ON THE ALLEGED *DATIVUS ETHICUS* IN PINDAR

Along with Pind. *Is*. 5.38-39, Slater 1969, 147 quotes five other instances of μοι as *dativus ethicus* or *sympatheticus* (K.-G. I 423.d). Hummel 1993, 132 writes that "[l]e datif y dépend pour ainsi dire non de l'un de consti-tuants de la phrase, mais des données incluses dans la situation d'énoncia-tion" (Schwyzer II 149 "logisch entbehrlich"). The situation is, however, different. In those five (plus, likely, one) cases the dative in fact has a very clear and determined syntactic function.

A brief reassessment of the *loci Pindarici* will clarify my assertion, whereas Pind. *Is*. 5.38-39 requires a thorough discussion in order to demon-strate it.

1) *Ol*. 6.22-25 ἀλλὰ ζεῦξον ἤδη μοι σθένος ἡμιόνων, / ᾇ τάχος, ὄφρα κελεύθῳ τ᾽ ἐν καθαρᾷ / βάσομεν ὄκνον ἵκωμαί τε πρὸς ἀνδρῶν / καὶ γένος "But hurry, yoke me the strength of the mules now, as speedily as possible, in order that we mount the chariot on an illumined[1] road and I arrive to that offspring of men", i.e. "make me the chariot ready". The dative is required by the verb ζεύγνυμι (*commodi*), as in the case of στέλλω (Soph. *Aj*. 1045): Schwyzer II 230 "bereit machen"[2]. The syntax recalls the more extensive construction of Hom. *Il*. 145-148 ἵππους δ᾽ Αὐτομέδοντα θοῶς ζευγνῦμεν ἄνωγε / […] τῷ δὲ καὶ Αὐτομέδων ὕπαγε ζυγὸν ὠκέας ἵππους, "[Patroclus] commanded Automedon to yoke the horses speedily […] for him Auto-medon led the fleet horses beneath the yoke".

2) *Ol*. 9.35-39 ἀπό μοι λόγον / τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῖψον· / ἐπεὶ τό γε λοιδο-ρῆσαι θεοὺς / ἐχθρὰ σοφία καὶ τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρόν / μανίαισιν ὑποκρέκει. "My mouth, to my benefit throw such a discourse far away, because reviling the gods is in particular a hateful skill and bragging beyond due measure sounds in harmony with acts of frenzied madness". In this "Abbruchsformel"[3], the dative is strongly of interest (*commodi*)[4], since ἀπό

---

[1] Cf. *Is*. 5.23: the path is "pure" because, along the road towards success and glory, one encounters no obstacles procured by illicit acts of foolishness (see n. 23 below). On the "cammino" see D'Alessio 1995.

[2] So Gentili 2013, 153, who translates "Ora, Finti, aggioga al più presto per me la forza delle mule" (nothing about the dative in Giannini's [= Gentili 2013] commentary). Adorjáni 2014, 162 takes it as a *dativus iudicantis* (Basile 1998, 280), insofar as it describes the "Gesichtspunkt des Dichters als Benefiziars" (his translations suggest otherwise: 12 "age iunge mihi, o Phintis, quam celerius vim mularum", 15 "Wohlan, schirre mir nun, o Phintis, schnellstmöglich die Kraft der Mäuler"); *silet* Hutchinson 2001 *ad loc*.

[3] Gerber 2002, 40. On the composition of the sentences at 35-40 see the excellent explanation offered by Gildersleeve 1890, 205.

is in tmesis with the verb[5]: the sentence introduced by ἐπεί (37) indicates why that plea is necessary (insulting the gods is aberration; that is why I need that you, my mouth, cast this kind of words away).

3) *Ol*. 10.1-2 τὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ἀνάγνωτέ μοι / … πόθι φρενός ἐμᾶς γέγραπται. "Read the [name of the] winner at Olympia… out to me from the place where it is written in my mind". The dative is the indirect object (*termini*) of the imperative[6].

4) *Pyth*. 1.58-59 Μοῖσα, καὶ πὰρ Δεινομένει κελαδῆσαι / πίθεό μοι ποινὰν τεθρίππων. "Muse, indulge me to sing [or: comply me to sing] in the presence of Deinomenes, too, as a reward for the four-horse chariot". The dative is the object of the verb, whereby πείθεσθαί τινι = "comply", "indulge one" or "listen to one" (*LSJ s.v.* B)[7]. The phrase cannot (homerically!) mean "sing, Muse, I bid you"[8], for it is not the (Homeric) Muse who must sing before the king, but the lyric I whom she aids (cf. e.g. *Ol*. 1.112, 3.4-6): this is confirmed by the accusative ποινὰν τεθρίππων, which functions as "Satzapposition" of κελαδῆσαι (note the "Wortstellung", with the apposition at the end of the sentence, see e.g. Aesch. *Ag*. 46, and both infinitive and apposition at *finis periodi*) indicating both purpose and result of the song (K.-G. I 284).

5) *Parth*. fr. 94b.66 M. ἡσ[ύχ]ῳ νῦν μοι ποδὶ στείχων ἀγέο. "Now precede me [= be my leader in the daphnephoric procession] striding with gentle foot". The dative is the object required by ἀγέομαι, as in Hom. *Od*. 23.134.

6) *Isthmian* 5 is "in easy Greek", claimed Malcolm M. Willcock in his brief commentary on the ode[9]. Not quite so. The textual issue at *Is*. 5.58

---

[4] Giannini in Gentili 2013, 532 interprets it as a *dativus ethicus*, as does Gerber 2002, 40: both refer to Des Places 1947, 8. Gentili 2013, 237 translates: "Getta lontano da me, o mia bocca, queste parole".

[5] Hummel 1993, 156.

[6] Race 1997a, 163, preceded by Mezger 1880, 426 "leset mir, wo in meinem Geiste der Olympiasieger geschrieben steht"; correctly Kromer 1976, 422. Gentili 2013, 263 translates with a *dativus termini* "leggetemi il nome" (nothing in Lomiento's [= Gentili 2013] commentary on the dative, but see the interpretation of the whole passage). Verdenius 1988, 55 does not comment on the syntax of the dative, but writes that "the imperative is used 'absolutely' ".

[7] This exegesis is anticipated by the translation of Gentili 2012, 35: "Musa, esaudiscimi ora, ch'io innalzi…" (nothing in Cingano's [= Gentili 2012] commentary).

[8] So Slater 1969, 422, Race 1997a, 221, and Pfeijffer 2005, 28 (nothing about the dative in the following discussion); Burton 1962, 103 also writes that "Pindar asks the Muse to sing […] a song", whereas Farnell 1932, 113 translates "O Muse, hearken to my prayer and […] ring out the song…".

[9] Willcock 1978, 38.

aside[10], there is another passage which merits re-examination: a conundrum in the midst of the ode – being the mythical *Priamel* at *Is*. 5.30-45 –[11] seems, in fact, to jeopardize the correct understanding of Pindar's words. Let us analyse 34-45:[12]

<div style="text-align:center">

ἀλλ᾽ ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ μεγαλήτορες ὀργαί

35 Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε· τοὶ καὶ σὺν μάχαις

δὶς πόλιν Τρώων πράθον ἑσπόμενοι

Ἡρακλέϊ πρότερον,

καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις. ἔλα νῦν μοι πεδόθεν·

λέγε, τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἕκτορα πέφνον,

40 καὶ στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων ἄφοβον

41 Μέμνονα χαλκοάραν·

41ᵃ τίς ἄρ᾽ ἐσλὸν Τήλεφον

42 τρῶσεν ἑῷ δορὶ Κα-

ΐκου παρ᾽ ὄχθαις.

Γ´ τοῖσιν Αἴγιναν προφέρει στόμα πάτραν

διαπρεπέα νᾶσον· τετείχισται δὲ πάλαι

45 πύργος ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀναβαίνειν.

</div>

But in Oenona it is the great-hearted spirits of Aeacus and his sons (they twice in battles destroyed the Trojans' city, first as followers of Heracles, then with the Atreids). Drive me now up from the plain[13]; tell which men slew Cycnus, which ones slew Hector and the fearless general of the Aethiopians, Memnon of the bronze armor? Who then wounded noble Telephus with his spear by the banks of the Caicus? One's mouth proclaims Aegina as their homeland, that illustrious island. From of old has she been built as a bastion for men to scale with lofty achievements. [transl. by Race 1997b, 178-180].

---

[10] A complete overview of paradosis, amendments, and interpretations can be found in Privitera 2009, 200-201. See Adorjáni 2007 (~ Adorjáni 2011, 140-171) with the review of Eckerman 2012, Gianotti 1970 with Gerber 1990, 42, and Silk 1998.

[11] On the *Priamel* see Dornseiff 1921, 97-99 ("eine Art Einleitung […] zu dem Haupt-spruch") with Bundy 1962, 36-37, Kirby 1984, Race 1982, 1-16, 24-27, 73-81, Race 1990, 115-117, and Faraone 2005.

[12] Greek text according to Snell-Maehler's standard edition; my colometry (I follow the paradosis).

[13] Other translations – the sole variable being the object implied for the verb – are Mezger 1880, 350 "fahre mir nun hin über den Grund!", Werner 1968, 317 "schwing mir jetzt vom Boden dich auf! Sage mir, wer…", Thummer 1969, 179 "Heb dich nun vom Boden weg! Sag, welche…", Willcock 1978, 43 "Now drive my chariot up from the level ground. Tell who…", Burnett 2005, 91 "Leap now, well off the ground! Speak out! Who were…", Privitera 2009, 83 "Spiccati ora dal suolo! di' chi uccisero…", Burnett 2010, 167 "Lift me now, well off the ground! Speak out! Who were the killers…". Fränkel 1968, 47 n. 2 paraphrases "nun ständig weiter auf diesem selben Pfade".

A. *Structure of the passage*. The passage as a whole does not raise serious exegetical issues, aside from 38-39 ἔλα νῦν μοι πεδόθεν, λέγε. Since τὸ δ᾽ ἐμὸν, / οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν, κέαρ ὕμνων γεύεται, "not without the Aeacids my heart savours the hymns" (20-21), Pindar sketches out the myth so as to offer evidence of Aegina's ancient glory: every city has its hero (30-33) > Aegina has the Aeacids, who sacked Troy twice (34-38) > Achilles (38-42). The climax is shaped by two questions:

α. Who (τίνες) killed Cycnus, Hector, and Memnon? The anaphoric plural form of the interrogative pronoun (39 τίνες… τίνες) serves to denote a group: "who were those who killed" or "which people killed". It recalls τοί (35) and anticipates τοῖσιν (43).

β. Who (τίς) wounded Telephus? (see below).

This suffices to recollect the story – i.e. the λόγος which Aegina's heroes ἐκέρδαναν (26-27) – to the audience and move forward. The narrator interrupts the myth *ex abrupto* and resumes the eulogy. Aegina stands (τετείχισται) as a tower of its ancient and contemporary glories. The virtues of its heroes could climb it. ἀναβαίνειν is a consecutive infinitive (K.-G. II 500) describing πύργος: "Aegina has been built up [= stands] as a tower, so that one can climb it [= ὥστε ἀναβαίνειν] only by means of his lofty virtues". The Pindaric concept develops an inductive reasoning (ἐπαγωγή) which is almost a syllogism: if the Aeacids are Aegina's heroes (at 43 τοῖσιν is *commodi*), and if Aegina is a tower which can be climbed only by means of the highest virtues (at 45 ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς is dative of instrument), then the Aeacids do possess the highest virtues. The consequence is immediate: since Phylacidas (and Pytheas won at the Panhellenic games, they too have ascended the tower with their prominent virtues, reached its summit and hold it along with the Aeacids.

B. *Syntax and meaning of 38-39*. The best explanation of the syntagm thus far proposed is that ἔλα… πεδόθεν represents a variation of the Homeric genitive "bei Ortsbestimmungen zur Bezeichnung des Bereichs" with "Verben des Gehens und Bewegung" (K.-G. I 384-385)[14]; however, the affixed μοι and the asyndetically appended λέγε leaves us in doubt.

a. Since antiquity these verses have been controversial and commentators paraphrased them so that the Muse is required to guide the narrator "on a plain road and over a level ground" (*schol*. 48a ἐπ᾽ εὐθείας ὁδοῦ καὶ δι᾽ ὁμαλοῦ) and to "proclaim in song the praise of these [heroes] from the beginning and tell" (*schol*. 48a τούτων ἐγκώμια… ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνύμνησον καὶ λέγε). The lyric I would either ask the Muse to "tell me about them from the roots" (*schol*. 48b λέγε μοι περὶ αὐτούς, ..., ἐκ ῥιζῶν) or "advance [= move

---

[14] Mezger 1880, 350.

onward] to the days of old starting from farther back and tell from the be-
ginning" (πρόαγε εἰς τοὔμπροσθεν ἀρξάμενος ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς λέγε).
Some scholars rely on *scholl.* 48a and 48b's idea of an address to the Muse[15];
others see a poet's address to himself[16]. Caution is necessary: "[w]e should
be wary of an interpretation which requires us to supply an important detail
which Pindar omits"[17]. Why should Pindar tacitly summon a Muse whom he
had not yet invoked, or even named? Strikingly, neither the Muse nor the
narrator needs to lift up the chariot of poetry to narrate the myth at a higher
level, "in the manner of epic"[18]. It seems odd that the narrator's mouth (43
στόμα, picking up 20 ὕμνον, 24 ἀοιδᾷ, 27 λόγον) ought to spread its wings
to deal with greater deeds in a solemn style[19]. Those warriors have been
mentioned (38 καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις) and the myth has already begun (34 ἀλλ᾽
ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ). A leap into the mythical dimension seems incongruous.

b. Unless we are willing to accept the conspicuously ineffectual meaning
and the faltering syntactic construction, we should proceed *ex contrario* and
postulate that the Pindaric words conceal a different meaning. Paul Maas
warns that it is irrational to accept the transmitted text (with anomaly) as
long as it makes some sort of sense. I therefore suggest reading 38-39 as fol-
lows (without anomaly, I hope): ἔλα, νῦν μοι πεδόθεν / λέγε· τίνες… χαλκο-
άραν; τίς ἄρ᾽ ἐσλὸν Τήλεφον… παρ᾽ ὄχθαις; "Go ahead, now tell me [their
account (of praise)] from the foundation: which people slew Cycnus, who
slew Hector and the fearless commander of the Aethiopians, bronze-armed
Memnon? Who then wounded noble Telephus on the banks of the Caicus?".
The argumentation originates from few minor changes in punctuation which
do not alter the paradosis: a short pause after ἔλα, a break after λέγε instead
of after πεδόθεν, two direct questions.

α. ἔλα is problematic.

i. It does seem an attractive alternative to ἄγε (Pind. *Ol.* 2.89, 13.68, *Pyth.*
1.60, *Nem.* 6.28, Bacch. 5.8) in the function of imperative of *Aufmunterung*
(K.-G. I 236), i.e. with the function of interjection, but it is hard to ascertain
this correspondence; it must remain a suggestion, albeit a tempting one in the
light of Ngrk. ἔλα = "vorwärts", "go ahead" (Schwyzer II 16, 341).

ii. If this seems a hurdle, ἔλα may be taken conservatively as imperative
stricto sensu: Aesch. *TGrF* 332 ἔλα, δίωκε μή τι μαλκίων ποδί, whereby ἔλα

---

[15] Bury 1892, 98-99, Farnell 1932, 366, Thummer 1969, 91, Race 1997b, 179 n. 2.

[16] Privitera 2009, 76 and 196, Burnett 2005, 96.

[17] Carey 1989, 548.

[18] Race 1997b, 179 n. 2.

[19] Privitera 2009, 76 and 196. The interpretation offered by Burnett 2005, 96 is extra-
vagant: "with a self-imposed 'leap' into the mythic dimension, the singers arrive among
warriors of the second Aiakid generation".

means either concretely "drive on" (see Eur. *Phaet*. 168, 176 Diggle) or metaphorically "push on", and Eur. *Herc*. 819 νωθὲς πέδαιρε κῶλον, ἐκποδὼν ἔλα, with the imperative used absolutely as "hurry!" (note that both instances may probably signify "go ahead!").

iii. The (slightly) shifted meaning of ἔλα as "go ahead", "hurry" in Pind. *Is*. 5.38 is perhaps confirmed by *schol*. 48b quoted above (πρόαγε εἰς τοὔμπροσθεν); interestingly, the lexicographical exegeses of Hesych. ε 1835 Latte-Cunningham ἔλα: … βάδιζε, λέγε (possibly an *interpretamentum* of Pind. *Is*. 5.38, given the apparently superfluous λέγε, which can hardly be considered a synonym of ἔλα) and Hesych. τ 390 Hansen-Cunningham τ᾽ ἔλα: σπεῦδε corroborate the suggested assumption.

β. νῦν μοι πεδόθεν λέγε is syntactically more fluent than the vulgate construction: "now tell me *pedothen*" forms a syntagm.

i. By contrast with the enclitic νυν, νῦν has no fixed position in the sentence (*Il*. 8.187, Ar. *Eq*. 637) and need not necessarily to be taken with ἔλα. Coming after the "Aufmunterung", it is linked to the deferred imperative λέγε.

ii. μοι is more naturally and conveniently understood as indirect object (*dativus termini*) of λέγε (*Od*. 11.374, see also 1.174) – as paraphrased by *schol*. 48b λέγε μοι – rather than as a *dativus ethicus* dependent on ἔλα and expressing the *Teilnahme des Redenden* (K.-G. I 423 offers obvious examples of such use). In *Is*. 5.38 the lyric *persona*'s emotional involvement seems absent.

iii. πεδόθεν is murky and the principal cause of the exegetical obstacle. *Scholl*. 48a and 48b quoted above bind it to λέγε. The literal interpretation of πεδόθεν as "from the πέδον"[20] may at first sight appear out of place[21]. A useful parallel seems *Od*. 13.295 μύθων… οἵ τοι πεδόθεν φίλοι εἰσίν, where πεδόθεν is used metaphorically. The translation commonly runs as "deceitful tales… which you love *from the bottom of your heart*"[22] or the like: the notion "from the deep" might be misleading. *Schol*. *Od*. 13.295 (II 572 Dindorf) reads οἷον ἐκ ῥίζης, ἐκ γενετῆς, ἀπὸ φυτῶν· ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς γεννωμένους ἐν τῷ πέδῳ πατεῖν, "just as 'from the root', 'from the (hour of the) birth', 'from the offspring', or 'from the fact that those who are born walk on the ground' ", perhaps hinting at an inborn quality, at something innate and pertaining to the essence of that man.

---

[20] πεδόθεν means "from the ground" (Eur. *Tro*. 98), "from the seabed" (Pind. *Ol*. 7.62; see πέδον in the same sense in *Pae*. A1.16 Ruth.), "from the foundation/base/foot [of the mount]" (Hes. *Th*. 680; see πέδον in the same sense in Pind. *Pyth*. 1.28); in Bacch. 9.5 πέδον should mean "plain". See *LfgrE* III 1086-1089 (πεδίον), 1089-1090 (πέδον πεδόθεν).

[21] See Fränkel 1968, 47 n. 2.

[22] Thus, for instance, Dimock 1995, 23. See *LfgrE* III 1090 (2) "metaph. 'from the ground up', *from the depths of one's nature*".

γ. τίνες… τίνες… τίς:

i. The construction of λέγω + indirect question would be *hapax* in Pindar; conversely, the direct object of λέγω can be easily inferred from 26-29 καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταί / λόγον ἐκέρδαναν· κλέονται / δ᾽ ἔν τε φορμίγγεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις ὁμοκλαῖς / μυρίον χρόνον· μελέταν δὲ σοφισταῖς / Διὸς ἕκατι πρόσβαλον σεβιζόμενοι. "for even those heroes who were brave warriors gained account [of praise] and are celebrated on lyres and in full range of pipe's harmonies for time beyond measure, and, thanks to Zeus, they provided a topic for wise poets and are revered" [transl. by Race 1997b 178, adapt.][23] (for the *figura etymologica* see K.-G. I 304-305, Schwyzer II 74-75). This is already implied in μεγαλήτορες ὀργαί / Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε <λόγον ἐκέρδαναν and μελέταν δὲ σοφισταῖς πρόσβαλον>.

ii. The questions are more incisive if stated in the direct form (*Ol*. 2.1, 89-90, *Is*. 7.1). Noteworthily, ἄρ(α) emphasizes the "Lebhaftigkeit" (K.-G. II 222-223), brings the speech to its peak, and furnishes the necessary rhetorical surprise which "forecasts the enlightenment" of the answer (*GP* 39-40),

---

[23] This passage (26-29) is parallel to the *gnome* at 12-16. As for the former (12-16): both μάτευε and ἔχεις are customarily understood as generalizing second persons referring to an unidentified "you", be this the present/future audience or a canonical Everyman (Privitera 2009, 191); after the first *gnome* at 12-13 – where τοι carries no emphatic force, but rather serves to grab the audience's and the narratee's attention (*GP* 537, 542.9 "hark!", whereby "the appeal is to the mind") – Phylacidas learns that the two *gnomai* apply to himself as soon as he hears (15) τούτων (Race 1989, 192 n. 5 states that "Pindar is fond of stating the general case in a gnome (or gnomic exhortation) before applying it to the occasion at hand"). The demonstrative looks back (K.-G. I 646-647) to the aforementioned blessings (12-13) and marks the transition from a universal (13) to a personal perspective: it is Phylacidas who is especially concerned with the μοῖρα καλῶν just expounded – I wonder whether the final gnome at 16, rather than a serving as a mere customized warning (Phylacidas must not go beyond the mortal limits, but as a man has to strive for goods appropriate to his condition), might more strikingly point out the fact that Phylacidas has reached the apex of prosperity allowed to mortal beings –; the δέ at 17 (*GP* 169) fastens the preceding *gnome* (14-16) to the τίν-Phylacidas and provides details of τούτων μοῖρ(α)… καλῶν (this back-tracing function of the syntagm τὶν δέ + vocative marks the definitive transition from the universal to the personal sphere already anticipated at 14-15). As for the latter passage (26-29): songs are required (19-20), but they will not be sufficient for the Aeginetan Psalychiads unless they mention the Aeacids (20), to whose city of Aegina the narrator has come (21-22); at 26 καὶ γάρ (*GP* 108) introduces a series of statements which connect the current events to the ancient history and myth: καί is emphatic ("even") and elevates the topic of awarding the κόμπον τὸν ἐοικότ᾽… ἀντὶ πόνων, the "praise, that which is fitting as a reward of the toils" (24-25), to a global dimension, the mythical past summarized by the partitive genitive (26 ἡρώων); γάρ explains (*GP* 58) that phrase at 24-25 by touching upon something universally known; a train of thoughts follows illustrating the warrior's κέλευθος to immortality (deeds > fame > poems/ song > immortality (see *Is*. 5.22-25); note the participle σεβιζόμενοι at 29, on which Pindar concentrates the climax of his explanation: "they are revered having provided a topic for wise poets".

which is left unuttered (see n. 27 below). The particle is even more vivid because the answer is only hinted and the dialogue only half-expressed:

– Tell me, what people slew Cicnus, Hector and Memnon?
– [The Aeacids of Aegina, of course!]
– And who wounded Telephus, then?
– [εἷς δὴ τῶν Αἰακιδᾶν, Indeed one of them!] (*schol.* 48b).

The syntax now appears more natural, fluent, and expressive. As intimated, its compliance with *scholl.* 48a (πρόαγε… καὶ… λέγε > ἔλα, … λέγε), 48b (λέγε μοι + ἐκ ριζῶν / ἀρξάμενος ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς > μοι πεδόθεν λέγε) may support its accuracy (see B.a above). The "Abbruchsformel" at 38 steers the myth toward its conclusion[24]. As for the structure, compare *Ol.* 2.89 ἔπεχε νῦν σκοπῷ τόξον, ἄγε θυμέ· τίνα… "Now bend the bow toward the target, come on my heart: whom…?", with *asyndeton* + imperative (ἔπεχε ~ λέγε) + temporal adverb stressing the interruption of the previous action (νῦν ~ νῦν) + *Aufmunterung* (ἄγε ~ ἔλα) + direct rhapsodic questions (τίνα ~ τίνες/τίς). ἔλα is explained by *schol.* 48a (πρόαγε) and Hesychius (βάδιζε, σπεῦδε) and strengthens the break-off.

C. *Concatenation of thoughts.* The Αἰακιδᾶν διήγησις might last a time. The story (27 λόγον, 28 μελέταν) was, however, very well-known to any Aeginetan from the Cyclic Epics and from local traditions (in *Is.* 6.19-21 ὕμ-με... Αἰακίδαι, / τέθμιόν μοι φαμὶ σαφέστατον ἔμμεν / ... ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίας, "I declare that I have a most clear duty, o Aeacids, to besprinkle you with words of eulogy", the superlative σαφέστατον indicates that the most obvious subject when praising an Aeginetan is in fact the εὐλογία of the Aeacids)[25]. The narrator pretends to narrate the full story: despite leaving it formally untold, he nevertheless recalls it to the audience and the *laudan-*

---

[24] This case is a slight variation on the examples described by Race 1989, 208: "a forceful word or phrase denoting death or suffering […] prepares for the poet's intrusion into the poem" and "Pindar is turning from some painful aspect of existence to praise of positive achievement; each marks a major turning-point in its ode". In the case of *Is.* 5.38-45 the "intrusion" of the narrator (38) seems to be wanted to defer the pivotal "praise of positive achievement" (43-45) after a brief reminder of the mythical events.

[25] On the Pindaric use of superlatives see Tibiletti 2021. Kurke 1991, 200 notes that foundation myths such as that of the Aeacids "transform an entire polis into a single family descended from a common mythic ancestor. Their purpose is to unify the city". In *Isthmian* 5 the Aeacid myth is confined in the succinct space of an epode (35-42); however, if Morrison 2011a, 248–249 (quoted above) is right, the re-performance of *Nemean* 5 (and possibly that of Bacchylides' *Epinician* 13) might have supplied the audience with a more extensive narration. Morrison 2011b, 318 n. 32 also envisages a re-performance of *Isthmian* 6, which served to illustrate the *laudandus'* πάτρα.

dus[26]. The absence of any answer to the questions at 39-42 is perspicuous in the light of the audience's knowledge; one surely thought or whispered "No doubt Achilles, one of the Aeacids!" (see B.b.γ). By doing this the promise that the hymns will feature the Aeacids (20-21) is fulfilled[27]. Who is the addressee of ἔλα, νῦν μοι πεδόθεν / λέγε? I would tentatively answer: no Muse, no mouth, no heart – Everyman! Or even: the audience, and the *laudandus* in the first place.

Furthermore: πεδόθεν could also pave the way to the following Αἴγιναν... τετείχισται... πύργος. The foundations of the tower of Oenona/Aegina are the Aeacids' ὀργαί, in particular Achilles' deeds of prowess (see *Nem.* 4.11-13); Achilles is the hero who laid the foundations of the island, the foundations for Aegina's glory (compare *Nem.* 3.64 τηλαυγὲς ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν, "the far-shining light of the Aecids is fixed from here [Aegina]")[28]. Such connexions (34-35 ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ μεγαλήτορες ὀργαί Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε > 38-39 πεδόθεν λέγε· τίνες... > 44-45 διαπρεπέα νᾶσον· τετείχισται δὲ πάλαι πύργος) are built through non-intolerable hyperbaton, since the sentence τοὶ καὶ... καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις is likely to be perceived as an informative parenthesis/appendix, as the relative/demonstrative pronoun may suggest (K.-G. II 353-354, Schwyzer II 705-706 with *Nem.* 10.11, an explanatory addition by asyndeton to *Nem.* 10.10).

If my examination of these six *loci Pindarici* proves acceptable, we can definitively exclude that Pindar employed the rhetoric artifice of the *dativus ethicus*.

University of Bern   ANTONIO TIBILETTI

---

[26] Carey 2001, 26 (tempo-acceleration to reach the apex and to bring the narration to conclusion).

[27] Carey 2001, 15 (the poet invites the audience to complete his narration), 16 (the poet is free to vary the conventional elements of the epinician ode by the power of his genius and unpredictability; convention nurtures the audience's expectations, the poet's creativity may satisfy or frustrate them).

[28] Schadewaldt 1928, 55 n. 2.

Works cited:

Z. Adorjáni, *Der Blick der Hoffnungen. Bemerkungen zu Pindars 5. isthmischer Ode, 56-58*”, “AantHung” 47, 2007, 143-173.

— *Auge und Sehen in Pindars Dichtung*, Hildesheim 2011.

— *Pindars sechste olympische Siedesode*, Leiden-Boston 2014.

N. Basile, *Sintassi storica del Greco antico*, Bari 1998.

E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1962.

A. P. Burnett, *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina*, Oxford 2005.

— *Pindar. Odes for Victorious Athletes*, Baltimore 2010.

R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation*, Oxford 1962.

J. B. Bury, *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar*, London 1892.

Ch. Carey, *The Performance of the Victory Ode*, “AJP” 110, 1989, 545-565.

— *Poesia pubblica in performance*, in M. Cannatà Fera - G. B. D'Alessio (eds.), *I lirici greci. Forme della comunicazione e storia del testo*, Atti dell'Incontro di Studi (Messina 5-6 novembre 1999), Messina 2001, 11-26.

G. B. D'Alessio, *Una via lontana dal cammino degli uomini (Parm. frr. 1+6 D.-K.; Pind. Ol. VI 22–27; pae. VIIb 10–20)*, “SIFC” s. III 13, 1995, 143-181.

J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, revised by K. J. Dover, Oxford 1954[2] [= *GP*].

É. Des Places, *Le pronom chez Pindare*, Paris 1947.

G. E. Dimock, *Homer. The Odyssey. Books 13-24*, vol. 2, Cambridge MA-London 1995.

F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, Berlin 1921.

Ch. Eckerman, Review of Adorjáni 2011, “Mnemosyne” 65, 2012, 790-792.

Ch. Faraone, *Catalogues, Priamels, and Stanzaic Structure in Early Greek Elegy*, “TAPA” 135, 2005, 249-265.

L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, II. London 1932.

H. Fränkel, *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, ed. by F. Tietze, München 1968[3].

B. Gentili (et alii), *Pindaro. Le Pitiche*, Milano 2012.

— (et alii), *Pindaro. Le Olimpiche*, Milano 2013.

D. E. Gerber, *A Commentary on Pindar Olympian Nine*, Stuttgart 2002.

G. F. Gianotti, *Pindaro, I. 5, 56–58*, “RFIC” 98, 1970, 405-407.

B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar. The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, New York 1890[2].

P. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare*, Louvain-Paris 1993.

G. O. Hutchinson, *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*, Oxford 2001.

J. T. Kirby, *Toward a General Theory of the Priamel*, “CJ” 80, 1984, 142-144.

G. Kromer, *The Value of Time in Pindar's Olympian 10*, “Hermes” 104, 1976, 420-436.

R. Kühner - B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, II. 1-2: *Satzlehre*, Hannover-Leipzig 1898-1904[3] [= K.-G. I, II].

L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca-London 1991.

F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder*, Leipzig 1880.

A. Morrison, *Aeginetan Odes, Reperformance, and Pindaric Intertextuality*, in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina. Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry*, Oxford 2011, 227-253.

— *Pindar and the Aeginetan patrai: Pindar's intersecting audiences*, in L. Athanassaki - E. Bowie (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song. Performance, Politics and Dissemination*, Berlin-Boston 2011, 311-335.

I. L. Pfeijffer, *Propaganda in Pindar's First Pythian Ode*, in K. A. E. Enenkel - I. L. Pfeijffer (eds.), *The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity. A Collection of Case Studies*, Boston 2005, 13-42.

G. A. Privitera, *Pindaro. Le istmiche*, Milano 2009.

W. H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*, Leiden 1982.

— *Elements of Style in Pindaric Break-Offs*, "AJP" 110, 1989, 189-209 (= Race 1990, 41-57).

— *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes*, Atlanta 1990.

— *Pindar. Olympian Odes. Pythian Odes*, I. Cambridge MA-London 1997.

— *Pindar. Nemean Odes. Isthmian Odes. Fragments*, II. Cambridge MA-London 1997.

W. Schadewaldt, *Die Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*, Halle an der Saale 1928.

E. Schwyzer - A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik*. II: *Syntax und syntaktische Stylistik*, München 1950 [= Schwyzer II].

M. S. Silk, *Pindar's Poetry and the Obligatory Crux: Isthmian 5.56-63*, "TAPA" 128, 1998, 25-88.

W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin 1969.

E. Thummer, *Pindar. Die isthmischen Gedichte*, I. Heidelberg 1968.

— *Pindar. Die isthmischen Gedichte*, II. Heidelberg 1969.

A. Tibiletti, *Pondering Pindaric Superlatives in Context*, "HSCP" 111, 2011, 39-53.

W. J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar*, II. Leiden-New York-Copenhagen-Köln 1988.

O. Werner, *Pindar. Siegesgesänge und Fragmente*, München 1967.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922.

M. M. Willcock, *On First Reading Pindar: The Fifth Isthmian*, "G&R" 25, 1978, 37-45.

ABSTRACT:

The article deals with six Pindaric passages where a *dativus ethicus* is supposed to be used by the poet. After a brief re-examination of Pind. *Ol*. 6.22-25, 9.35-39, 10.1-2, *Pyth*. 1.59, and *Parth*. fr. 94b.66 M., and on the grounds of a more detailed analysis and reconsideration of the traditional exegesis of *Is*. 5.38-39 it may be concluded that such rhetorical device never occurs; by contrast, the dative in these passages rather fulfills the common and specific syntactic function of either *commodi*, *termini*, or object.

KEYWORDS:

Pindar, dativus ethicus, syntax, rhetoric, style.