The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Date of Pindar's Tenth Nemean

W. T. Lendrum

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 05 / June 2002, pp 267 - 269

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0020615X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0020615X

How to cite this article:

W. T. Lendrum (1902). The Date of Pindar's Tenth Nemean. The Classical Review, 16, pp 267-269 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0020615X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

- 8 βασιῦμαι ποτὶ τὰν Τιμαγήτοιο
παλαίστραν
97 τήρησον ποτὶ τὰν Τιμαγήτοιο
παλαίστραν
9 αὐρίον, ὥς νιν ἴδω καὶ μέμψομαι
οἷά με ποιῇ.
58 σαύραν τοι τρίψασα κακὸν ποτὸν αὐρί-
ον οἰσῶ.
144 κοῦτε τι τήνος ἐμὴν ἐπεμέμψατο
μέσφα τό γ' ἐχθές,
29 ὡς τάκοιθ' ὑπ' ἔρωτος ὁ Μύνδιος
αὐτίκα Δελφίς.
96 πᾶσαν ἔχει με τάλαιναν ὁ Μύνδιος·
ἀλλὰ μολοῖσα
44 εἴτε γυνὰ τήνφ παρακέκλιται εἴτε
καὶ ἀνὴρ,
τόσσον ἔχου λάθας, ὅσσον ποκὰ
θησέα φαντί
150 κείτε μιν αὔτε γυναικὸς ἔχει
πόθος εἴτε καὶ ἀνδρὸς
οὐκ ἔφατ' ἀτρεκὲς ἴδμεν, ἀτὰρ τόσον
αἰὲν Ἔρωτος
50 ὡς καὶ Δέλφιν ἴδοιμι, καὶ ἐς τόδε
δῶμα περάσαι
103 εἰς ἐμὰ δώματα Δέλφιν. ἐγὼ
δέ νιν ὡς ἐνόησα
58 σαύραν τοι τρίψασα κακὸν ποτὸν
αὐρίον οἰσῶ.

- 161 τοιά οἱ ἐν κίστῃ κακὰ φάρμακα φαμί
φυλάσσειν,
72 τὰν πομπὰν θάσασθαι· ἐγὼ δέ οἱ ἄ
μεγάλοιτος
138 ἀνέρος. ὥς ὁ μὲν εἶπεν· ἐγὼ δέ οἱ ἄ
ταχυπειθής
102 ὡς ἐφάμαν. ἄ δ' ἦνθε καὶ ἄγαγε τὸν
λιπαρόχρων
165 χαίρε Σελαναία λιπαρόχροε, χαίρετε
δ' ἄλλοι

Are there not responsions galore within the limits of this idyll, to say nothing of the echoes of other idylls that it contains? *e.g.*

1. 1 ἀδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα
= 2. 141 ἐψιθυρίσδομες ἀδύ.

And yet will anyone be bold enough to maintain that Theocritus intended them as a *memoria technica* for the benefit of those who should attempt to learn the poem by heart? The idea is preposterous. The fact is that throughout the whole course of ancient and modern literature the principles of unconscious iteration have been at work, and that in the odes of Pindar as in the idylls of Theocritus we must recognise the results of their operation.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

THE DATE OF PINDAR'S TENTH NEMEAN.

NOTHING but the singular beauty of the tenth *Nemean* could pardon me for raising so dull a question as that of its date. But when I find the latest student of the subject, and he a most sympathetic reader of Pindar, M. Gaspard, in his very valuable *Chronologie Pindarique*, suggesting the year 500 B.C. as the date of the poem, I am disposed to raise a protest. In B.C. 500 Pindar was at most in his twentieth year; and I find it *a priori* improbable, that a Theban youth of that age, who had as yet published nothing except perhaps *Isthmian* vii, a poem in honour of a countryman of his own, should have been selected as their laureate by citizens of distant Argos. Further *Nem.* x is marked by all the features of Pindar's ripest powers. In splendour of phrase, in rapidity and vigour of narrative, in dramatic vividness of representation it challenges comparison with the fourth Pythian itself, while the sublimity and pathos of its myth are, I think, unrivalled in the literature of Greece. M. Gaspard is

fully alive to these excellences, but he holds that they 'sont de celles qui tiennent au génie même de Pindare, et à ses qualités innées: elles dérivent de la nature bien plus que de l'art, et il n'y a pas lieu de s'étonner si on les retrouve même dans une œuvre de première jeunesse.' This is perhaps a question of individual opinion; but we happen to possess specimens of Pindar's youthful manner, certainly in *Pyth.* x, which dates from 504 B.C., and almost certainly in *Isthm.* vii, which, as M. Gaspard has himself shown, is probably Pindar's earliest work; and I am surprised if any one can compare these two poems with *Nem.* x and not admit a marked advance in the latter both in literary art and intellectual power. M. Gaspard finds evidence of youth in the style of our poem, 'haché en phrases courtes qu'elle a en commun avec les autres poèmes de la jeunesse.' But the sentences are not shorter than those of other poems, *e.g.* *P.* ix 67 f. *N.* xi 43 f., which belong to Pindar's latest years. In my judgment this peculiar

feature tells rather the other way. The situation in the myth of *Nem.* x.—the devotion of a brother to a brother—suggests that of one of the more successful of Tennyson's later poems, the beautiful and touching *Balin and Balan* :—

But when their foreheads felt the cooling
air,
Balin first woke, and seeing that true face,
Familiar up from cradle-time, so wan,
Crawl'd slowly with low moans to where he
lay,
And on his dying brother cast himself
Dying ; and he lifted faint eyes ; he felt
One near him ; all at once they found the
world,
Staring wild-wide ; then with a child-like
wail,
And drawing down that dim, disastrous
brow
That o'er him hung, he kiss'd it, moan'd and
spoke.

But I am not sure that the prodigality of the English poet does not contrast unfavourably with the reserve of the Greek.

ταχέως δ' ἐπ' ἀδελφεοῦ βίαν πάλιν χώρησεν ὁ
Τυνδαρίδας,
καί νιν οὐπω τεθναότ', ἄσθματι δὲ φρίσσοντα
πνοῆς ἔκλεχεν.
θερμὰ δὴ τέγγων δάκρυα στοναχαῖς
ὀρθιον φώνησε.

Certainly the magnificent couplet with which the poem so abruptly closes and so dramatically suggests the eager joy of Polydeuces in declaring, without a word uttered, but only by his acts, his choice of the alternatives offered him by Zeus,

ὥς ἄρ' αἰδάσαντος, οὐ γνῶμα διπλόαν θέτο
βουλάν.
ἀνὰ δ' ἔλυσιν μὲν ὀφθαλμόν, ἔπειτα δὲ φωνὴν
χαλκομίτρη Κάστορος

is effective beyond praise.

Further, M. Gaspard misses that connexion between the myth and the circumstances of the victory which the mature *technique* of Pindar demands. The myth, he says, forms 'un hors-d'œuvre qui, dans la contexture du poème, pourrait facilement être détaché du reste, sans que la suppression s'en fit sentir. L'épénicie pourrait s'arrêter après la gnome : καὶ μὲν θεῶν πιστὸν γένος du vers 54.' But is it so? Theaeus of Argos had been successful in the 'Hecatombaea' of his native city : he now contemplates competing at Olympia (l. 29 ff.), and Pindar draws an augury of his success from the fact that his house is under the patronage of the

Tyndaridae, who will be faithful to their trust—καὶ μὲν θεῶν πιστὸν γένος. It is this very 'fidelity' of the Tyndaridae that gives point to the myth, and Pindar is careful to insist upon it in Polydeuces' outcry, l. 78 :—

οἴχεται τιμὰ φίλων τατωμένῳ
φωτὶ παῦροι δ' ἐν πόνῳ πιστοὶ ἰβροτῶν,

where, as others have noted, the word *πιστοί* significantly recurs.

But it is not only in literary power and technical art that Pindar's work shows development : there is a corresponding development in his religious views. Croiset and, following him, M. Gaspard himself, have done full justice to this point. In his earliest Odes Pindar is seen still under the influence of the current Greek view of a 'jealous God'—τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἐστι φθονερόν (Hdt. l. 32) : cf. *Isthm.* vii. 39 : ὁ δ' ἀθανάτων μὴ θρασσέτω φθόνος *Pyth.* x. 20, φθονεραῖς ἐκ θεῶν μετατροπαῖς. This view disappears entirely from his later work, in which directly and indirectly, in season and out of season, sometimes by suppression of facts, sometimes by flat contradiction, but more often by selecting the less objectionable of two alternative versions, Pindar is never weary of his attempt to purify the legends of the gods of unseemly detail and to preach his own profound belief in the divine perfection. The point is too familiar to readers of Pindar to need illustration here, and it is only now alluded to because the treatment of the myth in *Nem.* x. affords more than one illustration of the practice. The current version of the quarrel between the Dioscuri and the Apharetidae represented it as due to the rape by Castor and Polydeuces of the brides of Idas and Lynceus. Pindar will have none of this : according to him it arose from 'some question about cattle,' ἀμφὶ βοῦσί πως χολωθεῖς Ἴδας (x. 61). Again, the legend made Castor and Polydeuces both sons of Zeus ; but, as Castor was slain, this must not be, and Pindar with emphasis maintains that Castor was a mortal's son (x. 80), thus tacitly contradicting, as the scholiast notes, his favourite authority Hesiod : ὁ μὲν Ἡσίοδος ἀμφοτέρους Διὸς εἶναι γενεαλογεῖ· ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος ἑτέροις τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἐξακολουθητικῶς τὸν μὲν Πολυδεύκην ἐκ Διός, τὸν δὲ Κάστορα ἐκ Τυνδαρέω εἶναι φησιν. Hence he never speaks of the brothers as Διωσκούροι. Consistently with this view, Pindar slips in a third alteration. In the *Odyssey* (xi. 304) it is stated that the Tyndaridae divided their time between the earth and the grave : ἄλλοτε μὲν ζῶουσ' ἐτερήμεροι, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε τεθνήσιν.

Pindar improves on this (x. 87) :

ἤμισυ μὲν κε πνεοῖς γαίας ὑπένερθεν ἑών,
ἤμισυ δ' οὐρανὸν ἐν χρυσείοις δόμοισιν,

where πνεοῖς and οὐρανοῦ are characteristic innovations upon the τεθνᾶσιν and ζώνου' of his predecessor.

There remains, I think, another indication of the date, not hitherto noticed, of a nature more precise than are any of the arguments advanced above. Theaeus, beside his victory in his native city, had also been successful in the 'Panathenaea' at Athens, where the prize was a jar of olive-oil. (x. 33 ff.) On this passage the schol. has a curious note: οὐκ ἔστι δ' ἐξαγωγή ἐλαίου ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν, εἰ μὴ τοῖσι νικῶσι. I know no other evidence for this exception to the prohibition of the export of oil from Athens, and I suspect that the reference in Pindar's lines is somewhat different. It is well known that about B.C. 550, when the Athenians were defeated by the Argives and Aeginetans, an embargo was laid by Argos on the importation of Athenian produce, especially pottery; cf. *Hdt.* v. 88: 'Ἀττικὸν μήτε τι ἄλλο προσφέρειν πρὸς τὸ ἱρὸν, μήτε κέραμον κ.τ.λ. In a valuable paper in a previous number of this *Review* (xii. 86) Mr. Hoppin has shown that this embargo must have lasted over seventy years, inasmuch as recent excavations at Argos have discovered scarcely any fragments of Athenian vases of the period B.C. 550-480. When the embargo was removed is unknown. Probably it was gradually relaxed or evaded; but it must have been formally rescinded in 460 B.C. when an Athenian-Argive alliance was formed. (Thuc. 1. 102). Readers of Pindar must have been often struck by the curious emphasis and detail of the lines in question (x. 33 ff). At first sight they have the air of a pointless conceit :

γαῖα δὲ καυθεῖσα πυρὶ καρπὸς ἐλαίας
ἔμολεν Ἥρας τὸν εὐάνορα λαὸν ἐν ἀγγείων ἔρκεσιν
παμποικίλοις.

'in earth burnt with fire the fruit of the olive came to the gallant host of Hera in richly-flowered enclosures of vases.' This feature will be removed, if we see in these lines a direct allusion by Pindar to the recent alliance between Argos and Athens and the consequent revival of the use of Athenian pottery at Argos. This is the alliance so often referred to in the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus, and such an allusion is entirely characteristic of Pindar, who loses no opportunity of glancing at the great political movements of his time and is indeed the most important contemporary witness for the history of his age that has survived for us. We are thus brought down to the very period which Dissen, arguing on quite different lines, long ago suggested. This was the period when Argos, after her capture of Mycenae (B.C. 464) became once more mistress of her plain and began again to resume her old place in the Peloponnese after the long depression succeeding her defeat by Cleomenes (494 B.C.). At such a time she may well have sent a citizen to compete in the games of her newly-formed ally Athens, and called upon the greatest poet in Greece to celebrate her reviving power by recalling the legends of fair women and brave men (x. 5 ff.) who had glorified her past. The poem must we know have immediately preceded an Olympian festival (x. 32): that, I suggest, was the festival of Ol. 80 = B.C. 460. The tenth Nemean thus follows next after Pyth. iv. (B.C. 462) and marks with it the zenith of Pindar's powers.

W. T. LENDRUM.

SOME SUGGESTIONS ON DIELS' *POETARUM PHILOSOPHORUM FRAGMENTA*.

Parmenides *fr.* 16. 1, 2

ὧς γὰρ ἐκάστοι' ἔχει κρᾶσιν μελέων πολυπλάγκ-
των

τῶς νόος ἀνθρώποισι παριστᾶται τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ
ἔστιν ὅπερ φρονέει μελέων φύσις ἀνθρώποισιν.

Diels' παριστᾶται is surely questionable for παρίσταται or παρίστηκε of MSS. There

seems to be a corruption in τὸ, for which I would suggest αὐτὸ. If αὐταυτο is possible, why should not αὐτὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ be admissible? 'is the very thing itself.'

Empedocles *fr.* 4. 9, 10, 11

ἀλλ' ἄγ' ἄθρει πάσῃ παλάμῃ, πῇ δὴλον ἔκαστον,
μήτε τι ὄψιν ἔχων πίστει πλέον ἢ κατ' ἀκοήν
ἢ ἀκοὴν ἐρίδουπον ὑπὲρ τρανώματα γλώσσης.