ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός “Law hinders me from telling a long version”. Both scholars argued that the τεθμός was an agreement between Pindar and his clients concerning the time of the delivery of the ode.

Other historical interpretations show good knowledge of the historical contexts in which they place the odes. Thus Asclepiades Fr. 10 explains a reference to Salamis in *Nemean* 2 by suggesting that Timodemus, the laudandus of the ode, was one of the Athenian klérouchoi on Salamis. Although we have no evidence that Asclepiades knew from historical sources that Timodemus was a klérouchos, the klérouchia was a common form of colonization in Athens of the sixth and fifth century BCE and it is possible that there existed an Athenian klérouchia on Salamis. Asclepiades was in any case aware of the existence of this form of colonization, and possibly also of its existence on Salamis.1

### 4.6.2 Mythology

The Pindaric scholars noted several problems of mythology within Pindar’s poetry. Typical problems concerned Pindar’s deviations in mythology from standard treatments. Thus Aristarchus Fr. 18 Horn and Aristodemus Fr. 1 both commented on Pindar’s reference to seven pyres for the seven against Thebes in *O.* 6.15, although not all the seven had been buried in Thebes. Aristarchus understood this as an example of Pindar’s poetic license in his treatment of the myth, whereas Aristodemus probably understood the pyres to have been burnt for the armies of the seven rather than their leaders. As in the case of historical interpretation, the scholars made use of Pindar’s text itself as well as of external sources to argue for their interpretation of mythological references. Thus Aristodemus Fr. 3 discusses the identification of Halirothius and his son Samus, winner at the four-horse chariot race at the first Olympic games organized by Hercules, referred to in *Olympian* 10. He rules out the possibility that Halirothius is the Athenian, who lived during Cecrops’ lifetime, since he could not have been a contemporary of Hercules and adds that Samus is in fact not Athenian, but Arcadian, and quotes an iamb of Diphilus mentioning a victorious Samus from Mantinea in defence of this.

---

1 Cf. commentary on Asclepiades Fr. 10 for further discussion and references.
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4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has studied selected aspects of Pindaric scholarship as reflected in the fragments of named scholars of the period studied and compared them to the more general setting of Hellenistic scholarship. The chapter began with a survey of ancient scholarly texts from which the fragments may derive. For most scholars, we lack explicit information concerning the type of text which their fragments derive from, but Theon Fr. 2 offers an example of a hypomnêma. Notable in this respect is also Aristodemus’ *Peri Pindarou*, which combined textual criticism with biographical anecdotes on Pindar. The chapter has also identified common characteristics of methodology and research interests in Hellenistic scholarship on Pindar, demonstrating a continual influence of Aristarchus’s principle of interpreting Pindar by his own text with the aim of avoiding inconsistencies. This principle is common in Alexandrian scholars but does not appear in the fragments of Crates of Mallus and Artemon, both associated with Pergamum. The Alexandrian scholars did not follow this principle slavishly, however, and did not exclude the use of external sources. The principle could be overruled by other concerns, as in Chaeris Fr. 7 where the scholar accepts Pindar’s reference to Orpheus as son of Apollo in *P.* 4.176–177 despite the resulting inconsistency in Orphic genealogy in the Pindaric corpus. On the other hand, we find proof of allegoresis only in the work of scholars from Pergamon. Crates’ own work on Pindar can not be proven to be allegorising, but what remains of Artemon of Pergamon, especially Frs. 2–4, does show allegoresis and the etymological interpretation typical of Crates’ Homeric scholarship but unknown among other Pindarists of the Aristarchean school.

In general, the fragments of Pindaric scholarship fit well into the picture of Hellenistic scholarship and show many similarities to Homeric scholarship, e.g. in the use of terminology in textual criticism and grammatical analysis. Other areas may be rather typical of Pindaric scholarship, such as the function of the myth within the ode, the difficulties in classification according to genre, and the reconstruction of the historical background of an ode. The latter topic is common within the fragments and gives proof of an understanding of Pindar as an author within a specific context and time, far removed from that of the Hellenistic scholars. The historical background of Pindar’s odes, as well as his own biography, is often reconstructed through his own works. Scholars from Alexandria and Pergamum understood passages in Pindar’s works as allusions to historical events (e.g. Aristodemus Fr. 5, Artemon Fr. 3), and used these very passages to reconstruct them. This approach, the so-called method of Chamaeleon, is typical of ancient biography and was suitable when external historical sources could not be found. In other cases the historical background was reconstructed using external sources. Explicit evidence for the use of the
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historian Menaechmus is found in the work of Chaeris, and Asclepiades refers to victory lists. Literary parallels are often used as historical sources, e.g. in Aristodemus’ Frs. 3 and 5, which quote Diphilus and Simonides in order to defend a textual variant of O. 10.70, as well as to reconstruct the biography of Sogenes, the laudandus of Nemean 7. We also noted types of comments which tend to be missing. Most notable is the absence of comments on metre. Metrical terminology is mentioned by Aristodemus in Frs. 7 and 11, but these comments are clearly of an exegetical nature and do not have the metrical structure as their main concern. A limited number of anonymous exegetical scholia on Pindar also refers to metre against or in defence of textual readings, such as in Crates Fr. 2.
5. Summary of Part I and Some Conclusions

Before proceeding to Part II, the actual collection of the fragments of named and known Pindarists contemporary with or active between Aristarchus and Didymus, we will pause here to look back at Part I and summarize its main points and add some concluding thoughts. The thesis will then recommence in Part II with some basic matters, describing in Chapter 6 the origin and background of the Pindar scholia, their manuscript sources and textual transmission as well as other sources of ancient scholarship on Pindar. After setting forth editorial principles in Chapter 7, the fragment collection itself and an English translation along with a commentary on details of language, transmission and content are given in Chapters 8 and 9, respectively.

Part I served the purpose of a general commentary on the body of remains of Hellenistic scholarship on Pindar. In Chapter 2 the framework of the period was delineated and the collected fragments situated within the larger context of ancient scholarship in the Hellenistic Age, with a natural focus on the development of the philological study of Pindar and on the work of Aristarchus and Didymus in particular. Here we questioned the common scholarly opinion that Aristarchus did not take a historical view of Pindar’s poetry. In Chapter 3 we identified the Pindaric scholars active in the period under study and explored the nature of their work through individual treatments of each of them in order better to understand their fragments. We also dealt with several problems noted in previous research, such as the floruit of Ammonius and his connection to Aristarchus, the identity of Asclepiades and Aristodemus, as well as the nature of the work of Artemon on Pindar, as to which we argued that it was primarily a work on Pindar rather than a work of history. As to Apollonius, Agestratus and Leptines, we can establish that they worked on Pindar, but the question of their dates and identities remains open. The focus in Chapter 4 was on ancient Pindaric scholarship in general. Hellenistic scholarship displays general similarities to that done on other classical authors, although certain aspects do stand out, such as the interest in the historical circumstances surrounding Pindar’s odes as well as the interpretation of their mythical digressions. The lack of commentary on the metre is noteworthy. The collected fragments cast doubt on the theory of Deas (1931) that historical interest in Pindar developed first
in Pergamum under the influence of Crates, given that the contemporaries and direct disciples of Aristarchus were already aware of the need to take historical, geographical and other kinds of information external to the text into account in order to understand the odes. The Hellenistic Pindaric scholars generally used all the information available to them when interpreting their poet and did not restrict themselves to internal evidence. For instance, Callistratus made use of geographical knowledge to explain Pindar’s “Asopian waters” in N. 3.3–4 as referring to the spring of Asopus in Aegina; furthermore, Ammonius bases his explanation of the description of Cyrene as “black-clouded” on his knowledge of the climate in Libya. The common image of an a-historical Aristarchus is probably influenced by the kind of textually internal interpretation associated with him. As pointed out by Nünlist (2015), however, Aristarchus did not object to the use of other sources in order to interpret the text. The observation that historical interests were common in the circle of Aristarchus ought to encourage further research on his own Pindaric studies.

We have noted numerous mentions of variant readings, although these rarely entered the text of Pindar as transmitted in the medieval manuscripts. This lends further support to the opinion common among scholars that the vulgate text goes back to an edition probably by Aristophanes of Byzantium. This edition presumably attained such an authoritative status that variant readings proposed by later scholars scarcely influenced it. Yet modern editors of Pindar have often acknowledged the value of these variants, and several of them have been adopted in standard editions of Pindar, e.g. the Σάμος of Aristodemus Fr. 3 for the Σᾶμ’ in the manuscripts (O. 10.70) or the ἐν ποτὲ Καλλίσταν in Chaeris Fr. 9 for the transmitted ἤν ποτὲ Καλλίσταν (P. 4.258). The conclusions of this thesis must, of course, be seen as tentative, inasmuch as they are restricted to what we can extract from the extant fragments. Our knowledge remains rather incomplete. The survival of these fragments depended on whoever transmitted them to posterity after excerpting from earlier sources. Didymus himself may be the ultimate source for much of the older Pindaric scholarship. His name often appears next to that of earlier scholars, e.g. in Σ N. 1.49c (Chaeris Fr. 10, Chrysippus Fr. 2). Due to Didymus’ well attested practice of quoting older sources, it is logical to assume that he also quoted previous colleagues even when the scholia do not make this explicitly clear. However, the voice that speaks to us in the scholia cannot be that of Didymus, since he is always referred to in the third person.

This voice is that of some anonymous scholiast who created a running commentary in the second century CE that was based on the works of Didymus and on such contemporaries as Theon and Aristonicus. This voice is our interface with the world of ancient Hellenistic scholarship on Pindar. Only through the choices made by such figures as this anonymous scholiast or the
scribe of the marginalia on POxy 841 or even, in the case of Aristodemus Fr. 12, Athenaeus are we able to study the Hellenistic Pindarists. Notice here that the lack of references to Pindar’s metre in the actual fragments does not necessarily mean that the Hellenistic scholars were uninterested in metrical questions. It could very well be the case that metrical scholia were also in circulation at the time and that metrical comments were deemed superfluous to the exegetical scholia because metre had already been treated elsewhere. Given that, with the exception of fragmentary papyri, our oldest extant manuscripts of Pindar were written in the twelfth century CE, in the preceding centuries the ancient scholia, both exegetical and metrical, probably served practical purposes in explaining Pindar and thus were adapted to the needs of readers. Nevertheless, the extant texts are not mere educational guides but also in their content precious fragments of ancient scholarship.
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This chapter gives an overview of the sources of the fragment collection. Section 6.1 is dedicated to the nature of the Pindar scholia in general. These marginal explanatory annotations in the medieval manuscripts of Pindar are at least partly Hellenistic in origin and constitute the main source for fragments of Pindaric scholarship. The section first discusses the history and nature of the Pindar scholia before giving a description of the textual tradition and individual manuscripts.

Fragments of ancient Pindaric scholars are also transmitted in ancient Pindaric papyri and texts by other authors. These sources are discussed in sections 6.2 and 6.3, respectively.

6.1 Pindar Scholia

6.1.1 Background

Modern scholarship generally uses the term scholion with reference to explanatory notes in the margins of medieval manuscripts explaining a primary text. The scholia on Pindar may be divided into metrical and non-metrical ones, and into ancient and Byzantine scholia (Dickey, 2007, p. 38). While the non-metrical scholia explain Pindar’s odes, the metrical ones offer a colon-by-colon metrical analysis of the odes. Metrical and non-metrical scholia are commonly found in the same manuscripts, but the differences between them are striking. The non-metrical scholia follow the text of Pindar throughout the manuscripts, while the metrical scholia are typically found at the beginning of an ode where they analyse its metrical structure.

The ancient Pindar scholia, both metrical and non-metrical, are anonymous, as is the case of most ancient scholiastic corpora. Nonetheless, the many references to ancient Pindarists in the Pindar scholia show their Hellenistic origin. According to Dickey (2007, pp. 70-71) the ancient Pindar scholia “are

---

1The ancient and Byzantine scholia are often referred to as scholia vetera and scholia recentiora.

2Metrical comments are rare within the non-metrical scholia. Cf. section 4.4.3.

3The Byzantine Pindar scholia can often be attributed to known Palaeologan scholars, cf. below.
virtually free of late interpolations, so that almost any piece of information found in them can be assumed to come from the Alexandrians (though not necessarily without abridgement and alteration). Scholia were generally not copied as conservatively as the texts they commented on. Rather, they were continuously adapted, epitomized, and expanded according to the needs in their specific contexts. For the purposes of this study, the ancient non-metrical scholia constitute the most important category. With the exception of some clearly much later interpolations, no references to authors active after the second century CE are found in the Pindar scholia. Wilamowitz (1889, p. 184; 1922, p. 2) therefore argued that the scholia go back to a commentary written for the Victory Odes at the end of the second century CE and based on Didymus’ commentary. Irigoin (1952, pp. 94–98, 104) accepted this view, but while Wilamowitz referred to the commentary as a Schulkommentar, Irigoin noted that the contents of this commentary must have been very heterogeneous, with material ranging from grammatical analysis and paraphrase to “explications savantes”. In fact, only parts of their contents would conform with the characteristics of ancient school commentaries, which “concentrated on mythological material and on a type of exegesis geared toward rendering the text more easily approachable” (Cribiore, 2001, p. 142). Some parts of the Pindar scholia, such as the paraphrase and discussions on mythology are typical of ancient pedagogical texts. The many references to ancient sources, some of which may have been more or less forgotten already in antiquity, appear instead superfluous or even counterproductive in explaining Pindar. A possible example of a school text on Pindar is that of PVindob. G 29817, a sixth-century papyrus containing Pythian 1 with substantial marginal annotations. According to McNamee (1994), these notes were taken by a teacher from a commentary on Pindar and added to the text of Pindar to be used during lecturing. Although these marginal annotations show similarities to the Pindar scholia they differ in some important aspects: they primarily consist of paraphrase, mythological exegesis and remarks on Pindar’s language; and they lack references to ancient scholars or more obscure authors. The only reference is to a typical school text, Euripides’ Phoenissae. The Pindar scholia, on the other hand, can hardly have originated from a source exclusively compiled according to the needs of basic education. Rather, the original source must have been a collection of exegetical materials designed not only to explain and paraphrase Pindar’s poetry, but also to preserve as much

---

1 Cf. also chapter 2 for an overview of the history of ancient scholarship on Pindar.

2 As noted by Montana each individual manuscript containing a scholiastic corpus “may represent in fact not merely an apograph but the one and only witness of a text-editing project ultimately satisfying some actual needs or a subjective intention” (Montana, 2011, p. 100).

3 Such interpolations include the verses of John Tzetzes found in B, Σ Ι 1.51d. Cf. section 2.4 for scholarship on Pindar after Didymus.
ancient exegetical material as possible.

The non-metrical scholia are usually connected to the commented text by *lemmata*, brief headings taken from the primary text. This practice goes back to ancient independent explanatory texts, where a *lemma* was necessary in order to locate the passage commented on in the primary text. Papyrus fragments and references in literature suggest that ancient scholarly texts were primarily transmitted independently from the primary texts they commented.\(^1\) Although marginal and interlinear annotations are common in ancient papyri, these are often short and generally do not offer as complex discussions as the medieval scholia (Dickey, 2007, p. 34).

How and when the medieval scholia originated has been the subject of much debate. J. W. White, in his edition and commentary on the scholia to Aristophanes’ *Birds*, argued that the transition from independent commentaries to marginal scholia appeared during the transmission from rolls to parchment codices when excerpts from still surviving independent commentaries were added to the margins (White, 1914, p. lxiv–lxv). Nigel Wilson (1967) supported White’s theory of an origin in late antiquity and adduced the evidence of papyrus fragments of codices from late antiquity with ample marginal annotations such as *POxy* 2258 (sixth–seventh century CE) containing poetical works of Callimachus.\(^2\) Nonetheless, Wilson acknowledges the possibility that independent commentaries survived into the ninth century and had a lasting influence on the scholiastic corpora. White’s hypothesis has more recently also been supported by Kathleen McNamee, who suggests that the layout of medieval manuscripts with dense scholia goes back to that of annotated legal manuscripts with broad margins from the fourth and fifth centuries CE (McNamee, 1998).

Two decades after the publication of White’s edition of the Aristophanes scholia, Günther Zuntz (1939) argued that the uncial script did not allow as ample marginal annotations as are found in the medieval manuscripts. Consequently, these must have appeared after the development of the Greek minuscule script in the ninth and tenth centuries CE. Zuntz also believed that the scholia were inspired by the *catenae*, biblical commentaries made up of excerpts from older biblical commentaries and often transmitted as marginal annotations, which Zuntz believed were invented after 700 CE (Zuntz, 1939, p. 582). The discovery of ample annotations in papyri from late antiquity discussed by Wilson and McNamee diminished the popularity of Zuntz’ theory about a late formation of the scholiastic corpora. It was taken up again by Fausto Montana who in 2011 argued that marginal annotations of late antique papyri only share exterior similarities with the medieval scholia and that scholiography should be defined as “an exegetic editio variorum, designed to be made up in

---

\(^1\) Cf. section 4.1 for the ancient commentary and other forms of scholarly texts.

\(^2\) Edited by Lobel (1952).
an orderly way alongside or around the text commented on” (Montana, 2011, p. 107). According to this view, annotations found on papyri are fundamentally different from the medieval scholia since the latter are the result of a systematic compilation of several sources, something not conclusively proven to be the case for any papyri of late antiquity (Montana, 2011, pp. 128–150, 156–160).

Within the limitations of this study, it is not possible to fully explore this question, but it might be rewarding to consider a synthesis of the two theories, as Wilson partly acknowledges. Although Montana is correct to state that no papyri contain medieval scholia, the act of compilation is not unique to the medieval scholia as the commentaries of Hellenistic scholars such as Didymus show.\(^1\) There is nothing against seeing hypomnēmata, papyrus marginalia and the medieval scholia as parts of a continuous development.

The Byzantine scholia are marginal commentaries composed mainly in the Palaeologan period (1261—1453). In the case of Pindar we have knowledge of scholia by Manuel Moschopoulus (born c. 1265), Thomas Magister (c. 1275–1347) and Demetrius Triclinius (active c. 1300–1325).\(^2\) Moschopoulus prepared an edition of Olympians that gained wide popularity and is preserved in around sixty manuscripts (Irigoin, 1952, p. 275). The edition was accompanied by a marginal commentary consisting of a continuous paraphrase and interlinear glosses of the Olympians with some linguistic, historical and mythological notes (Tissoni, 2014, p. 12).\(^3\) Thomas Magister’s commentary is less well known and its extent remains debated. Abel (1891) attributed scholia on the Olympians and Pythians 1–2 to him. However, Abel’s death in 1890 left his edition unfinished and, although it was completed by Geyza Némethy, it lacks a proper treatment of the sources and a description of Abel’s critical method.

The full commentary may have contained Olympians and possibly Pythians 1–4, although the evidence for Pythians is inconclusive (Gaul, 2007, p. 292).\(^4\) Triclinius based his marginal commentary on Pindar partly on that of Thomas Magister and Moschopoulus and partly on the ancient scholia.\(^5\) Triclinius’ commentary to the later Pythians and all Nemeans and Isthmians as edited by Mommsen (1865; 1867), are directly based upon the ancient scholia. An important difference between Byzantine and ancient scholia is that the former

\(^{1}\) Cf. section 4.1.2 for a discussion of the so-called composite commentaries.

\(^{2}\) For more information on these scholars cf. (Wilson, 1996, pp. 244–256).

\(^{3}\) The commentary can be consulted in the edition of Abel (1891).

\(^{4}\) Comparing the Thoman manuscript Vat. Gr. 1333 with Abel’s edition Gaul (2007, pp. 284–296) has cast considerable doubts on the reliability of Abel’s edition. Recently, Giannachi (2020) has argued that Thomas Magister wrote scholia and glosses on the Olympians and Pythians 1–4 which were further developed by Demetrius Triclinius.

\(^{5}\) In Triclinian manuscripts of Pindar some scholia have the heading ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν σχολῶν, “from the ancient scholia”, while other scholia are introduced by τοῦ αὐτοῦ, i.e. “Thomas Magister”.
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rarely mention ancient sources. This is even the case when they tacitly accept interpretations attributed to Hellenistic scholars in the ancient scholia, as seen in Triclinius’ commentary on Nemean 2.13 (Σ N. 19 (ed. Mommsen, 1865)) which follows Didymus’ view (Fr. 41 Braswell = Σ N. 2.19). It is possible that the Palaeologan scholars had access to some ancient scholia now lost, to which the twelfth-century scholars John Tzetzes and Eustathius may have had access. The tendency in Palaeologan scholia to omit explicit references to their sources makes it difficult to determine if any Palaeologan material not found in the extant ancient scholia derives from the Hellenistic Pindarists, but the Byzantine scholia are often helpful in the interpretation of the ancient scholia.

6.1.2 The Manuscripts

Of the over 200 surviving Pindar manuscripts, around 20 are independent of Palaeologan editorial work. Most of these manuscripts contain non-metrical scholia. For the present edition of the fragments from the Pindar scholia, the following manuscripts have primarily been studied.


---

1I have only found two explicit references to a Hellenistic scholar, Didymus, in the Byzantine scholia, the Σ O. 6.55 (ed. Abel, 1891) and Triclinian Σ P. 10.51 (ed. Mommsen, 1867). Both closely follow the wording of the corresponding ancient scholia.
2Cf. Scheer (1908, p. xiv) for Tzetzes’ knowledge of now lost scholia and D’Alessio (2012, p. 29) for Eustathius’ knowledge of now lost Pindaric odes.
4Remaining manuscripts are later copies of these or derive from editions made by Palaeologan scholars such as Manuel Moschopoulus, Thomas Magister and Demetrius Triclinius. The case of the Planudes’ possible edition is discussed further below.
5Exceptions are found in Venetus Marcianus gr. 465 and Palatinus gr. 40 which contain no scholia (Irigoin, 1952, pp. 205–209, 232–234). Many manuscripts also contain metrical scholia but these are of less importance for this study.
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Q Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Codex Laurentianus, Pl. 32.35. Early fourteenth century. Described by Turyn (1932, p. 31) and Irigoin (1952, pp. 234–236). Contains O. 1–P. 12 with scholia on folios 2–90r. The scholia are preceded by the Vita Thomana (folio 1v).
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T Roma, Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Vaticanus Graecus 121. Late thirteenth century. Described by Turyn (1932, p. 39) and Irigoin (1952, pp. 21–216). Contains O. 1 – N. 2 on folios 48v–89. The scholia are preceded by the Vita Thomana (folio 48r).


The text of Pindar and the accompanying scholia in these Pindar manuscripts belong to two distinct traditions, commonly referred to as the Ambrosian and Vatican recensions. A limited number of scholia in the two recensions are so similar that Drachmann reconstructed a synthetic critical text, and many more scholia have similar content but differ in wording. Due to these significant similarities it is probable that the two recensions share a common ancestry. Irigoin (1952, pp. 102, 106–108) believed that the Ambrosian and Vatican recensions split in the late third or early fourth century CE. Noticing confusions of uncial letters in the Ambrosian recension, he argued that it was transliterated into minuscules independently of the Vatican recension at a late period by a scribe not well acquainted with this task (Irigoin, 1952, p. 246). Irigoin’s theory is widely accepted, e.g. by Browning (1960, pp. 15–16) and Daude et al. (2013), but was criticized by Young (1966), who was not able to find a significant number of errors due to confusion of uncials within the Ambrosian recension. Young instead suggests that Pindar was transcribed once, presumably around year 1000 and that the Ambrosian and Vatican Recension did not split before this date. Deas (1931, pp. 51–53) similarly believed that the last common ancestor of the Ambrosian and Vatican recension belonged to the tenth or eleventh century. He based his opinion on the fact that the twelfth century Etymologicum Magnum cites both Vatican and Ambrosian scholia. As noted by Deas, these quotations go back to the older Etymologicum Genuinum which he

1The scholarly consensus on the relationship between surviving manuscripts containing Pindar scholia depends on the work of Anders Bjørn Drachmann, the editor of the Pindar scholia, as well as on Alexander Turyn and Jean Irigoin, who in their works on the textual history of Pindar also attempted to reconstruct the textual history of the scholia.

2E.g. Σ O.2.106c, Σ O. 3.17c, Σ O. 3.53a-b, Σ O. 4.19c.

3E.g. Asclepiades Fr. 4 (= Σ O. 8.10e and i) and Aristodemus Fr. 2a–b (= Σ O. 10.55b and c).
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dates to the ninth century. While Turyn (1932, p. 14) believed that the author of the *Etymologicum Genuinum* knew and cited both recensions, Deas found this improbable and argued that Ambrosian and Vatican scholia must have been found in one manuscript as late as the ninth century.

The Ambrosian recension is represented by Pindar’s *Olympian* 2–12 with scholia in one manuscript from the late twelfth century, Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (A). Irigoin and Turyn date A to the late thirteenth century but Mazzucchi (2003, p. 274–275) noted similarities to scripts of the late twelfth century and argued for a date 1185–95 CE. If Mazzucchi’s dating is correct, A is, together with B, the oldest medieval manuscript of Pindar. The Ambrosian recension, as far as we may judge from A, only contains *Olympians* (Irigoin 1952, pp. 106–108; Deas 1931, p. 57–58). A omits *Olympian* 13 and 14. Originally, it did not contain *Olympian* 1, but Pindar’s text and the scholia were later added from the Vatican recension. Where the textual state allows a comparison of the two recensions, the scholia of the Ambrosian recension contain significantly more references to named ancient authorities than the Vatican. Occasionally, e.g. in Σ O. 6.23a (=Aristodemus Fr. 1), lacunose scholia transmit little but the name of the source. For that reason Deas (1931, pp. 58–65) believed that the manuscript derived from a scholarly copy of the Ambrosian archetype.1

Except for A and its sixteenth-century copy, Vrat. red. 40, all surviving medieval manuscripts of Pindar belong to the Vatican recension.2 The Vatican recension exists in two traditions: the complete recension, which transmits all four books of the *Victory Odes*, and the abbreviated recension, preserving only *Olympians* and *Pythians*. The complete recension is represented by Vaticanus Graecus 1312 (=B), parts of Laurentianus Pl. 32.52 (=D), the manuscripts of the Paris recension, and *Nemeans* 1–2 in Vaticanus Graecus 121 (=T) and Vindobonensis Historicus Graecus 130 (=U). B dates to the late twelfth century and is, alongside A, the oldest surviving medieval Pindar manuscript. The manuscript contains text and scholia of all books of Pindar’s *Victory Odes* until *Isthmian* 8. The manuscript is in a bad condition; it is partly lacunose and often illegible.

The scholia of B appear to have been revised during the late twelfth century.3 Compared to other examples of the Vatican recension, B is characterized by a

---

1 “A derives from a ‘scholarly’ copy of the archetype; that this recension was little used and fell into a state of decay, from which it was rescued by someone who must have been sufficiently interested in such matters to preserve what could be preserved from a battered and probably old manuscript” (Deas, 1931, p. 64).

2 With the exception of papyri and quotations in other authors, text and scholia of *Olympian* 1,13 and 14, and all *Pythians, Nemeans* and *Isthmians* are thus only found in this recension.

3 “[...] les scholies du manuscrit B sont très loin de l’état original, tel que les manuscrits de la recension raccourcie nous ont permis de le reconstituer. Les scholies ont été abrégées, inter-polées et corrigées” (Irigoin, 1952, p. 162).
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different sequence of individual scholia and the omission of particles, definite articles and, occasionally, lemmata (Grandolini, 1984). The manuscript often differs from remaining testimonies of the Vatican recension in inserting or omitting explanatory comments.¹ B also has some shorter grammatical and lexicographical scholia not found in other manuscripts.²

D is the most complete manuscript of Pindar and contains the text of all the odes, O. 1. — I. 9.8, with scholia up to Σ I. 8.133. The manuscript is in a relatively good condition and dated to the early fourteenth century by Irigoin (1952, p. 322) and Turyn (1932, p. 18). The manuscript derives from several different textual traditions (Irigoin, 1952, p. 330). Turyn and Irigoin distinguish six different parts in the Pindar text and scholia of the manuscript. Only the last part, containing the Nemeans and Isthmians, actually belongs to the complete recension and is very similar to B. For the greater part of the Pythians, the text of D closely resembles that of Gottingensis philologus 29 (=G) while for Olympians the manuscript partly belongs to the abridged Vatican recension, partly to the Paris recension.

Together with B, D is the only textual witness to the scholia on Nemeans 6–11 and Isthmians. Although the scholia for these odes are very similar in B and D, both manuscripts omit some material found in the other. This is relevant for some of our fragments, such as Chrysippus Fr. 6 in Σ I. 1.81d, which is not found in B.

Irigoin located also the Paris recension,³ as well as the text and scholia of Nemean 1 and 2 in U and T, within the complete Vatican recension. Originally, the Paris recension contained at least Olympians, Pythians and Nemeans up to Nemean 6, but no surviving manuscript transmits the whole recension. Irigoin (1952, pp. 248–255) argued that a number of metrically preferable readings of Pindar’s text were conjectures by a Palaeologan philologist and even sees the recension as interpolated. Irigoin was convinced that the recension belonged to the period before Manuel Moschopoulus, and dated it to 1280. He further attributed the recension to Moschopoulus’ teacher Maximus Planudes, without giving explicit evidence for a connection between these manuscripts and Planudes. This view is criticized by Günther, who argues that the lack of a systematic metrical revision of Pindar’s text and the many metrically incorrect readings in the manuscripts contradict the idea of a recension made by a Byzantine philologist. Günther (1998, pp. 56–66) instead ascribes the variants in the

¹In Σ P. 4.36a, Τριτωνίδος ἐν προχοαῖς· Τρίτων ποταμὸς Λιβύης, ἐν ὧι Ἀθηνᾶ ἐγεννήθη B adds ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ Τριτογένεια ὀνομάζεται and Σ P. 4. 18 ἀθάνατον στόματος· τῆς Ἡσίοδος ἐπει, ὡς μὲν Χαῖρις, ἐκ μέρους τὴν ἀθάνατον, ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἡσίοδος ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ ἁθάνατον τῷ θησίν B omits ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ.
²E.g. Σ P. 4.65, 4.68, 4.508.
³This is the terminology of Alexander Turyn, Irigoin refers to the Planadean edition.
text of Pindar of the recension to the vicissitudes of the textual transmission itself. Despite Günther’s arguments against a systematic revision of Pindar’s text in the Paris Recension is the result of philological revision, the scholia on Pindar have obviously been the subject of revision.\(^1\) This is apparent in cases such as \(\Sigma \ P. 4 \ .61b\), where the Paris manuscripts \(\text{C} \) and \(\text{P}\), instead of enumerating the possible reasons for Euphemus’ receiving the clod from Eurypylus, as do the other manuscript, simply state \(\sigma \upsilon \tau \alpha \iota \varepsilon \pi \rho \rho \rho \tau \eta \tau \alpha \iota \varepsilon \varsigma \alpha \iota \tau \iota \varsigma\), “together with the proclaimed reasons”, with reference to the similar content of the earlier scholion, \(\Sigma \ P. 4 \ .36c\). Other scholia, such as \(\Sigma \ P. 2 \ .150.a-b\), are only found in manuscripts of the Paris recension and could be additions.

Parisinus Graecus 2774 (\(=\text{C}\)) contains \(O. \ 1 – \ P. \ 5. \ 51\) with scholia until \(\Sigma \ P. \ 5.57\), all belonging to the Paris recension. Irigoin (1952, p. 263) dates the manuscript to 1290–1330. Parisinus Graecus 2403 (\(=\text{P}\)) contains \(O. \ 1–N. \ 6.44\) and scholia until \(\Sigma \ N. \ 6. \ 73\), with lacunae, but the Paris recension is only represented from \(P. \ 2\) and onwards, while the scholia on earlier odes instead derive from Vindobonensis Supplementum Graecum 64 (\(=\text{Vi}\)), discussed below, a manuscript of the abridged Vatican recension. Three manuscripts of the Paris recension, all containing \textit{Olympians} have not been inspected within this study, except when they are quoted in Drachmann’s apparatus: Ambrosianus E 103 sup. \((=\text{N})\), Leidensis Q 4 B \((=\text{O})\) and Vaticanus Graecus 915.\(^2\)

The scholia to \(O. \ 1\) in \(A\) do not belong to the Ambrosian recension but were added from a manuscript of the Vatican recension. Drachmann noted similarities between the scholia to \(O. \ 1\) in \(A\) and the manuscripts of the Paris recensions such as \(\text{C}\) and \(\text{N}\). Irigoin (1952, pp. 242–243) suggests that \(A\)’s scholia on \(O. \ 1\), like the Paris recension derive from the complete Vatican recension.

Scholia from the complete Vatican recension appear also in two manuscripts containing \textit{Nemean} 1 and 2, Vindobonensis Historicus Graecus 130 \((\text{U})\) and Vaticanus Graecus 121 \((\text{T})\). Whereas these manuscripts otherwise belong to the abridged Vatican recension, the scholia on \textit{Nemeans} show similarities with \(\text{P}\) (Irigoin, 1952, pp 209–212). \(\text{U}\) also has some otherwise unknown additions in common with Triclinius’ commentary.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Irigoin (1952, p. 253) describes the scholia of the Paris recension as “fortement modifiés et interpolés”.

\(^2\)\(\text{N}\) dates to the late thirteenth century and contains the text and scholia of \textit{Olympians} (Irigoin, 1952, p. 257). Most text and scholia belong to the Paris recension but parts of text and scholia to \(O. \ 7–9\) appear to derive from the abridged recension (Irigoin, 1952, p. 260). \(\text{O}\) dates to around 1300 and like \(\text{N}\) it mostly derives from the Paris recension, but parts of the scholia on \textit{Olympian} 7 and 9 derive from the abridged recension (Irigoin, 1952, p. 260). Vaticanus Gr. 915 was written before 1311 and contains the text of Pindar for \(O. \ 2. \ 77 — \ O. \ 8. \ 53\), including \(\Sigma \ O. \ 2. \ 104 \ a — \Sigma \ O. \ 6. \ 170\). Text and scholia belong to the Paris recension (Irigoin, 1952, p. 261).

\(^3\)E.g. in \(\Sigma \ N. \ 1.49\) διαπορεῖται τίνι ἀφορμῇ εἰς τοὺς \(\text{(}\text{U, τὸν Triclinius)}\) περὶ Ἡρακλέους
6.1. Pindar Scholia

The abbreviated Vatican recension covers only *Olympians* and *Pythians*. Within the abridged Vatican recension two different traditions may be identified descending from the lost prototypes λ and the *Thessalonicensis* reconstructed by Irigoin.\(^1\) λ’s descendants include the two manuscripts Laurentianus Pl. 32, 37 (≡E) and Laurentianus Pl. 32, 33 (≡F). E contains the complete *Olympians* and *Pythians* and is an important textual witness to the scholia on both books. Already Drachmann noted that B and E occasionally agree on textual readings not found in other Vatican manuscripts (Drachmann, vol. 1, p. xi) and this observation was supported also by Snell (1956). F is generally similar to E but with significant contamination from the Paris recension (Irigoin, 1952, pp. 314–8). It contains scholia until Σ P. 5.34.\(^2\)

Remaining manuscripts belong to the tradition of *Thessalonicensis‘* descendants. G dates to the mid thirteenth century making it one of the older Pindar manuscripts and probably the oldest representative of the abridged recension (Irigoin, 1952, p. 172). Like B, it is a scholarly copy of Pindar, possibly produced for schoolmasters (Fries, 2017, p. 746). It contains text and scholia of *Olympians*, *Pythians*, and the text of the three first *Nemeans*, although the scholia and text of O. 1 and *Nemeans* were added in the 16th century.

Q contains text and scholia of all *Olympians* and *Pythians*. According to Irigoin (1952, p. 236), Q shows traces of philological correction. Vindobonensis Supplementum Graecum 64, which I, following Fries (2017), have given the siglum Vi, was partly neglected in pre-Irigoin scholarship, which was largely unaware of its existence. The manuscript belongs to the abridged Vatican recension and contains text and scholia to O. 1 – P. 4. 239. It was in the possession of a certain Germanus, who added some scholia to the manuscript. The manuscript is particularly interesting since it appears to be the *exemplar* of the text of O. 1 - P. 1 in P and U.

H is a fourteenth century manuscript containing *Olympians* and *Pythians* with scholia, as well as some verses of the *Batrochomyomachia* and Dionysius Periegetes.

T contains *Olympians* and *Pythians* with scholia, but also the first two

\(^{1}\) The latter was so called by Irigoin (1952, p. 146) because he traced it to twelfth century Thessalonica.

\(^{2}\) Two manuscripts that have not been inspected for this dissertation partly belong to the tradition from λ but also contain much material from other traditions: Athous Iberorum 161 and Vaticanus Graecus 902. The former contains the *Olympians* and the *Pythians* but with scholia only on O. 1–P. 1. The scholia partly belong to the tradition of λ, partly to that of the *Thessalonicensis* and partly to the Paris recension. Vaticanus Gr. 902 contains the text of the first ten *Olympians*. The scholia from Σ O. 9.72e till the end of O. 10 have been added from the *Thessalonicensis* (Irigoin, 1952, pp. 288–293). The scholia mostly belong to the tradition of λ, but after Σ P. 3 appear to derive from the Paris recension.
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Nemeans with scholia, although with major lacunas. U is a descendant of Vi containing scholia on Olympians and Pythians and the two first Nemeans with scholia. Whereas the earlier parts of the manuscripts derive from the Thessalonicensis tradition, the scholia on Nemeans in both T and U are similar to the complete Vatican recension and especially P.

6.2 Papyrus Fragments

Many papyrus fragments of paraliterary texts on Pindar have been unearthed in Egypt. Among these materials are found a biography, several independent commentaries as well as texts of Pindar with marginal annotations. These works are all important testimonies to Pindaric scholarship in antiquity. The famous Pindar biography in POxy 2438 probably refers to Aristophanes of Byzantium as the classifier of Pindar’s work, but otherwise our most important papyrus sources for named Hellenistic scholars are fragments of independent commentaries on Pindar as well as marginal annotations in papyri, especially on the Paeans in POxy 841.

6.2.1 Commentaries

Most papyrus commentaries on Pindar are anonymous. Modern scholars have suggested that the commentary PBerol. 13875 on an adespoton is a commentary by Didymus on Pindar but this is speculative. The major exception is POxy 2536, published in 1966 by E.G. Turner and dated to the second century CE, which is the only papyrus commentary to Pindar explicitly attributed to an ancient scholar, Theon (Fr. 2). This Theon is most probably identical with the Hellenistic scholar Theon, also mentioned in Σ O. 5.52a and in marginal annotations of POxy 841. Surviving parts of the papyrus comment on Pythian 12. POxy 2536 is an extraordinary example of Hellenistic scholarship of Pindar, since it appears to us in the form of an actual hypomnēma on Pindar by a named Hellenistic scholar. Nonetheless, POxy 2536 is probably not a verbatim copy of Theon’s commentary, but rather a selection of excerpts from the original commentary or an intermediary version.

---

1 The papyrus is edited by Lobel (1961) and De Kreij (2017).
2 Examples include POxy 2451 on the Isthmians and POxy 5201 on the Olympians.
3 According to Benelli (2013, p. 619), the commentary is “höchstwahrscheinlich” from Didymus, but the attribution is based on inconclusive evidence: the presence of the nouns ἀντωνυμία, “pronoun”, and ἐπίσημον, “distinguishing mark”, and the comparison of Pindar to Simonides and/or Bacchylides found in the commentary. Such traits are indeed also found in preserved fragments of Didymus but are not exclusive to this scholar.
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6.2.2 Marginalia

According to McNamee (2007, p. 2), approximately 5% of classical literary papyri contain marginal and interlinear annotations. To distinguish them from medieval scholia they are here referred to as *marginalia*.

The relationship between *marginalia* and the medieval scholia is much-discussed and not fully understood. In any case, the *marginalia* offer us glimpses into how Pindar’s poetry was read, taught, and studied in ancient Egypt, from where the bulk of our material originates. For the purposes of this study, the most interesting annotated Pindar papyrus is *POxy* 841 (second century CE). It transmits a significant part of the *Paeans* and was published by Grenfell & Hunt in 1908. It has particularly wide margins and interlinear spaces, possibly designed to allow annotations (Rutherford 2001, p. 139; McNamee 2007, p. 97).

We may distinguish brief and often interlinear annotations, mostly variant readings, written in capitals or semi-capitals, and longer exegetical marginalia in semi-capitals or a rapid cursive hand. Rutherford (2001, p. 149) suggests that the latter derive from what he describes as a “meta-ὑπομνήματα, perhaps a collection of earlier ὑπομνήματα assembled by Didymus and epitomized by Theon” (Rutherford, 2001, p. 149). Both textual and exegetical notes contain references to ancient Pindarists. Certain are the names Chrysippus (Fr. 24 on *Pae.* 8.1–2) and Theon (Fr. 3 on *Pae.* 2.37). The abbreviation Ν on *Pae.* 6.122 should most probably be resolved as Νι(κάνων), a scholar active in the second century CE.

More problematic is a series of abbreviations beginning with α which could be expanded to the names of 4 different scholars known to have worked on Pindar: Aristophanes of Byzantium, Aristarchus, Aristodemus and Aristonicus.

1. AP[1] *Pae.* 10a.1–6
2. A[ *Pae.* 8a.31
3. AP[ *POxy* 841 Fr. 94.3
5. AP *Pae.* 2.61
6. ΑΝ *Pae.* 2.75–76
7. ΑΝ *Pea.* 6.89
8. AP[Ν *Pae.* 6.181

1 Cf. 6.1.
2 For the abbreviation Z/ZH, formerly resolved as Ζη(νόδοτος) cf. section 2.1.1.
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ΑΡ|Ν and the similar ΑΡΙ|Ν are found in several (para-)literary papyri: in POxy 1174 of Sophocles’ Ichneutai, a variant reading is attributed to ΑΡ|Ν; in POxy 2803, Stesichorus’ Iliou Persis, it is possibly the source of a variant reading; in POxy 2387 of Alcman’s Partheneia a marginal annotation mentions that in the edition of ΑΡ|Ν something in Alcman’s text had been marked as spurious (Römer, 2013, pp. 129–33).

In the case of POxy 841, Grenfell & Hunt argued that this abbreviation should be resolved as Αριστοφάνης but there are significant reasons in favour of Αριστόνικος. In POxy 3710, a commentary on the Odyssey, ΑΡΙ|Ν is found next to the full form Αριστοφάνης, which suggests that the abbreviation does not refer to this scholar, as noted by D’Alessio and Ferrari (1989, p. 169, n. 28). Αρίσταρχος and another suggested resolution, Αριστοδήμος are improbable since the Ν appears to be constructed by the overlay of iota and nu (McNamee, 1981, pp. 10, 30, 63, 119). Recently, Antonopoulos (2013, pp. 56–57) in a discussion of the abbreviation in POxy 1174 has pointed out that “the revisor first wrote N and then added a vertical crossbar drawn through its middle [...] The only name that starts with ΑΡ|Ν and contains a syllable ΝΙ is Αριστόνικος; therefore here and in all other cases where this abbreviation occurs, one should read Αρ(ιστόνικος) with certainty”. These arguments are also valid for POxy 841 and we should therefore attribute at least Pae. 6.89 and 6.181 to Aristonicus (Fr. 7–8).

More problematic is the abbreviation found above Pae. 2.75 where Grenfell & Hunt read AN, resolved as Α(ριστοφάνης). McNamee (2007, p. 323) instead reads Ν, i.e. Α(ριστόνικος), and Rutherford (2001, p. 261) reads Νι, i.e. Νι(κάνωρ). The alfa is insecure as there only remains an oblique stroke. I have here followed McNamee and attribute the fragment to Aristonicus as Fr. 6 (Dubium) but the identification is insecure.

For the remaining abbreviations the evidence is inconclusive. McNamee (2007, p. 319) has argued that economy favours attributing all these abbreviations to one source. I cannot agree with this, since we find different abbreviations written by the same hand. To enable any identification at all we have to assume that the scribe was consistent in his abbreviations, which is why at least ΑΡ|Ν in Pae. 10a.6 and ΑΡ|Σ on Pae. 10b.9 should probably not be attributed to Aristonicus. Behind AP in Pa. 2.61 is found an oblique stroke. This can hardly be Ν and possible identifications include Aristophanes, Aristarchus and Aristodemus.

The letters following οὕτως α in Pae. 8a.31 are missing. The alfa might be the initial letter of an abbreviated name, but this can not be proven.

ΑΡΙ|Ν in POxy 841 Fr. 94.3 could possibly be resolved as Aristonicus. We have an alfa and a rhota followed by a lacuna. It is possible that Ν was found in the lacuna. Unfortunately, no traces of the missing letters survive, making
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confirmation or rejection impossible.

6.3 Other Sources

Most ancient Pindarists worked also on other authors. Fragments survive in papyrus fragments and extant scholiastic corpora especially on Homer and Aristophanes. These do not give direct information about the scholar’s work on Pindar but contribute to our understanding of the scholar’s activity. In addition to scholia and papyrus fragments, information on scholarly activity on Pindar is also found in texts less directly concerned with Pindar. Athenaeus Deipnosophistae contains a fragment from Aristodemus’ Peri Pindarou and biographical information on our scholars can be found in Byzantine etymologica and lexica, especially the Suda. The twelfth-century scholar John Tzetzes made extensive use of the Pindar scholia in his works, especially his commentary on Lycophron’s Alexandra. He occasionally quotes ancient Pindarists, such as Asclepiades Fr. 9 (Tzetzes Σ Lycoph. Alex. 886 ed. Scheer and Historiae 2.43 ed. Leone), but never in a form which differs from the text found in the Pindar scholia or in any other way suggests that he had access to fuller scholia in these cases. Although Tzetzes does not offer independent information on the history of Pindar scholarship his understanding of the Pindar scholia may help us in interpreting them.
7. Edition

This chapter describes the editorial principles behind the present edition as well as that of Drachmann and gives an overview of other editions. Drachmann’s Teubner edition is the standard text of the Pindar scholia and of immense value for anyone working on Pindaric scholarship. In the case of the scholia on *Nemeans* and *Isthmians*, Abel’s edition is also valuable.

7.1 Drachmann’s Editorial Principles

Drachmann was well aware of the complex textual history of the scholia and carefully describes his editorial principles in the prefaces of his three-volume edition.

*Olympians* are represented in all ancient manuscripts containing scholia. For his edition Drachmann consistently used A, B, C, D, E and Q and occasionally included readings from other manuscripts. For *Pythians* Drachmann primarily used B, D, E, G, Q. He also collated C and P for *Pythians* 1–3 and 7, F for *Pythians* 1–3 and occasionally H, T and U. For the *Nemeans* and *Isthmians*, the number of textual witnesses is limited, and Drachmann consistently collated the five relevant manuscripts: P for scholia on *Nemeans* 1–4 and 6, T and U for scholia on *Nemeans* 1–2 as well as B and D for scholia on all *Nemeans* and *Isthmians*.

In the case of the Ambrosian Recension of Σ O. 2. – Σ O. 12, Drachmann only had A at his disposal. The difficulties thus lay in the textual state of this manuscript, which contains severe textual problems. As a result of the Vatican recension’s many manuscripts, Drachmann had difficulties establishing preferences among them. Despite its great age, Drachmann, like later Irigoin and Turyn, noted several problems with B which is why in the edition of the scholia on the *Olympians* he preferred any consensus of C, D, E and Q, except when the readings offered by B were “aperte meliora” or supported by other manuscripts (Drachmann, vol. 1, p. xiii). In his edition of the scholia on *Pythians*, Drachmann appears to have used the same principles (Drachmann, vol. 2, p. xii). Drachmann rarely attempted to unite scholia of the Ambrosian and Vatican recension in one critical text. For *Nemeans* and *Isthmians* Drachmann,

1 Cf. section 6.1.2.
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preferred P where available for the choice of lemmata but did not otherwise establish any priority among the manuscripts and chose those readings that seemed to him most suitable, as long as they did not depart too far from B.

7.2 Principles of this Edition

While preparing this new edition, I have re-examined the manuscripts containing fragments of Hellenistic scholars and compared the readings to those found in the editions by Drachmann and, for Nemeans and Isthmians, Abel. I have also consulted some manuscripts not known or used by Drachmann, such as Vi, and made more consistent use of some manuscripts which were less consistently used by Drachmann, e.g. H. Even though I agree with Irigoin and Turyn that the Paris recension is probably a heavily interpolated version of the scholia, I have included it more consistently in my apparatus than Drachmann (particularly for Pythians) by including readings from P.

The manuscripts and odes specified in Table 7.1 were consulted via microfilms or digitisations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Odes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>O. 1 – O. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>All books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>O. 1 — P. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>All books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Olympians and Pythians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>O. 1 — P. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Olympians and Pythians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Olympians and Pythians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P. 1 — N. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Olympians and Pythians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>N. 1 — N. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>N. 1 — N. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi</td>
<td>O. 1 — P. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B is in a very bad state and partly illegible, especially for Nemeans and Isthmians. In cases where I have not been able to read a passage I have followed Drachmann’s or Abel’s readings.

The Pindaric corpora of scholia offer many problems for an editor and especially so when we attempt to reconstruct the exact wording of a Hellenistic
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scholar through the fragments transmitted in scholia. The information attributed to the Hellenistic scholar might, if genuine, have passed through several stages of compilation, abbreviation and alteration, before it entered the scholiastic corpus. Therefore it is generally not possible to reconstruct the original form of the Hellenistic scholar’s text, but in practice editors instead attempt to recreate the text of a common ancestor of the manuscripts containing the scholia in which the fragment is found. Regarding editing scholia Filippomaria Pontani (2016, p. 312–313) writes that

[...]

These problems are also highly relevant in the case of the Pindar scholia wherever we have a multitude of different textual traditions. Although the material studied in the present thesis, fragments of named ancient scholars, by definition is assumed to go back to one common source – the work of a scholar working on Pindar – the scholia which transmit them are to some extent in a state of flux. This is apparent when we compare the Ambrosian and Vatican recensions, which must be seen as traditions of equal value for our purposes. However, the case of the Vatican recension is somewhat different, in that the form of the fragments is generally quite stable, even if we also have considerable textual variations here. The differences between the Vatican and Ambrosian recensions are well exemplified by the case of Asclepiades Fr. 4a and b as follows in Table 7.2.

The textual witnesses in both the Ambrosian and Vatican Recension here give the same core information, a variant reading attributed to Asclepiades, which must have been found in the common source of both recensions. The two variants agree that Asclepiades did not read the dative λιταῖς in O. 8. 8 ἄνετα δὲ πρὸς χάριν εὐσεβίας ἀνδρῶν λιταῖς but instead the nominative plural λιταί. Asclepiades’ reading λιταί is the only part of the two variants of the fragments which is explicitly identified as a fragment of Asclepiades’ scholarly work on Pindar. Nonetheless, both scholia contain further information in the form of explanations of or opinions on Asclepiades’ opinion. Thus in Σ O. 8.10e the scholiast adds that Asclepiades must have accepted a case of a plural noun congruing with a singular verb, the so-called schema Pindarikon. Σ O.
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Table 7.2: Asclepiades Fr. 4 in the Ambrosian and Vatican Recension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambrosian</th>
<th>Vatican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ασκληπιάδης δὲ χωρὶς τοῦ σ γράφει λιταί· δεήσει δὲ καὶ οὕτων λαμβάνειν τὸ ἄνεται ἀντὶ πληθυντικοῦ τοῦ ἄνοντα, ἵνα ἂν τελειοῦντα δὲ αἰ λιταί πρὸς τὴν χάριν τῆς εὐσεβείας.</td>
<td>γράφει δὲ ὁ ᾿Ασκληπιάδης ἄνευ τοῦ σ λιταί, καὶ οὕτως καθίστηται τὸν λόγον πρὸς δὲ τὸ κεχαρισμένον τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀνύοντα, ἵνα ἂν τελειοῦντα δὲ αἰ λιταί πρὸς τὴν χάριν τῆς εὐσεβείας.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.10i instead says that “Asclepiades renders the meaning in this way” followed by a paraphrase of the meaning. Also Σ Ο. 8.10e contains paraphrases of the meaning of the text according to Asclepiades’ reading. We cannot tell if the paraphrase in the scholia derives from Asclepiades. The wording of 10i strongly suggests that Asclepiades did interpret the passage, but it might also be a later scholiast’s interpretation of the variant reading. In this and similar cases, Drachmann’s decision was to print the text of both recensions. Boeckh (1819, p. 189) had instead attempted to combine both versions, resulting in the following text:

γράφει δὲ ὁ ᾿Ασκληπιάδης ἄνευ τοῦ σ λιταί, καὶ οὕτως καθίστηται τὸν λόγον πρὸς δὲ τὸ κεχαρισμένον τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀνύοντα λιταί, ὡς ἂν αὐτῇ τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν εὐσεβείᾳ κεχαρισμένῳ τῷ λιτανεύειν ὄντος.

Boeckh’s solution has certain advantages since it offers an attempt to reconstruct the original form of the fragment, but also has considerable disadvantages by altering the actual form of the fragment. The present edition follows Drachmann in including both the Ambrosian and Vatican recensions in cases where they transmit such different versions of one fragment that they cannot be easily combined.

Textual variation within the Vatican recension causes other problems. While the Ambrosian recension is only represented by one primary manuscript, the Vatican recension is transmitted in several manuscripts with complex internal relationships. Thus in the Vatican recension of Σ Ο. 8.10i, the different traditions within the recension offer several textual variants. The text printed above, γράφει δὲ ὁ ᾿Ασκληπιάδης, is that found in manuscripts of the abridged recension (EGHQVi), but B has γράφει δὲ κατ’ ἐνίους ὁ ᾿Ασκληπιάδης and
the Paris recension has γράφει δὲ κατὰ Ἀσκληπιάδην (B) and γράφεται δὲ καὶ κατὰ Ἀσκληπιάδην (C).

It would also have been possible to print the text of variant manuscripts of the Vatican Recension as independent fragments. Yet, due to the more homogenous appearance of the Vatican recension and the generally less significant differences between the variants in the Vatican recension, the present edition instead constructs one text of the Vatican recension. In cases such as Σ O. 8.10i = Asclepiades Fr. 4b, where we have several acceptable readings, I have primarily followed the text of the abridged recension, as it shows fewer traces of philological correction.\(^1\) I have, however, not hesitated to accept readings from other traditions where these are superior, as in (Σ P. 4. 44b = Ammonius Fr. 3) where B transmits τὸ ταῖς αὐτῆς βουλαίς and other manuscripts transmit derived readings.\(^2\)

For Nemeans and Isthmians all manuscripts belong to the complete Vatican recension: B, D, P, T and U. I have primarily followed the readings of B and D where no consensus is found among the manuscripts. Where B and D diverge, I have more often followed B than D.

Although Drachmann is restrictive in his use of emendations, I have removed some of his and older editors’ conjectures.

- κεφαλαιώδει ... τῷδε : κεφαλαιώσει ... τῷδε Drachmann Σ O. 2.16b = Artemon Fr. 1
- διωσάμενόν φησι τὸν Πίνδαρον : διωσάμενός φησι ὁ Πίνδαρος Drachmann Σ P. 3.52b = Artemon Fr. 5
- παροίνια : παριθένια Drachmann Σ N. 11.inscr.a = Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 2
- ἱδιώτην ἐπαινῶν : BD, ἱδίως τὸν ἐπαίνον PU, ἱδίως τὴν ἐκ παίδων Drachmann Σ N. 1.49c = Chaeiris Fr. 10, Chrysippus Fr. 2.
- τὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ δῆλον : ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὴ τὸν Drachmann Σ N. 1.49c = Chaeiris Fr. 10, Chrysippus Fr. 2.
- ἕξ : ἕξακι Drachmann Σ I. 1.11c = Aristodemus Fr. 9
- περὶ Αἴαντος : B, τοῦ Αἴαντος D περὶ τοῦ Αἴαντος Drachmann Σ I 4.58d = Chrysippus Fr. 16
- Αἰνείας : Δεινίας Drachmann Σ I. 4.104g = Menecrates Fr. 2

---

\(^1\) Cf. discussion of the manuscript traditions in section 6.1.2.

\(^2\) Variants are κατά αὐτῆς (DGHPVI), τὰ κατὰ ταυτῆς (EF), κατὰ ταυτῆς (Q) or ταῖς κατ’ αὐτῆν (C).
7.3. Structure of Edition

- δεύτερον : δὶς Drachmann Σ I. 4.120b = Chrysippus Fr. 23

I have not followed Drachmann in several of his supplementations and deletions.² In many other cases I have adopted the emendations suggested by Drachmann and other scholars, such as Wilamowitz’ ἕρμαισιν for ἕρμεσιν (A) in Σ O. 6.23a (= Aristodemus Fr. 1).

For Theon’s commentary on the Pythians, we have only one textual witness, POxy 2536. The present text is based on that of Turner’s editio princeps. Where the present edition differs from Turner’s, it has been noted in the critical apparatus. Unless otherwise stated, all readings and supplements are Turner’s. The text of fragments from marginalia on papyri is that of McNamee (2007) with some minor alterations. Fragments deriving from Athenaeus are given in the edition of Olson (2020) with one alteration.

7.3 Structure of Edition

The fragments have been ordered according to the passage in Pindar they comment on. Fragments commenting on O. 1 are positioned before fragments on O. 2 and fragments on Olympians before fragments on Pythians. The fragments of Hellenistic scholars found in papyri on Paeans are positioned after the fragments of the Victory Odes and are themselves in turn followed by fragments that neither derive from the scholia on Pindar nor papyrus fragments. The sigla of the inspected manuscripts containing the fragment in question are printed after the fragment or part of fragment for which they have been inspected.

With minor adjustments, I have kept the numbering and the subdivision into paragraphs of the scholia made by Drachmann. This numbering follows the ancient colometry of the medieval manuscripts rather than the line numbers of Pindar in modern editions which was introduced by Boeckh. Σ O. 1.35 thus comments upon O. 1.23. The disadvantage of using the ancient colometry is the difficulty in cross-referencing to the standard editions of Pindar’s poetry.³ In the present edition of the fragments the corresponding line number in Pindar is therefore given next to that of the scholion as Σ O. 1.35 = O. 1.23.

Drachmann, as well as earlier editors, further divided the scholia on each colon into smaller scholia. The criteria for this division are sometimes vague,

---

¹Supplements not followed include Σ O. 2.31b-22a = Asclepiades Fr. 1, Σ P. 4.61b = Asclepiades Fr. 8, Σ N. 1.49c = Chaeris Fr. 10, Chrysippus Fr. 2. Deletions not accepted are found e.g. in Σ O. 5.42a = Theon Fr. 1, and Σ N. 7.150a = Callistratus Fr. 3.

²The numbering according to cola is designated in Snell-Maehler’s edition by smaller numbers in the outer margin.
but mostly correspond to the existence of particular words, such as ἄλλως, “alternatively”. Drachmann gave each such scholion an identifying value using the number of the colon commented upon and the alphabetical value corresponding to their position in his edition. I have kept this system with some minor changes. Since the number of individual scholia on one lemma can be large it has often been necessary to print only the most relevant parts of the scholia in this edition. In such cases I have included the commented colon’s lemma, if extant, and noted that text has been left out.

7.4 Editions of the Ancient Pindar Scholia

The editio princeps of the Pindar scholia was Zacharias Callierges’ Pindar edition, often referred to as the Romana, in 1515. This was one of the very first Greek books printed in Rome and contained the text of Pindar’s odes as well as the accompanying scholia of the Vatican recension. The layout of the Romana reflects that of the medieval manuscripts by placing the text of Pindar in the centre of each page with the scholia in the wide margins. The text of the scholia appears to be based primarily on B (Fogelmark, 2015, pp. 55, 283). A few readings in the Romana are probably Callierges’ conjectures. Interesting for the purposes of this study is the text of Σ P. 4. 61 = Chaeris Fr. 2, where B, D, G, Q and VI have the reading χάρης and C, E, P and X χάρις. In the Romana we instead find the otherwise unattested Χαῖρις and this possible conjecture by Callierges has been unanimously accepted in later editions. A second edition of Pindar with Scholia was published in 1542 by Brubach, which offered “[p]aucas novas lectiones e codice nescio quo petitas” (Drachmann, vol. 1, p. xix). The scholia were also included in the Pindar edition by Beck (1792-1795) and in the three editions by Heyne (1773–1817), which contain several conjectures accepted by later editors, e.g. Heyne’s Δίδυμος (Fr. 55 Braswell) for Πίνδαρος in Σ N. 3.16b. Of even greater importance was the edition of the Pindar scholia made by August Boeckh (1819). In its introductory discussion of the Pindar scholia and the ancient authorities mentioned by them, he first sketched out the philological activities on Pindar in the Hellenistic period. An edition of the scholia on the Nemeans and Isthmians was published in 1884 by the Hungarian philologist Eugen Abel. Abel’s edition is characterized by an ample critical apparatus in which all earlier editions of the scholia, as well as Triclinian manuscripts, were included. Especially helpful are the many discussions in the apparatus. The first editor of the Pindar scholia to take full account of the Ambrosian Recension was Anders Bjørn Drachmann, who edited the ancient

---

1 Further editions in the 16th–17th centuries were published in 1599 by Paulus Oliva Stephanus and 1697 by West and Welsted (Braswell 2013, p. 9, n. 3).
7.5 Principles for Translation

The aim of the translation is to make the fragments accessible to Greekless readers as well as to offer an extra interpretative dimension to the fragments. The Greek of the scholia and scholarly texts in general offers relatively few grammatical and syntactical complexities, but the technical nature of the texts and their compact and often elliptical style make them difficult for readers not accustomed to the genre.\(^1\)

Within my translation I have striven to render the Greek as faithfully as possible while still offering a readable text. I have tried to translate Greek words consistently, whenever possible. For example, the verb form ζητεῖται, when used to introduce a problem of interpretation, is consistently translated as “the question is”. In cases where a word has a technical and a non-technical meaning which cannot easily be rendered by one English word I have deviated from this principle. Thus, ἀκούω is rendered both as “understand” when it is applied to interpretations of a text and “hear” when it refers to sound perception, and ἀποδίδωμι both as “explain” in its technical sense and “deliver” in its non-technical sense. When translating technical vocabulary, I have generally followed the glossaries of Dickey (2007) on scholarly language in general and Nünlist (2009) with a focus on ancient literary criticism. These principles are not always tenable: some words such as κεῖμαι, with the non-technical meaning “to lie down”, are used in a wide array of technical meanings that cannot be rendered by a single English expression.

When additions are necessary to make the English text understandable these have been added in square brackets. In some cases footnotes have also been added to further explain abbreviated or ambiguous passages. Due to the textual-critical and lexicographical nature of several fragments, certain words are transliterated rather than translated. In these cases, the Greek word is transliterated and set in italics with the English translation in square brackets.

When the original form of the Greek word is relevant, e.g. in etymologies, the Greek word is set in round brackets following the translation.

\(^1\)For an introduction to scholarly Greek cf. Dickey (2007).
7.6 Principles for Commentary

The commentary is directed to anyone interested in the history of classical scholarship and especially in Hellenistic scholarship on Pindar. Although the views of the ancient grammarians on Pindar tend to be negatively seen by modern scholarship, it should also be of interest for students of Pindar and Greek lyric in general, especially those interest in Pindaric reception.

Although Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922, p. 3) noted that the fragmentary state makes it impossible to reconstruct the original works of the ancient Pindarists, a close study of the independent fragments nonetheless lets us draw some conclusions regarding their interests in Pindar, what questions they asked and how these were answered. We may also at least hypothesize on the methods used and the processes reaching to these answers. When dealing with these remains of Pindaric scholarship, a major problem is their fragmentary nature. Each fragment is only a small piece of a larger work, taken out of its original context. In order to fully understand a fragment we will need to address the question of context, while simultaneously taking on internal problems and points of interests within each fragment. Topics that will be addressed, when appropriate, include:

1. Authorship and attribution
2. Procedures – What does the fragment say and how did the scholar reach these conclusions?
3. Textual difficulties
4. Language and technical vocabulary

The commentary’s focus is on the individual fragment. When necessary, cross-references will be given to more general discussions of relevant topics. The commentary primarily discusses the fragments in running form. If necessary, more specific problems are addressed independently in paragraphs on specific lemmata.
8. Text and Translation
Signa et compendia in textu et in apparatu critico adhibita

... In apparatu: litterarum vestigia. In editione: lacuna.

<α β γ> Includuntur verba a editore supplleta.

[α β γ] In apparatu includuntur litterae quae Drachmann in codicibus olim fuisse videntur, sed hodie legi nequeunt. In editione fragmentorum e papyris repertorum includuntur verba a editore supplleta. In editione ceterorum fragmentorum includuntur verba a editore deleta.

α β γ littera dubia vel mutila.

a Prima ubi duae recensiones unius scholii inveniuntur.

b Secunda ubi duae recensiones unius scholii inveniuntur.

ac ante correctionem.

cp compendium.

pc post correctionem.

acc. accepit.

add. addidit.

B? lectio codicis B dubia.

cett. ceteri (codices).

codd. codices.

con. coniecit.

del. delevit.

emend. emendavit.

hab. habet, habent.

ind. indicavit.

l. n. legi nequit.

lac. lacuna.

leg. legit.

litt. litterae.

n. l. non liquet.

om. omisit.

praem. praemisit.

ras rasura.
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s. s. supra scriptum.
scr. scripsit.
secl. seclusit..
sugg. suggestit.
suppl. supplevit, supplendum.
τ(ὰ) compendium omissae terminationis.
Editiones in apparatu adhibitae


Triclinius Scholia recentiora Demetrii Triclinii.

Sigla codicum

A Ambrosianus C 222 inf (Martini-Bassi 886).
B Vaticanus Graecus 1312.
C Parisinus Graecus 2774.
D Laurentianus Plut. 32.52.
E Laurentianus Plut. 32.37.
F Laurentianus Plut. 32.33.
G Gottingensis Philologus 29.
H Vaticanus Graecus 41.
N Ambrosianus E 103 sup..
O Leidensis Q 4 B.
P Parisinus Graecus 2403.
Q Laurentianus Plut. 32.35.
T Vaticanus Graecus 121.
U Vindobonensis Historicus Graecus 130.
Vi Vindobonensis Supplementum Graecum 64.
Aristonicus Fr. 1

Σ O. 1.35c = O. 1.23

(35a.) ἱππιοχάρμαν ... (35c.) ἔνιοι δὲ ἀναγινώσκουσι παροξύνοντες τὴν παραλήγουσαν συλλαβήν τοῦ Συρακουσίων καὶ τὴν ἐσχάτην τοῦ ἱππιοχαρμάν περιποίοσιν, ίν’ ἢ Συρακουσίων ἰππιοχαρμῶν. (ADEFHQVi) τὸν γὰρ Ἱέρωνκ οὐκ εἶναι Συρακούσιον ότε ἐνίκα· κτίσαντα γὰρ αὐτὸν τὴν Κατὰν καὶ προσαγορεύσαντα Αἴτνην ἀπ’ αὐτῆς Αἰτναϊον αὐτὸν λέγουσιν. (DHQ) εὐήθεις δὲ φησὶ Διδύμος (Fr. 1 Braswell) τούτους· τότε γὰρ ῾Ηέρων ἦν Ἐλευθέρων ὅτε ἐνίκα, κτίσαντα γὰρ αὐτὸν τὴν Κατὰν καὶ προσαγορεύσαντα Αἴτνην ἀπ’ αὐτῆς Αἰτναῖον αὐτὸν λέγουσιν. (HQVi)

Ammonius Fr. 1

Σ O. 1.122c = O. 1.76

10 πέδασον ἔγχος. Ἀμμώνιος ἔγχος Οἰνομάου τὸ ἅρμα ἤκουσεν (AHPQ-TUVi).

Artemon Fr. 1 (FGrH 569 Fr. 1), Menecrates Fr. 1 (FHG 2: 2, 344)

Σ O. 2.16b-c = O. 2.29

(16a) ἰερὸν ἐσχον οἴκημα. Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 3 Horn) τὴν πόλιν οἰκήμα ποταμοῦ προσηγορεύσατα ἡ φησὶ διὰ τὸ ὄμονον εἶναι τῷ ποταμῷ Ἀκράγαντί.
Aristonicus Fr. 1

Σ O. 1.35c = O. 1.23

He who delights in horses: ... Some read the penultimate syllable of Syrākousiōn [Syracusan] with an acute accent and the ultimate of hippiocharmān [who delights in horses] with a circumflex, so that the sense is “of Syracusans who delight in horses”. For Hiero was not Syracusan at the time of his victory: since he had founded Catana and renamed it Aetna they call him Aetnean after it. Didymus calls these people simple-minded. For Hiero was Syracusan and not yet Aetnean at this time, as Apollodorus says. Aristonicus [argues] persuasively that he was Aetnean but was called Syracusan.

Ammonius Fr. 1

Σ O. 1.122c = O. 1.76

Restrain the spear: Ammonius understood Oenomaus’ spear as his chariot.

Artemon Fr. 1 (FGrH 569 Fr. 1), Menocrates Fr. 1 (FHG 2: 2, 344)

Σ O. 2.16b-c = O. 2.9

They won a sacred home: Aristarchus says that Pindar addressed the city⁷ as “home by the river” because it has the same name as the river Acragas. For

---

¹Acragas.
τὴν γὰρ ὀνομασίαν ἡ πόλις ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἔσχεν (BCEFGHQVi).

(16b) Ἀρτέμων δὲ ὁ ἀπὸ Περγάμου τὴν Γέλαν οἴεται δεῖν ἀκούειν. καὶ γὰρ ταῦτην ὀνομασίαν εἶναι Γέλα τῷ ποταμῷ, τοὺς δὲ Ἀχαραγάντων Σικανούς ἄποικους ὅστε τὸ πατέρων ἀοτόν (O. 2.7) ἐν Γέλᾳ ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ Θήρωνος προγόνων συντετάχθη· κεφαλαίωσε δὲ χρήται τίμη· τὸ καρμόντες (O. 2.8) ἤρθ’ προστίθησιν μᾶλλον ἀκούειν ἐπί τῶν τὴν Γέλαν ἐκτικάτων, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀχαράγαντα. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄποικοι τοῦ ποταμοῦ συνεκρίσθησαν, οἱ δὲ χαλεπῶς καὶ μόλις. Ἀντίφημος γὰρ ὁ Ῥόδιος καὶ ἔντυμος ὁ Κρής, οἱ τὲς εἰς Γέλαν στείλαντες ἄποικιαν, πρῶτον μὲν περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐκαμών ὡς μετρίως, συναθροίζοντος τούς ἑπτὰ πρὸς τὰς ὀκτὼ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἑπτά πρὸς τὰς ὀκτὼ (BCEFGHQVi 21)

ἑπτὰ πρὸς ταῖς ὀκτὼ Drachmann emend. ex Σ O. 2.70b (in A), εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ BH, κζʹ EFGQVi

22 θυμῷ om. B
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(16c) Μενεκράτης δὲ φησὶ ληρεῖν τὸν Ἀρτέμωνα· μὴ γὰρ καμεῖν τοὺς περὶ Ἀρτέμωναν τὴν Γέλαν οἴεται δεῖν ἀκούειν· τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου πάλιν ἐξ Ἀθήνας ἀποστῆναι· τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου πάλιν ἐξ Κάδμους. ἀποδεικτέαντα ἵππον ἰπποταμόντος τοὺς ἐκ Πελοποννήσου καὶ Ῥόδου καὶ Κρής, ἐπτά περὶ τὸν διάπλουν, ἐπτά περὶ τὸν κατοικισμόν, καὶ πάλιν διαγωνισμένοι πρὸς τοὺς Σικανούς.

(2018) ex Σ
the city was named after the river. Artemon of Pergamum believes that one should understand it as Gela. For this city also shares its name with a river, Gela, and the Acragantians are colonizers from Gela. Therefore the “choicest bloom” of ancestors” was written in reference to Theron’s ancestors in Gela. Artemon uses this general [argumentation]: He said that it is more fitting to take “suffering” as referring to the founders of Gela rather than of Acragas. For the latter founded the city without hardships, but the former with difficulty and hardship. For those who dispatched the colony to Gela, Antiphemus from Rhodes and Entimus from Crete first suffered greatly at the gathering when they were assembling settlers from Peloponnesos, Rhodes and Crete, and thereafter during the journey, during the settlement, and again as they were fighting against the Sicanians.

Menecrates says that Artemon speaks foolishly. The followers of Antiphemus did not suffer in connection to the colony, but rather everything worked out quite easily for them. So about whom does he say “those who had suffered much”? About Theron’s ancestors. They were Thebans descending from Cadmus, whose son is Polydorus, whose son is Labdacus, whose son is Laius whose son is Eteocles whose son is> Polydorus whose son is Haemon. After having killed kinsman during a hunting-expedition he departed to Athens. His descendants again departed from Athens with the Argives to colonize Rhodes and thereafter came to Acragas. Seven generations are counted in addition to the eight [from Cadmus] untill Theron.¹ Perhaps therefore Pindar says, “who suffering much in their hearts received the sacred home by the river” with this

¹According to Menecrates Theron descends from Haemon.
Chrysippus Fr. 1 (Fr. 1 Braswell)

Σ O. 2.104b = O. 2.57


Asclepiades Fr. 1

Σ O. 3.21b-22a = O. 3.12

ἀτρεκὴς ἀτρεκὴς Ἐλλανοδίκας... Αἰτωλὸς ἀνήρ· τοὺς Ἐλλανοδίκας, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πάντας τοὺς Ἡλείους Αἰτωλοὺς εἶπεν· οὐκ ἁμαρτάνει τοῦτοι γὰρ ὄνομασθήσαν ὑπὸ Αἰτωλοῦ τοῦ Ἐνδυμίωνος, ἢ ἡ τὴν Ὀξύλου εἰς Ἡλιν ἀφίξιν, ὡς περὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ἀξιοῖ περὶ δὲ τοῦ τῶν Ἐλλανοδικῶν ἀριθμοῦ Ἐλλάνικος (FGrH 4 Fr. 113) φησι καὶ Ἀριστόδημος (FGrH 414 Fr. 2), ὅτι τὸ πρῶτον ἡμῆν, τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον ἴτ' τοσαῦται γάρ αἱ τῶν Ἡλείων φυλαί, καὶ ἐφ' ἐκάστης εἰς ἣν Ἐλλανοδίκης (A).

Aristonicus Fr. 2

Σ O. 3.31a = O. 3.18

ἄλσει· οὐ θαυμαστὸν εἰ τὸ μήπω πεφυτευμένον ἄλσος εἶπεν.
in view.

Chrysippus Fr. 1 (Fr. 1 Braswell )

Σ O. 2.104b = O. 2.57

Or: that of those who have died here: Chrysippus understands thus: here they are avenged by the dead, but in the underworld by those who judge there, be it Hades or someone else. It is not unlikely, he says, that the living are punished by those who have died. For tragedy is full of occasions were the wronged injured parties pray to the subterranean heroes for succour, as Electra (prayed) to Agamemnon.

Asclepiades Fr. 1

Σ O. 3.21b-22a = O. 3.12

Strict: <The strict Hellanodikas [Hellenic judge] ... The Aetolian: Pindar calls the> Hellanodikai, or rather all Eleans, Aetolians. For so they were named from early on after Aetolus, the son of Endymion, <or> because of Oxylus’ arrival in Elis, as Asclepiades thinks. Concerning the number of the Hellanodikai, Hellanicus and Aristodemus say that they were first 12 and thereafter 10. Because so many are the phylai of the Eleans and there was one Hellanodikas from each.

Aristonicus Fr. 2

Σ O. 3.31a = O. 3.18

Grove: It is not strange that Pindar calls a place not yet planted alsos

\[^1\]The helpless souls, ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες O. 2.57.
‘Αριστόνικος προληπτικῶς φησιν εἰρῆσθαι· οἱ δὲ ὅτι πάντα τὰ ἱερά, κἂν μήπω πεφυτευμένα ἦ, ἄλση ἐκάλουν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι. καὶ Ὄμηρος (II. 2.506)·

῾Ογχηστόν θ’ ἱερόν, Ποσειδήιον ἄλσος.

ἐκατά τὰ διήκειν ᾿Ογχηστόν, ἰψ’ ὑψηλοῦ κείμενος (A).

Artemon Fr. 2 (FGrH 569 Fr. 2)

Σ O. 5.1b = O. 5.1

5 (1b) λέγει δὲ πρὸς τὴν Καμάριναν τὴν ᾿Ωκεανοῦ, ἥ ὁμώνυμος ἡ πόλις καὶ λίμνη (BCDEFHQVi), ὅτι δέξαι τῶν ἀρετῶν καὶ τῶν στεφάνων τῶν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ καὶ τῆς ἀπήνης τὸ ἄωτον, ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸν ὑμνὸν, ὡς ἐστι δόρα τοῦ Ψάμμιος νεκρικότος. τὸν ὑμνὸν δὲ ἰστὸν τῶν στεφάνων καὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν εἶπεν, ἐπεὶ οἱ νικώντες ἐκ τοῦ ὑμνεῖσθαι ἐυκλεεῖς γίνονται. Αρίσταρχος (Fr. 10 16 Horn) δὲ ἀκούει ᾿Ωκεανοῦ θυγατέρα Καμάριναν τὴν λίμνην, ἀφ’ ἧς καὶ τὴν πόλιν ὠνομάσθαι. Ἀρτέμων δὲ πρὸς τὴν ᾿Αρέθουσαν τὸν λόγον εἶναι φησι. αὕτη δὲ ἐν Συρακούσαις κρήνη· ὑποτέτακται δὲ ἡ Καμάρινα ταῖς Συρακούσαις. ἔχει δὲ ἡ ᾿Αρέθουσα καὶ πᾶσα κρήνη τὰς πηγὰς ἀπὸ ᾿Ωκεανοῦ. βέλτιον δὲ ὡς Ὀρίσταρχος (CDEFGHQVi).

Theon Fr. 1 (Fr. 36 Guhl)

Σ O. 5.42a = O. 5.18

15 Ἡδαίον τε σεμνὸν ἄντρον ἡ ἡ ἱδαίον ἄντρον ἐν Ἡλίδι Δημήτριος ὁ Σκήψιος (FGrH 2013 Fr. 54) ἐν νεῶν διακόσμω ἱερὸν Διός. ἐνοίκι δὲ νομίζοντες μῆ

1 προληπτικῶς Drachmann, προληπτικὸν Drachmann, προληπτικὸν (όν) A 5-6 λέγει δὲ πρὸς Καμάριναν τὴν ᾿Ωκεανοῦ τὸν ὑμνὸν ὡς ἐστι δόρα τοῦ Ψάμμιος hab. post εὐκλέατες γίνονται EF || λέγει δὲ Ἰερή λάν ἀρετῶν ἡ νοῦς δέ λέγει B, Drachmann || τὴν Καμάριναν | Καμάριναν CGHQ || ἡ ὁμώνυμος ἡ πόλις καὶ λίμνη ὅτι δέξαι τῶν ἀρετῶν καὶ τῶν στεφάνων τῶν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ hab. inter κέλητι καὶ νεκρικότος τὸν ὑμνὸν δὲ ἦ E, τὸν δὲ ἦ F Λιμπίδης | ἔν Ὀλυμπίας BC || ἀν Ὀλυμπίας EF, Ὀλυμπίας VI 7 ὡς δὲ C, Q || δόρα | δόρον C 8 τὸν ὑμνὸν δὲ ἰστόν ] τῶν δὲ ὑμνὸν διακόσμου ἱερὸν Διός. ἐνοίκι δὲ νομίζοντες μη
Artemon Fr. 2

[grove]. Aristonicus says that Pindar says this in anticipation. Others [say] that the ancients called all sacred places *alsos* even if they were not yet planted. Also Homer:

Sacred Onchestus, the Poseidonic grove.

For Onchestus is not rich in trees at all, being situated in the highlands.

Artemon Fr. 2 (*FGrH* 569 Fr. 2)

\(\Sigma\ O.\ 5.1b = O.\ 5.1\)

Pindar says to Camarina, Oceanus’ daughter, with whom the city and the lake share their name, that she should accept the best of virtues and crowns in Olympia and the best of the mule-wagon, i. e. the hymn, which is the gift of Psaumis, the winner. Pindar refers to the hymn as the best of crowns and virtues, since the winners become renowned by being the subject of hymns. Aristarchus understands the daughter of Oceanus’ as lake Camarina, for which the city is named. Artemon however says that the phrase refers to Arethousa. This is a spring in Syracuse and Camarina is subject to Syracuse. Arethousa and all springs have their source in the Oceanus. But it is better [to understand the reference] as Aristarchus [does].

Theon Fr. 1 (Fr. 36 Guhl)

\(\Sigma\ O.\ 5.42a = O.\ 5.18\)

And the sacred cave of Ida: “There is a cave of Ida in Elis sacred to Zeus, says Demetrius of Skepsis in the *Catalogue of ships*. But some who do not
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

τῶν ἐν ᾽Ηλίδι χωρίων αὐτὸν μεμνῆσθαι ὑπέλαβον μνημονεύειν Ὕδης τῆς ἐν Κρήτῃ ἢ τῆς ἐν Τροίᾳ. οὕτως Θέον φησίν (A).

Aristodemus Fr. 1 (FGrH 383 Fr. 10)

Σ O. 6.23a = O. 6.15

ἐπτὰ δ’ ἐπειτὰ πυρὰν τῶν διαβεβοημένων ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦτο: πῶς ἑπτὰ φησὶ γενέσθαι πυρὰς; τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐπιστρατευσάντων καὶ οὐ πάντων καέντων; Ἀριστόδημος μὲν κατεπόθη σὺν τοῖς ἵπποις ἐν ᾿Ωρωπῷ· Πολυνείκης δὲ οὐκ ἐτάφη· ἀταφὸς γὰρ ἔμειν. ᾿Αμφιάραος μὲν κατεπόθη σὺν τοῖς ἵπποις ἐν ᾿Ωρωπῷ· Πολυνείκης δὲ οὐκ ἐτάφη· ἀταφὸς γὰρ ἔμειν. ῾Αρμενίδας (FGrH 378 Fr. 6) γράφουσι· καὶ πυρὰς ποιεῦντες ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς ῾Ερμαῖσιν ἐνταῦθα ὅπου καλοῦνται ῾Επτὰ Πυραὶ, ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ παίδων Νιόβης ἐκεῖ καυθέντων ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ παίδων Νιόβης ἐκεῖ καυθέντων ἀπὸ τῶν ἱδ’ χωρισθεισῶν τῶν συζυγιῶν (A).

Asclepiades Fr. 2

Σ O. 6.26 = O. 6.16

ποθέω· ο Ασκληπιάδης φησὶ ταῦτα εἰληφέναι ἐκ τῆς κυκλικῆς Θηβαΐδος (Fr. 10 PEG) (A).

Asclepiades Fr. 3

Σ O. 7.24c-d = O. 7.13

(24c.) τὰν ποντίαν ὑμνέων παῖδ’ Ἀφροδίτας· σύνηθες τῷ Πινάρω τά
believe that Pindar mentions the regions of Elis have supposed that he is mentioning the Ida on Crete or at Troy.” So says Theon.

Aristodemus Fr. 1 \((FGrH \ 383 \ Fr. \ 10)\)

Σ Ο. 6.23a = Ο. 6.15

Then seven pyres: Among the discussed topics is also this [question]: how can Pindar say that there were seven pyres when seven went to war but not all were burnt? Amphiaraos was swallowed with his horses in Oropos and Polyneikes was not buried. For he remained unburied. Adrastos arrived in Argus alive. Four remain, Tydeus, Capaneus, Parthenopaeus, Hippomedon. Aristarchus says that Pindar, as in other situations, also here tells the story in a peculiar way. But Aristodemus says that the seven pyres are for perished ... Both Hippomedon and Armenidas write as follows: “They built seven pyres at the Hermæ and therefore they are called Seven Pyres, or it is due to the seven against Thebes, or to the fourteen children of Niobe cremated there in seven pairs.”

Asclepiades Fr. 2

Σ Ο. 6.26 = Ο. 6.16

I long for: Asclepiades says that Pindar took this from the \textit{Thebais} of the [Theban] cycle.

Asclepiades Fr. 3

Σ Ο. 7.24c-d = Ο. 7.13

Hymning Aphrodite’s sea-daughter: it is typical of Pindar to appoint the
τῶν Νηρηίδων ὀνόματα κατά τῶν πόλεων τῶν ὁμωνύμως λεγομένων τάττειν, καὶ τούμπαλιν· ἔστι δὲ ὅτε καὶ συμπλέκειν, ὡσπερ καὶ νῦν. Ἀφροδίτης μὲν γὰρ λέγει τὴν ἡρωίδα· ὅτι δὲ ποντίον ὀνομάζει, τὴν νῆσον βούλεται δηλοῦν. ἐὰν δὲ γράφηται παῖδα Αμφιτρίτης, ὡς Αμφιτρίτης σωτὴς καὶ Ποσειδόνος οὐσίας τῆς Ρόδου θυγατρός, κατὰ δὲ ταύτην τὴν γραφὴν τὸ ποντία οὐκέτι ἐπὶ τῆς νῆσου θετέον (BCDEFGHQVi), ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῆς Αμφιτρίτης· καὶ γὰρ αὕτη ἐνάλιος δαίμων.

(24d.) Ἀσκληπιάδης δὲ φησι γενεαλογεῖσθαι τὴν ῾Ρόδον ᾿Αφροδίτης καὶ Ἡλίου· τὸν γὰρ ῾Ηλιον αὐτῆς ἐρασθῆναι καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ νῆσῳ μιγῆναι (BCDEFGHQVi).

Aristionicus Fr. 3

Σ O. 7.154α = O. 7.84

καὶ Θήβαις· ἐν μὲν Θεσπιαῖς ᾿Ερώτια· ἐν ταῖς Πλαταιαῖς τὰ ᾿Ελευθέρια, ταῦτα Ἀριστόνικος· ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος (Fr. 13 Braswell) Βασίλεια καὶ Αμφιάρεια καὶ Δήλια ἐπὶ Δηλίῳ καὶ Τροφώνεια ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ (A).

Asclepiades Fr. 4a

Σ O. 8.10e = O. 8.8

(10a) ἁνεται δὲ πρὸς χάριν ... (10e.) Ἀσκληπιάδης δὲ χωρὶς τοῦ σ γράφει λιταί· δεήσει δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν λαμβάνειν τὸ ἄνεται ἀντὶ πληθυντικοῦ τοῦ ἀνύονται, ἣν ἢ τελειοῦνται δὲ αἱ λιταί πρὸς τὴν χάριν τῆς εὐσεβείας (A).
names of Nereids to cities of the same name and vice versa. There are also times when he combines them, as now. For Pindar calls the heroine “Aphrodite’s daughter”. Since he refers to her as “of the sea” his intention is to signify the island. If we read, on the other hand, “daughter of Amphitrites”, [his intention is to signify] that Rhodes itself is the daughter of Amphitrite and Poseidon. According to this reading the adjective *pontios* (= “of the sea”), should no longer refer to the island, but to Amphitrite, because this is a goddess of the sea. Asclepiades says Rhodes is the daughter of Aphrodite and Helios. For Helius desired her and they had intercourse on the island.

**Aristonicus Fr. 3**

Σ O. 7.154a = O. 7.84  

And [the prizes] in Thebes: “The Erotian games are in Thespiae, the Eleutheria in Plataeae.” Aristonicus states this. Didymus [says that Pindar refers to] the Basileia and Amphiareia, the Delia on Delos and the Trophoneia in Lebadeia.

**Asclepiades Fr. 4a**

Σ O. 8.10e = O. 8.8  

[Prayers] are fulfilled in return for [piety]: Asclepiades writes *litai* [prayers] without sigma. It will be necessary for him to accept *anetai* [“is accomplished” 3rd pers. sing. pass. of *anô*] instead of the plural *anontai* [“they are accomplished” 3rd pers. pl. pass. of *anô*] so that the sense is: “prayers turn out favourably due to piety”.
Asclepiades Fr. 4b

Σ O. 8.10i = O. 8.8

(10h) ἄνεται δὲ πρὸς χάριν ... (10i.) γράφει δὲ ὁ Ἀσκληπιάδης άνευ τού σ λιταί, καὶ οὕτω καθώς τηρῇ τὸν λόγον πρός δὲ τὸ κεχαρισμένον τῇ εὔσεβείᾳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀνύονται λιταί· ὡς ἂν σύμφωνῃ τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν εὐσεβείᾳ κεχαρισμένου τοῦ λιτανεύεται άντος (BCDEFGHQi).

Asclepiades Fr. 5

Σ O. 8.29a = O. 8.22

(29a) πάρεδρος ἀσκεῖται Θέμις· Ἀσκληπιάδης ἀντὶ τοῦ τιμᾶται πρὸς τοῦ ξενίου Διός (BCDEFGHQi).

Aristodemus Fr. 2a (FGrH 383 Fr. 11), Leptines Fr 1, Dionysius Sidonius Fr. 1 (Dumbium)

Σ O. 10.55b = O. 10.45

(55a.) Ἀλτιν ... (55b.) οἱ περὶ Ἀριστόδημον καὶ Λεπτίνην καὶ Διονύσιον γράφοσιν Ἀλτιν. μὴ γάρ πρέπον εστὶ τῆν ἄρτον τιμὴν μεταφέρειν Ἡλιάν ιεργάν γενέσθαι τῷ Διός καὶ λόγον ἔχει τοῦ τοῦ Διός ιερόν ιδρύσατα εἰς Πίσης· οὐ γάρ ἐν Ἡλίῳ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐπὶ τὴν πανήγυριν θοινώσαν, ἀλλὰ ἐν Πίσῃ. τὸ γάρ ἐν κύκλῳ τοῦ ιεροῦ καταγωγαῖς διείληπτο· διῴκησε δὲ ἡ Πίση τῆς Ὁλυμπίας γένοτα. Ἀλτιν. οὖν γραπτεόν· οὕτως γὰρ τὸν περὶ Ὁλυμπίας τόπον ἐκάλουν (A).

Aristodemus Fr. 2b (FGrH 383 Fr. 11)

Σ O. 10.55c = O. 10.45

᾿Αλτιν. Ἀριστόδημος γράφει ἄντι τοῦ Ἁλιν Ἁλτιν. ὁ Ἀριστόδημος γράφει δὲ τὸ ἀσκεῖται ἀντὶ τοῦ τιμᾶται (BGQi) ἡ Πίση τῆς Ὁλυμπίας τόπον ἐκάλουν αὐτοῦ.
Asclepiades Fr. 4b

Σ O. 8.10i = O. 8.8

[Prayers] are fulfilled in return for [piety]: Asclepiades writes litai [prayers] without the sigma and renders: prayers are fulfilled in accordance to the favour won by men’s piety. Just as if prayer is accepted because of men’s piety.

Asclepiades Fr. 5

Σ O. 8.29a = O. 8.22

Themis, enthroned [beside Zeus], is venerated: Asclepiades: “is honoured at the side of Zeus of hospitality”.

Aristodemus Fr. 2a (FGrH 383 Fr. 11), Leptines Fr 1, Dionysius Sidonius Fr. 1 (Dubium)

Σ O. 10.55b = O. 10.45

A. Altin: The followers of Aristodemus, Leptines and Dionysius write Altin. It is not fitting that Elis which had just been destroyed should be dedicated to Zeus. And it is reasonable that a temple is dedicated to Zeus in Pisa. For those who come to the assembly do not feast in Elis but in Pisa. For the area around the temple is occupied by guest-houses. Pisa is three stades removed from Olympia. One should therefore write Altin. For they used to call the area around Olympia so.

Aristodemus Fr. 2b (FGrH 383 Fr. 11)

Σ O. 10.55c = O. 10.45

Altin: Aristodemus writes Altin [Zeus’ sacred precinct at Olympia] instead

1I.e. the Olympic games
῾Ολυμπίαν τόπον καλεῖσθαι, καὶ τὸν Δία ἐξ ἐπιθέτου ῾Αλτιον (BCDE-FGHQVi). μὴ γὰρ λόγον ἔχειν τὴν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ πεπορθημένην ῾Πλιν ἱερὰν καὶ καθαρὰν ποιῆσαι. ἀλλὰ μὴ δὲ ἱερὸν εἶναι Δίως ἐν ῾Ηλίνι, ἀλλ’ ἐν Πίσῃ. ἀπωκίσθαι δὲ τὴν Πίσαν τῆς ´Ολυμπίας σταδίους ἕξ. Δίδυμος (Fr. 20 5 Braswell) δὲ κατὰ χώραν ἐὼν τὴν γραφὴν τὸν Πίνδαρον τὴν Πίσαν ῾Ηλίν λέγειν φησίν. οἱ γὰρ ῾Ηλεῖοι ἑαυτοὺς ποιησάμενοι τοὺς Πισάτας ῾Ηλίν τὴν Πίσαν μετωνόμασαν. εἰ οὖν ἡ Πίσα μετέβαλε, τί ἂν εἴη ἐμποδὼν γράφειν τὴν ῾Ηλίν ἱερὰν Διὸς οἰκίαν εἶπεν ἀντὶ τοῦ Πίσαν (Callim. Aet. 6, Fr. 196 Pfeiffer). ῾Ηλίν ἀνάσσεσθαι Διὸς οἰκίαν ἔλλιπε Φυλεῖ· ἱερὰν δὲ τὴν ῾Ηλίν ἀντὶ τοῦ Πίσαν διὸς οἰκεῖον εἶπεν Καλλίμαχος (Callim. Ia. 6, Fr. 196 Pfeiffer). ῾Αλίος ὁ Ζεύς (BCEFGHQVi).

Aristodemus Fr. 3 (FGrH 383 Fr. 12)

Σ Ο. 10.83b = Ο. 10.70

ἄλλως· ἀν’ ἵπποις τέτρασιν· ἐὰν μὲν γράφηται σᾶμα ῾Αλιρροθίου, ἔσται αὐτὸς ὁ ῾Αλιρρόθιος ἥκων ὡς ἂν ἐπίσημος ἐγένετο ὁ ῾Αλιρρόθιος· ἐὰν δὲ Σάμος ῾Αλιρροθίου φανερὸν· οἷον, Σᾶμος ῾Αλιρροθίου ἐνίκησεν. Ἀριστόδημος δὲ φησι μὴ δύνασθαι συγχρονεῖν ῾Αλιρρόθιον τὸν κατὰ Κέκροπα ῾Ηρακλεῖ.
of Álin [Doric form of Elis]. This is the name of the area around Olympia and Zeus has the epithet “of Altis” (Altios). For it is not reasonable that Hercules should hallow and purify Elis which had been ruined by him. There is not even a sanctuary of Zeus in Elis, but in Pisa. Pisa is 6 stades removed from Olympia. Didymus, who keeps the reading in its place,¹ says that Pindar refers to Pisa as Elis. After subduing the inhabitants of Pisa the Eleans called Pisa by the new name Elis. And if Pisa was changed in this way, what would prevent us from writing Elis as Ális²? Callimachus also called Zeus’ homeland Elis instead of Pisa.

He³ left Elis, Zeus’ homeland, to Phyleus to reign.

Sacred Elis is used for Pisa. Callimachus also referred to Zeus of Pisa as Elean: “Zeus from Ális”.

Aristodemus Fr. 3 (FGrH 383 Fr. 12)

Σ O. 10.83b = O. 10.70

Alternatively: on four horses: If sāma Halirrothiou [“sign of Halirothius”] is written, Halirothius will be the one present, as if Halirothius would be remarkable (episēmos, “having a sign”).⁴ But if we write Sāmos Halirrothiou [“Samus son of Halirothius”] it is obvious that Samus, the son of Halirothius,

¹This means that Didymus did not emend his text. Alternatively it could also be understood as that Didymus keeps the “spelling for the place”, i.e. Elis as suggested by Braswell (2013, p. 166).
²Doric form of Elis.
³Hercules.
⁴This reading would suggest that Halirothius is the winner.
Ἀλλὰ μηδὲ Ἀρκάδα εἶναι, ἀλλ' Ἀθηναίον... Σῆμον δέ τινα νῦν νενικηκέναι ἅρματι, ὡς φησὶ Δίφιλος ο ἡ Θησηίδα ποιήσας ἐν τινὶ ἰάμβῳ οὗτων τρέψας δὲ πώλους ὡς ὁ Μαντινεῦς Σῆμος, ὡς πρῶτος ἅρματ' ἤλασεν παρ' Ἀλφειῷ (Fr. 1 IEG²) (BE-FGHQVI).

Artemon Fr. 3 (FGrH 569 Fr. 3)

Σ 1. inscr. a

γέγραπται μὲν ο ἐπινίκιος Ἰέρωνι, λέγετα δὲ ο Πίνδαρος οὕτως ἐπιβεβλῆσθαι κατὰ Ἀρτέμωνα τὸν ἱστορικόν, ὅτι δὴ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰέρων χρυσὴν ὑπέσχετο κιθάραν. τὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα πεπλήρωται οἰκειότατα γὰρ Πυθίου ὄντος τοῦ ἀγώνος τὸν θεὸν προστάτην ὃντα ἀνυμνεῖ (CDEFGH-PQVi).

Apollonius Fr. 1

Σ 1.3a = P. 1.2

σύνδικον μοισᾶν κτέανον· συνῳδὸν, οἱονεὶ οὐκ ἐναντίον. ὁ δὲ Ἀπολλώνιος σύντροπον ἠκουσε· δίκη γὰρ ὁ τρόπος ὡς καὶ Ὅμηρος (Od. 19.43)

αὕτη τοι δίκη ἐστί (CDEFGHQPVi).

---

1 Ἀρκάδα| Ἀρκάδιον HQVi || νῦν om. E 2 Δίφιλος| lac. E Ὅμηρος F || ἰάμβῳ BHGVi, ἰάμβῳ EF, ἰαμβείῳ Q 3 τρέψα| τρέψαν Q 4 πρῶτος| πρῶτος πρῶτος G || ἤλασεν Heyne, ἤλασε codd. 6 μὲν| γὰρ μὲν H || ἐπινίκιος| ἐπινίκιος GH || λέγετα... κιθάραν| Ἀρτέμων δὲ ὁ ἱστορικὸς οὕτω φησὶ ἐπιβεβλῆσθαι τὸν Πίνδαρον ὅτι δὴ αὐτῷ χρυσὴν ὑπέσχετο ὁ Ἰέρων κιθάραν C 7 Ἀρτέμωνα| Ἀρτέμωνα EPG 8 τὰ δὲ... πεπλήρωται om. C || οἰκειότατα... ἀνυμνεῖ| οἰκειότατα τὸν θεὸν ἀνυμνεῖ πυθικὸς γὰρ ἐστὶ ο ἀγών C 11 lemma| σύνδικον C || σύνδικον| οἱ οἱ οἵως C σύνδικον P || οἰονεὶ| καὶ οἷος C || ἐναντίον| ἐναντίον EF, ἐναντίον εἶπον C 12 καὶ om. F
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Artemon Fr. 3

was the winner. Aristodemus says that the Halirothius who lived during Cecrops’ time could not be contemporary with Hercules. He is also not even Arcadian, but Athenian. And [he says] that someone by the name of Sēmos\(^1\) in fact has won with the chariot, as Diphilus, the author of the Theseis, says in some iamb:

\[
\text{Having raised his young horses like Semus from Mantinea who first drove chariots along the Alpheius.}
\]

Artemon Fr. 3 (FGrH 569 Fr. 3)

\(\Sigma\) \(\text{P. 1.inscr. a}\)

The victory ode was written for Hiero and according to Artemon the expert on stories (historikos)\(^2\) Pindar begins in this way\(^3\) because Hiero had indeed promised him a golden kithara. But that is redundant, for, since it is a Pythian game, Pindar praises the presiding god in a most fitting way.\(^4\)

Apollonius Fr. 1

\(\Sigma\) \(\text{P. 1.3a} = \text{P. 1.2}\)

Rightful possession of the Muses: concordant, that is, not opposed to another. But Apollonius interprets it as “in joint manner”. For dikē [right] means tropos [manner], as also Homer says:

\(^1\)The Attic-Ionic form of the name.
\(^2\)Cf. 3.7 for the meaning of this term.
\(^3\)By addressing the chrysea phorminx (= “golden lyre”) in the first line of the ode.
\(^4\)The Pythian games were held in honour of Apollo and the lyre was one of his typical attributes.
Artemon Fr. 4 (FGrH 569 Fr. 4)

$\Sigma \, P. \, 1.31c = P. \, 1.16$

ἄλλως· τὸν ποτὲ Κιλίκιον θρέψε; στασιάζεται ἡ περὶ τοῦ Τυφῶνος ἱστορία. οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ὄρει τῆς Βοιωτίας ὑποκείσαν ἔφασαν, καὶ ὡς εἰσὶν αὐτοῖς πυρὸς ἀναδόσεις· οἱ δὲ εἰς Φρυγίαν ἔτεροὺς ἐν Λυδίᾳ. Ἀρτέμων δὲ τε τις ἱστορικὸς πιθανότερον λογοποιεῖ. καθάπαξ γὰρ φησὶ πᾶν ὄρος ἔχον πυρὸς ἀναδόσεις ἐπὶ Τυφῶνι καὶ τηρεῖται. ἤστι δὲ τὸ πιθανὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος ἱστορίας· τύφειν γὰρ τὸ καίειν (DEFGHQVi). ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος φησὶ τὸν Τυφῶνα ἐν Κιλικίᾳ τεθράφθαι, ὡς καὶ Ὁμήρος (II. 2. 783).

εἰν Ἄρμοις, ὡς φασί Τυφώεως ἔμμεναι εὐνάς;

10 ὑποκείσαται δὲ τῷ ὀρεί καὶ αὐτοῖς πυρὸς κρατῆρας καὶ τοὺς ἀναδομένους πρηστῆρας (EFGHPQVi).

Dionysius Sidonius Fr. 2

$\Sigma \, P. \, 1.172 = P. \, 1.88$

πολλοὶ μάρτυρες ἀμφοτέροις· τῷ τε ἀληθεῖ καὶ τῷ ψευδεῖ· ἢ σοὶ καὶ τῷ ἄλλως ...

2 ἀλλως ... θρέψεν om. C || ἀλλως om. C || lemma EF, τὸν ποτὲ cett. || περὶ παρὰ EF 3 καὶ ὡς εἶσιν | ἐνθαὶ καὶ C, καὶ ἑστὶν EF, ὡς εἰσὶ καὶ P 4 ἀναδόσεις | ἀναδόσεις εἰσίν C || Ἀρτέμων ... ἱστορικὸς | Ἀρτέμων δὲ τοῖς ὀνόματοις F 5 ἐχον πυρὸς ἀναδόσεις | ἐχον πυρὸς ἀναδόσεις Vi, πυρὸς ἀναδόσεις ἐχον C 6 δὲ | γὰρ Q || εἰς αὐτῆς ... ἱστορίας EF, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτῆς (αὐτῆς aut -ου?) DG, αὐτοῦ P) DGHPQVi, εξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὀνόματος C 7 ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος om. PQVi | φησὶ τὸν Τυφῶνα ἐν Κιλικίᾳ τεθράφθαι | τὸν Τυφῶνα ἐν Κιλικίᾳ τεθράφθαι φησι C 8 τεθράφθαι | τεθράφθαι EF 9 εἰν Ἄρμοις | ἐναρχίοις FGHVi, ἐναρχίοις EP, ἐναρχίοις Q, om. C || Τυφώεως | Τυφώεως QVi, Τυφώεως GH, Τυφώεως P 10 κρατῆρας | κρατέρου Q || καὶ τοὺς ... πρηστῆρας om. C 12 lemma | ἀμφοτέροις C
Artemon Fr. 4 (FGrH 569 Fr. 4)

Σ 1.31c = P. 1.16

[Typho] whom the Cilician [cave] once reared: There is disagreement regarding the story of Typho. For there are those who say that he dwells beneath a mountain in Boeotia and that there are eruptions of fire there. Some say that he is found in Phrygia, others in Lydia. Artemon, a certain expert in stories (historikos), on the other hand, writes in a more convincing way. For he simply states that every mountain with eruptions of fire burns by the power of Typho. The persuasiveness results from an examination (ex historias) of the word itself: for typhēin means kaiein [to burn]. Pindar however says that Typho was raised in Cilicia, just as Homer says (Il. 2.783).

In the country of the Arimi, where men say is the bed of Typho.

He dwells beneath the mountain where there are craters of fire and erupting storms.

Dionysius Sidonius Fr. 2

Σ 1.172 = P. 1.88

Many witnesses for both: For both truth and falsehood. Or for you [Hiero]

\(^1\text{Cf. 3.7 for the meaning of this term.}\)
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

υἱῷ. ὁ δὲ Σιδώνιος· σοὶ καὶ τοῖς ὑποτεταγμένοις (CEFGHPQVi).

Ammonius Fr. 2, Callistratus Fr. 1, Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 1

Σ P. 2.inscr. a

megaloπόλεις ὦ Συράκουσαι· γέγραπται μὲν Ἱέρωνι ἄρματι νικήσαντι, ἀδήλως δὲ εἰς ποιὸν ἁγώνα διεστασίασται γάρ οὗ μετρίως τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν. οἱ μὲν γάρ οὐδὲ ὄλοις ἐπίνικοι αὐτῶν εἶναι φασί, Τίμαιος δὲ θυσιαστικῆν ἄγει κριμνων CP 15 λιπαρᾶν τε Θηβὰν codd. 18 ὡστε] ὡς Q || γράφειν EF, γράφεσθαι cett.

τὰς Θήβας δέ που εἶπε λιπαρὰς 10

μὲν ἱερώνι ἅρματι νικήσαντι Q, om. cett. et Drachmann λοπόλιες CP 5 εἰρηνικὰς δὲ οὐκ διαφέρεσθαι. οὐ γάρ τὸ μέλος, ἀλλ’ ἐν Αθήναις εἰρηνικὸς ἄστει. καὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐν διεστασίασται γάρ οὗ μετρίως τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν

Ammonius Fr. 2, Callistratus Fr. 1, Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 1

and your son. [Dionysius] from Sidonius says: for you and your subjects.

Σ P. 2.inscr. a

O Syracuse great city!: The ode was written for Hiero after his victory with the chariot. It is unclear for what kind of competition, since there was considerable disagreement (about this) before our time. Some even say that it is not a victory ode at all. Timaeus says that it is a sacrificial ode, Callimachus a Nemean, Ammonius and Callistratus an Olympian, some, like Apollonius the “Eidographer”, a Pythian, and some say it is Panathenaic. Dionysius Phaselites in fact does not believe that one should write liparān apo Thēbān [“from shining Thebes”], but liparān ap’ Athānān [“from shining Athens”] since the victory ode is Panathenaian. For Pindar is somehow prone to speak of Athens as “shining” (liparos) but of Thebes as “of golden chariots” (chrysarmatos), “of good chariots”, (euarmatos), “of white horses” (leukippos) or “of blue headbands” (kyanampykas). This is obviously a careless scholar. For Pindar also calls many additional cities “shining”, such as Smyrna, “and to the shining city of Smyrna”, and Egypt in the Dithyrambs, “the shining Egypt near the coast”. He even calls Thebes shining somewhere: “The great rock of shining Thebes”. And besides it is simple-minded to say that the ode was carried from Athens to Hiero. For not the song, but the victory reaches him from Athens.
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

ἦν ὁ τὸ ποίημα συνθείς (CEFHPQVi).

Asclepiades Fr. 6 (Dubium, FGrH 12 Fr. 32)

Σ P 3.14 = P 3.8

τὸν μὲν εὖππου θυγάτηρ τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν οἱ μὲν Ἀρσινόης οἱ δὲ Κορωνίδας φασίν εἶναι. Ἀσκληπιάδης δὲ φησι τὴν Ἀρσινόην Λευκίππου εἶναι τοῦ Περίκλου, ἣς καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος Ἀσκληπιός καὶ θυγάτηρ Ἕρωτις (Hes. Fr. 50 MW) (BCDFHPQVi).

καὶ ἢ Ἀρσινόης ὅμοιοςς·

Ἀρσινόη δὲ μητέρα Δίως καὶ Λητοῦς υἱώ

τίκτ᾽ Ἀσκληπιόν υἱὸν ἄμυμον τε κρατερὸν τε (BCEFGHPQVi).

Artemon Fr. 5 (FGrH 569 Fr. 5)

Σ P 3.52b = P 3.29

(52a) πάντα Ἰσαντί νόμος ὁ Πίνδαρος παρ' ἑτέρου ἤκουσεν, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἔγνω. (CEFHPQ) (52b) ὁ δὲ ᾿Αρτέμων τὸν Πίνδαρον ἐπαινεῖ, ὅτι παρακρουσάμενος τὴν περὶ τὸν κόρακα ἱστορίαν αὐτὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐγνωκές...
Asclepiades Fr. 6 (Dubium)

And Pindar is not from Athens, but from Thebes. One should therefore write *apo Thebān* [“from Thebes”], which is where the composer of the poem comes from.

Asclepiades Fr. 6 (Dubium, *FGrH* 12 Fr. 32)

\[ \Sigma P. 3.14 = P. 3.8 \]

Whom daughter of the well-horsed: Some say that Asclepius was the son of Arsinoē, others of Coronis. Asclepiades says that Arsinoē is the daughter of Leucippus, son of Perieres. Asclepius was her and Apollo’s son and Eriopis their daughter.

Who in union with Phoebus gave birth in the halls to Asclepius, leader of men, and fair-haired Eriopis.

And of †Arsinoē similarly:

But Arsinoē had intercourse with the son of Zeus and Leto and gave birth to Asclepius, a blameless and mighty son.

Artemon Fr. 5 (*FGrH* 569 Fr. 5)

\[ \Sigma P. 3.52b = P. 3.29 \]

With omniscient mind. That Apollo did not hear it from someone else, but knew it by himself. Artemon praises Pindar since he says that Apollo knew by himself and shuns the story of the raven. For it is told that the raven revealed...
ναι φησὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα· ἱστορεῖται γάρ, ὅτι τὴν Ἰσχυοίας μίξιν ἐδήλωσεν ἀυτῷ ὁ κόραξ, παρὸ καὶ δυσχεράντα ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγγελίᾳ ἀντὶ λευκοῦ μέλανα αὐτὸν τούτοις· τούτου δὴ τὸν μύθον διωσάμενον φησὶ τὸν Πίνδαρον <φάναι> τῷ ἑαυτοῦ νῷ καταλαβεῖν τὴν Ἀπόλλωνα τὰ πεπραγμένα τῇ Κορωνίδι: παράλογον γὰρ τὸν Πάλλην μαντευόμενον αὐτὸν μὴ συμβαλεῖν τὰ κατ’ αὐτοῦ δρώμενα. χάρειν οὖν φράσα τῇ μύθῳ τέλεον ὄντι ληρώδει αὐτόν φῆσι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα παρὰ τοῦ νοῦ πυθόμενον ἐπιπέμψαι τὴν Ἀρτεμίνα τῇ Κορωνίδι· τὸ δὲ περὶ τὸν κόρακα μύθόν φησὶ καὶ Ἡσίοδον μνημονεύοντα λέγειν οὕτως (Fr. 60 M-W).

tίμως ἄρ’ ἀγγελός ἦλθε κόραξ ἱερῆς ἀπὸ δαιτὸς Πυθὼ ἐς ἠγαθέην, καὶ ἤφησεν ἐργ’ ἄκηρεν τῷ Φοίβῳ ἀκερεκόμῃ, ὅτι Ἰσχυοίας Κορώνην Εἰλατίδης, Φλεγύαο Διογνήτοιο θύγατρα (BCDEFGHPQ).

Crates Fr. 1 (FGrH 310 Fr. 14)

Σ P. 3.102a–b = P. 3.57

βήλας δι’ ἀμφοῖν· οἷον, οὕτω περίθυμος ἐγένετο ὁ Ζεύς, ὥστε ἐνσκῆψαι βέλος διαμπὰξ δι’ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν μαστῶν ἢ τῶν πλευρῶν, δι’ αὐτοῦ τε τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἰατρευθέντος, ὥστε καὶ τὸν Ἀσκληπιον ἀνῃρῆσθαι καὶ τὸν ἀναβεβιωκότα. ὁ δὲ Κράτης τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν φῆσι καὶ τὸν διδάξαντα αὐτὸν Χείρωνα. οὐδεὶς δὲ τούτῳ μαρτυρεῖ (BCDEFGHQVi).

the affair of Ischys to him. Apollo was disgusted by the message and made
the raven black instead of white. Artemon says that Pindar rejecting this myth
\(<\text{said}>\) that Apollo comprehended by his own mind what had been done by
Coronis. For it is against reason that he who prophesies to others should not
comprehend what is done regarding himself. Dismissing the ridiculous myth,
Pindar says that Apollo, perceiving it in his own mind, sent Artemis for Coronis.
Artemon says that Hesiod also recalls the myth of the raven, who spoke in the
following way:

At that time a messenger came, a raven, from the sacred feast to
most holy Pytho and told Phoebus with unshorn hair of the unseen
deeds, that Ischys, Elatus’ son, had slept with Coronis, the daughter
of Zeus-born Phlegyas.

Crates Fr. 1 \((FGrh \ 310 \ Fr. \ 14)\)

\(\Sigma \ P. \ 3.102a–b = P. \ 3.57\)

Striking through both: That is to say: Zeus became so wrathful that he
hurled a missile through both breasts or ribs, through Asclepius as well as the
one who had been healed, so that both Asclepius and the one revived were
destroyed. Crates, says [that these were] Asclepius and Cheiron, his teacher.
No one testifies to this.
Aristodemus Fr. 4 (FGrH 383 Fr. 13)

Σ P. 3.137b = P. 3.77

ἀλλ’ ἐπεύξασθαι μὲν ἐγὼν ἐθέλω ματρί. Ἀριστόδημος φησιν’ Ὄλυμπικοῦ αὐλητοῦ διδασκομένου ὑπὸ Πινδάρου γενέσθαι κατὰ τὸ ὄρος, ὅπου τὴν μελέτην συνετίθη, καὶ ψόφον ἰκανὸν καὶ φλόγος καταφοράν· τὸν δὲ Πίνδαρον ἐπαστοθύμουν συνιδεῖν Μητρὸς θεῶν ὅπου τὴν μελέτην συνετίθει, καὶ ψόφον ἱκανὸν καὶ φλόγα καταφοράν. τοὺς δὲ πολίτας πεμψάντας εἰς θεοῦ πυνθάνεσθαι περὶ τῶν ἐκβησομένων, ὅτεν αὐτὸν συνιδεῖσθαι πρὸς τῇ εἰκή Μητρὸς θεῶν καὶ Πανὸς ἀγάλμα. τοὺς δὲ ἐκπλαγέντας τὸν Πίνδαρον διὰ τὸ προειληφέναι τὸν χρησμό, ὁμοίως τῷ Πινδάρῳ ἐκεῖσε τιμᾶν τὴν θεὸν τελεταῖς (BCDEFGHPQVi).

Chaeiris Fr. 1 (Fr. 11 Berndt), Asclepiades Fr. 7

Σ P. 4.18 = P. 4.11

ἀθανάτου στόματος· τῆς Μηδείας· εἶπεν, ὡς μὲν Χαῖρις, ἐκ μέρους τὴν ἀθάνατον, ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἡσίοδος ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ (956–962, 992–996) ἀθάνατον αὐτήν φησιν· ὡς δὲ ᾿Ασκληπιάδης, ὅτι οὐδὲν τῶν ῥηθέντων ὑπ’ αὐτῆς ἀτελὲς γεγένηται οὐδὲ ἐφθάρη (BCDEFGHPQ).

Asclepiades Fr. 8

Σ P. 4.36c = P. 4.20

πρῴραθεν Εὔφημος καταβάς· ζητεῖται δέ, δι’ ᾧ οὖν ἱδεῖν ιδεῖν τῆς Μηδείας· εἶπεν, ὡς μὲν Χαῖρις, ἐκ μέρους τὴν ἀθάνατον, ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἡσίοδος ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ (956–962, 992–996) ἀθάνατον αὐτήν φησιν· ὡς δὲ ᾿Ασκληπιάδης, ὅτι οὐδὲν τῶν ῥηθέντων ὑπ’ αὐτῆς ἀτελές γεγένηται οὐδὲ ἐφθάρη (BCDEFGHPQVi).
Aristodemus Fr. 4 (FGrH 383 Fr. 13)

Σ P. 3.137b = P. 3.77

But I wish to pray to the mother: Aristodemus says that as the aulos player Olympichus was being taught by Pindar there was a loud noise in the mountain and a flame falling down [from the sky] where they were practising. Pindar thought that he saw a stone statue of the Mother of gods walking on its own feet. Therefore he dedicated a statue in front of his house to the Mother of gods and to Pan. The citizens sent messengers to inquire of the god about what should happen. The god answered that a shrine should be dedicated to the Mother of gods. The citizens, amazed at Pindar’s anticipation of the oracle, thereafter celebrated the goddess with rites in the same way as Pindar.

Chaeris Fr. 1 (Fr. 11 Berndt), Asclepiades Fr. 7

Σ P. 4.18 = P. 4.11

Immortal mouth: Medea’s. As Chaeris says, Pindar called her immortal by the part (ek merous), since Hesiod also calls her immortal in the Theogony. But Asclepiades says: “because nothing said by her has gone unfulfilled or failed”.

Asclepiades Fr. 8

Σ P. 4.36c = P. 4.20

Euphemus leaping down from the prow: The question is why Euphemus leaping down from the prow.

---

1 Alternatively “Approaching Pindar’s feet.”
2 I.e. pars pro toto by calling her mouth immortal.
βῶλον ὁ Εὔφημος. καὶ οἱ μέν φασιν ὅτι πρῳρεὺς ἦν· φαίνεται γὰρ καὶ ὁ Ἐυρύπυλος ἐπιστὰς τῇ πρῷφῃ: οἱ δὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν συγγένειν' ἄμφοτεροι γὰρ Ποσειδώνος, ο ὁ δὲ δεὶς καὶ ὁ λαβὼν (BCDEGHPQVi). ὁ δὲ Ὀσκηληπιάδης τὰ ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις Ἑράων (Fr. 253 M-W) παρατίθεται:

ἡ οἰὴ Ὁρίη τικνόφρων Μηκιονίκη, ἡ τέκεν Εὔφημον Γαῖηόχῳ Ἐννοσιγαίῳ μιχθεῖσ' ἐν φιλότητι πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης (BCEGHPQVi).

Ammonius Fr. 3

ΣΡ. 4.44b = P. 4.25

δώδεκα δὲ πρότερον τοῖτο προσειληφέναι, φησὶ Δίδυμος. Πίνδαρον τερατείας χάριν τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ πρέπον τὸ πρὸς εἰδότας λέγειν. ὁ δὲ Ἀμμώνιος περὶ τούτων οὕτω γράφει· καὶ ἑαυτὴν συμπεριλαμβάνει διὰ τὸ ταῖς αὐτῆς βουλαῖς τὴν ἔξω φυγὴν ποιήσασθαι—ἐκβιβάσαι γὰρ συνεβούλευσε καὶ διὰ τοῦ Ἀδρίου ποιῆσαι τὸν πλοῦν· τοῦτο δὲ ταὐτὸν τῷ ἐκ τοῦ Ἡσιόνα ὑπὲρ τὴν Λιβύην κομίσαι τὴν ναῦν εἰς τὴν Τριτωνίδα—ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὡς διὰ τοῦ Φάσιδος εἰς τὸν Ἡσιόνα ἐκπεπτωκότων (BCDEFGHQPVi).

Chaeris Fr. 2 (Fr. 12 Berndt)

ΣΡ. 4.61a = P. 4.35

δεξιτερὴ προτυχόν: Χαῖρις φησι δεῖν γράφειν προτυχόν, ἵνα ᾔ ἀναρπάσας...
Ammonius Fr. 3

received the clod of earth. Some say that he was the bowsman, since it seems that Eurypylus was also standing at the bow. Others say because of their kinship. For both are sons of Poseidon, the giver and the receiver. Asclepiades adds this passage from the *Great Ehoiai*:

Or like her: at Hyria, shrewd-spirited Mecionice, who bore Euphemus to the earth-holding earth-shaker mingling in golden Aphrodites’ love.¹

Ammonius Fr. 3

ΣP. 4.44b = P. 4.25

Twelve days earlier: This Pindar has added, says Didymus, to tell a marvellous story to us, since it is not fitting that she tells this to those who already know it. In regard to this, Ammonius says: “Medea includes herself because they made their flight outwards [from the Oceanus] on her advice – she had suggested that they disembark and sail through the Adriatic. This is tantamount to carrying the ship from the Oceanus over Libya to Lake Tritonis – but rather [they carried their ship over Libya] since they had sailed into the Oceanus through the Phasis.”

Chaeris Fr. 2 (Fr. 12 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.61a = P. 4.35

[Taking] with his right hand [the clod] that came to him: Chaeris says that

¹Translation is that of Glenn W. Most.
δὲ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς ἀρούρης τὸ παρατυχὸν ξένιον ἔδωκεν· ὅπερ ἦν ἡ βῶλος (CDEFGHPQVi).

Asclepiades Fr. 9

$\Sigma$ $P$. 4.61b = $P$. 4.35

δεξιτέρᾳ προτυχόν ὧν δὲ Εὔφημος ἐδέξατο, πολλῶν οὖν, ζητεῖται. καὶ οἱ μὲν φασὶ διὰ τὸ ἐγγύς· πρῳρεὺς γὰρ ἦν· διό φησι Πίνδαρος ($P$. 4.23) πρῴραθεν (BCDEFGHPQVi). οἱ δὲ διὰ συγγένειαν, οἱ δὲ ἀλλὰ τὴν βῶλον, εἶτε Τρίτων ἢ εἰκασμένοις Εὐρυπύλῳ εἶτε ἢ Εὐρύπυλος, οὗτος ἢ Ποσειδῶνος ὡς· ἄλλος δὲ καὶ ὅλη ἡ λιβύη τε τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος διὰ τὸ μεμίχθαι Λιβύη τὴν Ποσειδῶνα· ταύτῇ οὖν καὶ οἱ Εὐρύπυλος διὰ τὴν συγγενήτητα ἐδέξατο. προσθείη δ’ ἄν τις, ὃτι καὶ Ταιναρίου ἐβασίλευε, Ποσειδῶνος δὲ αὕτη ἱερὰ ($BCEFGHPQVi$)

᾿Ασκληπιάδης δέ φησιν ὅτι καὶ Περικλύμενος καὶ ᾿Εργῖνος καὶ ᾿Αγκαῖος· τίοὖν οὐδεὶς εἰλήφετο τούτων; φησὶ γοῦν αὐτὸς δῶρον ἔχειν τὸν Εὔφημον παρὰ Ποσειδῶνος τὴν θάλασσαν ἀπημάντως διαπορεύεσθαι ὡς διὰ γῆς. πρὸς δὲ τοὺς λέγοντας ὅτι Εὔφημος κυβερνήτης ἦν καὶ πρῳρεύς – τοῦτο γάρ ἱστορεῖ Θεότιμον ($FGrH$ 470 Fr. 2) – λεκτέον ὅτι καὶ πάνυ λόγον ἔχει τὸν κυβερνήτην ὡς ἡγούμενον τῆς νεῶς τὴν βῶλον παρὰ Τρίτωνος λαβείν (BCDEFGHPQVi).

Ammonius Fr. 4

$\Sigma$ $P$. 4.93b = $P$. 4.52

κελαινεφέων δὲ πεδίων· τῶν τῆς Λιβύης· καὶ οἱ μὲν διὰ τὸν ἱστορεῖ Θεότιμον ἤσιν· ἐβασίλευε καὶ περικλύμενος καὶ ῾Εργῖνος καὶ ῾Αγκαῖος· τίοὖν οὐδεὶς εἰλήφετο τούτων; φησὶ γοῦν αὐτὸς δῶρον ἔχειν τὸν Εὔφημον παρὰ Ποσειδῶνος τὴν θάλασσαν ἀπημάντως διαπορεύεσθαι ὡς διὰ γῆς. πρὸς δὲ τοὺς λέγοντας ὅτι Εὔφημος κυβερνήτης ἦν καὶ πρῳρεύς – τοῦτο γάρ ἱστορεῖ Θεότιμον ($FGrH$ 470 Fr. 2) – λεκτέον ὅτι καὶ πάνυ λόγον ἔχει τὸν κυβερνήτην ὡς ἡγούμενον τῆς νεῶς τὴν βῶλον παρὰ Τρίτωνος λαβείν (BCDEFGHPQVi).
Asclepiades Fr. 9

one must write protuchon [neut. ptcp. of protunchanô, “come upon”], so that the sense is “quickly snatching from the earth what his hand lighted upon, he gave it as a guest-gift”. This was the clod of earth.

Asclepiades Fr. 9

Σ P. 4.61b = P. 4.35

[Taking] with his right hand [the clod] that came to him: The question is why Euphemus received it when many were present. Some say that he received it because he was close [to Eurypylus], since he was the bowsman. Therefore Pindar says “from the bow”. Some say because of kinship and some that he who gave the clod of earth, whether it was Triton in the shape of Eurypylus or Eurypylus, he was a son of Poseidon.1 Alternatively, [since] the whole of Libya was sacred to Poseidon because of his intercourse with [the nymph] Libya. Euphemus therefore received the clod of earth because of his kinship.2 Someone might add that he also ruled over Taenarus and this city is sacred to Poseidon. Asclepiades says that Periclymenus, Erginus and Ancaeus [were also among the Argonauts].3 Why did not one of them receive the clod of earth? At any rate he says that Euphemus from Poseidon had received the gift of passing over the ocean unharmed, as if on earth. Against those who say that Euphemus was both steersman [kubernētēs],4 and bowsman [prōireus] – Theotimus tells this – it must be pointed out that it is reasonable that the steersman, in his position as commander of the ship, should take the clod of earth from Triton.

Ammonius Fr. 4

Σ P. 4.93b = P. 4.52

Black-clouded plains: those of Libya. And some say [that they are called 

\[^1\] As was Euphemus.

\[^2\] With Eurypylus, Triton and Poseidon.

\[^3\] Periclymenus was son of Poseidon’s son Neleus (Σ P. 4.306c), Ancaeus and Erginus were both sons of Poseidon (Ap. Rhod. Argon. 1.185–189).

\[^4\] The main commander of the ship.
αὐτόθι συνεχῆ ὄμβρον καὶ τοὺς χειμῶνας, διό καὶ εὔκαρπος ἡ Κυρήνη
dιὰ τὸ συνεχῶς δεύεσθαι· τινὲς δὲ διὰ τὸ τῶν πεδίων μέγεθος. (93b.)

Chaeris Fr. 3 (Fr. 13 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.156b = P. 4.88

(156a.) ἐν δὲ Νάξῳ φαντὶ θανεῖν ... (156b.) ᾿Αμώνιος ἐν τῇ Νάξῳ
τεθνήκασιν οἱ ᾿Αλωεῖδαι, οἱ καλοὶ ἐκεῖνοι. μέμφεται δὲ Χαῖρις ἐπὶ τῇ
παραλήψει τῶν ᾿Αλωειδῶν· ἀρκεῖ γὰρ ὁ ᾿Απόλλων καὶ ὁ ῎Αρης.

Chaeris Fr. 4 (Fr. 14 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.188b = P. 4.106

(188a.) οἴκαδ’ ἀρχαίαν κομίζων ... (188b.) ᾿Αμώνιος Χαῖρις γράφει ἀρχὰν
ἀγκομίζων ἵνα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀνακοιμούμενος τοῦ ἐμοῦ πατρός, ἡτὶς βασιλεύσει
τα πάντα τὰ δίκαια. ὁ γὰρ Πελίας ἄφειλε τὸν Αἴσονα τὴν ἀρχὴν
(BDEFGHPQVi).

Chaeris Fr. 5 (Fr. 15 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.195a = P. 4.110

ἁμετέρων ἀποσυλῆσαι· Χαῖρις γράφει ἁμετέρων, καὶ περισπᾷ τὸ

3 ᾿Αμώνιος om. D || ᾿Αμώνιος | ᾿Αμώνιος δὲ B || μόνον | μόνην B 4 διὰ | καὶ διὰ
Q 5 ἀποσκοτοῦσθαί B, ἀποσκοτεῖσθαι cett. 6 lemma B, ἐν δὲ Νάξῳ φαντὶ E, ἐν δὲ
Nάξῳ DFGHQVi, ἰμμέμφησα παῖδας CP 7 ᾿Αλωεῖδαι | ᾿Αλωεἶδαι ᾿Αλωίδαι B || οἱ
καλοὶ om. C 8 ᾿Αλωεῖδαι | ᾿Αλωεῖδαι (ἤδην E) BE || ὁ ᾿Απόλλων | ᾿Απόλλων CP || ὁ
῾Αρης om. CP 9 εἰκάζομέν | εἰκάζομεν B || ότι ... ἐπιμανῆναι novum scholium designat
C 10–11 αὐτῷ ἐπιμανῆναι BE, ἐπιμανήσῃ αὐτῷ cett. 12 lemma E, ᾿Αρχαίαν κομίζων
P, οἴκαδ’ ἀρχαίαν DFGHPQVi, om. B || ᾿Αμώνιος om. F 13 ἀγκομίζων | ἀγκομίζων
E, ἀγκομίζων πατρός ἐμοῦ B 14 πάντα τὰ δίκαια | πάντων δίκαια(ν) λόγο(ν) DG || ἀφεὶλετο | ἀφεὶλετο BEHV || Ἀτόσονα P 16 lemma BECP, ἁμετέρων cett.,
post lemma add. B ἡμ[ετέρων ἀποσυλῆσαι
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black-clouded] because of the constant rain and storms there. This is the reason why Cyrene is fertile, since it is constantly wet. Others say because of the size of its plains. Alternatively: Ammonius says that it is because in comparison to the rest of Libya, clouds are only found around Cyrene. Or it is rather an indication of the impression of size, since the eyes are blinded when the horizon is not visible.

Chaeris Fr. 3 (Fr. 13 Berndt)
\[\sum P. 4.156b = P. 4.88\]

They say died in Naxos ... alternatively: The Aloadae died in Naxos, those beautiful giants. Chaeris criticizes the comparison with the Aloadae. For Apollo and Ares are sufficient. For we liken some individuals to gods, but never to gigantic and monstrous men. That Jason was beautiful is obvious from the fact that according to some even Hera was mad for him.

Chaeris Fr. 4 (Fr. 14 Berndt)
\[\sum P. 4.188b = P. 4.106\]

[I come] home preserving the ancient [honour]: Alternatively: Chaeris writes archân agkomizôn [“restoring the realm”] so that [the sense] is “about to restore the realm of my father, which is governed against all justice”, inasmuch as Pelias had deprived Aeson of his realm.

Chaeris Fr. 5 (Fr. 15 Berndt)
\[\sum P. 4.195a = P. 4.110\]

To rob from our: Chaeris writes hametérôn [gen. pl. of hameteros, “our”]
ἀρχεδικᾶν, ἵν' ὑπ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων πατέρων τῶν ἀρχεδικῶν ἀποσυλῆσαι αὐτὸν πεύθομαι. ἐὰν δὲ ἀρχεδικὰν τὴν ἀρχὴν, ἵν' κατὰ δίκην, τούτεστι κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον, εἶχον οἱ ἐμοὶ γονεῖς. μιᾶς έτακται ὑπὲρ ἀρχαίαν κομίζων· διόπερ ἀκολούθως ἐπήγαγεν· ἰκόμεν οἴκαδε ἀρχαίαν κομίζων· διὸ ἐπήνεγκεν· ἁμετέραν ἀποσυλῆσαι ἐὰν δὲ περισπωμένως ἀναγινώσκωμεν ἀρχεδικὰν, οὐκ ἐκκόπτει ἡ γραφή· ἔσται γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοιοῦτος· τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀρχὴν τῶν ἀρχεδικῶν μου γονέων πεύθομαι τὸν Πελίαν ἀποσυλῆσαι (BCDEFGHPQVi).

Chaeris Fr. 6 (Fr. 16 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.258a-b = P. 4.145

(258a.) Μοῖραι δ' ἀφίσταν' εἴ τις ἔχθρα πέλει· ἐὰν δὲ τὶς ἔχθρα ὡς ἄν τις εἴπῃ, οὐκ εὑμοιροῦσι, οὐκ ἀφίσται. (258b.) ὡς ἄν τις εἴπῃ, οὐκ εὐμοιροῦσι, οὐκ ἀγαθῇ μοίρᾳ χρῶνται. (258b.) οὐκ ἀφίσται, τὸν ἀρχεδικὰν, ἵν' ἀφίσται; ὡς ἄν τις εἴπῃ, οὐκ εὐμοιροῦσι, οὐκ ἀφίσταινταί αἱ Μοῖραι· ὡς ἄν τις εἴπῃ, οὐκ ἀγαθῇ μοίρᾳ χρῶνται.

Ammonius Fr. 5, Chaeris Fr. 7 (Fr. 17 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.313a = P. 4.176

ἐξ ᾿Απόλλωνος ὑπὸ σφομικτᾶς· ᾿Απόλλωνος τὸν ᾿Ορφέα φησὶν εἶναι, ὡς ἄν τις

1 ἀρχεδικῶν | ἀρχεδικῶν ubique DFGHQVi
2 βιάζεται δὲ μεταγράφων om. B || προτέταχε | προστέταχε E 5 ἐπήγαγεν | ἐπῆγαγε B || ἀφίσται | ἀφίσται αὐτὸν πεύθομαι DG || ἀναγινώσκωμεν | ἀναγινώσκωμεν BEGVi 7 αὐτόν πεύθομαι | μουσογονέων E 9 lemma B, εἰ τὶς ἔχθρα πέλει CDFGH, εἰ τὶς ἔχθρα P 10 καὶ ἀποκρύπτειν om. CP 11 ἀφίσται | ἀφίσται DE || ἀφίσται αἱ Μοῖραι | μοίραι | μοίραι BVi 14 διαφόραξ | διαφόραξ CDFGH || ἀναίδειαν προστραπῆναι | ἀναίδειαν προστραπῆναι | ἀναίδειαν προστραπῆναι | καὶ οὐκ ἀπιθάνως ο Χαῖρις (BCDEFGHPQVi).
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and puts a circumflex on archedikân [gen.pl. of archedikās, “rightful ruler”) so that [the sense] is “I hear that he robbed from our fathers, the rightful rulers”. But if [one reads] archedíkan [acc. sg. of archedikâ, “rightful realm”]: “the realm which my parents held with right, that is rightfully”. Chaeris violates the text when he changes it. For Pindar has mentioned archēn [realm] earlier. “I came home preserving the archaían [as adjective, ‘ancient’, as noun, ‘realm’]”.

Therefore Pindar logically added: “robbed our [realm]”. But if we read archedikân with circumflex, the text is no hindrance. For the meaning will be such: “I hear that Pelias robbed our rule from my parents, the rightful rulers”.

Chaeris Fr. 6 (Fr. 16 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.258a-b = P. 4.145

The Fates withdraw, if any feuding arises: If there is hatred among kinsmen, so that they hide and conceal their shame – that is are not ashamed – the Fates are absent from such things. Just as someone might say, “they are ill-fated”, “they do not have a good Fate”. Chaeris adds the iota and writes aphistainto so that the expression is in the optative mode: “May the Fates be absent, if there is disagreement in our family, so that shamelessness is turned away”. And Chaeris says this persuasively.

Ammonius Fr. 5, Chaeris Fr. 7 (Fr. 17 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.313a = P. 4.176

A lyre-player from Apollo: Pindar says that Orpheus is Apollo’s [son],

1The scholiast appears to have understood archaían as a noun with the sense “realm”.
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αὐτὸς ὁ Πίνδαρος (Fr. 128c) καὶ ἄλλοι Οἰάγρου λέγουσιν. Ἀμμόνιος δὲ σύμ-
φωνον τὴν ἱστορίαν θέλειν εἶναι, οὕτως ἀποδίδωσιν· ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος φορμικ-
tάς· ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος μουσικός·

ἐκ γὰρ τοι Μουσέων καὶ ἅπαν Οἰάγρου λέγουσιν ᾿Αμμώνιος δὲ σύμ-
φωνον τὴν ἱστορίαν θέλειν εἶναι, οὕτως ἀποδίδωσιν· ἐξ ᾿Απόλλωνος φορμικ-
tάς· ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος μουσικός·

ὥσπερ οὖν ἐκ Διὸς λέγουσιν εἶναι τοὺς βασιλεῖς (Hesiod Theog. 94–
95), οὐχ ὅτι γόνος εἰσὶ τοῦ Διός, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ βασιλεύειν ἐκ Διὸς ἔχουσιν,
οὕτως ἐξ ᾿Απόλλωνος φορμικτὴν αὐτὸν εἶπεν· ἡγεμὼν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῆς κιθαρῳ-
δίας (BCDEFGHPQVi).

Πιέρες αἰνοπαθεῖς, στυγνὴν ἀποτίσετε λώβην ᾿Ορφέαν ἀποκτείναντες ᾿Απόλλωνος φίλον υἱόν.
καὶ ᾿Ασκληπιάδης (FGRH 12 Fr. 6a) ἐν ἑκτῷ Τραγῳδουμένων ἱστορεῖ ᾿Απόλλωνος καὶ Καλλιόπης ῾Υμέναιον, ῾Ιάλεμον, ῾Ορφέα (BCEFGHPQVi).

Chaeris Fr. 8

whom both he himself and others call Oeagrus’ [son]. Ammonius, wishing to keep the story consistent, explains thus: “a lyre-player from Apollo is a musician of Apollo.”

For it is from the Muses and far-shooting Apollo that men are poets upon the earth and lyre-players.

This is like saying that kings are from Zeus (Hesiod *Theog.* 96), not because they are the offspring of Zeus but because they have their kingship from Zeus. In the same way he calls Orpheus a lyre-player from Apollo, the god being the prince of instrumentally accompanied song. However, Chaeris says, not unpersuasively, that those born of gods, such as the Dioscuri and Hercules, may be referred to as such; Orpheus as well, on account of being Apollo’s son by birth. He adds an oracular response which he says that Menaechmus recorded in the *Pythikos*. It goes like this:

Dire-suffering Pieres, you will pay with abhorred disgrace for having killed Orpheus, Apollo’s dear son.

Asclepiades in the sixth book of the *Tragodoumena* tells us that Hymenaeus, Ialemus and Orpheus were sons of Apollo and Calliope.

Chaeris Fr. 8 (Fr. 18 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.446 = P. 4.250

**Murderer of Pelias**: Chaeris does not want to read *Peliaophónon*, [“Mur-
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

ἐκ γὰρ δυοῖν τελείων ἐστί, τοῦ Πελίαο καὶ τοῦ φόνου. γίνεται δὲ τοιαύτη σύνθεσις, ὡς μεταβάλλεσθαι τὸν τόνον· ἦταν οὖν, φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος (Fr. 26 Braswell), προενεκτέον τὰν Πελιαοφονόν αξιτόνως, ἢν ὁ φονευτικόν· ἢ παραξυτόνως, ἢτις ἦν τοῦ Πελίου φόνος (CDEFGHPQVi).

Chaeris Fr. 9 (Fr. 19 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.459a = P. 4.258

5 ἂν ποτε Καλλισταν ἀπώκησαν χρόνῳ νάσον. Χαῖρις βούλεται γράφειν ἐν ποτὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἂν ποτε, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Πινδάρου συνήθειαν (BCDEGHPQVi).

Agestratus Fr. 1

Σ P. 10.85a = P. 10.55

10 ἐστὶ πάλις Ἐφύρη μυχῷ Ἀργεσίον ἰπποβότοι; καὶ ἀποδίδωσι τὴν διάνοιαν οὕτως, ὅτι νικήσει ὁ νικηφόρος Ἱσθμία καὶ ὡς καὶ Ὅμηρος (Ili. 6.152).

Chaeris Fr. 9

derer of Pelias”] as a compound, because it consists of two words, Peliao [gen. of Pelias] and phonou [=genitive of phónos “murderer”]. The compound is such that the accent is thrown back. Therefore, says Didymus, one must either pronounce tan Peliaophonón with the accent on the last syllable, so that the meaning is “killing”, or with the accent on the penultimate, which would mean “the murderer of Pelias”.

Chaeris Fr. 9 (Fr. 19 Berndt)

Σ P. 4.459a = P. 4.258

With time they settled the island once called Calliste: Chaeris wishes to write en pote instead of an pote, in accordance with Pindar’s customary usage.

Agestratus Fr. 1

Σ P. 10.85a = P. 10.55

I hope, when the Ephyræans: It has often been inquired, whom he is now calling the Ephyræoi. Agestratus says the Corinthians. Ephyra is Corinth, as Homer says:

There is a city Ephyre in Argo’s heartland, pasture for horses.

He explains the meaning thus: the victorious one will win in Isthmia and be celebrated by the Corinthians. This is ridiculous! For if he prays for something more [than the Pythian victory], what would it mean if not to pray to win the Olympic games?
Πολυδέκτῃ. λυγρὸν τ' ἔρανον εὐφωμενοῖς γ(ἀρ) αὐταῖς τρώταις ἔδειξεν ὁ Περσεύς τῇ νυμφαὶ καὶ(αί) οὐ(τως) ἀπελιθώθησαν.

|σ(.| ]βιαζομένης γ(ἀρ) τῆς Δα-|

[ῦσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Πολυδέκτηρος συνέβη αὐτήν κατα-

|[φυτείν πρὸς τὸν βαμμὸν τοῦ τὸν δὲ Πολυδέκτην] εὐλαβομένοιν τὸν Περσέα πέμψαι [ἐπὶ Μεδόσης] χαρατομένων ὡς ἀπολούμενον καὶ ὡς ἱν ὅ ἀναφέρθησαν τὸν μὲν Πολυδέκτην θεωρήσανται τῇ τῆς Γοργόνος κεφαλῆς ἀπελιθώθησαν.

[χρυσοῦ φαμεν αὐτοῖς γ(αρ) Ζεὺς χρυ-

|[σεσίς γενόμενοι] συνήλθε τῇ Δανάη, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ τῶν γηγάντων πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, τὸν ἀπὸ τὴν τῆς Δανάην

[οὐ ταύτην εἶναι τὴν Γοργόνα ἀλλὰ τὴν ἡγενῆ ἥν ἡ γῆ ἀνέδωκεν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῶν γιγάντων πρὸς τοὺς θεούς τὸν ἀπὸ χρυσοῦ φαμεν αὐτοῦ· οὕτω γαρ Ζεὺς χρυ-

Theon Fr. 2 (Fr. 38 Guhl)

POxy 2536 on P. 12.14–32

col. i

Polydectes. Baneful [feast ...]
As they were feasting
[Perseus showed] them the head and they were thus turned to stone.
... (?) were saved (?) so that ...
... as [Polydectes] sought to violate Danaë 5R
It happened that she
[sought refuge] at the altar [ (?) of Poseidon (?)] and
[Polydectes], beware of Perseus, sent him
to cut off the head [of Medusa] with the intention that he should perish and
... when Polydectes saw 10R
the head [of the Gorgon], he was turned to stone
and [Danaë] rescued. Some say that the Gorgon is not this one [Medusa],
[but the] earth-born whom Gaia gave forth
[During the war between] the giants and the gods.
Of him of self-flowing [gold we speak]: Perseus. For Zeus 15R
[Having turned himself to] gold came together with Danaë. But since from
[these]: But, he says, after the virgin, that is Athena,
[had helped her favourite] man she composed the song.
[For, he says, so], did Athena assist Perseus
[in killing] the Gorgon. In order to 20R
[imitate the sound] of Euryalas’ swift jaws until the goddess found:
[For the goddess invented], that is Athena, aulos-playing
[to imitate with the tool] of the auloi, that is with musical
[instruments, the lament] of the swift jaws,
[of Gorgon Euryala], and cause wailing. By mentioning one 25R
[also the other], Sthenno, is included. But him ...

[That passes through thin] bronze at the same time (th’ ama): Some thama [of-
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

[καὶ δονάκων] τοὶ παρὰ καλλιχόρον νάοισι: ἄκυρον τὸ
[νάοισι· Εὐριπιδῆς δ' ἐν Οἰδίποδι (Fr. 556 Kannicht)· τὸν ὅ' ὑπνωτζοιόν δόνα-
[χ', ὡν = x = Μέ]λας ποταμῶς ἀην' ὑπνῶν αὐλῶν σωφῆν (Tertia manus).

col. i. 1.4 in margine: ἢ ἀπὸ κοινοῦ τοῦ ᾽Αυκώρωσε (P. 12.13)

col. i. 1.21 in margine: ἐρυκλάγτεν μεγαλοκλάγτεν (Secunda manus)

col. ii

... ...
10 τοὺ[-το] δὲ ὀσπερ' ἐπισφραγίζει θυυποιοι νάοισι· τὸ γις μόρσιμοι(ν)
ο' πα φυκτόν: το' γ' ἀμφοιδ[α]ν ωώς (ἔστι) παραφυγείν
ἀλλ' ὧς μοίρα β[όυλησται] το' δει εὔτυχησαι
γ[ράφ(εται)] καὶ(α) ο' παραφ[υκτόν

Θέο[νος] τοῦ Ὄρτεμιδώρου
Πυθιονίκων Ὄπομνημα (Tertia manus)

Aristonicus Fr. 4

Σ N. 1.inscr.b

ζητεῖται δὲ, τί δηποτε τῷ Ἀλφειῷ προσδιαλέγεται καὶ τῇ Ὄρτυγίῳ, τῆς

cett. || προσδιαλέγεται | προσδέχεται D, προσεύχεται P
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Aristonicus Fr. 4

ten, swift].
[And reeds] who live at the [river] of fair dances: improperly
[“live”. Euripides] says in Oedipus: “and the reed, maker of song,
[which the Black] River [produces], the skilful nightingale of pipes sweetly
blown.”

Marginal annotation to col. i. l. 4: Or “he diminished” is used collectively.  

Marginal annotation to col. i. l. 21: deep-sounding: loud-sounding

Pindar does this as if putting a seal upon it.
What is destined can in no way be escaped. For it is not possible to escape
what has been decided by Fate, but what she wants [must] happen.
It is also written “is not to be escaped”.

Theon’s, son of Artemidorus, commentary on Pindar’s songs for
Pythian victories.

Aristonicus Fr. 4

Σ N. I.inscr.b

The question is why Pindar addresses Alpheus and Ortygia although the

1Adapted from Collard and Cropp (2008).
νίκης οὐκ οὔσης Ὄλυμπιακῆς, ἀλλὰ Νεμεακῆς; ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν φασίν, ὅτι τὰ ἱπποτροφεῖα τοῦ Ἱέρωνος καὶ τοῦ Χρομίου ὀμοίως ἐν τῇ Ὅρτυγίᾳ ἦν· τῷ δὲ ἱερὰν εἶναι τὴν ἁρτήν Αρτέμιδος, τὴν δὲ θεόν ὀνομάζειν εἶναι· καθὸ Σῶφρων (Fr. 166 Hordern) μὲν αὐτὴν ἀτρέσθην, Ὄμηρος δὲ (I. 6.205) χρυσήνην· καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος προσεφώνησαν αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς Ἀρτέμιν· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις φάναι τὸν Πίνδαρον (P. 2.7)· ποταμίας ἕδος Ἀρτέμιδος. Ἀριστόνικος δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ φησὶν ἀτρέσθην τὴν κρήνην Ἀρτέμιδος, τὴν δὲ θεόν ἱππικὴν εἶναι· καθὸ Σῶφρων (Fr. 166 Hordern) μὲν αὐτὴν ἀτρέσθην, Ὄμηρος δὲ (I. 6.205) χρυσήνην· καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος προσεφώνησαν αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς Ἀρτέμιν· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις φάναι τὸν Πίνδαρον (P. 2.7)· ποταμίας ἕδος Ἀρτέμιδος. Ἀριστόνικος δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ φησὶν ἀτρέσθην τὴν κρήνην Ἀρτέμιδος, τὴν δὲ θεόν ἱππικὴν εἶναι· καθὸ Σῶφρων (Fr. 166 Hordern) μὲν αὐτὴν ἀτρέσθην, Ὄμηρος δὲ (I. 6.205) χρυσήνην· καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος προσεφώνησαν αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς Ἀρτέμιν· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις φάναι τὸν Πίνδαρον (P. 2.7)· ποταμίας ἕδος Ἀρτέμιδος. Ἀριστόνικος δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ φησὶν ἀτρέσθην τὴν κρήνην Ἀρτέμιδος, τὴν δὲ θεόν ἱππικὴν εἶναι· καθὸ Σῶφρων (Fr. 166 Hordern) μὲν αὐτὴν ἀτρέσθην, Ὄμηρος δὲ (I. 6.205) χρυσήνην· καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος προσεφώνησαν αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς Ἀρτέμιν· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις φάναι τὸν Πίνδαρον (P. 2.7)· ποταμίας ἕδος Ἀρτέμιδος. Ἀριστόνικος δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ φησὶν ἀτρέσθην τὴν κρήνην Ἀρτέμιδος, τὴν δὲ θεόν ἱππικὴν εἶναι· καθὸ Σῶφρων (Fr. 166 Hordern) μὲν αὐτὴν ἀτρέσθην, Ὄμηρος δὲ (I. 6.205) χρυσήνην· καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος προσεφώνησαν αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς Ἀρτέμιν· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις φάναι τὸν Πίνδαρον (P. 2.7)· ποταμίας ἕδος Ἀρτέμιδος.

Aristonicus Fr. 5

Σ. Ν. 1.37 = Ν. 1.25

(37) χρή δ’ ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοις· 'Αριστόνικος οὖν· χρῆ καθ’ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀτρέστην, ἀλλὰ συνασκεῖν ἅ ἐχει ἐκ φύσεως, ὁ δὲ νοῦς· χρὴ δὲ ταῖς εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς βαδίζοντα καταχρῆσθαι ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῇ φύσει, μηδὲ τῷ φθόνῳ μάρνασθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθούς, ἀλλὰ συνασκεῖν ἅ ἐχει ἐκ φύσεως, ὁ δὲ νοῦς· χρὴ δὲ ταῖς εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς βαδίζοντα καταχρῆσθαι ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῇ φύσει, μηδὲ τῷ φθόνῳ μάρνασθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθούς, ἀλλὰ συνασκεῖν ἅ ἐχει ἐκ φύσεως, ὁ δὲ νοῦς· χρὴ δὲ ταῖς εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς βαδίζοντα καταχρῆσθαι ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῇ φύσει, μηδὲ τῷ φθόνῳ μάρνασθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθούς, ἀλλὰ συνασκεῖν ἅ ἐχει ἐκ φύσεως, ὁ δὲ νοῦς· χρὴ δὲ ταῖς εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς βαδίζοντα καταχρῆσθαι ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῇ φύσει, μηδὲ τῷ φθόνῳ μάρνασθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθούς, ἀλλὰ συνασκεῖν ἅ ἐχει ἐκ φύσεως, ὁ δὲ νοῦς· χρὴ δὲ ταῖς εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς βαδίζοντα καταχρῆσθαι ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῇ φύσει, μηδὲ τῷ φθόνῳ μάρνασθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθούς, ἀλλὰ συνασκεῖν ἅ ἐχει ἐκ φύσεως, ὁ δὲ νοῦς· χρὴ δὲ ταῖς εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς βαδίζοντα καταχρῆσθαι ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῇ φύσει, μηδὲ τῷ φθόνῳ μάρνασθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθούς, ἀλλὰ συνασκεῖ}
victory is not Olympian but Nemean. Some say that the stables of Hiero and Chromius were likewise in Ortygia. The sacred spring of Artemis is there, and the goddess is connected with horses. Therefore Sophron calls her “untrembling”, and Homer “with golden reins”. And Pindar addressed the spring as well as its goddess Artemis. Therefore Pindar also elsewhere says “abode of Artemis of the river”. It is sufficient to say that the goddess is connected with horses and that the island is dedicated to the goddess. For it is a lie, that Hiero’s stables are located there. Aristonicus says that there is an Ortygia in Ephesus as well, where Artemis seemed to have been born. For Apollo seems to have been born on Delos, but she herself in the Asian Ortygia.

Aristonicus Fr. 5

Σ N. 1.37 = N. 1.25

One must [follow] straight paths: Aristonicus [explains] as follows: one must follow the nature with which one was born and not forcibly divert it elsewhere nor contend with good persons out of envy, but practice what one has by nature. The sense is: one must walk one’s own way and make full use of that which belongs to oneself and one’s nature nor insult one’s art through

1 Arethousa.
2 This refers to N. 1.1–3 ῎Αμπνευμα σεμνὸν ᾿Αλφεοῦ.. δέμνιον ᾿Αρτέμιδος, “Alpheus’ holy breath ... Artemis’ bedstead”.
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Chaeris Fr. 10 (Fr. 20 Berndt), Chrysippus Fr. 2 (Fr. 2 Braswell)

\[ \Sigma N. 1.49c = N. 1.33 \]

(49b) ἔγω δ' Ἡρακλέος ἀντέχομαι προφρόνως... (49c) ἄλλος· ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 58 Horn) φησιν, ὅτι οἱ νοῦις, ὃτι υπόθεσις αὐτῷ ἐδέδοτο τοιαύτῃ ὥστε μνησθῆναι τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅπερ ἐστίν, ὡς καὶ ἄλλως· ἐγὼ δὲ ἤρακλέος, ἀπίθανον.

5 μὴτο δὲ, ὅτι ἡ Ἡρακλῆς τοιοῦτος. τοῦτο δὲ ἐδέδοτο τοιούτῳ. τί γάρ, ὅτι τὴν πρῶτην περὶ Ἡρακλέους γενομένην συμφορὰν, ὥστε μνησθῆναι τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς φησιν ἅπαντος ἐκ φύσις ἀγαθὸς ἄνεφαν, ὥστε οὐκ ἂν ἁμοίωσε τὸν ἔπαινον.

10 ἐν μόνον τὸ περὶ τούς ἄλλως· ἐγὼ δὲ ἤρακλέος· διαπορεῖται τινι (Triclinius, τὸν U) ἐπὶ τούς περὶ Ἡρακλέους λόγους παρῆλθε· μηδεμίαν γὰρ ἔχειν (Drachmann, μηδὲ γὰρ παρεῖναι U) ἐς τὰ (Drachmann, τὸν U) παρέλαβε· μηδὲ γὰρ παρεῖναι (Drachmann) εἰς τὰ παρόντα Ἡρακλέως οἰκεῖωσιν U et Drachmann ὥστε ὡμοίωσε τὸν ἔπαινον.

15 ὁ δὲ Χαῖρίς φησιν ὅτι ὁ Χρόμιος πολλὰ συμπονήσας τῷ Ἱέρωνι κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀμοιβῆς ἔτυχεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ὡς οὖν οὗτος ἔλαβε πόνων τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν, ὥστε ὡς οὖν οὗτος ἔπαθλον ἔλαβε πόνων τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιφανεστέρων ἂν ἐπῄνει τὸν ῾Ηρακλέα. ὁ δὲ Χρύσιππος Νεμεακὸν εἶναί φησι τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ ἐνεστὶν εἰπεῖν· τί δήποτε ὁ Πίνδαρος ἰδιώτην ἐπαινῶν τὴν τοῦ ῾Ηρακλέους παρέλαβε συμφορὰν εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τῆς φιλοπονίας; μᾶλλον γὰρ ἔδει κοινότερον πάντας τοὺς ἄθλους εἰς ὑπόμνησιν ἀγαγεῖν, ὅτι καθὴρας γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν ἀπεθεώθη. ὁ δὲ Χρύσιππος Νεμεακὸν εἶναί φησι τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ
other pursuits.

Chaeris Fr. 10 (Fr. 20 Berndt), Chrysippus Fr. 2 (Fr. 2 Braswell)

\[ \Sigma N. 1.49c = N. 1.33 \]

I gladly cling to Heracles: ... Alternatively: Aristarchus says, that some believe that the subject had been given to Pindar and that he should mention the god. But he himself says that this is unconvincing. But perhaps because Pindar constantly praises those who are naturally excellent rather than those who are so by education, and because Heracles is such a one. But this is unconvincing. For in what way is it for the display of natural excellence that Pindar celebrated in his own way the first misfortune occurring to Hercules? Hercules, of course, manifested natural excellence in every respect so that Pindar need not have made his praise a point of comparison by mentioning only what Heracles did with the snakes, but if at all he should praise Heracles on the basis of his more famous deeds. Chaeris states that Chromius, after having toiled so much with Hiero from the start, received so much compensation from Hiero that he was able to breed horses from his wealth. Just as Chromius won fame as a reward for his toils, so too Heracles after enduring much hardship was rewarded with immortality and marriage to Hebe. But in this regard one might also ask: Why did Pindar while celebrating a private man include this misfortune of Heracles to show his industriousness? Rather he ought to have commemorated all his toils more generally, since he was apotheosized for cleansing land and sea.
δῆλον ἐπίνικον· διά τε τὸ Νεμεαῖον εἶναι τὸν λέοντα, ταύτῃ τὸν Ἡρακλέα τούς τοῦ νεκροκτός ἐπαίνοις ἐγκαταμεμίχθαι. ἀντιπράττει δὲ καὶ τούτῳ τὸ μηδ’ ὅτι οὖν τὸΝίδαρον εἰπέν περὶ τοῦ λέοντος, ὅπερ αἰτιώτατον τῆς παραβάσεως φησιν ὁ Χρύσιππος εἶναι. βέλτιον δὲ φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος (Fr. 40 Braswell) ἐκεῖνο λέγειν, ὥσπερ τὸν Πίνδαρον εἰπεῖν περὶ τοῦ λέοντος, ὥσπερ αἰτιώτατον τῆς παρεκβάσεως φησιν ὁ Χρύσιππος εἶναι.

βέλτιον δέ φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος (Fr. 40 Braswell) ἐκεῖνο λέγειν, ὥσπερ τὸν Πίνδαρον εἰπεῖν περὶ τοῦ λέοντος, ὥσπερ αἰτιώτατον τῆς παρεκβάσεως φησιν ὁ Χρύσιππος εἶναι. βέλτιον δὲ φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος (Fr. 40 Braswell) ἐκεῖνο λέγειν, ὥσπερ τὸν Πίνδαρον εἰπεῖν περὶ τοῦ λέοντος, ὥσπερ αἰτιώτατον τῆς παρεκβάσεως φησιν ὁ Χρύσιππος εἶναι.

ναυσιφορήτος δ’ ἀνδράς πρώτη χάρις εἰς πλόον ἐρχομένοις πομπαίον ὁμορφόν. τοιοῦτο λέγοι ἂν τι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Χρομίου· ἐπεὶ νῦν ἦρκται ἀγωνίζεσθαι καὶ ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς ἐνίκησεν, ἐλπὶς ἐστὶν αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν οὖν βούλεσθαι στεφάνων πρὸς τί οὖν τὸ περὶ Ἡρακλέους ὑπόδειγμα; ὅτι καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς βρέφος ἄτι μεταχειρισάμενος τοὺς δράκοντας, καὶ τοὺς αὖθις ἄθλους κατεπράξατο· καὶ ὥσπερ τούτου περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα γεγενημένου ὁ Ἁμπτρύων Θηβαῖον τὸν Τειρσίαν προανέκρινε περὶ τοῦ παιδός, ὁ δὲ προεμαντεύσατο τοὺς ἐσομένους αὐτῷ ἄθλους, οὕτως αὐτὸς ὁ Πίνδαρος ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης τοῦ Χρομίου νίκης προμαντεύεται, ὅτι καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν στεφάνων τεύξεται (BDPU).

Crates Fr. 2 (Fr. 59 Broggiato)

ΣΝ. 2.17c = N. 2.11

(17a) ὁρείαν γε Πελειάδων· Αρίσταρχος (Fr. 60 Horn) . . . (17c) ὁ δὲ Κράτης γράφει θερείαν Πελειάδων, ὅτι θερείας ἐπιτέλλουσι· τούτῳ δὲ ἀντιπράσσει ἥ τε ἀντίστροφος καὶ τὸ μὴ μόνον θέρους αὐτὰς ἐπιτέλλειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χειμῶνος (BDPTU).
Chrysippus says that it was a Nemean contest and obviously so was the victory ode. Given that the lion was Nemean, Heracles was included in the praise of the victor. This is opposed to the fact that Pindar does not say anything about the lion, which Chrysippus says was the most important reason for the digression. Didymus says that it is better to say that Pindar also wishes to make clear here what he said about Aetna.

For seafaring men the first blessing as they set out on a voyage is the coming of a favourable wind.

He might also be saying something like this concerning Chromius. Because he has now begun to compete and has won just after beginning, there is hope of him also obtaining the other crowns. But in what way is the example of Heracles relevant? That Heracles too, while still a child, killed the snakes, and then again accomplished his labours. Furthermore, just as Amphitryon questioned Tiresias the Theban about the child Heracles when this happened, and Tiresias foretold the future toils of Heracles, so too Pindar himself prophesies on the basis of Chromius’ first victory that he will obtain the remaining crowns as well.

Crates Fr. 2 (Fr. 59 Broggiato)

Σ N. 2.17c = N. 2.11

Pleiades of mountains (oreian): ... Crates writes “Pleiades of summer” (thereían), because they rise in summer. The antistrophe¹ and the fact that the Pleiades rise not only in summer, but also in winter, speaks against this.

¹I.e. the metre of corresponding position in the antistrophe.
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

Asclepiades Fr. 10

Σ Ν. 2.19 = Ν. 2.13

καὶ μὲν ἡ Σαλαμίας γε ψέφαι· ζητεῖται διὰ τί δήποτε τὰ περὶ Σαλαμίνα εἰς τοὺς περὶ Τιμόδημον λόγους προσέρχεται· οὐ γὰρ δήπου Σαλαμίνιος ἦν· ἀντικρισάοντας (Fr. 61 Horn) μὲν οὖν τῆς Αιαντίδος φυλῆς εἶναι, οὐκ ἀριστεύει δὲ ψηφισάν· οὐ γὰρ Αχαρνεῖς τῆς Οἰνηΐδος φυλῆς εἴσιν· οἱ δὲ Τιμόδημον φασίν, ὅτι εἰκός ἐστιν αὐτὸν εἶναι τῶν τὴν Σαλαμίνα κατακληρούσαν Ἀθηναίων· εἰκός οὖν αὐτὸν γεννηθέντα Ἁθήνησι τετράφθαι ἐν Σαλαμίνι· Δίδυμος (Fr. 41 Braswell) δὲ φησί, ὅτι ἴσως ἄμεινον λέγειν· ὅτι προσῆκε τὸν δῆμον τῆς Αἰαντίδος φυλῆς εἶναι, δὲν μὴν δέ φησιν· οἱ γὰρ Ἀχαρνεῖς τῆς Οἰνηΐδος φυλῆς εἰσίν· οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀσκληπίαδην φασίν, ὅτι εἰκός ἐστιν αὐτὸν Ἁθηναίων κατακληρούσαν καὶ ἅλλως· τίς ἀπόδειξις· τῆς ἐπιφερομένης (BDPTU).

Callistatus Fr. 2

Σ Ν. 3.1c = Ν. 3.1

(1a.) ὦ πότνια μοῖσα, μάτερ ἁμετέρα· ... (1c.) ἐζήτηται δὲ πῶς ἐπικαλεῖται, ἄλλως· ἐζήτηται (BDPTU).
Asclepiades Fr. 10

Σ N. 2.19 = N. 2.13

And Salamis raised him: The question is why the reference to Salamis has been added to the passages about Timodemus. He was certainly not a Salaminian. For Pindar says outright that he was from the deme Acharnae. Aristarchus, on the one hand, says that Timodemos belonged to the phyle Aiantis. He says this incorrectly since the Acharneans belong to the phyle Oeneis. Those around Asclepiades, on the other hand, say that it is probable that Timodemos was one of the Athenians who were assigned lots on Salamis. Thus, it is probable that Timodemus was born in Athens, but raised on Salamis. Didymus for his part, says, that it is perhaps better to say that Timodemos traced his ancestry to Ajax, as did Miltiades, Cimon, Alcibiades and the historian Thucydides, Olorus’ son. Perhaps because the Athenians held Ajax in honour, so that they did not only create a phyle with the name Aeantis but also adorned a couch with panoplia for him, and also because it is reasonable to compare Timodemus as a practitioner of pancration to the most warlike and courageous among the Greeks. Salamis thus is capable of raising a fighting man. What is the proof? The one adduced.

Callistratus Fr. 2

Σ N. 3.1c = N. 3.1

O mistress Muse, our mother: . . . The question is why Pindar invokes the


Chapter 8. Text and Translation

tαι τὴν Μοῦσαν ἐλθεῖν εἰς Αἴγιναν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὸν ὕμνον ᾀσθῆναι, καὶ ἅμα τοὺς νεανίσκους φησὶ μένειν, δι’ οὓς αὐτὴν ἐπικαλεῖται, οὖς ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἀλλ’ ἐν Νεμέᾳ· ὁ γὰρ ᾿Ασωπὸς οὐκ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ, ἀλλὰ περὶ Φλειοῦντά ἔστι καὶ Νεμέαν. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 62 Horn) φησιν, ἢτοι τὸν χορὸν ὑπὸ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς νίκης τὸν ὑμνησμένον τινα ἤσαι, ἢ τὸν ᾿Αρχιλόχου (Fr. 394 IEG²) Καλλίνικον, οὐ καὶ τὸν Πινδάρον μνημονεύειν διὰ τούτων (Pind. O. 9.1).

τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος φωνάζει,

καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς: μεταβάνοις οὖν τοῦ χοροῦ εἰς τὴν Αἴγιναν καὶ μέλλοντας ἄστει τὸν ὑμνησμένον τινα ἐπίνικον τόπον ὑμνησμένων τοῖς οὖς αὐτὴν ἐπικαλεῖται, οὐκ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἀλλὰ περὶ Φλειοῦντά ἔστι καὶ Νεμέαν. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 62 Horn) φησιν, ἢτοι τὸν χορὸν ὑπὸ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς νίκης τὸν ὑμνησμένον τινα ἤσαι, ἢ τὸν ᾿Αρχιλόχου (Fr. 394 IEG²) Καλλίνικον, οὐ καὶ τὸν Πινδάρον μνημονεύειν διὰ τούτων (Pind. O. 9.1).

τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος φωνάζει,

καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς: μεταβάνοις οὖν τοῦ χοροῦ εἰς τὴν Αἴγιναν καὶ μέλλοντας ἄστει τὸν ὑμνησμένον τινα ἐπίνικον τόπον ὑμνησμένων τοῖς οὖς αὐτὴν ἐπικαλεῖται, οὐκ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἀλλὰ περὶ Φλειοῦντά ἔστι καὶ Νεμέαν. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 62 Horn) φησιν, ἢτοι τὸν χορὸν ὑπὸ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς νίκης τὸν ὑμνησμένον τινα ἤσαι, ἢ τὸν ᾿Αρχιλόχου (Fr. 394 IEG²) Καλλίνικον, οὐ καὶ τὸν Πινδάρον μνημονεύειν διὰ τούτων (Pind. O. 9.1).

τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος φωνάζει,

καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς: μεταβάνοις οὖν τοῦ χοροῦ εἰς τὴν Αἴγιναν καὶ μέλλοντας ἄστει τὸν ὑμνησμένον τινα ἐπίνικον τόπον ὑμνησμένων τοῖς οὖς αὐτὴν ἐπικαλεῖται, οὐκ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἀλλὰ περὶ Φλειοῦντά ἔστι καὶ Νεμέαν. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 62 Horn) φησιν, ἢτοι τὸν χορὸν ὑπὸ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς νίκης τὸν ὑμνησμένον τινα ἤσαι, ἢ τὸν ᾿Αρχιλόχου (Fr. 394 IEG²) Καλλίνικον, οὐ καὶ τὸν Πινδάρον μνημονεύειν διὰ τούτων (Pind. O. 9.1).

τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος φωνάζει,

καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς: μεταβάνοις οὖν τοῦ χοροῦ εἰς τὴν Αἴγιναν καὶ μέλλοντας ἄστει τὸν ὑμνησμένον τινα ἐπίνικον τόπον ὑμνησμένων τοῖς οὖς αὐτὴν ἐπικαλεῖται, οὐκ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἀλλὰ περὶ Φλειοῦντά ἔστι καὶ Νεμέαν. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 62 Horn) φησιν, ἢτοι τὸν χορὸν ὑπὸ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς νίκης τὸν ὑμνησμένον τινα ἤσαι, ἢ τὸν ᾿Αρχιλόχου (Fr. 394 IEG²) Καλλίνικον, οὐ καὶ τὸν Πινδάρον μνημονεύειν διὰ τούτων (Pind. O. 9.1).
Muse to come to Aegina to sing the hymn and at the same time says that the youths, on account of whom he invokes the Muse, are staying not on Aegina but in Nemea. For Asopus is not in Aegina but around Phlius and Nemea. Aristarchus says, that the chorus either sings an improvised song on the occasion of the victory or Archilochus’ *Kallinikos*, which also Pindar recalls in the following words:

The resounding song of Archilochus.

And so on. Therefore when the chorus had travelled to Aegina and was about to sing the hymn composed by Pindar, it could reasonably say: “the young craftsmen of the honey-sounding revels at the Asopian water.” Therefore, what he wishes to say is: the choruses who crafted the improvised song in Asopus await you in Aegina, about to sing the victory ode composed by Pindar. Didymus says that the commentators are utterly deceived by the fact that [several] rivers share the same name. For there are several Asopuses, and he says that the river in Aegina is one of these. Callistratus says that there is an Asopis in Aegina. It is also possible to understand it as the river Asopus in Boeotia, as the choral dancers from Aegina keep close to Pindar because of his writing the victory ode for Aristocleides.

Ammonius Fr. 6

Σ N. 3.16b = N. 3.10

Begin [daughter] of the sky: … Aristarchus has pointed out that the muse is the daughter of Uranus, as Mimnermus and Alcman relate. Ammonius adds that Pindar calls Uranus “ruler” because he was king before Cronus became king. But the case has been changed from *ioi polunephelou oranōt* [gen. “many-clouded Uranus/sky”]. Didymus says that it is better to understand the

---

1 Aristarchus apparently argued that the chorus is not waiting at the Asopian waters but have already sung there.

2 The primordial god of the sky.
υνεφέλου οὐρανοῦ θύγατερ. βέλτιον δέ φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος (Fr. 55 Braswell)
ἀκούειν τὸ ὅλον οὖτως· τοῦ πολυνεφέλου κρέοντος οὐρανοῦ θύγατερ, τοῦ Δίως, κρέων γάρ οὐρανοῦ ὁ Ζεὺς, Δίως δὲ Μούσαι (BDP).

**Ammonius Fr. 7**

Σ N. 4.53a–b = N. 4.33

τά μακρὰ δ’ ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός· Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 67 Horn): εἰς νομιμάν ἐπιούσαν ὑποκέιμενόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ ἀποδοῦσαι τὸν ἐπίνικον. πάντα γάρ, φησι, τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ Ἀλκυονέα μακρὰς διελθεῖν κωλύσαι. τοῦ πολυνεφέλου κρέοντος οὐρανοῦ θύγατερ, τοῦ Διός κρέων γάρ οὐρανοῦ ὁ Ζεὺς, Διὸς δὲ Μοῦσαι (BDP).

**Asclepiades Fr. 11**

Σ N. 6. inscr.

Τοῦτον τὸν Ἀλκιμίδαν ἀναγράφεσθαι φησιν Ἀσκληπιάδης ἀντὶ Αἰγινήτου Κρῆτα οὕτως· Ἀλκιμίδας Θέωνος Κρῆς (BD).

**Aristodemus Fr. 5**

Σ N. 7.1a = N. 7.1

Εἰλείθυια πάρεδρε Μοισάν: ζητεῖται διατί ἀπὸ τῆς Εἰλείθυίας εἰσβέβληκε,
whole phrase in this way: Daughter of the ruler of the much-clouded sky, Zeus. For Zeus rules the sky, and the Muses are from Zeus.

Ammonius Fr. 7

Σ N. 4.53a–b = N. 4.33

But the law keeps me from telling the long tale: Aristarchus says: Pindar had pledged to deliver the ode at the coming new moon. For I am hindered, he says, from going through at length everything concerning Heracles and Alcyoneus. What kind of law? The law of the victory ode. The law of the victory ode, he says, hinders me from using extensive digressions. But Ammonius says that Pindar has promised to deliver the victory ode at a certain time. Therefore this law, which the kinsmen of the champion and I have made concerning the day when I shall deliver the ode, hinders me from writing more, for I do not have time, wherefore he adds: “Hours urging on”, that is, the hours urge me on.

Asclepiades Fr. 11

Σ N. 6.inscr.

Asclepiades says that Alcimidas is recorded not as an Aeginetan but as a Cretan thus “Alcimidas from Kreta, son of Theon”.

Aristodemus Fr. 5

Σ N. 7.1a = N. 7.1

Eleithyia, enthroned beside the Fates: The question is why Pindar begins
καὶ τί δήποτε τῇ Εἰλείθυιᾳ προσδιαλέγεται. ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν φασὶ νέον ὄντα τὸν Σωγένην ἐτέρου νικήσαντος αὐτὸν κατὰ χάριν ἀνηγγέλθα τοῦ πατρὸς Θεαρίωνος εἰς τοῦτο φιλοτιμηθέντος, τὸν δὲ ἀγωνισάμενον Νεοπτόλεμον τοὔονα Αχαιόν παρὸ καὶ εἰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ Νεοπτόλεμον τῶν Ἀχιλλείως τὸν ποιητὴν παρεξήγησαίναι λόγους. αὐτοσχέδιον δὲ φησι τοῦτο εἶναι οἱ Δίδυμοι (Fr. 54 Braswell): οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀφ’ ἑτέρου ὀνόματι κηρύττεται, μόνον δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἱππικοῖς ἀγῶσι νενόμισται τὸ ἔθος, ὥστε τοὺς βασιλέας καὶ τυράννους ἀναγράφεσθαι· πλούτου γὰρ καὶ χορηγίας τὴν ἱπποτροφίαν ἐπίδειξιν εἶναι καὶ οὐ τῆς ῥώμης. οἱ δὲ φασὶ πρὸς τοὔονα τοῦ Σωγένους παρειλικύσθαι τῇ Εἰλείθυίᾳ· εἶναι γὰρ αὐτὴν σωγενῆ, τινες, διὰ τὸ τὰ γεννώμενα ἀνασῷζειν· τὸν οὖν Πίνδαρον ψυχρευσάμενον πρὸς τοὔονα τῆς Εἰλείθυίας μεμνηθαι καὶ τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ εὖ· τότε γὰρ καταφέρεται εἰς τοῦτο ὁ Πίνδαρος, ὅταν ὑπῇ τις ὁμωνυμία· οἷον (Fr. 120 Maehler):

᾿Ολβίων ὁμώνυμε Δαρδανιδᾶν, παῖ θρασύμηδες ᾿Αμύντα·

καὶ (Fr. 105 Maehler):

Σύνες ὅ τι λέγω, ζαθέων ἱερῶν ὁμώνυμε πάτερ, κτίστορ Αἴτνας.

νῦν δὲ οὐδὲν τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι τῶν θεῶν αὐξανομένοις ἀγαθὰ δωροῦνται, ἡ δὲ Εἰλείθυια αὐτὴν τὴν πρώτην καταβολήν.

ἔστι δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο λέγειν· τί δήποτε τὴν Εἰλείθυιαν ἰδίως ἐπὶ τοῦ Σωγένους παρέλαβεν, αλλ’ οὐχὶ καὶ ἐπ’ ἄλλων εὐφυΐᾳ διενεγκόντων;
with Eleithyia and why he addresses her. Some say that when Sogenes was still young someone else won the contest. He was nonetheless proclaimed [the victor] as a favour to his father Thearion, who earnestly desired this. The contestant was an Achaean by the name of Neoptolemus. Therefore the poet also digresses about Neoptolemus, son of Achilleus. Didymus says that this is an improvised [explanation]. For no-one is proclaimed winner under another name. It is only a custom in horse-races that kings and tyrants are recorded,¹ because horse-breeding is a demonstration of wealth and patronage and not of bodily strength. Others say that Pindar added Eleithyia in reference to the name of Sogenes. For she is, some say, the saviour of offspring (Sōgenēs) because she rescues those that are born. Pindar accordingly in a frigid way mentions Eleithyia on account of the name. This too, is not well said, for whenever there is a homonym, Pindar refers to it, for example:

Namesake of the fortunate Dardanidae, daring son of Amyntas

and

Understand what I say, father who is namesake of sacred sacrifices, founder of Aetna.

But there is nothing of the kind here. Some say that Sogenes’ father Thearion served as a priest for Eleithyia. This too, is untestified. Some say that there was a temple of Eleithyia in the neighbourhood of Sogenes. But this is also unreported. Others have said, that Pindar constantly praises those who are naturally excellent rather than those who are so by education. Accordingly, Eleithyia made Sogenes apt for athletic competition right from birth. Other gods bestow their gifts to people as they grow, but Eleithyia bestows the very foundation. But in this regard one might also say: Why then did Pindar

¹Instead of the actual jockey.
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Αριστόδημος δὲ ὁ ᾿Αριστάρχου μαθητὴς βέλτιον οὕτω φησίν· ὀψέ ποτε τῷ Θεαρίωνι καὶ παρά τὴν ἡλικίαν ἤδη προήκοντι, εὐξαμένῳ τῇ θεῷ Σωγένην τεκνωθῆναι, καὶ τὴν τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ γέννησιν οἷον Εἰλειθυίας εἶναι χάριν. διὰ τὴν ίδιότητα οὖν τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ ἀθλητοῦ πρὸς τὴν θεὸν ταύτην ἐπήρεισε τὸν λόγον. επιστοῦτο δὲ τοῦτο εξ ἐπιγράμματος Σιμωνίδου (Fr. 166). ἐνικῶς δὲ εἶπεν Εἰλειθυία, ὡς καὶ Ἡσιόδος (Theog. 922):

ἡ δ’ Ἡβην καὶ Ἁρηα καὶ Εἰλείθυιαν ἔτικεν.

ὁ δὲ Ὀμήρος (Il. 16.187, Il. 11.270) ἐκατέρως. ὅτι δὲ τῆς Ἡβης ἀδελφὴ ἡ Εἰλείθυια, πρόκειται τὰ Ἡσιόδο (BD).

Dionysius Charmidis Filius Fr. 1

Σ N. 7.35a = N. 7.25

εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἐὰν ἀλάθειαν· ἔνιοι μὲν ἀνέγνωσαν ἑάν δασέως, ἀντὶ τοῦ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ· βέλτιον δὲ ψιλῶς, ὡς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ τοῦ Χαρμίδου (BD).

Aristodemus Fr. 6 (FGrH 383 Fr. 14)

Σ N. 7.56a = N. 7.38

Μολοσσίᾳ δ’ ἐν βασιλεύειν ὅλγον χρόνον· ἀνάγει τοὺς χρόνους· ὑστερον γὰρ ἀπὸ Μολοσσοῦ τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου καὶ Ανδρομάχης τοῦναμα ἔλαβεν ἡ Μολοσσία. παρεκβαίνει δὲ εἰς τὰ περὶ Νεοπτολέμου, ὡς μὲν Ἦρισταρχος (deest in Horn), ὅτι νικήσας καὶ χαρισάμενος τὴν ἀνάρρησιν τῷ Σωγένει Νεοπτολέμου ἦν τοὔνομα, Ἡπειρώτης τὸ γένος, ὅπερ ὄχι ὀὔτω

apply Eleithyia only to Sogenes and not to others who are naturally superior. Aristodemus, the pupil of Aristarchus, says it better in this way: Therion was blessed with Sogenes at a late age, after praying to the goddess, having already passed his prime. The birth of his son was like a grace from Eleithyia. Pindar directed the discourse to the goddess because of the special nature of the champion’s birth. This is made credible by the epigram of Simonides. Pindar speaks of Eleithyia in the singular, just like Hesiod:

She gave birth to Hebe and Ares and Eleithyia.

But Homer [uses] both [singular and plural]. That Eleithyia was a sister of Hebe is shown by the works of Hesiod.

Dionysius son of Charmides Fr. 1

Σ N. 7.35a = N. 7.25

If it were [possible to see] the truth: some read ἅγα [fem. acc. of ἡγος ‘his/her’] with aspiration, used for τὴν ἅγατο [his own]. But it is better without aspiration, as Dionysius, son of Charmides.

Aristodemus Fr. 6 (FGrH 383 Fr. 14)

Σ N. 7.56a = N. 7.38

He ruled for a short period in Molossia: Pindar is being anachronistic. For it was only later that Molossia received its name from Molossus, the son of Neoptolemus and Andromache. Pindar digresses about Neoptolemus, according to Aristarchus, because the one who had won and given up the title to Sogenes as a favour was called Neoptolemus and was of the Epirotan race. Didymus,
φησίν ἔχειν ὁ Δίδυμος (Fr. 56 Braswell)· ὡς δὲ Ἀριστόδημος, ὅτι ἀλείπτῃ ἐκέχρητο τῷ Νεοπτολέμῳ. διὸ εἰς ἐπαινὸν τοῦ ὄνοματος τῇ ἱρωϊκῇ κέχρηται παρεκβάσει (BD).

Aristodemus Fr. 7

Σ. Ν. 7.70 = Ν. 7.48

εὐώνυμον εἰς δίκαια τρία ἔπαινα διαφέρετο: Ἀρίσταρχος (Fr. 72 Horn)

5 οὕτως· ἐπεὶ μέμψις τοῖς Αἰγινήταις πρὸς τὸν ποιητὴν ἦν χάριν τοῦ Νεο-

τολέμου, εἰς τὴν ἀπολογίαν τὴν περὶ Νεοπτολέμου δικαίως διαφέρεται τρία ἔπαινα, φησίν· ὅτι μόρσιμον ἦν αὐτῷ ἀλείπτῃ εἰς τὴν ἀναμνήστικὴν μνήμην ἐληλυθέναι τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου.

10 τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὔ ποτε φάσει κέαρ· οὐκ ἀτρόπως φησὶν οὐδὲ ἀπεοικότως εἰς μνήμην ἐληλυθέναι τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου. ὁ μὲν οὖν Καλλίστρατος, ἐπεὶ ἔφησε...
Aristodemus Fr. 7

however, says this was not the case. According to Aristodemus, on the other hand, it was because Sogenes had a trainer named Neoptolemus, and Pindar therefore in commendation made a digression on the name of the hero.

Aristodemus Fr. 7

Σ N. 7.70 = N. 7.48

Three words will suffice for the right to a good name: According to Aristarchus: because the Aeginetans had a ground of complaint against the poet for the sake of [the treatment in Paean 6 of] Neoptolemus, three words will rightly suffice for his defence concerning Neoptolemus: That he was destined to die in this way; that it was appointed that one of the Aeacids at the time of his death should die in a temple; thirdly that one of the Aeacids should see to law and justice in the processions of the heroes. Three reasons therefore, he says, are enough for the right to a good name. This is to say: there are three reasons, which he recounts, sufficient for his death to have occurred righteously. Some defend Neoptolemus’ death by offering these three [reasons]: that he was killed because of the sacrificial meat, that the Delphians regretted their slaying of him, and that he was destined to be killed. But Aristodemus understands the three words as the triads: for in the beginning they used to call the strophe, antistrophe and epod a word (epos). And of course, there are three triads in the victory ode.

Aristodemus Fr. 8, Callistratus Fr. 3

Σ N. 7.150a = N. 7.102

My heart will never say: Pindar says that he neither mentioned Neoptolemus in an unseemly nor inappropriate manner. Callistratus says that since


tὸν Σωγένη γείτονα εἶναι τοῦ Ἡρακλέους, καὶ ὁ Νεοπτόλεμος δὲ γειτνιὰς τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖς, κατὰ τούτο γράφειν οἰκείοις μεμνήσθαι τοῦ Νεοπτόλεμου, διὰ τὴν ἄμφιτροφίαν γειτνιάσαι: οὔ δὲ Ἀριστόδημος, ὅτι μεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Αἰγινητῶν ἐπὶ τῷ δοκεῖν ἐν Παιᾶσιν (Paean 6) εἰπεῖ τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον εἰπών, ὁ δὲ ᾿Αριστόδημος, ὅτι μεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Αἰγινητῶν ἐπὶ τῷ δοκεῖν ἐν Παιᾶσιν (Paean 6) εἰπεῖ τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον ἀμφοτέρων γειτνιάσιν· ὁ δὲ ᾿Αριστόδημος, ὅτι μεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Αἰγινητῶν ἐπὶ τῷ δοκεῖν ἐν Παιᾶσιν (9–10).

Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 2

Σ. N. 11.inscr.a

Οὖδὲ ὅλως, φησὶν ὁ Δίδυμος (Fr. 62 Braswell), ἔχειν τὴν φωθή ταύτην εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς συνεώς τούτου οὐ γὰρ ἰερὸν ἀγῶνα νενίκηκεν ὁ ᾿Αρισταγόρας, ἀλλὰ περιξοῦς.

ἡπατῆσιν ὁ Δίδυμος ἐνίος, ὡς δοκεῖν ἱεροὺς στεφάνους αὐτὸν ἀνῃρᾶσθαι. διὰ τῆς ᾠδῆς δὲ σημαίνεται, ὅτι στεφάνους ἔσχεν ὡς δεκαέξ., ἀλλὰ σὺν δόξῃ τέλος δυωδεκάμηνον περάσαι.
Pindar said that Sogenes is a neighbour of Heracles, and Neoptolemus is a
neighbour of the god at Delphi, their proximity is his reason for mentioning
Neoptolemus. But Aristodemus says that Pindar had been reproached by the
Aeginetans for appearing to say in the *Paeans* that Neoptolemus came to Delphi
to commit sacrilege. Therefore he now says this as if to defend himself, since
Neoptolemus did not die while committing sacrilege but was killed while fight-
ing for the sacrificial meat. Therefore Pindar will later add: but to plough the
same three and four times is pointless. That is to say: I have defended myself
sufficiently as regards Neoptolemus. Why should I repeat the same thing? It
is useless to repeat the same words as if to silly children. Pindar says “tear to
pieces” (*elkysai*) instead of “insult” (*enybrisai*). The metaphor is from dogs
who tear bodies to pieces.

**Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 2**

Σ N. 11.inscr.a

This ode should not have been included among the *Victory Odes* at all, says
Didymus. For Aristagoras did not win at a sacred contest, but at local games.
He says that the ode was written for Aristagoras when he was a magistrate and
leader of the city. This is apparent from what he says:

May he complete his term of twelve months in glory and with heart
unscathed.

Didymus calls some deceived when they believe that Aristagoras collected
sacred garlands. It is obvious from the ode that he won some sixteen crowns
but not from the *periodic* games,¹ so they were misled by the saying:

---

¹I.e. The Pan-Hellenic games which were held regularly during a four-year period.
ἐλπίδες δ’ ὀκνηρότεραι γονέων παιδὸς βίαν ἔσχον ἐν Πυθῶνι
πειρᾶσθαι καὶ ᾿Ολυμπίᾳ αέθλων.

οὐ γὰρ σημαίνει διὰ τούτων ὡς ῾Ισθμία καὶ Νέμεα νενικηκότος αὐτοῦ. ἀλλὰ τούναντιν οἱ γονεῖς δι’ εὐλάβειαν συγγενεῖς οὐκ ἀπέστειλαν αὐτόν ἐπὶ τοὺς ιεροὺς στεφάνους, ἐπεὶ κἂν ῾Ισθμία καὶ Νέμεα εἰλήφει. ἐηθείες γὰρ (22–23):

ναὶ μὰ γὰρ ὄρχων, ἐμὰν δόξαν παρὰ Κασταλίᾳ καὶ παρὰ εὐδένδρῳ μολὼν ὄχθῳ Κρόνου κάλλιον ἂν δηριώντων ἐνόστησῖ ἰτιπάλων.

5 ὀμνύει γὰρ ὁ Πίνδαρος, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δόξαν, εἰ ἐξεδήμησεν εἰς Πυθῶ καὶ ᾿Ολυμπίαν, κάλλιον ἂν τῶν συνανταγωνιστῶν ἐπανελήλυθε εἰς τὴν πατρίδα, τούτους ἐνύηκεν δὲ ἐλπίδες ὀκνηρότεραι κατέσχον γονέων αὐτόν, διὸ οὐδ’ ὅλως εξεδήμησε, συντακτέον τοὺς παραίνειν, καθὰ καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὸν Φασηλίτην ἀφέσκει (BD).

Aristodemus Fr. 9 (FGrH 383 Fr. 15)

Σ I. 1.11c = I. 1.10

15 ἐπεὶ στεφάνους ἐξ ὤπασε Κάδμου στρατῷ· διαπορεῖται τίς ἐνεχείρισε τῷ Κάδμου στρατῷ, τούτους ταῖς Θήβαις, τοὺς στεφάνους. ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν τὸν ᾿Ισθμὸν ἀκούουσιν, ὡς ἕξ νενικηκότων τῶν Θηβαίων τὰ ῾Ισθμία· ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν ῾Ηρόδοτον· τοῦτον γὰρ ἑξάκις ῾Ισθμία νενικηκέναι Θηβαῖον ὁντα· τούτων δὲ οὐδέτερον ἐν ταῖς ᾿Ισθμιακαῖς ἀναγραφαῖς ὡμολόγηται· δι’ ἧν αὖταν οἱ Αριστάρχειοι (Fr. 77 Horn) ψυλόντες καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ νικηφόρου ἐκλαμβάνοντες τὸν λόγον, περισσήν εἶναι φασι τὴν ἕξ πρόθεσιν ποιητικῆ
Aristodemus Fr. 9

But his parents' overly cautious expectations kept their strong son from competing in the games at Pytho and Olympia.

By this Pindar does not indicate that Aristagoras won the Isthmian and Nemean games. On the contrary, because of parental over-caution, his parents did not send him to compete for sacred crowns, since he would [in that case] have undertaken [to win] the Isthmia and Nemea. Pindar will add:

For I swear that, in my judgement, had he gone to Castalia and to the well-wooded hill of Cronus, he would have had a more noble homecoming than his wrestling opponents.

Pindar thus swears that, in his opinion, if he had travelled to Pytho and Olympia, Aristagoras would have returned to his fatherland greater than his competitors, that is he would have won. But now his parents’ timid hope held him back and he did not travel at all. Didymus says that the ode should be assigned to the Drinking songs, in which he agrees with those around Phaselistes.

Aristodemus Fr. 9 (FGrH 383 Fr. 15)

Σ I. 1.11c = I. 1.10

Because it bestowed six crowns on Cadmus’ people; The question is who handed over the crowns to Cadmus’ host, this is Thebes. Some understand it as the Isthmos, because six Thebans were victorious at the Isthmian games. Others say Herodotus himself, for he was Theban and won the Isthmian games six times. There is no evidence for this in the Isthmian Victory Lists. The Aristarcheans therefore, reading ex [prefix in ekopazō “send forth”] with a smooth breathing and taking it as a reference to the winner, say that it is a
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

συνηθείᾳ· τὸ γὰρ ὅλον εἶναι· ἐπεὶ ὤπασεν, ὅ ἐστι περιεποίησεν· ἄλλως τε οὐκ ἁναγκαῖον ἀριθμὸν κεῖσθαι· πολλῷ γὰρ μᾶλλον κυδαίνεσθαι τὸν νενικηκότα. Ἀριστόδημος δὲ ὁ ᾿Αλεξανδρεὺς δασύνων καὶ διαιρῶν τὸ μὲν ἓξ ἐπὶ τοῦ ᾿Ηροδότου ἀκούει, τὸ δὲ ὤπασεν ἐπὶ τοῦ ᾿Απόλλωνος· προστάτης γὰρ τῶν ἀγώνων ὁ θεός. ἐξ οὖν προνοίᾳ φησὶ τοῦ θεοῦ νενικηκέναι τὸν ᾿Ηρόδοτον, οὐκ ᾿Ισθμικοὺς ἀγῶνας, ἀλλὰ συμμίκτους, οὓς καὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιλέγειν Πίνδαρον, ἐν μὲν ᾿Ιόλεια ἢ ᾿Ηράκλεια, ἐν δὲ ᾿Ορχομενῷ Μινύεια, ἐν δὲ Εὐβοίᾳ Βασύλεια, ἐν δὲ Θεσσαλίᾳ Πρωτεσίλεια, καὶ ἐν ᾿Ισθμῷ νῦν, καὶ ἄλλους δὲ περιχωρίους οὓς διὰ μακρῶν παρῆλθεν ὁ Πίνδαρος (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 3 (Fr. 3 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.56 = I. 1.40

οὐκ δὲ νῦν καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει· ὁ Χρύσιππος ἐμφαίνειν φησὶν, ὡς καὶ πρότερον μὲν συνετῶς ἐγχωρήσαντα, ὡς μὴ κινδυνεύσῃ, καὶ μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον δὲ ἠσφαλισμένον τὰ καθ' ἑαυτόν· τοῦτο οὖν φῆσι· ὁ παθὼν τῷ νῷ προμαθὴς γίνεται.

῾Αλκμάν (Alcm. Fr. 125 PMGF)

πεῖρά τοι μαθήσιος ἀρχά.

καὶ ᾿Ομηρος (Hesiod Op. 218).

Chrysippus Fr. 4 (Fr. 4 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.67 = I. 1.48

μηλοβότᾳ τῷ ἀρότῳ τῷ ὀρνιχολόχῳ τῷ τὰ μῆλα νέμοντι, τῷ ποιμένι, τῷ τά μῆλα νέμοντι, τῷ ποιμένι,
superfluous prefix in accordance with poetic usage. It all only means, when he bestowed, that is, obtained. In any case, the number is not necessary; it only serves the more to glorify the victor. But Aristodemus from Alexandria reads hex [six] with a rough breathing, takes it as a separate word, and connects it with Herodotus, but ὀπασεν with Apollo, who is the god presiding over the games. Thus Pindar is saying that, by the god’s providence, Herodotus has won six contexts - not only Istmian but combined. As Pindar himself adds: In Thebes the Ioleia or Heraclea, in Orchomenus the Minyan games, in Euboea the Basileian games, in Thessaly the Protesileian games and now in Isthmos, as well as other local games, which Pindar has recounted at length.

Chrysippus Fr. 3 (Fr. 3 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.56 = I. 1.40

One who has toiled gains also foresight for his mind: Chrysippus states that Pindar indicates that just as the one who prudently did not earlier allow taking risks, so too he\(^1\) secures what is his upon his return. Accordingly he says: He who has suffered becomes foreseeing in his mind. Alcman (says):

Experience is the beginning of learning.

And Homer [i.e. Hesiod] says:

But only when he has suffered does the fool learn this.

Chrysippus Fr. 4 (Fr. 4 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.67 = I. 1.48

Shepherd, plougher and fowler: he who drives sheep to pasture – the shep-

\(^1\)Herodotus.
καὶ τῷ τὴν γῆν ἀροῦντι, καὶ τῷ τὰς ὄρνις θηρεύοντι, καὶ ὃν πόντος τρέφει·
Χρύσιππος τὸν ἐμπορον, Δίδυμος (Fr. 66 Braswell) δὲ τὸν ἀβέα φησὶ (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 5 (Fr. 5 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.76a = I. 1.52

ἡμι δ’ ἐκεί Κρόνου σεισίγθων’ ὕπον· Χρύσιππος, παρεήθησαι, φησὶ,
τὸν Ποσειδῶνα διὰ τὴν γειτνίασιν τοῦ Ὀγχηστοῦ, καθὼς συμβέβηκεν
ἰπποδρομίου Ποσειδῶνος ἐφεύγων ἐν Θήβαις εἶναι (BD).

Aristodemus Fr. 10 (Dubium, FGrH 383 Fr. 16)

Σ I. 1.79c = I. 1.56

καὶ σέθεν, Ἀμμιτρύων, παῖδας προσειπεῖν ... Μινύα δὲ μαχον τὸν
Ὀρχομενοῦ εἶπεν’ ὅτους γὰρ λέγεται καὶ Ὀρχομενὸς Μινύεος τοῦ
γὰρ ἐνROLLER (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 6 (Fr. 6 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.81c–d = I. 1.57

(81b.) καὶ τὸ Δάματρος ... (81c.) ἄλλως. ἐν τοῖς δρόμοις τούτου καὶ
ἀγωνίσμασι προσήκον ἢμιν ἀνυμνήσατε Ἑλευσίνα καὶ Εὔβοιαν. τὸ δὲ
γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις (I. 1.57) πρὸς πάντα ληπτόν τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ γὰρ τὸν
Ποσειδῶνα, φησὶ, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Εὔβοιαν τε καὶ Ἑλευσίνα διὰ τοὺς δρό-

2 δὲ om. D 4 καθὼς | καθὸ D 6 Μινύα | μινύει D 7 εἶπεν | εἴρηκε D || οὗτος γὰρ |
οὕτως γονὸν D 8 ἐνϕόκησεν | ἐνϕόκησεν D 14 τοῦτον τοῦτοι Callierges 15 ἢμιν | ὑμῖν |
D 17 φησὶ | φασὶ D
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Chrysippus Fr. 5

herd – he who ploughs the earth, he who hunts birds, and whom the sea rears. Chrysippus says the merchant, Didymus the fisherman.

Chrysippus Fr. 5 (Fr. 5 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.76a = I. 1.52

To us he seems to be the earth-shaking son of Cronus: Pindar has included Poseidon, says Chrysippus, because of his proximity to Onchestus, since there happens to be a temple to Poseidon Hippodromius in Thebes.

Aristodemus Fr. 10 (Dubium, FGrH 383 Fr. 16)

Σ I. 1.79c = I. 1.56

And to address your children, Amphitrion: He calls Orchomenus Minyas’ heart-land. It is also called Minyan Orchomenus, for Minyas founded the city. Some, such as Pherecydes, trace the lineage of Minyas to Orchomenus but others trace the lineage of Orchomenus to Minyas. Other trace the lineage of both to Eteocles. Dionysius records Minyas as Ares’ son. Aristodemus writes that Minyas is the son of Aleus and therefore they are addressed as Minyans.

Chrysippus Fr. 6 (Fr. 6 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.81c–d = I. 1.57

And Demeter’s [sanctuary]: ... Alternatively: in his races and competitions it is fitting for us to celebrate Eleusis and Euboea. The “circling race-courses” ought to be taken in reference to all the games that are mentioned. It is fitting to sing of Poseidon, he says, and the other gods and Euboea and Eleusis because...
μους καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐταῖς ἀγώνας, καθ’ οὓς ἐνίκησεν ὁ ἐγκωμιαζόμενος, ὑμεῖν προσήκει (BD). (81d.) Χρύσιππος· ἐν Εὔβοιᾳ ἤγεται τῷ Ἀιδή τὰ Βασίλεια (D).

Aristodemus Fr. 11

Σ I. 1.85b = I. 1.60

...(85a.) πάντα δ᾽ ἐξειπεῖν ... (85b.) ἄλλως· ἦτοι ὅτι πρὸς τὸν διδόμενον μισθὸν καὶ τὰς ὁμοίας ἀγώνιας, ἵν᾽ ἢ οὕτω πάντα αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀγωνίσματα εἰπέν βραχὺν μισθὸν ἔχων ὁ ἴμων οὐ συγχωρεῖ μοι· ἦτοι ἡ συμμετρία τῶν εἰκημένων λόγων ἀφαιρεῖται τῇ ἔκτασιν καὶ τῷ μῆκῳ. Αριστόδημος δὲ καὶ τούτῳ λαμβάνων πρὸς τὸ μόνον τῶν ἑπισημών αὐτὸν μνημονεύειν, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς παρωδευκέναι, βραχύ φησι μέτρον εἰρηκέναι τοῦ ὑμνοῦ διὰ τὸ τὰς ἐκδόσεις τῶν ἑπινίκων πρὸς ἀριθμὸν ἐπῶν καὶ τριάδων ἔχειν τοὺς μισθοὺς· παρὸ καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιλαμβάνεται.

Chrysippus Fr. 7 (Fr. 7 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.96a = I. 1.68

...(96a.) εἰ δὲ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαίον εἰ δὲ τις τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔνδον ἀποταμιευόμενος ἄδοξον πλοῦτον πλοῦτον τοῖς δι᾽ εὐδοξίαν ἀναλίσκουσιν ἐπεμβαίνων καταγελᾷ, οὐ διαλογίζεται τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἄδοξον περιστέλων καὶ πέμπων (96b.) ἦτοι οὐ διανοεῖται τῷ ἅδῃ τηρῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἀνεύ δόξης· οἷον οὐ νοεῖ, ὅτι ἄνευ δόξης τελευτήσει. (96c.) Χρύσιππος δὲ γράφει ἀλαοῖσιν, ἐξ οὗ σημαίνεται τυφλοῖς, ἐπειδὴ ὁ πλοῦτος τυφλός (BD).

Artemon Fr. 6 (FGrH 569 Fr. 6), Asclepiades Fr. 12, Callistratus Fr. 4

I. 2. inscr. a

(inscr. a.) Οὕτος ὁ ἐπίνικος γέγραπται μὲν εἰς Ξενοκράτην Ἀκραγαντίνων,
of the races and competitions there, where the subject of the encomium was
victorious. Chrysippus says that the Basileia to Hades are held on Euboea.

Aristodemus Fr. 11

Σ I. 1.85b = I. 1.60

To recount all [victories]: ... Alternatively: either that he prolongs the
odes according to the salary offered so [that the sense is]: since the payment
is small, the hymn does now allow me to tell of all his achievements. Or
because the symmetry of what is said excludes amplifications and verbosity.
Connecting this to his only mentioning the notable contests and passing over
the rest, Aristodemus says that Pindar called the hymn’s metre short due to the
production of victory odes being paid for according to the number of words and
triads. Therefore he held himself back.

Chrysippus Fr. 7 (Fr. 7 Braswell)

Σ I. 1.96a = I. 1.68

But if a man keeps wealth hidden inside: If someone has kept inside his ill-
reputed wealth, then insultingly mocks those who spend theirs reputedly, he
does not consider how he lays out his soul and sends it ill-reputed to Hades.
Or he does not notice that he prepares his soul for Hades without good repute.
That is to say, he does not notice that he will die without good repute. But
Chrysippus writes alaoisín, [“unseeing”], by which is meant tuphlois, [“blind
matters”], since wealth is also blind.

Artemon Fr. 6 (FGrH 569 Fr. 6), Asclepiades Fr. 12, Calli-
stratus Fr. 4

I. 2. inscr. a

This victory ode is written for Xenocrates from Acragas, but delivered to
πέμπεται δὲ Θρασυβούλῳ διὰ τινὸς Νικασίππου, ὡστε εἶναι ἀποστολικὸν αὐτοῦ. τὸν δὲ Ξενοκράτην τούτον οἱ μὲν προϋπομνημονεύον Θήρωνος ἀδέλφον εἶναι φασίν, ὁ δὲ Ἀρτέμων περὶ τούτων Συκιελίτας πεπολυπραγμονηκὼς αὐτὸν μόνον συγγενὴ φησιν εἶναι Θήρωνος. οὗτος δὲ ο Ξενοκράτης οὐ μόνον Ἱσθμία νεκρὴν ἐπείποι, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια κρ. Πυθιάδα, ὡς Αριστοτέλης (Fr. 411a Gigon) ἀναγράφει· καὶ Σιμωνίς δὲ (Fr. 513 PMG) ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέρας αὐτοῦ τὰς νίκας κατατάσσει. Θρασύβουλοι δὲ Σικελιῶται διττοί· ὁ μὲν Δεινομένους, νεώτατος ἀδελφὸς τῶν περὶ ῾Ιέρωνα καὶ Γέλωνα, ὁ δὲ τῆς γυναῖκος τοῦ ῾Ιέρωνος ἀδελφὸς, οὗτος δὲ Ἡστίατος οὐ μόνον Ἵπποι νενίκηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια κρ. Πυθιάδα, ὡς Αριστοτέλης (Fr. 80 Horn) ἀναγράφει· καὶ Σιμωνίς δὲ (Fr. 513 PMG) ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέρας αὐτοῦ τὰς νίκας κατατάσσει. Θρασύβουλοι δὲ Σικελιῶται διττοί· ὁ μὲν Δεινομένους, νεώτατος ἀδελφὸς τῶν περὶ ῾Ιέρωνα καὶ Γέλωνα, ὁ δὲ τῆς γυναῖκος τοῦ ῾Ιέρωνος ἀδελφὸς, οὗτος δὲ Ἡστίατος οὐ μόνον Ἵπποι νενίκηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια κρ. Πυθιάδα, ὡς Αριστοτέλης (Fr. 411a Gigon) ἀναγράφει· καὶ Σιμωνίς δὲ (Fr. 513 PMG) ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέρας αὐτοῦ τὰς νίκας κατατάσσει. Θρασύβουλοι δὲ Σικελιῶται διττοί· ὁ μὲν Δεινομένους, νεώτατος ἀδελφὸς τῶν περὶ ῾Ιέρωνα καὶ Γέλωνα, ὁ δὲ τῆς γυναῖκος τοῦ ῾Ιέρωνος ἀδελφὸς, οὗτος δὲ Ἡστίατος οὐ μόνον Ἵπποι νενίκηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια κρ. Πυθιάδα, ὡς Αριστοτέλης (Fr. 80 Horn) ἀναγράφει· καὶ Σιμωνίς δὲ (Fr. 513 PMG) ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέρας αὐτοῦ τὰς νίκας κατατάσσει. Θρασύβουλοι δὲ Σικελιῶται διττοί· ὁ μὲν Δεινομένους, νεώτατος ἀδελφὸς τῶν περὶ ῾Ιέρωνα καὶ Γέλωνα, ὁ δὲ τῆς γυναῖκος τοῦ ῾Ιέρωνος ἀδελφὸς, οὗτος δὲ Ἡστίατος οὐ μόνον Ἵπποι νενίκηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια κρ. Πυθιάδα, ὡς Αριστοτέλης (Fr. 411a Gigon) ἀναγράφει· καὶ Σιμωνίς δὲ (Fr. 513 PMG) ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέρας αὐτοῦ τὰς νίκας κατατάσσει. Θρασύβουλοι δὲ Σικελιῶται διττοί· ὁ μὲν Δεινομένους, νεώτατος ἀδελφὸς τῶν περὶ ῾Ιέρωνα καὶ Γέλωνα, ὁ δὲ τῆς γυναῖκος τοῦ ῾Ιέρωνος ἀδελφὸς, οὗτος δὲ Ἡστίατος οὐ μόνον Ἵπποι νενίκηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια κρ. Πυθιάδα, ὡς Αριστοτέλης (Fr. 411a Gigon) ἀναγράφει· καὶ Σιμωνίς δὲ (Fr. 513 PMG) ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέρας αὐτοῦ τὰς νίκας κατατάσσει.
Thrasybulus by a certain Nicasippus so that it must be classified as an ode sung on departure. Earlier commentators say that Xenocrates was the brother of Hiero, but Artemon, who inquired closely into the Sicilians, says that he was only a relative of Theron. This Xenocrates not only won an Isthmian horse victory but also a Pythian at the 22nd Pythiad, as Aristotle records. Simonides, too, describes both these victories when he celebrates them. There are two Sicilian Thrasybuluses. One is the son of Deinomenes, youngest of the brothers of Hiero and Gelo. The other is Hiero’s brother-in-law whom Pindar mentions now. Aristarchus regarded Thrasybulus as Xenocrates’ brother, but some say that he was his son. Asclepiades conjectures from probabilities when he states that the statements about Xenocrates were made after his death since much in the ode is put in the past tense, which would have been put in the present, if he were still alive. Callistratus says that Pindar, having not received a proportionate salary due to Xenocrates’ stinginess, addresses Thrasybulus, his son. He wrote the ode not for Xenocrates – so says Callistratus – but for Thrasybulus. The introduction pertains to a reproach about money, as though he wanted to receive the salary he deserved.

Callistratus Fr. 5

Σ I. 2.19a = I. 2.12

For you are wise: Those around Callistratus say that this supports them. For it is obvious that Pindar, demanding salary from Thrasybulus, includes the saying about money and says: “I do not tell this to one who does not know, for you are wise and will know why this is said”. But some understand ágnôta [unknown matters] – without hiatus – with the accent on the antepenult syllable instead of ouk agnōtī aeídō [‘I do not sing to someone without knowledge’]
ἀγνώτων, φησίν, ἃδικον. ὁ δὲ Δίδυμος (Fr. 67 Braswell) μειοῦσθαί φησι τὸ ἄξιομα τοῦ ποιητοῦ, εἰ μηδέπω τοῦ ἐπινίκου συντεταγμένου γνώριμος ἐστιν ἢ τοῦ Ξενοκράτους νίκη ἐμπαλίν γάρ ὁ Πίνδαρος ἄρανεῖς καὶ ἀδόξους φησίν εἶναι τὰς νίκας, εἰς ὃς αὐτῷ μηδὲν γέγραψε. γελοῖος (BD).

Diodorus Aristophaneus Fr. 1

Σ I. 2.54a = I. 2.37

5 αἰδοῖος μὲν ἢν ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν ἀμφίβολον. ἦτοι γὰρ αὐτὸς ἢν, φησίν, ἐντροπῆς ἄξιος ὁμιλητών τοῖς ἀστοῖς, ἢ αὐτὸς ἐνετρέπτεσθαι εἰς τὸ τοῖς ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν. Ἰονίδωρος δὲ ὁ Ἀριστοφάνειος μὴν νοήσας νοήσας, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦ παρεληλυθότος χρόνου κεῖται τὸ ἢν, ψηφίζειν φησί γεγραφεῖν, ὡμένο τοῖς νίκαις, ὡμένα τοῖς ποιηταῖς ἐναλάττονται χρόνοι, ὡμέν τὸ ἐπὶ τέλους λεγόμενον τὸ

Νυκάσιππ’ ἀπόνειμον, ὅταν ξείνον ἐμὸν ἡθαῖον ἠληθείς (I. 2.46–48)

πρὸς τὸν ζῶντα, οὔ πρὸς τὸν τετελευτηκότα (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 8 (Fr. 8 Braswell)

Σ I. 2.58b = I. 2.39

(58a.) ὀμδέποτε ξεινῶν ὁνόματος ἐμπνεύσας· ἀλληγορικότερον ἐχρήσατο τῷ λόγῳ ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν οὐριοδρομοῦσιν καὶ μὴ συστελλοῦσιν τὰ

Diodorus Aristophaneus Fr. 1

and claim that Pindar says it regarding winner and the Isthmian victory.\(^1\) “I do not sing”, says Pindar, “of unknown matters”. But Didymus says that the honour of the poet is diminished, if the victory of Xenocrates was well-known although a victory ode had not yet been composed. For Pindar on the other hand says that the victories, for which he has not yet written an one, are invisible and without fame. Ridiculous.

Diodorus Aristophaneus Fr. 1

Σ I. 2.54a = I. 2.37

He was honoured while dwelling with the citizens: Ambiguous. For either he himself, says Pindar, was worthy of respect while dwelling with the citizens, or he was respected while he dwelling among the citizens. Diodorus the Aristophanean, noticing that the ἐν [1. pers. sing. impf. of εἶναι, “to be”] is in the past tense, says that the poem was written as a dirge, but without noticing that among the poets tenses may be altered and that at the end is said:

Impart these words to him, Nicasippus,
when you visit my honorable host.

Which is said to him while alive, not after his death.

Chrysippus Fr. 8 (Fr. 8 Braswell)

Σ I. 2.58b = I. 2.39

The wind blowing hospitality: Pindar employs figurative language, using the metaphor of ships that have fair wind and do not shorten their sails. For he

\(^{1}\)I.e. that the winner and his victories are not unknown.
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

ἱστία νεῶν· τὸν γὰρ φθόνον ἀνέμῳ εἴκασε, τὴν δὲ τῶν ξένων τράπεζαν νηῒ οὕριως καὶ ἀβλαβῶς πλεούσῃ. οὐδέποτε, φησί, τὸ ἱστῖον τῆς τραπέζης, οὗ Ἑσσωκράτης ἦ τοὺς ξένους ὑπεδέχετο, συνεστείλειν οὕριοι δὲνομος πνεύσας, ἀλλ' ἢ πλήρει τοὺς ἱστίους πρὸς τὰς τῶν ξένων ἑστιάσεις ἐχρήσατο. (58b.)

Χρύσιππος οὕτω· Ἑσσωκράτης δὲνομος δὲνομος δὲνονομος οὗτος εὐχεμάσση, ὡστε μὴ διωμα- λίσαι τὴν τράπεζαν (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 9 (Fr. 9 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.11c = I. 4.7

(11a.) τοὶ μὲν ὅν Θῆβαις τμήσεσας ἀρχέθηκεν ἠγάθοις λέγονται ... (11c.) Χρύσιππος οὖν πιθανῶς· τὴν ὑβρίν κελαδεινῆν εἴρηκε διὰ τὸ λάλους εἶναι τοὺς ὑβριστάς.

Chrysippus Fr. 10 (Fr. 10 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.18c = I. 4.11

(18a.) ἀνορέσας δ' ἐσχάταις ... (18c.) οὗ δὲ Χρύσιππος οὕτως· αἱ δ' ἀν- δρεῖαι ὑμῶν καὶ ἐν οἴκῳ διαφαίνονται καὶ μέχρι τῶν Ἡρακλείων στήλων διϊ- κνοῦνται. (18d.) στήλαις δὲ εἶπεν ἀντὶ τοῦ στηλῶν, ὡς καὶ στεφάνοισι (I. 1.18?) θέγαν ἀντὶ τοῦ στεφάνων (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 11 (Fr. 11 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.21c = I. 4.13

(21a.) καὶ μηρέται μακροτέραν σπεῦδεῖν ἀρεταν· ὑπὲρ Ἡρακλείους φησὶ στήλαις μὴ δύνασθαι τὴν ἀρετὴν πέμψαι (BD). (21b.) ὡς καὶ στεφάνων τὸ πρὸς ζῷον ὅπερ περατόν (N. 4.69). ἐνσεβαίνει δὲ τὸ χρή. (21c.) Χρύσιππος τὸ
Chrysippus Fr. 9
compares envy to a wind, and the guests’ table to a ship sailing with fair wind
and safety. Never, he says, has a fair wind shortened the sail of Xenocrates’
table, where he received his guests, but he always used full sails for the banquets
of guests. Chrysippus says: Xenocrates has not yet been disturbed in such a
way as not to be able to maintain his standards at the table.

Chrysippus Fr. 9 (Fr. 9 Braswell)
Σ I. 4.11c = I. 4.7
From the beginning [they are said] to have been honoured in Thebes: ... Chrysippus persuasively says that Pindar called abuse noisy because the abusive are talkative.

Chrysippus Fr. 10 (Fr. 10 Braswell)
Σ I. 4.18c = I. 4.11
The most extreme manhood: ... Chrysippus says this: your manly deeds show themselves in the home and reach as far as Hercules’ pillars. Pindar says stēlais [dat. plural of stēla, “pillar”] instead of stēlon [gen. pl.] just as he also says “touch the stephanoisi [dat. pl. of stephanos, ‘crown’]” instead of stephanōn [gen. pl.].

Chrysippus Fr. 11 (Fr. 11 Braswell)
Σ I. 4.21c = I. 4.13
And never to search for a greater deed: Pindar says that one cannot send a manly deed beyond Heracles’ pillars. This is similar to “one should not pass to the west of Gadeira”. But he leaves out chrē [“it is necessary to”].
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

σπεύδειν φησὶν ἀντὶ τοῦ σπευδέτωσαν (D).

Chrysippus Fr. 12 (Fr. 12 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.25a = I. 4.16

ἀλλ’ ἁμέρᾳ γὰρ ἐν μιᾷ Χρύσιππος ἀποδέδωκεν, ὅτι τέσσαρες συγγενεῖς προπεπτώκασιν ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ πόλεμον αὐτῶν, καὶ τοῦτο λέγει λελυπηκέναι τὸν οἶκον (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 13 (Fr. 13 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.29a = I. 4.18

καθάπερ ἐκ χειμῶνος ἔαρ καθέστηκεν αὐτῷ νενικηκότι, ὡσπερ ἐαρίζουσα γῆ ἐκ χειμῶνος ἐκδίδωσι τὰ ῥόδα, ὡς ἄμεινον (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 14 (Fr. 14 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.42c = I. 4.25

ἡ οἰκία Μελίσσου. τὸ γὰρ ποικίλων μηνῶν, ἤτοι καθὸ ποικίλα ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ γίνεται, ή ποικίλων τῶν καρπῶν, καθ’ οὓς ὅλη ἡ γῆ ποικίλη γίνεται τῇ τῶν φυτῶν ἐξανθήσει.
Chrysippus Fr. 12

Chrysippus says that *speudein* [infinitive of *speudō*, “search for”] is used instead of *speudetōsan* [3rd pers. pl. imperative].

Chrysippus Fr. 12 (Fr. 12 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.25a = I. 4.16

In one day: Chrysippus explains that four relatives had fallen on one day in their battle and that Pindar says that their home grieves about this.

Chrysippus Fr. 13 (Fr. 13 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.29a = I. 4.18

Now after the storm: Now, he says: just as winter has turned to spring for him after winning, as the earth in spring yields roses after winter, their house blooms anew. He is speaking figuratively in regards to life. But Chrysippus says: after that misfortune and the winter, they have blossomed. The house of Melissus, he says, has changed to spring. The “many-coloured months” refer either to the many colours of the season, or the many-coloured fruits by which all the earth becomes many-coloured through the blossoming of the plants which is better.

Chrysippus Fr. 14 (Fr. 14 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.42c = I. 4.25

And who also on the high ground of Athens ... The following: such [were] the encomiums to your ancestors for crowns and games. Some, however, say: such songs did your ancestors receive from the poets of the time. This, says...
δὲ Χρύσιππός φησιν ὡς ἄλλων ἐγκωμιακότων ποιητῶν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῶν πάλαι τὰς νίκας (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 15 (Fr. 15 Braswell)

\[ \Sigma \text{ I. 4.47c} = \text{I. 4.28} \]

(47a) ὡδὲ παναγυρίων ξυνὸν ἀπείχον ... (47c.) Χρύσιππος δὲ, σεσημείωται, φησίν, ὁ τόπος διὰ τὴν ψάχνει τῷ γὰρ ἐκατοντόν βιούλεται εἰπεῖν τῶν ἀπειράτων καὶ ἀπράκτων ἄγνωστοι εἰσίν αἱ λαλιαί, ὁ ἐστὶν, ἢ τὸ μὴ πειραθή πράξεων ἀγαθῶν, οὗτος ἀκλεὴς γίνεται. γελοίως (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 16 (Fr. 16 Braswell)

\[ \Sigma \text{ I. 4.58d} = \text{I. 4.35} \]

(58a.) ἰστε μὰν Ἀἴαντος ἀλκὰν φοίνιον ... (58d.) ὁ δὲ Χρύσιππος αίνιγματωδῶς φησί κεῖσθαι τὴν περὶ Αἴαντος ἱστορίαν· ἄδηλον γὰρ, πότερον εἰς τὴν πάλην τείνει τὴν γενομένην πρὸς Ὁδυσσέα, ὥστε ἑνίκησε δόλῳ, ἢ εἰς τὰ περὶ τὴν κρίσιν τῶν ὅπλων. ὃ μεν δὲ φησίν, ὅτι καὶ ὡς ὁ Ἀἲς μείζων ἃν κατὰ τὸν ἀγῶνα βαστάζων τὸν Ὁδυσσέα δόλῳ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐλήφθη, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Μέλισσος μείζονα ἄντα τῇ τέχνῃ ἑνίκησε (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 17 (Fr. 17 Braswell)

\[ \Sigma \text{ I. 4.58e} = \text{I. 4.35} \]

(58a.) ἰστε μὰν Ἀἴαντος ἀλκὰν φοίνιον ... (58e.) Χρύσιππος οὕτω φησίν·
Chrysippus Fr. 15

Chrysippus, [means] that other poets had been praising their victories in ancient times.

Chrysippus Fr. 15 (Fr. 15 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.47c = I. 4.28

Nor did they hold back [their curved chariot] from national festivals: ... Chrysippus says: the passage has been marked out because of the expression. For Pindar wants to say the opposite: The chatter about the inexperienced and unsuccessful is unknown, which means: if someone does not attempt good deeds, he remains without fame. Ridiculous.

Chrysippus Fr. 16 (Fr. 16 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.58d = I. 4.35

Surely you know of Ajax’ bloodstained valour: ... But Chrysippus says that the story about Ajax is riddling, for it is not obvious whether it refers to the wrestling match against Odysseus, when he won by trickery, or refers to the decision about the armour. But he says better that, just as Ajax, though he was of greater stature and lifted Odysseus in the match, still he was defeated by him through trickery, so too did Melissus win over a stronger opponent by practicing his art.

Chrysippus Fr. 17 (Fr. 17 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.58e = I. 4.35

Surely you know of Ajax’ bloodstained valour: ... Chrysippus says: you
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

ἴστε Αἴαντα, ὃς μέγας ὢν ὄνειδος τοῖς ῎Ελλησι περιεποίησε τὴν κακοκρισίαν αὐτῶν φανερὰν ποιήσας, ἐπεὶ προσεχαρίσαντο τῇ ᾿Αθηνᾷ (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 18 (Fr. 18 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.63a = I. 4.47

ἀλλ’ Ὅμηρος τοι τετίμακεν· Χρύσιππος ἀμφίβολον γρηγορτό τοῦτο εἶναι, πότερον ἐπὶ Αἴαντος ἢ ἐπὶ Ὅδυσσεώς λέγει· πάντοτε γὰρ ὁ Πίνδαρος τόν Αἴαντα ὑμαμάζει, νῦν δὲ ὁ λόγος συναότε Οδυσσεῖ, καὶ γὰρ τὸ λέγειν, ὡς αὐτοῦ πάσαν ὄρθωσιν ἀρετὰν καταβάθησαν ἔφρασεν (I. 4.37–38), ἐπὶ Ὅδυσσεώς συμφωνεῖ, ἐπεὶ καὶ δὲ ἔλεγεν τῆς ῾Ιλιάδος ἢ Ὅδυσσεία βαθύτερος· καὶ ἡ Πίνδαρος μὲν πολλῶν κοινῶν ἐγκώμιον, ἡ Ὅδυσσεία δὲ μόνου Ὅδυσσεώς· καὶ οὐκ ἂν, θέλων συστῆσαι τὸν κρείττονα ἕτος ἐλαττοῦμεν διὰ τύχην καὶ τέχνην, τὸν Αἴαντα ἐγκομιαζόμενον εἰσήγαγεν ὑπὸ Ὅμηρου· τοῦτο γὰρ ἔλεγχον εἶχεν τοῦ ἐγκωμιαζομένου ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ.

Chrysippus Fr. 19 (Fr. 19 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.68c = I. 4.40

(68a.) τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶει ἕρπει ... (68c.) Χρύσιππος ἔφη αὐτὸ τὸ ποίημα τοῦ Ὅμηρου ἀθάνατον λέγειν ἦ τάς τῶν ἐμπεριεχομένων πράξεις τῷ ποιήσατι (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 20 (Fr. 20 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.87c = I. 4.52

(87a.) καίτοι πότ’ Ἀνταίου δόμους ... (87c.) Χρύσιππος, ἀκυρότερον,
Chrysippus Fr. 18 (Fr. 18 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.63a = I. 4.47

But Homer has made him honoured: Chrysippus says that it is ambiguous whether Pindar says this concerning Ajax or Odysseus. Pindar always admires Ajax but here the meaning suggests Odysseus. That Pindar says, “who has set straight his whole achievement and retold it with his staff”, agrees with Odysseus, since the Odyssey is performed more than the Iliad. Also, the Iliad is an encomium common to many, but the Odyssey only for Odysseus alone. Also, if Pindar wishes to show how a stronger man is defeated by a lesser one through luck and craft, he would not have brought in Homer’s praise of Ajax. For this would bring blame to the one praised by him. According to them, the alla is antithetic. But the sense is: although Odysseus was lesser, Homer has honoured him. Ridiculous. The same absurdity remains. If indeed Pindar says this, he is condemning himself, the poet will be bringing a charge against himself by censuring Odysseus.

Chrysippus Fr. 19 (Fr. 19 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.68c = I. 4.40

This follows as immortal sound: ... Chrysippus said that Pindar calls Homer’s poem itself immortal or else the deeds of those included in it.

Chrysippus Fr. 20 (Fr. 20 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.87c = I. 4.52

And even to Antaeus’ home: ... Chrysippus says that Pindar speaks rather

---

1Due to Athena’s involvement the Greeks were led into giving the armour of Achilleus to Odysseus instead of Ajax as is told in the Little Iliad.
2I. e. if Pindar were celebrating Ajax, he would bring reproach on Melissus by implying that he won his match by trickery.
3Chrysippus and those who follow him.
φησί, τὴν Λιβύην εἴρηκε πυροφόρον· οὐ γάρ πᾶσα τοιαύτη, μήποτε δὲ, ὅτι τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ παράκειται, ἢτις ἐστὶ πολύπυρος (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 21 (Fr. 21 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.104b = I. 4.61

(104a.) τῷ μὲν Ἀλεκτρᾶν ὑπερθεν ... (104b.) ἄλλως. Χρύσιππος, πρὸς ταῖς καλουμέναις, φησίν, 'Ηλέκτραις πύλαις ᾤκησεν ᾿Αμφιτρύων· μετὰ ταῦτα 'Ἡρακλῆς ἄνειλε τοὺς ἐκ Μεγάρας παῖδας κατὰ ταύτας τὰς πύλας, <έφε> αἷς κατ' ἐτος Θηβαῖοι ἐναγίζουσι τε τοῖς πασί καὶ ἀγώνας ἐπιταφίους ἄγουσι (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 22 (Fr. 22 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.104d = I. 4.61

(104a.) τῷ μὲν Ἀλεκτρᾶν ὑπερθεν ... (104d.) Χρύσιππος δὲ, ἐκ περιφράσεως τοὺς βωμοὺς αὐτοὺς στεφανώματα βωμῶν εἰρηκέναι· ἢ κατὰ παραγωγὴν εἴρηκε τὰ νέα νεόδματα (BD).

Menecrates Fr. 2 (FGrH 701 Fr. 2)

Σ I. 4.104g = I. 4.61

(104a.) τῷ μὲν Ἀλεκτρᾶν ὑπερθεν ... (104g.) ἄλλως· περὶ τῶν Ἅρακλέως ἐκ Μεγάρας παῖδων Δυσίμαχος φησὶ (FGrH 328 Fr. 5) τινας ἱστορεῖν μὴ ὑπὸ Ἅρακλέους ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τίνων δολοφονηθήν τέξινν οἱ δὲ Λύκον τὸν βασιλέα φασὶν αὐτοὺς φονεύσαι· Σωκράτης (FGrH 310 Fr. 9) δὲ ὑπὸ Λύγεαν φησὶν αὐτοὺς δολοφονηθήναι. καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ δὲ διαλλάττουσι Διονύσιος μὲν ἐν πρώτῳ Κύκλων (FGrH 15 Fr. 2) Θηβαῖσιν καὶ Δησύσωνα, Εὐριπίδης (Fr. 1016 Kannicht) δὲ προστίθηναν αὐτοῖς καὶ Ἀριστόδημον.
improperly when he calls Libya “wheat-bearing”, for the whole country is not such, but perhaps because it borders Egypt which is rich in wheat.

Chrysippus Fr. 21 (Fr. 21 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.104b = I. 4.61

For him above the Electran gates: ... Alternatively: Chrysippus said that Amphitryon lived close to the so-called Electran gates. Later Hercules killed his children by Megara at these gates. At these gates the Thebans each year offer sacrifices to the children and hold funerary games.

Chrysippus Fr. 22 (Fr. 22 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.104d = I. 4.61

For him above the Electran gates: ... Chrysippus says that by *periphrasis* [circumlocution] Pindar calls the altars themselves circles of altars. Or he expresses *ta nea* [the new] as *neodmata* [newly built] by derivation.

Menecrates Fr. 2 (*FGrH* 701 Fr. 2)

Σ I. 4.104g = I. 4.61

For him above the Electran gates: ... About the children of Hercules and Megare Lysimachus says that, according to some, they were not murdered by Hercules but by strangers. Some say that King Lycus had them killed. Socrates says that they were murdered by Augeas. They also differ on the number of children. In the first book of the *Kyklos*, Dionysius says that they were Therimachus and Deicoon. Euripides adds to them even Aristodemus. Aeneas of Argus mention Therimachus, Creontiades, Deiocon and Deion. Pherecydes in the second
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

Αἰνείας δὲ ὁ Ἀργεῖος (FGrH 306 Fr. 8) Θηρίμαχον, Κρεοντιάδην, Δηϊκόωντα, Δηΐονα· Φηρεκύδης δὲ ἐν δευτέρῳ (FGrH 3 Fr. 4) Αντίμαχον, Κλύμενον, Γλήνον, Θηρίμαχον, Κρεοντιάδην, λέγων αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πῦρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐμβεβλῆσατο· Βάτος δὲ ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἀττικῶν ἱστοριῶν (FGrH 268 Fr. 5) Πολύδωρον, Ἀνίκητον, Μηκιστόφονον, Πατροκλέα, Τοξόκλειτον, Μενεβρόντην, Χερσίβιον. Ἡρόδωρος δὲ (FGrH 31 Fr. 32) καὶ δίς φησι μανῆαι τὸν Ἡρακλέα· ἐκαθάρθη δὲ ὑπὸ Οἰβάλου, ὥς φησι Μενεκράτης λέγων αὐτοὺς εἶναι ὀκτὼ καὶ καλεῖσθαι οὐχ Ἡρακλείδας, οὐδὲπώ γὰρ Ἡρακλῆς ὀνομάζετο, ἀλλ’ Ἀλκαίδας (BD).

Chrysippus Fr. 23 (Fr. 23 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.120b = I. 4.71

(Callistatus Fr. 6)

Σ I. 5. inscr. c

(Theon Fr. 3 (Fr. 37 Guhl))

Pae. 2.37 ἄλκαί δὲ τείχως ἀνδρῶν (POxy 841)

-καὶ Θέω(ν). ὅμοιον τὸν πότερον δίκα τείχος ὑψιστὸν ἢ σκολιαῖς ἀπάταις

book mentions Antimachus, Clyenus, Glenus, Therimachus and Creontiades and say that they were thrown into the fire by their father. In the second book of his *Attic Histories* Batus mentions Polydorus, Anicetus, Mecistophonous, Patrocles, Toxocleitus, Menebrontes and Chersibius. Herodorus says that Hercules in fact had two fits of rage. Hercules was purified by Oebalus according to Menecrates who says that he had eight sons that were not yet called Heraclidae for he had not yet been named Hercules, but Alcidae.¹

Chrysippus Fr. 23 (Fr. 23 Braswell)

Σ I. 4.120b = I. 4.71

Earlier a third, the steersman’s: ... Alternatively: as if he had been crowned three times at the funeral game, twice as a boy and once after he became a man. Chrysippus: Pindar makes clear that he won a second time as a man and once as a boy. The third stands for the first which is why *prosthen* [earlier] is added, since he first won boy contests.

Callistratus Fr. 6

Σ I. 5. inscr. c

Alternatively: Callistratus says that [the ode] was written for Phylacidas only and that Pytheas’ victory has been included in the ode extraneously, just as Pindar includes the victory of their relative Euthymenes in the next ode.

Theon Fr. 3 (Fr. 37 Guhl)

*Pae.* 2.37 “men’s valour [stands as the loftiest] wall”

Theon writes -*kāi* [with strength] instead of *alkai* [valiant acts]. This is

¹Hercules was originally called Alcaeus or Alcides.
Chapter 8. Text and Translation

(Pind. Fr. 213.1–2 Maehler).

Aristonicus Fr. 6 (Dubium)

*Pae.* 2.75–76 ἐν δὲ μηνός πρῶτον τύχεν ἀμφρ *(POxy 841)*

"Α(ριστο)νί(κος)

Aristonicus Fr. 7

*Pae.* 6.89 δόσα τε Πολιάδι *(POxy 841)*

"Α(ριστο)νί(κος) δόσα

Aristonicus Fr. 8

*Pae.* 6.181 εὖ[θ]αλέος ύγιεί[ας] σκιάζεσθε *(POxy 841)*

5 "Αρ(ιστο)νί(κος) χ

Chrysippus Fr. 24 (Fr. 26 Braswell)

*Pae.* 8.1–2 Κλυτοὶ μάντι[ες] Ἀπόλλωνος [ἔ]γω μὲν ὑπὲρ χθονὸς *(POxy 841)*

ἐγώ Χρύσ(ης)

Aristodemus Fr. 12 *(FGrH 383 Fr. 9)*

Athenaeus *Deipnosophistae* 11.495e-496a

πενταπλόα. μνημονεύει αὐτής Φιλόχορος ἐν δευτέρᾳ Ἀττίδος *(FGrH

3 "Α(ριστο)νί(κος) McNamee, Ά(ριστοφάνης) Grenfell & Hunt, Radt, Νί(κάνωρ) Rutherford
4 "Α(ριστο)νί(κος) McNamee, Rutherford, Ά(ριστοφάνης) Grenfell & Hunt, Radt
5 "Αρ(ιστο)νί(κος) McNamee, Rutherford, Άρ(ιστοφάνης) Grenfell & Hunt, Radt
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similar to “whether justice is the highest wall or [is reached] through crooked fraud”.

Aristonicus Fr. 6 (Dubium)

Pae. 2.75–76 “That day fell on the first of the month.”

Aristonicus\(^1\) [reads] _en_ [prefix of _entugchanō_, “fall in with”].

Aristonicus Fr. 7

Pae. 6.89 “And what (_hosa_) [strife] against Polias”

Aristonicus: _hossa_ [what].\(^2\)

Aristonicus Fr. 8

Pae. 6.181 “shade over [with crowns] of flourishing health”

Aristonicus: ...

Chrysippus Fr. 24

Pae. 8.1–2 “Famous seers of Apollo, I over the land”

“I” Chrysippus ...

Aristodemus Fr. 12 (_FGrH_ 383 Fr. 9)

Athenaeus _Deipnosopistae_ 11.495e-496a

_Pentaploa_ [Fivefold]: Philochorus mentions this drink in the second book

\(^1\) Or possibly Nicanor.

\(^2\) Aristonicus writes the pronoun with double sigma as in the reading of the papyrus of the same pronoun in _Pae._ 6.86.
328 Fr. 15). Ἀριστόδημος δ’ ἐν τρίτῳ Περὶ Πινδάρου (FGrH 383 Fr. 9) τοῖς 
Σκίροις φησιν Ἀθήναζε ἀγώνα ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τῶν ἐφήβων δρόμου· τρέχειν 
δ’ αὐτοὺς ἔχοντας ὕμηλον κλάδον κατάκαρπον, τὸν καλοῦμενον ὤσχον. 
τρέχουσι δ’ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διονύσου μέχρι τοῦ τῆς Σκιράδος Ἀθηνᾶς 
ἱεροῦ, καὶ ὁ νικήσας λαμβάνει κύλικα τὴν λεγομένην πενταπλόαν καὶ κωμάζει 
μετὰ χοροῦ. πενταπλόα δ’ ἡ κύλιξ καλεῖται καθ’ ὅσον οἶνον ἔχει καὶ μέλι καὶ 
τυρὸν καὶ ἀλφίτα καὶ ἐλαιόβραχῷ.
of his *Atthis*. Aristodemus in the third book of his *On Pindar*, says that a contest is held at the *Skira* consisting of a footrace for ephebes to Athens. They run with a vine-branch full of grapes which is called ὀσχος. They run from the sanctuary of Dionysos to that of Athena Sciras and the winner receives the *kulix* [cup] known as *pentaploa* and joins the dance. The *kulix* is called *pentaploa* because it contains wine, honey, cheese, meal and a little olive oil.
9. Commentary

Aristonicus Fr. 1

In antiquity the reading and interpretation of *O.* 1.23 was much debated. According to Snell-Machler’s edition the ode refers to the victorious Hiero as Συρακόσιον ἱπποχάρμαν βασιλῆα, “King of Syracuse who delights in horses”. This is the text of the medieval manuscripts as well as *POxy* 5201, a commentary on *Olympian* 1 from the first century BCE/CE, which reads Συρακόσιον ἱπποχάρμαν.¹ According to the scholiast, some (ἐνιοί) did not accept this reading but preferred Συρακόσιον ἱπποχαρμάν βασιλῆα, “King of Syracusans who delight in horses” arguing that Hiero called himself Αἰτναῖος [of Aetna] after refounding the city of Catana under the name Aetna. Didymus and Aristonicus both criticized this argument. Didymus’ criticism was based on chronology – Hiero won this victory before founding Aetna and could therefore not be referred to as Αἰτναῖος. To Aristonicus the time of the foundation of Aetna was irrelevant for Hiero’s epithet. According to this scholar, the epithets could have been used interchangeably. This view is also found in Σ *O.* 1. inscr. a: νικήσας δὲ τὰ Ὀλύμπια ἀνέκηρυξεν ἑαυτὸν Συρακούσιον καὶ Αἰτναῖον, “After his victory in the Olympic games he proclaimed himself Syrakousios and Αἰτναῖος.”

A strong argument in favour of the manuscript reading Συρακόσιον is the metrical scheme of the ode which does not allow the words last syllable to be long. As far as we can tell, the metrical argument was not relevant to Didymus and Aristonicus.

εὐθήνεις δὲ φησι Διύμος τούτους· τότε γὰρ ὁ Ἰέρων ἦν Συρακούσιος καὶ οὐδὲ ἦν Αἰτναῖος, ὡς φησιν Ἀπολλόδωρος: Didymus argues that Hiero had not yet founded Aetna at the time of this victory.² Didymus adduces Apollodorus of Athens as his source. Apollodorus (c. 180-110 BCE) was a student of Aristarchus and his writings included a *Chronika*, a chronological work in iambic trimeters, which was probably Didymus’ source (Jacoby, 1902, pp. 242–243). According to Diodorus Siculus 11.49.1, Aetna was founded in the 77th Olympiad (476–473 BCE), that is, during the four years following Hiern’s

---

¹ Cf. section 4.5.1 for the content of this commentary.
² Cf. Braswell (2013, pp. 132–33) for this fragment of Didymus.
Ammonius Fr. 1

Olympic victory at the games in 476 BCE.¹

Ammonius Fr. 1

In the Pelops-myth of Olympian 1, the hero seeks help from Poseidon before his chariot race against king Oenomaus of Pisa (O. 1.75–78).

If the loving gifts of Cypris count at all for gratitude, Poseidon, come! Hold back the bronze spear of Oenomaus and speed me in the swiftest of Chariots to Elis and bring me to victorious power.

The scholiast here records Ammonius’ interpretation of ἔγχος, which always has the meaning “spear” in Pindar.² Ammonius’ understanding of ἔγχος as referring to a chariot is therefore surprising, and several suggestions for explaining it have been made.

Lehrs (1873, p. 10) suggested that Ammonius read πέδασον ἔντος Οἰνομάου χάλκεον, “hold back the bronze gear of Oenomaus” but unfortunately did not further elaborate on the passage.³ The singular ἔντος is uncommon but attested in Archilochus Fr. 5 IEG², as well as in the (dubious) Hesiod Fr. 343 M-W. On both occasions it refers to armaments (Archilochus’ shield and Athena’s Aegis in Hesiod). Gerber (1982, pp. 120–121) suggested that Ammonius understood ἔγχος as a metaphor for Oenomaus’ chariot, possibly under influence from the Homeric πεδῆσαι ἅρμα (Il. 23.583). Daude et al. (2013, pp. 396–398) suggested that this is not the Aristarchean scholar,⁴ but rather the homonymous Alexandrian grammarian of the fourth century CE, traditionally identified as the author of two works on figurative language and synonyms.⁵ They reconstruct the original context of the fragment as a discussion of synonymy where Pindar’s πεδῆσαι ἔγχος was equated with the Homeric πεδῆσαι ἅρμα, both having the sense “spare someone’s life”. Daude et al. date this author to the fourth century CE, a very late date for a source of the

¹The date of Hiero’s victory is confirmed by the victory list in POxy 222.
²Cf. the dictionary of Slater (1969) s. v. ἔγχος.
³It may be noted that Pindar does in fact use the plural ἔντεα with the attribute χάλκεος in reference to chariots in O. 4.22 χαλκέεσι δ’ ἐν ἔντεσι νικών δρόμον.
⁴The otherwise universally accepted opinion, cf. Deas (1931, p. 13) and Irigoin (1952, p. 57).
⁵De improprīis and De adfinium vocabulorum differentia edited by Nickau (1966).
Chapter 9. Commentary

Pindar scholia. The authors suggest a solution to this problem by arguing that this scholion is a late contribution to the scholiastic corpus.

Or, cette scholie n’est connue que par les manuscrits A et Q; A, on l’a vu, a été complété pour la 1re Olympique sur le prototype ζ, source de l’édition planudéenne et daté du XIIe siècle par J. Irigoin (1952, P. 140). Le manuscrit Q comportant lui aussi des insertions planudéennes, il n’est pas impossible que la scholie reproduite uniquement par AQ soit beaucoup plus tardive que les scholies de l’époque alexandrine et romaine, et que l’emploi supposé métonymique ou métaphorique de ἔγχος pour ἅρμα proviennent, ne pas de l’aristarchéen Ammonius, mais de quelque remarque adventice d’un Ammonius théoricien (quelque peu sophistiqué) du bon usage de la synonymie (Daude et al., 2013, p. 397)

The arguments for a recent origin and especially for any connection to Planudes are however insufficient. Although Drachmann only notes A and Q as sources for his edition the fragment is in fact found in all manuscripts of the Thessalonican tradition with scholia on Olympian 1 (HPGPQTVi). Since the fragment is also found in A, where the scholia on Olympian 1 go back to the distinct tradition of ζ, the scholion might very well go back to a common archetype of the Vatican recension.\(^1\) This does not completely rule out the possibility of the later Ammonius being its author, but there is no reason to assume that it entered the scholiastic corpus at a very late date. Since we have several other references to the Aristarchean Ammonius, however, this does appear to be the more economical identification unless more explicit connections to the later Ammonius are discovered. Although Lehrs’ and Daude’s suggestions are interesting they are speculative and lack concrete evidence. The preferable interpretation is instead that Ammonius simply understood ἔγχος as Oenomaus’ chariot and not as his lance. Ammonius’ surprising interpretation might be explained by the important role of chariots in Olympian 1 and the fact that at the time of his request to Poseidon, Pelops is just about to race against Oenomaus.

Artemon Fr. 1, Menecrates Fr. 1

*Olympian* 2 relates that the ancestors of Theron, tyrant of Acragas (modern Agrigento), the ode’s laudandus, ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἴκημα ποταμοῦ, “won a sacred home by the river” (*O*. 2.9). The scholia transmit two different identifications

---

\(^1\)Irigoin (1952) suggested that the Paris recension of Pindaric manuscripts derived from Planudes. For an overview of the relationship between the medieval manuscripts of the Vatican recension and the Paris recension containing Pindar scholia cf. section 6.1.2.
Athenian Fr. 1, Menecrates Fr. 1

Aristarchus, later followed by Menecrates, understood it to be Acragas, which lay on a river with the same name. Artemon on the contrary argued that the place alluded to by Pindar is Gela, the metropolis of Acragas, which had also received its name from a river, Gela. According to Artemon, Pindar’s reference to the toils suffered by Theron’s ancestors in line 8 of the ode (καμόντες οἳ πολλὰ θυμῷ) could not refer to the foundation of Acragas which was unproblematic. Rather, it must have referred to the obstacles encountered by the settlers of Gela, which he identified with Theron’s ancestors. Although Artemon’s understanding has been described as “manifestly forced and unconvincing” (Broggiato, 2011, p. 57), the information that Acragas was a Gelan colony agrees with Thucydides (6.4.3–4). Whereas Artemon understands ἔσχον as referring to the foundation of Gela, Aristarchus had probably taken it as a reference to the arrival of Theron’s ancestors in Acragas, which, according to one tradition, they reached without passing through Gela. From Σ O. 2.29d it appears that Aristarchus identified the toils suffered by Theron’s ancestors with a period of civil war that caused them to leave Rhodes for Acragas.

The idea that Theron’s ancestors left Rhodes for Acragas had already been mentioned by Timaeus (FGrH 566 Fr. 92 = Σ. O. 2.15a.) The historian of the Greek West adduced Pindar Fr. 119 Maehler, an encomium written on Theron mentioning his Rhodian origins, as an authoritative source for this information.

And they settled in Rhodes . . .
Having set out from there, they inhabit a lofty city, and as they offer the most gifts to the immortals, a cloud of ever-flowing wealth has followed them.

A century later Polybius (c.200–c.118 BCE) even stated that Acragas was a Rhodian colony (Polyb. 9.27.8). In the more recent study of Acragas’ history Adornato (2011) argues that Polybius’ opinion is a recent tradition, probably connected to traditions among Theron’s family, the Emmenidae, and that there is no evidence for a Rhodian origin of Acragas.

Artemon’s interpretation instead presupposes that Theron’s ancestors were present at Gela during its foundation. Broggiato (2011, p. 48) suggests that through his connection to Pergamum, Artemon had access to other sources.

1 Also mentioned by Thucydides 6.4.1.
2 Cf. Σ O. 2.29d.
than the Alexandrians, and that these sources did not connect Rhodes and the
Emmenidae. The idea that the Emmenidae travelled first to Gela rather than
Acragas, was also supported by Hippostratus (FGrH 568 Fr. 3), although we do
not know whether Artemon or Hippostratus were older or if any connections
existed between them.\(^1\) It is not clear whether Aristarchus was relying here
on Timaeus, as suggested by Tibiletti (2018) and Vassilaki (2009), since the
information given by Aristarchus could derive from the ode itself and Fr. 119.

Menocrates criticizes Artemon and favours Aristarchus’ interpretation of
οἰκήμα ποτάμου. He reverses the argument of Artemon and dismisses the
identification with Gela since the colonization of this city was unproblematic.

The extent of Menocrates’ fragment is not self-evident. The texts of Arte-
mon of both Jacoby (FGrH 568 Fr. 1) and Pitcher (BNJ 568 Fr. 1) only include
Μενεκράτης ... πάντα συμβεβηκέναι. Schneider (2000, p. 71) on the other
hand assumed that the rest of the scholion also derives from Menocrates. The
sudden switch to oratio recta suggests rather that we should ascribe it to the
anonymous scholiast.\(^2\) It therefore appears probable that the rest of the scholion
should not be attributed to Menocrates.

The explanation given by the anonymous scholiast, or else Menocrates,
argues that the hardships refer to Theron’s ancestors. A certain Haemon,
son of Polydorus and descendant of Cadmus, was displaced from Thebes to
Athens. His descendants later took part in the colonization of Rhodes and
from there went directly to Acragas. This agrees with the information given by
Pindar in the enkomion on Theron (Fr. 118–119 Maehler). According to the
manuscripts, Haemon was the son of Cadmus’ son Polydorus. A scholion of
the Ambrosian Recension, Σ O. 2.70f, instead states that Haemon was the son
of a later descendant of Cadmus by the name of Polydorus. Assuming that the
two scholia have a common origin Drachmann noted a lacuna in the present
scholion where a list of descendants of Cadmus should be supplied. I have here
followed Drachmann’s interpretation and given the supplement suggested by
Tibiletti (2018) which is based on the text of the Ambrosian Recension.

Chrysippus Fr. 1

The eschatological passages in Olympian 2 were the source of much discussion
among the ancient commentators. In lines 57–60 Pindar mentions punishments
in the afterlife for sinful actions by both living and the dead:

\[
\text{ὅτι θανόντων μὲν ἐνθάδ' αὐτίκ' ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες}
\]

\(^1\) Whereas Jacoby puts Hippostratus’ ante quem in the third century BCE, Williams (2010)
dates him to the first century BCE or later.

\(^2\) Cf. Deas (1931, pp. 31–40) for the use of the first person by the anonymous scholiast.
That the helpless spirits of those who have died on earth immediately pay the penalty – and upon sins committed here in Zeus’ realm, a judge beneath the earth pronounces sentence with hateful necessity.

Chrysippus’ idea that the dead punish the living is peculiar and not found in other scholia on these eschatological passages. Chrysippus differs from Aristarchus (Σ. O. 2.102b = Fr. 7 Horn) who assumes that “those who have died” (θανόντων) pay their price. Braswell (2015, pp. 131–132) states without further discussion that Chrysippus’ interpretation makes sense if we interpret the price paid on earth as death itself. This interpretation does not, however, explain why Chrysippus believed that the dead actively punish the living. Mommsen (1864) instead argued that Chrysippus understood θανόντων as meaning ὑπὸ θανόντων, a view accepted also by Deas (1930). This explanation gains further credibility by the paraphrase in the following Byzantine scholion which renders θανόντων as ὑπὸ θανόντων (ed. Abel (1891, pp. 128–129)):

Σ. O. 2.102-106 Εἰ δέ μιν · οὐδὲ μέμνηται τὰς τρεῖς μετεμψυχώσεις, εἰ δὲ τις τούτων ἔχων τὸν πλούτον οἶδε τὸ μέλλον, ὅτι οἱ ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες αὐτίκα ἐνθάδε ὑπὸ τῶν θανόντων ποινὰς ἔτισαν, οὐκ ἂν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ἀδικίαν ἐχρήσατο.

If him: Pindar mentions the three transmigrations of souls in this way. If anyone with wealth knows that in the after-life helpless souls immediately are penalized there by those who have died, he would not have made use of himself for wrongdoing.

In support of his unorthodox view, Chrysippus adduces cases of invocations of the dead in Greek tragedy. Chrysippus explicitly refers to Aeschylus’ Choephoroi and Electra’s prayer to her father Agamemnon that his own killers be killed in retribution (124–152). Another invocation of a deceased person in tragedy, Darius, is found in Aeschylus’ Persae 607–693, and within the Pindaric corpus such notions are implied in Pythian 4. 158–162 where Pelias tells Jason that he can take away the wrath of the dead (μᾶνιν χθονίων) by bringing the soul of his ancestor Phrixus to Thessaly (Johnston, 1999, pp. 20–46).
Asclepiades Fr. 1

The scholion expounds Pindar’s reference to the *Hellanodikas*, the judge of the Olympic games, as an Aetolian although the games took place in Elis. The anonymous scholiast argues that Pindar calls all Eleans Aetolians and mentions two mythological explanations for his use of the adjective: 1) They were called Aetolians because of the ancient king Aetolus of Elis. 2) They were called so because of the Elean king Oxylus who was an Aetolian.

Asclepiades is said to have preferred the latter view. The mythological nature of the fragment makes possible an identification with a mythographer, such as Asclepiades of Tragilus, but Asclepiades’s statement appears to derive from a context where Eleans were referred to as Aetolians. To the best of my knowledge, this is only the case in Pindar. Thus, it is very possible that the quotation derives from a work that commented on Pindar directly.

\[\text{ἀτρεκής· ἀτρεκὴς < Ἑλλανοδίκας ..... Αἰτωλὸς ἀνήρ· τοὺς Ἑλλανοδίκας, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πάντας τοὺς Ἡλείους Αἰτωλοὺς εἶπεν}: \]

I follow here the text of Drachmann. The manuscript reading probably results from the contamination of two originally independent scholia: one now lost on the lemma *ἀτρεκὴς Ἑλλανοδίκας*, and the scholion which probably originally commented on the lemma *Αἰτωλὸς ἀνήρ*. If this scholion, as Drachmann suggests, read τοὺς Ἑλλανοδίκας .. Αἰτωλοὺς εἶπεν, a contamination could easily have taken place because of haplography. The latter scholion also survives in the Vatican recension as Σ. 3.22b, with the lemma *Αἰτωλὸς ἀνήρ υψόθεν*.

\[\text{ἄνωθεν ἀπό Αἰτωλοῦ τοῦ ἕνδυμιῶνος. <ἡ> δὲ τὴν Ὀξύλου εἰς Ἡλιῶν ἄφιξιν}: \]

I have here accepted Boeckh’s supplement <ἡ> since Σ. 3.22c in the Vatican recension offers the two explanations separately (ἠτοὶ ἀπὸ Αἰτωλοῦ .. ἃ ἀπὸ Ὀξύλου).

\[\text{Ἕλλανικος φησι καὶ Ἀριστόδήμος}: \]

*Hellanicus of Lesbos was an author of mythographical, ethnographical and chronographical works active in the fifth century BCE (Pownall, 2016). Boeckh (1819, pp. xiv–xv) believed Aristodemus to be identical to the Pindar commentator but Schwartz (1895a) indicated that the fragment belongs to Aristodemus of Elis and comes from a work on local history of Elis or a list of Olympic victors. For an up-to-date discussion of this Aristodemus, cf. Anderson (2008).*

Aristonicus Fr. 2

In *Olympia* 3.18 Pindar mentions how Hercules brought the olive-tree to Διὸς ... πανδόκῳ ἄλσει, “Zeus’ all-welcoming grove”, i.e. the Altis at Olympia. Ancient scholars noted that ἄλσος commonly refers to what we would call a grove but that at the time of Hercules’ arrival there was strictly speaking
incorrect, since the area was still barren. Aristonicus explained that Pindar refers to the area proleptically as a grove. Other commentators simply state that the word ἄλσος can be used for any sacred place, as does Homer when referring to the Boeotian town Onchestus. The example of Onchestus is also mentioned by Strabo (9.2.33) according to whom its sanctuary to Poseidon was bare of trees, situated at a high latitude and called “grove”, due to poetic embellishment.

προλεπτικῶς: The adverb is found only here in the Pindar scholia but is common in other scholiastic corpora, where it is typically used concerning forward references in plot (Nünlist, 2009, pp. 34–42). Aristonicus’ grammatical usage of the term in this fragment here parallels that of Apollonius Dyscolus on anticipatory use of anaphora in De Constructione 1.44 (ed. Uhlig).

Artemon Fr. 2

Olympian 5 encourages “Oceanus’ daughter” to accept the ode. Like all modern commentators, Aristarchus takes this as a reference to Camarina, an Oceanid nymph with the same name as the home-city of the poem’s laudandus Psaumis as well as of a lake in the proximity. Artemon however, as in Fr. 1, diverges from Aristarchus’ view, identifying Oceanus’ daughter with Arethousa, a nymph and a sweet-water lake in Syracuse on the island of Ortygia in the harbour of the city (Larson, 2001, pp. 213–214).

According to Broggiato (2011, pp. 549–50), Artemon based his reasoning on the view of Crates from Mallus that all fresh water comes from Oceanus. 1 Artemon’s view that Camarina was subject to Syracuse might have derived from the manuscript reading Καμάριναν, which easily could be interpreted as ὃς τάν σὰν πόλιν αὐξὼν Καμάριναν, instead of ὃς τάν σὰν πόλιν αὐξὼν, Καμάρινα. 2 If this was the reading available to Artemon, he could very well have believed that Syracuse was being addressed and consequently, following the ideas of Crates, that Oceanus’ daughter would be a reference to the famous spring Arethousa. Camarina was an independent city re-founded by colonists from Gela in 461 BCE, but since it had originally been founded as a colony by Syracuse in the sixth century, the idea of Camarina as subject to Syracuse is understandable.

1 Cf. 3.7 for his relationship to Crates and to the idea of polymatheia.
2 Καμάριναν is the reading of the pre-Palaeologan manuscripts and Καμάρινα a conjecture by Moschopoulus.
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Theon Fr. 1

This fragment is found in a scholi on the identification of the Idaean cave mentioned by Pindar in *Olympian* 5.18. The scholi mentions that according to Demetrius of Scepsis a cave bearing such a name was found in Elis, the region where Olympia was situated, while according to unnamed sources Pindar referred to Idaean caves of Crete or the Troad. At the end of the scholi reference is made to Theon as a source of the preceding information. Giese (1867, pp. 41–42) identified this scholar with Theon, son of Artemidorus, but did not attribute the fragment to a commentary on Pindar, deriving it instead from his work on Apollonius Rhodius.\(^1\) Since the discovery of Theon’s commentary on *Pythians* in *POxy* 2536 (= Theon Fr. 2), it appears probable that he also worked on the *Olympians*, and we might with some confidence attribute this fragment as well to a commentary on Pindar. It is not obvious whether Theon is the source of the whole scholi, i.e. whether he is quoted as the source of both Demetrius and the anonymous views, or if he is mentioned as an example of the proponents of the latter view – as suggested in the translation by Biraschi (2011) “così affirma Theone”. The former alternative seems slightly more probable since Demetrius is also mentioned in connection to the cave of Ida in the scholia to Apollonius Rhodius (Σ. 3.134), which at least in part derive from Theon’s commentary on the *Argonautica* (Dickey, 2007, p. 69).

\(\Delta \nu θυ \pi \xi o\) \(\circ \Sigma \chi \nu \psi \mu o\): Demetrius of Scepsis was active during the middle of the second century BCE. He appears to have been active in the town of Scepsis in the Troad and wrote thirty books on the Catalogue of Trojans in *II*. 2.816–877 (Pfeiffer, 1968, pp. 249–251).

Aristodemus Fr. 1

According to *Olympian* 6.15 seven funeral pyres were kindled at Thebes after the defeat of the Seven against Thebes. The ancient scholars noted that the seven funeral pyres could not be for the seven commanders of the expedition because Adrastus was still alive, while Amphiarraus had been swallowed by the earth and Polyneices’ corpse had not been buried at all. Aristarchus, commenting on this apparent contradiction, said that it was an example of Pindar’s idiosyncratic treatment of myths. Unfortunately, the fragment does not tell to what specific mythological variation Aristarchus was referring to. It is hardly possible that Aristarchus thought that Pindar said that the corpses of the seven commanders were burned, given that Adrastus is alive in the ode, and Pindar himself mentions the earth’s swallowing of Amphiarraus (*O*. 6.13–14), which at most makes for

---

\(^1\) Cf. section 3.16 for Theon’s interests in Hellenistic poets.
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five burials by burning. It is more probable that Aristarchus referred to the fact that in Pindar the fallen are properly cremated. Pindar’s version differs in this respect from Euripides’ Supplices and Sophocles’ Antigone where the lack of proper burial rites of Polynices and the Seven make up the background of the plots of the plays. The differences in Pindar’s treatment of the myth from that of the Attic tragedians can probably be explained as deriving from an older epic version, going back to the Thebais (Adorjani, 2014, p. 137).

Aristodemus’ fragment is lacunose, as noted already in Boeckh’s edition of the scholia. In the transmitted text of the fragment, a genitive plural of the aorist participle of ἀπόλλυμι, “destroy, kill” modifies the ἑπτὰ πυράς, “seven pyres”. We would thus expect an infinitive such as εἶναι or a passive form of καίω as well as a noun for what had been slain. Boeckh’s suggestion, that Aristodemus believed the seven mounds were raised for the seven defeated armies, appears probable and gains support from Σ O. 6.23d (Vatican recension). The Vatican recension lacks an explicit reference to ancient authorities but contains in part the same core information as the Ambrosian.¹ The text of the Vatican recension reads:

αὐτῷ ἐπιλυτέον οὕτως, ὅτι τὰς πυρὰς ὁ Πίνδαρος καταριθμεῖται οὐ πρὸς αὐτούς τοὺς στρατηγούς, ἀλλὰ τὰ τούτων στρατεύματα· ἑπτὰ γὰρ τάξεις στρατευμάτων περί τὰς ἑπτὰ πύλας τῶν Θηβῶν μάχην συνεστήσαντο, καὶ οὕτω τῶν ἐν ἐκάστη πύλῃ τεθνηκότων στρατιωτῶν φησι γενέσθαι πυρκαϊάς.

But [the problem] is to be solved in the following way: Pindar does not count the actual commanders, but their armies. For seven lines of armies went to battle around the seven gates of Thebes and in this way, he says, were mounds raised for those who died at each gate.

This explanation of the seven pyres is also found in Σ N. 9.53c. If this is in fact Aristodemus’ original explanation, the lacuna might be explained as a case of homoeoteleuton of ὁ δὲ ᾿Αριστόδημός φησι τὰς ἑπτὰ πυρὰς ἐπὶ καίων στρατιωτῶν/στρατευμάτων τῶν περὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ πύλας ἀπολομένων.

Asclepiades Fr. 2

In Olympia 6.16–17, Adrastus expresses his grief over the loss of Amphiaras after the defeat of the Seven against Thebes.

¹For the relationship between the two recensions cf. section 6.1.2.
Ποθέω στρατιῶς ὀφθαλμὸν ἐμᾶς ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ’ ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάρνασθαι.

I dearly miss the eye of my army, good both as a seer and at fighting with the spear.

Asclepiades states that Pindar has “taken” this from the Thebais (Fr. 10 PEG). This epic poem was part of the ancient Theban cycle and had the war of the Seven against Thebes as its subject. Already in 1830, Ernst Ludwig von Leutsch noted that O. 6.17 reads as a hexameter with the exception of the antepenult syllable. Leutsch suggested that the verse was a reworking of an original hexameter-line ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ’ ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάχεσθαι from the Thebais (Leutsch, 1830, p. 63). Later scholars have generally accepted this theory, although their exact reconstructions of the original verse differ.¹

Other fragments of ancient Pindarists use literary parallels as a part of larger arguments, such as Artemon Fr. 4 on Pindar’s treatment of the myth of Ischyros and Coronis being more logical than that of Hesiod, or for explaining the meaning of Pindaric passages, such as Chrysippus Fr. 1 referring to tragedy when discussing the eschatological passages in Olympian 2. In its surviving form this fragment instead emphasizes the literary borrowing per se. Concerning the reasons why Asclepiades noted this literary parallel, Phillips (2016, p. 174) notes that the Thebais may have been a text with which readers were not expected to be familiar, or that the connection as such was worthy of pointing out. The lack of context makes the reconstruction of Asclepiades’ motives difficult, and a combination of several factors may have played a role. Nonetheless, the fact that Asclepiades points out the intertextual relationship in such a direct way suggests an interest in Pindar’s sources.

Despite Asclepiades’ remark, it is possible that ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ’ ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάχεσθαι was a more generic formula for Amphiaras and not specific to the Thebais since the similar wording ὡς ὁ ἀγαθὸς μὲν ἔην ἄγορῃ, ἄγαθὸς δὲ μάχεσθαι is found in Hesiod’s Cat. Fr. 25.37 M-W.²

Asclepiades Fr. 3

Asclepiades’ genealogy of Rhodes as the daughter of Helius and Aphrodite has no parallels in extant Greek literature. It appears to derive from an alternative interpretation of Olympian 7.13–14, given below in the edition of Snell-Maehler:

¹Cf. Davies (2014, pp. 91–92) for an overview of different reconstructions.
²Cf. Rutherford (2015, pp. 452–453) for a discussion of this formula.
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Singing a hymn to Rhodes of the sea, the child of Aphrodite and bride of Helius.

Asclepiades apparently understood νύμφα not as “bride” but as “young girl, nymph” and interpreted the text as παῖδ’ Ἀφροδίτας ᾿Αελίοιό τε νύμφαν, ῾Ροδον, “daughter of Aphrodite and Helius, the nymph Rhodes”. The clause τὸν γὰρ Ἡλίον αὐτῆς ἐρασθῆναι καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ νήσῳ μιγῆναι of the fragment appears to be a paraphrase of O. 7.72 ἐνθὰ ῾Ρόδῳ ποτὲ μιχθεὶς, “there he lay with Rhodes”. Possibly Asclepiades understood ῾Ρόδῳ as a locative dative.

Although the mythological nature of the fragment might suggest a mythographical source, such as Asclepiades of Tragilus, the otherwise unknown idea of the relationship of Helius and Rhodes is best explained as a variant reading of Pindar’s text which suggests that the fragment originated in a discussion of Pindar. The genealogy lacks support outside of the scholiastic corpora on Pindar, but is mentioned in another scholion on this passage:

Σ.Ο. 7.24c¹ οὐχ οὔς τινες ἠβουλήθησαν, ἐξ Ἡλίου καὶ Ἀφροδίτης τὴν νύμφην γεγενῆσθαι· ἐναντίον γὰρ τὸ ἐπαγόμενον Ἀελίοιό τε νύμφαν· ἀλλ’ ἄκούστεον τὴν ῾Ρόδον ᾿Αφροδίτης παῖδα διὰ τὸ ἀνθηρὸν καὶ χαριέστατον, νύμφην δὲ Ἡλίου. λέγεται γὰρ θεσαμένος τὴν νύμφην καὶ ἐρασθεὶς, ἐκακούσας ἐν τῇ ὀμοιώμων νήσῳ συγγενέσθαι; ἢνα τὸ μὲν ποντίαν παῖδ’ Ἀφροδίτης ἐπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς νήσου λάβωμεν, τὸ δὲ Ἀελίοιο τε νύμφαν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς ἱροῖδος ἀκούσωμεν.

Not as some have held, that the nymph [Rhodes] was born to Helius and Aphrodite – For “Helius’ nymph” which is brought up is opposite to this – but it is necessary to interpret Rhodes as Aphrodite’s daughter, because of her blossom and charm, and as Helius’ wife. For it is told that he was struck by desire as he watched her and thereafter went to her and lay with her on the island of the same name. Let us take “Aphrodite’s child of the sea” as a reference to the island and “Helius’ nymph” as the heroine.

The scholiast argues against taking Rhodes as the daughter of Helius and Aphrodite. Although Asclepiades is not mentioned by name, he appears to be the source referred to by the generic τινες mentioning the same genealogy of

¹Drachmann designated this scholion as 24c, although it should rather have been named 24e.
Rhodes. It is obvious that the anonymous scholiast understood this interpretation as a result of a close reading of Pindar. We might hypothesize that the fragment in its original context discussed how to interpret Ἀφροδίτας Ἀελίοι τε νυμφαν, where Asclepiades argued for his punctuation and the resulting genealogy.

Aristonicus Fr. 3

Aristonicus specifies the reference to Theba games in O. 7.84–85 by mentioning the Erotia in Thespiae and the Eleutheria in Plataeae. The Erotia of Thespiae were celebrated in honour of the city’s most celebrated god, Eros, and contained musical and gymnastical contests (Plut. Amat. 748f, Paus. 31.3) The Eleutheria of Plataeae were founded in memory of the great victory against the Persians and the preserved liberty of Greece. The games consisted of both cultural and athletic events and were famous for their hoplitodromia (Philost. Gymnasticus 8). According to Plutarch (Aristides 21) they were founded by Aristides directly after the victory in 479 BCE, although the first contemporary evidence derives from the fourth century BCE (Albanidis, 2008).

Asclepiades Fr. 4a and 4b

The medieval manuscripts of O. 8.8 read ἄνεται δὲ πρὸς χάριν εὔσεβίας ἀνδρῶν λιταῖς, “men’s prayers are fulfilled on account of their piety”. According to both the scholia of the Ambrosian and Vatican recension, Asclepiades preferred to read ἄνεται δὲ πρὸς χάριν εὔσεβίας ἀνδρῶν λιταί. The construction ἄνεται + dative encountered in this passage is problematic. Asclepiades assumed the sense to be that the prayers are fulfilled (cf. τελειοῦνται in Fr. 4a) and suggested that λιταῖς therefore should be emended into λιταί (nominative plural). Although not mentioned explicitly in the scholia the resulting reading would be a case of the so-called schema Pindaricum or Boeoticum, the conjunction of plural noun and singular verb. With the exception of neuter nouns, the construction is not common in Greek.¹ As seen by the name itself, the construction was associated with Pindar by the ancient grammarians. The twelfth-century scholar Eustathius recognized it to be particularly common in Pindar,² and the (anonymous) Pindar-scholion Σ I. 5.73 refers to οὐδ’ ὁπόσαι δαπάναι ἐλπίδων ἔκνισ’ ὄπιν, “nor have all their costs vexed the zeal of their hopes”, (I. 5.57)

¹According to Melchert (2011) there are 23 attestations of this construction, of which fifteen are found in the Pindaric corpus. Melchert does not include the use of εἶναι with plural nouns, such as in Hdt. 7.34: ἐστι δὲ ἕπτα στάδιοι.
²Eustathius Comm. II. 4.67.13 van der Valk
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Asclepiades’ τιμᾶται is an example of an intralingual translation, or paraphrase. The use of ἀσκέω, “practice” for revering gods is primarily found in Pindar.² ἀντὶ τοῦ is a typical introduction for a paraphrase in ancient scholarship.³

Aristodemus Fr. 2a and b, Leptines Fr. 1, Dionysius Sidonius Fr. 1 (Dubium)

In Olympian 10.43–49 Pindar records that Hercules fences in the Altis, the sacred grove of Zeus, at Olympia:

οὐ δ’ ἀρ’ ἐν Πίσᾳ ἔλσαις ὅλον τε στρατόν
λάαν τε πᾶσαν Διὸς ἄλκιμος
ὑώς σταθύματο ζῴδεον ἄλσος πατρι μεγίστων περὶ δὲ πάξας Ἄλτιν μὲν ὄγ᾽ ἐν καθαρῷ
diέκρινε, τὸ δὲ κύκλῳ πέδον
ἐθηκε δόρπου λύσιν,
tιμάσαις πόρον Ἀλφεοῦ
μετὰ δώδεκ᾽ ἀνάκτων θεῶν

Thereupon, Zeus’ valiant son gathered the entire army and all the booty at Pisa, and measured out a sacred precinct for his father most mighty. He fenced in the Altis and set it apart in the open, and he made the surrounding plain a resting place for banqueting, and honoured the stream of Alpheus along with the twelve ruling gods.

¹The Pindar scholia comment upon similar constructions elsewhere, e.g. in Σ 1.158a, without giving the construction a name.
²It is found also in P. 3.109, ὄνομ᾽ ἀσκήσεω, “I shall honour fortune” and perhaps in N. 11.8–9, καὶ ξενίου Διὸς ἀσκέται θέμις ἄνακτος, “and the ordinance of Zeus Xenius is venerated in continuous feasts”.
³Cf. section 4.5.1 for a discussion of this form of explanation.
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The medieval manuscripts agree that what Hercules fenced in was the Altis. The wording of Didymus’ fragment on the other hand suggests that his text read Ἰλιν, the Doric form of Elis, the region where Olympia lay.

The other scholars mentioned, Aristodemus, Leptines and Dionysius, instead favoured the reading Ἄλτιν, i.e. the Altis at Olympia. Although the personal names are complemented by οἱ περὶ, the view stated probably reflects the opinions of the individual scholars rather than the views of a hypothetical school.¹ The Aristodemus mentioned here is probably identical with the Alexandrian scholar and pupil of Aristarchus mentioned in several scholia. The identification of Dionysius is difficult since several like-named scholars are mentioned in the Pindar scholia. The slightly more probable identification is Dionysius Sidonius, also mentioned in Σ P. 1.172, due to the textual nature of both this fragment and fragments by this scholar on Homer.² Dionysius Phaselites cannot be ruled out, although the other remaining fragments of this scholar concern the classification of odes rather than textual questions. Another possibility is Dionysius, son of Charmides, to whom a conjecture on Ν. 7. 24–25 is attributed. This Dionysius appears less probable due again to the few textual records surviving of his work.³ Lefkowitz (1991, p. 147) without offering any grounds for her assumption, identifies the scholar with Dionysius Thrax, author of the famous grammatical treatise, but we have no evidence for any interest in Pindar by this scholar.

The identification of Leptines is likewise problematic. We have no other references to his work on Pindar but he might be identical to the Leptines quoted in scholia on Theocritus (Σ Θεοκρ. 1.112 ed. Wendel) and Homer (Σ Il. 23.731a1 (A) and a2 (T)).

The argument given in favour of their reading, the inappropriateness of fencing in Elis, suggests that the reading Ἰλιν known to Didymus, was known to Aristodemus as well. This opens up the possibility that Ἄλτιν is a conjecture, although we cannot rule out the possibility that Aristodemus defended an already existing tradition. If this was in fact a conjecture, it is unusual in having entered the medieval textual transmission which otherwise tends to be conservative.

The inappropriateness referred to by Aristodemus et al. is not moral but refers to the microcosm of the myth as told in Olympian 10. In O. 10.34–38 Pindar tells how Hercules destroyed Elis.

καὶ μὸν ξεναπάτας
Επειδὼν βασιλεὺς ὀπιθέν

¹Cf. Callistratus Fr. 5 for a discussion on this construction.
²Cf. section 3.13 for his work on Homer.
³Cf. section 3.12 for one possible other reference to Dionysius Charmides’ son in a papyrus commentary on Homer.
οὐ πολλὸν ἴδε πατρίδα πολυκτέανον ὑπὸ στερεῷ πυρί
πλαγαῖς τε σιδάρου βαθὺν εἰς ὀχετὸν ἄτας
ἵζοισαν ἑὰν πόλιν.

And indeed, not long afterwards, the guest-cheating king of the
Epeians saw his wealthy homeland sink into the deep trench of
ruin beneath a ruthless fire and strokes of iron—even his own
city.

According to the authors of this fragment it would either be unfitting (~μὴ
πρέπον) or without reason (~μὴ λόγον ἔχειν) for Hercules to dedicate Elis to
Zeus after its destruction. This form of reasoning closely resembles Aristarchus’

Aristodemus Fr. 3

In Olympian 10, Pindar includes a list of the victors from the first contest at
Olympia. According to the text of Snell-Maehler, the winner in the chariot
race was Samus from Mantinea, son of Halirothius (~ἀν’ ἵπποισι δὲ τέτρασιν
ἀπὸ Μαντινέας Σάμος ὁ Ἀλιροθίου (O. 10.69–70). The text transmitted in the
medieval manuscripts reads ἀπὸ Μαντινέας Σάμος ὁ Ἀλιροθίου. The anonymous
scholiast, taking σάμος as a Doric form of σῆμα, “mark, sign”, notes that this
reading indicates that Halirothius himself was the winner. From Σ O. 10.83a
we know that Didymus Fr. 21 Braswell supported this reading. Aristodemus
instead reads the personal name Σάμος, which was adopted also by Snell-
Maehler. Perhaps in response to an otherwise lost identification of Samus’
father, Aristodemus elaborates on the identity of Halirothius and proves that he
could not be the Halirothius who lived during Cecrops’ reign in Athens. This is
probably the son of Poseidon who tried to rape Cecrops’ granddaughter Aglau-
rus (Ps-Apollodorus Bibliotheca 3.180). The Parian Chronicle (IG XII.5.44
Fr. A. 4–5) puts the subsequent trial of Ares in the reign of Cranaus, Cecrops’
successor. Aristodemus probably noted that this Halirothius would have lived
several generations before Hercules, who was approximately contemporary
with the much later Athenian king Theseus.¹ This implicates that Aristodemus
did not believe that the Samus from Mantinea was the son of Poseidon’s son
Halirothius. Aristodemus also pointed out the impossibility of such an identifi-
cation due to geographical reasons since the winner was not from Athens but
from Arcadian Mantinea. In support of his reading Aristodemus adduced two
verses of Diphilus mentioning a horse-driving Samus.

¹Cf. e.g. Euripides Herc. 619 where Hercules’ mentions that he has rescued Theseus from
the underworld.
Δίφιλος ὁ τὴν Θησηίδα ποιήσας: We know neither the location nor date of Diphilus. West (1974, p. 31) suggested that the iambics cited derive from the Theseis, a choliambic work, which would have presupposed a burlesque treatment of the Theseus myth. As noted by Rotstein (2010, p. 290) it is not necessary to attribute the two iambics to the Theseis, which the scholiast might have mentioned to identify the Diphilus. A similar line, also attributed to the author of a Theseis, presumably Diphilus, is quoted by Didymus Fr. 21 Braswell in Σ. Ο. 10.83a in a slightly different form: στρωφᾷς δὲ πώλους ὡς ὁ Μαντινεὺς Ἡρως “You turn the foals like the hero from Mantinea”. Didymus was able to defend his reading σᾶμ᾿ Ἀλιροθίου using this line since it did not specifically mention Samus.

Artemon Fr. 3

The opening words of Pythian 1, χρύσεα φόρμιγξ, “golden lyre”, form one of the most famous Pindaric phrases that has in modern times been used as a symbol for archaic literature as such. Artemon however interpreted it biographically as an allusion to the circumstances surrounding the ode. According to the scholar from Pergamum, Hiero had promised a golden lyre as payment to Pindar, and the same view is found also in Σ. Ρ. 1.1a where an anonymous source states that the poet is reminding Hiero of the promise (ὁ ποιητὴς ὑπομιμήσαν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας). The Byzantine scholia on Pindar (Σ. Ρ. 1.1 (Abel)) likewise accept Artemon’s view and say that Pindar reminds Hiero of his promise in a “riddling fashion” (αἰνιγματωδῶς). As noted by Broggiato (2014, p. 31), Artemon’s interpretation of the ode’s introduction is paralleled by Callistratus’ (Frs. 4–5) interpretation of references to money in Isthmian 2 as a reminder of an outstanding payment.

Apollonius Fr. 1

The identity of this Apollonius is uncertain as the scholia do not transmit any identifying attributes or biographical information. Irigoin (1952, p. 52)
Artemon Fr. 4

suggested that he is identical with the son of Chaeris by this name mentioned in the scholia on Aristophanes and Homer. Although we have limited evidence to go on, the identification with the son of Chaeris, presumably the Pindaric scholar, is an attractive hypothesis. This scholar would have been active in the late second or early first centuries BCE and the nature of the present fragment is typical of Pindaric scholarship of this period.

The scholion concerns the interpretation of \( P. 1.1-2 \) where the lyre is described as \( \text{Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων σύνδικον Μοισάν κτέανον, } \) “The syndikos possession of Apollo and dark-haired Muses.”

Whereas the anonymous scholiast paraphrases σύνδικος as συνῳδὸς, “concordant”, Apollonius equates the adjective with σύντροπος, “in joint manner”. This uncommon word is primarily found within the scholiastic corpora on Pindar where it also occurs in \( \Sigma P. 1.3d \), paraphrasing σύνδικος, as well as in some Byzantine scholia on the passage. The word is also found paraphrasing σύνοικον, “dwelling in the same house with”, in the Scholia Recentiore to Aristophanes’ \textit{Plut.} (\( \Sigma \text{Plut.} 1147a \) ed. Chantry). LBG translates “zusammenpassend”, but since Apollonius’ use of the word is quoted in opposition to συνῳδὸς we must assume that it has a different meaning. A gloss on σύνδικος edited by Abel (1891, p. 432), in manuscript U (fo. 136v) paraphrases σύνδικος as σύντροπον, κοινόν, “in joint manner, common”, which suggests that σύντροπος has a similar meaning to κοινός, “common”. It therefore appears probable that Apollonius used the adjective in the sense, “in joint manner”. Apollonius apparently understood Pindar as saying that the lyre is the common possession of Apollo and the muses.

In support of his interpretation, which requires that δίκη, “right”, can be used as a synonym with τρόπος, “manner”, Apollonius included an example from \textit{Od.} 19.43. Odysseus here tells Telemachus, who has noted the presence of the invisible Athena, that “this is the manner of the Gods who inhabit Olympus” (\( \text{Αὕτη τοι δίκη ἔστι θεῶν οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν. } \) The D-scholia on the \textit{Odyssey} agree with Apollonius and paraphrase δίκη as τρόπος (\( \Sigma \text{Od.} 19.43 \) (D) (Ernst)).

Artemon Fr. 4

In \textit{Pythian} 1.16–20 Pindar describes the gigantic monster Typho, buried under the volcano Aetna.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Τυφώς ἑκατοντακάρας, τόν ποτε} \\
\text{Κύλιαν ὄτρεψεν πολυώνυμον δάντρον, νῦν γε μάν}
\end{align*}
\]

1\( \Sigma \text{Vesp.} 1238a \) and \( \Sigma \text{Il.} 3.448 \) (A).
2Cf. section 3.6 for the possibility of identifying him with Apollonius the “Eidographer”.
3Cf. Abel (1891, p. 432).
Typho the hundred-headed, whom
the famous Cilician cave once reared; now, however,
the sea-fencing cliffs above Cyme
as well as Sicily weigh upon his shaggy chest, and a skyward
column constrains him,
snowy Aetna, nurse of biting snow all year round.

The scholiast recounts several ancient theories on the location of Typho’s
imprisonment:

1. Some argued that Typho lay under a mountain in Boeotia. Perhaps this
refers to the mountain Typhaonion (Fontenrose, 1959, p. 79).

2. Some put it in Phrygia or Lydia. This refers to the Catacecaumene region
in Lydia where Strabo 12.8.19 locates the fight between Zeus and Typho

3. Artemon argues that Typho is found beneath all volcanoes.

Artemon’s interpretation is strikingly innovative by not identifying Typho
with a specific monster nor a specific location. Instead he interprets Typho
allegorically as a symbol for volcanic activity. He defended his view by means
of etymology, deriving Typho from the verb τύφω, “smoke, burn slowly”. Such
a “philosophizing” use of etymology was typical for Crates of Mallus and
his approach to literature but alien to Aristarchus and the followers of his
school.\(^1\) As first shown by Broggiato (2011, p. 551) Artemon here makes use
of etymology and allegorical interpretation where Typho symbolizes volcanic
activity, to show the poet’s correct understanding of the physical reality of the
world, his **polymatheia**. As suggested by Pitcher (2007) Artemon may also
have resorted to etymology in order to reconcile the different accounts about
the location of the imprisonment. Artemon is not explicitly stated here to have
worked on Pindar directly, but only on the Typho myth. Since we do know from
Fr. 3 that Artemon commented on *Pythian* 1, his treatment of the myth could
well derive from a Pindaric context. In fact, the nature of Pindar’s treatment
of the Typho myth might have contributed to Artemon’s interpretation since
Pindar positions Typho under two distinct volcanic areas, Sicily with Aetna, as
well as Cumae with Vesuvius.

\(^1\)Cf. 4.2.
Dionysius Sidonius Fr. 2

In *Pythian* 1.85–89 Pindar urges Hiero to rule his people justly and truthfully:

> ἀλλ' ὅμως, κρέσσον γὰρ σκεπτωμῷ φθόνος,
> μὴ ταρίει καλά. νόμα δικαίω πηθαλώ στρατόν· ἠφευδεῖ δὲ πρὸς ἧμοιον γάλκευε γλῶσσαν.
> εἰ τι καί φλαύρον παρακύψει, μέγα τοι φέρεται,
> πάρ σέθεν. πολλῶν ταμίας ἐσσι' πολλοὶ μάρτυρες ἀμφοτέροις πιστοί.

Do not pass over any noble things. Guide your people with a rudder of justice; on an anvil of truth forge your tongue. Even some slight thing, you know, becomes important if it flies out from you. You are the steward of many things; many are the sure witnesses for both.¹

The scholiast addresses the identity of the referent of ἀμφοτέροις and offers three differing interpretations:

1. Truth and falsehood.
2. Hiero and his son (Deinomenes).
3. Hiero and his subjects.

The first interpretation that ἀμφοτέροις refers to truth and falsehood in Hiero’s action is based upon the reference to the truthful anvil in l. 86 (Phillips, 2016, p. 153), and the second interpretation was derived from the celebration of Hiero and his son through the ode (Meliadò, 2019, p. 202). The third interpretation that ἀμφοτέροις refers to Hiero and his subject citizens is attributed to Dionysius Sidonius. As Meliadò suggests, Dionysius’ interpretation was probably based on Pindar’s reference to him as πολλῶν ταμίας, ‘steward of many’ in l. 88.

Ammonius Fr. 2, Callistratus Fr. 1, Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 1

The occasion of the victory celebrated in *Pythian* 2 and the nature of the ode, was much debated in antiquity. The Sicilian historian Timaeus referred to

¹Adapted from Race (1997b) who translates ἀμφοτέροις as “for deeds of both kinds”.
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the ode as a “sacrifical ode”, while Callimachus (Fr. 450 Pfeiffer) argued for a classification as a Nemean, thereby possibly starting the practice of putting victory odes not celebrating victories at the four great Panhellenic games at the end of the book of *Nemeans*. The classification that prevailed within the manuscript edition was the Pythian, here attributed to “some” (ἐνιοί), including Apollonius the “Eidographer”, either the predecessor or successor of Aristophanes of Byzantium’s as head librarian of the royal library in Alexandria. The proponents of the Pythian classification may have believed that the ode celebrated the same victory as *Pythian 1*. Lines 3–12 show that the celebrated victory was in a chariot-race. We know of only two chariot victories by Hiero at Pan-Hellenic games: at Pythia in 470 BCE (celebrated in Pindar’s *Pythian 1* and Bacchylides Ode 4) and at Olympia in the 78th Olympiad (468 BCE) as mentioned in the scholia on *Olympian 1* (Σ Ο. 1. inscr. a-b), a victory celebrated in Bacchylides Ode 3.

Callistratus and Ammonius regarded this ode as an Olympian. Their arguments are not known, but they may have identified the victory of *Pythian 2* with Hiero’s Olympic victory in 468. The resources of the Alexandrian library probably contained victory lists, including those by Hippias of Elis, Aristotle, and the Alexandrian librarian Eratosthenes (Christesen, 2007, p. 163), and we know from *POxy* 2368 that Bacchylides’ poetry was studied in Alexandria (Maehler, 2004, pp. 25–8). It is thus very probable that scholars like Callistratus and Ammonius would know of Hiero’s victory at Olympia in 468, possibly his greatest athletic achievement. Due to the ode’s grandeur and the fact that *Pythian 2* appears to have been composed for a chariot victory, one could well imagine that Callistratus and Ammonius attempted to identify it with the victory of 468 to which no other Pindaric ode was assigned.

Dionysius Phaselites on the other hand did not assign the victory to one of four major Pan-Hellenic games. Instead he suggested that the ode was Panathenaic, i.e. written for a victory at the great Panathenaia in Athens. Beside the more famous rhapsodic contests these games also contained important athletic contests. Some of these were open for participation to all Greeks, and the equestrian races, especially the chariot race, were prestigious events (Tracy and Habicht, 1991, pp. 196–201). We do not, however, have any external information on a victory won by Hiero in Athens.

The scholion tells us that Dionysius propagated a variant reading of *P. 2.4* of the ode. Snell-Maehler’s edition and the medieval manuscripts give the following text of ll. 4–5 where the poet addresses the audience:

---

1. It should however be noted that also the book *Isthmians* contain several odes of differing provenance cf. commentary of Aristodemus Fr. 12.
3. This view is accepted by Young (1983, p. 42–48).
To you I come from shining Thebes bearing this song and its news of the four-horse chariot that shakes the earth

Instead of τῶν λιπαρῶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν, “from shining Thebes”, Dionysius wished to read τῶν λιπαρῶν ἀπ’ Ἀθηνᾶν, “from shining Athens”. Dionysius defended his conjecture by the supposed Pindaric practice of using the adjective “shining” (λιπαρός), for Athens and not for Thebes. The anonymous scholiast criticizes Dionysius stating that Pindar refers to several cities beside Athens as radiant, including Thebes in an otherwise unknown fragment (Fr. 196 Maehler). It should nonetheless be noted that in the surviving Pindaric corpus Athens is the toponomy most often given the epithet. Pindar refers to Athens as “shining” on three occasions:

1. λιπαρῶν εὐωνύμων ἀπ’ Ἀθηνᾶν (N. 4.18–19)
2. ταῖς λιπαραῖς ἐν ᾿Αθήναις (I. 2.20)
3. Ὅ ταὶ λιπαραὶ καὶ ιοστέφανοι καὶ ἀοίδιμοι, Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα, κλειναὶ Ἀθῆναι, δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον (Fr. 76 Maehler).

Other place-names referred to as “shining” in the manuscript tradition are Marathon (O. 13.110), Orchomenus (O. 14.3), Naxos (P. 4.88), as well as the references to Egypt (Fr. 77 Maehler), Smyrna (Fr. 204 Maehler), and Thebes (Fr. 196 Maehler), mentioned by the anonymous scholiast in this scholion. Dionysius might have noted an over-representation of Athens, especially if he was not aware of the fragments adduced by the anonymous scholiast. We may further note that two of the Athenian references are contrasted with Thebes, either by Pindar himself or in the Pindaric tradition. In N. 4 Athens is referred to as “shining” whereas Thebes is given the attribute “with seven gates” (heptaptylos). Fr. 77 is on the other hand intimately connected to the biographical tradition on Pindar.

῏Ω ταὶ λιπαραὶ καὶ ιοστέφανοι καὶ ἀοίδιμοι, Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα, κλειναὶ Ἀθῆναι, δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον.

O shining and violet-crowned and celebrated in song bulwark of Hellas, famous Athens, divine citadel.

---

1The wording of the scholia is inconclusive on whether it was a conjecture by Dionysius due to his belief that the ode was written for a Panathenatic victory, or if the classification was based on the reading.
According to Isocrates (Antid. 166) Athens awarded Pindar with ten thousand drachmas for this poem whereas later biographical tradition instead state that Pindar was fined a thousand drachmas by Thebes which Athens paid for him. ¹ These reasons taken together could account for Dionysius’ decision to associate the λιπαρὸς in Pindar with Athens instead of Thebes.

Asclepiades Fr. 6 (Dubium)

Discussing the identity of Asclepius’ mother, the scholion cites Asclepiades as a source of a tradition different from Pindar. Whereas in Pindar’s Pythian 3 Coronis is Asclepius’ mother, the scholia quote Asclepiades for the information that Asclepius was the son of Arisonië, daughter of the Messenian prince Leucippus.

The attribution and original context of this fragment is problematic. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1886, pp. 78–79) assigned it to “den Grammatiker und tüchtigen Pindarerklärer Asclepiades” and Jacoby only hesitantly attributed it to Asclepiades of Tragilus (FGrH 12 Fr. 32), acknowledging the possibility that the fragment derives from the Pindarist.

That the scholiast here quotes Asclepiades as an authority on a variant mythology suggests that the fragment derives from a mythographical work. This rather suits Asclepiades of Tragilus than Asclepiades of Myrlea.

The fragments quoted by Asclepiades are generally attributed to Hesiod (Fr. 60 M-W) due to the information in Pausanias 2.26.7 that it was Hesiod who invented the Asclepius’ Messenian genealogy.

Artemon Fr. 5

Pythian 3 tells the story of Asclepius who was saved from his mother’s womb by his father Apollon after the god had struck her down because of her affair with Ischys.

ἐσχε τοι ταύταν μεγάλαν ἀυάταν καλλιτέπου λήμα Κορωνίδος· ἐλθόντος γὰρ εὐάσθη ξένου λέκτρους ἀπ’ Ἀρκαδίας. οὐδ’ ἐλάθε σκοπόν· ἐν δ’ ἄρα μηλοδόκω Πυθῶνι τόσσαις ἄιεν ναοὺ βασιλεύς Λοξίας, κοινῶι παρ’ εὐθυτάτης γνώμην πιθών, τάντα ἱσάντι νόφρ (24–29)

¹This variant is mentioned by the Pindaric biographies Vita Ambrosiana and Vita Thomana (Drachmann, vol. 1, pp. 1–8).
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Indeed, headstrong Coronis of the beautiful robes fell victim to that great delusion, for she slept in the bed of a stranger, who came from Arcadia. But she did not elude the watching god, for although he was in flock-receiving Pytho as lord of his temple, Loxias perceived it, convinced by the surest confidant, his all-knowing mind.

Pindar’s version differs from the myth, known from Hesiod Fr. 60 M-W and several younger sources such as Ps-Apollodorus Bibliotheca 3.10.3 and Ovid. Metamorphoses 2.596–599, where the raven informs Apollo of Coronis’ adultery. In Pindar the god needs no messenger but perceives this through his omniscient mind. According to Stamatopoulou (2017, p. 72) Pindar has here reconfigured the Hesiodic narrative to enhance Apollo’s divinity and the scholiast tells us that Artemon praised Pindar for this treatment of the myth.

Artemon uses the term παράλογος to refer to the Hesiodic version. Broggiato (2014, pp. 36–37) suggests that this is an example of Artemon using Alexandrian terminology, but Artemon’s use is different from the linguistic use, “contrary to analogy, irregular”, by Alexandrians in the Homer scholia.1 The term is here used in the sense ‘unreasonable, absurd’ and it is apparent that Artemon appreciated Pindar’s avoidance of the absurdity of the god of prophecy relying upon a bird in the Hesiodic version (Mazzotti, 2003, pp. 78–79). The quotation from Hesiod shows that the poem in question was known in Pergamum. The poem is commonly identified with the Catalogue of Women or the Megalai Ehoiai.2

αὐτὸν δὲ ἑαυτοῦ ἐγνωκέναι φησὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα: This is only found in B and was secluded by Drachmann. Pitcher (2007) argues that the reading of the other manuscripts is ungrammatical because of the lack of a finite verb in the ὅτι clause in other manuscripts. Although it must be acknowledged that this phrase might be latter addition in B or one of its ancestors due to the missing finite verb, I nonetheless follow Pitcher and keep the reading of B since a phrase similar to this must have been present in Artemon’s original context.

διωσάμενόν φησι τὸν Πίνδαρον φάναι: Drachmann suggested that this is a corruption of διωσάμενος φησι ὁ Πίνδαρος whereas Pitcher argued that an infinitive φάναι was omitted by a scribe. As noted by Pitcher, this omission could be explained as a form of haplography due to the repetition of the verbum dicendi. This explanation seems slightly more probable than Drachmann’s, which is why I have included Pitcher’s supplement.

---

1 Cf. section 3.7 for further discussion.
2 Cf. (D’Alessio, 2005) for further discussion and bibliography.
Chapter 9. Commentary

Crates Fr. 1

The scholion on the myth of Asclepius' death as described by Pindar in *Pythian* 3.55–58. recalls the variant that Zeus struck down Asclepius with his teacher Chiron, presumably after resurrecting him from the dead. The attribution of the fragment is problematic. All manuscripts except C and F read κράτης, presumably Crates of Mallus (Deas, 1931, p. 11). C instead has σωκράτης, which has been identified as Socrates of Argos (FGrH 310), e.g. by Broggiato (2001, p. lxvii). Socrates of Argus is also mentioned on two other occasions in the scholia on Pindar (Σ P. 3.14 = FGrH 310 Fr. 12 and Σ N. 3.92 = FGrH 9 310 Fr. 13). F has the reading σου.¹ Since all the other manuscripts have the reading κράτης and Socrates is mentioned elsewhere in the scholia on this ode, a scribe might have changed Κράτης into Σωκράτης.² Several other fragments of Socrates, including FGrH 310 Fr. 12, found in the scholia on *Pythian* 3 also concern Asclepius. Therefore it would be reasonable for the scribe to assign this fragment as well to him. If we accept the attribution to Crates, his interpretation probably depends upon a very liberal understanding of Pindar’s text. Chiron plays an important role within *Pythian* 3, an ode directed to Hiero while he was plagued by illness, but his death is never mentioned by Pindar, although implied.³ Pindar does however mention that Asclepius resurrected a dead man and that both were then struck down by Zeus (P. 3.47–58). This is followed by a series of gnomai on the briefness of life and the impossibility of immortality (59–62) before Pindar says that Chiron, if alive, could have provided a healer to heal the sickly Hiero. Pindar’s references to Chiron not being alive in the ode (P. 3.1–3, 63) might have led Crates to believe that Chiron’s death must have been mentioned within the ode and therefore to draw the conclusion that Chiron was in fact the man resurrected from the dead by Asclepius. If we follow this interpretation, the statement οὐδὲὶ δὲ τοῦτῳ μαρτυρεῖ (BC, τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ EP, τοῦτω συμμαρτυρεῖ DFGHQVi) could go back to Crates himself, who held that this version lacked support in other sources. This speculation has the advantage of explaining why Chiron and Asclepius could be understood to be those struck down by Zeus.

---

¹It is not clear how this reading should be resolved, but it is not similar to the name Σωκράτης in Σ P. 3.14 in the same manuscript.
²Both C F belong to the Paris recension which contains several innovations that are probably due to Byzantine activity, cf. section 6.1.2.
³Ἱθελον Χείρωνα κε ... ζωείν, “I wish that Chiron ... was still alive ” l. 1–3, εἰ δὲ σώφρων ἄντρον ἔναι ἕτε Χείρων, “If wise Chiron still lived in his cave”, l. 63
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Aristodemus Fr. 4

The fragment of Aristodemus is cited in the scholia on Pythian 3.77–9.

ἀλλ’ ἐπεύξασθαι μὲν ἐγὼν ἐθέλω Ματρί, 
tὰν κοῦραι παρ’ ἐμὸν πρόθυρον σὺν Πανὶ μέλπονται θαμὰ 
σεμνὸν θεόν ἐννύχιαι.

But for my part, I wish to pray to the Mother, to whom, along with Pan, the maidens often sing before my door at night, for she is a venerable goddess.

The anecdote can hardly be historical and probably derives from Pindar’s poetry (Slater, 1971, p. 141). Aristodemus’ reference to Pindar’s house could have been inspired by the παρ’ ἐμὸν πρόθυρον in Pythian 3.78 and the biographical episode might be an explanation of why songs are sung to the Mother of the gods and of Pan at Pindar’s house (Ganter and Zgoll, 2014). The passage has traits typical of the biographical traditions of ancient poets, such as anticipation of and correct response to divinity, found also in biographical anecdotes on Archilochus and Socrates (Sinos, 2020, pp. 138–139). The ancient biographical tradition on Pindar generally emphasizes his piety and the shrine at Pindar’s house is mentioned in several sources.¹

Lehnus (1979) suggests that Aristodemus was inspired by a Pindaric hymn to the Mother, and Lefkowitz (2012, pp. 63–65) speculates that Pindar’s encounter with the statue was based on an actual epiphany of the goddess narrated within the poem. As noted by Taretto (2017, p. 20), Aristodemus’ narrative could also have been inspired by Pindar’s Dithyramb for the Thebans (= Fr. 70b Maehler) which contains several correspondences in settings and events.²

Whereas it is possible to see sources of inspiration for the epiphany in Pindar’s own poetry, it is more difficult to trace the origins of Pindar’s teaching of Olympichus. Modern scholarship tends to identify Olympichus with the father of a Theban aulite Potamon mentioned on the funerary stele CEG 509 dated to the first half of the fourth century BCE (Wilson, 2007, pp. 145–6, 148 n. 35). Taretto (2017, pp. 26–8) suggests that Potamon claimed Pindaric heritage through his father and that stories connecting Olympichus and Pindar circulated long before Aristodemus. This is an intriguing hypothesis although no direct evidence for a link between the historical Olympichus, father of Potamon, and

¹Σ P. 3.138 and 139 attribute the shrine to the Mother of the gods, whom they identify with Rhea, and Pan. According to the Vita Ambrosiana it was dedicated to Pan and Demeter, according to Pausanias 9.25.3 to Dindymene.

²In ll. 8–21 of the dithyramb the mother of gods appears accompanied by sound and lightning.
Chapter 9. Commentary

Pindar exists. Regardless of its actual historicity, a Theban aulete by the name of Olympichus active in the fifth century was certainly well suited to be connected with Pindar in later times because of the name’s connotations with Olympia and indirectly also with epinician poetry.

Μητρὸς θεῶν: While Aristodemus refers to the deity as Mother of the gods other scholia on this episode identify her by name with Rhea (Σ P.3.138 and 139).

κατὰ τὸ ὄρος: According to Petridou (2016, p. 213) the mountain in question is Mount Helicon, but there is nothing in the fragment to support this identification.

καὶ Πανὸς ἄγαλμα: Drachmann finds the reference to Pan, which is omitted in the Paris Recension (CP), suspect. Aristodemus’ story primarily concerns the Mother of the gods, and it is possible that an earlier variant of the anecdote did not concern Pan at all and that either Aristodemus or the scholiast later added Pan to explain Pindar’s mentioning both in the ode.

Chaeris Fr. 1, Asclepiades Fr. 7

In Pythian 4.9–11, Pindar refers to the immortal mouth of Medea:

καὶ τὸ Μηδείας ἔπος ἀγκομίσαι
ἐβδόμῳ καὶ σὺν δεκάτῳ γενεᾷ Θήραιον, Αἰήτα τό ποτε ζαμενὴς
παῖς ἀπέπνευσ᾿ ἀθανάτου στόματος,
δέσποινα Κόλχων.

To fulfil in the seventeenth generation that word spoken on Thera by Medea, which the high-spirited daughter of Aeetes and queen of the Colchians had once breathed forth from her immortal mouth.

According to Braswell (1988, p. 76), Pindar’s use of the adjective athanatos implies that Medea is a goddess and agrees with the Corinthian tradition that Medea was originally a goddess. The scholia preserve two interpretations attributed to the Hellenistic scholars Chaeris and Asclepiades. Although Villagra Hidalgo (2014, pp. 249–250) has suggested that the latter should be identified with Asclepiades of Tragilus – since Medea is present in tragedy and this scholar could have referred to Pythian 4 in a discussion of her in his Tragodoumena – but as Asclepiades engages directly with Pindar’s wording, it seems most likely that it comes from a work on Pindar, which speaks in favour of attributing the fragment to Asclepiades of Myrlea, as does Pagani (2006).

Chaeris believed that by calling Medea’s mouth immortal, Pindar was referring to the heroine herself as such, i. e. as a goddess. Furthermore, Chaeris recognizes the trope of part (the mouth) for the whole (Medea). Alexandrian
Asclepiades Fr. 8

scholars such as Aristarchus knew this trope which they commonly referred to as (τὸ ὅλον) ἀπὸ μέρους (Schironi, 2018, pp. 142–144). Chaeris variant ἐκ μέρους is comparatively rare but, in the Pindar scholia, can also be found in Σ P. 5.35c, διὰ δὲ τῆς Κασταλίας ἐκ μέρους τὴν Πυθώ δεδήλωσεν “By Castalia Pindar has indicated Pytho by the part”. Chaeris backs up his argument by referring to Hesiod’s Theogony. This work does not explicitly call Medea immortal or divine, but implies her divinity; in lines 956–62 Medea is said to be a descendant of Helius and Oceanus; in lines 992–996 Medea and Jason are included in the catalogue of goddesses who had children with mortal men.¹

Asclepiades, on the other hand, believed that Medea’s immortal mouth was a reference to her prophetic powers. This interpretation can be explained as prompted by an aversion to seeing Medea as a goddess, as well as by the Pindaric context itself, since the passage introduces Medea’s prophecy on the founding of Cyrene. It is also possible that Asclepiades’ interpretation was influenced by the attribute zamenēs given to Medea in line 10.²

τῆς Μηδείας· εἶπεν: This phrase is not found in the Paris recension (CP). Possibly, a scribe found the phrase superfluous or ungrammatical and omitted it. The pre-Drachmann editors Heyne and Boeckh have ἀθάνατον στόμα τῆς Μηδείας εἶπεν, but this has no manuscript support. Although the general meaning of Chaeris’ fragment is clear, it is not obvious how τῆς Μηδείας is syntactically connected to the rest of the scholion. I interpret it as a possessive genitive referring to the lemma and have therefore inserted a raised dot after τῆς Μηδείας.

ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ: B omits Chaeris’ reference to ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ on the immortality of Medea. Grandolini (1984) suggested that the scribe of B omitted this since he could not find an explicit reference to Medea’s immortality in the Theogony. This is more probable than a medieval scholiast inserting the explicit reference in other manuscript traditions.

Asclepiades Fr. 8

Like several other scholia, Σ P. 4.36c discusses why it is Euphemus, king of Tuenarus and the Argo’s próreus, “bowsman”, who receives the clod of earth, a symbol of the future founding of Cyrene by his descendants, from the god Triton, in the shape of Eurypylus, at Lake Tritonis.

¹Hellenistic acquaintance with the tradition of Medea’s immortality is also seen in the scholia on Euripides’ Medea 10 (Dindorf). According to the scholiast, Musaeus mentioned the immortality of Medea in his work Peri Isthmiōn (FGrH 455 Fr. 1).

²This is often translated as “inspired” or “prophetic”, cf. Maslov (2015, p. 195) and Kampakoglou (2019, p. 369). Yet, as shown by Braswell (1980, p. 187), its original Pindaric meaning was “strong” or “mighty”.
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He said that he was Eurypylus, son of the immortal Holder and Shaker of the Earth, and he recognized that we were in a hurry. He immediately picked up some earth in his right hand and sought to give it as a makeshift guest-gift.

Modern scholars argue that Pindar included the episode between Triton/Eurypylus and Euphemus because the laudandus, king Arcesilaus of Cyrene, traced his ancestry to Euphemus. The ancients did not consider this explanation but argued instead that Euphemus received the gift either because of kinship with Triton/Eurypylus or because of his position as prōreus.

Fr. 8 and 9 both concern Euphemus and without doubt derive from the same original context. In comparison with Asclepiades Fr. 7, they engage less directly with the text of Pindar. They do not discuss specific words used by Pindar but the motif of Euphemus receiving the clod of earth from Eurypylus. Although this is first attested in Pindar’s Pythian 4, it is also found in the fourth book of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica. The original context may therefore have been a commentary on Pindar or on Apollonius Rhodius or simply a general work on mythology. If it comes from a commentary, an identification with Asclepiades of Myrlea is probable; in the case of a mythological work, an identification with Asclepiades Tragilus is also possible. Modern scholarship commonly identifies this Asclepiades as the one from Myrlea (Adler 1914, pp. 41–42; Schwartz 1960, p. 23; D’Alessio 2005, p. 177).

As seen in Fr. 9, Asclepiades did not find the kinship with Triton/Eurypylus to be a sufficient reason for the selection of Euphemus. Here he quotes a fragment from Hesiod’s Megalai Ehoiai (Hes. Fr. 253 M-W). Since Pindar himself stated that Euphemus is the son of Poseidon, Asclepiades can hardly have quoted it only for its genealogical information on Euphemus’ father. He might have quoted it as an alternative genealogy because it differs from Pindar who says that Euphemus is the son of Europa, Tityus’ daughter. This would

\[\text{Cf. e.g. Braswell (1988, pp. 88–90) and Jackson (1987, p. 26, n. 14).}\]

\[\text{Cf. section 3.9 for further discussion of the identification of Asclepiades in the Pindar scholia.}\]

\[\text{Cf. P. 4.46 τὸν τοῦ \textit{Euρώπα Τίτυος θυγάτηρ τίκτε \textit{Καφισοῦ παρ᾽ ὄχθαις, “whom Europa, Tityus’ daughter gave birth to on the banks of Caphisus.”}\]
however make little sense in solving the problem. Since Asclepiades did not find the argument of kinship to be sufficient it is possible, as suggested by D’Alessio (2005, p. 197), that Asclepiades did not quote the fragment only for its genealogical information. Hesiod may have mentioned Euphemus and the Libyan episode in the Megalai Ehoiai. Asclepiades may have referred to this fragment as a source of the Libyan episode and Euphemus’ role in it. If this interpretation is correct, the same fragment was also referred to in Asclepiad’s Fr. 9.

Εὔφημος καταβάς: In the manuscripts of the abbreviated Vatican recension (DEGHQVI), the text is found in two very similar versions that differ in the following respects. The version common to all recensions, X\textsuperscript{a} in the apparatus, is part of a longer scholion following the lemma Τριτωνίδος λίμνης. The second version, X\textsuperscript{b} of the abbreviated Vatican recension, is instead an independent scholion on the lemma πρώραθεν Εὔφημος καταβάς. X\textsuperscript{b} does not include the Hesiodic fragment quoted by Asclepiades. I have here chosen to print the lemma of X\textsuperscript{b} and otherwise follow the text of X\textsuperscript{a}.

οἱ μὲν φασὶ ὅτι πρῷρευς ἦν: The πρῷρευς, “bowsman”, was responsible for looking out for dangers such as underwater rocks. His function was of utmost importance and he would generally be second in rank to the steersman (Morton, 2001, p. 72).

οἱ δὲ διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν: Ancient scholars appear to have preferred this argument. It is also found in scholia on Apollonius Rhodius (Σ 4.1562–63a).

ὁ δὲ Ἀσκληπιάδης τὰ ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις Ἡοίαις παρατίθεται: In the Pindar scholia, παρατίθεται is the common verb used when quoting a literary source as evidence. It is used not only for quotations of poetry but also of works by authors we would call historians (e.g. Timaeus FGrH 566 Fr. 97) in Σ O. 6.158c). Schwartz (1960), attributing the fragment to Asclepiades of Myrlea, who possibly was connected to Pergamum, although this is uncertain,\textsuperscript{2} argued that the Megalai Ehoiai was the title used by Pergamene scholars for the work known to Alexandrian scholars as Catalogue of Women. The later compilers of the Pindar scholia were not aware of this distinction and believed that the two titles referred to two different poems (Schwartz, 1960, p. 23). D’Alessio (2005) has however shown that it is improbable that the compilers did not have direct knowledge of the poem(s) and that there are important differences between them, making it probable that the terms refer to two independent works.

\textsuperscript{1}Cf. commentary Fr. 9 for further discussion on Hesiod’s possible treatment of the myth.

\textsuperscript{2}Cf. section 3.9.
Ammonius Fr. 3

Medea’s prophecy on the colonization of Cyrene in *Pythian* 4 relates how the Argonauts carried Argo through the Libyan desert and encountered Triton in the shape of Eurypylus.

The token which Euphamus once received at the outflow of Lake Tritonis, when he descended from the prow and accepted earth proffered as a guest-present by a god in the guise of a man —- and father Zeus, son of Cronus, pealed for him an auspicious thunderclap —- when he came upon us hanging the bronze-jawed anchor, swift Argo’s bridle, against the ship. Before that, we had drawn up the sea-faring bark from Oceanus in accordance with my instructions, and for twelve days had been carrying it across desolate stretches of land.

The scholion 44b mentions the views of two ancient scholars: Didymus Fr. 25 Braswell on the function of Medea’s prophecy within *Pythian* 4, and Ammonius on Medea’s inclusion of herself in the narrative on the Libyan episode.

Didymus noted that Medea recalls to the Argonauts in detail what they have all experienced and know very well. It is thus not proper, within the plot, for Medea to narrate this. Among Hellenistic scholars it was common practice to athetesize Homeric lines on account of impropriety but Didymus did not see this as an alternative for *Pythian* 4. Instead he argued that Pindar added this to Medea’s prophecy in order to create a marvellous effect on the audience (Mazzotti, 2003, pp. 82–83).

Ammonius commented that Medea included herself in the narrative, presumably by using first person plural verbs (φέρομεν) and pronouns (μήδεσιν ... ἀμοῖς), because the Argonauts decided to escape the Oceanus. A γὰρ-clause...
Chaeris Fr. 2

explains what Medea suggested, namely to disembark the ship and sail through the Adriatic sea. More problematic is τοῦτο δὲ ... εἰς τὴν Τριτωνίδα. If the conjecture ταὐτὸν is correct, Ammonius says here that Medea’s advice is equivalent to carrying the ship. In Medea’s prophecy Ammonius would have noted the Argonauts “having drawn up” (ἀνσπάσσαντες, P. 4.27) the ship in accordance with her advice, although Pindar does not explicitly attribute carrying of the ship to Lake Tritonis to her instructions. With the emendation ταὐτὸν, Ammonius is simply drawing out information implicit in the story. With the manuscript reading, Ammonius (or an anonymous scholiast) is describing the route through the Adriatic as contrary to conveying the ship overland through Libya to Lake Tritonis. Thus the final clause begun with the adversative ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον reduces Medea’s role and has to be attributed to the writer of the scholiion and not to Ammonius. Since on their return from Colchis in Pythian 4 the Argonauts pass the world-encircling river Oceanus, probably imagined to be connected to Colchis via the river Phasis, and the Red sea, they would have reached Libya from the south-east (Zahrnt, 2012, p. 82).

τὸ ταῖς αὐτῆς: The reading of B. All the other manuscripts replace the independent genitive αὐτῆς by κατ(α) + genitive or accusative. While B has τὸ ταῖς, also found in the τὸ ταῖς κατὰ of C, most manuscripts of the abbreviated Vatican recension have τὸ τὰ κατὰ. Although the textual history is complex I have here chosen to print the text of B, which is obviously more correct Greek.

διὰ τοῦ ᾿Αδρίου: The Adriatic could in pre-Roman times be understood as even including the Ionian sea (Cary and Murray, 2012). In Apollonius Rhodius the Argonauts in fact reach the Adriatic Sea westwards travelling westwards from Colchis over the Black Sea and the Ister (Donau), coming thereafter to Libya from the north. This can hardly have been Ammonius’ opinion since he accepted their entering Libya from the Oceanus.

Chaeris Fr. 2

Scholion P. 4.61a offers an alternative reading of P. 4.35. Snell-Maehler’s edition of verses 34–35 reads:

δὲν δ’ εὐθὺς ἁρπάξας ἀρούρας
dεχιτερὰ προτυχὸν ξένιον μάστευσε δοῦναι.

1The conjecture was suggested by Dr. Eric Cullhed at my final seminar.
2P. 4. 251 ἐν τ’ ῾Οκεανοῦ πελάγεσσι μίγεν πόντῳ τ’ ἐρυθρῷ “And they came upon Oceanus’ waters and the Read Sea”.
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He immediately picked up some earth in his right hand and sought to give it as a makeshift guest-gift.

According to the scholiast, Chaeris defended the reading προτυχών, which is found in the Pindar text of B and C.¹

The Greek alphabets in use during Pindar’s lifetime probably did not distinguish the long and short o-sounds of Ο and Ω using Ο for both. This, and the problems it might have caused during the transcription into the new Ionic alphabet were known to the Alexandrians and may have influenced Chaeris’ editorial decisions.²

Χαῖρις: All manuscripts have either Χάρης or χάρις. Χαῖρις is first found in Callierges’ edition. Probably noting the many other fragments of Chaeris on Pythian 4, he emended the manuscript readings into Χαῖρις. The names Χαῖρις and Χάρης are known to have been confused during textual transmission (Berndt, 1902). Because of the many other references to Chaeris in the scholia on Pythian 4, this conjecture is acceptable.

ἵν’ ἂν αναρπάσας δὲ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς ἀρούρης τὸ παρατυχὸν ξένιον ἔδωκεν· ὥπερ ἦν ἡ βῶλος: Calvani (2012, p. 152) argues that the paraphrase derives from Chaeris because of the ἵν’ ἂν which is found in several other fragments of Chaeris (Frs. 4–6). It is however a standard introductory phrase for paraphrases and is typical of the Pindar scholia.³

Asclepiades Fr. 9

As in Fr. 8, Asclepiades is here quoted in a discussion about the reasons for singling out Euphemus among the Argonauts as the one to receive the clod of earth from Eurypylus/Triton.

In most manuscripts this scholion follows Σ P: 4.61a without any obvious division between the two scholia. In B, where 61a is omitted, the scholion follows the lemma Δεχιτέρᾳ προτυχόν. I have here chosen to print this lemma in order to differentiate between them.

Asclepiades appears to criticize the view that Euphemus received the clod only because of kinship with Triton and Eurypylus via their common ancestor Poseidon. According to Asclepiades, this does not suffice as the sole reason, given that other descendants of Poseidon, namely Periclymenus, Erginus and Ancaeus, were also among the Argonauts. While we do not know Asclepiades’ exact position on this question, we do know that he quoted Hesiod’s genealogy

¹The original reading has in both manuscripts subsequently been corrected to προτυχών.
²Cf. section 4.4.1.
³A query for ἵν’ ἂν at the query interface of the TLG returns 97 hits within the ancient scholia on Pindar.
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of Euphemus in the *Megalai Ehoiai*, as seen in Asclepiades Fr. 8, and that he argued that Euphemus had received the gift of passing over water unharmed.

At least since Jacoby in his commentary on *FGrH* 470 Fr. 2, most commentators assume the subject of φησὶ to be Apollonius Rhodius, who refers to Euphemus’ walking on water in *Argonautica* 1.182–4. If we take αὐτὸς as Apollonius Rhodius we must accept that all explicit references to Apollonius disappeared during textual transmission.

The twelfth-century Byzantine scholar John Tzetzes, who knew the fragments of Asclepiades from the Pindar scholia instead understands Asclepiades as the subject in his two quotations of the fragment. This is the more natural interpretation of the Greek as Apollonius can hardly be intuitively supplied as the subject of φησὶ.

If we accept the text as it stands, φησὶ γοῦν ... διὰ γῆς is either an answer to the preceding question (τί οὖν οὕτως εἰλήφετο τούτων;), or a piece of antiquarian information. In the former case, Asclepiades may have argued that Euphemus was singled out among Poseidon’s descendants due to his gift of walking on water.

The source of Asclepiades’ information on Euphemus’ water-walking ability, might have been Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica*, but it is equally probable that Hesiod’s *Megalai Ehoiai* was the source, although no surviving fragments of the work attest to it. Asclepiades Fr. 8 quotes Fr. 253 M-W on Euphemus’ parentage while discussing the reasons for his receiving the clod of earth. Since Euphemus’ relationship to Poseidon is stated in Pindar (P. 4.46 and 173–174), this information would not have influenced Asclepiades’ argument. From Fr. 9 we also know that Asclepiades did not accept Euphemus’ parentage as a sufficient reason for receiving the earth clod. It is therefore probable that Asclepiades quoted the *Megalai Ehoiai* not only for information on Euphemus’ origins, but also for his ability to walk on water and, possibly, for his part in the Libyan expedition (D’Alessio, 2005, pp. 196–197).

In any case, the αὐτὸς most probably refers to Asclepiades himself, who was citing either Apollonius Rhodius or Hesiod and added the information that Euphemus was able to walk on water, a fact not mentioned by Pindar. Within Asclepiades’ argument this was probably a part of the explanation of why Euphemus was singled out among the Argonauts.

The scholion refers to the historian Theotimus, but this reference probably does not derive from Asclepiades. Rather, its source may be Didymus who also quotes Theotimus (*FGrH* 470 Fr. 1) in scholia on *Pythian* 5.

---

1 Ασκληπιάδης φησὶ δῶρον ἔχειν παρὰ Ποσειδῶνος τὴν θάλασσαν ἀπημάντως ὡς διὰ γῆς πορεύεται (Tzetzes Σ. Λυχ. Αλεξ. 886). Ασκληπιάδης δε φησὶ τούτου ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος ἔχειν δῶρον τὴν θάλασσαν ὁδεύειν ἄνευ βλάβης, καθὼς καὶ τὸν Θρίωνα ὄσπερ τις γῆν ὁδεύει (Historiae 2.43).
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Εὔφημος κυβερνήτης ἦν καὶ πρῳρεὺς: The κυβερνήτης, or steersman, was a ship’s pilot, positioned in the stern, whereas the πρῳρεὺς was standing in the bow (Morton, 2001, p. 72). Since Euphemus would not have been able to hold these functions simultaneously Drachmann supplemented <μὴ> πρῳρεὺς. It is however possible that Euphemus was promoted to κυβερνέτης after the death of Argo’s original steersman, Tiphys (Vater, 1849, p. 24).1

Ammonius Fr. 4

The scholion concerns the interpretation of the adjective κελαινεφής, “with dark clouds”, used by Pindar to describe the plains of Cyrene in Pythian 4.50–53.

νῦν γε μὲν ἀλλοδαπᾶν κριτὸν εὑρήσει γυναικῶν ἐν λέχεσιν γένος, οἵ κεν τάνδε σὺν τιμᾷ θεῶν νάσον ἐλθόντες τέκωνται φῶτα κελαινεφέων πεδίων δεσπόταν·

Now, however, he will find in the beds of foreign women a chosen race, who will come honored by the gods to this island and beget a man to be ruler of the plains with dark clouds.

The interpretations of κελαινεφής transmitted in the scholia explain the adjective as a reference to either the fertility and persistent rainfall around Cyrene or the size of the plains around the city.

As a scholar in Alexandria, Ammonius would have some knowledge of the topography of Cyrene. Many important Alexandrian scholars, including Callimachus and Eratosthenes, were originally from Cyrene and the city belonged to the Ptolemaic kingdom for a major part of its existence.

Ammonius apparently adhered to the view that κελαινεφής refers to Cyrene’s fertility, and adds that in Libya, clouds are only found around Cyrene. Cyrene was well known for its rainfall in antiquity (Braswell, 1988, pp. 132–133), but Ammonius’ remark also reflects the fact that Cyrene lies in a valley of the Jebel Akhdhar, “Green Mountains”. Rain-clouds from the Mediterranean are not able to pass these mountains and the rest of Libya receives little rain and primarily consists of desert (Austin, 2008, p. 187).

παρὰ τὴν άλλην Λιβύην: The expression is best understood as a comparison, “in comparison to the rest of Libya” (LSJ C. I. 7).

ἀποσκοτοῦσθαι: The reading is found only in B. The text of B is generally problematic but occasionally offers better readings. All other manuscripts have ἀποσκεῖσθαι, “look steadily, keep watch”. This does however not make

1Historically the πρῷευς was often promoted to κυβερνῆς (Morton, 2001, p. 72).
much sense in the context, where ἀποσκοτοῦσθαι, “to be darkened, blinded” is preferable.

As Jason returns to Iolcus after a life in exile, Pindar lets the assembled citizens, unaware of his identity, compare him to a series of divinities and giants (P. 4.87–92).

Οὐ τί που οὗτος Ἀπόλλων, σοῦδέ μὰν χαλκάρματός ἐστι τόσις Ἄφροδίτης: ἐν δὲ Νάξῳ φαντὶ θυνεῖν λυπαρὰ Ἰφιμεδείας παῖδας, Ὄτον καὶ σέ, τολμάεις Ἐπιάλτα ἄναξ.

καὶ μὰν Τιτυὸν βέλος Ἀρτέμιδος θήρευσε κραιπνόν, ἐξ ἀνικάτου φαρέτρας ὀρνύμενον, ὥρα τις τάν ἐν δυνατῷ φαλοτάτων ἐπιφανεῖν ἔραται.

He surely is not Apollo, nor certainly is he Aphrodite’s husband of the bronze chariot; and they say that in shining Naxus Iphimedea’s sons died, Otus and you, bold king Ephialtes; and certainly Artemis’ swift arrow hunted down Tityus, as it sped from her invincible quiver, warning a person to desire to attain loves within his power.

The ancient scholars praised the comparison of Jason to divinities but were critical of the additional comparisons with the giant brothers Ephialtes and Otus, the Aloadae. Chaeris accordingly criticizes Pindar for suggesting them as a possible identification of Jason made by the citizens of Iolcus. Chaeris’ point of criticism, also found in the anonymous scholiast in Σ 4.160a-b, is even more critical of the comparison with Tityus (Cannatà Fera, 2019).

ἀκύρως δὲ τὸν Τιτυὸν ἐνταῦθα παρατίθησι τερατώδη ὄντα καὶ ἄλλως ἁσεβῆ. b. ἄλλως: ὁ μὲν Τιτυὸς μέγας ἦν, καλὸς δὲ οὐ.

He adds Tityus improperly, for he was of a monstrous body and in other ways sacrilegious. Alternatively: Tityus was big, but not good.

οἱ Ἁλωεῖδαι: The Aloadae were the giant sons of Iphimedea and Poseidon. While hunting on Naxis, Artemis took the shape of a deer. Aiming for the Artemis-deer the Aloadae instead shot and killed each other, as told by Pindar in P. 4.88 and by Apollodorus Bibliotheca 1.7.4. ὅτι δὲ εὐφρενίς ἦν ὁ Ἰάσων, δήλον ἐκ τοῦ καὶ τῆς Ἱεραν κατὰ τινας αὐτῶς ἐπιμανήνας: The source of this information is unknown. Jason is however strongly favoured by Hera in Apollonius Rhodius’ Argonautica.
Chaeris Fr. 4

The scholia attribute to Chaeris the ἀρχὰν ἀγκομίζων of Pindar’s οἴκαδ’ ἀρχαίαν κομίζων (P. 4.106). This reading has been adopted by some modern editors, such as Gildersleeve (1885), who read ἀρχάν ἄγκομίζων, but it is not found in Snell and Maehler’s edition. The reading is described as “paléographiquement admissible, mais inutile” by Irigoin (1952, p. 58) and “unnecessary” by Braswell (1988, p. 197).

Texts of lyric poetry available in Alexandria would generally be written in scriptio continua without word-division. The sequence ΑΡΧΑΙΑΝΚΟΜΙΖΩΝ would have appeared very similar to Chaeris’ suggestion ΑΡΧΑΝΑΓΚΟΜΙΖΩΝ. It is therefore not surprising that Chaeris’ text came into existence, either out of scribal error or philological ingenuity. It is possible that Chaeris had access to a textual witness where the latter reading was found, but there are no traces of such a variant in the medieval textual tradition of Pindar.¹ Chaeris’ preference of this reading might have been based on his own views of correct Pindaric syntax. As Braswell (1988, p. 197) implies, Chaeris might have thought that a simple κομίζω without prefix could not have the meaning “recover”. As seen in Fr. 9, Chaeris followed the Aristarchean principle of textually internal interpretation. Even though Pindar on several occasions uses κομίζω, it is possible that the occurrence of ἀνακομίζω in Pythian 4.9 Μηδείας ἔπος ἀγκομίσαι, “to fulfil that word by Medea”, may have influenced his decision.

ἄγκομιζων: This is the reading in most manuscripts. B adds πατρὸς ἐμοῦ after ἄγκομιζων, thus quoting a longer part of Pindar’s text. This was perhaps added in order to clarify the variant’s meaning and its position within Pindar’s text. E has the reading ἄγκομιζων, a verb not attested elsewhere, which must be a scribal error.

Chaeris Fr. 5

The text of Pythian 4.109–110 in Snell-Maehler’s edition reads:

πεύθομαι γάρ νιν Πελίαν ἄθεμιν λευκαῖς πιθήσαντα φρασίν ἀμετέρων ἀποσυλᾶσαι βιαίως ἀρχεδικῶν τοκέων

For I am told that lawless Pelias gave in to his white wits and usurped it by force from my justly ruling parents.

¹Unfortunately there are no papyri on this part of Pythian 4. Cf. section 4.4.1 for Alexandrian scholars and word-division.
The scholiast records the reading by Chaeris, identical to that of the medieval paradigm accepted by Snell-Maehler. Chaeris preferred the accentuation ἀρχεδικάς, “justly ruling”, but also recorded the alternative ἀρχεδίκας, “ancient right”.

According to Braswell (1988, pp. 200-202) the variants in accentuation and interpretation of ἀρχεδίκας/δικῶν within this scholion derive from uncertainty over the meaning of the hapax legomenon ἀρχεδίκας.¹

We may note that Chaeris offers one text with two possible accentuations, of which he preferred the former ἀρχεδικάς. By doing so he acknowledges two homographs and makes a decision among them. Chaeris is here following the example of Aristarchus who often used accents to decide among homographs (Schironi, 2018, pp. 111–113).

The anonymous scholiast criticizes Chaeris’ reading and instead suggests the reading ἁμετέραν ἀρχεδικάς and that the possessive pronoun ἁμετέραν refers to an ἁρχή implicit from the ἁρχαίαν in P. 4.105–6. The participle μεταγράφων, “copy, transcribe” suggests that Chaeris’ reading was a conjecture from the perspective of the anonymous scholiast and ἁμετέραν the original reading.

βιάζεται δὲ μεταγράφων: This parenthetic utterance was put in brackets by Drachmann, possibly believing it to be a later addition to the scholion. Since it is only omitted in B, which also omits problematic passages on other occasions,² it is more probable that it disappeared at a late date from the tradition of B.

The subject of βιάζεται is probably Chaeris and μεταγράφων is here, as in Σ P. 4.445c, used in the sense “change a text”. The reading criticized is probably Chaeris’ ἁμετέραν, instead of the scholiast’s preferred ἁμετέραν, rather than Chaeris’ accentuation of ἀρχεδικάς, since the scholiast agrees with it.³ The expression βιάζεται μεταγράφων does not appear to be attested elsewhere in Greek literature⁴ but μιαζεσθαι γραφήν is used by the twelfth-century scholar Eustathius (Comm. Il. 3.738.13–18 van der Valk) on Il. 15.336 regarding Zenodotus’ treatment of the Homeric text. Zenodotus had argued that Oileus (father of Ajax the Lesser) was really called Illeus and that the prefixed omicron was the definite article. Here is also the expression κακουργεῖ μεταγράφων found .

---
¹ Similar information is also given by cf. Σ 195b ἀρχεδικάς ἐὰν περισπωμένως, τῶν δικαίων βασιλέων· ἐὰν δὲ βαρυτόνως ἀρχεδικάς, ἀρχεδικήν, ἐὰν δὲ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς βασιλείαν, τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς βασιλείαν, "if archedikân with circumflex, 'the righteous kings'. But if archedíkan with acute on the paenultima, archedìken the sense is: 'the original kingdom, which they held with right".
² Cf. Chaeris Fr. 1 on the omission of the reference to Hesiod’s Theogony.
³ Cf. section 4.4.1 for accentuation within Hellenistic scholarship.
⁴ A proximity-search in TLG for μεταγράφω and βιάζω within a distance of 10 words did only return this passage.
That some pronounce Oeleus without the initial omicron, has already been shown. The ancient (scholia, cf. Σ II. 15.336d) say that Stesichorus and Hesiod know this pronunciation. Zenodotus follows them and does violence to the Homeric text everywhere. Therefore in “and neither did the great-hearted Locrians follow the son of Oileus” (II. 15.336) and such verses he is wrong in his transcription and reproduces derivations from Oileus without omicron.

The meaning of βιάζω in the context of transcribing or changing texts is obviously to make violence to the text by altering it in an incorrect way.

Chaeris Fr. 6

According to the scholia, Chaeris read Π. 4.145 as αφίσταιν·, i.e. an optative. The reading is found in the Pindar text of manuscript Π, but remaining manuscripts have the indicative. Chaeris’ reading was adopted by Callierges in his edition of Pindar and is accepted by Snell-Maehler but many modern scholars, including Irigoin (1952, p. 58) and Braswell (1988, pp. 229–230) are critical to it. According to Braswell (1988, p. 230), Chaeris interpreted the Pindaric phrase as what we would refer to “as a future less vivid condition”.

Ammonius Fr. 5, Chaeris Fr. 7

In Pythian 4.176–177 Pindar includes Orpheus among the Argonauts.
And from Apollo came the father of songs, the widely praised minstrel Orpheus.

The scholion mentions different views on how to interpret ἐξ Ὄπολις, “from Apollo”. It appears that for both Ammonius and Chaeris the normal sense of the expression was “son of Apollo”. Chaeris understood Orpheus to be Apollo’s actual son, but Ammonius believed it to be a metaphor for Orpheus as a lyre-player of Apollo.

The reasons for Ammonius’ metaphorical interpretation lie in the fact that Pindar himself refers to Orpheus as son of Oeagreus of Thrace. According to the scholiast, Ammonius wished to keep Pindar’s historia, the mythological and historical background, consistent and therefore resorted to a metaphorical interpretation. The wish to avoid inconsistencies is a striking trait in Aristarchus’ work on Homer (Schenkeveld, 1970, pp. 163–170). Aristarchus’ solution to such problems was in the first place to athetize a line. Metaphorical interpretation as a solution to such problems is less typical for Aristarchus, and is even referred to as “Stoic fashion” by Asirvatham (2014). Metaphors and figurative language were however not foreign to Aristarchus, who interpreted Homer and other authors, such as Pindar, both literally and figuratively. In fact, Aristarchus had no objections to allegory in the sense of figurative language, but did not accept interpretation in the form of “extratextual allegoresis, not justified by the text or by the narrative” (Schironi, 2018, p. 142).

Ammonius supports his argument by quoting Hesiod’s Theogony, where it is said that men become singers by “the grace of the Muses and Apollo”.

Chaeris, on the other hand, preferred a literal understanding of ἐξ Ὄπολις as “son of Apollo”. According to him, the expression means that Orpheus is actually the son of Apollo. As evidence for this opinion Chaeris quotes an oracle found in Menaechmus’ Pythikon (FGrH 131 Fr. 2), which says that Orpheus is Apollo’s son.

At the end of the scholion we also find the testimony of Asclepiades of Tragilus (FGrH 12 Fr. 6a) who in his Tragodoumena said that Orpheus, as well as Hymenaeus and Ialemus, were Apollo’s sons. Although it is not explicitly stated, it is possible that Chaeris is the source of this fragment as well.

Chaeris Fr. 8

Chaeris here comments that the Pindaric word Πελιαοφόνος (P. 4.250) is not a compound but two independent words.

1 Maehler reconstructs the source text as a thrēnos, Fr. 128c.

2 Cf. section 4.2 for further discussion of Aristarchus’ and the Alexandrian’s approach to interpreting literature.
Braswell (1980) argues that γίνεται δὲ τοιαύτη σύνθεσις, ὡς μεταβάλλεσθαι τὸν τόνον is Chaeris’ argument for rejecting the compound on accentual grounds. There is however no obvious connection between Chaeris’ view on the status as a compound and the accent. Rather, it is a comment by the anonymous scholiast, who states that the compound is such that the accentuation is variable, i.e. that the compound had several possible accentuations with different meanings. This is exemplified by Didymus’ alternatives πελιαοφόνον and πελιαοφόνον.¹

Chaeris does not explicitly state his reasons for rejecting the compound. A conspicuous feature of the compound is that the first component, the personal name Pelias, has a form identical to that of the genitive case of the name. Although Braswell (1980) has defended the compound by suggesting that Peliao- is not a genitive but a reinterpreted stem Peilia- with an added Bindevokal, it would not be surprising if Chaeris interpreted the first member of the compound as a genitive. Chaeris may not have accepted a genitive as the first part of a compound which would be an untypical trait in Greek.²

Chaeris Fr. 9

This fragment reports Chaeris’ conjecture ἔν ποτε for the ἄν ποτε (P. 4.258) and defends it as in accordance with Pindar’s customary usage. The reference to Pindar’s customary usage strongly suggests that Chaeris here was following the principle of interpreting Pindar form Pindar.³ The usage referred to by Chaeris is the use ἐν + accusative to express direction (ἐν . . . Καλλίσταν). This Doric trait of Pindar’s language is also found e.g. in P. 2.11, ἐν εἷς ἄρματα πεισχάλινα, “to the polished car”.

Agestratus Fr. 1

Agestratus here takes a stance on the problem of the identification of the Ephyra referred to in Pythian 10.55–59

ἐλπομαι δ’ Ἑφυραίων
δι’ ἀμφὶ Πηνεῖον γλυκεῖαν προχεόντων ἔμαν

¹It may be noted that these go against the accentual theory, known from Herodian De Prosodia Catholica) 234.29–235.18 Lentz, that verbal compounds are paroxytonic if the verbal component has an active sense and proparoxytonic if the verbal adjective is passive, as in the pair καρατόμος, “head-cutting” and καράτομος, “beheaded”.

²“Far from forming systematic categories, Greek compounds with inflected [First Component] are exceptional cases, and their syntactic origin (however remote) is easy to prove” (Tribulato, 2015, p. 19).

³Cf. section 4.2.1.
Theon Fr. 2

τὸν ῾Ιπποκλέαν ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον σὺν ἀοιδαῖς
ἕκατι στεφάνων θαητὸν ἐν ἅλιξι θησέμεν ἐν καὶ παλαιτέροις,
νέασιν τε παρθένοισι μέλημα.

I hope, when the Ephyraeans
pour forth my sweet voice beside the Peneus, that with my songs I
may make Hippocleas
even more splendid for his crowns in the eyes of his comrades and
his elders,
and the darling of unmarried girls.

Agestratus argues that Ephyra refers to Corinth and defends this position
with a literary parallel from Homer. The scholia on Nemean 7 mention the
different uses of Ephyra, and state that there are in fact four Ephyra, including
the original name of Corinth (Σ N. 7.53). Using this interpretation of Ephyra,
Agestratus argues that Pindar was hoping for the laudandum to win also at the
Isthmian games, which the anonymous scholiast criticizes. It may be noted
that Agestratus here understands Pindar’s prayer as an actual wish for future victories, rather than as a reference to the present victory as does most modern scholarship, which instead tends to see an example of the “encomiastic future”, a future which refers to a present action, i. e. the choral celebration itself (Hubbard, 1995, pp. 42–45).¹

Theon Fr. 2

POxy 2536 was discovered in Oxyrhynchus and published in 1966 by E. G.
Turner (1966). It is dated to the second century CE and contains the lower parts
of two columns at the end of a roll. The end title Θέω[ος] τοῦ Ἀρτεμιδώρου
Πινδάρου Πυτιονικῶν ῾Υπόμημα describes the work as the commentary on
the Pythians by Theon. The discovery of this papyrus proved conclusively
that Theon indeed worked on Pindar, a question which had been the subject
of much discussion.² The title only gives evidence of a commentary on the
Pythians. Comments by Theon on the Olympians and the Paeans (Frs. 1 and 3)
suggest that his work on Pindar also encompassed these books, but probably
in independent rolls. That our present papyrus only contains comments on the
Pythians may be explained by the fact that a single papyrus roll would typically
only contain a hypomnēma on one book (Hartog, 2017, p. 106). The surviving

¹Several commentaries from the 19th century as well as more recent ones (Miller, 1991)
follow the variant suggestion of the anonymous scholiast that the prayer refers to an Olympian
victory, rather than an Isthmian.
²Cf. section 3.16.
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columns contain comments on P. 12.14–32. Despite the title the papyrus can hardly be a verbatim copy of Theon’s work but rather consists of excerpts from Theon’s commentary which were written down by several hands. According to Turner (1966) the papyrus is written by three hands. The first hand wrote col. i 1–26, a second hand added two marginal annotations and a third hand wrote col. i 27–30 and the second column. Ucciardello (2012, pp. 120–121) argues that the second and third hands are the same.

The beginning of the commentary on Pythian 12 as well as the upper parts of the surviving columns and the left hand side of the first column have been lost. Comparison with the surviving scholia on the ode lets us reconstruct extensive parts of the first column. Especially lines 4–5 of the first column and the beginnings of the second remain problematic. The name of the deity of the altar in line 7 has been left out, which suggests that it could not be read in the scribe’s exemplar of the commentary.\textsuperscript{1}

Despite these shortcomings the papyrus offers a rare glimpse into Hellenistic exegetical activity on Pindar and scholarly commentary in general. The commentary combines basic traits of commentaries, such as paraphrase and mythographical explanations, with aspects of the scholarly hypomnèma, such as literary parallels, variant readings and stylistic comments on Pindar. A considerable part of the remains paraphrases the ode and explains the mythical sections of Pythian 12, which concern the Perseus’ decapitation of Medusa, his punishment of Polydeuces for his enslavement of Danaë, and Athena’s invention of the aulos.

In addition, the commentary reports two variant readings and quotes an otherwise unknown line from Euripides’ Oedipus. It also appears to state that Pindar in this ode writes something typical for his style, possibly the final gnomical sayings in the end of the ode.

The commentary shows substantial overlaps with the medieval scholia. Many lemmata are the same and many comments show considerable similarities, which suggest that “a middle position between the original version of Theon’s work and its later reductions which ended in the inclusion of the material in the medieval scholia (Ucciardello, 2012, p. 119).”

**Column i**

Lines 4–5: No satisfactory interpretation has yet been proposed for ll. 4–5. Turner (1966) thought that line 5 contained a lemma which was explained by βιαζομένης in the same line. Calvani (1973) suggested the lemma to be ματρὸς (\(\tau\’ εμπεδον\) δουλοσύναν for line 5. As already noted by Turner a supplied lemma keeps the remains of line 4 hanging in the air. If we imagine e.g. (\(\alpha\alpha\alpha\gammaα\alpha\gamma\alpha\)ν) λέχος at the beginning of l. 5, this leaves little room for the

\textsuperscript{1}Treu (1974) speculates that there also existed other problems in the text available to the scribes of POxy 2536.
Theon Fr. 2

ἵν’ ᾖ καὶ τὴν of l. 4 which must have been followed by a noun modified by τὴν and probably at least a verbal form.

Cadili (2003) suggested that Theon’s commentary commented upon a Pindaric text with the variant reading ἔκτοσε, “outwards” instead of the paradosis’ ἔμπεδον, “constant, lasting”. Cadili’s suggested the following reading for ll. 4–5:


He released his mother: from without {from within}, so that [the sense] is “He saved his mother from slavery.”

According to Cadili ἔκτοσε and ἔσωθεν a scribal error. Cadili’s supplement is interesting but, in the case of l. 4, problematic. The gloss does not really convey the meaning of the suggested lemma, and we still have to explain the scribal error. Although the lemmata of the Pindar scholia often contain different readings than the paradosis of Pindar, these tend to be explainable as different grammatical or orthographical analyses. This variant reading would be an irregularity, since the text of the lemmata of POxy 2536 is generally similar to that of the lemmata in the Pindar scholia of the medieval transmission.¹ The idea of a variant reading in the lemma is therefore problematic. Cadili’s supplement on l. 5 may on the other hand well represents the essence of the original text.

However, Treu, who noted that ἔσωθεν could be a poetical passive aorist of σῴζω, “save”, suggested that line 4. contained a quotation of another, perhaps dramatic, author, paraphrased by the ἵν’ ἶ. Karamanou (2006, pp. 150–160) argues that this might be a quotation from Euripides’ Dictys that explored the events after Danaë’s and Perseus’ arrival at Seriphus, where Polydeuces reigned. This is also the explanation which seems to me most convincing, although I have not dared to attempt a reconstruction for such a line.

τὸν βῶμον τοῦ: The name of the god of the altar has been left out, presumably because the scribe could not read it in the exemplar. The article τοῦ shows that it must be a male god and Karamanou (2002, p. 174) and supplies the name Poseidon and argued that Theon’s version of the myth goes back to Euripides’ lost drama Dictys. The surviving fragments of the tragedy do not relate this episode but Karamanou reconstructs it by connecting it to an Apulian vase (Princeton Art Museum 1989.40) where Dictys and Danaë take refuge at Poseidon’s altar. Interestingly the name of the god is also left out by Ps-Apollodorus Biblioteca 2.45. Treu (1974, pp. 68–69) suggests that Zeus is

¹Cf. however the example of πα φυκτόν/παρφυκτὸν in the second column below.
the God mentioned, but the size of the lacuna (approximately 12 letters) tells against this.

ἐνιοὶ δὲ φασὶν οὐ ταύτην εἶναι τὴν Γοργόνα ἀλλὰ τὴν γηγενῆ ἣν ἡ γῆ ἀνέδωκεν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ τῶν γιγάντων πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς. Theon here refers to an alternative myth where the Gorgon was not identical with the Medusa slain by Persues, but a creature created by Gaia in order to fight against the Olympic Gods in their war against the Titans.

The enioi here might be a reference to Euripides’ Iōn 987–989. In this drama Gorgon is, as here, born to Gaia to aid the Titans against the gods (Calvani, 1973, pp. 143–145). It could also refer to Euhemerus (FGrH 63 Fr. 7, active in the early third century BCE) who had said that Gorgon was killed by Athena, and not by Perseus, although the occasion or Gorgon’s parentage is not mentioned.

μετὰ ἀναίρεσιν: Maehler (1994, p. 91) suggested this supplement after noting that Turner’s final sigma in fact is a semicircle as that of Ν in τούτοσιν in l. 23. Treu’s ἔξτρατησεῖ οἷος demands to read Ω instead of Σ as the second readable letter of the line, but it seems more similar to the Σ of κότοις in l. 2.

ἡ ἀπὸ κοινοῦ τοῦ ἁμαύρωσε: This marginal note concerns the use of ἁμαύρως. Pindar himself might have said, “Yes, he blinded the awesome race of Phorcus.

The ἀπὸ κοινοῦ here appears to be synonymous with the κοινὸς found in the Scholia Vetera on this passage: Σ. P. 12.25b: κοινὸς δὲ ληπτέον τὸ ἁμαύρωσε, τὰς Γοργόνας δηλονότι. “He blinded must be taken collectively, obviously the Gorgons (and not only Medusa).” It appears that ἀπὸ κοινοῦ here refers to the fact that Pindar says that Perseus blinded the daughters of Phorcys, the Graeae, although he only cut the head of the Medusa. The genitive of the article is probably a case of assimilation to the case of the preceding ἀπὸ κοινοῦ (Calvani Mariotti and Derenzini, 1977, pp. 173–174).

ἐρικλάγκταν: This is a typical example of a gloss where Pindar’s Kunstsprache is translated into a more easily understandable form. The explanation μεγαλοκλάγκτην is otherwise unattested and appears to have been created to explain the parts of the lemma. The poetical prefix ἔρι- is replaced by the more common μεγαλ- and the Doric long alpha of the final syllable is changed into -ην. Ucciardello (2012, pp. 122–123) suggests that this marginal annotation was not excerpted from Theon’s commentary but from other exegetical tools, such as a word-list.

ἄλλα μιν: The lemma appears to be unfinished and there exist no traces of its explanation. Turner suggested that a possible continuation of the lemma
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and its explanation was found at the top of the second column. The comment’s content is unknown. The Scholia Vetera under the lemma ἀλλά νιν εὑροισα (Σ. P. 12.39) discuss the background of the “many-headed nomos” invented by Athena. It appears probable that the lemma was continued at the top of the now lost next column. Later the second hand added the lines at the bottom of the first column.

ἐνιοὶ θαμὰ: The variant θαμὰ for the lemma’s θ’ ἅμα is typical for ancient textual criticism on Pindar (and poetry in general). The Alexandrian scholars were well aware of the effect of factors such as the scriptio continua, and the development of alphabet with changing practices for annotating vowel length, breathings and accents.¹

ἄκυρον τὸ [νάοισι]: Turner here supplies δονακῶν but νάοισι, suggested by Maehler (1968) is preferable. This is based on comparison with Σ. P. 12.45b τὸ δὲ νάοισι κάλαμοι σκληρῶς καὶ διθυραμβωδῶς προήγαγεν ἐδει γὰρ εἰπεῖν φύονται, “that reeds dwell is said in an austere and dithyrambic way. He should say grow.”

ἄκυρον is used in the sense “improper”, i. e. to describe a metaphorical usage (De Kreij, 2021).

As noted by Calvani Mariotti and Derenzini (1977, pp. 171–172) the Euripidean parallel was probably included as a reference to a more typical expression for reeds. Unfortunately, the exact wording used by Euripides to describe the reeds has been lost. Treu suggested ἐκφυεῖ whereas Austin (1968, p. 65) suggested ἐκτρέφει.

Column ii

The first surviving lines of the second column are in a very battered state. As of yet, no convincing reconstruction has been suggested. In contrast to the first column we are not able to find any secure overlaps with the scholia vetera. It is probable that the surviving lines commented upon lemmata found before τὸ δὲ μόρσιμον οὐ παρφυκτόν such as ἐκ δὲ τελευτάσει νιν οὐ τίτοι σάμερον δαίμων. We probably have the verb παρέχεται in the second surviving line of the column. This could be a paraphrase of ἐκ δὲ τελευτάσει νιν although the scholia vetera paraphrase by ἐπὶ τέλος ἃζει.

τοῦτο δὲ ὠπερ ἐπισφραγίζουν ποιεῖ: Calvani Mariotti and Derenzini (1977, p. 173) argue that ἐπισφραγίζου in the Pindar scholia has the meaning “confirm”, in the sense of returning to a point already made (ribadire). From this meaning they argue that the expression refers to Pindar’s repetition of κάματος, “toil” in εἰ δὲ τις ὀλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ἀνευ καμάτου οὐ φαίνεται, “if there is any happiness among men, it does not appear without toil” (P. 12.28–29), which he

¹ Cf. section 4.4.1.
also mentioned earlier in the ode.\(^1\) However, the meaning of the verb in this context does not suggest a return to a point already made.

Treu (1974, pp. 82–83) instead interpreted ἐπισφραγίζω as Theon saying that by using a maxim Pindar puts his stamp on the ode. This would suggest that Theon understood the gnome as a typical trait of Pindar. If Treu’s interpretation is correct ἐπισφραγίζων probably refers to some or all of the maxims in lines 28–32.

εἰ δὲ τὶς ὀλίβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ἄνευ καμάτου
οὐ φαίνεται: ἐξ δὲ τελευτάσει νιν ἦτοι σάμερον δάμην — τὸ γε
μόρσιμον οὐ παρφυκτὸν —, ἀλλ’ ἔσται χρόνος σῶτος, ὃ καὶ τιν’
ἀελτία βαλὼν
ἐμπλαν γνώμας τὸ μὲν δώσει, τὸ δ’ οὔπω.

If there is any happiness among men, it does not appear without toil. A god will bring it to fulfilment either today — what is fated cannot be avoided — but there will come that time which, striking a person with surprise, will unexpectedly give one thing, but defer another.

As mentioned by De Kreij (2021) there are several parallels to this use of sphragis. Commonly, as in Theognis 19–23, the “sphragis-poem”, it is used to indicate that the author included his own name in the poem. This is not the case in Pindar, but Theon might either have argued that Pindar puts his seal on the poem by adding the gnomic sayings typical for his style or perhaps that he completes the poem by adding them.

γράφεται καὶ οὐ παρφυκτὸν: Theon here adds a variant to the lemma’s παρφυκτὸν, without attributing it to a specific source. Surprisingly, παρφυκτὸν is almost unanimously accepted in the medieval manuscripts. Only \(\textsc{P}\) follows the reading of the lemma in having παρφυκτὸν. We may explain this situation in at least two ways. If παρφυκτὸν was the reading of the Pindar vulgate during Theon’s lifetime, the alternative ψαρφυκτὸν was an existing variant, suggested by Theon or someone else, that later entered the medieval textual transmission. \(\textsc{P}\), the only surviving witness of the Paris recension for \textit{Pythian} 12, would in this case have preserved the original reading of the Alexandrian vulgate. Another possibility is that the reading of the \textit{lemma} is Theon’s suggestion and that the παρφυκτὸν of the commentary is the reading of the vulgate. In this case, the reading of \(\textsc{P}\) is probably of normalization of the hapax ψαρφυκτὸν.\(^2\)

---

\(^{1}\)In \textit{P}. 12.18 Pindar mentions Perseus’ labours as he cut off the head of Medusa.

\(^{2}\)For the relationship between the Paris recension and other textual traditions of Pindar, cf. section 6.1.2.
Aristonicus Fr. 4

The opening of Nemean 1 addresses the island of Ortygia, the nymph of the eponymous island in Syracuse.

"Ἀμπνευμα σεμὸν Ἀλφεοῦ, κλεινᾶν Συρακοσσᾶν θάλος ᾿Ορτυγία, δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος, Δάλου κασιγνήτα (N. 1.1–4)

Hallowed spout of Alpheus, Ortygia, offspring of famous Syracuse, couch of Artemis, and sister of Delos.

This scholion mentions a debate of the reasons for this address in the ode, written for Chromius, a general of Hiero of Syracuse. Unnamed authorities argued that the racing stables of Hiero and Chromius were found on the island Ortygia. This interpretation is rejected by the scholiast who argues that the island was sacred to Artemis, the divinity of horses and implies that this is sufficient reason, since the ode was written for a victory in the chariot race. The scholiast additionally quotes Aristonicus for the information that there was an Ortygia in Ephesus and that this was the birth-place of Artemis, a reference to the grove in Ephesus mentioned by Strabo 14.1.20 as the birthplace of Artemis and Apollo. Since Aristonicus could hardly have suggested that Pindar is referring to the Ortygia in Ephesus here, the information at first sight appears to be irrelevant to the general argument of the scholion, since it does not support the opinion of the scholiast. Although it might have been included by the scholiast as a piece of “antiquarian” information on different locations named Ortygia, it should be noted that Aristarchus (Σ. N. 1.3 = Fr. 55 Horn) had suggested that Ortygia was referred to as δέμνιον Ἀρτέμιδος, “couch of Artemis”, because “some” (ἔνιοι) believed her to have been born on the island. It is therefore possible that Aristonicus’ information on the birth-place of Artemis was originally part of an argument directed against Aristarchus. Aristonicus would in this case have rejected Aristarchus’ explanation, since it is not the Ortygia in Sicily, referred to by Pindar in the ode, but the Ortygia in Ephesus, that is the birth-place of Artemis.

Aristonicus Fr. 5

The scholia give Aristonicus’ paraphrase of Nemean 1.25 χρὴ δ’ ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς στείχοντα μάρνασθαι φυᾷ, “but one must travel in straight paths and
strive by means of natural talent". This is a typical example of a loose paraphrase, which not only translates the individual words into koinē, but also explains the content of a phrase by offering a summary. In this case the result is significantly longer than the original. This is due to Aristonicus’ aim of explaining the ambiguous line, which had been discussed already by Aristarchus (Σ N. 1.38 = Fr. 57 Horn) and would later be discussed by Didymus (Σ N. 1.36 = Fr. 39 Braswell). Aristonicus’ paraphrase adds several points not mentioned in the original line, such as φθόνος, “envy”, which is a very common motif in Pindar’s poetry but not explicitly mentioned in the original line. Thus, the paraphrase is a method to clarify the Pindaric line by defining its meaning. Since Aristonicus explains μάρνασθαι as τῷ φθόνῳ μάρνασθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθούς, it is apparent that he followed Aristarchus’ interpretation, which glosses μάρνασθαι with μάχεσθαι, “fight”, and understood μάρνασθαι as “contend, strive”. This stands in contrast to Didymus, who glosses the verb with ἐνεργεῖν, “be in action, operate” and believed that Pindar was saying that one should act openly and not with tricks.

Chaeris Fr. 10, Chrysippus Fr. 2

The scholion discusses why Pindar included the myth of Hercules’ triumph as an infant over the two snakes sent by Hera to kill him in Nemean 1.35–47. The scholars mentioned seek the myth’s motivation in biographical and historical circumstances, such as Chaeris, or in associative thinking, such as Chrysippus, or in Pindar’s usage, such as Aristarchus. Chaeris believed that the myth reflected Chromius’ biography, seeing it as “a kind of metaphorical history that partially maps onto the laudandus’ circumstances” (Phillips, 2019, p. 444). According to Chaeris’ argument, Chromius, general and brother-in-law to Hiero who appointed him as governor of Aetna, had fought hard for the Syracusan tyrant. Later he gained such wealth that he was able to raise horses and to actually win the chariot race at the Nemean games. The myth of Hercules, who after his difficult beginnings was later greatly rewarded, is therefore to be understood as an analogy. How did Chaeris come up with this theory, which is paralleled by Σ N. 1.8 that says that Chromius was originally Hiero’s charioteer before gaining wealth and organizing his own chariots? It is improbable that Chromius’ early career was explicitly mentioned by historical sources known to Hellenistic scholars. Chromius was mentioned by Timaeus (FGrH 566 Fr. 21) as a guardian of the son of Hiero’s brother Gelon. Since Didymus Fr. 59 Braswell had to reconstruct Chromius’ career from Timaeus’ treatment of Gelon (FGrH 566 Fr. 18) it does not appear that Chromius’

1Cf. section 4.5.1.
earlier career was mentioned by the historian, nor any other sources known to Didymus. When historical sources were missing, the ancient grammarians instead reconstructed biographical data on victorious athletes from the texts celebrating them.\textsuperscript{1} It is thus possible that Chaeris’ understanding of Chromius biography was influenced by a gnome in \textit{Nemean} 9, also celebrating Chromius: ἐκ πόνων δ’ οἳ σὺν νέοτατι γένωται σύν τε δίκα, τελέθει πρὸς γῆρας αἰών ὀμέρα, “From labors which are borne in youth and with justice life becomes gentle toward old age” (\textit{N.} 9.44).

Chrysippus argues that Pindar included Hercules because of his connection to Nemea through the Nemean lion. There was some debate in antiquity on the classification of \textit{Nemean} 1, as Timaeus (\textit{FGrH} 566 Fr. 142a-b) believed it to be an Olympian ode, possibly because of the references to Alpheus at the beginning of the ode, as suggested by D’Alessio (1997, p. 52), or because of the references to Olympic victories in l. 17, as suggested by the scholia (\textit{ΣN.} 1.25a). There is, however, little reason to assume, as Braswell (2015, p. 132, n. 13) does, that Chrysippus took a stance against Timaeus’ classification. Rather, Chrysippus tried to explain the function of the myth from the knowledge that the ode was Nemean.

\textit{παρεκβάσεώς}: As in Aristodemus Fr. 5 the manuscripts have \textit{παρα-} instead of \textit{παρεκ-}. I have on both occasions followed Abel and Drachmann in printing \textit{παρεκ-} which is the more common form used e.g. in Ammonius Fr. 7.

\textbf{Crates Fr. 2}

The fragment of Crates is part of a long scholion which discusses the constellation of the Pleiades mentioned by Pindar \textit{Nemean} 2.10–12.

\begin{quote}
\begin{small}

ἐστι δ’ ἐοικός ὀρειᾶν γε Πελειάδων μὴ τηλόθεν Ωαρίωνα νεῖσθαι.

and it is likely that Orion is travelling not far behind the mountain Pleiades.
\end{small}
\end{quote}

Aristarchus Fr. 60 Horn noted that Orion following the Pleiades here signifies that for the \textit{laudandus} Timodemus even greater victories will follow the present one at Nemea. Crates is quoted for his stance on the much discussed question why Pindar uses the adjective ὄρειος, “of the mountains”, for the

\textsuperscript{1}Cf. section 4.6.1 for reconstruction of historical and biographical data among Hellenistic scholars.
Pleiades. Earlier parts of the scholion which have been left out in this edition suggest that the Pleiades were “of the mountains” because their father was Atlas or because it was a pun on the name of Orion and that the adjective was a Pindaric form of ὄυραῖος, “of the tail”, because they were the tail of the constellation Taurus, a view also mentioned in Hyginus (Poet. Astr. 2.21.6). Crates argued the Pleiades should be referred to as θέρειοι, “of the summer”. The use of the word, γράφει, “he writes”, in the fragment strongly suggests that this was Crates’ reading of Pindar, rather than a general statement on the Pleiades. Young (1965) suggested that Crates’ variant derives from a misreading of round uncialis, but it may also be a conjecture by Crates himself. In any case, Crates explained the use of θέρειοι from the heliacal rising, where the Pleiades rise before sunrise and are visible in the early morning (Lamberton, 2009, p. 30). In antiquity this was a sign of the beginning of summer, as seen in Hesiod (Op. 383–84):

Πληιάδων ᾿Ατλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομενάων
ἀρχεσθ’ ἀμήτου, ἀρότοιο δὲ δυσομενάων

When the Pleiades, Atlas’ daughters, are rising begin your harvest, when they fall, begin your ploughing.

Cf. section 4.4.1 for the terminology used for variant readings.
This is probably the so-called acronical rising (the star’s final rising after nightfall) between the autumn equinox and the winter solstice (Sparavigna, 2008).
Cf. section 4.4.3 for ancient discussions of Pindar’s metre.
Τιμοδήμωι ᾿Αθηναίωι ᾿Αχαρνεῖ παγκρατιαστῆι (Moschopoulos, παγκρατεῖ D, παγκράτιον TU).
Asclepiades Fr. 10

refers to as παλαίφατον εὐάνορες, “having brave men of old” (N. 2.16-17). In the same ode, however, Pindar mentions Salamis and its rearing of heroes:

Καὶ μὰν ἡ Σαλαμίς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατάν
dynatōs. ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἕκτωρ Ἀλάντος ἄκουσεν. ὦ Τιμόδημε,
σὲ δ' ἀλκά
pαγχρατίου τλάθυμος ἀέξει (N. 2.13–15).

And indeed Salamis is certainly capable of rearing a fighter. At Troy Hector heard from Ajax; but you, O Timodemus, the stout-hearted
strength of the pancratium exalts.

The ancient grammarians saw an apparent case of inconsistency, as the ode appears to suggest that Timodemus was simultaneously from Salamis and Acharnae. Aristarchus had suggested that Timodemus was an Athenian from the phylē Aeantis – arguing that Timodemus was not raised in Salamis but that Pindar’s reference to Salamis’ rearing of men was derived from the tribe named in honour of the Salaminian hero. Asclepiades instead suggested that Timodemus was one of the Athenian settlers of the cleruchy on Salamis. The cleruchy was an Athenian form of colonization common from the sixth century BCE and onwards, where the state distributed plots of land in conquered territories to its citizens in return for the obligation of paying Athenian taxes and offering military support (Moreno, 2007, p. 107). Asclepiades was thus aware of Athenian historical institutions, although the historicity of the Athenian cleruchy on Salamis per se is questionable, as Asclepiades is the only source which with certainty mentions it explicitly. A possible additional source is the earliest surviving Athenian decree, the so-called Salamis decree (IG II(2) 1227), although the reference to the cleruchy is a much-debated supplied reading.¹ According to the scholiast, Asclepiades did not have external evidence for Timodemus being a cleruch on Salamis, which was only argued from εἰκός, “probability”, an important concept in ancient Greek scholarship (Braswell, 2013, p. 135). However, the fact that Asclepiades refers to the cleruchy shows that he had a good knowledge of the political situation of the political history of Athens, although we are not able to evaluate the validity of the information on this Athenian cleruchy, let alone on Timodemus’ background.

οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀσκληπιάδην: for this construction, cf. commentary on Callistratus Fr. 5.

¹ Cf. Frullini (2020, pp. 15–18) for different views on the reconstruction of this decree.
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Callistratus Fr. 2

This scholion quotes Callistratus’ interpretation of the “the water of Asopus” referred to at the beginning *Nemean* 3.1–5.

*ὦ πότνια Μοῖσα, μάτερ ἁμετέρα, λίσσομαι, τάν πολυξέναν ἐν ἱερομηνίᾳ Νεμεάδι ἰκέο Δωρίδα νάσον Αἴγιναν· ὅρα γὰρ μένοντ’ ἐπ’ Ασωπίῳ μελιγαρύων τέκτονες κόμου νεανία, σέθεν ὄπα μαίμενοι.*

O Mistress Muse, our mother, I beg of you, come in the Nemean sacred month to this much-visited Dorian island of Aegina, for by the water of Asopus are waiting the builders of honey-sounding revels, young men who seek your voice.

As we can tell from the surviving scholia the identification of these waters was much debated in antiquity. Whereas Aristarchus Fr. 62 Horn identified the water of Asopus with the homonymic river at Nemea. In order to explain why the Muse should come both to Asopus and Aegina, he suggested that the choir that sang an improvised song in direct connection with the victory at Nemea. Callistratus instead identified the Asopian waters with a place called Asopis on Aegina. This site is probably to be identified with a spring of Asopis there mentioned in the *Etymologicum Genuitum* (s. v. 'Αμφιφορίτης) as the site of a contest called the Amphorites (Polinskaya, 2014, pp. 164–171). Callistratus’ theory of “Asopian waters” as a local water-source is preferable to that of Aristarchus since the γὰρ-clause contains a motivation for the Muse to come to Aegina (Pfeiffer, 1999, p. 247). Callistratus’ suggestion was adapted by Didymus (Fr. 42 Braswell) who instead suggested that there was a river named Asopus on the island.

The fragment shows that Callistratus possessed some knowledge of Aeginetan geography that could not have been exclusively deduced from Pindar’s odes, but must have depended upon external sources. These could have included Pythaenetus (*FGrH* 299), whose work on Aegina was important for Didymus and for the scholiasts on Pindar in general (Ceccarelli, 2017). Another source might have been Callimachus’ lost *Ia*. 8 (Fr. 198 Pfeiffer) which according to the *Diegesis* (VIII 21–24) – a summary on Callimachus’ *Iambs* in *PMilan*. 18 – was written to Polycles from Aegina, the winner of the contest of the Amphorites, although the papyrus does not mention the Asopis (Clayman, 1980, pp. 38–39).
Ammonius Fr. 6

In Snell-Maehler’s edition the narrative voice of Nemean 3.10-11 addresses the muse as daughter of the lord of the sky, i.e., Zeus:

\[ \text{ἄρχε δ` οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι, θύγατερ, δόκιμον ὕμνον} \]

But begin for the ruler of the cloud-covered sky, daughter a proper hymn.

Snell-Maehler’s edition follows the reading of B, by normalizing the manuscript’s οὐρανῶ into the standard genitive form οὐρανοῦ. Ammonius and his predecessor Aristarchus must have read Οὐρανῷ πολυνεφέλᾳ κρέοντι θύγατερ, “daughter of cloud-covered ruler Uranus” which partly corresponds to the reading of D, οὐρανῷ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ.¹ Didymus, on the other hand, read οὐρανῷ (or possibly οὐρανῶ) πολυνεφέλᾳ κρέοντι θύγατερ which he paraphrased as daughter of sky-ruling Zeus.

Race’s translation, based on Snell-Maehler’s punctuation, suggests that the hymn is directed to the ruler of heaven, which is obviously Zeus. All the ancient grammarians instead appear to have taken οὐρανῶ into πολυνεφέλᾳ κρέοντι θύγατερ as a possessive dative modifying θύγατερ.

The different readings probably result from the monophthongization of the long diphthongs which was in progress during the second century BCE (Miller, 2013, pp. 53–53). According to the reading of Aristarchus and Ammonius, the genealogy of the Muse differs from that of Homer (e.g. Il. 2.491–492) and Hesiod (e.g. Theog. 25), where the Muses are Zeus’ daughters. That Pindar deviated from this standard genealogy was noteworthy and Aristarchus supported the correctness of his interpretation by the example of Alcman and Mimnermus who appear to have made use of both genealogies (Mojsik, 2011, pp. 28–42). Ammonius’ fragment presupposes that he accepted Aristarchus’ reading and the Uranus genealogy. In the text adopted by Ammonius, the participle κρέοντι modifies Ὅυρανος, suggesting that Uranus is a ruler. Since Uranus only plays a minor role in Greek religion, Ammonius argued that Pindar was referring to Uranus’ position as the first ruler of the world, as told by Hesiod (Theog. 126–175). Ammonius noted that the case had been changed from genitive to dative, a case of the linguistic variation noted by Hellenistic scholars in archaic poetry, so-called ἐναλλαγή.² Ammonius obviously interprets Pindar as saying that the Muse is Uranus’ daughter which necessitates understanding the dative as a marker of possession.

¹The form οὐρανῶ attested in P is otherwise unknown.
²Cf. 4.5.2.
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Δίδυμος: The manuscripts all read Πίνδαρος which is probably a corruption. Heyne’s suggestion of Δίδυμος is accepted by Drachmann, Abel and Braswell (2013, p. 208). Since Didymus also in other scholia, e.g. Σ N. 1.49c (=Chaeris Fr. 10, Chrysippus Fr. 2, Didymus Fr. 40 Braswell), is found at the end of a series of scholars, I have accepted the conjecture.

Ammonius Fr. 7

In Nemean 4 Pindar praises Timasarchus from Aegina, winner in the boys’ wrestling. In ll. 33–34 Pindar breaks off the myth of Hercules and Telamon sacking Troy with an abrupt Abbruchformel.

Τὰ μακρὰ δ’ ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός ὥραι τ’ ἐπειγόμεναι·

But the law of song keeps me from telling the long tale, and the pressing hours;

Ammonius and Aristarchus are quoted for their interpretations of the law, τεθμός, hindering Pindar from continuing the mythical narrative. According to Aristarchus this refers to an agreement between Pindar and the client that the ode should be handed over at a specific time. Like Aristarchus, Ammonius explains the formula as a local injunction. Reconstructing the circumstances of the ode and its creation from the text itself, he draws the conclusion that Pindar, according to the agreement with the client, did not have time to further elaborate on the myth because of the tethmos. Like in Aristodemus Fr. 11, we here have an example of an attempt to explain Pindar’s Abbruchformeln as the poet’s comments upon the circumstances of the ode.1

Asclepiades Fr. 11

Although the surviving title of Nemean 6 identifies the ode’s laudandus as Alcimidas from Aegina, Asclepiades argued that the laudandus was not “recorded” (ἀναγράφεσθαι) as an Aeginetan, but as a Cretan, son of Theon.2 The wording suggests that Asclepiades had access to an actual Nemean victor list where he could not find a fitting Alcimidas from Aegina, but only one from Crete. Although Gerber (1999, p. 55) and Maehler (1985, p. 401) question the historicity of Ascepiades’ information, it is very possible that he drew this information

1 Cf. section 4.6.1 for historical interpretation of Pindar.
2 Manuscript D preserves the title Ἀλκιμίδῃ Αἰγινήτῃ παιδὶ παλαιστῇ, “For Alcimidas of Aegina, boy’s wrestling”.
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from a victor list. The Nemean victor lists are not as well known as their Olympian and Pythian equivalents and have left few traces, but appear to have been available to Didymus, who in N. 8. inscr. a (Fr. 58 Braswell) says that neither the laudandus of Nemean 8, Deinias, nor his father Megas were found among the Nemean victors.¹ Some records of winners at Isthmia and Nemea must hence have existed, although full catalogues of Isthmian and Nemean victors were apparently unavailable, as can be seen in the large number of discussions on the identity of Nemean victors (Christesen, 2007, p. 108). If this interpretation of the fragment is correct, it shows that Asclepiades made use of external historical sources when studying Pindar, as he probably also did in Fr. 10.

Aristodemus Fr. 5

Nemean 7 begins with a prayer to Eleithyia, goddess of birth, which puzzled the ancient grammarians. They generally attempted to explain the mentioning of the goddess from circumstances of the victory or in the biography of Sogenes the laudandus. Aristodemus thus argued that Eleithyia was mentioned due to the circumstances of Sogenes’ birth. Thearion was childless and of advanced age when he received a son after praying to Eleithyia. Since Aristodemus’ interpretation depends upon the view that Thearion was old, Fränkel (1961, pp. 392–393) suggested that the interpretation is connected to l. 58–59, Θεαρίων, τίν δ’ εοικότα καιρόν ὀλβίου δίδωσι, “But, Thearion, to you (destiny) gives fitting measure of prosperity”. The scholion on this line (Σ. N. 7.85) also remarks that Thearion was old at the time of Sogenes’ victory, something which could have been deduced from Pindar’s use of καιρός, “fitting measure, critical time” which is frequently used of time.²

Aristodemus’ reference to Simonides on the other hand suggests that his argumentation did not depend upon Nemean 7 exclusively, but on the information found in a poem attributed to Simonides. Several epigrams to victorious athletes by Simonides are known. These include at least two on victorious Aeginetans: the surviving epigram to Theognetus from Aegina (30 FEG), as well as the song “how the ram was sheared”, τὸν Κριόν, ὡς ἐπέχθη, attributed to Simonides by Strepsiades in Nub. 1355–56, which may be an allusion to an actual poem written for a certain Crius.³ It is thus not impossible that Simonides wrote an

¹παρέχει δὲ, φησὶν ὁ Δίδυμος, τὴν ἀπορίαν τὸ μηδέτερον αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς νεμεακαῖς νίκαις (BD: ταῖς νεμεανίκαις Boeckh), “Didymus says that the difficulty (in identifying the circumstances of Deinias’ and Megas’ victories) depend on them not being among the Nemean victories”.
²Cf. LSJ s. v. καιρὸς III.
³according to the scholia on the passage,⁴ Crius was a wrestler from Aegina.
epigram to Sogenes of Aegina, or at least that Aristodemus knew of such a poem that was attributed to him (Hadjimichael, 2019, p. 37).

Young (1970, p. 637) argues instead that Aristodemus explained the prayer to Eleithyia as a pun on the etymology of Sogenes’ name, which we may translate as “safely born”. According to Young, Aristodemus’ idea of a linguistic pun was supported by the epigram of Simonides, which he identifies with Anthologia Palatina 6.216 ascribed to Simonides, but not included in any current edition of his works:

Σώσος καὶ Σωσῶ, σῶτερ, σοὶ τόνδ’ ἀνέθηκαν·
Σώσος μὲν σωθείς, Σωσῶ δ’ ὅτι Σώσος ἐσώθη.

Soso and Soso, o saviour, (σῶτερ), dedicated this to you, Sosos because he was saved (σωθείς) and Soso because Sosos was saved (ἐσώθη).\(^1\)

This theory is criticized by Molyneux (1992, pp. 88–9), who correctly argues that Simonides is only quoted in support of the idea that Sogenes was born in Thearion’s old age. The scholion does not mention any onomastic pun, but concerns biographical data. Since the epigram attributed to Simonides does not concern Sogenes, but only the name Sosos, it is not likely that this is the source quoted by Aristodemus. Rather, Aristodemus quoted a now lost epigram written for the victorious Sogenes.

There can surely be no doubt that the writer of the scholium or his source knew of, or believed in, the existence of an epigram which included the biographical details quoted in the scholium (Molyneux, 1992, p. 89).

Dionysius son of Charmides Fr. 1

In Nemean 7 Pindar, as an example of the incompetence of the common mob, says that had it known of the truth concerning Ajax’ greatness he would not have committed suicide. The text in Snell-Maehler reads:

Τυφλὸν δ’ ἔχει
ἤτορ ὁμόλος ἄνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος.
Εἰ γὰρ ἦν
ἐ τὰν ἀλάθειαν ἰδέμεν, οὐ κεν ὅπλων χολωθείς
ὁ χαρτερός Αἴας ἐπαξέ διὰ φρενῶν
λευφὸν ξίφος (N. 7.23–27).

\(^1\)Translated by Molyneux.

---
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Aristodemus Fr. 6

The great majority
of men have a blind heart, for if they could have seen
the truth, mighty Ajax, in anger over the arms,
would not have planted in his chest
the smooth sword.

€ τὰν is a conjecture by Boeckh for the medieval manuscript’s €τὰν. Dionysius’ son of Charmides read the psilotic €τὰν. The reading is also found in the lemma of the scholia, although it did not enter the manuscript tradition of Pindar’s text. As suggested by Boeckh, the proponents of the psilotic form, and probably Dionysius as well, understood it to be a form of the Homeric €ὐς, “good, brave”.

Aristodemus Fr. 6

The question why Pindar included Neoptolemus in Nemean 7 is much debated by the scholia on the ode. Aristarchus saw a connection between the celebrated victory and the hero by suggesting that the ode’s laudandus Sogenes was too young to participate in the contest. Instead a boxer named Neoptolemus participated and won on his behalf. The hero was consequently included in the ode as an homage to the homonymous boxer. Aristodemus followed Aristarchus in explaining the hero’s justification within the ode by an historical homonym, which he identified as Sogenes’ trainer. The two Neoptolemuses are probably inventions by Aristarchus and Aristodemus. Aristodemus does not state how he argued for this, but Fränkel (1961, p. 390) suggests that Aristodemus derived his interpretation from Pindar’s use of βοαθόων/οῶν in l. 33.

τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται
ὡν θεός ἁβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων
Βοαθόων, τοι παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλόν εὐρυκόλπου
μόλον χθονός (N. 31–34).

yet honor belongs to those helpers
whose fair story a god exalts after they die.
I have come to the great navel
of the broad-bosomed earth.

---

1Reference in Abel (1884, p. 209).
2Cf. section 4.6.1 on the common practice to explain the odes by reconstructing historical circumstances from the text commented on.
3The translation of Race (1997a) has been adapted to suit the text of Snell-Maehler.
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According to Fränkel, Aristodemus understood Neoptolemus to be the helper implied in βοαθόων. If this is correct, Aristodemus must have believed that Neoptolemus was an allegory for Sogenes’ trainer. Fränkel’s interpretation presupposes that Aristodemus read a Doric participle βοαθέων/βοαθοῶν of βοηθέω, “help, aid”, rather than Snell-Maehler’s βοαθόων, genitive plural of the Doric βοάθοος, “helping, aiding”, as well as the 3. pers. sing. (ἐ)μόλεν instead of the 1. pers. sing. / 3. pers. pl. μόλον. Σ N. 7.47 tells us that Didymus Fr. 55 Braswell read ἐμόλεν and took Neoptolemus as its subject but there is no testimony in favour of βοαθόων in the scholia, which consistently accept βοαθόων, a genitive plural modifying τεθνακότων in N. 7.32. In fact, βοαθέων was, to the best of my knowledge, first suggested by Schmidt (1869, pp. cxxxvii–cxxxiv) from where it was later taken over by Fränkel. It is also apparent from Aristarchus’ (Fr. 70 Horn) discussion of the passage that he read βοαθόων. The lack of support in the scholia does not completely rule out the possibility that Aristodemus accepted this reading since it is a minor change. As noted by Heath (1993) Aristodemus might also have based his argument on the fact that other odes, such as Olympian 8, mention the name of the trainers of young winners.

According to Horn (1883, pp. 64–65 n. 94) and Radt (1958, pp. 85–86 n. 4), the attribution of the biographical-historical explanations of Neoptolemus’ role in the poem to Aristarchus and Aristodemus must be incorrect and due to textual errors. Horn’s argument is that the biographical explanation of the myth is incompatible with the idea supported by both ancient scholars of Nemean 7 being Pindar’s apology for his description of Neoptolemus’ death in Paean 6. Against Horn and Radt it must be objected that Aristarchus and Aristodemus are answering two distinct questions in the relevant scholia. The fragments found in the present scholion answer why Neoptolemus is mentioned at all in the ode, a question which both Aristarchus and Aristodemus answered by saying that it honoured a man by the name of Neoptolemus. The second question concerns the apologetic statements in the ode, which Aristodemus in Frs. 7–8 explains as due to an unfavourable description of Neoptolemus in the Paeans. It is however not necessary to assume that Aristodemus or Aristarchus explained also the inclusion of the myth as a part of the apology.

Aristodemus Fr. 7

Ancient grammarians interpreted several statements in Nemean 7 as an apology of Pindar for an allegedly negative treatment of Neoptolemus in Paean 6 (Rutherford, 2001, p. 321). Line N. 7.48 reads:

1 Cf. commentary on Aristodemus Fr. 7.
εὐώνυμον ἐς δίκαν τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει.

When it comes to his just renown, three words will suffice.

What the three words here refer to is still much debated. Lloyd-Jones (1973, p. 133) argues that the number simply means “a few”, i.e. that it is easy to give Neoptolemus his righteous fame, whereas Teffeteller (2005) argues that Pindar refers to the three words (1) οὐ ψεῦδις, (2) ὁ μάρτυς, (3) ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατεῖ in N. 7.49. The ancient grammarians unanimously agree that the τρία ἔπεα are three specific points and sought to identify them within the ode. Aristarchus argued that the “three words” were a reference to the three reasons for his death mentioned in vv. 44–47. 1) it was decided by fate that one should die in the temple, 2) he should be an Aeacid, and 3) he should participate in the hero-processions there. Aristarchus thus made an anaphoric interpretation. Aristodemus on the other hand believed that the three words referred to the three remaining triads in the ode. This is one of the few references to Pindar’s metre in the exegetical scholia and shows that Aristodemus was aware of the triadic structure of Pindar’s poetry.1

Aristodemus Fr. 8, Callistratus Fr. 3

This scholion offers the interpretation of Callistratus and Aristodemus of Nemean 7.102-104:

τὸ δ’ ἐμὸν οὐ ποτὲ φάσει κέαρ ἀτρόποισι Νεοπτόλεμον ἑλκύσαι ἔπεσι.

My heart will never say that it has treated Neoptolemus with unyielding words.

Callistratus believed that N. 7.102-104 was Pindar’s defence for including Neoptolemus in the ode. Callistratus believed that since Pindar in N. 7.88 refers to Hercules as a neighbour (γείτονι), Neoptolemus could be included in this ode since he was a neighbour of Delphi. This refers to the grave of Neoptolemus which was located close to the temple of Delphi (Pausanias 10.24.6). As in Fr. 7, Aristodemus instead saw the statement as Pindar’s apology for his treatment of Neoptolemus in Paean 6.104–120 where Neoptolemus’s death is described as retribution for his murder of Priam.

1 Cf. section 4.4.3 for metrical analysis in Hellenistic scholarship on Pindar.
Modern scholarship tends to translate ἄτροπος as “unchangeable” or “unyielding” (Steiner, 2001, p. 155). The anonymous scholiast instead clearly paraphrases it as “unfitting” (οὐκ ἄτρόφως . . . οὐδὲ ἀπεικότως). It appears that both Aristodemus and Callistratus understood it in a similar sense, although they differ in their interpretation of ἐλκύσας. Callistratus’ view that Pindar was defending the inclusion of the mythological section on Neoptolemus suggests that he understood ἐλκύσας as “include within the ode”. Callistratus must thus have understood ἄτροποι ἔπεσι as a reference to the mythical digression. Aristodemus instead appears to have taken ἐλκύσας as “abuse”. According to the scholar, the statement is Pindar’s defense against accusations from the Aiginetans because of the treatment of Neoptolemus in the Paean.

Dionysius Phaselites Fr. 2

Nemean 11 is remarkable among the surviving victory odes in not being written for an athletic victory but for Aristagoras’ installation as prytanis at Tenedus. The book of Nemeans contains two further odes not written for victories at the Panhellenic games: Nemean 9 written for a victory at the Sicyonian Pythia and Nemean 10 for the Heraea at Argus. Irigoin (1952, p. 40–41) therefore argued that the Nemeans were the last book of the Victory Odes, containing odes written for victories other than the four Pan-Hellenic games. As noted by Emanuele Prodi this theory is complicated by the fact that some odes classified as Isthmian in antiquity were not written for Isthmian victories (Prodi, 2017, pp. 554–55, n. 22). Although Nemean 11 is not written for a victory, the theme of athletic victory is present in lines 13–29, which probably led to the classification as a victory ode, possibly by Aristophanes of Byzantium (D’Alessio, 1997, p. 55). This classification prevailed throughout the textual transmission but remained the subject of discussion. The introductionary scholion on Nemean 11, primarily recounts Didymus’ arguments for refuting the classification as a victory ode but also states that he himself followed Dionysius of Phaselis in classifying it as a Paroinion, or “drinking song”. Neither Dionysius’ nor Didymus’ arguments for this classification survive, but Puech (1923, pp. 141–142) argued that it depended on lines 6–10:

Πολλὰ μὲν λοιβαῖσιν ἀγαζόμενοι πρώταν θεῶν,  
tolla δὲ κνίσᾳ ὁδῷ πιπέμενται καὶ θεῶν  
καὶ ξενίου Δίως ἀσκεῖτα χέμαναν  
ἐν τραπεζίσσαις; ἀλλὰ σὺν δόξα τέλος  
δωδεκάμηνον περάσας ἀτρώτῳ κράδια.

Often worshipping you first of gods with libations  
and often with savor of sacrifice. The lyre and song resound for
Aristodemus Fr. 9

them,
and the ordinance of Zeus Xenius is venerated
in continuous feasts. May he complete his term
of twelve months in glory and with heart unscathed.

We here have references to celebrations and food (λοιβάσιν, κνίσᾳ, τραπέζαις) as well as music (λύρα, ἀοιδά). The original context of Dionysius’ fragment might very well be his On poets, mentioned in the medieval Vita on Nicander (Crugnola, 1971, p. 33) where Dionysius appears to have been interested in questions of classification of odes.\(^1\) D’Alessio (1997, p. 57) suggests that Dionysius joined the poem to Fr. 123 Maehler, also written for a person from Tenedus, Theoxenus.

Παροίνια: Boeckh conjectured Παρθένια, “songs sung by maidens”, in order to harmonize Dionysius’ statement with the surviving catalogues of Pindar’s works, which do not mention Paroinia but are unanimous in attributing Parthenaea to him.\(^2\) It is however possible that Dionysius made use of other categories than those in the ancient catalogues. Dionysius’ paroinia are probably a synonym of skolia, “drinking songs” which were included (perhaps a sub-genre) in the book of enkomia in the Alexandrian edition of Pindar (Barbantani, 2017, p. 375).

Aristodemus Fr. 9

In ll. 10–12 of Isthmian 1, written for Herodotus of Thebes, winner in the chariot race, Pindar tells us that six victories were bestowed on Thebes:

ἐπεὶ στεφάνου
ἐξ ὤπασεν Κάδμου στρατῷ ἐξ ἀέθλων,
καλλίνικον πατρίδι κῦδος.

Because it bestowed six crowns on Cadmus’ people from its games,
the glory of victory for their fatherland.

The scholia tell us that the surviving catalogues of Isthmian victories neither had recorded six Theban victors at the Isthmian games, nor six victories by Herodotus. The ancient Grammarians therefore attempted to interpret ἐξ, “six”, in a way compatible with the catalogues. The “Aristarcheans” believed that we should read ἐξ and took it as a prefix to the verb ὄπασεν, while Aristodemus instead took it as two words, the numeral ἐξ and the verb ὄπασεν. Aristodemus

---

\(^1\) Cf. section 3.11.
\(^2\) Cf. section 4.4.2 for the ancient classification of Pindar’s odes.
believed that the subject of ὤπασε was Apollo, whom he referred to as “patron of the contests”. Apollo was obviously not the patron deity of the Isthmian games, which were held in honour of Poseidon (Strabo 8.6.22), nor of the chariot, but we may speculate that Aristodemus saw Apollo as a patron of Herodotus’ athletic career or of sports in general. This fragment shows that already long before Didymus the ancient grammarians used historical sources, e.g. in the form of victor lists of the Pan-Hellenic games, in interpreting Pindar.¹

A variant of this scholion is found in the papyrus POxy 2451 A Fr. 1. It recalls the debate on the reading of ἕξ but does not mention Aristodemus’ interpretation. Benelli (2014) suggests the following text:

ἐπεὶ στ[ε]θάν[ους] ἕξ ὤπασεν οἱ μὲν [ἀκούσωσι τὸ ἕξ ὡς] ἔρι

Since it handed over six crowns some interpret hex as Pindar saying that there were six Theban victors, others read with the spiritus lenis so that it is eξ¯opasen instead of ὤπασεν.

ἀναγραφαῖς: The records of Isthmian victors were, like those on Nemean victors, simple and incomplete catalogues when compared to those on the Olympic and Pythian victors Christesen, 2007, pp. 108–11.

οἱ’Αριστάρχειοι: It is not obvious whether this is a paraphrase of the views of Aristarchus or refers to a tradition following the ancient scholar. Benelli (2014, pp. 819–20, n. 22) suggested that we identify the Aristarcheans with either Aristarchus’ successor Ammonius or Chaeris because of the latter’s quotation of Menaechmus’ Pythikos (Chaeris Fr. 3), but this does not necessarily mean that the Aristarcheans refer to Chaeris (or Ammonius).

περισσὴν ... συνήθεια: Πρόθεσις here refers to a prefix, rather than a preposition as in Σ II. 19.62a1 (A) (on ἀπομηνίσαντος): καὶ ἄτι περισσή ἦ ἀπὸ πρόθεσις, ἀντὶ τοῦ μηνίσαντος, “[it is marked] because apo is a superfluous prefix, instead of [simple] menisantos”. The notion of redundancy, which we observe in the “Aristarcheans’” περισσήν, was an important tool for describing elements of poetic syntax untypical of later usage ².

Chrysippus Fr. 3

The fragment paraphrases the gnome of Isthmian. 1.40, ὁ πονήσας δὲ νόω καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει. The former ὡς is used adverbially, “just as”, introducing a

¹Cf. section 4.6.1 for the historical interpretation of Pindar.
²Cf. section 4.5.2
Chrysippus Fr. 4

The scholion paraphrases Isthmian 1.47–48:

μισθὸς γὰρ ἄλλος ἄλλος ἐπ’ ἔργμασιν ἀνθρώποις γλυκύς, μηλοβότᾳ τ’ ἄροτᾳ τ’ ὅρνιχολόχῳ τε καὶ ὅν πόντος τράφει

For a different payment for different tasks is sweet to men, whether to a shepherd, a plowman, a fowler or to the one whom the sea nourishes.

Chrysippus apparently took ὅν πόντος τράφει to be a merchant. Braswell (2015) suggests that it was Pindar’s use of misthos (salary) in v. 47 that inspired Chrysippus to use this interpretation.

Chrysippus Fr. 5

Chrysippus’s fragment discusses why Poseidon is mentioned in Isthmian 1.52–54, where Pindar himself calls it “fitting” (ἔοικε, I. 1.52) to sing of Poseidon. Chrysippus explains that it depends on the proximity of Onchestus, famous for its sanctuary to Poseidon, to Thebes, the home-town of the laudandus Herodotus. Pindar himself refers to Poseidon as a neighbour (γείτονα) in the ode, so the interpretation was close at hand. The concept of neighbourhood is also used on other occasions by ancient Pindarists, such as by Callistratus Fr. 3, to explain the invocations of gods or heroes or the inclusion of mythical digressions. According to Braswell (2015, p. 135) the reference to a sanctuary to Poseidon Hippodromius in Thebes, is not to a temple in Thebes but to that in Onchestus. Braswell bases his opinion on the lack of other ancient sources for

1 Contra Braswell (2015, p. 133).
2 Translation is that by Murray and Wyatt (1999).
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the existence of a temple of Poseidon in Thebes. The wording of the scholion does however strongly suggest that a temple in Thebes is intended, and that we do not have any evidence for a sanctuary of Poseidon in Thebes does not have to mean that Chrysippus did not believe that there was one. This is especially true since Chrysippus’ information on the location of temples and sacred games may very well also be confused in Fr. 6.

Aristodemus Fr. 10 (Dubium)

As in Fr. 9, Aristodemus here comments on a Theban question. Since the fragment does not directly comment upon Pindar’s text, it could derive from a work on the history and mythology of Thebes’ history rather than a commentary on Pindar. Since Aristodemus Fr. 9 shows that he worked on Isthmian 1, it seems reasonable to include it within this collection because it could derive from antiquarian information given by Aristodemus in a work on Pindar. The Argonauts were by tradition referred to as Minyans. This is the case also in P. 4.69 on which Σ P. 4.122 comments that:

Πλευσάντων Μινυῶν: τῶν Μινυῶν: φησὶ δὲ τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν, ὅτι οἱ πλείους αὐτῶν εἰς Μινύαν τὸν Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Τριτογενείας τῆς Αἰολου τὸ γένος ἀνήγγειλεν, καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος (Argonautica 1.230-231) φησιν; ἐπεὶ Μινύαο θυγατρῶν οἱ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι ἀφ’ αἵματος ἐυχετόων.

When the Minyans sailed: The Minyans. [Pindar] says that most of the Argonauts trace their ancestry to Minyas, son of Poseidon and Tritogeneia, daughter of Aeolus. Apollonius Rhodius also says: Since most, and the best, [of the Argonauts] boasted they were of the blood of Minyas’ daughters.

As noted by the anonymous scholiast to Apollonius Rhodius Σ 1.229–233 (ed. Wendel), the Argonauts descended from Minyas, son of Poseidon and Tritogeneia, daughter of Aeolus. Apollonius Rhodius also says: Since most, and the best, [of the Argonauts] boasted they were of the blood of Minyas’ daughters.

Διονύσιος: Jacoby identified this Dionysius with Dionysius from Samos, the Cyclographer (FGrH 15 Fr. 14). He was probably active in the second or third centuries BCE and wrote an Historical cycle, possibly a mythological handbook (Ceccarelli, 2009).
Chrysippus Fr. 6

In this fragment, Chrysippus identifies the contest on Euboea mentioned by Pindar in *Isthmian* 1.57 καὶ Εὔβοιαν ἐν γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις, “and [to mention] Euboea, when speaking of curved racecourses” as a festival *Basileia* held for Hades. The festival is only known from scholia on Pindar: the anonymous Σ I.1.11, as well as in marginal annotations from the 16th century in a copy of Callierges’ edition of Pindar. Chrysippus’ information that the *Basileia* were held in honour of Hades is surprising since the famous *Basileia* at Lebadeia was celebrated for Zeus Basileus, instead of Hades. Perhaps Chrysippus was not able to identify the festival of Euboea and conjectures that since Pindar in l. 56 alludes to the Eleusinian games, held in honour of Demeter and Persephone according to Σ O. 9.150b, the festival at Euboea was held in honour of Persephone’s husband, a hypothetical Hades Basileus. As noted by Braswell (2013, p. 136) we have no external evidence for the cult of Hades on Euboea or in other parts of Greece except Elis, where there was a sacred enclosure and temple of Hades (Pausanias 6.25.2).

Aristodemus Fr. 11

Aristodemus comments on Pindar’s use of an *Abbruchformel* in *I*. 1.60-63:

πάντα δ᾿ ἐξειπεῖν, ὥσ᾿ ἀγώνιος Ἶρμας
Ἡροδότῳ ἔπορεν
ἵπποις, ἀφαιρεῖτα βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχων ἔχων
ὑμνος.

But recounting all the victories Hermes, patron of games,
has granted to Herodotus
and his horses, my hymn’s brief length forbids.

According to the scholiast, Aristodemus saw here an example of Pindar’s habit of mentioning outstanding and omitting lesser victories. On the other hand, Aristodemus understood βραχὺ μέτρον ὑμνος, “the brief length of the hymn” as a reference to victory odes being written to a certain number of words and triads settled by the terms of payment, meaning that Pindar would have told of further victories, if his payment had been sufficient. The understanding of the *Abbruchformel* as a genuine statement by Pindar due to the historical

---

1 Σ N. 6.102 and I. 1.81, edited by Semitelas (1875)
2 This festival, which was mentioned by Didymus Fr. 13 Braswell is discussed at length by Müller (2014).
circumstances of the ode is also apparent in Ammonius Fr. 7. References to payment or even to the poet’s greed are common in the scholia and Pindaric phrases are often understood as hints about fees, including Artemon Fr. 3 and Callistratus Fr. 2.¹

έπῶν: I accept the conjecture by Drachmann. If we follow this reading, έπῶν modifies ἀριθμόν, “the number of words”, which makes good sense. The readings of the manuscripts, εἰπεῖν (B) and εἰπῶν (D), are more complicated. If we accept the manuscript readings, ἔκδοσεῖς τῶν ἐπινίκων must be the object of εἰπεῖν/εἰπῶν, “to tell the productions of the victory odes”, which makes little sense.

Chrysippus Fr. 7

Isthmian 1 ends with a warning not to keep wealth hidden in I. 1.67–68:

Εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον,
ἄλλοισι δ’ ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ ᾿Αἴδᾳ τελέων οὐ φράζεται δόξας ἄνευ-
θεν.

If someone holds secret riches within, and laughs as he attacks others he does not consider that he will end up in Hades without honour.

Chrysippus’ fragment suggests an alternative reading ἄλαοῖσιν, understanding it as the dative plural of the epic ἄλαός, “blind”, instead of the transmitted ἄλλοισι, “others”. From the scholia’s paraphrase of ἄλαοῖσιν, it appears that Chrysippus understood the subject of ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ to be attacking the “unseen things”, a reference to wealth, a common metaphor in classical literature.² Irigoin (1952, p. 64) states that Chrysippus’ variant is an unmetrical and senseless conjecture, while Young (1965, p. 248) believed it to be misreading of an uncial Lambda for an Aleph. Braswell (2015, p. 136) recently suggested that it is a conjecture and “an attempt to answer the question why the miser is laughing”, i.e. because other waste their time on their wealth, while the “miserly τις” hides his own wealth. I tend to support Young’s theory, since it does not seem probable that Chrysippus would resort to conjecture in order to support the resulting interpretation which is rather far-fetched and in addition to being unmetrical,³ it does not improve the sense of the text.

² Cf. e.g. Aristophanes Plat. 90 and Hipponax Fr. 36.1 IEG².
³ The wording of Bundy (1962, p. 85).
⁴ The corresponding lines in the ode (17, 34, 51) all have an initial long syllable.
Isthmian 2 was written for Xenocrates, brother of the tyrant Theron of Acradas, but the circumstances for its creation are heavily debated. The ode appears to have been written after Xenocrates’ death in 472 BCE, since it is directed to his son Thrasybulus, and was perhaps commissioned on account of a memorial celebration of Xenocrates’ victories (Verdenius, 1988, p. 119).

Callistratus apparently noticed that Xenocrates is never addressed directly in the ode. He does not, however, appear to have considered the possibility that Xenocrates was already dead. Instead he argued that Pindar deliberately decided against addressing him. The reason for this, Callistratus says, was that the laudandus had not paid Pindar because of “stinginess” (μικρολογία). The poet instead directed his words towards Thrasybulus. This theory was probably influenced by the description of the contemporary mercenary muse in I. 2.6–13:

For at that time the Muse was not yet greedy for gain nor up for hire,

nor were sweet, soft-voiced songs with their faces silvered over being sold

from the hand of honey-voiced Terpsichore.

But now she bids us heed the Argive’s adage, which comes . . . closest to the truth:

“Money, money makes the man,” said he who lost his possessions and friends as well.

But enough, for you are wise. Not unknown is the Isthmian chariot victory that I sing.

Apparently, Callistratus saw a hidden message from Pindar to Thrasybulus in these lines criticizing his father, an idea which was further supported by his variant reading of ἄγνωτ’, “unknown”, as ἄγνωτ’, “ignorant”, which suggested that Thrasybulus was aware of the hidden meaning in the statement.\(^1\) The idea

\(^1\) Cf. commentary on Callistratus Fr. 5 for further discussion of this variant reading.
that Pindar is here complaining over a lack of payment is typical of the scholia.\footnote{Cf. commentary on Aristodemus Fr. 11.} Pindar does not explicitly refer to Xenocrates as dead, but Asclepiades argued from probability (καταεικοβολεῖ) that the ode was written after Xenocrates’ death. He probably came to this conclusion because of the references to Xenocrates in historical tenses, primarily in I. 2.35–42: Xenocrates obtained sweet temper (ὀργὰν . . . γλυκείαν . . . ἔσχεν), was respected (αἰδοῖος ... ἦν), welcomed banquets for the gods (θεῶν δαῖτας προσέπτυκτο), and his guest-friendship never ceased (ὑπεστεῖλ’). The use of the historical tense was also noted by Diodorus Aristophaneus Fr. 1. The fragment of Artemon is quoted as a source on genealogy of the Emmenidae. This fragment does not directly discuss Pindar’s text and might also derive from a historical work although it would suit a commentary on Pindar’s Sicilian odes well.

The scholia on Pindar generally see Xenocrates as Theron’s brother and here this view is represented by anonymous earlier commentators, οἱ προϋπομνηματισάμενοι. The identification of this expression, which also is found in a discussion of the Emmenidae in Σ O. 3.68a, is the subject of some debate but Calvani Mariotti (1999) argues that it refers to a group of early historians.\footnote{According to Miller (1970, p. 55), it refers to Aristophanes of Byzantium, but we have little evidence for attributing such a commentary to this scholar.} We can only hypothesize on the reasons for Artemon’s view that Thrasybulus was only a relative. Broggiato (2011, p. 548) has suggested that Artemon had access to alternative historical sources in Pergamum. An interest in Emmenid genealogy is also attested in Artemon Fr. 1.

**Callistratus Fr. 5**

The mentioning of the mercenary Muse in *Isthmian* 2 is followed by the transitional line 12 which in Snell-Muehler’s edition read: ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὅν σύρος, οἷς ἄγνωτ’ ἄτιόω, “But enough, for you are wise. Not unknown is [the Isthmian chariot victory] that I sing”. Instead of ἄγνωτ’, accusative plural neuter of ἄγνωτος, “unknown”, Callistratus read ἄγνωτ’, understanding it as the dative singular of ἄγνως, “ignorant”. This reading suggests that Thrasybulus is aware of the message hidden behind the references to money in the ode: the lack of payment for Pindar’s ode.\footnote{Cf. commentary on Callistratus Fr. 4 for further discussion of this topic.}

Οἱ περὶ Καλλιστρατον: The meaning of οἱ περὶ + personal name in accusative case has been much debated. Although the construction οἱ περὶ is often referred to as a periphrasis of a simple personal noun, economical reasons tell against seeing such periphrastic expressions as pure synonyms to the personal noun, as the language of the scholiastic corpora is typically condensed and condensed and condensed and...
elliptic. The occurrences of this construction within the corpus of this dissertation are best understood as examples of its “authoritative use”.¹ According to Gorman (2001, p. 211) referents of this use “may form a group that exists only in the mind of the author. The named object of περί is usually an author – or one who, like Socrates and Carneades, have had their words recorded by others – and the group around him is constituted by those who have or do or will share the author’s point of view.”.

Συνεργεῖ: The verb should be translated as “support”. Those around Callistratus argue that Pindar’s phrasing supports the theory presented by Callistratus in Fr 4. Braswell (2013, p. 254) instead translates “belong together” with reference to the two statements ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὦν σόφος and οὐκ ἄγνωτ’ ἀείδω. He argues that Callistratus was saying that these two statements support each other.

Diodorus Aristophaneus Fr. 1

Diodorus, like Asclepiades Fr. 12, noted that Xenocrates is referred to with the historical tense of the copula in I. 2.35 and concluded that this meant that Xenocrates was dead when the ode was produced. From this information, Diodorus argued that the ode was a thrēnos, “dirge, lament”, for the deceased Xenocrates rather than a victory ode. His line of reasoning is similar to that of other ancient grammarians, who argued that the thrēnos was a song performed some time after the death of the laudandus’ death and included praise (Harvey, 1955, p. 55). Since the Alexandrian edition of Pindar by Aristophanes contained one book of Thrēnoi, which is evident from the lists given by the Vita Ambrosiana and P.Oxy 2438, Diodorus’ re-classification still fits well within the Alexandrian system classification used for Pindaric poetry.

Διόδωρος: The manuscripts have Διόδοτος. Boeckh’s conjecture was based on the epithet Ἄριστοφάνειος, which is used only for three individuals, Callistratus (Athen. Deipn. 1.21c, 6.8253e-f), Artemidorus of Tarsus (Athen. Deipn. 4.182c-d, 9.387d-e, 11.485e, 14.662d) and Diodorus of Tarsus (Athen. Deipn. 5.180e). Although the use of the epithet is otherwise only known from Athenaeus, and we thus cannot be sure that this use was common, this solution appears preferable to assuming an otherwise unknown grammarian with the epithet. The error Διόδοτος might have been influenced by the Diodotus mentioned in Isthmian 7.31, father of the ode’s laudandus Strepsiades.

μὴν νοῆσας: I have adapted the suggestion mentioned by Bitto (2012, p. 215). The text of the manuscripts makes little sense. The scholiast could hardly have argued that Diodorus classified the ode as a thrēnos due to his

¹The importance of this category was first noted by Dubuisson (1977, p. 164) the terminology used here is based on Gorman (2001).
disregard of the use of historic tenses, which, as we also noted in Asclepiades Fr. 12 on the same ode, was the argument for assuming that Xenocrates was already dead.

Chrysippus Fr. 8

Pindar uses a nautical metaphor when describing Xenocrates’ hospitality which Chrysippus paraphrases and explains.¹

Chrysippus Fr. 9

Chrysippus believes that it is the abuse that makes sounds. Braswell (2015) suggests that Chrysippus was influenced by O. 13.10 which refers to hybris as θρασύμυθος, “bold of tongue”.

Chrysippus Fr. 10

Chrysippus here paraphrases Pindar’s I. 4.11–12:

\[
\text{ἀνορέαις δ’ ἑσχάταισιν}
\]
\[
\text{όδοισον στάλαισιν ἅπτονθ’ Ἡερακλείαις.}
\]

and by their unexcelled manly deeds have grasped from their home the pillars of Heracles.

Chrysippus argues that Pindar is saying that the manly deeds are conspicuous at home and reach the pillars of Hercules. Braswell (2015) does not include the comment on Pindar’s use of the dative στάλαισιν instead of the genitive within his edition of Chrysippus. Since Chrysippus commented on Pindar’s language it is possible this comment, too, derives from the grammarian. If this is the case, Chrysippus here offers a parallel for Pindar’s usage of the dative for the genitive by quoting I. 1.18, with the variant στεφάνοισι for the manuscripts’ άεθλοισι. If this is the case, Chrysippus’ reading suggests a misunderstanding of Pindar’s text, ἐν τ’ άεθλοισι (στεφάνοισι) δίγον πλείστων ἄγώνων, where πλείστων ἄγώνων is obviously the object of δίγγανω.

¹Cf. section 4.5.1 for a discussion of paraphrase and intralingual translation in Hellenistic scholarship.
**Chrysippus Fr. 11**

**Chrysippus Fr. 11**

In *Isthmian* 4.13 Pindar says to Melissus that he should not strive to go beyond the pillars of Hercules.

καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν.

And not seek further deeds.

Chrysippus here notes that Pindar uses the inifinitive σπεύδειν as an imperative, which Chrysippus renders by the *koine* form σπευδέτωσαν. Aristarchus had already noted such cases of interchange of moods by giving corresponding *koine* forms.1

**Chrysippus Fr. 12**

Pindar in *I.* 4.16–18 mentions the misfortunes suffered by Melissus’ family:

ἀλλ’ ἂμερα γὰρ ἐν μιᾷ
τραχεῖα νιφὰς πολέμου τεσσάρων
ἀνθρώπων ἐρήμωσεν μάκαιραν ἑστίαν

But in one day the rough snow of war deprived the happy hearth of four men.

Chrysippus paraphrases Pindar saying that four relatives fell in battle in a single day causing grievance to the family. Noteworthy is the replacement of the more poetic ἑστίαν, “hearth” with οἶκον, “home”.

**Chrysippus Fr. 13**

Chrysippus here paraphrases *Isthmian* 4.18–20:

νῦν δ’ αὖ μετὰ χειμέριον ποικίλα μηνῶν ζόφον χθὼν ὥτε
φοινικέοισιν ἄνθησεν ῥόδοις δαιμόνων βουλαῖς.

But now again, after a winter’s gloom lasting months, it is as if the dappled earth had blossomed with red roses by the gods’ designs.

---

1 Cf. section 4.5.2.
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Braswell (2015, p. 139) translates “after that misfortune they flourished even during the inclement weather”. Braswell understands Chrysippus’ καὶ and adverbial (“even”) and τὸν χειμῶνα a temporal accusative, rather than a complement of μετά. As noted by Vecchiato (2018b, pp. 186–187), we should here rather see an example of an explicative καὶ in a paraphrastic passage in the sense, id est, a common feature of the Pindar scholia described by Lehrs (1873, pp. 21–23).

Braswell’s interpretation presupposes that Chrysippus read μετὰ χειμερίων [...] μηνῶν (“during the winter months”). Snell-Maehler’s text and the medieval paradosis instead suggests that the earth blossoms after winter (μετὰ χειμέριον), but it is not impossible that Chrysippus had access to or came up with such a reading.¹ There is however no need to resort to speculation on the text available to Chrysippus, since the καὶ is easily explained as explicative.

Chrysippus Fr. 14

This contains a note on the reference to the ancient songs sung on account of earlier victories of Melissus’ family, the Cleonymidae, in local games in Isthmian 4.25–27:

 ámb te kán γουνοῖς ᾿Αθανάν ᾧραρ καρύξασα νικᾶν
 ἐν τ’ ᾿Αδραστείοις ἀέθλοις Σικυῶνος ὤπασεν
toikôe tón tóti éonton φύλλ’s aoidán.

That fame heralded their chariot’s victory both on the heights of Athens and in the games of Adrastus at Sicyon, and granted such leaves of song as these from men who lived then.

Chrysippus gives a correct loose paraphrase of the passage by stating that other poets praised the victories at their respective time. The translation by Braswell (2015), “Chrysippus says that this [is true] of other poets who have celebrated the victories in times past” is partly incorrect. ὡς + absolute genitive is a common construction within the Pindar scholia and is used similar to a subordinate ὅτι or ὡς clause. Chrysippus is simply rendering the sense of the passage, and there is not reason to supply “is true” in the translation.

Chrysippus Fr. 15

Chrysippus here remarks on I. 4.30 τῶν ἀπειράτων γὰρ ἄγνωστοι σιωπαί, “the silence of the inexperienced is unknown”, that the passage (topos) has

¹Hartung (1856) conjectured χειμερίων.
been marked out (sesēmeiōtai) because of the expression (phrasis). Körte and Braswell both argue that the practice of marking suspicious or notable passages using a χ was invented by Aristarchus. Two objections may be raised. Firstly, the sign used here is not explicitly identified, although χ is used on other occasions in the Pindar scholia, e.g. Σ P. 3.18a, I. 6.47e. Secondly, and more importantly, critical signs per se were not invented by Aristarchus. As noted by Pontani the sign χ may have been used already by Aristophanes of Byzantium to mark positions discussed in (some form of) commentary (Pontani, 2019, pp. 5–8). Although the use of critical signs indeed suggests a connection to the Alexandrian tradition of literary scholarship, this fragment alone might thus not be conclusive evidence for putting Chrysippus after Aristarchus, although it seems to be a plausible hypothesis. According to Körte (1900, p. 134), Chrysippus is here explaining a sign in his copy of the text, possibly made by Aristarchus, whereas, according to Braswell (2015, p. 140–141), Chrysippus himself made the sign. In my opinion the perfect σεσημειώται, equivalent to an aorist, rather suggests that Chrysippus comments upon an already existing critical sign in his text. A parallel is found in Σ I. 6.47e where the anonymous scholiast discusses possible reasons why Aristarchus has annotated a passage using χ.

Chrysippus Fr. 16

Pindar refers to Ajax’ suicide in Isthmian 4.34–36b:

καὶ κρέσσον’ ἀνδρῶν χειρόνων ἔσφαλε τέχνα καταμάρψαις;
ἰστε μάν Αἴαντος ἀλκάν, φοίνιον τὰν ὀψίᾳ ἐν νυκτὶ ταμών περὶ ὧ
φασγάνῳ μομφὰν ἔχει παιδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ’ ἔβαν.

And the skill of inferior men can overtake
and bring down a stronger man. Surely you know of
Ajax’s bloodstained valour, which he pierced late at night
on his own sword, and thereby casts blame
upon all the sons of the Hellenes who went to Troy.

As on several occasions, Chrysippus is interested in the function and reference of the myth within the Pindaric ode. Chrysippus expresses uncertainty on the object of Pindar’s reference. It may either refer to the wrestling match between Odysseus and Ajax at the funeral games for Patroclus (II. 23.700-739) or to their contest about Achilles’ armour (cf. Od. 11.552–562) which

---

1 Cf. section 4.1 for critical signs in Pindar.
2 Cf. e.g. Chrysippus Fr. 2 and Fr. 18.
ultimately resulted in Ajax’ suicide. Chrysippus concludes that the myth refers to Melissus’ victory and mirrors the way in which Melissus defeated a greater opponent by his cunning rather than by his strength. This understanding of the myth as a metaphor for the laudandus is also found e.g. in Chaeris Fr. 10.

This adverb is occasionally used in the sense, “with hidden meaning” in reference to allegorical interpretations, but the following γαρ-clause shows that it is here used to denote that the passage is of unclear meaning.

**Chrysippus Fr. 17**

According to Pindar, Ajax’s suicide brought shame upon the Greeks. Here Chrysippus paraphrases Pindar’s expression and line of thought. Despite Chrysippus’ uncertainty in Fr. 16 concerning the reference of the myth and his apparent preference for understanding it as a reference to the wrestling games, he here obviously identifies it with the Greeks’ decision to give Achilles’ armour to Odysseus and not to Ajax.

**Chrysippus Fr. 18**

Modern scholars all agree that in Isthmian 4.55–57 Pindar tells how Homer has honoured Ajax.

But Homer, to be sure, has made him honored among mankind, who set straight his entire achievement and declared it with his staff of divine verses for future men to enjoy.

Chrysippus instead states that it is ambiguous whether Pindar refers to Homer as having honoured Ajax or Odysseus. Surprisingly, he accepts that it is Odysseus who was honoured by Homer. Chrysippus acknowledges that Pindar generally admires Ajax, yet concluded that the one celebrated must be Odysseus. Chrysippus’ main argument is that δς αὐτοῦ πάσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ φάβδον ἔφρασεν must refer to the Odyssey since the Odyssey is recited more (μᾶλλον ...οἰκομενία) than the Iliad. This possibly suggests

---

1Pindar indeed mentions Ajax’ suicide and the unfairness of the judgment also in Nemean 7 and 8 (Willcock, 1995, p. 79)
that, according to Chrysippus, the *Odyssey* was more popular than the *Iliad*. This is contradicted by the number of papyri of the two works, where the *Iliad* outnumbers the *Odyssey* about 2:1 (Haslam, 1997, pp. 60–61). Perhaps Chrysippus instead suggested that the *Odyssey* is more rhapsodic in nature due to the prominence of the rhapsodes Phemius and Demodocus, although it is questionable whether the verb ῥαψωδέω can have this meaning. Secondly, according to Chrysippus, Pindar must be referring to Odysseus since Homer dedicated a whole work to celebrating Odysseus, whereas Ajax is only one of many celebrated in the *Iliad*. A third argument of Chrysippus was his idea that Pindar identified Melissus with the lesser one who defeats the greater one through cunning. This would suggest an identification of the celebrated one with Odysseus, well known for his cunning.

**Chrysippus Fr. 19**

Chrysippus says that Pindar calls either Homer’s poem or the deeds of those mentioned within it immortal. As noted by Vecchiato (2018a), Braswell’s (2015, p. 143) translation “Chrysippus said that the poem of Homer says that the poem itself is immortal or that the deeds of those included in the poem [are immortal]” is probably incorrect. The subject of the infinitive λέγειν can hardly be the poem itself, but must be Pindar. Chrysippus’ comment is basically a loose paraphrase of lines 40–41 τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἕρπει, εἴ τις εὖ ἐπὶ τι, “For that thing goes forth with immortal voice, if someone says it well”. In their original context, the lines are found after the description of Homer’s honouring of Ajax (*I. 4.37–39*), and refer to poetry’s effect of conferring immortality, which Chrysippus has certainly misunderstood, as noted both by Braswell and Vecchiato. However, there is nothing in the text of Pindar to suggest that the work of Homer calls itself immortal here. Braswell’s decision was possibly caused by the fact that Πίνδαρον, the subject of the infinitive λέγειν, is left out, but as noted by Vecchiato, this is also the case in e.g. Chrysippus Fr. 20 and Fr. 22. Vecchiato (2018b, pp. 187–189) suggests that Chrysippus understood τοῦτο as the work of Homer, which Pindar refers to as immortal, and the protasis as a reference to the rhapsodic performance. This interpretation is preferable since it offers an explanation for Chrysippus’ paraphrase.

**Chrysippus Fr. 20**

Braswell (2015, p. 144) suggests that Chrysippus anachronistically identified Pindar’s Libya with an area relatively far to the west of Egypt, while Pindar used this name to refer to the area west of the Nile, which would explain his
criticism of the fertility of Libya. However, already Pindar appears to refer to Libya as the third continent in *P.* 9.8–9. Nonetheless, for Pindar Libya is closely connected with Cyrene, which he frequently refers to as fertile.\(^1\) The reason for Chrysippus’ comment is not anachronism, but rather his awareness of the tradition that Antaeus lived in the Libyan desert. According to Chrysippus, the description of Libya is *ἀκυρότερον*, i.e. an example of improper or not literal use, since not the whole of Libya is fertile (and especially not Antaeus’ dwelling-place in the desert). The statement begun by *μήποτε* is probably an addition by the anonymous scholiast explaining the reasons for Pindar’s description of Libya.

**Chrysippus Fr. 21**

Chrysippus comments that Hercules’ father Amiphytryon lived close to the Electran gates where the sons of Hercules were worshipped. Later Hercules killed his sons with Megara at these gates, where the Thebans every year sacrifice to his sons and hold funeral games in their honour.

**Chrysippus Fr. 22**

If *ἐκ περιφράσεως* are Chrysippus’ own words, this shows that he, unlike Aristarchus uses periphrasis as an independent trope whereas Aristarchus on the other hand uses *περιφραστικῶς* for *synecdoche* Schironi, 2018, p. 143 n.89. Related is the statement that the notion of being “new” is expressed by adding a suffix (*κατὰ παραγώγην*). *παραγώγη* refers to derivation in general, but generally not of compounds, and in Epaphroditus Fr. 44 Braswell it is directly contrasted with composition. Chrysippus is thus probably saying that this is also a circumlocution.

**Menecrates Fr. 2**

The identification of this Menecrates is problematic. Since the scholia on Pindar most probably mention Aristarchus’ follower with the same name (Menecrates Fr. 1), Fowler (2013, p. 704) argues that it is natural to identify the present Menecrates with him (rather than with the fourth-century BCE Menecrates of Xanthus, writer of a history of Lycia). The present fragment differs from Fr. 1 in its relationship to Pindar’s text. In *Isthmian* 4 the story of the death of Hercules’ sons has not so much been altered as gained a form that differs from the common

\(^1\)E.g. in *P.* 4.52 and Ammonius Fr. 4.
myth in which they are killed by Hercules in his madness. Pindar instead describes the tombs of the children as “bronze-armed”, which suggests that they were already of age and killed in battle with unknown opponents (Fowler, 2013, p. 269). This was noted by the anonymous scholiast who first quotes several sources that attribute the killing to others. Menecrates adds instead information on the purifying of Hercules by Oebalus. The purifying requires Hercules to have killed his sons in rage which suggests that Menecrates’ comment is on the myth in general, rather than on that of Pindar. Also the information on the number of Hercules’ sons, where he agrees with Pindar, and the patronymic used for the sons is an example of mythographical information that cannot be conclusively connected to Pindar. If Menecrates was a commentator on Pindar, this information would have been adduced as mythological variants to the myth told in Isthmian 4. That Menecrates is quoted alongside several other sources on Hercules might suggest that they were quoted from a common mythographical source. The fragment is also quoted by Tzetzes (Tzetzes Σ LycoPh. Alex. 663 = FGrH 701 Fr. 2) who identifies Menecrates as an author on Nicea (Μενεκράτης δὲ ὁ περὶ Νικαίας συγγεγραφώς). The identification with the author on Nicea, also mentioned in Plutarch Thes. 26.3, is probably Tzetzes’ own invention by combining the two sources.

Οἰβάλου: The name Σικάλου of B is otherwise unknown, as is that of D, Σιβάλου. Abel suggested the conjecture Οἰβάλου, which I have here accepted. Oebalus was a Spartan king and the father of Hippocoon who, together with his sons, was slain by Hercules after refusing to cleanse him for the murder of Iphitus and killing his cousin Oeonus (Pausanias 3.15.3–5).

οὐχ ᾽Ηρακλείδας, οὐδέπω γὰρ ᾽Ηρακλῆς ὠνομάζετο, ἀλλ’ ᾽Αλκαΐδας: According to a tradition, known from Ps-Apollodorus’ Bibliotheca 2.4.12, Hercules was named Alcaides after his grandfather Alcaeus. According to a variant known from Diodorus Siculus (1.24.4, 4.10.1), Hercules was originally known as Alcaeus, while Apollodorus states that the name Hercules was given to him after the murder of his sons by the Pythian priestes. It appears that Pindar was aware of this tradition since in Pae. 20.4 (= Rutherford S1), he refers to Hercules as Ἀλκαίδας and in Pindar Fr. 291 Maehler said that Hercules was originally called Alcides.

Chrysippus Fr. 23

Chrysippus’ interpretation differs from that of the anonymous scholiast in Σ 120b. Whereas the scholiast believes that two victories (διπλόν νίκαν) were won while Melissus was as a boy and one as an adult, Chrysippus, probably

---

1 This was known already to Stesichorus, cf. Pausanias 9.11.4.
correctly, believes that Melissus won one victory as a boy and two as an adult. It appears that the anonymous scholiast took παίδων as a modifier of διπλόαν νίκαν. This interpretation was facilitated by the fact that the manuscripts have ὁδ' ἀνήρ διπλόαν νίκαν ἀνεφάνατο παίδων τρίταν πρόσθεν, without the connective τε ατερ παίδων which was only supplied by Hermann in a note in the third edition of Heyne’s Pindar edition. The interpretation of the scholiast is however, as Chrysippus notes, problematic because of the following τρίταν πρόσθεν. Chrysippus therefore argued that τρίταν referred to the first victory, as a boy, and that the adverb was added because it had taken place earlier than the διπλόαν νίκαν, which accordingly was won as a man.

Callistratus Fr. 6

*Isthmian* 5 was written for Phylacidas from Aegina, son of Lampon, following his Isthmian victory in pancration. Phylacidas is also celebrated in *Isthmian* 6 and his brother Pytheas is the recipient of *Nemean* 5. *Isthmian* 5 is sprinkled with references to the athletic victories of the family, which also included an uncle Euthymenes who won at Nemea:

Τὶν δ' ἐν ῾Ισθμῷ διπλόα θάλλοισ' ἀρετά,
Φυλακίδα, κεῖται, Νεμέᾳ δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν
Πυθέα τε παγχρατίοι (I. 5.17–19).

For you, Phylacidas, a flourishing double achievement is stored up at the Isthmus, and at Nemea for both you and Pytheas in the pancratium.

αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις
Φυλακίδα πλαγγάν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι,
χερσὶ δεξιόν, νόῳ ἀντίπαλον (I. 5.59–61).

I praise Pytheas too among those who subdue bodies for guiding straight the course of Phylacidas’ blows, being quick with his hands and a good match with his mind.

These references to different victories and victors caused some discussion on the recipient of the ode, and three theories are found in the scholia.

1. According to a certain Hephaistion (second century CE), cited in Σ I. 5. inscr. a, the ode was written for Pytheas alone.

2. Anonymous authorities stated that the ode was written for both Pytheas and Phylacidas.
3. The ode was written for Phylacidas alone.

Callistratus followed the third theory, also accepted by modern scholars. By saying that Pindar had “included” (συμπεριειλῆφθαι) Pytheas’ victory “from without” (ἐξωθετεῖν), Callistratus explains the references to Pytheas in the ode as deriving from other victories than that primarily celebrated in the ode. He supported this theory with a reference to Isthmian 6. In this ode, also dedicated to Phylacidas, Pindar mentions that he has come, as a leader of the κόμος, “procession”, to not only Phylacidas, but also to Pytheas and Euthymenes.

ἐν τῇ μετὰ ταύτην: This is a reference to Isthmian 6, the next ode in the established sequence of the medieval manuscripts. The wording suggest that in Callistratus’ book of Isthmians the odes were ordered as in ours. The existing odes within each book are ordered according to athletic disciplines (Prodi, 2017, p. 554). Each book starts with odes for equestrian competitions. Secondly come odes written for contact sports, such as pancration in the case of Isthmians 5 and 6, followed by foot races and miscellaneous. This arrangement is attributed to Callistratus’ teacher Aristophanes of Byzantium (Negri, 2004).

Theon Fr. 3

The fragment is found as a marginal notation on the second Paean in POxy 841 and discusses Pae. 2.37: ἀλκαὶ δὲ τεῖχος ἀνδρῶν “valiant acts are men’s wall.” The variant reading -και is written in a second hand while a third hand has added the attribution to Theon and the literary parallel (Merro, 2019, p. 218). The literary parallel from Pindar (Fr. 213 Maehler) is a relatively common quotation, first cited by Plato in Rep. 2.365b and also quoted by Maximus Tyre (12.1).

POxy 841 quotes the fragment in the form πότερον δίκα τεῖχος ὕψιστον ἢ σκολιαῖς ἀπάταις while Maehler has πότερον δίκα τεῖχος ὕψιον ἢ σκολιαῖς ἀπάτας ἀναβαίνει ... Possibly Theon’s ἀλκαὶ corresponds to the σκολιαῖς ἀπάτας as the means by which an action upon the τεῖχος is performed.

Theon’s version differs from Maehler’s by i) having the superlative ὕψιστον, which Grenfell & Hunt explained as caused by a hypothetical superlative in the lacuna found in Pae. 2.38, and ii) by having the nominative δίκα instead. Trapp’s edition of Maximus of Tyre has δίκα, but this is a correction in Vat. Gr. 1390 which originally read δίκα as does Paris. Gr. 1962). Although it is possible that an iota mutum has been left out in the papyrus as suggested by Merro (2019), the similarity with Maximus of Tyre shows that we need not resort to conjecture.

The present text of Paean 2 suggests that the valiant acts are the wall of men, but Theon’s variant reading could suggest that he saw the ἀλκαὶ as a means.
Because of the lacuna in line 38 we do not know the appearance of this part of *Paean* 2 or how Theon interpreted it, but if we accept Bury’s suggestion (via Grenfell & Hunt) adopted by Maehler, Theon’s reading would result in the following lines:

\[\text{ἀλκᾷ δὲ τεῖχος ἀνδρῶν}\]
\[[ὑψιστον ἵσταται]\]

With force, men’s wall
stands highest

Since the second triad of *Paean* 2 appears to have contained several references to fighting and war this would suit the context well (Rutherford, 2001, pp. 269–270). The parallel is probably adduced because of the similar use of τεῖχος.

### Aristonicus Fr. 6 (Dubium)

The reading is uncertain. Radt (1958, p. 72) agreed that we should read an alpha at the beginning of the abbreviation but resolved it as Ἀριστοφάνης. Rutherford reads Νικάνωρ whereas McNamee reads Ἀριστο(στο)νί(κος).

The abbreviation is found in an interlinear position above ἐν δὲ in Pindar’s text. This is probably the reading attributed to Aristonicus. An alternative variant is found in the margin, ἐν δὲ, with rough breathing of unclear meaning (McNamee, 2007, p. 332). Aristonicus’ reading, without the rough breathing, should probably be understood as an example of tmesis of ἐγτυγχάνω (Radt, 1958, pp. 72).\(^1\)

### Aristonicus Fr. 7

This fragment is found in a marginal annotation on *POxy* 841.

Lines 87–89 of the *Paean* 6 read

\[\text{ὁσσα τ}ˈ\text{ ἔριζε λευκωλένῳ ἀκνάμπτον ῾Ηρᾳ,}\]
\[\text{ἀκνάμπτον ῾Ηρᾳ μένος ἀνερείδων}\]
\[\text{ὅσα τε Πολιάδι.}\]

What great strife he waged with white-armed Hera as he pitted his unyielding strength against her, and what strife against Polias!

---

\(^1\) Cf. section 4.4.1 for accentuation and breathings in Hellenistic scholarship.
Aristonicus Fr. 8

The fragment consists of the abbreviation Α | Ν which should most probably be resolved as ῎Α(ριστο)ν(κος) (cf. 3.15). Following this abbreviation is found ὅσσα, a variant reading for the papyrus’ ὅσα.

We can only hypothesize on the reasons for Aristonicus’ variant. Since ὅσσα is found in close proximity to ὅσα, it is possible that Aristonicus attempted to make Pindar’s text consistent. Aristonicus’s reading suggests that the syllable is anecepts, but the first syllable in the fifth line of the strophe/antistrophe in other instances is short. The variation between ὅσσα/ὅσα is also attested in O. 13.107 (Radt, 1958, p.144). The apparent non-conformance to metrical demands implied in the reading could possibly speak against the suggested identification with Aristophanes of Byzantium, who is known to have considered metrical correspondence in his work on Pindar. The χι found in the margin next to line 87 could possibly refer to Aristonicus’ variant reading, or to a discussion of this passage in an independent commentary.

Aristonicus Fr. 8

This marginal notation in POxy 841 is heavily mutilated. Of the information following the abbreviated name of the scholar, ΑΡΙ | Ν, only one hardly visible letter, probably the upper part of a kappa, remains.

Radt (1958, p. 192) and D’Alessio and Ferrari (1989, pp. 168–9) believe that a variant reading followed the scholar’s name, although as Prodi (2013, p. 25) has noted, other types of comments are also possible.

Rutherford and D’Alessio have shown that the third triad of Paean 6 was not transmitted only as a paean but also as a prosodion. This view resulted from a marginal scholion which Rutherford reinterpreted as a title Λίγιν[ηήτα]ς εἰς Αἰ[κὸ]ν.προσ[ό]διον as well as the drastic change of content in the third triad which suddenly addresses the Aeginetans instead of the Delphians.

D’Alessio was also able to connect the previously unlocated fragment 108 of POxy 841 to reconstruct a marginal note to line 124 ἐν τῷ α[τῶ]ν προσοδίων φέρεται, “it is transmitted in the first book of Prosodia”.

Furthermore D’Alessio has argued that the third triad was transmitted independently as a Prosodion in POxy 1792 with a different colometry (D’Alessio, 1997).

Does the fragment of Aristonicus derive from a work on the Paeans or on the Prosodia? Economy clearly favors that only one work of Aristonicus was cited, since our evidence indicates that Aristonicus’ work on the Paeans did not only concern the third triad of Paean 6.

I will not discuss here the original context of the third triad, but Rutherford’s and D’Alessio’s reconstructions of the marginalia in POxy 841 and the
identification with \(POxy\) 1792 appear convincing. Apparently the third triad was transmitted both as a part of \(Paean\) 6 and as a Prosodion.

The position of the \(Prosodion\) as an integral part of \(Paean\) 6 in \(POxy\) 841 suggests that it belonged to the Alexandrian edition of Pindar’s \(Paeans\), and it therefore appears probable that Aristonicus would have worked on \(Paeans\), rather than on \(Prosodia\). Still, we cannot completely rule out the possibility that Aristonicus was quoted from two individual works on the \(Paeans\) and on the \(Prosodia\).

**Chrysippus Fr. 24**

The fragment is found in a marginal margin note on \(Pae\). 8 in \(POxy\) 841, fr. 83.

\begin{verbatim}
Κλυτοὶ μάντι[ες] Ἀπόλλωνος,
ἐγὼ μὲν ὑπὲρ χθονός
ὑπὲρ τῆς ὅικεσανοῦ
Θημιὸς τ’ ἐπι[ (Pae. 8.1–4)]
\end{verbatim}

Famous seers of Apollo,
I (have come?) over the land,
over the ocean,
and to (the shrine?) of Themis

The marginal note consists of \(\text{ἐγὼ}\) and the abbreviation \(\chiρυ\). Grenfell & Hunt first suggested that \(\chiρυ\) of the papyrus is an abbreviation for the scholar Chrysippus, but also mention the possibility that the name is that of a speaker in the poem. This theory may also have been the idea supported by Braswell (2015, p. 148) who translates “I Chrysippos [say]”, although Vecchiato (2018b, p. 190) believes that Braswell understood it as Chrysippus the scholar speaking in the first person. However, \(\text{ἐγὼ}\) is more probably a \textit{lemma} referring to \(Pae.\) 8.2. It is possible that the Chrysippus fragment contained a statement on the identification of the \(\text{ἐγὼ}\) in line 2, e.g. with the poet or with the chorus, as suggested by D’Alessio (1994, p. 118, n. 3). Alternatively, the name Chrysippus may be the anonymous annotators’ identification of the first-person speaker.

**Aristodemus Fr. 12**

This fragment is transmitted in the eleventh book of Athenaeus’ \textit{Deipnosophistae} as an example of an obscure word for a drink, the \textit{Pentaploa}, consisting of five ingredients. According to Athenaeus, Aristodemus mentioned that the drink was the prize for the winner of a foot-race in Athens from the temple
of Dionysus to that of Athena Sciras. This probably refers to the contest held at the Oschophoria, a festival dedicated to Athena, Dionysus, and, possibly, Theseus. It is known to have consisted of a procession from Dionysus’ temple to the sanctuary of Athena Sciras led by two young men dressed as women and carrying vine-branches, ḍσχοι, and a foot-race between adolescent boys also holding vine-branches (Parker, 2005, pp. 211–212).

Since Aristodemus situates this contest at τὰ Σκίρα, Jacoby argued that no foot-race took place at the Oschophoria but during the festival of Scira, which, according to some sources, included a procession from Athens to a place called Sciron (Parker, 2005, p. 173–77).

The ancient sources situate the race at the Oschophoria. Proclus Chrestomathia 88–92 (= Photius’ Bibliotheca 322a) mentions a race in connection with the Oschophoria, and other sources call the participants of this race ḍσχοφόροι, without explicitly connecting them to the festival. Finally the Salaminioi-inscription (SEG 21:527) mentions a contest in connection to the Oschophoria although the word used, ἄμιλλος, does not necessarily refer to a foot-race Vidal-Naquet, 1968, p. 58, n. 6. Since no other sources mention a foot-race at the Scira but generally connect the elements mentioned by Aristodemus with the Oschophoria, it appears probable that Aristodemus (or Athenaeus) confused the two festivals.

Since the fragment is attributed to Aristodemus’ Peri Pindarou, it is a reasonable assumption that it derives from a discussion on a poem by Pindar or on his biography, but the fragment as such gives no explicit information to let us reconstruct its original connection to Pindar. It does however offer information on a foot-race within a festival, probably the Oschophoria, as well as its prize, information that is not untypical for Pindaric scholarship.

No victory ode transmitted in the medieval manuscripts is written for victors of a foot-race at the Oschophoria, but Proclus mentions a lyric genre, the ḍσχοφόρικον μέλος, performed in honour of the participants of the foot-race.

No specimens of this genre were known before the publication by Lobel in 1961 of the Pindaric commentary in POxy 2451, dated to the first or second centuries CE. Lobel divided the papyrus into two parts: A on known Isthmians and B on otherwise unknown odes, but he noted that the odes commented on in

---

1So Σ Nic. Alex. 109a (ed. Geymonat). Herodian in Σ Dionysius Thrax (Hilgard 450) states that the ḍσχοφόρικον μέλος was written for the winners of a foot-race.

2Rutherford and Irvine (1988, p. 44) mention further examples of confusion between the two festivals.

3We might compare with the scholia on Nemeans 9–11, odes written not for Nemean victories but those won at minor games (N. 9 and 10) or at the installation to public office (N. 11). Σ N. 9. inscr. discusses the festival where the laudandus competed, the Pythia at Sikyo, and states that this and the two following Nemeans are in fact not written for victories at the Nemean games.
Chapter 9. Commentary

the 17 fragments of B were possibly appended to the book of Isthmians just as the last three Nemeans were to that book (Lobel, 1961, p. 155). The fragment B17 (= Pindar Fr. 6c Maehler) contains bits of a commentary on a poem with the title ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΜΙ ΩΣΧΟΦΙΟΡΙΚΟΝ, “Oschophoric (song) to ... from Athens”. This shows that in the Hellenistic time, one editor believed that the ode was dedicated to the victor at the Oschophoria. Rutherford and Irvine, 1988, p. 43. The surviving parts of the commentary in POxy 2541 discuss the nature of the celebrated victory although they are very fragmentary D’Alessio, 2012, p. 55.1

This gives us a possible original context for Aristodemus’ discussion of the foot-race. Aristodemus could have discussed the context of the victory celebrated in the poem. An objection to this theory is Aristodemus’ identification of the festival with the Scira. Since the foot-race in Aristodemus’ description involves the carrying of the ὀσχος, Aristodemus would have identified the poem as an Oschophorikon, i.e. written for the winner of the oschophoric race, even if he believed the festival to be the Scira.

᾿Αριστόδημος δ’ ἐν τρίτῳ Περὶ Πινδάρου: Cf. section 3.4 for a discussion of the possible nature of this work by Aristodemus and 4.1 for the genre of the peri literature.

᾿Αθηνάζει: In his edition of Athenaeus Meineke (1858) suggested Ἀθήνης whereas Jacoby in the text of FGrH 383 Fr. 9 deleted the adverb of motion. It can hardly be historically correct here since the race, according to the fragment, takes place from the temple of Dionysus to the temple of Athena Sciras. The temple of Dionysus is probably identical to the sanctuary of Dionysius Eleutherius situated south of the Acropolis in connection with the Dionysian theatre, i.e. in central Athens. The temple of Athena Sciras was located in Phaleron, southwest of the city.2 Thus the foot-race began within Athens and proceeded to the outskirts of the town. The problematic adverb might go back to Aristodemus’ possible confusion of the direction of the foot-race, to errors in Athenaeus’ citation of his own source, or to the subsequent textual transmission of Athenaeus’ work. Since Aristodemus’ description of the foot-race is confused also about the name Skira/Oschophoria, the first option lies close at hand. I have therefore kept the manuscript reading.

2 Herodotus 8.94 also mentions a sanctuary of Athena Sciras on Salamis.
10. Svensk sammanfattning
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