

Linguistic Commentary

1 Invocation (1–6)

In the first six verses the chorus addresses Acragas. This invocation provides us with some fundamental information on the Panhellenic victory: winner's hometown (1–3), winner's name (5), place of victory and discipline in which the victory was obtained (6, cf. chapter 1, sections 1 and 3). An opening apostrophe to the winner's personified hometown is also found in *I.* 7.

Together with *O.* 12 (1, λίσσομαι, παῖ Ζηγὸς Ἐλευθερίου) *P.* 12 is the only Pindaric victory ode beginning with 'I entreat', though it does not comply with the standard traits of the cletic hymn (e.g. Sapph. 1.1–3 V ποικιλόθρον' ἀθάνατ', Ἄφροδίτα ... λίσσομαί σε, || μὴ μ' ἄσαισι μηδ' ὀνίαισι δάμνα on which see Cameron 1939, Privitera 1967, Burzacchini 2005; on the cletic hymn see also Pfister 1924, Meyer 1933), featuring an explicit 'I call' (e.g. Sapph. 1.16 V δῆυτε κάλημμι; cf. *O.* 14, *N.* 7.1–4) and a verb of movement in impv. (e.g. Sapph. 1.5 V τυιδ' ἔλθ' [ε]; *descende* in Norden's [1913:148] terminology; cf. *P.* 11.1–10, *N.* 3.1–3). Here, instead, Acragas is invited to welcome Midas and his victory ode. This is a Pindaric *topos*, which is occasionally found in the first verses of encomia ἐπὶ νίκῃ, (cf. *O.* 5.1–3, *P.* 8.1–4, *N.* 11.1–5, *O.* 4.6–10, *O.* 8.9–10, cf. Schadewaldt 1928:269, who defines δέξαι "formulaic" (see also Heath 1988:189, Bremer 2008:6–7)). In such passages the impv. 'welcome!' is preceded by the accusative of the thing/the person that shall be welcomed by the addressee and by a series of vocatives with embedded relative or participle clauses (*P.* 8.3–4), usually following the first or the second (*P.* 8.1–2) vocative. The beginning of *Pythian Twelve* is slightly different from the above cited parallels: the initial appeal ('I entreat you') is followed by four vocatives (1–3) encasing a relative clause (2–3)—the antecedent of this clause is the second person singular σε 'you' (thee), at 1—, which is located between the third and the fourth vocative. A sequence of this kind creates a sense of solemn suspension. In *P.* 12 the *rallentando* increases the expectations of the audience, as it lends a certain grandeur to the announcement of the winner's name (first named after 5 verses). Indeed, the poet's request is only clarified at 5, the impv. δέξαι being additionally preceded by a predicative and a modal complement (4). The verb is, in turn, followed by the accusatives of the thing and the person that Acragas is invited to welcome (5–6).

I would claim that the naming of Acragas supports the conclusion that the ode was performed in the winner's hometown (cf. chapter 1, section 3). For a

visual disposition of the syntactic elements in the apostrophe cf. Sulzer 1961:34. On the *prooimion* and further Pindaric comparanda cf. Maslov 2015:310.

1 Αἰτέω ‘I entreat’, cf. αἴτημί σε (fr. 155.3), αἰτέω σε (N. 9.30). In Pindar, the verb is usually constructed with 2 acc. (of the person entreated and of the thing entreated), or acc. (of the person entreated) and inf. (of the thing entreated). On the use of the first person in Pindar cf. D’Alessio 1994, Currie 2013. In our verse, the speaking persona is the chorus. This is the only Pindaric instance of αἰτέω being followed by an acc. of the person asked (1, σε) and an impv. (5, δέξαι, cf. Slater 1969 s.vv. αἰτέω, αἴτημι, cf. Hummel 1993:274), i.e. another sentence. A construction of this description resembles that of λίσσομαι ‘I entreat/beseech’, followed by the impv. of the thing requested in O. 12.1–2, P. 1.71, N. 3.1–3, and constructed with acc. and impv. in fr. 52f.1–6 (*Pae.* 6.1–6 = D6 Rutherford) σε, χρυσέα | κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ || λίσσομαι [...] με δέξαι ‘I beseech you, golden Pytho famous for seers, welcome me’ (as *per* Race 1997b, differently, Slater 1969 s.v. λίσσομαι). According to Lefkowitz 1991:35, together with O. 14, P. 12 may be recognized as a ‘dedicatory’ ode, i.e. as a poem in which the poet’s task is to offer prayer, unlike the epinicia, which have an encomiastic scope. I believe that an encomiastic component, though not as prominent as in epinicia honouring tyrants or aristocrats, is definitely present (cf. 5, εὐδόξω Μίδα, 6, Ἑλλάδα νικάσαντα τέχνα) albeit Midas is extolled in a different way to what Pindar’s modern-day readers are used to: i.e. he is praised in relation to the glorious past of his art (τέχνα) rather than to his lineage (on Midas’ glory see also chapter 10).

1 σε ‘you’, (2.sg. ‘thee’), the city of Acragas, personified. Acragas is allegedly homonymous of the local nymph (cf. MacLachlan 2021:40–41). This mythological figure is only mentioned in Σ P. 12.1a Dr. πρὸς τὴν ἡρωῖδα τὴν Ἀκράγαντα, while Stephanus of Byzantium speaks of a male (river) Acragas (see below, 3 Ἀκράγαντος). In fact, since names ending in -ας (gen.sg. -αντος, with a ptc. suffix) are masculine (cf. Risch 1974²:26–27 on the Homeric MNS), a feminine Acragas would be unique. Although a nymph called Nestis was worshipped in Acragas (cf. Portale 2012), she is not the nymph Acragas. The existence of such a character is a secondary invention by Pindar’s scholiast.

1 φιλόγλαε ‘lover of brilliance’ first occurs in P. 12.1 and is glossed as φιλόκαλος ‘lover of beauty’ by Σ P. 12.1ab Dr. The compound is also attested in Ba. 13.225 (as an attribute of ‘hospitality’), 18.60 (of Athens), fr. 3.13 and Pos. E. 136.3 (of Eros). Compounds with FCM φιλο^o are already attested in Mycenaean (cf. e.g. WN *Pi-ro-wo-na* /*Philowoinā*/, PY Ae 344, MY V 659.7). According to Risch 1974²:193 (cf. Tribulato 2015:168, 334–335, 421–422), the so-called ‘φιλοπτόλεμος-

type' was primarily possessive ('having a[n] own/beloved X'), but soon came to be associated with φιλέω 'to love'. As a consequence, they came to overlap a compound type with a verbal FCM: 'loving X'. Gk. φιλάγλαος is remarkable: most compounds of type φιλοπτόλεμος exhibit the structure [φιλο^οSUBSTANTIVE], cf. e.g. φιλομμειδής (*Il.* 5.375+, with SCM μεῖδος 'smile') etc. The same applies to the Pindaric compounds with FCM φιλ(ο)^ο.¹ In contrast, φιλάγλαος reflects a rare structure [φιλο^οADJECTIVE],² since its SCM is the adj. ἀγλαός 'splendid, shining, bright' (*Il.* 1.23+), synchronically connected to the semantic field of 'beauty' (cf. ἀγλαῖα, ἄγαλμα, on which cf. Neer–Kurke 2019:46, 92–122, esp. 95–96).

The syntax underlying the compound may thus be reconstructed as [to LOVE (φιλο^ο/φιλέω)–SPLENDID/BEAUTIFUL THINGS (: ἀγλαά)] or [to LOVE–the SPLENDID THING (*par excellence*: light/feast)]. According to Meusel 2020:562, ἀγλαός is a lexicalized variant of φαεννός 'shining', with which it shares a number of phraseological matches, e.g. ἀγλαόκωμος (*O.* 3.6), κῶμον ... φάος ἀρετᾶν "kōmos (feast/celebration) ... light of excellent deeds" (*O.* 4.9–10), the subst. φάος being an etymological congener of φαεννός.³ To this we may add that since Antiquity ἀγλαός has been glossed through λαμπρός, cf. Hsch. α 587 LC ἀγλαά· λαμπρά, which, in turn, shares collocations with φαεννός (cf. Massetti 2019:133). Since ἀγλαός applies to φάος in fr. 52m.15 (*Pae.* 12.15 = G1 Rutherford), we can assume that it was indeed associated with the semantic field of 'light, brightness' in the Pindaric *Sprachgefühl*. If φιλάγλαος meant 'loving the shining [light, i.e. φάος]', *ex Graeco ipso* it matches [φάος–φιλεῖν], Eur. *HF* 90, and [φάος–φίλος], Eur. *IA* 1509.

1 καλλίστα βροτεᾶν πόλιων "most beautiful of mortal cities", cf. *Od.* 5.101 βροτῶν πόλις, Eur. *Hipp.* 486 θνητῶν ... πόλεις; for καλλίστα ... πόλιων cf. *P.* 9.69 καλλίσταν πόλιν.

2 Φερσεφόνας ἔδος "abode (lit. seat) of Persephone". The GN Φερσεφόνα (Pi.) is one of the so-called 'poetic forms' of Persephone's name. The form Φερσεφόνα, together with other versions of the name with an initial φ- (e.g. Φερ[ρ]όφαττα,

1 Cf. φιλάνωρ (MN, in *O.* 12.13, epithet in fr. 236), φιλάρματος (*I.* 8.20), φίλιππος (*N.* 9.32), φιλοκερδής (*I.* 2.6), φιλόμαχος (fr. 164), φιλόμολλος (*N.* 7.9), φιλόνομος (*O.* 6.19), φιλόξενος, φιλόξεινος (*I.* 2.24, *O.* 3.1), φιλόπολις (*O.* 4.16), φιλόφρων (*P.* 1.94, *P.* 8.1) and the subst. φιλοτιμία 'ambition' (fr. 210) and φιλοφροσύνη 'act of friendliness' (*O.* 4.14, fr. 128d.14).

2 Cf. the type 'fond of jeering' (*Od.* 22.287+, cf. adj. κέρτομος, -ον subst. in κέρτομα βάζειν, Hes. *Op.* 788).

3 Both φάος and φαεννός are based on IE *b^heh₂- 'to shine, become visible', cf. LIV² 68–69, IEW 104–105; on φάφος cf. Peters 1993:107, NIL 7–11.

Φερρόφαττα [Att. vase-paintings, 5th c. BCE], Φερσέφασσα [Soph., Eur.], Φερσέφαττα Aristoph., etc.), reflects a synchronic connection between the goddess name and the verb φέρω (cf. Wachter 2007–2008:165). Indeed, according to ancient lexicographers, Persephone is the ‘bringer (φέρω) of death (φόνη) or profit (ἄφενος)’, cf. *EM* 665.50 <Περσεφόνη>· παρά τὸ φέρω καὶ τὸ φόνος, cf. Hsch. φ 317 ΗC Φερσεφόνεια: ... ἡ φέρουσα τὸ ἄφενος ... διὰ τὸν καρπὸν, <ῆ> ἀπὸ τοῦ φέρειν ὄνησιν.⁴

As Persephone is the spouse of Hades (cf. e.g. ΗΗ 2), her house is most commonly identified as the underworld (cf. e.g. *O.* 14.21 μελαντείχεά νῦν δόμον Φερσεφόνας, *I.* 8.55 δῶμα Φερσεφόνας). Without any context, the ‘abode of Persephone’ would probably seem apt to designate the goddess’ gloomy kingdom. Here, contrary to our possible expectations, the abode of Persephone is *sunny* Acragas (cf. 1, φιλάγλαε ‘lover of brilliance’). The collocation [ABODE–PERSEPHONE_{gen.}] is a variation kenning for the city in which the goddess was worshipped,⁵ cf. other kennings with the structure [ABODE–GOD/GENOS/HERO_{gen.}], in which ἔδος (*s*-stem from IE **sed-* ‘to sit’, cf. LIV² 513–515, IEW 884–887, NIL 590–600, Stüber 2002:144–145) expresses ‘abode’, e.g. Ὀλυμπον ... ἀθανάτων ἔδος (*Il.* 5.360+), θεῶν ἔδος ... Ὀλυμπον (*Il.* 5.367+). *Ex Pindaro ipso* cf. *P.* 2.7 ποταμίας ἔδος Ἀρτέμιδος (= Ortygia), *N.* 4.11–12 Αἰακιδᾶν || ἡύπυργον ἔδος (= Aegina); *ex Graeco ipso* cf. also Aeschl. *Pers.* 126, *TrGF* 158.3, *TrGF* 664a.4, Eur. *TrGF* 781.35 (= *Phaeth.* 248). Further Pindaric and Aeschylean passages make reference to a certain place as the ‘seat’ (ἔδρα : **sed-reh*₂) of a divinity, cf. *O.* 7.76, *O.* 14.2, *I.* 7.44, Aeschl. *Ag.* 596.

The kenning alludes to the cult of Persephone in Acragas. According to Pindar (*N.* 1.14), Zeus gave Sicily to Persephone; indeed, the scholia specify (cf. *Σ O.* 6.161g.2 A, *N.* 1.17 A) that Sicily or Acragas (*Σ O.* 2.15d Dr.) were given to the goddess εἰς τὰ ἀνακαλυπτήρια (“the presents given to the bride when she first took off her veil”, cf. Gildersleeve 1885 *ad P.* 12.2). In the 6th c. BCE three sanctuaries

4 Φερσεφόνια means *‘slayer of sheaves’, cf. Περσεφάττα < **perso-k^hηtiā-*, cf. Wachter 2006, *contra* Petersmann 1986, Anttila 1997, 2000:164–165: ‘die von Feuer (πέρρα), Licht Übervolle’ (with SCM from IE **g^hen-* ‘to swell’, as *per* Heubeck 1954), Bader 1989:38: ‘who destroys (πέρθω) death’ (with φόνη from IE **g^hen-* ‘to kill’), Janda 2000:224–250: ‘die das/den Glänzende(n) (φάος) hinüberbringt (πέρω, πορέν)’. On the etymology of the name and its variants, see now Nussbaum 2022.

5 A kenning (pl. kennings or *kenningar*) is “a bipartite figure of two nouns in a non-copulative, typically genitival grammatical relation (A of B) or in composition (B-A/A-B) which together make reference to, ‘signify’ a third notion C” (Watkins 1995:44). According to Mittner 1954:15, we can distinguish a ‘substitution kenning’, which replaces one term in the poetic discourse, and a ‘variation kenning’, which is juxtaposed to the term it refers to, as iteration, apposition, epithet etc. For a study and a repertoire of kennings in Greek literature cf. Wærn 1951.

near the city (Sant’Anna, San Biagio, and the Rock Sanctuary) were dedicated to the cult of Demeter and Persephone. A further sanctuary in honour of Demeter was built by Theron between 490 and 480 BCE, cf. Hinz 1998:70–92, Mertens 2006:197, 239, 317, Holloway 2000:60–63, Hannah–Magli–Orlando 2017.

2 ἅ τ’ ὄχθαις ἔπι “who on the banks”. This relative clause is comparable to an ornamental epithet (cf. Hummel 1993:321–322, 390). Gk. ὄχθη may apply to a height of any kind (e.g. *Od.* 9.132+). In Pindar it often means ‘river-bank’ and is usually preceded by *παρά* or *ἐπί*, cf. *P.* 4.46 Καφισοῦ παρ’ ὄχθαις, *N.* 9.22 Ἴσμηνοῦ δ’ ἐπ’ ὄχθαισι, *I.* 5.42 Καίκου παρ’ ὄχθαις. I concur with Bernardini 2006⁴:671 (*contra* Cerrato 1934) in taking the relative clause as referring to *σε* ‘you’ (1), i.e. the personified city (*καλλίστα ... πολίων*, fem.) and not to Persephone or the (inexistent) nymph Acragas (cf. 1 *σε*, 3 Ἀκράγαντος).

2 *μηλοβότου* “sheep-grazed (i.e. grazed by the sheep)” is built with the same lexical material as the compound *μηλοβότης* ‘shepherd’ (*I.* 1.48+), the collocation [*μηλα*_{nom.}–*βόσκομαι*], cf. *Od.* 12.128, *HH* 3.412, and the GN *Μηλόβοσις* (*HH* 2.420).⁶ The epithet only applies to the river Acragas (Ἀκράγαντος, 3) in Pindar. The wording of 2–3 *Φερσεφόνας ἔδος, ἅ τ’ ὄχθαις ἔπι μηλοβότου ... Ἀκράγαντος* resembles that of *Hes. fr.* 180.3–4:

..... .. πυ]ροφόρου Ἀσίας ἔδος [
..... .. μηλ.]οβότους Ἔρμον πάρα δ[ι]νήεντα

... seat of wheat-bearing Asia [] sheep-grazed, beside the [eddy]ing] *Hermus* ...

TRANSL. MOST 2007

3 *ναίεις ... ἐύδματον κολώναν* “you, (who) dwell upon the well-built hill”. Acragas was located on a hill (San Biagio). The verb *ναίω* builds a repetition with 26, cf. chapter 2, section 4 (1st ring).⁷ The collocation [*ναίω*–*κολώννα*_{acc.}] matches [*ναίω*–*κολωνός*_{acc.}], occurring in *Hes. fr.* 59.2: *ναίουσα κολωνούς* (of Coronis).

6 *μηλοβότου*: the compound is first attested in Hesiod and reflects a ‘type *θεόδητος*’ (Risch 1974²:210–211), i.e. a compound with a zero-grade deverbial (ptc.) SCM, which, in this case, is based on *βόσχω* (IE **g^heh₃*- ‘to feed’, cf. Tribulato 2015:373–374).

7 *ναίω* reflects **h₂s-je/o-*, from IE **nes-* ‘to go home’, cf. LIV² 454–455, IEW 766–767, Forte 2017: ‘to turn’, Frame 2009: ‘to return’, Ginevra 2022: ‘to return safely home, to attain the desired goal’. *ἐύδματος*, ‘well-built’ (attested only here, in Pindar), Ion. *εὐδητος* (*Il.* 1.448+), is a ‘*θεόδητος*-type’ with a FCM *εὐ^o* (:IE **h₂su-* ‘good’ [adj.] and ‘well’ [adv.], *u*-stem from **h₁es-* ‘to

3 Ἀκράγαντος “of Acragas”, gen.sg. of Ἀκράγας, -αντος, river and city name. The genealogy of the river is recalled by Stephanus of Byzantium α 167 (= *Ethn.* p. 62.15) ἀπὸ Ἀκράγαντος τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Ἀστερόπης τῆς Ὠκεανοῦ. According to Lewis (2019), in Pindar’s odes for Acragantine victors (*O.* 2, *O.* 3, *P.* 6, *P.* 12, *I.* 2), the river Acragas is a civic symbol “rooted in the [...] landscape”. The centrality of the water stream in the civic imagery may be confirmed by the analysis of the numismatic evidence: by the end of 6th c. BCE Acragantine coins featured a crab (Kraay 1976:208, Jenkins 1990:43), interpreted by Holloway (2000:124) as a pun on the river’s name (cf. *κάρκινος* ‘crab’, Ἀκράγας).

3 ὦ ἄνα “O queen” (= Att. ὦ ἄνασσα). The form ἄνα is feminine only here, being mostly employed as voc.sg. of masc. ἄναξ (so in *P.* 9.44, cf. Alph. Gk. [F]ἄναξ ‘ruler’, cf. Leumann 1950:39–44; Myc. *wa-na-ka* /*wanaks*/, PY Na 334+, designating a functionary) vs *I.* 5.6 ὠνασσα “O queen”.⁸ The vocative preceded by ὦ and the form ἄνα are probably not used to convey a particular tone or emotion (cf. Dickey 1996:199–206 with bibliography inherent poetic usages). Greengard 1980:57 argues that the vocative may suggest here a ‘reinvocation’ of the deity, which precedes the victory announcement. But, as I already pointed out, no deity is actually called upon in this beginning passage. Although Persephone is named at 2, it is unlikely that she is the referent of the vocative. ‘O queen’ must again refer to personified *polis* Acragas. In my view, the word choice is aimed at creating a quasi-echoing effect within the verse (κὼλῶΝΑΝ Ὠ ΑΝΑ). Echoes of this kind are occasionally fashioned by Pindar, as a representative example cf. *N.* 3.1 ὦ ΠΟΤΝΙΑ ΜΟΙΣΑ, МАТЕР АМΕТЕРА.

be’, cf. LIV² 241–242, IEW 340–341, cf. Pinault 2003:162–165, Nussbaum 2014:231), and, as SCM, a *to*-adj. from δέμω ‘to build’ (IE **demh₂*- ‘to build’, cf. LIV² 114–116, IEW 198–199, cf. Nikolaev 2011). The compound can perfectly match YAv. *hu.ḍāta*- ‘well formed/made’ (= **h₁su-dm̥h₂-tó-*, Y 9.16+; differently, Bartholomae AirWb. 1824 s.v., tracing °*ḍāta*- back to YAv. **ḍā-* ‘to put/set’, IE **d^heh₁-*). The term κολώνᾱ (also found in fr. 140b.5), exists as well as κολωνός ‘hill’ (HH 2.272+; on the word-formation cf. Schmeja 1963, Peters 1980:168). The forms reflect a thematization (κολωνός) and an individualizing feminine (κολώνᾱ) derived from an *n*-stem (**kolH-n-* from IE **kelH-* ‘to rise up’ cf. LIV² 349, IEW 544, cf. Lith. *kálnas* ‘mountain’, Lat. *collis* ‘hill’ < **kolnis*, OE *hyll*, MoE *hill* < PGmc. **hulni-*).

8 ὦ ἄνα: a feminine form *wa-na-sa** /*wanat^sa-/** (: ἄνασσα, cf. Peters 1980:289–290) is also attested in PY Fr 1219.2. The etymology of the term remains opaque: Willms 2010 supports Szemerényi’s (1979) proposal, i.e. **uen-aġt-* (?) or **u_n-aġt-* ‘leader’ (IE **h₁aġ-* ‘to lead, convey’ [**h₂eġ-* in LIV² 255–256, cf. IEW 4–5]) of the kin/people (IE **uen-*). Alternatively, the FCM **u_n-* could be interpreted as ‘goods’ or ‘victory’ cf. Ved. *van* ‘to overpower, conquer’ (IE **uen-* on which, as a recent reference, cf. Weiss 2018), **u_n-aġ-t-* ‘conveyer’ (IE **h₁aġ-*) of goods (IE **uen-*) could formally match Ved. *vanġj-* ‘merchant’ (RV 1.112.11a+). Palaima 1995 proposes a non-IE origin for the *wanax*’ functions.

4 ἴλαος “benevolent ... receive (δέξει)”; cf. [εὐφρων_{pred.}-δέχομαι], *P.* 9.73, *N.* 5.38; on the phraseology ‘to receive benevolently’ cf. chapter 1, section 3.

4 ἀθανάτων ἀνδρῶν τε “of immortals and men”. The expression can be identified as a *quantifier* (or merism) for the notion of [TOTALITY], in this case: “all intelligent beings” (West 2007:100). Quantifiers of this type usually consist of a pair of contrasted terms and display two different structures: (a) [ARGUMENT + NEGATED-ARGUMENT], e.g. ‘the living and the non-living’, or (b) [ARGUMENT + COUNTER-ARGUMENT], e.g. ‘the living and the dead’ (cf. Watkins 1995:46). In Pindar, merisms for [ALL (INTELLIGENT) BEINGS] exhibit both structures (a) and (b), and are expressed by means of different lexemes for the [ARGUMENT + NEGATED/COUNTER-ARGUMENT]. The Pindaric quantifiers also find perfect and partial phraseological matches in Greek and other IE languages, cf.

- (a) [MORTAL + IMMORTAL]: Pi. [θνατός + ἀθάνατος] displays derivatives of IE **d^henh₂-* ‘to leave’ (LIV² 144–145, cf. IEW 249, *contra* Beekes EDG s.v. θάνατος) for both members of the collocation, cf. fr. 169.2 θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων (cf. *Il.* 12.242+) and can be compared to Ved. [*mártya-* + *amṛta-*] cf. e.g. *amṛtam mártyaṃ ca* (RV 1.35.2b+), exhibiting an identical structure and different lexemes—Ved. *mártya-* and *amṛta-* are derivatives of IE **mer-* ‘to die’ (cf. LIV² 439–440, IEW 735). The variant [MORTAL (**mer-*) + IMMORTAL (**ṛ-d^hṛh₂-*)], with different lexemes expressing the two members of the collocation, occurs in the epics (*Il.* 11.2+), but is not attested in Pindar.
- (b) [MORTAL/MAN + IMMORTAL/GOD]: different combinations are attested:
- (b.1) [IMMORTAL (IE **d^henh₂-*) + MAN (IE **h₂ner-*)], cf. *P.* 12.4 ἀθανάτων ἀνδρῶν τε;
- (b.2) [GOD + MORTAL (IE **mer-*)],⁹ cf. *P.* 3.30 οὐ θεός οὐ βροτός, which can be compared with Ved. *devásas ca mártāsas ca* “gods and mortals” (RV 6.15.8+), Av. *daēuuāišcā mašiiāišcā* “with/by daēvas and mortals” (pl.instr., Y 29.4);
- (b.3) [GOD + HUMAN], with different lexemes for ‘human’ (ἄνθρωπος ‘human’, ἀνήρ ‘man’),¹⁰ cf. *P.* 9.40 ἔν τε θεοῖς ... κἀνθρώποις, fr. 194.6

9 A type [IMMORTAL + MORTAL MAN] and [IMMORTAL GOD + MORTAL MAN] is attested in *Il.* 14.199 ἀθανάτους ἦδὲ θνητοὺς ἀνθρώπου, *Od.* 24.64 ἀθάνατοί τε θεοὶ θνητοὶ τ’ ἀνθρώποι.

10 In further Pindaric passages [GOD] and [MAN] occur at close distance, but in a different syntactic relation (i.e. non-copulative), cf. *O.* 1.64–66, *O.* 11.10, *P.* 3.81, *N.* 6.1, *N.* 10.54.

θεῶν καὶ κατ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγυιάς, fr. 224 θεὸν ἄνδρα τε,¹¹ which can be compared with ON *godð öll ok gumar* “all gods and humans” (*Ls.* 45.3, 55.6), *allra guðanna ok manna* “among all gods and men” (*Gylf.* 21).¹²

4–5 σὺν εὐμενίᾳ || δέξαι: “along with the goodwill (of all) receive”.¹³ Cf. [σὺν (εὐμενῆς νόος)_{dat.}–δέχομαι] in *P.* 8.19, fr. 52e.45 (*Pae.* 5.45 = D5 Rutherford); cf. also, though more vaguely, *O.* 5.2–3 καρδίᾳ γελανεῖ || δέκευ.

5 δέξαι στεφάνωμα τόδ' (ε) “receive this crown”. Panhellenic champions were awarded crowns. Since laurel was sacred to Apollo, Pythian winners were crowned with laurel (Blech 1982:137–138). In Pindar's poems, the collocation [δέχομαι–CROWN_{acc.}] is well attested in connection with victory events since [ATHLETE_{nom.}–δέχομαι–CROWN_{acc.}] equates [ATHLETE–WINS], cf. *O.* 6.27, *P.* 1.100, *I.* 3/4.11, *I.* 6.4 and *P.* 9.125, containing a substitution kenning for ‘crown’: πτερά ... νικᾶν “the wings of victory”. Here, however, ‘this crown’ is a metaphor for the hymn. A closer look at the usages of στεφάνωμα in Pindar reveals that the term means ‘the (metaphoric) crowning object’ which is awarded to the victor. In a complementary fashion, the hymn is occasionally compared to a crown (cf. section 1.1 below).

5 ἐκ Πυθῶνος “(sc. coming) from Pytho”. According to Riaño Rupilanchas (2001:68), this reference hints to the fact that the ode was performed in Acragas. Pytho (Πυθῶν, Πυθῶνος), the other name of Delphi, is related to Πυθώ, the name of she-serpent killed by Apollo. According to the foundation myth, the god established the agon in honour of his enemy's death (Davies 2007, see also chapter 1, section 1). As we learn from *HH* 3, the name Pytho was synchronically connected to the verb πύθω ‘to rot’, cf. *HH* 3.373–374 Πύθιον ἀγκαλέουσιν ἐπώνυμον, οὐνεκα κείθι || αὐτοῦ πύσε πέλωρ μένος ὀξέος Ἡελίοιο.¹⁴

11 In principle, *Pi. P.* 4.13 παῖδες ὑπερβύμων τε φωτῶν καὶ θεῶν could also belong to this group. In the passage, however, Medea is addressing the Argonauts, who (literally) are ‘sons of gods and heroes’. Therefore, it is unlikely that the expression means ‘you all’.

12 ON *godð öll ok gumar* matches Hes. *Th.* 372–373 ἐπιχθονίοισι [...] ἀθανάτοισι τε θεοῖσι “to the humans and the immortal gods”, since both ON *gumi-* ‘man’ and Gk. ἐπιχθόνιος ‘terrestrial’ derive from the IE **dʰǵʰom-*/**dʰǵʰem-* ‘earth’, cf. also *Il.* 5.442 ἀθανάτων τε θεῶν χαμαὶ ἐρχομένων τ' ἀνθρώπων “of the immortal gods and men who walk on the earth”.

13 σὺν εὐμενίᾳ: εὐμενία, poetic form for εὐμένεια, is a substantivizing/individualizing feminine based on a possessive compound εὐμενῆς ‘whose μένος (mental energy) is good’ (*HH* 22.7+, on εὐ^o see above, 3). The compound matches μένος ἦϋ “brave spirit” (*Il.* 17.456+); yet it perfectly overlaps Ved. *sumánas-* ‘benevolent’ (RV 1.36.2c+), YAv. *hu.manah-* ‘id.’ (Vr. 3.3+), cf. Durante 1962:33. Ved. [*bhadrá–mánas-*] “good mental energy” (RV 2.26.2b+) may partially match Ved. *sumánas-*, cf. Schmitt 1967:120.

14 Πυθῶνος: as pointed out by Toporov 1974 (cf. also Watkins 1995:460–463), it is likely that

5 εὐδόξῳ Μίδα “for Midas of good fame”. As already touched upon (chapter 1, section 1), the lack of references to the winner’s *genos* suggests that he did not belong to an illustrious family. Μίδα is also the name of the Phrygian king whose figure, as Roller (1983:309–310) highlights, came to be associated with qualities and achievements considered by the Greeks as ‘typically’ Phrygian, including music. In fact, King Midas is credited with the invention of a type of *aulos* (Pli. *HN* VII 204, Athen. 617b) and with the introduction of *aulos*-music at sacrifices and funerals (*Suid.* s.v. ἔλεγχος). It is probably for this reason that Clay (1992:519) and Martin (2003:169, fn. 69) surmise, though without any strong textual support, that *P.* 12’s Midas is a stage name of Phrygian colour. Although the traditions on king Midas and the invention of flute music are preserved in sources that are dated at a much later age than Pindar, it is tantalizing to imagine that these connections were older. If so, *our* Midas, whether Midas be his real name or his stage name, would have borne a name of a certain mythological and musical weight.

Gk. εὐδοξος displays a SCM °δοξος, cf. Gk. δόξα ‘fame’, a linguistic cognate of δέχομαι (cf. Chantraine DELG, Frisk GEW, Beekes EDG s.v. δόξα, see also chapter 10, section 4). Since κλέος and δόξα are synonyms (Massetti 2019:116–117), εὐδοξος semantically overlaps εὐκλεής ‘having good fame’ (also ‘making fame good’, with factitive nuance, see below, 24). Gk. εὐκλεής is the inherited compound for ‘having good glory/fame’.¹⁵

6 αὐτόν τέ νιν “and him, himself”, cf. Slater 1969 s.v. νιν “combined with αὐτόν, emphatic”. For the city receiving and welcoming (δέχομαι) the winner cf. *O.* 4.9, *P.* 8.19, *N.* 4.11, *N.* 5.38, *N.* 11.3. In *P.* 9.73 ἄ νιν εὐφρων δέξεται recalls Ἴλαος ... δέξει ... νιν (cf. 4–5 and chapter 1, section 3).

Πυθώ reflects a derivative of IE *b^heyd^h- ‘bottom’ also seen in Gk. πυθμήν ‘bottom of a vessel, the sea’, cf. Ved. *budhná-* ‘bottom’, OE *botem* (MoE *bottom*), ON *botn* ‘id.’ Primordial dragons are traditionally located ‘at the bottom (of something, e.g. the sea, the cosmic tree)’, cf. Ved. *áhi- budhnyá-* ‘the serpent of the depth’ (RV 7.34.16–17+) and ON Niðhoggr, who is situated at the bottom of the tree Yggdrasil (cf. Dumézil 1959, Ström 1967, Ginevra [forthc./b]). Significantly, the Ved. collocation [*áhi- budhnyá-*] matches Gk. Πυθώ ... ὄφιν (Call. *H* 2.100–101).

15 εὐδόξῳ cf. εὐκλεής: εὐκλεής reflects **h₁su-klémes-* and has a perfect match in Ved. *susrávas-* ‘having good fame’ (RV 1.49.2c+); Av. **hu.srauuah-* ‘id.’, cf. YAv. MNS *Haosrauuayhan-*, *Haosrauuayhana-*, and *Haosrauuah-* (with secondary ‘substantivizing’ vṛddhi, cf. Rau 2007); OIr. *sochlu* (on which cf. Thurneysen 1946:216); further partial matches are the OCS MN *Vesclaves* and YAv. [*vayhu- srauuah-*], in which ‘good’ is expressed by means of IE **mesu-* ‘good’ (Schmitt 1967:82–87).

6 Ἑλλάδα νικάσαντα τέχνα “(him,) who beat Hellas in the art (which ...)”. Gk. νικάω and τέχνη also combine in Hes. *Th.* 496 νικηθεὶς τέχνησι βίηφί τε. For ‘Hellas’ as a designation for ‘Panhellenic competitors’ cf. *P.* 11.50, *N.* 10.25. According to Σ *P.* 12.12a Dr. (followed by Slater 1969 s.v. τέχνα, Köhnken 1971:143–144, 1976:263–265, Sotiriou 2001:124, Bernardini 2006⁴:672; cf. also chapter 6, section 2) τέχνα refers here to the ἀύλητικὴ τέχνη ‘art of playing the *aulos*’. This interpretation is supported by the fact that τέχνα regularly denotes ‘skill’ or ‘craft’ in Pindar, not ‘the object produced by means of a skill’ (a meaning attested in Soph. *OC* 472+). Conversely, Mezger (1880:197) Schroeder (1922:112), Wilamowitz (1922:144), Burton (1962:26), Schlesinger (1968:276) and Pöhlmann (2010–2011:45) argue that the verse refers to the νόμος πολυκέφαλος. I believe that such an implicit reference could provide a solid basis for the choice of the myth. This interpretation may be sustained by making reference to semantic and lexical repetitions within the ode (cf. chapter 1, section 4, chapter 2, sections 4–5).

1.1 *Excursus: στέφανος and στεφάνωμα in Pindar*

Two Gk. terms for ‘crown’, στέφανος ‘crown, wreath’/‘garland’ and στεφάνωμα, ‘id.’ are derivatives of IE ^{*}(s)teg^{mh}- ‘to crown’ (so Beekes EDG s.v. στέφω). Specifically, στέφανος is a (*a*)no-derivative of the root, while στεφάνωμα reflects a deverbal *mḥ*-formation to the denominative verb στεφανώω ‘to crown’. In Pindar, στέφανος (43x) mostly denotes ‘crown’, ‘wreath’ as a physical object, whereas στεφάνωμα (8x) designates the ‘crowning object’. Besides referring to ‘crown/wreath’ (cf. *N.* 5.54, *I.* 2.15, fr. 333a.7), στεφάνωμα is often used metaphorically (cf. *P.* 1.50, *P.* 9.4, *I.* 3/4.44, *I.* 3/4.61). Conversely, for στέφανος only two instances out of 43 reflect a metaphorical usage of the term: in *O.* 8.32 στέφανος applies to a ‘circling wall’. Since Σ *O.* 5.1b Dr. identifies the expression στεφάνων ἄωτον ‘the crowns’ choicest flower’ as the ‘hymn’ in *O.* 5.1, it is commonly assumed that στέφανος stands for ‘hymn’ in the passage. In my opinion, however, the kenning [στέφανος_{gen.pl.}-ἄωτος] might just refer to the ‘best crowns’, i.e. those awarded to winners of the Panhellenic games in honour of Zeus (cf. Kurke 1993:140).

According to ancient commentaries, στεφάνωμα is a metaphor for ‘song’ in *P.* 12.5 (Gildersleeve 1885 *ad P.* 12.5, Bernardini 2006⁴:672; differently, Kurke 1993:140, who supports a literal meaning ‘crown’), cf. Σ *P.* 12.7 Dr. τὸ ἐκ τῆς Πυθῶνος στεφάνωμα, τὸν ὕμνον; Σ *P.* 12.5 *prae* 8 Mo. τότε τὸ στεφάνωμα τοῦ ἐνδόξου μίδα τὸ ἐκ πυθῶνος, ἦτοι τὸν ὕμνον τόνδε τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ νίκῃ τῶν πυθίων γινόμενον αὐτῷ. The term στεφάνωμα also designates the hymn in Eur. *HF* 355–356: ὑμνήσαι στεφάνωμα μόχθων [...] θέλω. This parallel supports the idea that στεφάνωμα is a metaphor in our passage as well.

The semantic distribution of the pair στέφανος ‘physical crown’ vs στεφάνωμα ‘the thing with which I crown someone/something’, i.e. the *metaphoric* crowning object, may be a Pindaric usage that reflects a morphological distinction. Indeed, στεφάνωμα seems to preserve the semantic de-instrumental nuance of the denominative στεφανώω from which the term is derived. The metaphor [HYMN/POEM] = [CROWN] finds parallels *ex Pindaro ipso* and *ex Graeco ipso*. In Simon. FrGH 1a.8.F 6 στεφανηπλόκος ‘weaving a wreath/garland’ (with a FCM based on στέφανος) applies to Homer: τὸν δὲ Ὀμηρον στεφανηπλόκον, [...] τὸν δὲ ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν συμπλέξαντα τὸν Ἰλιάδος καὶ Ὀδυσσεΐας στέφανον. Not only do the verbs ‘to sing’ and ‘to crown’ appear at close distance in Pindaric and Bacchylidean poetic discourse, as if they were hinting at concomitant and/or associated gestures, cf. *P.* 8.56–57, *N.* 7.77, *Ba.* 4.14–18 (cf. Nünlist 1998:215–223; cf. also D’Alessio 2004:288, fn. 75), but, in a variety of Pindaric passages, the verb ‘to crown’ also means ‘to celebrate with song and dance’, e.g. *O.* 1.100–103 ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι || κείνον ἰππίῳ νόμῳ || Αἰοληΐδι μολπῆ || χρῆ (cf. *N.* 5.53–54, *I.* 5.62–63, *I.* 7.39, *I.* 7.49–51, *I.* 8.66a–67). After all, hymns and crowns both materialize victory, in an ‘audible’ or a ‘visible’ form. For this reason, Pindar stresses that these things *are received* by the winner and by his fatherland (cf. chapter 10, section 4), cf. [δέκομαι–στέφανος_{acc.}] (see above), cf. [δέκομαι–SONG/HYMN_{acc.}], cf. *O.* 5.3, *O.* 6.98, *O.* 8.10, *O.* 13.29, *P.* 1.80, *P.* 5.22, *I.* 1.51, fr. 52f.129 (*Pae.* 6.129 = D6 Rutherford). Remarkably, in *O.* 1 the hymn is represented as a crown (Nisetich 1975, cf. also Stoneman 1981), being the subject of the verb ἀμφιβάλλω ‘to put around (: to crown)’ cf. *O.* 1.8–9 ὅθεν ὁ πολύφατος ὕμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται || σοφῶν μητίεσσι (on πολύφατος cf. Hummel 1992; on ἀμφιβάλλω, cf. Slater 1969 s.v. “to put τι around τιν, crown with”, who points out that the verb is employed in connection with ‘crown/wreath’ and ‘hair’ in *P.* 3.13, *P.* 5.31, while the context of fr. 337.5 is unclear).

Finally, both ‘crowns’ and ‘hymns’ are imagined as objects which can be ‘braided/woven’, as in the collocation [(δια)πλέκω–στέφανος_{acc.}], underlying στεφανηπλοκέω ‘to plait wreaths’ (*Sapph.* 125 V+), cf. *O.* 2.74–75 ἀναπλέκοντι ... στεφάνους; *N.* 9.53 θεμιπλέκτοις ... στεφάνοις; fr. 70c.7 (= *Dith.* 3.7) πλόκον σ[τεφάνων] κισσίνων, and [(δια)πλέκω–SONG_{acc.}], on which see below 8, [θρήνον] διαπλέξαισ’ Ἀθήνα.¹⁶ Significantly, in *P.* 12.5–8 Midas’ hymn is imagined as a crown (woven by Pindar), while Athena is said to have *braided* a song inspired

16 Cf. also *Ba.* 19.5–8 φερεστέφανοι Χάριτες | βάλωσιν ἀμφί τιμάν || ὕμνοισιν ὕφαινε νυν ἐν || ταῖς πολυγράτοις τι καινόν “... whose songs are crowned with honour by the garland-bearing Graces. Weave, then, in lovely (Athens) something new”. Here φερεστέφανος is reminiscent of στεφανοφόρος ‘bringing wreaths/crowns’ (*Ba.* 19.51, fr. 2, fr. 20b.48) and the collocation [CROWNING OBJECT_{acc.}–φέρω], connected with the Graces in *Pi.* *N.* 5.54 φέρε στεφανώματα

by the Gorgons' lament. This suggests to us a possible overlap between Pindar (weaver of crowning hymns) and Athena (weaver of the 'tune of many heads').

2 Transition (7–8) and Myth (8–24)

The reference to the τέχνη through which Midas triumphed at Delphi works as the starting point for the mythological digression of the ode, which is introduced by a relative clause (6–8). For a visual description of 6–7 cf. Sulzer 1961:23, who identifies chiasmatic structures.

The transition occupies the last verses of the first strophe, while the mythological excursus is fully developed in the following strophe (cf. Nierhaus 1936:58–59, who stresses that the narration is 'over-bridging' the strophe's limits). This section concerns the genesis of the 'tune of many heads'. After Perseus decapitates the Gorgon, Medusa's sisters Euryale and Sthenno lament for their loss. Athena, who assisted Perseus in his endeavour, hears their sounds and composes a melody by imitating the Gorgons' and the Gorgons' serpents' cries. And so the 'tune of many heads' is born. Perseus then brings Medusa's head to Seriphus and manages to free his mother Danae from the slavery Polydectes had imposed on her. In chronological order, the actions of Perseus and Athena are as follows:

- a Athena helps Perseus and Perseus beheads Medusa
- b Athena hears Euryale's lament and decides to imitate it
- c Athena *finds* the 'tune of many heads'
- d Perseus shows Medusa's head in Seriphus, petrifies the islanders, and frees Danae.

The mythological digression is constructed in a chiasmatic way. The focus moves from Athena (7–10) to Perseus (11–18) and then back to Athena and her invention (18–23), forming two concentric rings (cf. chapter 2, sections 4–5). The events concerning the creation of the *nomos pollān kephalān* are firstly presented in descending chronological order (i.e. from the most recent to the most ancient), then in ascending chronological order (i.e. from the most ancient to the most recent), according to a process also found in Greek epics (cf. e.g. Latacz 2009:27 *ad Il.* 1.12b–21, Gaisser 1969) and elsewhere in choral lyric (e.g. *Pi. P.* 3.8–46). The section starts by mentioning Athena's invention (7–8); Pindar

σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισσιν. Moreover, the Bacchylidean expression βάλωσιν ἀμφὶ τιμάν || ὕμνοισιν (6–7) resembles ὕμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται || σοφῶν μητίεσσι (*Pi. O.* 1.8–9).

then moves backwards in time: at 9–10, a new relative clause connects Athena's invention to the moment in which the goddess hears the Gorgons' lament that she decides to re-enact. At 11 a temporal clause shifts the focus further back to the clash between Perseus and Medusa. The poet then concentrates on the heroic achievements of Perseus (11–16), which are presented in ascending chronological order: Perseus defeats Medusa and thanks to her head petrifies the inhabitants of Seriphus (11–12). At 13–15, advancing towards the centre of the ode, Pindar highlights the extraordinary nature of Perseus' victories by providing more details about his achievements. The emphatic particle ἤτοι at 13 and the use of copulative coordinating elements at 14–15 do not simply contrast with the hypotactic constructions, by means of which the poet has so far played with the chronological dimensions of the myth, but also work to reaffirm the definitive triumph of Perseus over all his enemies in an accumulative, almost catalogue-like form. Within the participle clause at 16 the expression κράτα συλλάσαις is located at the very centre of the poem, a position which gives prominence to Perseus' culminating act.

The scene of Perseus producing Medusa's head or the moment that immediately precedes it are both attested on Attic vase-paintings dated around the end of 6th c. BCE. On an Attic hydria (cf. Tsountas 1885:124–125, πίναξ 5) a character, most likely identifiable as Polydectes, sits close to Perseus, who stands on a βήμα and holds the κίβισις. The beholder glimpses Medusa's head, which has not yet been shown to the tyrant of Seriphus. Scenes of the head's production are found on the red-figure Attic pelike from Cerveteri (Museo Villa Giulia, Roma; *LIMC* s.v. Polydektes 2) and the kalyx krater from Camarina, dated ca. 480 BCE and attributed to the Mykonos Painter (Museo Civico, Castello Ursino, Catania, cf. ARV² 515.6, 1657, *LIMC* s.v. Polydektes 3, Barresi-Valastro 2000:82–84, nr. 63).¹⁷

After this section, a quick reference to Perseus' extraordinary birth, once again within a relative clause (17), marks the second part of the circular digression. The narration then proceeds in an almost uninterrupted ascending chronological order (18–23). The section begins with a temporal clause (ἐπεί, 18): after Athena rescues Perseus, the goddess invents a melody to imitate Euryale's lamentation and calls it 'tune of many heads' (19–23). The comparison between the time of the myth and the sequences of the mythological digression may be summarized as follows:

17 Further artistic representations are: an Etruscan bronze statuette dated to the 1st half of the 4th c. BCE (Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg, inv. nr. 1929.22); a Roman coin from Argos (2nd–3rd c. BCE, probably portraying a statue from the *herōon* of Perseus in Argos, cf. Imhoof-Blumer-Gardner 1887:35).

TABLE 6 Chronological order and mythological digression

Chronological order	Mythological digression
a Athena helps Perseus and Perseus beheads Medusa	c Athena <i>finds</i> the tune of many heads (7–8)
b Athena hears Euryale's lament	b Athena hears Euryale's lament (9–10)
c Athena <i>finds</i> the tune of many heads	a Perseus beheads Medusa (11, 13, cf. 16)
d Perseus frees Danae in Seriphus	d Perseus frees Danae in Seriphus (12, 14–16) → Perseus was born from [Danae and] flowing gold
	a Athena helps Perseus (18–19)
	b Athena hears Euryale's lament (20–21)
	c Athena <i>finds</i> the tune of many heads (22–23)

As TABLE 6 makes evident, the structure of the mythological excursus manages to underscore both the 'peripheral facts', i.e. Athena's invention, and the central events, i.e. Perseus' heroic endeavours. Indeed, the descending and ascending chronological sequences concerning the origin of the 'tune of many heads' depart from and emphasise the central image of Medusa's head (16). The emphasis is additionally expressed by the lexical repetitions of the section. As already touched upon (cf. chapter 2, sections 4–5), between 7 and 22 the terms for 'to find/discover' (ἐφευρίσκω, εὐρίσκω) and 'head(s)' (κεφαλαί, κράς), are repeated three times each. While the repetition of the verb stresses the action of Athena, the repetition of 'head(s)' hints at Perseus' victory's token, the name of the newly invented melody, and the origin of this same melody.

The mythological digression concludes with Athena's gifting men the *nomos kephalān pollān*, 'glory-making memento of the contests' (24). The reference to the context in which the *nomos* is performed somehow reconnects the poem to the present and paves the way to the next conceptual transition of the ode.

6 τάν ποτε "the one (that) once", cf. *P.* 10.31. The relative pronoun often marks the passage to the mythological section in Pindar's odes, cf. Jllig 1932:32, fn. 4, Des Places 1947:48–50, Slater 1969 s.v. ποτε (b) and 1983:118, Carey 1981:18, Hummel 1993:326–327, Devlin 1995:98–100, Bonifazi 2004:42–47. Carey 1981:67 underlines that, by using relative clauses to introduce mythological excursus, Pindar gives the impression of extempore composition and avoids rhetoric rigidity.

7 Παλλάς ‘Pallas’, epithet of Athena (cf. Παλλάς Ἀθηναίη, *Il.* 1.200+), here goddess of musical invention.¹⁸ The Pindaric version of the myth is reprised by Nonnus of Panopolis (cf. Massetti 2023), who, just like Pindar, connects the θρήνος πολυκάργητος with the Gorgons’ lament. In the *Dionysiaca*, Athena is also said to invent the ὁμοζυγέων τύπον αὐλῶν “the type of pipes united with one yoke” by imitating Euryale’s lament (*D.* 24.35–38). Thus, for Nonnus, the invention of the double-piped *aulos* is concurrent with that of the νόμος πολυκέφαλος (cf. chapter 6, section 5). Differently, Pindar seems to omit the tradition concerning ‘Athena *primus inventor* of the *aulos*’, the *aition* of the ode actually concerning only the invention of the νόμος κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν. Since the myth is essentially unparalleled in antiquity, Vivante (1990) and Wallace (2003:79) propose that it is a Pindaric invention. According to Steiner 2013:175, Pindar constructs the myth so as to provide an authoritative antecedent for novel and controversial aspects of his musical technique as well as to eradicate the association between the *aulos* and Phrygia/the Phrygian mode. In my opinion, this latter point contrasts with the Phrygian name of the winner, Midas (see above, section 1, 5), which may support a Phrygian association. To be sure, the invention of the instrument is elsewhere ascribed to Phrygian Hyagnis, father of Marsyas (Athen. 624b citing Aristoxenus, [Plut.] *Mus.* 1132f, 1133d–f, *Marm. Par.* A 10, Apul. *Florid.* 1.3, cf. Huchzermeyer 1931:14, fn. 57, Leclercq-Neveu 1989, Maniates 2000 on Marsyas). But according to the version *vulgata* (cf. e.g. [Apollod.] 1.24, Ov. *F.* 6.697–706+), which, as shown by Wilson (1999), ultimately reflects an Athenian tradition, the *aulos* had been invented/discovered by Athena. However, having seen her face deformed when playing it, the goddess threw it away and the instrument accidentally came into the possession of Marsyas, cf. Aristot. *Pol.* 1341b, Tel. 805–806 (on which cf. LeVen 2014:109–110), Melan. 758+, D.S. 5.49.1, Hyg. *Fab.* 165, Plut. *De cohib. ir.* 456b, quoting Trag. adesp. 11 381; on Athena playing the *aulos* or associated with Marsyas cf. *LIMC* s.v. Athena 617–623; on the sculptural group ‘Athena and Marsyas’ (Paus. 1.24.1, Pli. *HN* XXXIV 57) cf. Daltrop 1980. Chuvin 1995 argues that the story concerning the Phrygian origin of the *aulos* and Athena’s rejection of the instrument is glossed over by Pindar, to reaffirm the dignity of the αὐλητικὴ τέχνη. Vernant (1995) proposes that Pindar is focusing on a different moment of the story, which precedes the rejec-

18 Παλλάς: the form was synchronically connected to πάλλας ‘young’ (e.g. cf. Ael. Dion. π 8, see also Beekes EDG s.v. παλλάς) or to the verb πάλλω ‘to brandish’ (Pl. *Crat.* 406d–407a), cf. IE *pelh₁-/*p₁h₁- ‘to brandish, wave’ (found in Gk. πάλεμος, Ved. *p₁tanā*- ‘fight’, ‘enemy army’, Lat. *populus*, Umbr. *puplum*). However, Πάλλᾶς (masc., a Titan, cf. ΗΗ 4.101+) may reflect a labiovelar, as suggested by Myc. *qa-ra₂* /*K^wallānt-s*/ (PY An 192.16+, cf. García Ramón 2021b).

tion of the instrument by the goddess. Our text and further sources do not support these theories: as several commentators proposed (Farnell 1932:234, Bowra 1961:113–114 and 285, Frontisi-Ducroux 1994, Papadopoulou–Pirenne–Delforge 2001), the myth of *Pythian Twelve* is best framed within Boeotian traditions on the ἀλγητική τέχνη. As Spinedi (2018: xxvii) shows, not only does a fragment of Corinna (668, in [Plut.] *Mus.* 1136b) mention that Athena taught Apollo how to play the *aulos*,¹⁹ but we also know that the ἀλγητική τέχνη was important to Boeotia and Boeotians: Boeotian families handed down the τέχνη of making and playing the *aulos* for generations (Roesch 1989); the art of the *aulos* was part of the Boeotian *paideia* (Plut. *Pelop.* 19, Athen. 184d) and Theban *auletai* were Panhellenic celebrities (cf. the parody of Aristoph. *Pax* 950–955, *Av.* 858, cf. also *Acharn.* 15–16, 865–866 for the *aulos* as a typical ‘Boeotian accessory’). Pindar was himself an *aulos*-player and teacher (*Suid.* s.v. Πίνδαρος, Cor. 695a, *Vita Ambr.*): a pupil of Skopelinos of Thebes, he later taught Olympichos the same art (Σ P. 3.137b Dr.).

In my view, several elements may have conditioned the choice of the myth: above all, the ode’s occasion, as Midas probably won by performing the *tune of many heads*, and its performance context, the Gorgon iconography being popular in Sicily (Akhunova 2020:14, 18–19, Belson 1981). In any case, Pindar might have relied upon a Boeotian tradition according to which Athena was a model for *aulos*-performers, i.e. Midas (Martin 2003:163) and the poet himself (Spinedi 2016). Whatever synchronic factors played a role in Pindar’s ‘assembling’ of the myth, I argue that Pindar exploited *traditional* building blocks on the level of themes, phraseology, and structure (cf. chapters 9–10).

The invention of wind instruments is often connected with lamentation and death in both IE and non-IE traditions. In this context, I would like to bring to light a less known typological parallel of the story, drawn from the Celtic world. The Irish saga *Cath Maige Tuired* ascribes the invention of the “whistle for signalling at night” to Bríg, a figure associated with the figure of the Celtic goddess Birgit, who is also identified with Lat. *Minerua* (so Olmsted 1994:163). Significantly, the whistle reproduces Bríg’s weeping, cf.

19 The date of Corinna’s production is debated: Lobel 1930, West 1970, 1990, Clayman 1993 defend a 3rd c. date; on the contrary, Coppola 1931 and Davies 1988 support the Archaic date suggested by ancient sources. Spinedi 2023 suggests that the mythological traditions mentioned by Corinna fit best within a programmatic agenda of the Late Archaic–Early Classical Age Boeotia. Given the uncertainty that surrounds this matter, Corinna’s fragment cannot be invoked *alone* as an authority for the existence of a tradition about ‘Athena discoverer of the *aulos*’ attested in Boeotia during the Archaic Age. Nevertheless, it reflects the existence of a difference between the Athenian and the Boeotian traditions on Athena and the *aulos*.

Cath Maige Tuired 125

Immesóí didiu Rúadán íer tabairt in gaí dó, & geogoin

555] *Goibninn. Tíscais-side an gaí as & fochaird for Rúadán co lluid trít; &*

556] *co n-érbailt ar bélaib a athar a n-oirecht na Fomore. Tic Bríc & cáines*

557] *a mac. Éghis ar tós, goilis fo deog. Conud and sin roclos gol & égem*

558] *ar tós a n-Érinn. (Is sí didiu an Prích-sin roairich feit do caismeirt a n-oidci.)*

But after the spear had been given to him, Rúadán turned and wounded Goibniu. He pulled out the spear and hurled it at Rúadán so that it went through him; and he died in his father's presence in the Fomorian assembly. **Bríg came and keened for her son. At first she shrieked, in the end she wept. Then for the first time weeping and shrieking were heard in Ireland. (Now she is the Bríg who invented a whistle for signalling at night.)**

TRANSL. GRAY 1982

7 ἐφεύρε ‘invented’. In other Pindaric passages, (ἐφ/ἐξ)εὐρίσχω²⁰ applies to the invention of a new type of composition/art/musical instrument (cf. Gentili 1971; Bernardini 2006⁴:673 proposes the meaning “inventare *ex novo*”, also in connection with *P.* 4.262), cf. *O.* 3.4 νεοσίγαλον εὐρόντι τρόπον, *P.* 1.60 ἐξεύρωμεν ὕμνον (cf. also *Stes.* 173.2), *Pi.* fr. 125 τόν ῥα Τέρπανδρός ποθ’ ὁ λέσβιος εἶρεν | πρῶτος, fr. 122.14 τοιάνδε μελίφρονος ἀρχάν | εὐρόμενον σκολίου.

In the choral lyric, the theme of poetic invention is developed through a palette of poetic images. The ‘poetic inspiration’ is materialized as a physical place, cf. the expression ‘to find the doors/way of the song/words’ (*O.* 1.110, *N.* 6.54, *Ba.* fr. 5.3–4; on the image of the ‘way’ cf. Becker 1937:68–85, Steiner 1986:76–86). In connection with the same theme, Pindar documents the first instance of the compound εὐρησιεπής ‘word-finder’ (*O.* 9.80, cf. *Aristoph. Nub.* 447), matching *Fέπη* ... εἶρε (Alcm. 39.1, cf. *Massetti* 2019:56–59). The compound partially matches other IE collocations and epithets, namely: Ved. *vacovid-* ‘word-finder’ (RV 1.91.11b+, *vacas-* : ἔπος, [**mek^u-e/os-*]), and the *iuncturae* [*vacas-*_{acc.}–*ved*] ‘find the word(s)’ (RV 8.19.12d), [*vac-*_{acc.}–*ved*] ‘to find the speech’ (RV 1.92.9), [*dhí-/manīṣá-/arká-*_{acc.}–*ved*] ‘to find a poetic vision, poetic thought/a chant’ (RV 3.57.1a+); OE *word* ... *fand* ‘found the words’ (*Beow.* 870).

20 (ἐφ/ἐξ)εὐρίσχω: derivative of IE **ureh₁-* ‘to find’, cf. LIV² 698, IEW 1160.

7 θρασειᾶν <Γοργόνων> “of the fierce Gorgons”.²¹ Gk. θρασύς means both ‘bold’ and ‘fierce/savage’ (cf. Slater 1969 s.v.).²² Γοργόνων (cf. Σ P. 12.12ab Dr.) is omitted by the mss. and was supplied by Triclinius. Lasso de la Vega 1986–1987:367–368 proposes a possible integration παρθένων, which, according to him, would have been lost for haplography. In contradiction of this assumption, there is no reason to imagine that Pindar could not have preserved a gen.pl. Γοργόνων: fr. 70a.5 (= *Dith.* 1.5) preserves πατέρα Γοργον[, which could be gen.pl. or sg. ‘father of the Gorgon[s]’ (cf. Lavecchia 2000:103 *contra* van der Weiden 1991:40, 42, who argues in favour of πατέρα γοργόν, identified with Acrisius). An integration <παρθένων> would create a repetition with παρθενίους (9).

According to Hesiod, the Gorgons are the daughters of Phorcys and Ceto who live beyond the Ocean (i.e. in the extreme West). Other sources, however, propose alternative genealogies and/or different mytho-geographical locations (cf. chapter 9, section 1.1–3). The myth of Perseus and the Gorgon is also found in *P.* 10, where Pindar mentions only Athena as Perseus’ helper and guide (*P.* 10.45; on Athena’s role cf. Suárez de la Torre 2016). Differently, fr. 70d.37–39 (= *Dith.* 4.37–39) (cf. Phillips 2016:266–268), Pher. 43–44 and [Apollod.] 2.4 recall Hermes or Hermes and Athena as helper(s) of Perseus (cf. Pellizer 1987:46–49). Finally, according to a tradition, which is first attested in [Hes.] Sc. 216–227, the Nymphs bestow a series of gifts to Perseus to help him against the Gorgons.

Vernant (1991:117–118) and Segal (1998:86) argue that the Archaic image of the Gorgons reflects an association with the dreadful sounds they uttered, invoking [Hes.] Sc. 231–233 ἐπὶ δὲ χλωροῦ ἀδάμαντος || βαινουσέων ἰάχεσκε σάκος μεγάλω ὀρυμαγδῶ || ὄξέα καὶ λιγέως. I must stress, however, that this passage refers to the battle clash rather than to the vocal sounds the Gorgons produce. An association between the Gorgon(s) and music/loud sounds could exist even without

21 Γοργόνων: the name Γοργόνες (first occurring in pl. in Hes. *Th.* 274+) has no clear etymology. It was synchronically connected to the adj. γοργός ‘grim, fierce’ (of gaze, Aeschl. *Sept.* 537+). Frisk *GEW* s.v. γοργός, proposes OIr. *garg(g)* ‘raw, wild’ as a possible linguistic cognate of the term, while Leumann 1950:154–155 explains γοργός as a back-formation to γοργῶπις (Aeschl. *Ag.* 302), γοργῶψ (Eur. *El.* 1257), γοργῶπος ([Aeschl.] *PV* 356). For Szidat (2013) Γοργῶ is an adaptation of Car. ΓΕΡΓΑΣ ‘stone’. Beside the fact that ΓΕΡΓΑΣ probably means ‘white (stone)’ (cf. Bianconi 2022), it is unlikely that Car. ΓΕΡΓΑΣ would have been borrowed into Greek as γοργός. Segal (1998) connects Γοργῶ to an allegedly IE root **garj-* (sic) ‘to emit a loud sound’. But the existence of such a root is doubtful: Skr. *garj* ‘to roar’ (epic), Oss. *qærzyn* ‘to groan’, OHG *krāhhon* ‘to make a sound’ and, possibly, Gk. forms in γοργ- point to a common ancestor **gerǵ-*, which displays a root structure (*DeRD-) incompatible with what we know about IE root shapes (cf. LIV² 5). Moreover, all the alleged derivatives of such a root may be explained as onomatopoeic parallel creations.

22 θρασειᾶν: *u*-adj. from IE **dʰers-* ‘to take courage’ (cf. LIV² 147, IEW 259; on other Caland-derivatives, such as θάρσος, θρασι^ο see de Lamberterie 1990:846–866, Rau 2009:119).

the etymological link between Γοργώ and the notion of ‘uttering a loud sound’ Segal (1998) proposes. The iconography of the Gorgons, who are commonly represented with an open mouth, resembles that used to represent roaring lions, cf. Belson 1981, Vernant 1985, Hirschberger 2000, Gufler 2002, Cooper 2006, Díez de Velasco 2007, Rodríguez Blanco 2011. On the Near Eastern origin of the Gorgon’s iconography and other elements of Perseus’ saga cf. chapter 7, section 3.

8 οὔλιον θρήνον “deathly *thrēnos*”. The meaning of οὔλιος is debated. It may be interpreted as a derivative of IE **h₃elh₁*- ‘to perish’ (cf. LIV² 298, IEW 777) with an active meaning, i.e. ‘destructive, deadly’ (cf. Slater 1969 s.v. οὔλιος, Köhnken 1971:136, cf. *O.* 9.76, *O.* 13.23, Kaimio 1977:152, with whom I align) or with a passive meaning, i.e. “Todesschrei” (Schroeder 1922, Bernardini 2006⁴:673). Gerber 1986:248 (cf. Pavese 1991:88 and Steiner 2013) proposes a meaning ‘thick’* > ‘often-repeated’ and derives the form from IE **mel(H)*- ‘to turn’ (LIV² 675, IEW 1140–1142), adopting the explanation provided by McKenzie 1925 and Greppin 1976 for οὔλιον κεκλήγοντες ‘uttering thick screams’ (*Il.* 15.756, 759). Moreover, Gerber points out that in *P.* 12 οὔλιον θρήνον parallels ἐρικλάγκταν γόον (21). I disagree with Gerber’s interpretation, although I think that οὔλιον θρήνον is paralleled by ἐρικλάγκταν γόον. Indeed, Pi. οὔλιον θρήνον and ἐρικλάγκταν γόον might be interpreted as two renewed versions of the same Homeric collocation: ὄλοοιο ... γόοιο ‘dire lament’ (*Il.* 23.10). This Homeric parallel, however, speaks against Gerber’s proposal (Gk. οὔλιος as ‘often-repeated’). Since ἐρικλάγκταν means ‘high-screaming’, ‘loud’ (see below, 21), it belongs to the semantic sphere of ‘acoustic volume’ rather than to that of ‘thickness’.

The term θρήνος may also be translated as ‘dirge’, however I opt for *thrēnos*, since the *thrēnos*-song came to be canonized as a poetic genre in antiquity (officially, in the Hellenistic Age). Here, the term is opposed to γόος ‘lament’ (cf. 21) and denotes the poetic creation of Athena in opposition to the inarticulated vocalisations of the Gorgons.

For Hubbard (1985:95), Athena’s song combines Athena’s joy and the Gorgons’ sorrow, the musical loveliness (*‘malthakos-quality’*, in Hubbard’s terminology) and the harshness (*‘trachus-quality’*) of death. Dolin 1965:86 proposes Athena’s joy derives from a sorrowful event in a similar way as Perseus’ achievement of fame happens as a consequence of the despair of his mother Danae. Although these two interpretations are fascinating, the text once does not provide any information about the feelings experienced by the Olympian goddess or the quality of the music she invented. Steiner (2013:182, invoking Eur. *Hel.* 177 and Aristoph. *Av.* 222 as parallels) proposes that Athena’s *thrēnos* “takes the form of an epinician melody”. In my view, this interpretation might receive ‘internal’ support (see below, 24). The *nomos* is said to be a λαοσόων μναστῆρ’

ἀγώνων ‘memento of the contests which stir people’. It thus entails a memorial dimension and a celebrative one (in this connection cf. also Nonnus’ interpretation, chapter 6, section 3).

8 (θρήνον) διαπλέξαισ’ Ἀθάνα “Athena, braiding the (*thrēnos*)”. Just like in traditional hexametrical poetry, Pindar places the nom.sg. Παλλάς at the beginning of the verse (cf. 7, Παλλάς)²³ and the nom.sg. Ἀθάνα (= Ἀθήνη) at the end of it (excp. *Il.* 5.260), cf. *P.* 10.45, *N.* 3.50 (we lack the context of fr. 52h.4 [*Pae.* 7b.4 = C2 Rutherford]). Παλλάς and Ἀθάνα are separated by six words and create a strong hyperbaton, which encases the finite verb ἐφεύρε (7) and the ptc. διαπλέξαισ(α) (8). According to Race (2002), Pindar’s hyperbata often occur at the end of a strophe or a period and thus mark a transition to a different theme. Here, the hyperbaton occurs at the beginning of the mythological digression about Perseus and the Gorgons.

Clay (1992), followed by Segal (1995:12), Papadopoulou–Pirenne-Delforge (2001), Martin (2003) and Phillips (2013), argues that διαπλέκω means to ‘interweave’²⁴ in the light of *HH* 4.79–80, σάνδαλα ... διέπλεκε “interwove [*recte* wove] sandals” and *N.* 7.98–99 βίοτον ... διαπλέκοις “[that] you may interweave [*recte* weave] a life”. According to this interpretation, Athena would be interweaving Euryle’s lament and Perseus’ cry of victory (cf. ἄυσεν, 11, “[he] shouted in triumph”, as *per* Schadewaldt 1928:308, see below). As shown by Held 1998:380–386 (cf. also Gentili 1984:8), διαπλέκω means ‘to weave, i.e. to fashion, produce’ (also metaphorically, cf. the collocations in which the verb combines with βίος in *Hdt.*, *Alcm.*, *Pl.* and elsewhere, paralleling *N.* 7.99, on which see Cannatà Fera 2020:477) and refers to the combination of two different laments (Euryle’s and Sthenno’s ones). The use of διαπλέκω in the episode is probably echoed by Nonnus, who, in introducing a short digression about the θρήνος πολυκάρηνος (*D.* 40.224), states that “the Phrygian auletes braided/wove a male song” (cf. chapter 6, section 3).

2.1 Weaving Songs: A ‘Gendered Metaphor’?

As Palmisciano (2017:186–188) and Steiner (2013:175–183) point out, Athena transforms the primeval, unmusical Gorgon *gōos* (‘lament’ or unarticulated lament, improvised by the kinswomen of the dead, here: the Gorgons) into a *thrēnos* (‘musical dirge’, performed by a professional musician, here: Athena). Such a representation could be interpreted as a poetic reflection of a real prac-

23 #Παλλάς Ἀθηναίη always occurs at the beginning of the verse (cf. also [Παλλάς–EPITHET] in *HH* 2.424). In Pindar, Παλλάς occurs at the verse-beginning here and in *O.* 13.66.

24 διαπλέκω: derivative of *IE* *plek- ‘to braid’, cf. *LIV*² 486, *IEW* 834–835.

tice: Feld (2012:264) suggests that “human experimentation with polyphony arose out of the cross-cultural phenomenon of collectively improvised wailing” (cf. also Weiss 2017:245). The first passages in which *goos* and *thrēnos* co-occur are preserved in Gk. traditional hexameter poetry. The two terms are associated with distinct groups of performers: in *Il.* 24.717–776, Hector’s *thrēnos* consists of a sung sequence executed by male *aidoi* and by a series of *gooi*, uttered by women of the household; analogously, in *Od.* 24.58–62 the Muses perform a *thrēnos* for Achilles, while Thetis and her sister perform a *goos* (cf. Alexiou 2002², Tsagalis 2004, Perkell 2008, Karanika 2014).

We know of the existence of professional female musicians in Greece (Pl. *Leg.* 800e.1–3, Hsch. κ 824 LC), who accompanied the lamentation over the dead by playing the *aulos*. In this regard, the identification of singers as *female* is significant. Since ‘weaving’ and ‘singing’ are two recognizable activities of women in epics, “the metaphor of weaving and poetic creation seems [...] to fit particularly well the role of women who are fulfilling their duties towards a close relative who has died: to weave a (funerary) cloth and to weave a (funerary) song” (Bozzone 2016). Other IE traditions attest parallels for the binomial ‘lamenting-weaving’ in relation to women (Foley 2002:188–218 on South Slavic, Nevskaja 1993, Ivanov–Nevskaja 1990, Ivanov 1987 on Balto-Slavic). In connection with the wording of *P.* 12.8, I would like to note a possible comparandum from the Old English poem *Beowulf*:

Beow. 3150–3152
swylce giōmor-gyd [Ge]at[isc] mēowle
[Bīowulfe brægd b]unden-heorde
[so]ng sorg-cearig

So too a **death-dirge** a **[Ge]at[ish] woman** [**wove** for Beowulf], her hair [**bound up**], a sorrowful [**so**]ng.

TRANSL. BOZZONE 2016:14

Unfortunately, the collocation [*brægd-giōmor-gyd*_{acc.}] with *brægd* ‘move quickly, knit, weave a death-dirge’ cannot be recovered with certainty because the verb is an integration to the text (Chickering 2006²:240, cf. also Westphalen 1967, who dedicates an entire book to the textual problems of *Beow.* 3150–3155). *Beow.* 3150–3152 offers two further parallels to the Pindaric verse: οὔλιον θρήνον partially overlaps OE *giōmor-gyd* ‘death-dirge’ and the dirge is performed by a woman.

Old Indic *Rigveda* does not seem to preserve traces of weaving and lamenting as activities that are regularly joined together. However, in RV 1.61 the meta-

phor of ‘weaving a song’ is opposed to that of ‘fashioning a song’ in a gendered way: men fashion a song (IE **tetk-*, Ved. *takṣ*, Gk. τέκτων, cf. *P.* 3.113–114+) as if it were a chariot, while women weave it (IE *[*H*]eμ-, Ved. *vā*), cf. RV 1.61.4ab *stómaṃ sáṃ hinomi, ráthaṃ ná táṣṭeva* ‘I put together praise—like a carpenter a chariot’, RV 1.61.8 *íd u gnás cid devápatnīḥ*, [...] *arkám ahihátya īvuh* ‘even the ladies, the Wives of the Gods, wove a chant at the serpent-smashing’. The gendered distribution witnessed in Vedic may be compared to the distribution of men’s and women’s material activities, which aim at immortalising the κλέα ἀνδρῶν in Greek traditional hexameter poetry. As Bozzone (2016) points out, Helen’s story cloth in *Il.* 3.125–128 represents the battles of Trojans and Achaeans, i.e. the κλέα ἀνδρῶν of the *Iliad*. To this I would add that Helen’s cloth is a sort of ‘female’-version of the work executed by a smith, cf. *Il.* 18.509–540 (Haephaestus engraves a battle scene on Achilles’ shield).

Pindar’s *Pythian Twelve* reflects a different state of things: Athena is said to both ‘weave a *thrēnos*’ and ‘construct (τεύχω, 19, see below) a *melos* (song)’. However, such a twofold lexical choice could be conditioned by the fact that Athena masters both skills, cf. e.g. *Il.* 5.733–735, HH 5.12–15, Pi. fr. 52i.66 (*Pae.* 8.66 = B2 Rutherford).

2.2 Weaving Songs in Pindar and Indo-European

In Pindar, (δια)πλέκω applies to the poetic composition, cf. *O.* 6.86–87 πλέκων || ποικίλον ὕμνον (on which cf. Giannini 2009, Adorjányi 2014:273); *N.* 4.94 ῥήματα πλέκων; fr. 52c.12 (*Pae.* 3.12 = D3 Rutherford) ἀοιδαῖς ἐν εὐπλεκέσσι; fr. 246a μελιρρόθων ... πλόκαμοι (cf. Vissicchio 1997:293–296). A variety of parallels may be identified for this metaphorical use of the verb, cf. Fanfani 2018. Le Feuvre (2015:324–326) reconstructs a collocation [μῦθος_{gen.pl.}–ἐπίπλοκος]* ‘(adj.) twisting, (subst.) weaver of words/stories’ in *Od.* 21.397. This collocation, preserved as *varia lectio*, would have been substituted in the tradition by ἐπίκλοπος ‘thieving’. The collocation [μῦθος_{gen.pl.}–ἐπίπλοκος]* would perfectly correspond to μυθοπλόκος ‘weaver of stories’ (*Sapph.* 188 V) and partially overlap ῥήματα πλέκων (*N.* 4.94) as well as ἀοιδά ... εὐπλεκῆς (fr. 52c.12 [*Pae.* 3.12 = D3 Rutherford]), cf. also Crit. 81 B 1.1–2, *carm. conv.* 917b.3, *Sapph.* 194A, Tel. 806.3–4).

At the same time, the use of (δια)πλέκω in connection with the poetic activity can be compared to that of other verbs belonging to the same semantic field, such as (ἐξ)ύφαίνω ‘to weave’ and ῥάπτω ‘to sew’. In Pindar (ἐξ)ύφαίνω combines with μέλος ‘chant, song’ (*N.* 4.44–45) and ἄνδημα ‘hair-band’ (fr. 179), a metaphoric designation for ‘hymn’.²⁵ Ὑφαίνω occurs in Bacchylides’ corpus with the

25 Cf. also Pi. *P.* 9.77–78 μίτραν ... ποικίλλω. Gk. ποικίλλω is used in a similar sense in *N.* 8.15, cf.

same value (Ba. 5.10, 19.8–9, fr. 1.4). The Pindaric collocation ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων (*N.* 2.2, cf. also *Lyr. adesp.* 995.1–2, *Sapph.* 195 V) partly corresponds to [ῥάπτω–ἀοιδῆ_{acc.}] (*Hes. fr.* 357.2), cf. the compound ῥαψωδός ‘rhapsode’ (cf. Tarditi 1968, Pavese 1974, Gentili 1995, Cannatà Fera 2020:297 with reference to alternative synchronic etymologies of Gk. ῥαψωδός). A reference to the act of spinning may underlie further Pindaric collocations, in which Gk. derivatives of IE **ten-* ‘to stretch’ (cf. LIV² 626–627, IEW 1065–1066) occur in connection with the creation of a poetic work. The use of συντανύω ‘stretch, bring together’ (Slater 1969 s.v. συντανύω) in *P.* 1.81 πείρατα συντανύσαις ‘bringing the threads together’ is explained by the scholion ad loc. as a weaving metaphor, cf. *Σ P.* 1.157d Dr. εἰ τὰ καίρια λέγεις τῶν πολλῶν τὰ πέρατα εἰς ἓν συντεμῶν καὶ συμπλέξας. A derivative of the same root occurs in the *iunctura* σχοινοτένειος ... ἀοιδά (fr. 70b.1 [= *Dith.* 2.1]).

The metaphor of ‘weaving songs/poetic words’ is lexicalized as ‘to sing’ in some IE languages. Several terms for ‘song, chant’ or ‘strophe’ can be traced back to IE roots meaning ‘to bind’ or ‘to weave’:

- (i) IE **sh₂e(ǵ)-* ‘to tie, bind’ (cf. LIV² 544, IEW 891–892) underlies *sāman-* ‘song, chant’ (**sh₂o-men-*, cf. RV 10.130.2d *sāmāni cakrus tāsārāṇy otave* “they made the *sāman*-chants the shuttles for weaving”), Hitt. *išhamāi-* ‘song’ (**sh₂em-ōi-*), Gk. ὕμνος (**sh₂omno-*, as per Eichner 1979:205),²⁶ and οἴμη ‘song’ (Osthoff 1901:158 ff., cf. Nagy 2017a ad O.08.074), which, in the *Odyssey*, has the meaning ‘song-path’ because it was synchronically crossed with Gk. οἶμος ‘path’ (cf. *Od.* 8.480–481, 8.73–74, 22.348, cf. Becker 1937:68–70, Durante 1976:176).
- (ii) IE **mebh^h-* ‘to weave’ (LIV² 658, IEW 1114, cf. Gk. ὑφαίνω, Ved. *vabh* ‘to tie, bind’) lies at the basis of OAv. *vaf* ‘to sing’, *vafu-* ‘utterance’. The use of (ἐξ)ὑφαίνω (*N.* 4.44–45, fr. 179, cf. Ba. 5.10, 19.8–9, fr. 1.4) and IE **mebh^h-* ‘to weave’ in connection with the poetic activity is further paralleled in Old English and Old Irish, cf. *Cyn. El.* 1237 *wordcraeft wæf* “I wove word-craft”; OIr. *Amr. Col. Ch.* 52 *fáig ferb fithir* “the teacher wove words” (Campanile 1977:37–38, West 2007:37–38).
- (iii) Just like in Pindar (cf. *P.* 1.81, fr. 70b.1 [= *Dith.* 2.1]), in Vedic poetry derivatives of IE **ten-* (Ved. [*ví-*]*tan* ‘to stretch’, *tántu-* ‘thread’) are too employed to describe the poetic creative process (cf. West 2007:36–37).

Kaimio 1977:149, Jackson [Rova] 2002, Cannatà Fera 2020:489, referring to Maehler 1963:90 and Köhnken 1971:28, fn. 32.

26 Other etymologies for the ὕμνος have been put forth, cf. Vine 1999:575–576, who proposes **sm̥onH-mo-* (cf. Lat. *sonāre*, IE **sm̥enH-* ‘to intone’, **sm̥enh₂-* in LIV² 611, IEW 1046–1047).

- (iv) Further semantic comparanda can be identified in Germanic and Latin: ON *mærd̥ ffolсноerða* “a song consisting of many threads” (*Ht.* 68.4) is vaguely reminiscent of εὐπλεκῆς ... ἀοιδά (fr. 52c.12 [*Pae.* 3.12 = D3 Rutherford]); the weaving-metaphor additionally underlies Lat. (*con*)*texere carmen* (Cic. *Cael.* 18+, with IE **tek-s-* cf. LIV² 619–620, IEW 1058, cf. Melchert 2018; see the phraseological dossier collected by Darmesteter 1878, who nevertheless wrongly traces Lat. *texere* back to **tefk-* ‘to fashion’).

From modern observation of weavers in India and Central Asia, Tuck 2006 suggests that the metaphor originates from the practice of weaving complex designs. Since complicated designs demand the memorization of a great amount of information, weavers used rhythmic chants to remember distinctive numeric sequences and reproduce specific patterns.

9 τὸν παρθενίους ὑπὸ τ’ ἀπλάτοις ὀφίων κεφαλαῖς “that (was poured forth) from under the unapproachable snaky heads of the maidens”, lit. “that (was poured forth) from under the maidens’ heads and the unapproachable heads of the snakes”, cf. Σ *P.* 12.15a Dr. ὄντινα τὸν θρήνον ὑπὸ παρθενίους Γοργόνων κεφαλαῖς καὶ ὀφίων ἀπλησιάστοις κεφαλαῖς ἐπήκουσε.

From the phraseological standpoint, cf. ὀφιδεος ... Γοργόνος “of snaky Gorgon” (*O.* 13.63); for [παρθένιος²⁷–HEAD], cf. Pi. fr. 94b.10–12 ὑμνήσω στεφάνοισι θάλλοισα παρθένιον κάρα. According to Nonnus too, the θρήνος πολυκάρηνος is inspired to the Gorgons’ lament and the snakes’ hissing, cf. *D.* 24.37–38 and *D.* 40.229–233 (cf. chapter 6, sections 2–3). Steiner 2013:179 proposes to take ὑπό + dat. as “attendant circumstances, including ... (with reference to) musical accompaniment”. Such a value, however, is attested only for ὑπό + gen. in Pindar (cf. Slater 1969 s.v. ὑπό, gen. [c]). ‘Under’ might hint at the place from which the *thrēnos* is poured, uttered, i.e. the *mouth* of the Gorgons.

The epithet ἄπλητος²⁸ applies to the Gorgons in [Hes.] *Sc.* 230 Γοργόνες ἄπλητοι and to Typhon ‘of fifty heads’ in Pi. fr. 93.1–2 ἄπλατον ... Τυφῶνα πεντηκοντοκέφαλον. The collocation ὀφίων κεφαλαῖς, displaying the inherited term for ‘snake’ ὄφεις,²⁹ and κεφαλή ‘head’ is also reminiscent of [Hes.] *Sc.* 161 ὀφίων κεφαλαί (of the hydra).

27 παρθενίους: cf. παρθένος, a term of opaque etymology for which Klingenschmitt 1974 proposes **pr-steno-* ‘whose breast are protruding’, cf. Delamarre 2008 *contra* Collinge 1970:77: **pr-th₂eno-*.

28 ἀπλάτοις: cf. ἀπλατος reflecting **η-plh₂-to-*, derived from IE **pelh₂-* ‘to approach’, LIV² 470–477, IEW 801–802.

29 ὀφίων, to IE **h₁og^{uh}i-*, cf. Katz 1998, Oettinger 2010a, 2010b.

10 τὸν αἶε λειβόμενον “she heard it being poured forth”. The subject of αἶε is Athena (Schlesinger 1968:277, Clay 1992:525, Bernardini 2006⁴), not Perseus, as suggested by Köhnken (1971:131, 1976:259) and Watkins (1995:40).

According to Gildersleeve (1885 *ad P.* 12.10), λειβόμενον is reminiscent of [δάκρυα-λείβω] ‘to pour forth tears’ (*Il.* 13.88+). The collocation [to POUR-θρήνος_{acc.}] is paralleled *ex Pindaro* and *ex Graeco ipso*, cf. *I.* 8.58 ἐπὶ θρήνόν τε πολύφραμον ἔχεαν (on the passage cf. Privitera 2001⁴:238), *HH* 19.18 θρήνον ἐπιπροχέουσ’ [α]; cf. also [to POUR-LAMENT(γός)_{acc.}] in Aeschl. *Choe.* 448 χέουσα πολύδακρυον γόνον. For [to POUR-HYMN/UTTERANCE_{acc.}], expressed by means of Gk. λείβω (*IE* 2. **leǵH-*, cf. *LIV*² 405–406, *IEW* 664–665) or χέω (*IE* **ǵʰeu-*, cf. *LIV*² 179, *IEW* 447–448) and derivatives, cf. *O.* 7.7, *P.* 5.100, *P.* 10.56, *Ba.* 5.15, *Ib.* S257a.27.3–4 ὕ[μνος ...] ... ἀπολείβεται “a hymn ... is poured forth” (suppl. West 1984:29),³⁰ Aeschl. *Suppl.* 631. Furthermore, Pindar applies the verb ‘to pour’ to the poet himself, cf. *I.* 1.4, fr. 123.10–11.

As pointed out by Kurke 1989, the collocation [to POUR (*IE* **ǵʰeu-*[*d*]-)–UTTERANCE_{acc.}] is expressed by means of the same verbal lexemes in Old Indic and Latin, cf. [to POUR(Ved. *hav*)-HYMN/PRAYER/PRAISE SONG_{acc.}(Ved. *mánman-*, *manīṣā-*, *gír-*)], Lat. *fundere preces* (Verg. *Aen.* 5.233+). Possible Hittite comparanda, namely instances of the collocation [*šunna-šuhḫa-ūtтар*_{acc.}] ‘to fill with words’, have been identified by Dardano 2018:47–64. The analysis of the corpus of Archaic Greek poetry allows us to recover a well-articulated system of images, which centre on the metaphoric overlap between ‘poetry’/‘songs’/‘verbal utterances’ and liquid substances (Nünlist 1998:178–205 and Manieri 2021 on the Greek passages; Massetti 2019:162–178 on possible *IE* comparanda). Since the poetic celebration of Panhellenic winners grants immortality to the laudandi, poetic words are often said to be like drinks of immortality: ‘the holy water of the Muses’ (*I.* 6.74, Simon. 577a, cf. Faraone 2002), ambrosia (*P.* 4.299, cf. Hes. *Th.* 69, *HH* 27.18, *Ba.* 19.2, Soph. *Ant.* 1134, Lyr. adesp. 936.15), nectar (*O.* 7.7).³¹ Words also originate from an immortal spring (*P.* 4.299, cf. *Ba.* 29.15), which is occasionally identified with the poet himself (*Pi.* fr. 94b.76). The same images are found in Old Indic (MBh. 12.279.1cd *amṛtasyeva vácasās* “of [your] speech like of *amṛta*” [‘drink of immortality’, **ṛ-mṛto-*, cf. Gk. ἀμβροσία]), while the poet is compared to an ‘inexhaustible’

30 For *IE* parallels to this passage cf. Massetti *forthc./b.*

31 On the attestations and semantics of ‘nectar’ and ‘ambrosia’ in Archaic Greek texts cf. Roscher 1883, Kretschmer 1949, Verdenius 1949, Uría Varela 1992, Manco 2012. Rahmani 2008 compares the usage of nectar and ambrosia with that of therapeutic substances in Anatolian rituals. On the etymology of the terms cf. Thieme 1952, 1965, Lazzeroni 1988, Watkins 1995:391.

(*ákṣīyamāna-*, reflecting **ṛ-dʰgʷhi-* cf. Gk. ἄφθιτος) ‘well-spring’ (Ved. *útsa-* < **ud-so-*, cf. Gk. ὕδωρ ‘water’) in RV 3.26.9, cf. Geldner 1951–1957.³²

Elsewhere Pindar speaks of poetic *streams*, cf. *N.* 7.12 ῥοαῖσι Μοισᾶν, *I.* 7.19 ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν (cf. *Il.* 1.249, Hes. *Th.* 39–40, 83–84, 96–97 [= *HH* 25.4–5], *HH* 5.237). In turn, this metaphor finds a perfect parallel in Old Indic poetry, where ‘to flow, stream’ is expressed by means of a variety of lexemes (Ved. *ars*, *kṣar*, [*sám-*]*sec*, *sarj*), including Ved. *sraṇ* (IE **sreṷ-*, LIV² 588, IEW 1003), a linguistic cognate of Gk. ῥέω, ῥοή, and ῥυθμός ‘rhythm’ [**sru-dʰmó-*]. The same IE root **sreṷ-* underlies ON *straumr*, which is featured in kennings for ‘poetry’, cf. *hornstraum* *Hrímnis* ‘the horn-strom of Hrímnir’ (EVald *Þórr* 1^{III}), *granstrauma* *Grímnis* ‘lip-streams of Grímnir’ (Eil *Þdr* 3^{III}), *mína* *straumr* *glaumberg* *vinar* *Míms* ‘my streams of the joy-cliff of the friend of Mímr’ (VSt *Erf* 1^{III}).

10 *δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάτῳ* ‘with grievous toil’. The expression refers to the Gorgons’ lament;³³ *ex Graeco ipso* cf. *Od.* 5.493 *δυσπονέος καμάτοιο* ‘toilsome effort’, although *πόνος* and *πένθος* are not etymologically related.

Köhnken (1971:129–136, 1976:258–259, *contra* Radt 1974:117, Clay 1992:525) proposes a different punctuation of the verse: ἄϊε λειβόμενον *δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάτῳ* || *Περσεύς, ὅποτε τρίτον ἄσεν κασιγνητᾶν μέρος* (cf. also Köhnken 1978:92, accepted by Snell–Maehler 1980, but rejected by Snell–Maehler 1987). According to this interpretation, *δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάτῳ* refers to Perseus’ battle, not to the Gorgons’ lament, as suggested by Σ *P.* 12.18 Dr. Contrarily to Köhnken, Radt (1974:117) notes that *πένθος* always applies to the ‘grief for a dead’ (cf. *N.* 10.77, *I.* 7.37). But Köhnken (1976:259–260) provides Pindaric examples (fr. 52d.53 [*Pae.* 4.53 = D4 Rutherford], fr. 133.1) of *πένθος* meaning ‘pain’, ‘sorrow’ in a wider sense, cf. *δυσπενθής ... δόλος* (*P.* 11.18, on which see Finglass 2007:90). Against the idea that *κάματος* applies to ‘human effort/toil’, being a synonym of *πόνος* and *μόχθος* (Köhnken 1976:259–260) cf. Bernardini (2006⁴:674, cf. also Riaño Rupilanchas 2001: Span. *dolor*), who translates the term as It. *pena* in the light of Simon. 20.8+. Akhunova 2020:7 argues that *δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάτῳ* is in *apo koinou* and applies to both Perseus, who accomplishes a toilsome endeavour, and the Gorgons, who perform a deadly lament.

32 Cf. Jamison–Brereton 2014:498, who provide a different interpretation of the passage.

33 *δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάτῳ*: Gk. *δυσπενθής* is a possessive compound with FCM *δυσ*^o (= Ved. *duṣ*^o, Av. *duṣ*^o, reflecting the zero-grade of the IE *s*-stem **démes-* ‘absence/lack’, cf. Schindler 1987, Stüber 2002:29), and a SCM to *πένθος* (*s*-stem from IE **kʷendʰ-*, according to LIV² 390, IEW 641, **bʰendʰ-* ‘to bind’ according to Beekes EDG s.v. *πάσχω*). Gk. *κάματος* is a derivative of **kemh₂-* ‘to become tired’ (cf. LIV² 323–324, IEW 557).

I find these explanations unlikely. I follow Snell–Maehler 1987 in rejecting Köhnken’s punctuation. It is certainly true that *δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάτῳ* may in principle denote different kinds of pain. However, as I already anticipated (cf. 10), it is Athena, i.e. the one re-enacting the Gorgons’ lament, who *hears* the sounds produced by the Gorgons, while they are mourning their sister.

11 *Περσεὺς ὁπότε* “when Perseus ...”. On the disposition of single elements at 11–12, cf. Sulzer 1961:56. On Perseus, Argive hero, son of Zeus and Danae (*Il.* 14.319–320+), cf. *LIMC* s.v. Perseus, Brommer 1973³:271–291, Pellizer 1987, Gantz 1996:300–311, Sansone di Campobianco 2003, Ogden 2008, 2013:93–99, Cursaru 2013, and Finglass (forthc.). A general account of Perseus’ deeds is found in Pher. 43–44, [Apollod.] 2.4, A.R. 4.1513–1517. Pindar mentions Perseus’ victory over the Gorgon(s) in *N.* 10.4, fr. 70a (= *Dith.* 1), fr. 70d.39–41 (*Dith.* 4.39–41), *P.* 10.44–48 (cf. Bieler 1931). In this poem, the episode is also connected with Perseus’ visit to the Hyperboreans. On this aspect of the myth and the problematic sequence of the events in *P.* 10 cf. Palaiogeorgou 2002, van den Berge 2007, Bernardini 2006⁴:638–639, summarizing the previous hypotheses (Farnell 1932, Dugas 1956, Pennington Bolton 1962:61–62, Barkhuizen 1976:10, Köhnken 1971:177–178, and Kirkwood 1982).

11 *ἄυσεν* “shouted (in triumph?)”. The verse is object of intense debate (cf. Sotiriou 2001). The form *ἄυσε(ν)* (aor. of *ἄυω* ‘to shout’) is preserved in all mss., except Φ, which has *ἄυσεν*. At the same time, Σ *P.* 12.19b Dr. preserves two explanations: (1) *ἄυσε* = *ἄυσεν* ‘he shouted’ (cf. *Il.* 20.48+), (2) *ἄυσε* = *ἄυσε* ‘he finished/killed’ (cf. *Od.* 24.71, *ἐξάνυω* in *Il.* 11.365). Boeckh 1811–1821 proposes a correction *ἄνυσσεν metri causa* (cf. *ἀνύσσεσθαι*, *Od.* 16.373 etc.), which Heyne 1824⁴, von Schroeder 1922, Farnell 1932, Turyn 1948, Bowra 1964 and Köhnken 1971 accept. Farnell stresses “the dramatic improbability that Perseus would shout to awaken the sisters when it was his cue to fly away”. To be sure, according to one tradition, Perseus finds Medusa and her sisters sleeping (cf. Aeschl. *TrGF* 262+) and beheads the Gorgon while she is not awake. However, iconographic sources dating to the 6th–5th BCE preserve different traditions: occasionally, Perseus beheads or attacks a running Gorgon (cf. e.g. the black-figure Attic olpe from Vulci, ca. 550 BCE, London, British Museum [= *LIMC* s.v. Perseus 113]). Analogously, it is certainly possible to distinguish between vases in which Perseus carries the head of sleeping Medusa in his *χίβις*, as the eyes of Medusa are closed (e.g. *LIMC* s.v. Perseus 161, a red-figure Attic kalpis, ca. 460 BCE, London, British Museum), in contrast to others, in which Medusa’s head has open eyes (e.g. *LIMC* s.v. Perseus 163: a red-figure Attic lekythos, ca. 460–450 BCE, São Paulo, Museum of Art). Since Pindar does not provide extensive details on the

episode in our text, ‘dramatic improbability’ cannot count as a decisive argument to prefer ἄνυσεν over ἄυσεν in *Pythian Twelve*.

Wilamowitz (1922:146) is the first modern commentator to favour ἄυσεν. However, since ἄνω in Homer is often followed by direct speech, he proposes that ἄγων stands for ἄγειν and connects it to ἄυσε. Schadewaldt (1928:50, fn. 1), followed by Burton (1962:29), Schlesinger (1968:277), and Papadopoulou–Pirenne-Delforge (2001), proposes that ἄυσεν applies to Perseus and means ‘to shout in triumph’. Clay (1992) concurs with the same interpretation, but makes the case that Perseus shouts when he petrifies the people of Seriphus. Segal (1995:15–16), followed by Steiner (2013:185), reads ἄυσεν, ‘he shouted’, and argues that Perseus shouts as he kills Medusa. Köhnken (1978:92–93, 1995:384–387) reads ἄυσεν [ἄύσεν] but proposes a meaning ‘to call for help’ (cf. also Sotiriou 2001:124 “beten”), which is attested in Homer (see below, 11). Pavese (1991:81–82) proposes that this is the verb ἄνω/ἄνω ‘to dry’ (cf. Hdn. *Od.* 2.132 αὔω· ξηραίνω “*hauō*: I (make) dry”) from IE **saus-* ‘to dry’ (*recte* **h₂seus-* ‘to become dry’, cf. LIV² 285, IEW 880–881), suggesting a semantic shift ‘to dry (someone) out’ > ‘to kill’, as in It. *fare secco* ‘to make dry, i.e. to kill’, cf. Hsch. α 8331 LC αὔων ... νεκρόν “*auon*: ... dead”. Bernardini (2006⁴:675) reads ἄνυσεν, ‘terminated (: killed)’, arguing that this verb does not create any syntactical or metrical difficulties, since 3 reflects – – UU – UU – x – U – – – U x (cf. Gentili 2006 “Nota Metrica” *ad P.* 12). Snell–Maehler 1987, with whom I concur, propose a different metrical interpretation of the verse: –D–E.

I believe that the reading is ἄύσεν ‘shouted/cried aloud’, which may refer to a particular moment of Perseus’ ambush. Perseus shouts as he attacks Medusa or after he has killed her (for ἄνω ‘to shout/cry’ without a direct object in battle scenes, cf. chapter 9, section 4.1).

11 τρίτον ... κασιγνητῶν μέρος “against the third part of the sisters”.³⁴ Köhnken (1978:92–93, 1995:384–387, *contra* Clay 1992), who interprets ἄύσεν as ‘call for help’, proposes a translation “when ... Perseus had called upon [her: Athena] for help for the third time”, interpreting τρίτον as an adverb (cf. *Il.* 11.462–463). Beside the fact that one would expect (ἐς) τρίς as ‘for the third time’ (cf. *P.* 4.61+), ἄνω ‘to cry for help’ is usually constructed with the accusative of the person called upon (cf. Pavese 1991:76; as an example cf. *Il.* 11.461+), but here we lack such an accusative (namely: Ἀθάναν, παρθένον *vel sim.*). The scholia

34 τρίτον ... κασιγνητῶν μέρος: τρίτος reflects a *to*-adj. **tri-to-*, built on the word for ‘three’ (IE **treǵ-es-*); μέρος [**smer-o/es-*] is an *s*-stem from IE **smer-* ‘to get a share’ (cf. LIV² 570, IEW 970); κασιγνητός reflects **kḥnti-ǵnh₂-to-* ‘born together’ with SCM from IE **ǵneh₂-* ‘to generate’ (cf. LIV² 163–165, IEW 373–375).

identify Medusa as ‘the third part of [three] sisters/Gorgons’, cf. Σ *P.* 12.19a Dr., 15 Mo. This explanation is preferred by a variety of modern commentators and translators (Gildersleeve 1885, Bernardini 2006⁴:674–675), myself included. Nevertheless, which verb we should join this accusative case to is debated. More specifically, Pavese 1991:86 and Bernardini 2006⁴:674, who respectively read ἄνυσεν ‘he dried out’ (Pavese) and ἄνυσεν ‘he killed’ (Bernardini), highlight the parallel with *P.* 4.65 ὄγδοον ... μέρος Ἀρκεσίλας “the eighth part (i.e. generation) of Arcesilas”. In this expression, structured as [NUMBER_{ord.adj.}–μέρος], the ordinal adjective designates ‘X_{nr.ord.} in a row’. Moreover, according to Segal (1995:11), *P.* 12.11 is reminiscent of Hes. *Th.* 277–278 (ἦ μὲν ἔην θνητῆ, αἱ δ’ ἀθάνατοι καὶ ἀγήρω || αἱ δὺο· τῆ δὲ μὴ παρελέξατο Κυανοχαίτης). Πι. τρίτον ... μέρος could thus apply to the ‘mortal Gorgon’, by singling her out. Although Pavese and Bernardini disagree on the form and the meaning of the verb of 11 (see above), they concur in making τρίτον ... μέρος the direct object of ἄνυσεν/ἄνυσεν ‘he dried out/terminated (= he killed) the third part of the sisters (i.e. Medusa)’. Gentili (2006: xxxvi–xxxvii), though ultimately supporting a reading ἄνυσεν ‘he killed’, suggests an alternative solution: if ἄνυσεν means ‘he shouted (in triumph)’, τρίτον ... μέρος could be interpreted as a relational accusative, i.e. “when Perseus shouted (in triumph) in relation to/for the third part of the sisters”. However, the relational accusative is not commonly found in these contexts in Pindar (cf. Clapp 1901, Hummel 1993:103–105). Such a construction of αὖω would thus be unparalleled.

I propose that the accusative designates the direction of the shout. Therefore, I take [αὖω–THIRD PART of the SISTERS] as ‘to shout towards/against somebody’. This construction is attested for verbs meaning ‘to shout/call’, like βοάω, a synonym of αὖω, in *P.* 6.36 βόασε παῖδα ὄν “he shouted to his son” (Race 1997a; on this passage cf. Fraenkel 1952 *ad* Aeschl. *Ag.* 48 who however proposes “he shouted:—My son!”), cf. also Eur. *Med.* 206–207 λιγυρά δ’ ἄχρα μογερά || βοᾷ τὸν ἐν λέχει προδόταν κακόνυμφον “the shrill accusations she utters against the husband who betrayed her bed” (transl. Kovacs 1994).

Schadewaldt 1928:20 and Burton 1962:29, followed by Segal (1995) and Race (1997a), take τρίτον κασιγνητᾶν μέρος as the direct object of the ptc. ἄγων “when Perseus shouted [in triumph] bringing the third part of the sisters and (bearing) death to Seriphus”. In this case, ἄγων would be in *apo koinou* (cf. μοῖραν ἄγων, 12, see below) like the ptc. φέρων in *P.* 10.46–48, cf. καὶ ποικίλον κάρα || δρακόντων φόβαισιν ἦλυθε νασιώταις || λίθινον θάνατον φέρων (cf. also Eur. *TrGF* 124.5–6 Περσεύς [...] τὸ Γόργονος κάρα κομίζων). This explanation, however, seems incompatible with the identification ‘third part of the sisters = Medusa’. It is certainly true that Perseus kills the Gorgon, but he *only takes her head* to Seriphus, not her entire body. At least some of the ancient commentators seem to be aware of

this: Σ P. 12.21 Dr. specifies that ‘the third part of the Gorgons’ must be Medusa’s head, cf. τὸ τρίτον μέρος τῶν Γοργόνων· ἐκ δὲ τούτου πάλιν τὴν τῆς Γοργόνης κεφαλὴν. To my knowledge, this use (‘part of group = head of part of group’) is unparalleled in Pindar, in Greek, and elsewhere. Indeed, the equation [HEAD-of PERSON] = [PERSON] does not work in a biunivocal direction. That is, [HEAD-of a PERSON] can stand for [PERSON] (e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 1); but [PERSON] does not automatically equate [HEAD-of a PERSON], cf. MoE *bring me his/her head* equates *kill him/her*, but *bring him/her to me* does not mean *bring me his head as a spoil*. Therefore, the interpretation ‘third part of the sisters = Medusa’s head’ seems forced to me.

12 εἰνάλια Σερίφω “in maritime Seriphus”. Schroeder 1900 conjectures ἐννάλιος for all Pindaric instances of the adjective (cf. *O.* 9.99, *P.* 2.79, *P.* 4.27, *P.* 4.204, *P.* 11.40). Finglass 2007:111 (with reference to Braswell [1988 *ad P.* 4.14(d)] and Irigoien 1952:23) points out that Pindar would have used the metrically lengthened εἰνάλιος (*Od.* 4.443+, cf. Chantraine 1948²:99–100). This Homeric compound is a derivative to a prepositional compound (Risch 1974²:189, Rousseau 2016:1–12) that can be recognized as the hypostasis of a collocation εἰν ἄλί (*Od.* 1.162+, on hypostatic compounds cf. Pinault [forthc.]).

12 λαοῖσι τε μοῖραν ἄγων “bringing doom to the people of Seriphus”. The petrification of Seriphus’ inhabitants is also described in fr. 70d.39–41 (= *Dith.* 4.39–41, as *per* Lavecchia’s [2000] edition and comment *ad loc.*). The term μοῖρα echoes μέρος, 11.³⁵ The co-occurrence of λαοῖσι and ἄγων, i.e. a derivative of IE *h₁aǵ-, parallels λαοσσώνων ... ἄγωνων (24). *Ex Pindaro ipso* λαοῖσι τε μοῖραν ἄγων can be compared to *P.* 10.47–48, cf. ἤλυθε νασιώταις || λίθινον θάνατον φέρων. Specifically, θάνατον φέρων matches μοῖραν ἄγων, because θάνατος and μοῖρα commonly pair in the Homeric binomial θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα ‘death and the allotment of fate (= doom)’ (*Il.* 3.101+), cf. also the collocation [μοῖρα_{acc.} θάνατος_{gen.}–ἔχω/κιγχάνω/λαμβάνω] in Calli. 1.15, Mimn. 6.2, Tyrnt. 7.2+, Sol. 20.4+, Theogn. 340+, Aeschl. *Pers.* 917, *Ag.* 1462, Eur. *Med.* 987+. Additionally, φέρω and ἄγω share some common usages, cf. Nagy 2015, 2017b.

Pavese (1991:89) suggests that the verse contains a word-play between λαός ‘people’ (cf. λαοῖσι on the possible connection with Hitt. *lahh-* cf. Gschnitzer 1977) and λίθας ‘stone’ (on the etymology cf. Nikolaev 2010b), cf. Hes. fr. 234.3 and Pi. *O.* 9.46 (cf. also Epich. 122, Call. fr. 496, Σ *O.* 9.70d Dr. ἐκ δὲ λίθων ἐγένοντο βροτοί, λαοὶ δὲ καλέονται).

35 μοῖρα reflects *smor-*ieh*₂, a derivative of IE *smer- (see above, 11).

13 ἦτοι “indeed” is an emphatic particle, equating ἦ τοι. According to Denniston–Dover (1954:553–554), “τοι serves to bring home a truth of which the certainty is expressed by ἦ”. In most Pindaric instances ἦτοι introduces a sentence (in *O.* 12.13 it is preceded by a vocative), cf. Slater 1969 s.v. ἦτοι (a)–(b).

13 τό τε θεσπέσιον “monstrous/supernatural (progeny)”,³⁶ note the alliterative sequence ΗΤΟΙ ΤΟ ΤΕ ΘΕΣ-. Gk. θεσπέσιος ‘proclaimed by the gods’ is similarly structured as Gk. θέσφατος, applying to divine utterances in Pindar (*P.* 4.71, *I.* 8.31). A meaning ‘proclaimed by the god’, or even ‘divinely proclaimed’, is well suited to the majority of the Pindaric instances of θεσπέσιος, since it applies to spoken or chanted words, cf. *N.* 9.7 (ἀοιδά), *I.* 3/4.57 (ἐπέων), *I.* 6.44 (εὐχαίς), fr. 52g.1 [*Pae.* 7 = D7 Rutherford] (μαντευμάτων). However, the term also occurs as a poetically lexicalized word for ‘divine’, ‘wonderful’, ‘monstrous/superhuman’ (cf. Fraenkel 1952 *ad* Aeschl. *Ag.* 1154). In connection with 13, it is significant that θεσπέσιος applies to Typhon’s heads in Hes. *Th.* 827–828, 855–856.

13 Φόρκοι ἄμαύρωσεν γένος “he weakened Phorcus’ race”. *Ex Graeco ipso* cf. Hes. *Op.* 284 τοῦ δέ τ’ ἀμαυροτέρη γενεῇ μετόπισθε λέλειπται.

According to Hes. *Th.* 270–274, the Gorgons are Phorcus’ daughters; conversely, in Eur. *Ion* 989 (cf. Theon *P. Oxy.* 2536, as *per* Calvani 1973) Medusa is the daughter of Earth (Γῆ). Pindar follows the genealogy found in Hesiod, cf. also fr. 70a.15–17 (= *Dith.* 1.15–17). According to the most common account of the mythological episode, Perseus also overcomes another group of Phorcus’ daughters, the Graeae, sisters of the Gorgons (Hes. *Th.* 270–274), on his way to Medusa. For this reason, it is debated which daughters of Phorcus are referred to at 13. This matter is further complicated by the interpretation of the verb ἀμαύρωσεν. Σ *P.* 12.23 Dr. glosses it as ἠφάνισε “made disappear (: killed)” and identifies Φόρκοι(ο) γένος with the Gorgons (τὰς Γοργόνας, cf. also Σ *P.* 12.24b Dr.). This interpretation is inconsistent with our context: Perseus only kills Medusa, while her sisters, who, according to Hesiod, are immortal, do not die. In *P.* 12, Pindar specifies that Euryale survives and performs a *goos* for her decapitated sister. Σ *P.* 12.24a, c, and d Dr. provide a different explanation and seem to confuse the Gorgons and the Graeae. Accordingly, Perseus decapitates Medusa and ‘blinds’ (ἐτύφλωσεν) ‘the other two’, supposedly, the Graeae (?), who shared one

36 θεσπέσιος (adj.) reflects **d^hh₁s-sk^we-tjo-*, cf. Beekes EDG s.v. θεσπέσιος; on the term in Homer cf. LfE s.v. θεσπέσιος. Gk. θέσφατος ‘established by the gods’ reflects **d^hh₁s-b^hh₂-to-*, with a SCM from IE **b^heh₂-* ‘to clarify’, cf. LIV² 69, IEW 105–106. On Φόρκος and its etymology cf. chapter 9, section 1.3.

eye, cf., among other sources, Aeschl. *TrGF* 262, preserving a version of the story in which Perseus throws the eye of the Graeae in Lake Tritonis. Finally, Σ *P.* 12.24e Dr. identifies γένος as '(Phorcus)' daughter', i.e. Medusa (for this use cf. *P.* 3.41, in which γένος refers to Asclepius; Soph. *Ant.* 1117+).

Modern commentators are divided on the matter: for Pavese 1991:89, Segal 1995:11 and Bernardini 2006⁴:676, Pindar is referring to the Gorgons; according to Farnell 1932, Burton 1962:29, and Nikolaev 2014:123, Pindar is referring to both the Graeae and the Gorgons; according to Gildersleeve 1885 *ad P.* 12.13 and Christ 1896, Pindar is talking about the Graeae. Two objections can be raised to this latter hypothesis: (a) the content of 11–12 can be summarized as follows: Perseus killed Medusa and brought death to Seriphus; 13–16 are introduced by ἦτοι 'indeed' and seem to repeat, in varied form, the content of the preceding verses, (b) mythographic sources about the Graeae mention them as the ones impeding the way to the Gorgons (cf. Dolcetti 2004 on Pher. 43 with reference to alternative traditions about Perseus' encounter with the Graeae). In fact, all sources in our possession mention that Perseus meets the Graeae *before* reaching the Gorgons' abode, not after. At this point of Pindar's narration the hero is moving towards Seriphus and has already met the Gorgons.

The interpretation of ἀμαυρόω is crucial for clarifying this textual detail. The verb is a denominative, based on the adj. ἀμαυρός 'weak, faint, obscure' (of εἶδωλον, *Od.* 4.84+, νεκός, Sapph. 55.4 V) and thus means 'to make (smth./smbd.) ἀμαυρός (obscure, weak)'. The family of Gk. words to which ἀμαυρός and ἀμαυρόω belong has been convincingly etymologized by Nikolaev 2014: ἀμαυρός reflects **ḡ-meh₂u-r-o-*,³⁷ from the IE root **meh₂-* 'great, large' (cf., among others, Gk. ὠμωρός 'great, famous', Gmc. **mēra-* 'famous', ORuss. [*Vladi*]měr). A meaning 'to weaken' perfectly suits the Pindaric passage and supports the identification of 'progeny of Phorcus' as 'the Gorgons' or even as 'the entire progeny of Phorcus, i.e. the Gorgons + the Graeae'. This explanation is also consistent with the most common value of γένος in Pindar (cf. Slater 1969 s.v. γένος) 'kin, people, descendants': by killing Medusa Perseus "weakened Phorcus' progeny", but he did not completely extinguish it.

14 λυγρόν τ' ἔρανον Πολυδέκτα θῆκε "and he made the feast repentful (lit. mournful) for Polydectes".³⁸ The term ἔρανος designates a banquet to which

37 ἀμαύρωσε: **ḡ-meh₂u-r-o-* is a compound with a thematized adj. from an heteroklitikon **meh₂-u-*/*-n-* as SCM, or **mh₂u-ro-*, a *ro*-adj. to a *u*-stem **moh₂u-/meh₂u-* as SCM (cf. the type ἔχυρός 'strong, secure' explained by Nussbaum 1998 as **seǵ^hu-ro-*).

38 λυγρόν: λυγρός is a derivative of IE *(*s*)*leug-* 'to swallow' (LIV² 567–568, IEW 964, cf. Kölligan 2005), and belongs etymologically with Lat. *lūgēre* 'to mourn' and TB *lakle* 'pain'.

every participant contributes with a share (cf. LfrE s.v. ἔρανος). For [to MAKE (τίθημι)–X_{acc.}–λυγρός_{acc.pred.}] cf. Eur. *Med.* 399 λυγρούς θήσω γάμους.

According to [Apollod.] 2.36 (cf. Tzet. Σ *Lyc.* 838) Polydectes asked Perseus to bring him Medusa's head, because this would be his nuptial gift to Hippodameia, daughter of Oenomaus. Preller–Robert 1921–1924⁴: II 233, fn. 3, propose that this second banquet (i.e. the ἔρανος of *P.* 12) is the continuation of the first one. As clarified by Theon's hypnomena (*P. Oxy.* 2536), Pindar is probably referring to a banquet, which took place *after* Perseus had collected the Gorgon's head (cf. also Σ *P.* 10.72a Dr.) and not, as suggested by Σ *P.* 12.25a Dr., to the *cena collaticia*, at which Polydectes had requested Medusa's head from Perseus (Bernardini 1971).

14–15 ματρός τ' ἔμπεδον δουλοσύναν τό τ' ἀναγκαῖον λέχος “[he made repentful] the constant bondage of his mother, and her bed forced by necessity”.³⁹ Gk. λέχος is a metonymic designation for ‘sexual union’, cf. *P.* 3.99, *P.* 4.51, *P.* 11.24. Polydectes had made Danae his concubine (AP III 2.1, Hyg. *Fab.* 63.5). Hence, their union is ἀναγκαῖον ‘forced by necessity’. The entire verse has a parallel in fr. 70d.15 (= *Dith.* 4.15) [φύτευε{ν} ματρί || [].αν λέχεά τ' ἀνα[γ]καῖα δολ[“was planting for the mother ... and the forced bed”, which refers to Perseus' and Danae's story.⁴⁰

16 εὐπάραου κράτα συλάσαις Μεδόισαις “when he took out the head of strong-cheeked Medusa”.⁴¹ The adj. εὐπάραος (cf. εὐπάραος, on which see Forssman

ἔρανον: as explained by Weiss 1998:46, ἔρανος can be traced back to IΕ **herh₂*- ‘to divide (and distribute)’ in the same way as δαῖς ‘banquet’ belongs together with δαίομαι ‘to divide (and distribute)’.

39 ἔμπεδον δουλοσύναν τό τ' ἀναγκαῖον λέχος: ἔμπεδος (ἐν, πέδον, from **pedo-* ‘place, ground’) means ‘(standing) on the ground, firm’, hence ‘constant’. The subst. δουλοσύνα reflects an abstract in -(ο)σύνη, i.e. a **tmōnā*-formation (Vine 1999:576–578) on δούλος, a word of debated etymology (cf. *Myc. do-e-ro /do^helos/*, for which Neumann 1986 proposes the meaning ‘the one taken from home’ [?], on which cf. Chantraine DELG, Frisk GEW, Beekes EDG s.v. δούλος). Gk. λέχος reflects an *s*-stem from IΕ **leg^h*- ‘to lie down’ (cf. LIV² 398–399, IEW 658–659).

40 This fragment includes a reference to a violence against Danae, but the identity of Danae's rapist is debated. Since Σ *Il.* 14.319 (= Pi. fr. 284) reports that Pindar told the story of Danae being raped by her brother Proetus, some editors and commentators identify Proetus as Danae's rapist in fr. 70d.15 (= *Dith.* 4.15), e.g. Snell–Maehler (in their 1987 Pindar's edition, *ad* fr. 70d.15) and Hirschberger 2004:296. The claim that Danae's abuser in fr. 70d.15 (= *Dith.* 4.15) is Polydectes is supported, among others, by Lobel 1961:88, Karamanou 2006:125–126, and Kenens 2012:163, fn. 44, Lavecchia 2000:232, and Finglass (forthc.). I align with this second view.

41 κράτα: on the etymology κράς and κάρα ‘head’ [**kerh₂-s-η-*], cf. Nussbaum 1986:195–218.

1966:152–153) is one of the two Pindaric compounds with SCM ὀπαραος [on which cf. Peters 1980:295–298], cf. χαλκοπάραιος ‘bronze-cheeked’ (*P.* 1.44, *N.* 7.71). It might in principle be compared to καλλιπάραιος ‘beautiful-cheeked’ (*Il.* 1.143+) because possessive compounds with a FCM εὐ° often overlap compounds with a FCM καλλι° (Masseti 2019:47–56, e.g. εὐστεφάνου τ’ Ἀφροδίτης, *Od.* 8.267+ : <καλλιστε[φά]νῶ Ἀφροδίτῆς>, *CEG* 454.3 (Nestor’s Cup)+ [Cassio 1994, Valerio 2017]). The parallel may be supported by Hes. *Th.* 270, in which καλλιπάραιος applies to the Graeae, cf. West 1966:244–245, who points out the difference between Hesiod’s and Pherecydes’ traditions about the Graeae.

Bernardini 2006⁴:677 proposes a meaning ‘strong-cheeked’ (It. *dalle forti guance*), stressing the absence of a ‘good-looking Medusa’ in the iconography contemporary to Pindar. A tradition about ‘beautiful Medusa’ is attested in a later age (cf. Attic 5th c. BCE red-figure pelike, Metropolitan Museum of Modern Art, New York; Cic. *Verr.* IV 56.124, Ov. *Met.* 4.793, Serv. *Aen.* 6.289, *Myth. Vat.* I 130–131, II 112; on the genesis of the motif of the ‘beautiful’ Gorgon see Zolotnikova 2016, 2019). According to Σ *P.* 12.24b Dr., Medusa was not beautiful but believed to be good-looking; so, she challenged Athena, who punished the maiden’s ὕβρις. Moreover, Σ *P.* 12.35a Dr. glosses καρπάλιμος as ἰσχυρός, supporting Bernardini’s (2006⁴) claim. In favour of the proposed translation ‘strong-cheeked’, Bernardini 2006⁴:677 refers to the use of εὐώλενος in *P.* 9.17. In this passage, the epithet applies to Cyrene who is fighting against a lion. Although I concur with Gentili’s and Bernardini’s (2006⁴) translation ‘strong-cheeked’ in *P.* 12.16, I do not consider the use of εὐώλενος in *P.* 9.17 a convincing parallel. Nothing prevents us from imagining that Cyrene appears beautiful while she is fighting with a lion. Σ *P.* 9.31 Dr. glosses εὐώλενος as λευκόπηχυς ‘having white arms’, probably influenced by λευκώλενος ‘white-armed’, regularly applying to Hera and Persephone in traditional hexameter poetry, i.e. to two goddesses whose physical strength is not regularly emphasized. Akhunova 2020:12–13 makes the case that εὐπάραιος refers to the “idea of the strain required [viz. to the Gorgons] to produce a sound”. This explanation, however, does not take into account that εὐπάραιος applies to dead Medusa and not Euryale, who is said to utter the lament (20–21).

Heyne 1824 proposes a reading συλάσαις (cf. συλάω), while the mss. preserve συλήσαις (B), ptc. to συλέω, defended by Forssman (1966:157–158), συλήσας (G) or συλήσας (rell. codd.). Burton 1962:29–30, Pavese 1991:90, and Segal 1995:13, fn. 14 argue that the verb means ‘to behead’. Hence, Pindar would be referring to the decapitation of Medusa, which is first described in Hes. *Th.* 280 Περσεὺς κεφαλὴν ἀπεδειροτόμησεν. However, according to Slater (1969 s.v. συλάω), the verb means ‘to take out’ (cf. *Il.* 4.105+). This interpretation is supported by Theon’s commentary to the passage (*P. Oxy.* 2536, cf. Angeli Bernardini 1971):

Pindar is thus focusing on the moment in which Perseus takes Medusa's head out of the κίβισις and shows it to the inhabitants of Seriphus.

17 υἱὸς Δανάας 'Danae's son'. Cf. [Hes.] *Sc.* 216 Δανάης τέκος, *P.* 10.45 Δανάας ... παῖς; Δαναΐδης in [Hes.] *Sc.* 229. For Danae in *P.* 12 as the 'anti-Clytaemnaestra' (*P.* 11), cf. Phillips 2016:241.⁴²

17–18 τὸν ἀπὸ χρυσοῦ φαμέν αὐτορότου || ἔμμεναι "who, it is said (lit. we say), was (born) from self-flowing gold". The account concerning Danae's conception is preserved by several authors (*Il.* 14.319, Aeschl. *TrGF* 46–47a, Soph. *TrGF* 165–170, Eur. *TrGF* 316–330, Simon. 38, cf. [Apollod.] 2.34, D.S. 9.4, Ov. *Met.* 4.607 ff., Pli. *HN* 111 9.56, Tzet. *Σ Lyc.* 838). When Zeus fell in love with Danae, who had been walled in by her father Acrisius in an unreachable place, he took the shape of golden rain to lay with her. Pindar (*I.* 7.5–7) preserves a similar story about Alcmena. The verb ῥέω commonly describes Zeus' accomplishment in the Danae episode, cf. Pher. 43, Isocr. *Hel.* 59.5, Eur. *TrGF* 228a. On the 'golden rain' and its possible meanings cf. Radermacher 1922, Cantilena 1990 (on *O.* 7), Garelli 2009. Newman–Newman 1984:87, fn. 2 suggest that the reference to 'self-flowing gold' may be a "pun on the victor's famous namesake, who turned everything into gold", just like in Ov. *Met.* 11.116–117 *ille etiam liquidis palmas ubi laverat undis*, || *unda fluens palmis Danaen eludere posset*.

Pindar attests three compounds with FCM αὐτο^ο 'self': αὐτόρυτος, αὐτόματος 'spontaneous, of one's own accord' (with **om̥-to-*, *P.* 4.60, cf. also *Il.* 2.408+), αὐτόφυτος 'self-engendered' (**ob^huh₂-to-*, *P.* 3.47, Trag. adesp. 15+) and two compounds with SCM ορυτος (**[s]ru-to-*): αὐτόρυτος 'self-flowing' and ἀμφίρυτος 'flown around, i.e. surrounded by streams' (*I.* 1.8, fr. 350). Αὐτόρυτος can be compared to χρυσό(ρ)υτος 'gold-streaming' or 'flowing as gold', which applies to Perseus' birth in Soph. *Ant.* 950 and Eur. *TrGF* 228a (cf. von Preller–Robert 1921–1924⁴: 11 230, fn. 4).

The 'inclusive' 1.pl. φαμέν contrasts with the 1.sg. αἰτέω. It is thus possible to recognize here an opposition between the performers ('I entreat, αἰτέω) and the Panhellenic public (φαμέν 'we say', i.e. 'it is said'), who is familiar with the myth of Perseus' birth.

42 υἱὸς Δανάας: the term for 'son' reflects a secondary thematic stem to **suH-ǵu-* (from IE **seuH-* 'to give birth', cf. LIV² 538, IEW 913–914, cf. also García Ramón [forthc.]). The name Danae is connected with that of Danaus (and Danaoi). The etymology of this MN is debated: Kretschmer 1935:15 proposes a tie with **deh₂-/*dh₂-*, underlying several river names (Danube, Tanais etc.), whereas Latacz 2001:150–165 (cf. also Oreshko 2018) suggests a possible borrowing from Egyp. *Danaja* (name of a country in Egyp. inscr. 1390–1352 BCE).

18–19 ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ τούτων φίλον ἄνδρα πόνων || ἐρρύσατο “but when she had rescued (her) beloved man from those troubles”, with ἐπεὶ meaning “when, after” (*pace* Köhnken 1976:263, fn. 37). For ἐκ ... πόνων ἐρρύσατο cf. Alc. 350.4 εὐρύσαο δ' ἐκ πόνων; for ἄνδρα ἐρρύσατο cf. *Od.* 5.484 ἄνδρας ἔρυσθαι. The collocation φίλος ἀνήρ is attested in hexam. (*Il.* 14.504+) and Pindar (*P.* 4.1, *P.* 5.123, *P.* 9.64, *N.* 7.62, *N.* 8.42, *I.* 6.18).

19 παρθένος ἀυλῶν τεύχε πάμφωνον μέλος “the maiden built a melody with all the voices of the pipes”. Παρθένος ‘virgin/maiden’ is a common designation of Athena (cf. also *O.* 13.71), who, together with Hestia and Artemis, is one of the three Olympian virgin goddesses (cf. *HH* 5.7–30).

Gk. τεύχω ‘to make’ is a derivative of the IE root **d^heug^h-* (“treffen” cf. LIV² 148–149, IEW 271, underlying both Gk. τεύχω and τυγχάνω), from which, among other terms, also OIr. *dúan* ‘poem’ [**d^h(e)ug^hnā-*] is derived (Watkins 1976). The verb τεύχω is constructed with a direct object meaning ‘song/hymn/voice’ in several passages of Gk. archaic poetry, cf. *P.* 1.4 (ἀμβολάς) and, *ex Graeco ipso*, *Od.* 10.118 (βοή), *Od.* 24.198 (ἀοιδή), Aeschl. *Sept.* 835 (μέλος), Ion 1.5 (ἐλεγείον). Moreover, the compound μελισσότευκτος ‘made/constructed by the bees’ refers to the poet’s song in fr. 152, while μελιτευχής ‘made of honey’ applies to the spring from which songs flow in Ba. 29.14. The latter compound partially matches Ved. *madhudúgha-* ‘milking out honey’ (RV 6.70.5b) and *madhudoghá-* ‘id.’ (RV 7.101.1b) with SCMS *°dúgha-* and *°doghá-* reflecting *°d^húg^h-o-* and *°*d^houg^h-ó-*, and FCM *madhu-* ‘honey’ (: Gk. μέθυ), semantically overlapping Gk. μέλι ‘id.’ (as a recent reference, cf. Massetti 2019:3–4). The metaphor ‘to fashion a song/poem/celebration’ (ἔπος, κῶμος) is expressed in Pindar by means of a variety of lexemes for ‘to make/create/fashion’ (cf. also the set of metaphors in which the construction of a poem is compared to that of a chariot, Gk. ἄρμα [**Har-s(-)mḡ-*], the ‘object, whose different parts are joined together’, cf. Steiner 1986:52–65, Massetti 2019:192–194). In particular, τέκτων ‘fashioner’, a nominal derivative of IE **tetk-* ‘to fashion’ (cf. LIV² 638, IEW 1058–1059, cf. [ἔπος_{acc.sg.}– παρατεκταίνομαι] in *Od.* 14.131, [τέκτων–παρθένιον_{gen.pl.}] in *P. Oxy.* 2389, fr. 9.8–10 (maybe by Pindar, cf. Lobel 1957 and now Recchia 2017), [τέκτων–κῶμος_{gen.pl.}] in *Pi. N.* 3.4) combines with **Har-* ‘to join, arrange’ (IE 1.**h₂er-* in LIV² 269–270, IEW 55–58) in *P.* 3.113–114. The verb ἐναρμόζω applies to the semantic field of ‘sung celebration’ in *I.* 1.16 (ἐναρμόξαι νιν ὑμνῶ “to arrange/fit him [: the winner] a hymn”), *O.* 3.5 (φωνᾶν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλω), cf. also [ἀοιδή_{acc.sg.}–(συν)ἀραρίσχω] in *HH* 3.164 and [γάρυς_{acc.}–ἀραρίσχω] in *Simon.* 595.3–4. Both collocations have Old Indic and Iranian comparanda: *takṣ* occurs with an object [SONG/HYMN], which may be expressed through different lexemes, namely: *bráhmaṇ-* ‘prayer’ (RV 1.62.13b+), *d^hī-* ‘poetic vision/poetic insight’ (RV 1.109.1d+), *mánman-* ‘poem’

(RV 2.19.8ab), *mántra*- ‘poem’ (RV 7.7.6b+), *stóma*- ‘praise’ (RV 5.2.11b+), *vácas*- ‘poetic word’ (RV 6.32.1d+), cf. YAv. *vacatašti*- ‘strophe’ (Y 58.8+) and [*taš-maθra*-] (Y 29.7b), on which cf. Schmitt 1967:14, 297–298, Darmesteter 1878. OInd. [*sám-ṛ* ‘to arrange together’-*laudandus*.acc.-*dhí*-instr.] parallels the structure of ἐναρμόξαι νιν ὑμνῶ (I. 1.16), cf. RV 3.11.2cd *hótāram ... dhiyá ... sám ṛṇvati* “(the chanters) bring together with their poetic insight the Hotar [= Agni]” (Jamison–Brereton 2014, modified by the author).

19 ἀλῶν ... πάμφωνον μέλος. Note the ‘pun-like’ tautometric position of μέρος (11) and μέλος (19).⁴³ The term ἀλός designates both the *aulos* and wind-instruments’ pipes, cf. ἀλοὶ πηκτίδος (IG IV.53, Aegina). The *aulos* consisted of two bored pipes, which were played simultaneously. Thus, the genitive ἀλῶν can be interpreted as a genitive of possession, cf. Gentili’s (2006⁴) translation “una melodia ... con tutte le voci dell’aulo”, with which I align, or as a genitive of relationship, cf. Race 1997a “a melody with every sound for pipes”. In two other Pindaric passages (O. 7.12, I. 5.27), πάμφωνος is connected with the *aulos* (on the topic cf. Kaimio 1977:148–149, Wilson 1999, Martin 2003), a musical instrument which Uhlig (2019:111) defines as “a tool made of voice”. Differently, πάμφωνος applies to ‘hymenaeus’ in P. 3.17 and to the χέλος in Men. *Leuk.* 6. According to Papadopoulou–Pirenne–Delforge 2001 (cf. also Barker 1984:57, Lasserre 1954:35) the *pamphōnon melos* could be produced through the partial obstruction of the holes or the control of the pressure exerted on the *aulos*’ reed. This hypothesis does not seem to find any support in the material evidence. Earlier types of *auloi*, such as the exemplars from Paestum (ca. 480 BCE) and Pydna (ca. 580 BCE), display two bored pipes of different length, in which fingerholes are shifted against each other only by a single hole (Hagel 2020:424). There was a margin of tuning at disposal of the player and the double-reed mechanism allowed a series of different effects (such as overblowing, pitch fluctuation, and vibrato, cf. Wysłucha–Hagel 2023:4). Given its vague semantic employment, here the adjective πάμφωνος may simply refer to a μέλος that exploits the full potential of the instrument.

43 ἀλῶν ... πάμφωνον μέλος: Gk. μέλος derives from IE **mel(H)*- ‘to be object of thought’ (Serangeli 2016). The etymology of μέλος suits the Pindaric usages of the word and Gk. cognate terms well, see, in particular O. 14.18, P. 4.15, P. 10.59. Cf. also the secondary root **meld^h*- from **mel(H)-d^heh₁*- (Kölligan 2018:231–233), which has a reconstruction supported by the parallel with Pi. P. 10.58–59 θησέμεν ... μέλημα “we will make (him) object of thought”. Furthermore, μέλπω and μολπή may belong to a root displaying a *p*-enlargement, also attested in OIr. *ṁmolor* ‘I praise’ (Stokes 1901:190).

20 ὄφρα τὸν Εὐρυάλας ἐκ καρπαλιμῶν γενύων “so that she (might re-enact the lament) from the trembling (lit. rapid) jaws of Euryale”. Sulzer 1961:27 provides a visual description of the verse. Hes. *Th.* 276 is the earliest source in our possession mentioning the names of the three Gorgons: Sthenno, Euryale and Medusa. According to Held (1998:384), by singling out Euryale’s lamentation, Pindar is implying that the tune produced by Athena contains only two strains. Differently, I think that the focus on Euryale may be conditioned by the phonetic shape of Euryale’s name, since the sequences ΕΥΡ(Ρ)-/-ΕΥ-/ΕΡ-/ΡΥ- occur five times within five consecutive verses (see below, 22).

The adj. καρπάλιμος, of unknown etymology (according to Chantraine DELG, Frisk GEW, Beekes EDG s.v. καρπάλιμος), regularly applies to the swiftness of feet in traditional hexameter poetry (*Il.* 16.342+, cf. LfrE s.v. καρπάλιμος) and later authors (Aristoph. *Thesm.* 957+). The Pindaric usage is unique. It might refer to the agitated movements of Euryale’s jaws and is thus freely translated here as *trembling*. For the image of the ‘gnashing jaws’ cf. *P.* 4.243, where the dragon’s jaws are described through λάβρος ‘furious’: δράκοντος ... λαβροτατᾶν γενύων, cf. also Eur. *HF* 253 λάβρον δράκοντος ... γένυυ.⁴⁴

21 χριμφθέντα σὺν ἔντεσι μιμήσαιτ’ ἐρικλάγκταν γόον “(so that) she might re-enact with instruments the loud (lit. high-screaming) lament that was extracted (from Euryale’s jaws)”. The passage emphasizes the acoustic dimension of Euryale’s lament. According to Vernant 1985 and Segal 1994, 1998, the association with loud sounds is a distinctive trait of the Gorgons.

For χριμφθέντα ... γόον cf. Aeschl. *Sept.* 84 χρίμπτει βόαν. The verb χρίμπτω (‘to near’ in Homer, cf. LfrE s.v. χρίμπτω) is here constructed with ἐκ + gen. (cf. 20) and means ‘to force from’ (Slater 1969 s.v. χρίμπτω), cf. Hsch. χ 743 ΗC χρί(μ)πτεσθαι ... ἐκβαλεῖν “throw out/extract from”. Akhunova 2020:10, instead, renders: “the lament brought up close to the swift jaws and [coming] out of them”, suggesting that this description hints at the “sensitive adjustments in pressure of the reed” that an aulete had to make while playing. This interpretation presupposes an overlap between Athena and Euryale. But the use of μιμέομαι makes it unlikely that such an overlap exists (see below). As a

44 ἐκ καρπαλιμῶν γενύων: significantly, both καρπάλιμος and λάβρος may be etymologized as belonging to roots with a basic meaning ‘to take/seize’. As first proposed by Schrader (1890:473) καρπάλιμος may be based on IE ^{*}(s)kerp- ‘to pluck’ (LIV² 559, IEW 944–945, cf. Gk. καρπός ‘fruit’, Lat. *carpō* ‘I seize’; on the -άλιμος formation cf. Arbenz 1933:28–29), while λάβρος may reflect a *ro*-formation from IE ^{*}sleh₂g^u- ‘to seize’ (LIV² 566, IEW 958, cf. Gk. λαμβάνω ‘I take’), cf. the semantic shift seen in Lat. *rapīō* ‘to seize’, *rapidus* ‘rushing’. The word for ‘jaw’ is inherited: Gk. γένυς reflects ^{*}genu- (cf. Nikolaev 2010a:1–18).

parallel for *σὺν ἔντεσι* instead of the ‘simple instrumental’ (*ἔντεσι*), Bernardini (2006⁴:679) proposes *P.* 4.39.

As stressed by Bernardini 2006⁴:679 (*contra* Köhnken 1976:95, fn. 9), Athena is the subject of *μιμήσαιτ(ο)*. According to Burton 1962:26 *μιμέομαι* hints at the expressive possibilities of the *aulos*, while Schlesinger 1968:278 argues that the verb refers to the nature of the artistic creation. In my view, this claim is supported by further Greek poetic parallels.

As emphasized by Gentili (1971) and Palmisciano (2017:186–188, 2022:107–108), in Pindar *μιμέομαι* denotes the act of creating an artistic work (a musical or dance performance), by re-enacting a non-artistic model, such as a non-articulated sound or a non-choreographed movement,⁴⁵ cf. fr. 94b.13–15 *σειρήνα δὲ κόμπων | αὐλίσκων ὑπὸ λωτίνων | μιμήσομ’ αἰοδαῖς* “I shall re-enact in my songs, to the accompaniment of lotus pipes, (that) siren’s clash”; fr. 107a *Πελασγὸν ἵππον ἢ κύνα || Ἀμυκλαίαν ἀγωνίῳ || ἐλελιζόμενος ποδὶ μίμειο καμπύλον μέλος διώκων* “re-enact the Pelasgian horse or a dog from Amyclae as you shake with your foot in the contest and drive forward the curved song” (on the *καμπύλον μέλος* cf. Franklin 2013:227–229). Below, I argue that an analogous idea underlies a non-Pindaric parallel, HH 3.161–164, which displays a number of similarities with *P.* 12.19–21:

HH 3.161–164

ὔμνον αἰείδουσιν, θέλγουσι δὲ φύλ’ ἀνθρώπων.
πάντων δ’ ἀνθρώπων φωνὰς καὶ κρεμβαλιστύν
μιμείσθ’ ἴσασιν· φαίη δὲ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος
φθέγγεσθ’· οὕτω σφιν καλή συνάρηρεν αἰοιδή

As they sing the **humnos**, and they enchant all different kinds of humanity. **All human voices and loud sounds** they know how to **re-enact [mimeisthai]**. And each single person would say that his own voice was their voice. That is how their **beautiful song has each of its parts fitting together [sunarariskein]**.

TRANSL. NAGY 2013:230, modified by the author

The similarities between *P.* 12.19–21 and HH 3.162–164 are remarkable, although the passages deal with different artistic genres. Both texts ultimately concern the creation and the nature of a piece of art, namely: a choral performance, in the case of the Delian maidens (on which cf. Nagy 2006, 2013), a musical piece

45 This aspect of *μίμησις* is criticized by Pl. *Leg.* 669de.

(the *nomos kephalān pollān*) in *Pythian Twelve*. Three common traits between the passages must be highlighted in this context:

- (i) the performance of the Delian maidens and that of Athena are both of *imitative nature*, more specifically,
- (ii) they figure as the re-enactment of a sound, which does not have a precise intonation (κρεμβαλιστύν in ΗΗ 3.162,⁴⁶ Euryale's ἐρικλάγκταν γόον in *P.* 12.21).
- (iii) the transition from 'sound'/'noise' or 'speech' to 'song/performance' (καλή ... ἀοιδή, ΗΗ 3.164; οὔλιον θρήνον, *P.* 12.8) happens through a process of *construction* (συνάρηρεν, ΗΗ 3.164, on which cf. Nagy 2006, οὔλιον θρήνον διαπλέξαισ[α], *P.* 12.8, τεύχε πάμφωνον μέλος, *P.* 12.19), which involves a great deal of skill (φαίη δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος || φθέγγεσθ' [ό-], ΗΗ 3.164; τέχνα, *P.* 12.6).

From a mere phraseological point of view, πάντων ἀνθρώπων φωνάς (ΗΗ 3.162) matches πάμφωνος; μιμείσθ' ἴσασι (ΗΗ 3.163) matches μιμήσαιτ(ο) (*P.* 12.21) and the use of συναραρίσκω in connection with ἀοιδή (ΗΗ 3.164) is comparable to that of τεύχω in *P.* 12.19, since the metaphor 'song' : 'fashioned object' may underlie both expressions (see above, 19). Finally, I would add, the Delian maidens perform a ὕμνος (ΗΗ 3.161), etymologically, 'a woven composition' (as *per* Eichner 1979:205), while Athena 'braids' (διαπλέξαισ[α], *P.* 12.8) a *thrēnos*. As Phillips 2013 points out, in the ode the theme of mimeticity could be regarded as multiplied: Athena creates the new *nomos* by imitating Euryale, Pindar imitates Athena and, in turn, *Pythian Twelve* may imitate the 'tune of many heads'.

21 ἐρικλάγκταν γόον "(the) loud (lit. high-screaming) lament". *Ex Graeco ipso* cf. Aeschl. *Pers.* 947 κλάγξω ... γόον. As Steiner 2013:179 points out, κλαγγή hints at the "animalistic quality of these sounds" since the term often denotes cries of birds and other animals. Significantly, in fr. 70b.18 (= *Dith.* 2.18) κλαγγή applies to the snakes of Athena's aegis. The compound ἐρικλάγκταν (*hapax eiremenon*) is glossed as μεγαλοκλάγκταν by Theon (*P. Oxy.* 2536). It exhibits a SCM °κλάγκτας*, which has an active meaning (on -τας formations cf. Leukart 1994). García Ramón (2011a) identifies phraseological and onomastic parallels for the Pindaric collocation, namely: ΗΗ 2.82 μέγαν γόον, the Myc. ΜΝ *E-ri-ko-wo* (PY An 656.2, Ep 212.2, Jn 845.7, 944, with a FCM *E-ri*° from IE **seri*° 'high' [loc.], cf.

46 V.l. βαμβαλιαστύν 'babble' (as a recent reference cf. West 2003b). On κρεμβαλιστύς cf. Nagy 1990a:43, Peponi 2009, who shows that κρεμβαλιστύς "denotes the act of generating a sound through percussion devices", referring to Athen. 636c and a variety of iconographic sources.

Willi 1999), which may reflect /*Erigowos*/ and so partially match both [μέγα_{adv.} – βόάω] (*Il.* 17.334) and the epithet Ἐριβόας (“whose cry is high”, Dionysus in *Pi.* fr. 75.10). The entire Pindaric *iunctura* is also comparable to γόον ὄξυβόαν (*Aeschl. Ag.* 57).

22 εὗρεν θεός· ἀλλά νιν εὐροῖσ’(α) “The goddess invented it, but invented (lit. inventing) it ...” Greengard 1980:24 highlights the chiastic disposition of the members of the collocation [GODDESS–FINDS/INVENTS], namely: Παλλὰς ἐφεῦρε (7) and εὗρεν θεός (22). On εὐρίσκω and the poetic invention see above, 7. Uhlig 2019:109 argues that “the iterative patterns of the ode mirror the mimetic tool at its center”. On the iteration of the verb with ptc. cf. Fehling 1969:146–148 (“Verkettung von Sätzen durch Partizip oder Nebensatz”). The quasi-alliterative repetition of the sequence EYP- and EP- between 16 and 22 stands out, cf. αὐτοPYτου (17), EPPYσατο (19), EYPYάλας (20), EPικλάγταν (21) EYPEν, EYPOῖσα (22).

22 ἀνδράσι θνατοῖς ἔχειν “for mortal men to have”, cf. ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι (*Il.* 10.403+) and *O.* 1.54, *O.* 13.31. The collocation [MORTAL–MAN] occurs in Homer and elsewhere also as βροτὸς ἀνήρ (cf. *Il.* 5.604+), a variation of which is attested in *P.* 5.3 βροτήσιος ἀνήρ.

23 ὠνύμασεν κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμον “and she called it the tune of many heads”. Gk. ὀνομάζω⁴⁷ means ‘to give a name’ in Pindar (Slater 1969 s.v. ὀνομάζω), unlike in Homer (cf. *LfrE* s.v. ὀνομάζω also ‘to call [smbd.] by name’).

Gk. νόμος is “a specific, nameable melody, or a composition in its melodic aspect, sung or played in a formal setting in which it was conventionally appropriate” (West 1992:216, cf. also Power 2010:215–224). In particular, the κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμος invented by Athena is commonly identified as the νόμος πολυκέφαλος. However, Phillips 2013, 2016 argues that the tune of many heads of *P.* 12 is the ‘Athena *nomos*’, proposing that the final line of each strophe mimics the Athena *nomos*’ modulation. The invention of the νόμος πολυκέφαλος was credited to Crates or Olympus (cf. *Pi.* fr. 157), who was also believed to have invented the *nomos Pythikos* (cf. *Pra.* 713, [*Plut.*] *Mus.* 1133de).

The scholia give three different explanations for the name of the κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμος: (1) the *nomos* imitated the sound emitted by the numerous snakes’

47 ὠνύμασεν: denom. from **h*₁/*h*₃*nh*₃-*m**h*₃- cf. Pinault 1982, with *v*-vocalism [ὄνομα, ὀνομάζω] for Cowgill’s Law, cf. Vine 1999:557–558.

νόμον: thematic *o*-grade derivative from IE **nem*- ‘to distribute’ (cf. LIV² 453, IEW 763).

heads (so Σ *P.* 12.39a Dr., cf. Perrot 2012:357–360), (2) fifty choreutes accompanied the *nomos* (so Σ *P.* 12.39b Dr.), (3) the *nomos* included several *prooimia* (so Σ *P.* 12.39c Dr.). On the basis of (3), Pöhlmann 2010–2011:44 suggests that the νόμος πολυκέφαλος included many episodes, named *prooimia* by Σ *P.* 12.39b Dr. As Bernardini (2006⁴:680) points out, Pindar’s text suggests that the *nomos* re-enacted the snakes’ hissing. Nonn. *D.* 40.229–231, which is inspired by *P.* 12, provides the same aetiological explanation (cf. chapter 6, section 3). Luisi (in Gentili–Luisi 1995:20) proposes that the νόμος πολυκέφαλος, performed on a double-piped *aulos*, consisted in the “virtuoso interweaving of arias passing from one reed of the *aulos* to another, or from one tetrachord to another” or in the “interweaving of arias in a sort of possible heterophony” (transl. from the Italian original by the author). Imagining that the *nomos* was that of such complexity appears consistent with its aetiology.

24 εὐκλέα λαοσσών μναστήρ ἄγωνων “a glory-making memento of the contests, which stir people”. As pointed out by Gentili 2006⁴: xxxvii, fn. 3, to the modern reader the entire Pindaric verse may recall the wording of *Od.* 22.210–211, where λαοσσός and μνηστήρ feature at a close distance, cf. οἰόμενος λαοσσόν ἔμμεν Ἀθήνην. || μνηστήρες δ’ ἐτέρωθεν ὁμόκλειον ἐν μεγάροισι. However, a dependence between Pindar and the Homeric passage cannot be proved. The co-occurrence of λαοσσών and ἄγωνων creates a repetition with cognate terms λαοῖσι and ἄγων, at 12 (see above). Greengard 1980:47 stresses that “ἄγωνων is the critical word in this transition from the goddess Athene’s flute to that of the victor Midas”.

As already touched upon (see above, 5), in Pindar Gk. εὐκλεής has a possessive (‘whose κλέος is good’) or a factitive value (‘making κλέος good’). Σ *P.* 12.42 Dr. glosses εὐκλεής as ἔνδοξος ‘famous’; but this does not necessarily speak in favour of a possessive meaning of εὐκλέα since ἔνδοξος recursively glosses εὐκλεής, cf. Σ *O.* 6.124b Dr. (on *O.* 6.76 and the role of Χάρις as ‘glory-maker’ through poetry cf. Adorjáni 2014:250). I believe that the compound has a factitive value in this context (cf. chapter 10, sections 3–4). Following Bernardini (2006⁴:680), who proposes that the adjective is in hypallage, Meusel (2020:304–310) reconstructs a collocation *[εὐκλεής–ἄγων] underlying 24 (cf. *I.* 3/4.1 εὐδόξοις ... ἀέθλοισι, Ba. 9.21 εὐδόξων ἄγωνων). This reconstruction matches the emendations Ahlwardt 1820 and Thiersch 1820 propose to the verse: εὐκλέων λαοσσόν. In turn, Meusel compares the Gk. reconstructed *iunctura* to Ved. [*śrauvasá-* —*ājí-*] (RV 7.98.4d), which would constitute an almost perfect match to the Pindaric collocation. While Gk. εὐκλεής may be transposed as [**h₁su-klémes-*], Ved. *śrauvasá-* reflects a thematic vṛddhi-derivative of *śrávas-*; Gk. ἄγων, Ved. *ājí-* are both derived to IE **h₁aǵ-* ‘to lead/drive’ (cf. LIV² 255–256, IEW 4–5).

The referent of the entire expression *εὐκλέα ... μναστῆρ' ἀγώνων* is identified with the *aulos* by Clay 1992:523, with the *ἀύλητικὴ τέχνη* by Köhnken 1976, and with the *νόμος πολυκέφαλος* by Bernardini 2006⁴:681. I concur with the latter hypothesis (cf. chapter 10).

24 εὐκλέα: The metrical interpretation of 24 is debated because of this word. The presence of *εὐκλέα* points to an anaclastic responsion, i.e. a responsion in which a choriamb equates an epitrite (cf. Schroeder 1922:503, Wilamowitz 1921:433–434), which is accepted by Gentili 2006⁴. Schmid's (1616) proposal to change *εὐκλέα* in *εὐκλεᾶ*, in order to keep the responsionality, is followed by the rest of modern editors (cf. Snell–Maehler 1987), while Maas [in Bowra 1930:503] defends the form *εὐκλεᾶ*, interpreting it as *εὐκλέεα* (comparing Ἀγασικλέει in *P. Oxy.* 659.50, cf. also Schröder's emendation *εὐκλέεα* with synizesis).

The acc.sg.masc. of compounds with SCM ending in **εμ-es-* commonly appears as *-ἔᾶ* in Pindar, cf. *ἀγακλέα I.* 1.34, *εὐκλέα cf. O.* 6.76, *P.* 8.62, *P.* 9.56, *N.* 5.15, *N.* 6.29, *N.* 6.46, fr. 52b.103 [*Pae.* 2 = D2 Rutherford], *Ἡρακλέα O.* 10.16, cf. also *νηλέα P.* 1.95 (reflecting **nāleues-* 'inescapable' or **nēleues-* 'pitiless'). In two cases, the final syllable is long (*-ἔᾶ*), but these accusatives are always placed at the end of the verse, cf. *Ἴφικλέα# P.* 9.88, *ἀγακλέα# fr.* 52d.12 (*Pae.* 4.12 = D4 Rutherford). The same treatment seems also to be analogically extended to the acc.sg.masc. of *εὐερκής*, cf. *εὐερκέᾶ#* (fr. 52d.45 [*Pae.* 4.45 = D4 Rutherford]). This compound displays a SCM *°ερκής* (cf. *ἔρκος* [**serk-e/os-*]), which shows no trace of *μ*-loss and possible vowel contraction. The form *εὐκλεᾶ* would thus stand out as unparalleled.

In Bowra 1930:82, Maas proposes that *εὐκλεᾶ* is based on an acc.sg. *-κλέεα** which contracts in *-κλεᾶ*, given the existence of the dat.sg. *Ἀγασικλέει* (fr. 94b.38). However, this hypothesis is unlikely. The acc.sg.masc. of an *s*-stem, regularly appears as *-κλεα* in Attic MNs with SCM *°κλής*, but as *-εεα*, *-εη* or *-η* in other dialects (Buck 1955:39–40, 90–91). Thus, one would need to assume that *εὐκλεᾶ* is an artificial form with hyperdoric colour. For this reason, *εὐκλέᾶ* is probably preferable here. Indeed, one may account for the outcome *-ἔᾶ* < *-εεα* < **εμ-es-η* in different ways: (a) through analogy to forms attested in Gk. hexameter poetry, and (b) through analogy to *s*-stem adjectives. Explanation (a) works for a form like *νηλέα νόον* (*P.* 1.95), which echoes *νηλέα θυμόν* (*Il.* 19.229). Phraseological analysis reveals that *νόος* and *θυμός* share some collocations *ex Graeco ipso*, cf. *πυκινὸς νόος* (*Il.* 15.461) and *πυκινῶ ... θυμῶ* (*P.* 4.73), and *ex Pindaro ipso*, cf. *νόον ιαίνει* (*P.* 2.89) and *θυμόν ιαίνειν* (*O.* 7.43).

For the acc.sg. *εὐκλέᾶ*, *ἀγακλέᾶ* both explanations (a) and (b) are possible:

- (a) Homer attests two acc.sg.masc. *-ἔᾶ* of compounds with SCM *°κλής*, namely: *δυσκλέα* 'in disrepute' and *ἀκλέα* 'without glory'. Chantraine

1948²:7, 74 notes that the Homeric vulgate preserves *δυσκλέα* 'Ἄργος (*Il.* 2.115 = *Il.* 9.22), *ἀκλέα* ἐκ μεγάρων (*Od.* 4.728) and proposes that this orthography may be explained as an "artifact of the written transmission" (Nussbaum 2018:269, fn. 7), which substituted °κλέα to °κλέε'. This view is contested by Nussbaum (2018:298), who explains *δυσκλέᾶ*, *ἀκλέᾶ* and *ηλέᾶ* as 'Neo-Ionic' forms resulting from hyphaeresis (namely: $V_1V_1V_2 > V_1V_2$: -εᾶ > -εᾷ). At the same time, Nussbaum (2018:307) also points out that Hom. *δυσκλέᾶ* and *ἀκλέᾶ* are not metrically guaranteed, since they occur in hiatus and as a consequence the hyphaeresis is not guaranteed either. Since *εὐκλέης* 'having or making good glory' and *ἀγακλέης* 'having great glory' are antonyms of *δυσκλέης* and *ἀκλέης*, they may have an underlying Homeric model.

- (b) One might alternatively imagine that accusatives like *εὐκλέᾶ* and *ἀγακλέᾶ* are analogical to the regular uncontracted acc.sg.masc. of compounds with *s*-stems as SCMS, i.e. -έᾶ < *-*eh-a* < *-*es-η*, cf. e.g. *μελαντειχέα* *O.* 14.20 (*μελαντειχῆς*, *τείχος*), *εὐτειχέα* *N.* 7.46 (*εὐτειχῆς*, *τείχος*), *εὐανθέα* *P.* 2.62, *I.* 7.51 (*εὐανθῆς*, *ἄνθος*), *λευκανθέα* *N.* 9.23 (*λευκανθῆς*, *ἄνθος*), *άλιερχέα* *O.* 8.25, *I.* 1.9 (*άλιερχῆς*, *ἔρκος*) etc. The uncontracted forms are attested in almost all dialects, except Attic.

From this analysis it follows that, in principle, *P.* 12.24 may contain *εὐκλέᾶ*, i.e. the accusative form of *εὐκλέης*. In this case, the metrical irregularity might be explained in two different ways. The verse may contain an anaclastic responson (see above). Alternatively, as argued by Bowra (1930:182) and mentioned by Gentili (2006⁴:317), the verse may exhibit a metrical lengthening of -ᾶ followed by λ- (*λαοσσών* is the next word), like the one seen in *Il.* 6.64 #οὔτα κατὰ λαπάρην, cf. West 1982:15–16; on the phenomenon of a short vowel which is metrically lengthened by a resonant or a semi-vowel in Pindar cf. Christ 1867:630–631, Maas 1913:307 [= 1914:19].

24 *λαοσσών μναστήρ* ἄγώνων The compound *λαοσσών* is built with the same lexical material as the collocation *ἐπεσσεύοντο ... λαοί* (*Il.* 2.86+),⁴⁸ with mid.intr. *σεύομαι*. Moreover, it partially matches Vedic collocations of the type [to SET IN MOTION (Ved. *cyan*)–MEN (Ved. *nár-*, *jána-*)/PEOPLE (Ved. *kr̥ṣṭí-*)], found in

48 *λαοσσών μναστήρ* ἄγώνων: *λαοσσών* (*Il.* 13.128+) displays a SCM based on IE **k̑ieṃ-* 'to put in motion', underlying Ved. *cyan* 'to set in motion', Av. *š(i)auu-* 'to undertake' (as per García Ramón 1993, 1994:71, cf. also Costa 1987, *contra* LIV² 394–395 [cf. IEW 539], reconstructing **k̑ieṃ-* 'to put oneself in motion'), cf. Gk. *σεύω*, *σοέω** 'to put in motion', from which the SCMS of *δορυσσός* 'brandishing the spear' ([Hes.] Sc. 54+) and *ἵπποσώας* 'inciting horses' (*P.* 2.65+) are derived.

RV 10.50.4c, 1.37.12b, 7.19.1b. As Newman–Newman 1984:90 point out, Athena’s invention possesses a power that is the opposite of that of Medusa’s gaze: “the many-headed tune eventually became, not something that immobilized men, but rather something which courted the men, into action at the games”.

Gk. *μναστήρ* is a *nomen agentis* based on the IE root **mneh*₂- ‘to think to’ (cf. LIV² 447, IEW 726–727), which underlies both Gk. *μνάομαι* ‘to woo’ and *μιμνήσκω* ‘to remember’. In principle, the term might count here as ‘inviter’ (cf. *μνάομαι*) or ‘reminder’ (Race 1997a, cf. *μιμνήσκω* and Σ I. 2.1a Dr., hence my translation ‘memento’), *pace* Köhnken 1971:140, who proposes ‘proclaimer’ (“Künder”). *Ex Pindaro ipso* cf. *μνασιστέφανος* ‘reminding crowns, inviting to the victory’ (Slater 1969 s.v. *μνασιστέφανος*), which probably refers to *ἀγών* in fr. 19 and matches the collocation *μναστήρ στεφάνων* “reminder of crowns”, “inviter to crowns/(victory)” (Pi. fr. 10).

3 Transition (25–27)

The mention of the ‘tune of many heads’ concludes the mythological excursus. The new transition section occupies 25–27 and thus precedes the final part of the poem. At 25, with a participle clause referred to the *κεφαλᾶν πολλῶν νόμος*, Pindar quickly shifts the focus from the occasion on which the *nomos* is executed (24) to the instrument on which the *nomos* is played (25), the *aulos*. Reference to single organologic components of the wind-instrument allows the poet to detach from the indistinct, blurred dimension of myth. At 26, once again by means of a relative clause, Pindar returns the ode back to earth, specifically to the Greek landscape of Orchomenos and the river Cephissus, on the banks of which the reeds used for the *aulos* thrive.

25 λεπτοῦ διανισόμενον χαλκοῦ θαμὰ καὶ δονάκων “(the tune) often passing through thin bronze and reeds”. For *λεπτοῦ ... χαλκοῦ* cf. *λεπτότατος ... χαλκός* “very thin bronze” (of a shield, *Il.* 20.275).

According to Wysłucha (2019:231 fn. 61, cf. also Σ P. 12.44a), the ‘thin bronze’ and the ‘reeds’ are a metonymy for the *aulos*. Differently, Papadopoulou–Pirenne-Delforge 2001 propose that the verse refers to the ‘bronze-coated’ *aulos*. After all, *χαλκέοψ* was integrated by Snell–Maehler in fr. 52c.94 (*Pae.* 3.94 = D3 Rutherford *χαλκ|έοψ’ ἀύλων ὀμφάν*) on the basis of this very passage and the reference to the ‘bronze voice’ of the maidens of Delphi in fr. 52b.100 (*Pae.* 2.100 = D2 Rutherford *χαλκέξ ... ἀύδᾶ*) may also hint at an *aulos* accompaniment. We know that all-metal *auloi* existed, but there is no actual archaeological evidence for them from ancient Greece. We should therefore imagine this

instrument from Pindar's age (beginning of 5th c. BCE) as similar to one from the 1st BCE–1st c. CE: the “Tibiae Gorga” (two separate pipes acquired at the beginning of the 20th c. by Evan Gorga, currently under restoration, but probably coeval of the *auloi* from Pompeii), which were almost entirely covered with a double layer of bronze foil;⁴⁹ the *tibia* held by Euterpe on the Pompeian fresco from the Inn of Sulpicii Monagine (Pompeii, inv. nr. 85182). Horace (*Ars* 202–204, on which cf. Brink 1971:262–266) too mentions a wind-instrument covered with brass or a metal-alloy (*tibia ... orichalco vincta*, 202, cf. Wysłucha 2022) as opposed to the simple, tender *tibia* (*tenuis simplexque*, 203, cf. Wysłucha 2018:231 on the passage), companion of the choir (*adspirare et adesse choris*, 204).

Alternatively, 25 might refer to the components of the *aulos*' upper part. In our text, the use of δονάκων stands out in opposition to the possible metrical equivalent καλάμων, which, in Pindar, commonly applies to the *aulos*' pipes (cf. *O.* 10.84, *N.* 5.38, fr. 52i.36 [*Pae.* 8.66 = B2 Rutherford], fr. 70.3). As Luisi (in Gentili–Luisi 1995:20–21) suggests, δόναξ may hint at a special type of reed, from which the *aulos*' mouthpiece was built (cf. Loscalzo 1989 on the Boeotian production). Indeed, the reed, called ‘hymn-maker’ (ὑμνοποιός) in Eur. *TrGF* 100 (quoted by Theon P. Oxy. 2536.29–30), not the pipes, is the primary producer of the *aulos*' sound. In early *auloi*, the mouthpiece probably consisted of two reeds, namely, “two trapezoidal ‘blades’ fastened together to form an opening”, which were controlled by the lips (by compression and expansion) so as to produce different sound effects (Wysłucha–Hagel 2023:3–4). Further support to this hypothesis may come from a comparison with Nonnus of Panopolis. In *D.* 24.38, the invention of the *nomos polykephalos* is said be concomitant to that of the ‘type of pipes, which has the same yoke’ or ‘are yoked together’ (ὁμοζυγέων τύπον ἀλώων); in *D.* 40.227, the Phrygian *auloi* on which the *nomos polykephalos* is performed are called δίζυγες ‘having two yokes or a towfold yoke’. Nonnus' terminology can be connected to that employed by Theophrastus (*Hist. Pl.* 4.11.1–9), who seems to apply ζεύγη to mouthpiece's parts in a general sense (in opposition to γλωττίς, denoting a single reed, cf. Wysłucha–Hagel 2023:30). So, in Nonnus, the compounds might refer to the fact that the many-headed *nomos* was performed on a double-reeded, double-piped *aulos* (as opposed to the *monocalamos*), cf. chapter 6, sections 2–3. As Nonnus' passage is likely to be based on Pindar's *Pythian Twelve*, we may reconstruct that, by Nonnus' time, our passage was interpreted as containing a reference to the *aulos*' mouthpiece.

49 <http://www.icr.beniculturali.it/pagina.cfm?usz=5&uid=67&rid=50&rim=159>
(last accessed: September 01, 2023).

A more remote option is that λεπτοῦ ... χαλκοῦ hints at the *syrinx*-mechanism, identified by Luisi (1995:26–27) as a bronze connecting-device or support that would have been added on the *aulos*' mouthpiece so to allow Midas to play the *aulos* τρόπῳ σύριγγος 'in the way of the *syrinx*' after the reed of his *aulos* had broken (Σ P. 12 *inscr.* Dr.). This hypothesis should be revised in the light of most updated archaeo-musicological analyses: as Hagel (2010–2011) shows, the *aulos*' *syrinx* designates a 'speaker hole', usually located in proximity to the *aulos*' mouthpiece or the highest fingerhole, aimed at enabling or facilitating overblowing, i.e. switching to a higher register (cf. Howard 1893:32–35). The *syrinx* allowed performers to produce shrill squeaking sounds, so that, by the middle of the 4th c. BCE,⁵⁰ *syringes* were regularly employed by the auletes who performed the *nomos Pythikos* at the Pythian games, since this re-enacted the sounds of Apollo's hissing enemy Python (cf. chapter 1, section 1). The *syrinx* was activated by "rotating rings with a hole that could be aligned with a hole in the core [scil. of the pipe], and sliders attached to rods, where the hole is covered by a moving plate" (Hagel 2010–2011:500). The rings seem to have been realized in metal on *auloi* of Roman age. Our information on *syringes* of the earlier *auloi* is scarcer. *Auloi* from the Classical Age feature the *syrinx*, but it might have been activated by removing a wax plug (Hagel 2010–2011:503). It is tantalizing to connect a *syrinx* mechanism, especially if we imagine it as a bronze ring, to the execution of the *nomos* performed by Midas. If this piece is identified with the *nomos kephalān pollān*, which, just like the *Pythikos*, re-enacted the Gorgons' serpents' hissing sounds (see above, 9, 21), using a *syrinx* might have helped the performer to re-enact the Gorgons' snakes. Against this hypothesis speak the archaeological evidence, namely, the *syringes* found in the Megara *auloi* (dated to the first half of the 3rd c. BCE, cf. Avgerinoú in Terzēs–Hagel 2022): these instruments offer the oldest (known) attested examples of *syringes*, which were activated by bronze rings. However, the rings were pushed away to uncover the speaker-hole. As a consequence they were not 'traversed by the sound' (διανισόμενον).

A further, maybe more likely, possibility is that the 'thin bronze' hints at metal reinforcing rings which are often found on the joints on bone *auloi*, or, maybe, to a bronze φορβειά, i.e. a band put round the lips of pipers to assist them

50 The provided date is connected with information concerning of Telephanes of Megara, cf. αὐτίκα Τηλεφάνης ὁ Μεγαρικὸς οὕτως ἐπολέμησεν ταῖς σύριγγιν ὥστε τοὺς αὐλοποιούς οὐδ' ἐπιθεῖναι πώποτε εἶασεν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐλοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Πυθικοῦ ἀγῶνος μάλιστα διὰ ταῦτ' ἀπέστη (Aristox. *apud* [Plut.] *Mus.* 1138a), "at any rate, Telephanes of Megara fought so harshly against the *syringes* that he never even allowed the *aulos*-makers to add them to [his] *auloi*, but preferred to stay away from the Pythian games mainly for this reason".

regulating the sound (cf. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 582, Hsch. ε 5411 LC ἐπίχαλκον στόμα τὸ τῶν ἀύλητῶν, διὰ τὴν φορβειάν, cf. Landels 1964:392, fn. 4). In this scenario, stating that the sound ‘often passes through the reeds and thin bronze’ would turn out to be a quite accurate description of the sound production. Pindar, who, as we know, had been trained as *auletes*, could have been aware of any of these details and have alluded to them in his poem.

The rare verb διανισόμενον, glossed as διαπορευόμενον by Σ *P.* 12.44b Dr., is an acc.masc.pr.ptc.mid. of the δια-prefixed verb νίσομαι ‘to come’ (cf. *O.* 3.10, *O.* 3.34, *N.* 5.37), which reflects a reduplicated pr. **ni-ns-e/o-* from the IE root **nes-* ‘to go home’ (see above, 3 νάεις). In all Pindaric instances, νίσομαι exhibits a long ī from 1CL *-*ins-* > *-*īs-* (cf. all dialects, except Thessalic and Lesbian). Therefore, there is no reason to read διανισόμενον with V (Sandys 1937). For διανισόμενον ... θαμά cf. *N.* 5.37 θαμά νίσεται ‘often comes’. In both *P.* 12.25 and *N.* 5.37 the use of the adverb θαμά would stress the idea of a repeated action, which can be assumed to already be a semantic component of the reduplicated present. According to Spelman (2018:37, fn. 3) this is one of the verses in which Pindar ‘describes various sorts of poetry and poetic traditions as iterative, abiding presences in the world’. As stated above, I think that this verse may actually be connected to the *aulos*’ technique: in wind-instruments the air is breathed into the reeds and the pipes to emit the sound.

The reading θαμά is preserved by the majority of the mss. and by Theon’s hypomnema as a *varia lectio* besides θ’ ἅμα ‘(passes through thin bronze) together with (the reeds)’ (adopted by Gentili 2006⁴).

26 τοὶ παρὰ καλλίχορον ναίεισι πόλιν Χαρίτων ‘which dwell by the Graces’ city of beautiful dancing places’. The city in question is Orchomenos, cf. *O.* 14.1–4, where 2 (referring to the Charites) αἴτε ναίετε καλλίπωλον ἔδραν vaguely recalls *P.* 12.26 and *P.* 12.1–2 (see above, ἔδρα and ἔδος both derive from IE **sed-*). The compound καλλίχορος, matching a collocation [καλός–χόρος] (*Od.* 12.318+, cf. esp. ΗΗ 27.15 Χαρίτων καλὸν χορὸν ἀρτυνέουσα), first occurs in hexam. (*Od.* 11.581+).

As Σ *P.* 12.44a, 45ab Dr. suggest (οἰκοῦσι ... φύονται), this is the verb ναίω ‘to inhabit’ (see above, 3), not νάω ‘to flow’, preserved by Theon (*P. Oxy.* 2536: νάοισι, judged as ‘improper’ [ἄκυρον] by Theon himself, cf. Maehler 1968, Treu 1974). The Charites are daughters of Zeus and Eurynome (*Hes. Th.* 907, [Apollod.] 1.13, *Call. Aet.* 6, *Paus.* 9.35.1, *Hyg. Fab. praef.*) or Helios and Aegle (*Ant.* 140, *apud Paus.* 9.35.5+), or Dionysus (*Anacr.* 38+). The cult of the Charites associated with three stones in Orchomenos was established by Eteocles, the son of river Cephisus (*Hes. fr.* 71, Σ *O.* 14 *inscr.* c Dr., *Strabo* 9.2.40, *Paus.* 9.35.1, 9.38.1), who had received them from the sky. In Orchomenos, the remains of a temple

in honour of the Charites have been identified cf. Amandry–Spyropoulos 1974. On the Charites in *O.* 14 cf. also Athanassaki 2003, Lomiento 2010–2011, Nieto Hernández 2017.

27 Καφισίδος ἐν τεμένει, “in the precinct of Caphisis”. Καφισίς is first attested in hexam. (*Il.* 5.709+) in connection with a lake (λίμνη). Here the name is identified with that of the river Cephissus’ nymph. The river Cephissus is a son of Ocean and Tethys (*Hyg. Fab.* 6). Gk. τέμενος denotes a sacred space, which is imagined as ‘cut-out for a god’ (on Gk. τέμενος, Lat. *templum* and common poetic usages cf. García Ramón 2008). The collocation [τέμενος–GOD_{gen./GOD_{adj.}}] is often attested in the Pindaric corpus as a variation or substitution kenning for a PN, cf. Ποσειδάωνος ... τέμενος (*P.* 4.204) Ποσειδάιον ... τέμενος (: the Isthmus, *N.* 6.41), Κρονίου πὰρ τεμένει (: Olympia, *N.* 6.61), τέμενος Ἄρεος (: Syracuse, *P.* 2.2), πῖον τέμενος Κρονίδα (: Libya, *P.* 4.56).⁵¹

27 πιστοὶ χορευτῶν μάρτυρες “faithful witnesses of dancers”. For πιστοὶ ... μάρτυρες cf. *P.* 1.88. In fr. 70 Pindar states that the streams of the Boeotic river Melas nourish the “most musical reed” (τὸν ἀοιδότατον ... κάλαμον, cf. Loscalzo 1989). A variety of ancient sources (*Theophr. Hist. Pl.* 4.11.8, *Strabo* 9.2.8) confirm that the Pelecania, a region located in the Copais marsh, at the confluence of rivers Cephissus and Melas, was renowned for the production of *aulos* reeds (cf. Roesch 1989). As Bernardini (2006⁴:682) points out, Corinna (692.2) describes the Cephissus as εὐδενδρος ‘rich in plants/trees’ (cf. Spinedi 2018:133). Maslov 2015:219 notes: “The reeds used in constructing *auloi* are not merely present at the choral performances; they are, literally, the vocal supporters of the chorus. The immediate proximity of this image to the mention of the choreuts (the only occurrence of the word χορευτάς in Pindar) is also suggestive, as it invites us to think of the members of the chorus, by analogy, as a collective of *martures*”.

4 Gnōmai (28–32)

As Rutherford (2013:51) underlines, some “*epinikia* end with a narrower vision of limits: the hero has achieved the ultimate, and he should go no further, and neither should the song”. The end-lines of *P.* 12 can be juxtaposed to those of

51 Cf. also Ἀργεῖον ... τέμενος (*Pi. N.* 10.19) with the structure [τέμενος–CITY_{adj.}]. Differently, Τυνδ]αριδᾶν ... || τεμέ]νει (supp. Lobel) in fr. 52s.2 (*Pae.* 18.2 = S7 Rutherford) may refer to an actual τέμενος of Castor and Polydeuces in Argos, as they were honoured with a theoxeny in the polis (*Pi. N.* 10.49).

other odes which end with *gnōmai* warning about the variability of fate, such as *O.* 7.94–95 (cf. *O.* 5.23–24, *P.* 7.20–22, *I.* 3/4.17–18).

The final section of our ode includes a series of three *gnōmai*, which, according to Boeke (2007:57) are structured in an opposite way to the myth (cf. “in the myth the movement is from hardship to the pleasures of music, but in the *gnōmai* the movement is in the opposite direction. Happiness is hard won, and life is uncertain”). More precisely, closing verses consist of two main clauses (28–29, 29–32) intercalated by a third *gnōmē* at 30, and expanded by a relative sentence at 31–32. The entire section is characterized by the use of a ‘chain’ of enjambments (ἄνευ καμάτου || οὐ φαίνεται, 28–29; τελευτάσει ... || δαίμων, 29–30; χρόνος || οὔτος, 30–31; on the enjambment in Pindar cf. Giannini 2008). The first *gnōmē* is formulated through a conditional sentence: its protasis, in which the verb ‘to be’ is unexpressed, occupies 28, while the verb of the apodosis is located at 29. The enjambment between the syntactic components of the apodosis clause, namely: the complement ἄνευ καμάτου ‘without toil/effort’ (28) and the main verb οὐ φαίνεται (29), gives prominence to the factor which conditions the achievement of happiness, i.e. ‘toil’, one of the main themes of the ode (cf. chapter 2, section 5).

The interpretation of the second *gnōmē* is debated. It begins at 29, but it is somehow suspended, being interrupted by the third *gnōmē*, which is formulated in parenthetical form at 30. The way we understand 29–32 is conditioned by the interpretation of ἦτοι at 29. Whether the particle is emphatic (‘truly’) or constructed with σήμερον (29) and taken as disjunctive (‘either today’), it is apparent that we lack something: continuation, if ἦτοι is emphatic; a second term for the correlation, if we concur with the disjunctive hypothesis. The *gnōmē* stops in anacoluthon and is continued by an adversative coordinating sentence (ἀλλ’ ἔσται χρόνος) after the parenthetical clause. By breaking the main *gnōmē*, the encased new clause lends drama to the passage. As noted by Race (1989:190) “one of the ways in which Pindar maintains an impromptu quality in his poetry is by appearing to react to his statements, as if he were hearing them—like a listener—for the first time”. In this case, one may argue, the parenthetical interruption, which coincidentally occupies a paroemiac sequence (UU–UU– – x), resembles a gnomic comment expressed by a tragic chorus.

The continuation of the previous *gnōmē* at 30 starts with an adversative conjunction ἀλλά. Although ἀλλά follows a negative clause like elsewhere in Pindar (Slater 1969 s.v. ἀλλά [1]), it is possible that here it introduces a *different attitude*. After all, ἀλλά, etymologically belonging together with ἄλλος [*h₂el-jo-], carries in itself “the primary sense of ‘otherness’, diversity” (Denniston–Dover 1954:1) and could be understood as ‘otherwise, else’ in this passage. The final

relative clause, with embedded participle clause, may be interpreted as quasi-consecutive “Time will be the one who gives one thing and delays another”.

28–29 εἰ δέ τις ὄλβος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, ἄνευ καμάτου || οὐ φαίνεται “if there is any happiness among men, it does not appear without toil”. Verses 28–30 were identified by Theon’s *hypomnema* as a ‘sort of σφραγίς’ (P. Oxy. 2536 τοῦ[τ]ο δὲ ὡσπ(ερ) ἐπισφραγίζων [π]οεῖ, cf. Anderson 2023). The *sententia* of 29–30, introduced as “a sort of cosmic law” (Welles 1966:92, Riaño Ruffilanchas 2001:81–82 who cites the conception underlying *Il.* 24.527–533 as a parallel), can be compared to other Pindaric *gnōmai* concerning the link between ‘happiness’ (ὄλβος) and ‘toil/effort’ (κάματος/πόνος, cf. Welles 1966:93, Köhnken 1976:259–260), cf. *P.* 1.46, *N.* 6.44–45, *I.* 6.10–12. The term ὄλβος, of debated etymology (cf. Chantraine DELG, Frisk GEW, Beekes EDG s.v. ὄλβος; see also Janda 2005:275–278), denotes happiness and (material) prosperity (cf. Slater 1969 s.v. ὄλβος, cf. also Konstas 2003, Coin-Longeray 2014). Ancient interpreters explain the *gnōmē* as hinting at Midas’ extraordinary victory (cf. chapter 1, section 2). According to these commentaries, Midas had won the competition even though his reed (Σ *P.* 12 *inscr.* Dr.) or pipe (Σ *P.* 12.52, 54 Dr.) broke, but he had carried on his execution μόνοις τοῖς καλάμοις τρόπῳ σύριγγος “only with the pipes, in the way of the *syrinx*” (Σ *P.* 12 *inscr.* Dr.). Modern commentators are divided on the truthfulness of this story. Wilamowitz 1922:146, Méautis 1956:226–228, Welles 1966:85, Thummer 1968–1969:75, fn. 52 strongly doubt the scholion; Puech 1922:165 and Burton 1962:26 are sceptical, Christ 1896 and Bowra 1964:293 state that Midas’ accident might have happened; Gildersleeve 1885, Sandys 1937, Gentili–Luisi 1995 and Bernardini 2006⁴ trust the scholiast. According to Welles 1966:93 and Köhnken 1976:94 the *sententia* is linked to the myth, regardless of any possible reference to Midas’ performance in Delphi. I align with this interpretation.

29–30 ἐκ δὲ τελευτάσει νιν ἦτοι σήμερον || δαίμων “whether a god will bring it to fulfilment today”. Denniston–Dover (1954:554) propose ‘verily today’ as a possible translation for ἦτοι σήμερον. For Christ (1896) ἦτοι expresses hesitation (“will it be today?”). As an alternative interpretation, followed by Slater 1969 s.v. ἦτοι 2.a, Denniston–Dover (1954:554) suggest that ἦτοι stands here in anacoluthon ‘either’. According to Bernardini 2006⁴:683 ἦτοι = ἦ τοι can introduce an alternative whose second part is implicit. Σ *P.* 12.51–52 Dr. propose that a temporal complement ‘today’ should be followed by an omitted/implicit ἢ ἄυριον “or tomorrow” or ἢ ὕστερον “or later”. While Schroeder 1922 joins ἦτοι and ἀλλά 30, Riaño Ruffilanchas 2001:83–85 unites ἦτοι with Χρόνος (personified): “this will accomplish today a god or ... Time”, neglect-

ing the presence of ἀλλά. A correlation ἤτοι ... ἀλλά is actually unparalleled and the conjunction should not be ignored, see below 30–31. Therefore, I align with the hypothesis of an anacoluthon (on Pindaric anacolutha cf. Misiano 2001).

The encl.3.sg.pron. νιν is interpreted by Σ P. 12.51–52 Dr. as referring to ὄλβος, while ἐκτελευτάω is understood as ‘to fulfil’ (ἐπὶ τέλος ἄξει ‘will bring to completion’, so Σ P. 12.51 Dr.), i.e. as a synonym of ἐκτελέω (*Il.* 9.493+). This interpretation is accepted by Boeckh 1811–1821, Cerrato 1934, Köhnken 1971, with whom I concur (*pace* von Mezger 1880 and Gildersleeve 1885, for whom νιν refers to κάματος).

In Pindar’s victory odes, derivatives of the Gk. root τελ-, that is, synchronically and etymologically connected with the term τέλος ‘end’, occasionally occur in ‘end-proximity’ position (within the last 10 verses of an ode), cf. *P.* 2.95, *P.* 3.115, *N.* 7.105 (τελέθω), *O.* 13.115 (τέλειος, as noted by Rutherford 2013:45), *O.* 3.41 (τελετά), *O.* 5.22, *I.* 7.48 (τελευτά), *P.* 5.117, *I.* 1.68 (τελέω), *P.* 9.118, *N.* 8.45 (τέλος). Pfeijffer 1991 argues for an ‘ambiguous’ meaning of ἐκτελευτᾶν, i.e. as both ‘to end’ (the god can *end* the human happiness) and ‘to fulfil’ (the god can favour the human being). Riaño Rufilanchas 2001:87 suggests an unstated substantive θέμις in the light of *HH* 4.531. Gk. δαίμων (on the synchronic connection with δαήμων ‘wise’ cf. *Pl. Crat.* 398b) denotes the divinity without a specific reference to a god nor any monotheistic nuance (cf. François 1957:69 ff., Burton 1962:188). The term is etymologically related to δαίωμα ‘to divide’ and may be traced back to *IE* **deh*₂-i- ‘to cut, divide’ (cf. *LIV*² 103–104, *IEW* 175–176). Such an etymological connection was also perceived at the synchronic level, cf. *Hsch.* δ 73 LC δαίμονες ... ἢ ὅτι πάντα μερίζουσιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ δάσασθαι (cf. also *Et. Gud.* δ 328.23). The fact that δαίμων was perceived as the ‘distributor’ at a certain level of Greek synchrony does not imply that Pindar too preserves this etymology, although the mention of δαίμων is immediately followed by a reference to the ‘allotment of fate’ (see below). On the passage cf. Boeke 2007:35. On specific usages of δαίμων in some Pindaric passages cf. Molyneux 1972 (*O.* 9), Taillardat 1986 (*P.* 8), Lavecchia 1999 (fr. 282).

30 τὸ δὲ μόρσιμον οὐ παρφυκτόν ‘the allotment of fate cannot be escaped’. Gk. μόρσιμον (τὸ μοιρίδιον *Theon P. Oxy.* 2536) is ‘allotment of fate’/‘share [of destiny]’ (from *IE* **sm*er- ‘to get a share’, cf. μέρος, 11). On ‘fate’ in this and other Pindaric *gnōmai* cf. Boeke 2007:32–37. The variant γε, found in *Theon’s* hypnema, is preferred by Pavese 1990:92, Riaño Rufilanchas 2001:87 and Bernardini 2006⁴:683. As Turner 1968 tab. 111 points out, *Theon* already read οὐ παφυκτόν (found in V and preferred by Pavese 1990:72), while παραφεύγω is preserved in *Theon’s* paraphrasis (*Pardini* 1997). However, the majority of the

manuscripts preserve οὐ παρφυκτόν (allegedly, *hapax eiremenon*). I read παρφυκτόν and propose a parallel *ex Graeco ipso*: *Il.* 6.488 μοῖραν δ' οὐ τινά φημι πεφυγμένον ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν.

30–31 ἄλλ' ἔσται χρόνος || οὗτος, ὃ καὶ τιν' ἀελπίτια βαλῶν “else it will be Time such as that, striking someone with surprise ...”. As emphasized by Riaño Rufilanchas (2001), the wording of the passage is similar to that of *Il.* 4.160–161, 164 εἴ περ γάρ τε καὶ αὐτίκ' Ὀλύμπιος οὐκ ἐτέλεσσεν, || ἔκ τε καὶ ὀπὲ τελεί [...]. ἔσσειται ἡμαρ ὄτ(ε), *Diag.* 2 κατὰ δαίμονα καὶ τύχαν || τὰ πάντα βροτοῖσι ἐκτελείται, and to that of other *sententiae* in which time plays a role in fulfilling human destiny (cf. Aeschl. *Pers.* 740). Furthermore, Riaño Rufilanchas proposes that (i) ἦτοι creates an opposition between δαίμων and χρόνος, (ii) χρόνος is personified in *P.* 12, like elsewhere in Pindar, cf. *O.* 2.17, *O.* 10.55, fr. 33, fr. 52d.11 (*Pae.* 4.11 = D4 Rutherford), fr. 159.

While, here, the hypothesis of a personified “Time” may suit the context, Riaño Rufilanchas’ proposal of a disjunction δαίμων ... ἦτοι ... χρόνος* (“a god or Time [will fulfill ...]”) may be weakened by the fact that χρόνος/Χρόνος is introduced by ἀλλά, which does not usually correlate with ἦτοι. This difficulty might be overcome by taking ἀλλά as ‘otherwise, else’, i.e. as “simply introducing a new attitude” (Slater 1969 s.v. ἀλλά 2.c). For ἀελπίτια cf. Archil. 105.3 ἐξ ἀελπίτης. The reading τιν'(α) is preferable over τίν ‘you’ (Christ 1896, cf. also Gildersleeve 1885), since it suits the general tone of the *gnōmē*, cf. *P.* 8.76–78 (as proposed by Welles 1966:95).

32 ἔμπαλιν γνώμας τὸ μὲν δώσει, τὸ δ' οὐπω “will give one thing against hope, and defer another”. The *sententia* vaguely resembles *O.* 12.10–12 (on which cf. Race 2004). Cf. *ex Pindaro ipso* τὰ καὶ τὰ (*P.* 5.55, *P.* 7.22, *I.* 5.52), on which cf. Bischoff 1938:159–160. The meaning of οὐπω is debated: some interpreters opt for ‘not’ (Gentili and Bernardini 2006⁴), others for ‘not yet’ (e.g. Slater 1969 s.v. οὐπω, Race 1997a). Both interpretations make sense, although the overall meaning of the *gnōmē* acquires different nuances according to which solution is preferred. By employing ‘not’ alone interpreters confer a more definite tone to the *gnōmē*: there is a certain allotment of fate, which comprises some things and does not comprise others; this is what will be given to men, according to the will of god or Time. Employment of ‘not yet’ emphasizes the *timing* of destiny’s gifts: ‘it will be Time the one who gives one thing and defers another’. I align with the latter interpretation which, in my view, is consistent with the references to Time and timing at 29–32. For 32, as well as with the ‘revelatory’ role of χρόνος/Χρόνος, attested elsewhere in Pindar cf. Komornicka 1976.