NOTES ON PINDAR

Heather White

Se ofrece la explicación de varios pasajes de Píndaro que han desconcertado a algunos críticos recientes.

Several passages of Pindar, which had puzzled recent critics, are explained.

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN PINDAR

Plato’s Meno (81b) preserves for us a fragment from Pindar concerning Hades:

οἵοι δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποινὰν παλαίον πένθεος
déxetai, ἐς τὸν ὑπερθεν ἄλλον κεῖσιν ἐνατυ ἔτει
ἀνδιόι ψυχὰς πάλιν:  
ἐκ ταύ βασιλῆς ἄγαυοι καὶ σβένει κρατινοι σοφία
εἰς μέγιστο  
ανδρεὶς αὐξοῦντ’ ἐς δὲ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἔπρωσ
ἄγνοι πρὸς ἀνθρώπων καλέονται.

Translation by Sir J. E. Sandys (Pindar, Loeb edition [London 1968] reprint, 593): “But, as for those from whom Persephone shall exact the penalty of their pristine woe, in the ninth year she once more restoreth their souls to the upper sun-light; and from these come into being august monarchs, and men who are swift in strength and supreme in wisdom; and, for all future time, men call them sainted heroes”.

HABIS 32 (2001) 31-37
The meaning of this fragment has been much debated\(^1\). I would like to point out, however, that the key to the correct interpretation of this fragment is given by the context. At *Meno* 81b, Socrates states that the soul is immortal and does not die together with the body. Instead it goes to Hades and is then reborn to lead another life on earth. Socrates implies that it is important for men to live “as righteously as possible” because their souls will be judged in Hades and punished for the crimes that they have committed on earth. In order to illustrate this point, Socrates quotes Pindar’s fragment.

It should be noted that Pindar has employed adjectival *enallage*. The phrase ποινὰς παλαιόθερος means “the ancient penalty of suffering”. For similar cases of adjectival enallage cf. my *Studies in The Poetry Of Nicander* (Amsterdam 1987) 51ff. In other words, according to Pindar, men are punished in Hades by Persephone and they are made to suffer for their crimes.

Similarly at *Olympian* 2.56ff. Pindar refers to the fact that the guilty are punished in Hades for the crimes that they have committed during their life on earth:

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{εἴ δὲ νῦν ἔχων τις αἰδεύ τὸ μέλλον,} \\
&\text{οὕτι θανάτων μὲν ἐνθάδ' αὐτίκ' ἀπάλαμοι φρένες} \\
&\text{ποινὰς ἔτισαν, -τὰ δ' ἐν τῷ δ' ἄρχῳ} \\
&\text{ἀλτρὰ κατὰ γᾶς δικάζει τις ἡδήρᾳ} \\
&\text{λόγον φράσασις ἀνάγκα.}
\end{align*}\]

Translation by Sandys (*op. cit.*, 23): “But if, in very deed, when he hath that wealth, he knoweth of the future, that immediately after death, on earth, it is the lawless spirits that suffer punishment—and the sins committed in this realm of Zeus are judged by One who passeth sentence stern and inevitable—.”

According to Pindar, having been punished in Hades, the souls return to earth where they lead new lives as kings, athletes and philosophers (cf. lines 4ff.). They are, moreover, called heroes by men. The souls of good men, on the other hand, enjoy a happy life in Hades (cf. Pindar, *Ol.* 2.61-68):

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{στρ. δ' ἵσαις δὲ νύκτεσιν αἰεί,} \\
&\text{ἵσαις δ' ἐν ἁμέρας ἄλινον ἔχοντες, ἀπονέστερον} \\
&\text{ἐσολοί δέκωντι βίοτον, οὐ χθόνη παράσοσοντες ἐν} \\
&\text{χερὸς ἄκμα} \\
&\text{οὐδὲ πάντιν θυρήρ} \\
&\text{65 κεῖνα παρὰ δίασταν' ἄλλα παρὰ μὲν τιμίαις} \\
&\text{θεῶν, ὀδινεὶς ἐχαίρου εὐθυκίαις, ἀδακρυν νέ-} \\
&\text{μονται} \\
&\text{αιώνα· τοι δ' ἀπροσόρατον ὄψιν πόνου.}
\end{align*}\]

Translation by Sandys (*op. cit.*, 23ff.): “while the good, having the sun shining for evermore, for equal nights and equal days, receive the boon of a life of

\(^1\) For a recent discussion of this fragment cf. Sir H. Lloyd-Jones, *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy* (Oxford 1990) 89ff.
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lightened toil, not vexing the soil with the strength of their hands, no, nor the water of the sea, to gain a scanty livelihood; but, in the presence of the honoured gods, all who were wont to rejoice in keeping their oaths, share a life that knoweth no tears, while the others endure labour that none can look upon.2

It is thus obvious that Pindar distinguishes between the happy life of the good souls after death and the miserable life of the guilty souls.

Conclusion. Socrates urges men to keep their souls as pure as possible because they will be punished in Hades for all the crimes that they commit on earth. The punishment will be inflicted on the souls of dead men by Persephone before she sends them back to earth to live another life.

THE CATTLE OF GERYON

At Gorgias 484b Plato preserves for us the following fragment from Pindar concerning Heracles and the cattle of Geryon:

νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς
θυνατῶν τε καὶ ἄθανατων
ἀγεί δικαιών τὸ βιαστατὸν
ὑπερτάτα χειρί. τεκμαίρομαι

5 ἔργουσιν Ἡρακλέους ἐπεὶ Γηρώνα βόας
Κυκλωπίων ἐπὶ προθύρων Εὐρυσθέος
ἀνατήτας τε καὶ ἀπρίτας ἠλασεν.


“Law, the lord of all, mortals and immortals, carrieth everything with a high hand, justifying the extreme of violence. This I infer from the labours of Heracles; for he drave to the Cyclopian portals of Eurystheus the kine of Geryon, which he had won neither by prayer nor by price.”

In the Gorgias, Callicles uses this quotation from Pindar in order to defend the right of the stronger to rule over the weaker. Scholars have been puzzled by Pindar’s words3. Moreover, they have been unable to understand what nomos it is that Pindar is referring to in this fragment.

The solution to this problem is given by Herodotus, who states (3.38) that Pindar was right when he called custom (νόμον) “the king of all” (πάντων βασιλέα). According to Pindar, custom justified Heracles’ violent attack on the cattle of Geryon. He means that Heracles lived in the heroic age when his ac-

2 Lloyd-Jones’ proposed interpretation of Olympian 2.56-60 is not convincing. He failed to understand (op. cit., 84ff.) that Pindar contrasts the fate of the evil or bad souls with the fate of the good souls. Moreover, he failed to note (op. cit., 89) that the penalty that the dead souls pay in the underworld is the punishment which is inflicted upon them by Persephone because of the crimes that they have committed during their life on earth.
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tions, although violent, would not have been considered unusual. In other words, Heracles was not to be blamed for his violent behaviour since it suited the heroic age in which he lived. As Herodotus pointed out, customs vary according to the country that one lives in. Similarly, customs vary according to different periods in history. Thus Pindar means that Heracles was acting according to the customs of the heroic age when he attacked Geryon violently and took his cattle without paying for them. Pindar recognised Heracles' actions as those of a violent man, but he considered that the customs which governed the heroic age explained why Heracles acted as he did. Obviously during the heroic age men were not devoted to philosophical speculation concerning moral questions such as those discussed by Plato in the Gorgias. Instead the world was a much simpler place, inhabited by monsters and heroes. Thus the behaviour of the characters of the heroic age should not be judged by the standards of Pindar's age.

A PAIR OF CROWS

At Olympian 2.84ff. Pindar refers to the difference between the true poet and his rivals:

\[
\begin{align*}
polla & \; \muοι \; \upsilon' \; \acute{a}γκώνος \\
\circkeia & \; \betaελη \\
\epsilonνδον & \; \epsilonυτι \; \phiαρέτρας \\
\phiωνάτα & \; \sigmaυνετούοιν \; \epsilonς \; \delta \; \tauο \; \piαν \; \epsilonρμηνέων \\\n\chiατίζει & \; \sigmaοφός \; \o \; \piολλά \; \epsilonιδώς \; \φυαί \; \muαβόντες \; \delta \; \lαβροι \\
\piαγγλωσσία & \; \kόρακες \; \o\; \ακραυτα \; \gammaαρύετον \\
\alphaυτ. \; \epsilon' & \; \Deltaιος \; \piρός \; \δραυχα \; \θείον.
\end{align*}
\]

Translation by Sir J. E. Sandys (Pindar, Loeb edition [London 1968], reprint, 27): “Full many a swift arrow have I beneath mine arm, within my quiver, many an arrow that is vocal to the wise; but for the crowd they need interpreters. The true poet is he who knoweth much by gift of nature, but they that have only learnt the lore of song, and are turbulent and intemperate of tongue, like a pair of crows, chatter in vain against the god-like bird of Zeus.”

The scholia explain the dual γαρύετον as a reference to Pindar's rivals, the Cean poets, Simonides and his nephew, Bacchylides: cf. Sandys, op. cit., 27. Lloyd-Jones (op. cit., 88f.) noted that some modern critics doubt the evidence of the ancient scholia concerning this passage. He then suggested that the dual γαρύετον is used here by Pindar because “crows are often seen in pairs”. In sup-

4 Cf. especially F. Mora, Religione e religioni nelle Storie di Erodoto (Milano 1986) 161f. That each epoch adhered to its own code of moral and social behaviour (νόμος) —a code not complied with, indeed alien to, other epochs— is a Leitmotiv of Greek thinking: for Herodotus cf. J. Schweighäuser, Lexicon Herodoteum (London 1830) s. v. νόμος; for Theocritus cf. my observations in Emerita 1976, 403f.; cf. also G. Giangrande in L'Antiq. Class. 1972, 131. Unfortunately, in recent years certain scholars have overlooked these obvious points.
port of this statement, Lloyd-Jones then quoted two passages from Aratus which
seemed to him to be relevant. The first passage occurs at *Phaen.* 966-9:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kaí poi kóraikes diáws stolagmós} \\
\text{foiní émymíasain toin údastos érhoméniou} \\
\text{hê pote kai krózantae bareith diassák phoiní} \\
\text{makrón épírhoízæsai tinaxámênovi pterâ puknâ.}
\end{align*}
\]

"Crows, too, imitate with their note the heavy splash of clashing rain, or after
twice croaking deeply they raise a loud whirring with frequent flapping of their
wings."

Lloyd-Jones added that "the same surprising combination of plural and dual
is found at 1021-3 of the same poem":

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kai xíres klaxhêdon épêgyômeaí broîmo} \\
\text{chelmonos méga stíma, kai énveághra korôvë} \\
\text{vúctoron deîdousa, kai ôfê boûnte kólooi.}
\end{align*}
\]

Translation by Mair (*op. cit.,* 287): "Sure signs of storm are geese hastening
with many a cackle to their food, the nine-generation crow cawing at night, the
jackdaw chattering late”.

It should be pointed out, however, that the employment of the dual instead
of the plural is not unparalleled in Greek poetry: cf. *Mus. Phil. Lond.* 4, 75, note
17. For the combination of the dual and the plural cf. moreover, Gow, *Theocri-
tus* (Cambridge 1965), reprint, vol. II, 402. It therefore follows that there is no
reason to suppose that Aratus was referring to a pair of birds in the two passages
which are quoted by Lloyd-Jones. Consequently it seems best, as Sandys has al-
ready underlined, to accept the interpretation of this passage which is given by
the ancient scholia and to understand that Pindar is, in fact, alluding to his two
rivals, Simonides and Bacchylides.

It may be noted, in conclusion, that V. Loebe, *De elocut. Arati* (Halle 1864)
17, correctly explains that the dual employed by Aratus in lines 968 and 1023 is
intended to be understood as a plural. This point is also explained by Maass, in
his edition of Aratus, Index II s.v. “dualis participii cum plurali nominis”. All
these facts concerning the use of the dual in Aratus are noted by S. Hatzikosta
in her above mentioned article published in *Mus. Phil. Lond.,* vol. IV.

**On Archilochus and Pindar**

At Pythian 2.53ff. Pindar states that he must avoid speaking badly of people:

\[\text{Lloyd-Jones argued (*op. cit.,* 137) that it is unlikely that Pindar would have referred to his}
\]
\[\text{own rivals in a poem written for a patron. This argument is not convincing. Lloyd-Jones failed to}
\]
\[\text{note that Theocritus spoke at length about his own affairs in a poem composed for Hiero of Syracuse:}
\]
\[\text{cf. *Idyll* 16.5ff. There is thus no reason why Pindar should not have acted in a similar way.}
\]
Translation by Sir J. E. Sandys (Pindar, Loeb edition [London 1968], reprint, 177): “But I must refrain from the violent bite of slanderous calumny; for, though far removed in time, I have seen the bitter-tongued Archilochus full often in distress, because he batted on bitter abuse of his foes. But wealth, with wisdom allotted thereto, is the best gift of Fortune.”

In a discussion of this passage, Lloyd-Jones (op. cit., 130) argued that Pindar means that Archilochus “profited” in some way from his “enmities”. According to Lloyd-Jones, moreover, the word παινώμενον supports his argument. It should be noted, however, that Lloyd-Jones has completely misunderstood Pindar’s words. The point is that Archilochus suffered because he abused his enemies in verse. Pindar states that he does not intend to speak badly of people because he does not wish to suffer like Archilochus did. For the correct interpretation of this passage cf. Farnell, Pindar, note ad loc.

Pindar next states that wealth is best when it is accompanied by wisdom. It should be noted that Pindar has employed chiasmus. Thus lines 56f. should be translated as follows: “To be rich with the good fortune of wisdom (σὺν τύχα ... σοφίας) is the best fate (πότμου ἀριστον).” Pindar then proceeds to praise Hieron, who is both rich and wise. Cf. also Farnell, ad loc., who noted that “one scholiast” proposes this solution.

The Grave of Neoptolemus

At Nemean 7.34f. Pindar mentions the fact that Neoptolemus was buried at Delphi:
the dimly known and on the famous; but honour groweth for those, whose fame
a god causeth to wax fairer, even the departed champions, who came to the mighty
centre of Earth's broad bosom. So in the Pythian soil low lieth the hero Neopto-
leus, who erstwhile sacked the city of Priam, where the Danai themselves
were sore distressed."

In his discussion of this passage, Lloyd-Jones (op. cit., 144ff.) noted that Far-
nell altered βασανόνων ("heroes") to βασανοῦν ("helping"). However, this textual al-
teration causes more problems than it solves. This point was understood by Lloyd-
Jones, who commented as follows (op. cit., 144): "In what sense did Neoptole-
leus come to Delphi ‘brining help?’ ". As a consequence, Lloyd-Jones suggested
(op. cit., 145) that the word βασανόνων ("helping") refers to Pindar and the mean-
ing is "It was to bring help that I came to Delphi". Cf. also page 151, where
Lloyd-Jones noted that "at 1.33 Pindar claims to have gone to Delphi to bring
help to Neoptolemus". He then added that "this surely refers to his having gone
there on the occasion of the performance of the Paean." Pindar, it will be re-
membered, had written a Paean which mentioned Neoptolemus’ murder at Del-
phi. There is, however, no evidence to support Lloyd-Jones’ hypothesis. We know
nothing of any visit by Pindar to Delphi in order to “help” the dead hero Neopto-
leus.

Once again the solution to the problem is simple. Textual alteration is not
necessary at line 33, since the transmitted text makes perfect sense. The words
τεθνακότων / βασανόνων ("dead champions"), in line 33, refer to the hero Neopto-
leus, who was famous because he had a grave at Delphi. He had gone to Del-
phi to make an offering and had been killed in a fight there. Thus Pindar means
that death comes to us all, even to heroes like Neoptolemus. However, Neopto-
leus was fortunate because he has a grave at Delphi which men continue to
venerate. Cf. also L. R. Farnell, Pindar, reprint 1961, Hakkert, 291ff. Farnell ob-
jected to the reading βασανόνων (substantive, “heroes”) because he failed to note
that the word βασανός is frequently used as a noun: cf. W. Peek, Lexikon zu den
Dionys. des Nonnos, s.v. βασάνος and Thes. Gr. Ling., s.v. βασάνος.