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1. Henricus Stephanus
Five biographies of mediocre quality dating from the late imperial and Byzantine periods transmit information about the life of Pindar. Two are in hexameters; one of them, probably the older, was utilized by Eustathius. A manuscript from the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan, designated Ambrosianus A, contains the so-called Vita Ambrosiana. There is also a Vita by Thomas Magister; and there is an entry on Pindar in the Suda lexicon. To these longer sources may be added scattered, often highly relevant, items of information supplied by authors of various periods, and internal evidence from the text of the poems themselves. By the early sixteenth century, erudites and scholars had assembled all this material (notably in the Roman edition of Pindar published in 1515 by Zacharias Callierges) and begun to mine it for biographies of the poet, which culminate in the impressive twenty-six-page account of his life by W. Schmid in his Geschichte der griechischen Literatur (Munich, 1929), 548–74, a richly detailed portrait in which every nugget of information is discussed and assigned full value. The publication of Mary R. Lefkowitz’s The Lives of the Greek Poets (London, 1981), however, marked a turning point. This work subjected the tradition to stringent critical review: many items of information that had been considered fundamental and unquestionable were now attributed to the improvisational ethos of Greek biographical writing, and to the substantially rhetorical character of the ode as a genre and its first-person speaker. This important change in critical perspective reduced the biography of Pindar to the following certain data: he was born in Cynocephale, a town near Thebes, probably during the Pythiad of 518 B.C. (fr. 193 Sn.-M.: perhaps in August). His first certainly datable work is Pythian 10, from 498; he was in his prime at around the time the Second Persian War ended in 480; and his last datable composition is Pythian 8, from 446. Pindar died at Argos at around eighty years of age, hence ca. 438. His great poetic talent is beyond question, and his style remains basically unchanged over the whole arc of his career: metrical and stylistic differences between Pythian 10, composed at age twenty, and the poems that followed, are detectable to an alert ear, but are outweighed by identical themes and motifs, and analogous compositional techniques.

But the new critical perspective stemming from the work of Lefkowitz had the effect of undermining the most traditional features of Pindar’s authorial personality, for it is one thing to express one’s own intimate convictions and another to express those of a patron. Less faith is now automatically placed in Pindar’s

2 The fragments of the Epinicia are numbered according to the system used in the edition of B. Snell, 4th ed. (Leipzig, 1964), revised by H. Maehler (Leipzig, 1971), abbreviated “Sn.-M.”
3 U. von Wilamowitz Moellendorff, Pindaros (Berlin, 1922), 128.
image as a proud and disdainful bard, a strenuous competitor of Simonides and Bacchylides, and an aristocratic upholder of inherited religious values; nor is it any longer taken for granted that he must have been present at all the festivals celebrated in his odes. He was certainly at Sicily, Athens, Argos, and Aegina, as well as at Delphi and Olympia and other important sites where games were held, but it is harder to accept that he also visited Cyrene (Pythian 4 and 5), Rhodes (Olympian 10), and Tenedos (Nemean 11).

Yet the assessment of the odes as rhetorical exercises in praise of patrons and as a means of earning a livelihood ought not to overshadow the assessment of their value as poetry, or their power to instruct and eternalize. Nor should the sincerity of the value system they embody, grounded in the order established by Zeus, the paradigm of sporting victory, and the exemplarity of heroic ideals, be seriously doubted.

The lives, the Suda, and P.Oxy. 2438, 35–39 attribute seventeen books of poems to Pindar, and although they differ in detail about the exact subdivision, it may reasonably be reconstructed as follows: one book of hymns, one book of paeans, two books of dithyrambs, two books of Prosodia (“processionals”), three books of Parthenia (“songs for maidens”), two books of Hyporchemata (“songs for light dances”), one book of encomia, one book of Threnoi (“laments”), and four books of Epinicia (“victory odes”)—the Olympians, the Pythians, the Isthmians, and the Nemeans. During the imperial age, likely under the Antonines, the four books of Epinicia became the standard edition for use in schools. From then on, and certainly during the age of Renaissance humanism, Pindar was the poet of the victory odes. A good deal of material from the other books survives in fragments preserved indirectly or on papyrus; these number more than 300, not counting dubious or definitely spurious ones. The victory odes number forty-six (fourteen Olympians, twelve Pythians, eleven Nemeans, and eight Isthmians, plus Isthmian 9, preserved in a single codex and normally placed among the fragments). The authenticity of Olympian 5 has been doubted since Antiquity, and the last three odes classed among the Nemeans are in fact two compositions celebrating a victory in a lesser competition and the entry into office of a magistrate, a prytanis. Within each festival category, the odes are placed in descending order by athletic specialty: first equestrianism (chariot races, horse races, mule races), then pankration, boxing, wrestling, hoplite racing, dolichos (“long race”), pentathlon, diaulos (“double-stadion race”), stadion, and finally musical contests.

Classical and Hellenistic Greek Literature

The fortune of Pindar in the Classical and Hellenistic periods may be traced from three types of testimony: direct quotation of the victory odes, or more often fragments of other odes, by literary authors; imitation, whether by the
comic poets in a parodic vein or by the great Alexandrian poets at a more refined level; and the corpus of Pindaric scholia from this period (the scholia vetera or ancient scholia), which testify indirectly to the philological labor lavished on the text of Pindar by erudites.

The oldest reference to Pindar occurs in the history of Herodotus (484–425 B.C.), who mentions fragment 169a Sn.-M.: “Well, then, that is how people think, and so it seems to me that Pindar was right when he said in his poetry that custom is king of all.” Other possible references to Pindar have been adduced (e.g. Herodotus IX 52 and Pind. P. IV 317) but remain dubious. A few Pindaric echoes have also been detected in the tragic poets, but literary elaboration is so pervasive there that it is almost impossible to decide one way or the other. The author most influenced by Pindar was probably Sophocles, as shown thematically by comparison of the motif of the vanity of human life (cf. Aj. 125–26 and Ph. 946–47 with P. VIII 136), and at the lexical level by the possible citation of the famous dithyramb in which Athens is called “bulwark of Greece” (fr. 76.3 Sn.-M.) in OC 58.

In contrast to this paucity, the comic poets of fifth-century Athens, particularly Aristophanes, supply illuminating testimony to the fortune of Pindar. We are told by Athenaeus (second and third centuries A.D.) that for Eupolis (ca. 446–411 B.C.) “Pindar’s poetry had been forgotten, on account of the neglect of the good” (I 3 = Eup. fr. 366 Kock). Several celebrated lines from Nubes (1357–58) would seem to confirm this, in which the young Pheidippides, challenging his father, maintains that Simonides (meaning, by metonymy, choral lyric in general) is an unimpressive and completely outdated poet. That Pindaric poetry was indeed perceived as antiquated and out of fashion is confirmed by several parodies in Aristophanes, who in Acharnenses (lines 637 and 639) and in Equites (line 1329) appears to make fun of Pindar’s dithyramb in praise of Athens (fr. 76.1 Sn.-M.), and who even imitates his manner elsewhere, whether referring explicitly to the model of a famous Prosodion (e.g. Eq. 1264–66 with fr. 89a Sn.-M.), or displaying his virtuosity in a highly comic pastiche (Av. 917–45). While such parodic displays by Aristophanes do confirm that Pindaric diction was regarded as antiquated and irredeemably outmoded, they also confirm that Pindar was a poet well known at Athens, and indeed would seem to validate the hypothesis

5 A. Bagordo suggests a direct imitation of Pindar by Aeschylus in “L’omaggio letterario di un Ateniese a un Tebano (Aesch. Sept. 774; Pind. Fr. [dith.] 75.3 ss. Sn.-M.),” in: R. Nicolai, ed., ΡΥΣΜΟΣ. Studi di poesia, metrica e musica greca offerti dagli allievi a Luigi Enrico Rossi per i suoi settant’anni (Rome, 2003), 205–9.
that his poems were actually studied in schools there. *Aves*, staged in 414 B.C., is the last Aristophanic comedy known to us to contain literal borrowings from, or comic allusions to, the poetry of Pindar, an indication that after that date there was very little interest in Pindaric poetry at Athens. From then on Aristophanes directed his parody at the style of the new dithyrambic poets, or the style of those tragedians who adopted the new Euripidean fashion, or even the archaic, highly wrought and scarcely comprehensible manner of Aeschylus.

Pindar appears rarely in Greek authors of the fourth century B.C. The only author who cites him repeatedly and sometimes even discusses a few sayings is Plato (ca. 428–348 B.C.). The most discussed passage is fr. 169a Sn.-M: in *Gorgias* (484b) Callicles takes up Pindar’s assertion that *nomos* governs all and adapts it to his anti-democratic and pro-aristocratic position. In *Protagoras* (337d) the Pindaric saying is cited for similar purposes by Hippias. In *Laws* (III 690 bc; IV 714e–715a; X 890 a) the speaker who discusses the saying is the Athenian Stranger: he interprets the Pindaric *nomos* to mean “law of nature,” to which all men must bow, and which warrants the dominion of stronger and wiser beings over those less so, both in nature and among mankind. In various other places, Plato preserves traces of Pindaric odes that are known to us only fragmentarily. For example, in *Meno* (81a–c) he quotes an ample extract from a Pindaric *threnos* in connection with the doctrine of metempsychosis (fr. 133 Sn.-M. = fr. 65 Cannatà Fera); and *The Republic* (I 330d–331a) is ornamented with a fervent eulogy of Hope (fr. 214 Sn.-M. = fr. 64 Cannatà Fera). The victory odes are drawn upon frequently: the *incipit* of the first *Olympian* turns up in *Euthydemus* (304 bc); line 2 of the first *Isthmian* is quoted in *Phaedrus*, an elegant literary reminiscence that embellishes the discourse; and in *The Republic* again (III 408b) there is a reference to the myth of Asclepius, who agreed to violate the laws of nature by undertaking to cure a dying man in exchange for gold (cf. P. III 96 ff.). In other fourth-century authors the citations of Pindar are few: in *Antidosis* (15, 166), Isocrates (436–338 B.C.) poses as Pindar’s rival, claiming that if the poet was considered worthy of proxeny and a reward of a thousand drachmas simply for having called Athens the bulwark of Hellas, then he himself ought to enjoy much higher regard from his fellow citizens (fr. 76.3 Sn.-M.). Aristotle mentions Pindar twice in the *Rhetoric*, repeating the *incipit* of the first *Olympian* (I.7, 1364a) and citing him expressly in relation to Pan (2.24.2, 1401a = fr. 96*, 2 Sn.-M.).

In the Hellenistic period, the work of Pindar aroused fresh interest, both literary and textual-philological. Callimachus (ca. 305–240 B.C.) was thoroughly acquainted with it: we learn from the ancient scholia that in his *Pinakes* he established a list of Pindar’s works, helping to constitute the corpus that was subsequently studied, and attempting to distinguish among the victory odes.7

---

As for the literary perspective, we find significant echos of Pindar. Callimachus confined himself exclusively to the elegiac distich in composing victory odes, although he possessed the technical capacity to compose lyric verse in the full Pindaric manner, probably because such verse would have amounted to no more than a sterile display of proficiency in the absence of music and dance. Pindaric reminiscences are however to be found in *Victoria Berenices*, the victory ode that opens book three of the *Aitia* (*Supplementum Hellenisticum* 254–286C), and in the victory ode for Sosibius (= fr. 384 Pf.). While both texts are composed in elegiac distichs and survive only in fragments, they reveal profound knowledge of the style, imagery, and language of Pindar. A probable imitation on the part of Theocritus of a place in the seventh Nemean has recently been identified, but we still lack a comprehensive and thorough recension of all the Pindaric reminiscences in that poet. Another author for whom Pindar is ever-present is Lycophon (second century B.C.), who in *Alessandra* (lines 554–62) not only echoes his stylistic obscurity, but closely imitates the episode of the duel between the Dioscuri and the sons of Aphaereus from Pindar’s Nemean 10 (lines 49–72).

But the Hellenistic age is important primarily because it was then that the text of Pindar first received scrupulous philological attention. Thanks to the corpus of ancient scholia edited by Drachmann, and the researches of Irigoin, we are able to form a clear idea of the work done by the great Alexandrian philologists, and the distinct profile of each. The first to work on Pindar was Zenodotus (ca. 325–260 B.C.), the director of the Library of Alexandria; he had the texts transcribed and saw to the uniformization of their orthography, for the manuscripts that transmitted the text had been copied in different regions of Greece. Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 230–180 B.C.), successor of Eratosthenes as director of the Library and Museum and a distinguished editor of the classical poets, was responsible for the subdivision of the works of Pindar, classifying them into seventeen books in obedience to criteria that have been followed with few exceptions by all editors of the text of Pindar down to very recent times. The other great merit of Aristophanes of Byzantium is to have established the metrical scheme of every ode, what would later be called the colometry of Pindar. The following may be considered the fundamentals of the colometry of Aristophanes of Byzantium: every colon contains from one to three rhythmic elements; the end of the colon frequently coincides with a word ending. His edition of Pindar included the text and brief indications to the reader (diacritic signs, colometric markers, a few variant readings), but no commentary, and laid a solid foundation for subsequent Pindar scholarship. Aristarchus of Samothrace (ca. 216–144 B.C.),

---


the great Homeric textual scholar, wrote an ample commentary on Pindar that must have had wide influence, since his name appears in the scholia more than seventy times. It is likely that the commentary of Aristarchus covered the entire output of Pindar; a few bits of it survive for the Dithyrambs and Paeans, and there are many fragments deriving from the Epinicia. The goal of Aristarchus was to clarify the meaning of the text, which he explained by adducing other passages from the same poet. But though this approach may have worked with Homer, it was less well suited to Pindar, an adequate account of whose mythological, historical, and geographical references would have required wider research drawing upon external sources. Notwithstanding these defects, the importance of the commentary of Aristarchus was recognized by his contemporaries and by posterity, and it constituted the foundation of the Pindar commentary of Didymus a century and a half later.

Latin Literature

In light of the objective greatness of the poet and the fame he achieved in the Alexandrian age, Pindar's fortune in the Roman world may be qualified as disappointing. Reliable evidence of direct acquaintance with his work is scant, his lines are seldom cited, and direct mention of either his name or his works is meager. Nonetheless, a few of these testimonials had decisive importance for Pindar's fortune in the age of humanism and the Renaissance, laying the basis for the judgment of posterity. The first Latin author to cite Pindar expressly is Marcus Tullius Cicero (106–43 B.C.): in Orator 4 Pindar is included in a short list of major Greek poets, along with Homer, Archilochus, and Sophocles. In De finibus 2.115 he again appears on a list, again accompanied by Homer and Archilochus, here for the purpose of contrasting poetry and the figurative arts, exemplified by Phidias, Polyclitus, and Zeuxis. The only direct citation appears, however, in a letter to Atticus (13.38.2), in which Cicero quotes what is now fr. 213 Sn.-M. At a later point in Orator (183) Cicero delivers an assessment of the enjoyment of Greek lyric poetry as a whole that will resonate in the later European fortune of Pindar: stripped of their musical accompaniment, the songs of the Greek lyric poets take on an appearance much like that of prose.

In the Augustan age fame did not desert Pindar entirely, and if we can believe the testimony we have, he was even the object of an attempt at imitation. In the Epistulae ex Ponto (4.16.27–28), Ovid (43 B.C.–17 A.D.) mentions a certain Rufus, whom he calls the only one to have sounded the lyre of Pindar (“et una / Pindaricae fidicen tu quoque, Rufe, lyrae”). Horace (65–8 B.C.) for his part recalls the poet Titius in Epistulae 1.3.9–14 as one who drank at the fountain of Pindar, attempting to render Pindaric meters into Latin (“fidibusne Latinis / Thebanos aptare modos studet auspice Musa”). That these attempts were unsuccessful we
may deduce from the failure to survive not only of any portion of the works of these authors, but even of any biographical information concerning them.

To Horace we owe the most famous assessment of Pindar’s inimitability, a judgment so celebrated that it is worth quoting in full, in prose translation: “Whoever strives, Iulus, to rival Pindar, relies on wings fastened with wax by Daedalean craft, and is doomed to give his name to some crystal sea. Like a river from the mountain rushing down, which the rains have swollen above its customary banks, so does Pindar seethe and, brooking no restraint, rush on with deep-toned voice, worthy to be honored with Apollo’s bays, whether he rolls new words through daring dithyrambs and is borne along in measures freed from rule, or sings of gods and kings, the progeny of gods, at whose hands the Centaurs fell in death deserved, and by whom was quenched the fire of dread Chimaera; or when he sings of those whom the Elean palm leads home exalted to the skies, of boxer, or of steed, and endows them with a tribute more glorious than a hundred statues; or laments the young hero snatched from his tearful bride, and to the stars extols his prowess, his courage, and his golden virtue, begrudging them to gloomy Orcus. A mighty breeze uplifts the Dircaean swan, Antonius, as often as he essays a flight to the lofty regions of the clouds.”

Although these lines are often cited to show that Pindar is beyond imitation (those who rashly make the attempt will meet the fate of Icarus), they supply other important observations too: Pindar’s style has the impetuosity of a river overflowing its banks (lines 5–8: “monte decurrens velut amnis . . . fervet immensusque ruit profundo / Pindarus ore”). It is audacious by reason of his innovations in vocabulary and rhythm, to the point that his poetry appears almost unregulated by meter (lines 10–12: “seu per audaces nova dithyrambos / verba devolvit numerisque fertur / lege solutis”). Moreover, the themes addressed by Pindar are not limited to the Epinicia, but extend to the deeds of the gods and heroes; his poems are even capable of rescuing those they laud from the darkness of death. Horace mentions Pindar again, in Ode 4.9 to Lollius, as an example of the immortality of poetic song (lines 5–6). The only other poet of the Augustan age to mention Pindar is Propertius (47–14 B.C.): in Elegies 3.17.36–37 he compares his own poetic afflatus in the celebration of Bacchus to that of Pindar: “Haec ego non humili referam memoranda cothurno / qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat.”

The other renowned appreciation of Pindar, destined for a fortune equal if not superior to that of Horace, comes from Quintilian (ca. 35–40?–96 A.D.). Again it is worth quoting in its entirety (Inst. Or. 10.1.61): “Of the nine lyric poets,
Pindar is by far the greatest, for inspiration, magnificence, sententiae, figures, a rich stock of ideas and words, and a real flood of eloquence; Horace rightly thinks him inimitable for these reasons.  

12 This assessment took on a life of its own, the initial expression lyricorum longe . . . princeps appearing with slight variations on the titlepages of many sixteenth-century editions of Pindar. The other silver-age poet who appears to have been struck, if not awe-struck, by the Pindaric style is Statius (40–96), who mentions him three times in the Silvae. In 1.3.101 Pindar’s lyric is a generic example of poetic excellence. In 4.7.5–8 Pindar is invoked immediately after the Muse Erato as an inspiring model in stirring and solemn tones: “And thou, Pindar, ruler of the lyric choir, grant me awhile the privilege of unwonted song, if I have hallowed thy own Thebes in Latin strains.”

13 In Silvae 5.3.146 ff. Pindar is mentioned among the authors taught to Statius by his father, as an example of the difficulty of his metrical style.

Pindar turns up in a few famous anecdotes from Antiquity: his death in the lap of a beloved youth in Valerius Maximus (9.12.7), and the equally celebrated episode of Alexander the Great sparing the poet’s dwelling, alone among the houses of Thebes, during the destruction of the city, in Pliny the Elder (NH 7.109.2). A literary querelle proposed by the philosopher Favorinus is not without interest: reported by Aulus Gellius (125–66) and picked up by Macrobius (sixth century), it sets Pindar against Vergil in describing the eruption of a volcano. Both Gellius (NA 17.10) and Macrobius (Sat. 5.17) supply rich detail in expounding the question and reporting the opinions of Favorinus, who awards poetic victory to Pindar’s lines from Pythian 1.21 ff. over Vergil’s description in the third book of the Aeneid (lines 570 ff.).

The only Christian Latin author drawn to Pindar as a possible literary model was Prudentius (348–413), who was labelled the “Latin Pindar” because he employed many different meters in his poetic works, and because of his insistence on the “athletic” aspect of the Christian faith, the saints and martyrs of which are frequently compared to winning athletes.  

14 Pindar is also memorialized elsewhere for his disapproval of the auri sacra fames of Asclepius, who had supposedly brought a mortal back to life when bribed with money to do so. This moralizing motif, which appears in two works of Tertullian (155–230), the Apologeticum (14) and Ad nationes (2.14), and in the Ad nationes (4.24) of Arnobius (255–327), provided fodder for many prefaces to commentaries on, and editions of, Pindar in the Renaissance. But the author who did most to define the literary stature of Pindar in relation to Hebrew and Christian models was Jerome


In a noble attempt to find classical influence, or at any rate classical correlatives, for several Hebrew literary forms in the Bible, he hazarded a comparison between Pindar and the psalmist David (Epist. 53.8), and between the Psalms and the Pindaric Odes (Praefatio in Eusebii Caesarensis chronicon, 3; Prologus in libro Iob de Hebraeo translato). This comparison roused wide debate among Renaissance men of letters and theologians: the linkage was adduced by Zwingli without mentioning Jerome, and harshly censured by Melancthon, who attributed it, with some alteration, to the blameless Poliziano or the Venetian humanist Lazzaro Bonamico, on no apparent grounds (see below I.12).

**Greek Literature of the Roman and Byzantine Empires**

During the imperial and Byzantine age, Pindar was a much-read and widely cited author, but apart from a few sporadic echoes, one sparsely imitated. Even fewer poets claimed to have taken direct inspiration from him, the sole exception being Nonnus of Panopolis. The most interesting aspect of this period, as we shall see, is the notable quantity of editions and commentaries on Pindar: enough detail from them survived, embedded in the corpus of scholia, to make it possible to reconstruct Pindaric exegesis from the imperial age right down to the end of the Byzantine period.

In defense of his assumption that in poetry, greatness marred by some defect is preferable to sterile perfection, the anonymous author (“Longinus”) of On the Sublime (first–second centuries A.D.?) adduces comparisons among a number of poets, counterpointing Bacchylides to Pindar. Of Pindar, the writer says that “On the other hand, Pindar and Sophocles sometimes seem to fire the whole landscape as they sweep across it, while often their fire is unaccountably quenched, and they fall miserably flat.”15 The same writer’s brief description of the eruption of Etna (35.4–5) has been interpreted as an habile echo of Pindar’s lines in Pythian 1. Plutarch may certainly be counted among the Greek authors of the imperial age who read, loved, and quoted Pindar. The presence of Pindaric echoes in his works, which range from direct citation to a more refined assimilation of content, are especially precious since they allow us to recuperate fragments of works not otherwise transmitted, and in some cases to restore their exact context.16 Pindaric echoes and reminiscences have also been detected


by scholars in Lucian (120–80), who is said to have derived the inspiration for his own literary aesthetic from Pindar; in Aelius Aristides (117–80), who may have reprised several lines in the hymn to Serapis (Or. XLV); and in the poet Tryphiodorus (fourth century). A recent study has drawn attention to Pindaric borrowings in the Life of Apollonius of Tyana by Lucius Flavius Philostratus (172–247); although not of help in reconstructing the lacunose text of Pindar’s eighth Paean, they do show imitation of a wide and varied kind, carried out with verve and a certain creativity.  

As mentioned, the poet upon whom Pindar makes his influence felt most strongly, in terms both of poetics and identifiable borrowings, is Nonnus of Panopolis, in whose Dionysiaca Pindar is invoked right in the proem as the tutelary numen of his poetry, defined more pindarico as ποικίλος ὕμνος (d. 1.15). The Bacchic epic appears to derive an authorization of sorts from the model of the great lyric author, who is explicitly referred to in the second proem of the Dionysiaca, at the beginning of canto 25, lines 11–21.  

The imperial and Byzantine age is also, or primarily, the period of the great philological and exegetical studies of the text of Pindar, transmitted to us in the scholia recentia (as opposed to the scholia vetera of the Alexandrian period). Thanks to the studies of Jean Irigoin, and subsequent contributions, it is possible to have a sufficiently precise idea of these labors, and to recover, if only in outline, their physiognomy. To the Augustan age belongs the commentary which Didymus (first century B.C.–first century A.D.) devoted to the four books of Epinicia: from what the scholia transmit, it appears to have been a solid work characterized by great erudition. Before giving his own explanation of the text, Didymus cites and discusses those of his predecessors; often his own explanation is original. The characteristic that most clearly sets his commentary apart from those of his predecessors, in particular those of the Alexandrian age, is his constant recourse to historical sources. The commentary of Didymus, whether in unabridged form, or in the form of summaries and brief epitomes, remained the standard for much of the late-antique and Byzantine epoch.  

The three leading Byzantine scholars who undertook editions or commentaries on Pindar belong to the period from the second half of the thirteenth century to the beginning of the fourteenth: Thomas Magister (ca. 1265–1325), Manuel Moschopoulos (ca. 1265–1316), and Demetrius Triclinius (ca. 1280–1340).


Thomas Magister, active at Thessalonica and an exponent of that school, prepared an edition of Pindar with commentary that certainly extended to *Pythian* 4, after which his notes, probably on account of an accident of transmission, break off. His exegetical and critical labors were based on a fairly simple criterion: the use of a master manuscript, from the text of which he departed only reluctantly, when problems of sense made it imperative to do so. Thomas Magister’s notes are of three kinds: stylistic and grammatical, in which he dwells on the exegesis of particularly complex terms and on the *ordo verborum*; a running paraphrase that sticks closely to the text, giving a synonym right after Pindar’s word, often preceded by a καὶ, and adding a freer paraphrase to the literal paraphrase in particularly difficult cases that elucidates the sense; and an apparatus of mythological, historical, and geographical notes in which he sought to reconstruct the myths to which Pindar often alludes. His edition, reproduced in twenty or so manuscripts, represents a solid, albeit unoriginal, piece of erudition, but the metrical aspect, to which several exegetical notes are devoted, is never utilized to emend the text or suggest improvements.

Manuel Moschopoulos, a student of Maximus Planudes (1260–1330), undertook an edition with commentary of the *Olympian* odes exclusively, regarding them as sufficiently representative of Pindar’s style. His edition bears no introduction, and is characterized by a systematically applied knowledge of metrics to the constitution of the text, without excessive concern for idiosyncrasy of dialect. The commentary that accompanied the Moschopoulos edition was of a particular kind: instead of a sequence of single explanations, it offered an integral and continuous paraphrase, with brief, linguistic, historical, and mythological explications inserted at intervals. While the Moschopoulos edition may appear, to a reader accustomed to modern commentaries, quite inadequate to understanding and elucidating most aspects of the Pindaric text, in the Byzantine age it had great success and was copied in over sixty manuscripts. The reasons for this diffusion are evident: the work is brief, being limited to the *Olympians*, and the paraphrase is clear and helpful for the immediate comprehension of the odes. As well, the short exegetical and grammatical notes, which could be memorized *inter legendum*, were particularly well executed. Even Theodorus Gaza, the first to translate into Latin and explain the *Olympians*, used a Moschopolean manuscript as his direct model.

A student of Thomas Magister, and probably his successor in the school of Thessalonica, Demetrius Triclinius prepared two different Pindar editions. The first contained the *Epinicia* and was not widely diffused, while the second, narrowed to the *Olympians* only, is reproduced in around twenty manuscripts. Close study of the *scholia recentia* shows that Demetrius Triclinius did not simply recycle his edition of the *Olympians* from the earlier one. The second Triclinius edition opens with the life of Pindar composed by Thomas Magister and
another life in verse, and contains other supplementary material to give readers an idea of Pindar and the nine lyric poets. Each book bore a title, and each ode bore a titular formula indicating the name of the victor, his city, and the sport in which he had achieved victory. From the philological point of view, the text established by Triclinius is notable for two fundamental innovations: the use of a number of manuscripts (in this respect he was a pioneer), and a colometry based on the meters. For his commentary Triclinius draws heavily on the preceding scholiographic tradition, but he often makes original contributions, and frequently adduces parallel passages from other authors, Homer in particular. These features give the philological labor of Demetrius Triclinius a very modern aspect: he is the first to utilize a range of witnesses in establishing the text, and the first to propose emendations *metri causa* convincingly and systematically. On this account, the work of Triclinius has been seen as the *trait d’union* linking the principles inherited from the Alexandrian philologists to the philology that would arise in the West beginning in the fifteenth century.

The Latin West

The Western Middle Ages were unacquainted with the *Epinicia*, though a different Pindarus Thebanus was known, and the *Ilias latina* attributed to him was read. But on the basis of the Latin sources Western Europeans did know of a Pindar numbered among the Greek lyric poets. Dante does not mention him, but in *Buc. carm. 10*.98–100 Petrarca refers to his death *pueri in gremio*, information relayed by Valerius Maximus, a well-known author (see Latin Literature above). Petrarca also mentions Pindar among the love poets in *Triumphus Cupidinis* 4.17 (“Alceo conobbi, a dir d’Amor si scorto, / Pindaro, Anacreonte. . .”), though Horace at *Carm. 4*.9.5–13, cites these three as lyric poets rather than love poets. Finally, a reference to Pindar and Horace has been detected in *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* (or *Canzoniere*) 247, line 11: “et l’una et l’altra lira.”

As with many other Greek authors, Europe’s acquaintance with Pindar commenced in the early decades of the fifteenth century, when a handful of Italian humanists travelled to Byzantium for the purpose of gaining adequate instruction in Greek. At the same time, masters from Byzantium were making the journey to Italy. As early as 1417–18, Guarino of Verona requested the aid of Georgius Trapezuntius in deciphering Pindar’s meters. Two Pindar manuscripts figure in

---

19 This epitome is in fact the work of a certain Publius Baebius Italicus: see M. Scaffai, *Baebii Italici Ilias Latina* (Bologna, 1982).
the inventories of Giovanni Aurispa. Francesco Filelfo possessed at least one Pindar codex before the 1430s, and two Pindar manuscripts (today Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Conv. Soppr. 94 and Conv. Soppr. 8) were held in the library of Antonio Corbinelli, a student of Manuel Chrysoloras; nor were these the only Pindar manuscripts present in the Medici libraries. But the presence of copies, in the case of an author not easily approachable, will not always have entailed comprehension of the text.

Pindar really only returned to the West with the lectures given by Theodorus Gaza on the *Olympians*, delivered at Ferrara between 1446 and 1449, of which we possess the *recollectae* (see I.1 and I.a). Despite their historical and cultural importance, Gaza’s Ferrarese lectures appear not to have had significant influence on contemporary men of letters: the Quattrocento was not destined to be an *aetas Pindarica*.

Pier Candido Decembrio (1392–1477), probably basing himself on an indirect tradition, was able to insert two very short translations from Pindar in his collection *Epigrammata et epistole metrice . . . ad illustrem Inichum Davalum magnum camerarium* (Milan, Biblioteca Trivulziana, Triv. 793, probably to be dated to his Neapolitan period, 1456–59). The first does not correspond to any of the fragments now attributed to Pindar; while the second (designated fr. 213 Sn.-M.) may derive from a combination of Plato’s *Republic* 2.8, 365 B with Cicero’s *Ad Att.* 13.38. Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481) cites lines 5–13 of *Ol.* 12, translating them into Sapphic hendecasyllables, in his oration for Iacopo Antonio Marcello, dated 1461.

As the decades advanced, Pindar was read more frequently: Andronicus Callistus delivered a course on Pindar at Bologna between 1463 and 1466, and at Florence in the early 1470s, where his students included Angelo Poliziano and Bartolomeo Fonzio. Manuscript Magl. VII. 1025 of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence preserves the version of *Ol.* 1 written by Fonzio, probably on the basis of a translation by Andronicus Callistus (see I.2).

But the authority of Horace and Quintilian was enough to ensure the spread of Pindar’s fame even among humanists who were not Graecists. In the proem to

---

23 For relevant bibliography, see F. Tissoni, *Le Olimpiche di Pindaro nella scuola di Gaza a Ferrara* (Messina, 2009), 23–24.
24 Fol. 4r: “Ex Pindaro monosticon / Et bona custodit deus in nos et mala semper.”
25 Here is Decembrio’s text on fol. 5v: “Ex Pindaro tristicon / Ardua iusticiae transcendam moenia pravae / Nequiciaeve prius superem undique vitam / Fortibus insidiis statuam separe latendo?”
his commentary on the *Divine Comedy*, Cristoforo Landino asserted the inimitability of Pindar on Horace's authority, and with Quintilian declared him the prince of lyric poets, emphasizing as well his skill in forming compound words.\(^{27}\)

Poliziano did not devote a specific study to Pindar, but he did insert a long digression about the life, works, and fortune of the Theban poet in his commentary on Statius, *Sylv. 4.7*, assembling and citing for the first time many of the sources known to us.\(^{28}\) In his *Nutricia* (lines 558–84) Poliziano evokes Pindar as the immortal poet, able to soar above the clouds and endow men of virtue with glory, and recalls the highlights of his biography.

Manuscript 5303 of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek of Vienna (fols. 423v–424r) preserves the Latin translation by Jacopo Sannazaro of *Ol. 1.1–23*. Carlo Vecce dates it to the period 1495–1501.\(^{29}\) Sannazaro first translates literally, respecting the cola of the original; there follows a version in *scriptio continua*, with oblique strokes that isolate portions of the text of varying length. According to Vecce, this must be an attempt to make a verse translation, or at any rate to render Pindar's text in *prosa numerosa*. Sannazaro would have been able to read Pindar in a codex of the Aragonese royal library, formerly in the possession of Antonello de Petruciis, the modern Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, gr. 2465. That Pindar was a classroom text at Naples in the last years of the Quattrocento emerges from the dialogue *Antonius* (Naples, 1491) by Giovanni Pontano, which contains an ironic reference to a young student declaiming the opening lines of *Ol. 1*.

It is well known that the earliest printed editions of Pindar were the *Aldina* of Aldus Manutius, appearing at Venice in 1513, and the *Romana* (Rome, 1515); both texts were widely read and used throughout the sixteenth century and were an essential resource for all subsequent editors, translators, and commentators. The *Romana* not only presented a very different Greek text, it was the first to publish the Greek scholia in their entirety. Those participating in this scholarly publishing enterprise were Zacharias Callierges, a philologist and printer from Crete, and Benedetto Lampridio (Benedictus Lampridius), a refined connoisseur of Greek meters and a Neo-Latin poet.\(^{30}\) This first flowering of scholarship led to the rise, in Italy, of a precocious and ephemeral literary Pindarism in Latin, with

---

the “metropindaric” Odes of Benedetto Lampridio, published posthumously in 1550.31

The importance for the study and imitation of Greek tragedy of the Florentine literary circle that met in the Orti Oricellari in the early decades of the sixteenth century is well known. While a similar interest in Pindar is not on record, one of the participants, Luigi Alamanni, was the first to imitate the Pindaric odes in Italian: his Inni were published at Lyons in 1533 with a dedication to the king, François I.

Turning to the study of the Epinicia in the universities, we may note that at Milan, where Chalcondyles had taught Greek, Stefano Negri (Stephanus Niger) delivered a course on Pindar (probably on the Olympians only) from 1516 to 1520, from which there remains an erudite inaugural oration and the initial gloss (Milan 1521; see I.b). At Padua the audience for the courses on Pindar given by Marco Musuro (Marcus Musurus) and then Lazzaro Buonamico and Lampridio included foreign students (like Johannes Cuno, on whom see I.3, Michel de L’Hospital, and others), who helped to spread knowledge of Pindar in Europe.

During the 1520s the reading of Pindar’s Epinicia in the original Greek, most likely in a copy of the Aldine edition, made a deep impression on the Swiss religious reformer Huldrich Zwingli, who appears to have taken part personally in the preparation of the third printed edition of the Greek text of the Epinicia, which appeared from the presses of Andreas Cratander at Basel in 1526, the scholar-editor in charge being Jacobus Ceporinus (see I.c). While the Greek text of the Basel edition does not stand out for any special qualities (reproducing the Aldine text with occasional corrections by Ceporinus), the fortune and the cultural importance of this publication were guaranteed by two pieces of front and back matter signed by Zwingli: a preface in which, after sketching a very flattering portrait of the person of Pindar, Zwingli heartily recommends the reading of the Epinicia for the useful moral teachings they contain, and for their profound erudition; and a postface in which the reformer, without mentioning Jerome (see “Latin Literature”), likens Pindar’s Epinicia expressly to the Psalms, giving examples of how obscure passages from the Bible text could be clarified by comparing them to Pindar’s Odes.32

Therefore, given the commitment demonstrated by Zwingli, it may safely be assumed that in the newly founded Collegium Trilingue, where a select group of young men, future exgetes of Holy Scripture, were taught Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, the reading of Pindar occupied an important place. Zwingli’s comparison was called into question a few years later by another celebrated reformer and translator of Pindar, Philip Melancthon (see I.12), but that did not prevent it

32 See ibid., at 153–69.
from influencing, for better or worse, the fortune and the misfortune of Pindar throughout the first half of the sixteenth century.

Just one year after the Zwingli edition, Menradus Moltherus inaugurated the high season of Latin translations of Pindar (Hagenau, 1527; see I.4) with his version of the first two *Olympians* (the first literal, respecting the cola, the second in the form of Sapphics). The year after that, Johannes Soter added to the second edition of his *Epigrammata Graeca veterum elegantissima* (Cologne, 1528) a Latin translation with facing Greek text of *Ol. 1*, based on the Zwingli edition (see I.5).

The year 1528 also witnessed the first complete Latin version, in prose, of Pindar's *Epinicia* by Joannes Lonicerus (Basel, 1528; see I.6a). Motivated, we may assume, by Zwingli's stance, aware of the market potential of the student population, and certainly not deaf to the urgings of the printer Andreas Cratander, Johannes Lonicerus succeeded in completing the work in the space of just two years. Though the translation no doubt received a warm welcome, Lonicerus remained unsatisfied with his initial result, both because the translation still fell short of his standards, and because he soon saw the need to supplement the Latin version with a commentary to explain the many obscurities of the text and guide the reader. In 1535, again from Cratander's press, there appeared the second edition of his translation (see I.6b): the bulk of the volume had more than tripled. The translation was now arranged in brief pericopes, each a complete unit of sense, followed immediately by the explanatory notes. But the novelty of the volume lies in more than just the additional material: the translation has been radically modified, to the point that the earlier version is scarcely recognizable: this is virtually a *retractatio*. This new edition with commentary enjoyed great success, and despite the absence of a facing text in Greek, it remained the text of reference until the edition of Henricus Stephanus (1560). That this was a successful publishing venture is confirmed by reprints of the 1535 edition, and by the wide circulation of this Latin translation and commentary in Catholic countries—though in some cases Lonicerus went uncredited, for it was the practice to remove the names of Protestant heretics from as many books as possible.

Pindar became a school text in Protestant countries, as evidenced by the anthology with Latin translation by Michael Neander (Basel, 1556; see I.10), a pupil of Melancthon. Vestiges of Melancthon’s own Pindar courses survive in notes preserved in Cod. philol. 166 from Hamburg, Staats-und Universitätsbibliothek taken during a course delivered in 1553 (see I.12a), and the edition published by his son-in-law Caspar Peucerus (Basel, 1558; see I.12b), who states that he is publishing the text of Melancthon’s lectures. Melancthon’s prose translation is not literal, but it does render the meaning of the text with elegance. In various writings, Melancthon and his students refuted the comparison of *Odes* to the *Psalms*, though without mentioning either Zwingli or Jerome; instead they
attributed the linkage to Poliziano or Lazzaro Buonamico, adding that these Italian scholars had had the temerity to prefer Pindar. In any case the prefaces to all these editions stress the morality of the Epinicia, with their constant exaltation of virtue and thus their formative value in the education of youth.

In the second half of the sixteenth century, the approach gradually becomes less moralizing while retaining the didactic emphasis, and more attentive to the literary aspect: commentaries with some textual and metrical discussion become more common. The highly successful translation of Henricus Stephanus (Geneva, 1560, with eight further editions down to 1626, as well as one by his son Paulus in 1599; see I.14) was dedicated to Melancthon and explicitly aimed at schoolboys learning Greek, hence its literal character. In contrast, the translation of Sudorius (single editions and a final complete one, all published at Paris in the period 1575–82) is exceptional in many respects: remote from the schoolroom, it is aimed at cultivated members of the royal administration, and even the king himself, Henri III. It foregrounds the literary aspect of the poems, rendering them in Horatian styles, and is the first complete translation published in a non-Protestant country (see I.16). Yet there is evidence that Pindar had been read in France for many decades: Michel de L’Hospital had attended Lazzaro Buonamico’s and Benedetto Lampridio’s lectures in Padua, while Jean Salmon Macrin testified in 1528 to the excellence of the courses on Pindar given by Jacques Tou-san, and was himself the leading imitator of Pindar by then. The edition of the Greek text of the Olympians and the Pythians by Christien Wechel (Paris, 1535) is further proof of the presence of Pindar in the schools. The lectures given by René Guillon (1553) are preserved in the notes made by students in two annotated copies of this Parisian edition.33

The most significant episodes for the reception of Pindar in the 1580s are the commentary by Franciscus Portus ([Geneva], 1583, see I.g), and above all the Commentarius absolutissimus of Benedictus Aretius ([Geneva], 1587; posthumous), with its erudite and monumental accessus (see I.h).

The century closes with the translation of Aemilius Portus (Heidelberg, 1598; see I.17), and the edition of Paulus Stephanus ([Geneva], 1599), who had an eminent collaborator in the person of Isaac Casaubon. They reprint the translation of Henricus Stephanus, the scholia vetera (revised on the basis of the edition of Frankfurt, 1542), and the scholia of Triclinius on the Olympians (see I.14b).

Another important aspect of the fortune of Pindar throughout the sixteenth century is his utilization on the part of compilers of sententiae and proverbial maxims, from Erasmus to Selneccerus (1568; see I.15) and Chytraeus (1596; see I.i); while in Neander’s Aristologia pindarica the maxims are often isolated

33 On the reception of Pindar in France in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, see J.-E. Girot, Pindare avant Ronsard. De l’émergence du grec à la publication des Quatre Premiers livres des Odes de Ronsard (Geneva, 2002).
from their context and treated independently. The importance of the moral *sententiae* in Pindar has for that matter been emphasized by many of his readers both ancient and modern; indeed, in sixteenth-century editions and translations attention is often drawn to the *sententiae* by quotation marks or other typographical signs in the margin, both in Greek and in Latin.

Thanks to the work of Zwingli and Melancthon, Pindar became the Greek author most cherished by Protestants—which might be the reason that in Italy the Greek text of Pindar was never printed in the sixteenth century after 1515. The only exception is the reprinting of the less dangerous Sudorius edition of 1582, though even it was given false typographical indications (see I.16). But the presence of substantial numbers of transalpine editions in all the libraries of Italy tells us that they must have circulated in the peninsula. In only two cases do we find single odes published in other works: *Pythian* 3, translated into hexameters by Jacobus Laureus, is printed at the end of his Latin translation of Aelian’s *De vera historia* (Venice, 1550; see I.8), and *Olympian* 1 appears in the treatise *De poeta* of Minturno (Venice, 1559; see I.13). This does not prove, however, that in sixteenth-century Italy Pindar was not read and translated; but the translations remained in manuscript and are frequently anonymous: see the entries dedicated tentatively to Faustus Sabaenus (*Ol*. 1–4 and 6; see I.7), to Petrus Angelius Bargaeus (all the *Epinicia*; see I.11) and the translation of the *Olympians*, this one signed, by Johannes Alexander Rondinelli (see I.9).

**Postillati (Annotated copies)**

Pindar’s fortune is attested as well by numerous print copies with handwritten, often anonymous, annotations. No blanket research has been carried out on this; for one thing, traditional catalogues and bibliographies often do not mention this feature of the copies they describe. Some examples may nevertheless be given: two copies of Chrestien Wechel’s edition (Paris, 1535), held in the Bibliothèque Municipale of Amiens, BL 1076 A, and in the Bodleian Library of Oxford, Antiq. f F 1535/2, contain notes from the course given by René Guillou in 1553. 34 A copy of the Lonicerus edition (1535) at the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid (R-642) contains notes by Quevedo; at the Universitätsbibliothek of Bern (formerly the Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek), a copy of the Brubach edition (Frankfurt, 1542) contains notes by Petrus Saurinus (Kristeller, *Iter* 5.97b); a copy of the Morelius edition (Paris, 1558) now held at London, British Library, 834 G. 29 (1–2), was annotated by Isaac Casaubon (Kristeller, *Iter* 4.205a); and Kristeller, *Iter* 4.378a, records the presence of a Pindar with notes by Joseph Scaliger at the Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit of Leiden.

---

Editions in Greek

In the wake of the first two Italian editions—the Aldina of Venice, 1513 and the Romana of 1515, complete with scholia—and the third from Ceporinus-Zwingli (Basel, 1526), the first half of the Cinquecento also yielded Chrestien Wechel’s imprint of the Olympians and Pythians (Paris, 1535), and the important imprint by Petrus Brubacchius of all the odes and the Greek scholia (Frankfurt, 1542). Complete editions of the Greek text alone in the second half of the century, following the second Zwingli edition (Basel, 1556), are mostly from France: Paris, apud Guilielmum Morelium, 1558; Paris, apud Ioannem Benenatum, 1567; Paris, e Typographia Steph. Prevostelau, 1586. There is also the only non-French imprint (of the text of Henricus Stephanus) from Leiden, ex officina Plantiniana, 1590. But as the individual entries above show, there are many editions in which the Greek text is presented with a facing translation.

The first complete translation into a modern European language is the French rendering by François Marin (Paris, 1617), followed nine years later, still in France, by that of the Sieur de Lagausie (Paris, 1626), in verse and prose. The first complete Italian translation of Pindar was also printed in the first half of the seventeenth century: in 1631 Alessandro Adimari translated all of Pindar into Italian, both in a paraphrase that aimed to give the sense of the original, and in “rima Toscana.” They were contained in a volume of considerable size, executed with care at the press of Francesco Tanagli, a Pisan printer; the apparatus included a list of the maxims and aphorisms, and an interesting rhetorical analysis of the Epinicia borrowed from that of Erasmus Schmid (1616).

After 1600

The beginning of the seventeenth century marks a significant turning point in the history of the Pindaric text. In 1616, at Wittenberg, the German mathematician and philologist Erasmus Schmid (1570–1637) brought out his second edition of the complete Pindar (the first dates from 1611). It may be regarded as the first truly modern edition: the Greek text, enhanced with over 600 emendations and established on the basis of a range of manuscripts, of which a classification is attempted, rivals that of the Roman edition of Callierges in importance, and earned admiration from Wilamowitz. The commentary, based on the ancient scholia, shows critical acumen and notable experience. Every ode is supplied with a schematic partition of the arguments, employing the rules and instruments of the art of rhetoric, almost as though they were epideictic speeches. A further important aspect of this edition is that it presents the first organized assemblage of the fragments of Pindar, surpassing and replacing the one prepared by Henricus Stephanus for the edition of 1560, and reprinted subsequently.
in various editions. Schmid’s preface ad lectorem expresses thanks to David Hoschel (1566–1617) for having sifted through the ancient authors in order to extract fragments of Pindar one by one, and checking for eventual discrepancies from the collection of fragments published by Paulus Stephanus. In 1620, at Saumur in France, the Pindar edition of Johannes Benedictus emerged from the press of Pierre Pié de Dieu. The text is Schmid’s, but the Latin paraphrase and the quality of the commentary made this oft-republished edition an important instrument for the study and diffusion of Pindar in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The period spanning the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries saw the appearance of the three editions of Pindar by Christian Gottlob Heyne (Göttingen, 1773, 1798, 1817, published posthumously by Gh. Schafer), attended by that of Beck (Leipzig, 1792–95).

A new epoch for the text of Pindar was inaugurated by the great edition of August Boeckh (Leipzig, 1811–21), the first to interpret the Pindaric ode as a historical document. The edition was divided into three parts: the first (1811) contained the text, the metrical appendices and the critical notes; the second (1819) contained the scholia; part three (1821) consisted of the Latin translation, the exegetical notes, and an annotated edition of the fragments. Ludolf Dissen, who had written the commentary on the Nemean and the Isthmian for the Boeckh edition, reprinted the Boeckh text accompanied by a complete and imposing commentary (Gotha, 1830). We may also signal the editions of Theodor Bergk (Poetae lyrici Graeci, Leipzig, 1843, 1853, 1866, 1878), which is distinguished by the quality of the emendations; that of Johann Adam Hartung, with a verse translation in German (Leipzig, 1855–56); and that of Tycho Mommsen, who assembled and made available in his phenomenal critical apparatus all the obtainable material on Pindar (Berlin, 1864): an effort that makes this edition extremely useful to scholars even today. The last years of the nineteenth century were notable for the amount of exegetical labor expended on Pindar. In Germany the Teubner edition of Wilhelm Christ was published at Leipzig (1869; reprinted 1896), as was the commentary of Friedrich Mezger (1880). In the English-speaking world, Charles Augustus Maude Fennell published the Greek text with English translation in two volumes (vol. 1, Cambridge, 1879, 2nd ed., 1893; vol. 2, Cambridge, 1883, 2nd ed., 1899), while Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, an American and the first professor of Greek at Johns Hopkins University, also published an edition (New York and London, 1885).

The twentieth century was inaugurated with the edition of Otto Schröder (Leipzig, 1900), which radically revised the edition of Bergk, and in reprints of

The translation of Pindar has always been a virtually impossible undertaking. Over the long history of Pindar translations, which at times blend seamlessly into the literary history of “Pindarism,” different and irreconcilable exigencies have prevailed in turn, depending on the goals the translators set for themselves. If the aim was to translate Pindar faithfully, rendering into another tongue the metaphors and the density of a poetic language often compressed and obscure, the result risked incomprehensibility. If the aim was a readable version that succeeded in smoothing the linguistic, syntactic, and conceptual asperities of Pindar into simpler language, it risked banalizing him and causing the poetry to evaporate. Finally, if the aim was to realize an elegant and literary translation, attuned to the poetic tradition and metrical structures of the target language, the risk was that of creating an independent literary production so remote from the original that it scarcely qualified as a translation.

In what follows I list a few important translations, subdivided by the nationality (and language) of the translator, naturally omitting the Latin translations of which an account has already been given. The first complete translation of Pindar in Italian is the one already noted by Alessandro Adimari (Pisa, 1631), comprising a literal paraphrase and a more elegant version in “rima toscana.” The following translations are also important: G. Borghi (Milan, 1825), G. Fraccaroli (Milan, 1914: includes a translation of the fragments); L. Traverso (Florence, 1956); L. Lehnuus (Milan, 1981: the *Olympians* alone); B. Gentili (Milan, 1994: the *Pythians* alone); G.A. Privitera (Milan, 1982: the *Isthmians* alone). For France, we may note the seventeenth-century translations of F. Marini (Paris, 1607, repr. 1617, 1677) and P. de la Gausie (Paris, 1626). To these the following may be selected for mention out of the many published: F. Colin (Strasbourg, 1841, with the fragments); J.F. Boissonnade (Grenoble and Paris, 1867); C. Poyard (2nd ed., Paris, 1881); and the widely used prose translation by A. Puech for the

The most famous and most studied German translation is that of the poet Friedrich Hölderlin. His Pindar translation was discovered and published by Norbert von Hellingrath, *Pindarübertragungen von Hölderlin* (Jena, 1910), and from that time on was the object of close attention both on the part of classicists and that of students of German literature.36 The translation is in unbroken poetic prose, and is characterized by its extreme literality and adherence to the original, to the point of retaining the Pindaric word order. Beginning with C.T. Damm (Berlin and Leipzig, 1770–71), which marks the modern rediscovery of Pindar in German, there were numerous German translators of Pindar, albeit ones less well-known than Hölderlin: F. Tiersch (Leipzig, 1820), which did enjoy a certain renown; G. Faehse (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1824, in verse); F. Ganter (Donaueschingen, 1844); J.J.C. Donner (Leipzig, 1860). For the twentieth century, we note the classic translations of F. Dornseiff (Leipzig, 1921) and U. Holscher (Frankfurt a.M., 1962); and K.A. Pfeiff (Tübingen, 1997).

Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who was influenced by Pindar as a literary model, also essayed a partial translation of Pindar (some lines from *Olympian 2*). This “specimen” translation, dating from 1815 and constituting an experiment in extreme literary fidelity, has recently received close study.37 Among other translations into English may be noted those of R. West (Oxford, 1697); P.E. Laurent (Oxford, 1824); F.A. Paley (London, 1868); T.C. Baring (London, 1875: in rhyme, even the fragments); C.J. Billson (Oxford, 1828–30: in verse). The Loeb translation by J. Sandys (London, 1915) was widely used; its place is now taken by W.H. Race’s new Loeb version (Cambridge, Mass., 1997). Most recently in English: A. Verity and S. Instone (Oxford and New York, 2007).

The first complete Spanish translation (following the experiments of Fray Luis de Léon and Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola in the *Siglo de oro*, or seventeenth century)38 is that of Patricio de Berguizas (Madrid, 1798), followed by the verse translation of I. Montes de Oca (Madrid, 1833), and I. Acaico, who printed his version in Mexico in 1882. The verse translation of A. Mencarini appeared at Barcelona in 1888. Among recent translations may be noted E. Suárez de la Torre (Madrid, 1988) and R. Bonifaz Nuño (Mexico, 2005).

Translations in other languages: A.J. de Castro Caeiro (Camarate, 2006) translates the *Pythians* into Portuguese. I. Björkeson (Stockholm, 2008), translates the *Olympians* and *Pythians* into Swedish; S.D. Baldes (Athens, 1904) offers the complete works in modern Greek and J. Csengery (Budapest, 1929) the same in Hungarian. Other, more recent modern translations are listed in the Bibliography below.
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I. EPINICIA

**Translations**

1. Theodorus Gaza – Theodore Gazis

Manuscript 692 of the library of the Seminario Vescovile of Padua contains, among other texts, notes deriving from a cycle of lectures on the *Olympians* delivered by Theodorus Gaza at Ferrara from 1446 to 1449. Arriving in Italy in 1440, Gaza taught at the school of Vittorino da Feltre until 1446, the year of Vittorino’s death. The same year he transferred to the Studio of Ferrara, with the support of Giovanni Aurispa, and certainly with the approval of Guarino of Verona. Scholars have known for some time of the *recollectae* of his Ferrara lectures on the *De corona* of Demosthenes and the *Gorgias* of Plato. From Basinio da Parma, his pupil, we know that at Ferrara, Gaza also lectured on Aristophanes, Sophocles, and the *Anabasis* of Xenophon.

The hand that transcribed the Pindaric *recollectae* in the Padua manuscript around thirty years after Gaza gave his course is recognizable as that of Ludovico Carbone (1430–85), one of the best-known of Guarino’s pupils, and, as he himself attests, a pupil of Theodorus Gaza as well. Carbone later taught at Bologna and Ferrara. On the first leaf of the manuscript there appears the name of Carbone, followed by that of Ludovico Casella (a well-known Ferrarese man of letters and political figure, the patron of Carbone); further down the name *Theodorus* can be read. Under black light the following inscription can also be read on the upper portion of the leaf: ΚΑΤΑ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΝ ΓΑΖΑΝ ΤΟΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΑ ΚΑΙ.
The *recollectae* of the lectures on the *Olympians* present a high degree of elaboration and complexity. They include a complete translation of the text, lemma by lemma, with an ample commentary (see I.a below) in which there are frequent references to Gaza by the name *Dominus Theodorus*, or by various abbreviations (often the sigla *Theo*). Although the topics treated in the classroom rarely go beyond grammatical exegesis, the auditors whom Gaza was addressing do not appear to have been beginners, and must have been in a position to understand a text of undeniable difficulty. It is certainly possible that Ludovico Carbone has compressed or modified to some degree the exposition of Gaza, for he knew Greek well and had mastered Greek and Latin grammatical terminology, but it is safe to assume that the notes are substantially reliable, and that they faithfully reflect the *expositio* of the master.

The Greek text is taken from a codex containing the edition of Manuel Moschopoulos, contaminated with occasional variants from other sources that are never clearly indicated, but are more likely to be the scholia than another manuscript. In some cases these variants may be a record of emendations proposed by Gaza himself.

The Latin translation of the *Olympians* relayed by these *recollectae* can be completely reconstructed, and is the oldest one of which we know. It performs an exegetical task of primary importance, and is distinguished by extreme literality and an apparent lack of interest in linguistic or stylistic elegance. These characteristics are evident both at the syntactic level, where scrupulous fidelity to the *Wortstellung* of the original sometimes yields results scarcely comprehensible in Latin, and at the lexical level, which covers a wide spectrum, ranging from post-classical and biblical words to calques of the Greek, often daring neologisms, and sometimes even rather odd compounds, which are nonetheless capable of conveying with vivid exactness the semantic complexity of the original text.

Translation (Padua, Bibl. del Seminario Vescovile, 692); F. Tissoni, *Le Olimpiche di Pindaro nella scuola di Gaza a Ferrara* (Messina, 2009), with the reconstructed translation at 229–74. [Inc.]: (fol. 2r) Aqua quidem optimum, / aurum vero veluti ardens ignis / excellit no-/cti divitiis quae viros magnificos efficiunt; / quod si certamina canere / cupis, carissimum pectus, / ne sole consydera / aliud calidius / in die lucidum astrum / per desertum aethera, / nec Olympiae certa- / men / melius cantabimus; / unde famosus / hymnus circumiacitur / sapientum consiliis, cantando / Saturni filium ad locupletem profecti / beatam Hieronis domum . . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 23r) Venusta Aglaia et amatrix canticorum / Euphrosyna, deorum optimi filiae / adiutrices nunc, Thaliaque / amatrix modulorum, videns hunc / cantum cum benigna fortuna / leviter pergentem. Lydio / enim Aesopichum in modo / in meditationibusque cantans / veni, quia victrix Olympiae Minya / tui gratia. Nigros muros habentem nunc domum / Proserpinae vade, Echo, / patri inclytum ferens nun- / cium, Cleodemum quatenus videns
fili- / um dicas quod ei nuper / sinus apud gloriosae Pisae / coronavit nobilium certaminum / pennis comam.

**Manuscript:**


**Biography:**

See CTC 1.130.

**Bibliography:**


---

2. Andronicus Callistus and Bartolomeo Fonzio

Manuscript VII.1025 of the Fondo Magliabechiano in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence, composed of fascicles of varied origin and date, includes three *sesterni* (gatherings composed of six leaves folded in half to yield twelve folios and twenty-four pages) datable to the second half of the fifteenth century that contain a Latin translation, anonymous and untitled, of the *Olympians*. The translation is incomplete: there must originally have been four *sesterni*, but the third has been lost, leaving a lacuna that comprises *Ol. 7.69–10.22*. Vincenzo Fera has recognized the hand as that of Bartolomeo Fonzio, and observed that the frequent marginal notes often refer to Andronicus Callistus. We have no document explicitly acknowledging Fonzio as the author of this Pindar translation, though he was learned in Greek and the author of other translations.

That Andronicus Callistus had delivered a course on Pindar at the Studium of Bologna, where he taught from 1463 to 1466, is on record, but there is no corresponding record of him delivering lectures on Pindar at Florence, where he
arrived in 1471 and remained for some time (by 1475 he was in Cremona). It is certain, however, that no matter how brief, his teaching had great importance for the future of Greek studies in Florence, where his students included Angelo Poliziano. Hence the strong likelihood that Fonzio had access to oral lectures on the *Olympians* by Andronicus, or a written version, and that the manuscript in the Fondo Magliabechiano represents his reworking of it. The situation is analogous in the case of Fonzio’s translation of *Apollonius of Rhodes*, preserved in an autograph and untitled manuscript, Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Riccardiano 539, that originated in the same way.

The translation is very faithful, and may be envisioned as an interlinear version for classroom use. The positioning of the words and the paragraph breaks attempts to reproduce the cola of the Greek text. This fidelity often entails anomalous syntactic and lexical usage, foreign to classical Latin, and frequent attempts to render the composite Greek words with neologisms. Numerous interlinear and marginal corrections prove that Fonzio continued over time to work at improving the translation, although he did not publish it: the Magliabechiano manuscript remains the sole witness.


**Manuscript:**


**Biography:**

See CTC 1.228 and 3.267.

**Bibliography:**

3. Marcus Musurus, Johannes Cuno, and Beatus Rhenanus

Sélestat (département du Bas-Rhin, Alsace region, France), Bibliothèque Humaniste, 102 contains a transcript of notes taken at Padua in 1509 during lectures by Marcus Musurus (fols. 163r–173r). The concluding words are “Ex lectione M. Musuri Cretensis. Patavii MDIX” (fol. 173r).

The hand has been identified by M. Sicherl as that of Beatus Rhenanus; the leaves belong to a codex written in large part by Johannes Cuno, whom we know to have followed the courses of Musurus at Padua in those years, and Beatus Rhenanus was Cuno’s pupil.

Given the complex transmission of these notes, it is very difficult to quantify the contributions of the three protagonists—how much may actually have been uttered by Musurus in the classroom, how much Johannes Cuno may have taken in and transcribed, or deliberately skipped, and how much Beatus Rhenanus may have polished these notes in copying them into his master’s codex. Jean Irigoin points out that the scattered notes transcribed by Johannes Cuno in London, British Library, Arundel 550 pertaining to the beginning of Ol. 1 (fol. 52v), and the fourth and fifth triads of Ol. 2 farther on (fol. 173r), lack any reference to Musurus and are unrelated to the notes in the Sélestat manuscript.

In the latter, fols. 167r to 172v contain a translation of Ol. 1–5, while fol. 173r has transcripts of a few Greek texts, among them a passage from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, De imitazione 2.5 pertaining to Pindar (Irigoin). Below the subscription referring to the lectures of Musurus (fol. 173r), there are further notes concerning the life and works of Pindar, and the Olympiads (fols. 173v–174r).

The translation is in prose, in irregular lines; capital letters at the start of each line mark the correspondence with the cola in the original Greek. Alternative translations are often written after individual words, almost always preceded by “idest,” while other readings or explanatory glosses appear between the lines or in the margin.

The literal translation has allowed Irigoin to identify with high confidence the Greek text used by Musurus as a copy of the second Triclinius edition.
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desideras, o chare anime [m.d. aliter cor] / Ne sole illustrius considerato aliu
[m.d. scilicet ad ignem] / In die splendidum astrum vacuo aer desolato ethere
[m.d. quoad aerem] / Neque Olympicum certamen praestantius canimus / Unde (decantatus) [interl. celeberrimus] hymnus [interl. laus] annectitur ad-
iungitur ampltectitur / Sapientum ingenia ad [interl. idest ut] canendum Saturni
filium ad opulentum pervenientes [interl. idest euntes] / Beatum Hieronis larem.

.../. ./. ./. [. Expl.]: (fol. 172v) Et sic opto te, o Olympionice, idest victor olympici
certaminis Neptunicis equis, quod delectaris sene, idest ut tolleres [sanitatem
cass.] senectutem lenem ad extremum, idest finem, filii, o Psalumi, circumstan-
tibus. Sanas autem si quis divitas, idest amice quesitas, sanitate irriget, idest
augeat, acquiescens [interl. sufficiens] opibus suis partis, addens benedictionem
laudem, ne querat fieri deus.

Manuscript:
Sélestat, Bibl. Humaniste, 102, fols. 167r–174r (Kristeller, Iter 3.346a; M.
Sicherl, Johannes Cuno [Heidelberg, 1978], 152).

Biography:
The date of birth of Johannes Cuno (Cono, Conon, Kuno) may be placed
in the years 1462/3, given that he was fifty years old when he died on 21 Feb-
uary 1513. He was probably born at Nuremberg, where he attended primary
school. Cuno joined the Dominican order and was a student of J. Reuchlin and
W. Pirkheimer. He resided in Italy, at Venice, Padua, and Rome, for a number of
years from 1499 on, frequenting Aldus Manutius and his circle and perfecting
his knowledge of Greek at Padua with Marcus Musurus, where he also knew
Lazzaro Buonamico. From 1511 to 1513 he lived at Basel, where he taught Greek;
Beatus Rhenanus was his pupil. Cuno translated works by Gregorius Nazianzen-
us, Gregorius Nyssenus, and Johannes Chrysostomus.

Bibliography:
F. Foffano, “Marco Musuro professore di Greco a Padova e a Venezia,”
Nuovo Archivio Veneto 3 (1892) 553–74; A. Horawitz, Beatus Rhenanus. Ein biog-
raphischer Versuch (Vienna, 1872); J. Irigoin, “Marc Mousouros et Pindare (avec
la collaboration de B. Mondrain),” in D. Harlfinger, ed., ФІΛΟΦΡΟΝΗМΑ.
Festschrift für Martin Sicherl zum 75. Geburstag. Von Textkritik bis Humanismus-
forschung (Paderborn, Munich, Vienna, and Zurich, 1990), 253–62; A. Oleroff,
“L’humaniste dominicain Jean Conon et le crétois Jean Grégoropoulos,” Scriptor-
torium 4 (1950) 104–7; H.D. Saffrey, “Un humaniste dominicain, Jean Cuno de
Nuremberg, précurseur d’Erasme a Bâle,” Bulletin d’Humanisme et Renaissance
33 (1971) 19–62; M. Sicherl, Johannes Cuno. Ein Wegbereiter des Griechischen in
4. Menradus Moltherus – Menrad Molther

To Menradus Moltherus (Menrad Molther) we owe the first printed, albeit partial, Latin translation of Pindar (Haguenau, 1527). He translated the first two *Olympians*, apparently from the Greek text of the Zwingli edition that had appeared the year before at Basel. The two odes are each preceded by a dedicatory letter and followed by a paraphrase.

Moltherus, as the first letter of dedication to Chonradus Peutingerus (Konrad Peutinger) reveals, was impelled to translate Pindar by the joy he derived from the beauty and variety of the poetry; he does not lay claim to any pedagogical utility or moral edification in his work. He asserts that he has aimed to translate word for word and line for line (*ferme uerbum uerbo, et uersum uersui reddens*), and that his work may be fully understood only by those who have addressed themselves to the same task, given the difficulty of conveying the greatness of Pindar’s poetry in Latin. Moltherus ends with an exculpatory formula: *In magnis autem voluisse sat est*. The version of the first ode is literal; Moltherus attempts to respect the position of the words, to the detriment of Latin elegance and often to the point of sheer incomprehensibility.

The second ode, in Sapphic meter, is preceded by another dedicatory epistle to Johannes Pinicianus, in which the difficulty of rendering Pindar into Latin is illustrated once again. The version is freer and more elegant than the first. An ample paraphrase follows both translations.

*Dedication 1.* Clarissimo et praestantissimo viro Chvonrado Peutingero I. V. Doctori, Menradus Moltherus S. D. [Inc.]: (sig. A2r) Pisae, eius quae est in Helide, summa laude olympia celebrata, clarissime Peutingere, non modo Ciceronis testimonio, videlicet apud Graecos olympionicen iudicari prope maius et esse gloriosius, quam Romae triumphasse, verumetiam quod hinc saecula ceperint numerari, manifestum est. . . . Victores, quos videt olympicis ludis, ita celebrat ut victoriarum obiter meminerit, laudes autem virtutum amplissimas, nunc a patria, nunc a familia, nunc ab ingenio, nunc a studiis, nunc a rebus gestis mira aque ac iucunda brevitate concinnavit. . . . (sig. A2v) Sententiae, quae frequenter inducuntur, selectissimae sunt, sive verborum proprietatem spectes, sive elegantiam. Omnia tersa, omnia gravia, omnia pressa et mira quadam varietate composita. Ego itaque huiusce varietatis voluptate delectatus, primam Graecam Olympici ludi cantionem latinitate donavi. Id quam feliciter fecerim, ferme verbum verbo, et versum versui reddens, is demum qui similem navare operam studuerit intellecturus est. . . . [Expl.]: (sig. A2v) Vix nanque vestigium apparat quo cognosci queat Pindarus, ubi latine loquitur, tanta illius est maiestas, tanta dignitas. Sane magno studio meo mihi haudquaquam satis factum est. In magnis autem voluisse (ut aiunt) sat est. Unde tibi, vir optime, et salutis patriae studiosissime, hunc ipsum laborem meum inscripsi ut otii mei, cuius Cato, teste

Translation 1. Pindari Olympiorum victores. Hieroni Regi Syracusano equo victori abeunti primus hymnus cantatus Menrado Molthero interprete. στροφή a, membrorum xvii. [Inc.]: (sig. A3r) Nihil praestat aquae quidem / Ignis utque coruscat / In tenebris micans, sic / Super eximias opes aurum est, / Sive clara olympica / Inde scribere speras, / Quaerites ne lucidam, / In polo rutilo / Die micante, sole stellam / Magis, pectus intimum / Nec trophaea clariora / Quam celebrantur Pisae, / Canere statuimus. . . ./. . . [Expl.]: (sig. [A7r]) Nil altius optes, / Hac oro dignitate tem-/pus ut peragas, et mihi / Per omnem inclyto pangere Graeciam / Nunc liceat trophaeum.

Paraphrasis in primum hymnum Pindari Hieroni victori cantatum in Olympicis, per Menradum Moltherum Augustanum. [Inc.]: (sig. [A7r]) Si rerum natura spectetur, nil aqua poterit esse iucundius, porro mortalium superbas opes, aurum, velut atra nocte flammivoma scintilla coruscans, superat. . . ./. . . [Expl.]: (sig. B2v) Precor interim, ut hac tibi celsitudine frui, mihi vero inter Graecos optimarum artium inventione, Eruditione, sapientia, eloquentia claros, non infimum locum tenenti, hunc in modum victorem posteritati liceat commendare. Finis primae odae.

Dedication 2. Ioanni Piniciano suo Menrado Moltherus S. D. [Inc.]: (sig. B3) Ut a gravibus studiis ad mansuetiores musas, perinde quasi a Dorio ad Phrygium me converterem, optime Piniciane, non ii dies modo, in quibus bacchanaelia celebrantur, verumtemiam gravissimorum virorum dispensandum esse tempus pro studio et animi remissione praecipientium, commovit autoritas. . . . Alterum non eodem (ut aiunt) cubito, sed sapphico carmine tralatum, tibi musarum quoque candido fautori, ut negotium meum agnosceres, nuncupavi. Verum Graeca, quae aemulari nequivi, haudquaquam passus sum factetiis et luminibus obsolescere, id quod vitio dat Gellius sui temporis poetis, comoedias graecas / Menandri, Posidii, Apollodori, Alexidis in latinum vertentibus, sed eorum sententiam ea qua maxime fieri in tam brevi diecularum curriculo diligentia potui, retuli. Equidem tanta est amoenitas, tanta ubertas in Pindaro, ut illam latina facundia vix indipisci possit, mei ingenioli exiguitas nequaquam. . . ./. . . [Expl.]: (sig. B3v) Habes itaque, optime Piniciane, quae res me hiscus diebus oblectarint. Sane si voluptas illa, quam mundus suspicit, mihi esset oblectationi, ex Anthistenis Socratici / voluptatem diffinientis verbis μανείην μᾶλλον, ἤ ἡσθείην. Bene vale, Heydelbergae pridie No. Martii, Anno a Iesu nato M.D.XXXVII.

Translation 2. Pindari Olympiorum hymnus secundus in laudem Theronis, latinus factus, Manrado Molthero interprete. [Inc.]: (sig. [B4]) Quem virum aut Heroa lyra vel acri / Tibia sumis celebrare Clio? / Quem deum? sedes propria est dicata / Pisa Tonanti. . . ./. . . [Expl.]: (sig. C3v) Quam tamen Theron
fuerit benignus, / Nescit ut certos numeros arena, / Sic nec hymnorum moduli sonori / Promere possunt.

Paraphrasis in Olympiorum secundum hymnum per Menradum Moltherum Augustanum. [Inc.]: (sig. C4r) Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri tibia sumis celebrare Clio? Quem nam Deum? Nempe Pisa Iovis sedes est maximi. . ./. . . [Expl.]: (sig. [C7r]) Dici autem haud quaquam potest, quanta Theron innocentia, liberalitate, continentiaque enituerit, cuius in alios tam facile est recensere collata beneficia, quam arenas maris dinumerare.

Editions:
1527, Haganoe (Haguenau): apud Henricum Gran. BL; Rome, BNC.
Digital copy: Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB (incomplete; only Ol. 1).
1596, Rostochii (Rostock): excudebat Stephanus Myliander (only the translation of Ol. 1, published in the work of David Chytraeus, Ex Pindari Odis, excerptae genealogiae . . ., sig. A6v–A8v; see Li below. BAV; Göttingen; Rostock, Universitätsbibl.

Biography:
Menrad Molther was born at Augsburg in 1500 (other sources say ca. 1505); he frequented the school of Johannes Pinicianus and studied at the University of Heidelberg from 1526. In 1529 he began the study of theology and in 1539 became a Lutheran pastor at Heilbronn. In 1551 he was a delegate to the Council of Trent. Molther corresponded with many contemporary men of letters, among them S. Grynaeus and J. Sinapius. He died on 8 April 1558 at Heilbronn. He wrote: Lucta christiana. Psalmi quinquagesimi deprecatoria (Haguenau, 1527); Romano-rum Pontificum omnium vitae et mores (Haguenau, 1527); and translated from the Greek De boni principis officiis by Agapetus the deacon (Haguenau, 1527). Molther was the editor of many rare works, mostly religious in nature, all printed at Haguenau (or in German, Hagenau; now in the département du Bas-Rhin, Alsace region, France) by J. Secerus (Setzer), such as Wilrami Abbatis in Cantica Salomonis mystica Explanatio (1528); Iusti Episcopi Orgelitani in Cantica Cantico-rum explanatio (1529); Liber historiarum partium Orientis, sive passagium Terrae Sanctae, Haythono Ordinis Praemonstratensis authore (1529); Flaccus Alcuinus, In Genesim quaestiones (1529); Flaccus Alcuinus, De rethorica et virtutibus disputation (1529; also printed at Paris by S. Colinaeus in the same year); Christiani Druth-mari theologi vetustissimi in Evangelium Mattaei expositio (1530).

Bibliography:
ADB 52.446–47 (G. Bossert); J. Benzing, Répertoire bibliographique des livres imprimés en France au seizième siècle. Haguenau. Tome III (Baden-Baden, 1993);
5. Johannes Soter – Johann Heyl or Heil

In 1528 Johannes Soter augmented the second edition of his *Epigrammata Graeca veterum elegantissima* (ed. pr. Cologne, 1525) with a translation and facing Greek text of the first *Olympian*. The Greek text is taken from the Zwingli edition of 1526, the appearance of which probably inspired Soter to try his hand at translating Pindar’s ode.

In the epistle to the reader, Soter declares that he has opted to expand his first collection with around two hundred epigrams that he has translated, and in some cases learned about for the first time since, and also that he has added texts falling outside the genre of the epigram, but worthwhile *vel argumenti amoenitate, vel alioqui singulari eruditione*, one of them being the first *Olympian* (πρῶτον τῶν ὀλυμπιονίκων τοῦ Πινδάρου εἴδος).

This is not a verse translation. Soter aims merely to reproduce the number of cola of the facing Pindaric ode. The translation is not *ad verbum*, and is distinguished by neither elegance nor correctness. The Greek text is divided into Strophe A’, kolon 17; Antistrophe, kolon 17; Epodos, kolon 13; Strophe B’, Antistrophe, Epodos; Strophe Γ’, Antistrophe, Epodos; Strophe Δ’, Antistrophe, Epodos (the indication of the cola appears only in the first tripartition). The Latin translation reproduces the first tripartition (*Strophe I, Membrorum XVII; Antistrophe, Membrorum XVII; Epodos, Membrorum XIII*) and subsequently indicates only the *membra*.

*Dedication.* Io. Soter Lectori S. [*Inc.*]: (sig. A2) Anno abhinc tertio, Lector candide, farraginem quandam tumultuariam Epigrammatum cum Graecorum tum Latinorum, non in hoc principio quidem a nobis, sed in privatum congestam usum, divulgavimus . . . . . iterum Epigrammatum illam συναθροισμόν sub incudem revocavi, consarcinatis illis prius exhibitis plus minus ducentis, vel versis interim, vel quae antea nos latuissent. Adiecta sunt et alia pleraque, fateor, quae ad Epigrammata quidem pertineant minime, sed quae vel argumenti amoenitate, vel alioqui singulari eruditione pellecti, quodque iuventuti non passim essent obvae, sumpta utcunque occasione, huic nostro Enchiridio inculcavimus . . . . . [*Expl.*]: (ibid.): Siquidem in hunc unicum, non unius modo aut alterius, sed multi multorum congesti sunt flosculi. Boni igitur consule hanc nostram impudentiam, atque Vale.

*Translation.* Hieroni Regi Syracusano, equo victori abeunti primus hymnus cantatus Strophe I, Membrorum XVII. [*Inc.*] (p. 70) Nihil praestat aquae
quidem / Ignis utque coruscat / In tenebris micans, sic / Super eximias opes 
aurum est, / Sive clara olympica / Inde scribere speras, / Quaerites ne lucidam, / In 
polo rutilo / Die micante, sole stellam / Magis pectus intimum / Nec trophaea 
clariora / Quam celebrentur Pisaes, / Canere statuimus / Iudicantibus sophis / Eius 
laus modica neque erit / Iovem qui colunt beata / Domo nunc Hieronis 
inclyti. . . . [Expl.] (p. 77) Micent clari alii, subinde /rebus or- natis alii, 
at ipse rex / Fastigium tenet. / Nil altius optes, / Hac oro dignitate tem- pus 
ut peragas, et mihi / Per omnem inclyto pangere / Graeciam / Nunc liceat 
trophaeum.

Editions:
1528, Colonia (Cologne): [Johannes Soter]. BL; BNF.
Digital copy: Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.
(*) 1544, Friburgi Brisgoviae (Freiburg im Breisgau): Stephanus Melechus Grauius excudebat. A reprint of the edition of 1528. Florence, BNC; BNF; Bern, 
Universitätsbibl.

Biography:
The biographical data on Johannes Soter (the humanist name of Johann 
Heyl or Heil) are very uncertain. We know that in 1517 he was enrolled in the 
faculty of medicine at the University of Cologne, but soon moved to the arts 
faculty, where he broadened his studies to include the oriental languages. In 1518 
he began an important and varied career as editor-printer at Cologne, and at 
Solingen from 1537, which he pursued until 1543. In 1518 he published a polyglot 
edition of the Psalms, signing a preface in Coptic. He took scholarly responsibil-
ity for several editions of classical authors: as well as the anthology of Greek 
epigrams, Vegetius, Frontinus, and Aelian (1524); the De materia medica of 
Dioscorides (1529–30), and the In Dioscoridem corollarium of Ermolao Barbaro 
(1530); Theriaca and Alexipharmaca by Nicander with a Latin translation (1530); 
and the Astronomicum of Hyginus (1534). His range extended further, to many 
works of Erasmus, including Moriae encomium (1534); De Bohemiorum origine 
by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini; Vandalia and Saxonia by Albert Kranz (ed. pr.); 
Vita et gesta Karoli Magni by Einhard, and many writings by sixteenth-century 
Protestants. Soter died at Cologne in around 1543.

Bibliography:
P. Heitz, Die Kölner Büchermarken bis Anfang des 17. Jahrhundert (Strassburg, 
1898); A.J. Johnson, “Some Cologne and Basle Types, 1525–1552,” Gutenberg-
Jahrbuch (1939) 197–201; NDB 9.84 (H. Lüfting).
6. Joannes Lonicerus – Johannes Lonicer

a. The edition of 1528

Very likely spurred by the Ceporinus-Zwingli edition of Pindar in Greek (Basel, 1525), certainly not indifferent to persuasion from the printer, Andreas Cratander, and alert to the needs of a large public of students, Johannes Lonicer undertook the burden of translating all of Pindar into Latin, and completed the work in just two years, as he himself affirms in the dedicatory epistle. His translation came out in 1528. This, the first complete translation of Pindar, adopted the medium of prose, a choice the translator justified with the parallel of the prose translations of Homer by Lorenzo Valla and Raffaele Maffei. As the choice of prose suggests, the guiding purpose was pedagogical, and the influence of Zwingli’s views is evident. In the dedicatory epistle, Pindar is presented as a poet *puicus, religiosus, pietatis amantissimus*, a poet whom it will not harm youth to read, indeed one worthy to be read *vel a summo theolo*go, such as the dedicatee, M. Adamus. The Pindaric odes are also of great use in the schoolroom as examples of rhetorical eloquence, since they closely match the speech-of-praise variant of the epideictic genre, but they are so hard to understand that explanatory help is needed, which Lonicer promises to supply in the near future (*scholiis . . . adornaturum pollicear*). Lonicer’s outlook appears extremely pragmatic: he reasons not as a man of letters, but as an instructor with the primary objective of offering his students a translation within their grasp, a translation that may forsake elegance but that renders the sense and the letter of the text. For that matter, the absence of a facing Greek text (the translation having been conceived as a complement to the Basel edition of 1526) allowed the translator to take occasional liberties, and we do from time to time observe Lonicer putting the sense ahead of fidelity to the letter.

*Dedication* (ed. of Basel, 1528). Eruditione ac morum integritate praestanti M. Adamo, Illustissimi Hessorum principis, etc. a sacris concionibus, Ioannes Lonicerus εὖ πράττειν. [*Inc.*]: (sig.A2r) Ubi superiore anno, charissime Adame, Pindarum Lyricorum principem succisivis horis vertissem, neque temerarium, neque εὔηθες me ratus sum quicquam admittere, si qualescumque labores illos in lucem publicarem. . . . Neque veritus sum theolo poetam offerre, potissimum talem, qui vel a summo Theolo / (sig. A2v) legi mereatur. . . . Ut enim semper de diis, heroibus, principibus, victoribus canit, ita gravibus verbis, antiquisque sententiis undique abundat, ut plane grandiloquentiae exemplum nobis in propatulo per ipsum exhibeatur. . . .[*Expl.*]: (ibid.) Porro si studio-sis haec non ingrata esse perspexero, Pindarum nostrum, propitio Christo, ita scholiis (citra quae fieri non potest ut penitius intelligatur) adornaturum pol-liceor, uti sperem nulli non apertissimum fore. Optime in Domino vale, meque redama, Francofordiae, An. M.D.XXVII.
Translation. Pindari Olympia Hieroni Syracusio Celeti Ode prima. Strophe I. colon XVII. [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) Prima sane res est aqua, aurum vero ut lucidus ignis noctu, ita praevalet eximie superbis divitiis . . . . [Exp.]: (fol. 24r) I nunc, fama, teque ad tenebras aedes Proserpinae recipias, patrique Cleodamo laetum numcium afferas, recitando ei ut nam filius sibi suam coronarit caesariem ex precisorum munerum alis in augustae Pisae finibus. Pindari Olympiorum finis.

Pindari Pythia Hieroni Aethnaeo Syracusio curru. Strophe I. col. XII. [Inc.]: (fol. 24v) O aurea cithara, Apollinis Musarumque violacea caesarie praeistantium consona possessio, te quidem basis et principium laetitiae audit . . . . [Exp.]: (fol. 53r) Fatum enim nemo unquam effugere potest. Atqui tempus aderit illud, quo et is qui extra speram situs erat, ad speram reiciat fatum, alterum quidem donans, alterum vero denegans. Pythiorum Pindari finis.

Pindari Nemea Chromio Aethnaeo Ode I. Strophe I. col. X. [Inc.]: (fol. 53v) O veneranda Alphei respiratio, inclytarum Syracusarum germen, Dianae cubile, Deli soror Ortygia, a te dulciloquus hymnus commovetur magnam celerrimum equorum laudem texere, Iovis Aethnaei gratia . . . . [Exp.]: (fol. 73v) Prudentiaque et praemeditati consilii fluxus a nobis remoti sunt. Ergo lucri modum venari opportunum ac decorum est. Amorum nanque quos consequi nequeas, vehementiores insaniae fuerint. Undecimae et ultimae Nemorum [sic] odae finis.

Pindari Isthmia Herodoto Thebano Ode I Strophe I col. VII. [Inc.]: (fol. 74r) Mater mea viris martiis abundans, Thebe, opus tuum omni negocio praestantius iudicabo. Ne mihi obscro irascatur aspera Delos, in qua nunc composui quid-dam bonis inclytisque parentibus amabilissimum . . . . [Exp.]: (fol. 85r) Cui qui teneram e myrtho coronam Cleandro nempe pancratii, cuius victor extitit, causa nocuerit, non redarguit optimi patruelis coaetaneorum generationem: posteaquam ipsum certamen cum fortuna Alcathoi inque Epidauro iuventus susceperat quem bonus Encomiis adhibet, pubertatem enim suam minime ignavam sub lustro virtutum domuit. Octavae et ultimae Isthmiorum odae finis.

Edition:
1528, Basileae (Basel): apud Andream Cratandrum. BAV; BL; Basel Universitatsbibl.; Toronto, Thomas Fisher Lib.
Digital copy: Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

b. The edition of 1535

In 1535, again from the press of Cratander, there appeared a second, thoroughly revised edition, enriched with various liminary matter, a commentary, and indices. Following the prefatory letter, directed this time to Jacobus de Tubenheym, the new counselor to the Prince of Hessen, Lonicer inserted a short essay entitled Encomium Pindari. Next comes the translation of the
odes; for obvious didactic reasons, it is subdivided into brief pericopes, each a complete unit of sense (comprising approximately fifteen to twenty cola), with callouts in the form of superscript letters of the alphabet to guide the reader to the corresponding explanatory notes, which are placed right after the pericope. All the odes are still translated into prose, as in the first edition, but Ol. 14 is now also translated into elegiac distichs. To round the volume off, Lonicer added two indices, one for the most significant words and topics, the other for the sententiae.

The Epistola nuncupatoria bears the date 1532, three years earlier than the printing of the volume, and is intended to give brief notices of a general kind about the method followed. Lonicer begins by stating his conviction that the new edition is indubitably an advance on the earlier one, not just because the translation is correctior and lucidior, but also because of the accompanying glosses and citations from other authors. He then returns to the question, already raised in his prefatory epistle to the first edition, of the suitability of translating Pindar into prose rather than verse. After confessing his own incapacity to render the Epinicia in verse, he adduces the authority of Cicero (Orat. 183): when stripped of their musical accompaniment, the songs of the Greek lyric poets appear not unlike prose, so given the impossibility of recreating the poetico-musical dimension of the Epinicia, they may as well receive a prose translation in order to make them fully comprehensible to an audience made up of readers of Latin.

The Encomium Pindari that follows is an important statement, because it allows us to understand the approach taken by Lonicer to the problem of presenting Pindar to the greatest advantage and acquainting a select public of students, and a wider one of interested readers, with his work. Internal evidence, as well as the choice of the word Encomium for the title, reveal that it originated as the text of a prolusion to a course on Pindar in the University of Marburg. After asserting that Pindar is still an author largely unknown in the West, Lonicer clarifies the purpose of his encomiastic discourse: to present to the public an author of the highest value, the prince of the Greek lyric poets (Lyricorum omnium facile principem, in the oft-repeated formula of Quintilian, Inst. 10.1.61, already used by Zwingli and destined to reappear on the titlepages of many subsequent editions), celebrated for his antiquity and his religious piety; and to make the students as desirous as possible to read him and study him in depth. The next point, upon which Lonicer lays great stress, is that Pindar was greatly esteemed by such authors as Horace and Quintilian, who had preferred him to all the rest at a time when the texts of the other lyric poets could still be read. There follows the central part of the Encomium, a biography of Pindar extracted from the ancient sources. The interesting aspect of this biography is not so much what Lonicer has to say about Pindar as what he chooses to pass over in silence, for the portrait of Pindar set forth here binds into a whole, and corrects, the ancient sources (the
lives available for consultation in the front matter of the Roman edition of 1515). In Lonicer’s view, not only was Pindar an estimable person, he was even able to overcome the defects of his environment, especially with regard to chastity, for he chose matrimony over the untrammeled and dissolute lifestyle normal at that time in Greece. This statement has no foundation in any ancient biographical source. To round off his panegyric, Lonicer offers an allegorical interpretation of the portrait showing Pindar being nourished by bees described in the Imagines of Philostratus: the bees and the honey allude to the mellitum eloquentiae flumen that pours forth from the Epinicia. But there is more. Just as bees are useful animals that produce nothing harmful to humans, the poetry of Pindar likewise proves universally beneficial, especially to young men, on account of the castitas of the poet, his avoidance of scabrous subjects like the amorous escapades of Jove, the loftiness and dignity of his style, and lastly his admiring stance toward the virtuous, and his reproof of the cowardly and the unjust. Lonicer then moves on to another, and perhaps his most challenging, topic: the obscurity of Pindar. Pindar’s style is admittedly arduous and the meaning sometimes hard to grasp; but this arises not out of any incapacity on the part of the poet, but rather out of a well-defined stylistic choice. His selection of themes shows that Pindar did not wish to be easily understood by everyone, only by an elect group of those who have undergone the struggle to comprehend him and who have a natural moral affinity with him. Pindar is thus not really an obscure poet; he only seems so to the unlearned, the lazy, and persons of doubtful morality.

In the two epistles he added to the Basel edition, Zwingli may have proposed an explicit comparison between Pindar and David, and portrayed the Epinicia as a useful exegetical resource for understanding the Psalms; Lonicer goes further, asserting that the spiritual benefit deriving from the reading of the Pindaric odes will be immense for all who have chosen to follow the example of Christ. There remains one last theme to be addressed by the orator: the utility of Pindar. He is a difficult author, requiring a commentary and a great deal of study: but the advantages accruing to those willing to make this effort will be commensurate, both from the moral and from the practical and professional points of view. From the viewpoint of morality, young men will learn from Pindar, a true praeco virtutis, the significance that he attributed to virtue in its various species: pietas, iustitia, castitas, fortitudo. In following the examples set forth, they will be able to forge their characters through direct emulation. From the professional point of view, the closely-supervised reading of the Epinicia will allow the students to strengthen their grasp of the art of rhetoric, especially the epideictic genre with its evident similarity to the poetic encomia sung in the Epinicia. Before taking leave of his listeners (and readers), Lonicer repeats his exhortation to youth to apply themselves with commitment and enthusiasm to the reading and study of Pindar.
The independence of the 1535 edition does not derive solely from the addition of these preliminary texts and the commentary. The translation itself has been so radically modified as to be scarcely recognizable, and amounts virtually to a *retractatio*. Comparison of the *incipit* and *explicit* of the two editions, given below, would suffice to demonstrate this, but we may supply a further example: the variation between the first lines of *Ol. 14*, which is also given a translation in distichs in 1535. In the 1528 edition we read: *Celebres reginae Charites, quae Cephisias naturae aquas equestrem habitatis sedem praeclарae Orchomeni, o veterum Minyorum episcopi, audite me postquam precor*. In the prose of 1535: *Celebres reginae Charites, Cephisias sortitae aquas, equestrem habitantes sedem preclarae Orchomeni, o veterum Minyorum Episcopi, hoc a vobis precor, nempe ut me audiatis*. The translation in distichs gives a very different interpretation of the Greek (ed. of Basel, 1535, p. 154):

Insignes agite huc Charites, Cephesidis undae
Praeclarum nactae conspicumque thronum,
Reginae Orchomeni celebres, e pectore quarum
Sollicito nunquam gens Minyda cadit,
Illius at priscam sane noctesque diesque
Curatis stirpem, conspicitisque probe.
Vestra pia nunc deposco mihi numina mente,
Ilicet ad nostras currite quaeso preces.

This new edition with commentary enjoyed great success, and despite the absence of a facing Greek text (though one does encounter copies that have been bound together with the Zwingli-Ceporinus Greek text), it constituted the text of reference (see I.10. Neander below) until the edition of Henricus Stephanus ([Geneva], 1560).

**Dedication** (ed. of Basel, 1535). Imaginibus, virtutibus et literis claro D. Iacobo a Tubenheym Illustrissimi Hessorum Principi a consiliis, domino suo, Ioannes Lonicerus εὖ πράττειν. [Inc.]: (sig. a2r) Callimachus minime vulgaris poeta, Eximie vir, gnomen cedro dignam inter alias plerasque, hanc memoriae prodidit: *Divitiae sine virtutibus haudquaquam aliquem felicem constituunt. Verissima profecto sententia: qua quid quaeso rectius ab elegantissimo Musarum sacerdote dici potuit?* . . . ./ . . [Expl.]: (sig. a2v) Vertimus autem eam ob causam prosa oratione Pindarum, quod immensi propemodum laboris sit Pindaricas odarum leges, simili versu exprimere: neque facile Pindaricae lyrae maiestatem et sublimitatem assequi aliquis posse videatur. Deinde, quod lyrica carmina non multum a soluta loquendi formula discendant. Si enim, ut Cicero [*Orat. 183*] inquit, optimorum quorumque poerarum, qui λυρικόι a Graecis appellantur, versus cantu spoliaveris, nuda remanebit oratio: et nisi tibicen accesserit, orationi sunt solutae simillimi. Curavi, quantum in me est, uti Thebanus vates, ni mihi nimium
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blandiar, a Latinis etiam intelligi possit. Superest iam, uti praestantia tua, eximie vir, et Poetam hunc, et laborem nostrum exporrecta et hilari fronte suscipiat: quod si factum esse percepero, satis praemii pro sudoribus hisce meis reportasse arbitror. Sin quibusdam hae vigiliae meae displicuerint, nihil mirum, quando- quidem Somni et Noctis filius Momus, ne superos quidem inculpatos relinquere queat. ἔῤῥωσο. Marpurgi. M. D. XXXII.

Pindari Encomium. Pindari Encomium a Ioanne Lonicero Marpurgi prouniciatum, et vitam et insignia vatis decora complectens. [Inc.]: (sig. a3r) Quia Latinis auribus autorem, quod equidem sciam, fere incognitum, iamnunc enarrandum, ut vires meae tulerint, recepi, Pindarum nimirum, ut Lyricorum omnium facile principem, sic vetustate ac pietate iuxta, apprime conspicuum: non indignum fuerit, Magnifice domine Rector, viri et adolescents iocundissimi, tanti vatis et laudum, et virtutum catalogum quendam texere, ut inde vel ad sempiternum, neque ullis seculis interitum eius poema inflammentur, alacrioerque ad coelestem Pindaricae lyrae, sive citharae sonitum audiendum (quo aquila in sceptro Iovis residens, praemia dulcedine in soporem collocatur) studiosi reddantur. Quod ut rectiori ordine perficiamus, de Lyricis poetis non nihil primum dicendum: Pindari nostri encomion, hac via, apertius illustriusque in medium prolaturi. . . . (sig. a5r) Quemadmodum autem apes non obsunt mortalium generi, sed maxime prosunt, excellentiissimo admirandae industriae operis: cum fucis duntaxat et furibus acre illis bellum: sic Pindari poetmata nullius mentem sive nefaria libidine, sive aliis id genus vitius, sceleribus, crimini bus, inficiunt. Non Lalages, non Lydiae, non Galateae, non Pasiphaes, non vana Iovis adulteria discere: verum ex pudico lyrico, pudicum etiam lyram, vel si mavis, citharam audire. Quin etiam et in Deum et homines pientissimus, virtutes unice praedicat. Et quum in hocce quattuor certaminum, sive ludorum circuitu, reges, principes, aliosque insignis victores semper celebret, uti ut praelarissima quaere doget, ac in summis versatur rebus, ita summo etiam dicendi charactere utitur: propter quem et Horatius nemini imitabile existimavit. Pertinet quidem Fabii iudicium, non ad solam hanc spectaculum Graeciae periodon, sed ad alia eius pariter opera. Attamen in his ludis phraseos eius σεμνότητας, gravitas et sub limitas satis sese ostendunt: augusta honestorum argumentorum tractatio ubertim etiam, pro lyricis normas, enitecit. Strenuos mehercule, et forteis, aequos et iustos laudibus adusque sydera evehit: ignavos, effeminatos, iniquos et iniustos ad Tartara usque protrudens. Interim de industria quaedam occultat, adeo ut et ipse non cuvis sese planum fore putet, dum inquit [Ol. 2.83–86] . . . Id est multae sunt mihi sub cubito in pharetra sagittae, quae intelligentibus tantummodo somant, et omnino interpretatione egent. Atque hanc voluntariam Pindari nostri nebulam et absconsionem, difficeratam quis appellare possit, eamque ob rem, me una cum Pindaro in discrimen vocare, tali vel consimili apud iudicem obiurgatione invadens. Ecquae est ista melliflua vatis eloquentia, quaenam et qualis
tantum abest, ut unius horae spacio perficiam. Quare satis fue/rit has paucas
denumerasse: reliquas enim suis posthac locis in ipso autore sumus observaturi.
Summam autoritatem et lyrici huius Poetae virtutes, quibus ubique praefulget,
hactenus pro virili nostra in propatulo conspiciendas collocavimus, non ut dig-
num, neque ut tanti autoris gravitas meruisset, verum ut mea tenuitas potuit.
Reliquum est, studiosissimi adolescentes, dum virtutes perpetuo ab hoc lyrico
commendari audimus, eoque ipso ethico, ut et nos minime desides ad earum
amorem accendamur, earum desiderio exardescamus, mentem nostram illarum
formationi submittamus, ne inferiores in bono gentibus deprehendamur olim,
quando cunctarum gentium conditor et gubernator cum omnibus et singulis
rationem gestae vitae est initurus. Mores etiam et studia nostra ita instituamus,
ut largitor omnis pretiosae rei Deus Opt. Max. inde nunquam non praedicetur,
futurae semper vitae memores. Sic fiet, ut longe praestantioribus bonis, quam
virtutes sunt Pindaricae, exornemur. Pindari Encomii Finis.

Translation. Pindari Olympia. Hieroni Syracusio, qui celete victoriam obti-
nuit, ode prima, Strophe I. colon xvii. [Inc.]: (p. 1) Optima\textsuperscript{a} sane res est aqua:
aurum vero ut lucidus ignis noctu, sic praevalet eximie\textsuperscript{b} superbis divitis\textsuperscript{c}. Sin cer-
tamina proloqui desideras, mi anime, ne porro sole contempleris aliud ferven-
tius interdiu\textsuperscript{d} fulgidum astrum\textsuperscript{e}, per desertum aethera\textsuperscript{f}. Neque Olympico agone,
praestantiorem, alium feremus: unde\textsuperscript{g} celeberrimus hymnus passim decantatur\textsuperscript{h};
prudentium decretis, quo evehunt Saturnium, ad praedivitem qui se recipiunt,
felicemque Hieronis\textsuperscript{i} larem. . . . [Expl.]: (p. 155) Convexum volucres pennaes vel ad aethera tollunt, / Victorem stadii gloria summa vehit. Olympiae finis.

Pindari Pythia. Hieroni Aetnaeo Syracusio, curru. Strophe I. colon XVII.
[Inc.]: (p. 155) O\textsuperscript{a} Aurea cithara, Apollinis Musarumque violacea pra-
estantium consona et conscia possessio, te quidem\textsuperscript{b} basis et\textsuperscript{c} laetitiae princip-
ium audit. Siquidem\textsuperscript{d} cantores vel\textsuperscript{e} signis persuadentur, quando\textsuperscript{f} percussa reddis
ambages choro admirandorum\textsuperscript{g} praeludiorum: ac\textsuperscript{h} dirum fortissimumque\textsuperscript{i}
aeterni ignis fulmen extinguis. Indormiscit et aquila in\textsuperscript{k} sceptro Iovis residens,
v惋ci utrinque\textsuperscript{q} demissa ala . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 302) Atque ea lex\textsuperscript{m} tenue per-
transit aes et calamos\textsuperscript{n}, qui prope insignem Gratiarum choris urbem in Cephe-
sidis delubro crescunt\textsuperscript{o}, fideles saltatorum testes\textsuperscript{p}. Quod si qua felicitas absque
labor non apparat, ipse tamen Deus, vel hodie vel paulo post consummabit.
Fatum enim nemo unquam effugere potest. Aderit autem tempus illud, quod et
eum, qui a spe exciderat, in spem reponat, alterum quidem donans, alterum vero
denegans.

Pindari Nemea. Chromio Aetnaeo, Ode I. Strophe I. colon X. [Inc.]: (p. 305)
O\textsuperscript{a} veneranda Alphei respiratio, celebrium Syracusarum germen, Dianae cubile,
Deli soror, Ortygia\textsuperscript{b}, a te dulciloquus hymnus commovetur magnam celeri-
morum equorum laudem texere\textsuperscript{c}, Iovis Aetaeai gratia\textsuperscript{d}; currus itidem\textsuperscript{e} Chromii
victricibus Nemeae operibus\textsuperscript{f} laudatorium et triumphale iugare melos excitat.
Fatim\textsuperscript{a}. At ex Iove homines finis manet: illum non prae-noscimus, non ob oculos ponimus, sed fastuosi incedimus, multas res in animo nostro versantes. Sed membra nostra\textsuperscript{b} impudenti spei alligata sunt. Prudentiaque et remoti consilii fluxus a nobis remoti sunt\textsuperscript{c}. Ergo lucri modum venari opportu-num ac decorum est. Amorum nanque, quos consequui nequeas, vehementiores insaniae fuerint.

Pindari Isthmia. Herodoto Thebano, Ode I. Strophe I. colon VII. [Inc.]: (p. 404) Mater\textsuperscript{a} mea\textsuperscript{b}, aureo scuto insignis Thebe\textsuperscript{c}, opus tuum omni negotio praestantius iudicabo\textsuperscript{d}, ne mihi obsecro irascatur aspera Delos\textsuperscript{e}, in qua nunc composui quiddam bonis inclytisque parentibus amabilissimum\textsuperscript{f}. Cede Apol-lonias paululum\textsuperscript{g}: utrarunque enim gratiarum, fortunantibus diis, copulabo summan. . . . . [Expl.]: (pp. 457–58): Proinde\textsuperscript{a} etiamnum rationem fert, prono-sque est ac promptus\textsuperscript{b} Musarum currus, ut memoriam † pugilis victoria cel-ebris [vel pugilis Nicoclis, in marg.] praedicet, ipsumque honoret, qui\textsuperscript{c} a Doricis selinis\textsuperscript{d} Isthmiam coronam nactus est, postquam et ille iam Perictyonas vicit, manu sua viros repellens turbansque, quem boni patruelis generatio, non afficit ignominia\textsuperscript{a}. Sertum praeterea coetaneorum quispiam Cleandro, pancratii cuius victor evasit, nomine ex myrto nectat\textsuperscript{e}: quoniam et Alcathoi certamen feliciter, ac\textsuperscript{f} iuventus antehac eum in Epidaurus suscepit, hinc bonorum virorum encomii eum adhibet. Pubertatem enim suam minime ignavam, in palaestra honestatis rite formavit.

The superscript letters are keyed to the commentary (see I.d below).

Editions:

Digital copy: Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

1543, Zurich: (an edition itemized by Graesse V, 296 and by C. Gottlob Heyne, Pindari carmina et fragmenta (Göttingen, 1798), 1.39). Not located.


Digital copy: Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

Biography:
See CTC 4.76.
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7. Faustus Sabaeus (?)

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 162, a miscellany comprising different fascicles of diverse origin and format, includes an anonymous Latin translation of *Olympians* 1–4 and 6.

A fairly homogeneous section of the manuscript, from fol. 99r to fol. 184r, written in quite similar hands certainly belonging to the sixteenth century, contains: at fol. 99r–154v a Latin poem entitled *Fuga Virginis Mariae*, attributed in the initial table of contents (of later date) to Faustus Sabeus; after blank leaves 155–57, at fol. 158r–173v, the Pindar translation in fair copy, unattributed; and at fol. 174r–184r, the *Vita Juliae virginis*, with the concluding subscription: “Faustus Sabeus Brixianus, custos Bibliothecae Vaticanae, vitam huius Virginis edidit propria manu hic descriptam.” The standard repertories attribute both *Vitae* to him. As Kristeller observes at *Iter* 1.189, it is impossible to state with certainty that the three works are by the same hand; but even if that could be established, it would not constitute adequate grounds to attribute the Pindar translation firmly to Sabaeus.

The odes are numbered and are given shortened titles; at the beginning of each there appears the first word of the Greek original. There is no division into strophes; after *Ol*. 4 there is a blank page (fol. 169v); *Ol*. 5 is missing (the ancient scholia, it should be noted, regarded the attribution of it to Pindar as uncertain); *Ol*. 6 ends in the middle of fol. 173v and a few following leaves have been cut out. The copy is fair, without corrections or interlinear glosses.

The translation aims to be literal and respects the layout of the cola; it is certainly not elegant. The Latin is not always classical (in the portion reproduced here, note *calefactorium*, *depurati*, etc.), which might appear odd given that Sabaeus habitually wrote elegant Latin verse and translated Greek epigrams with delicacy. But this might be a youthful school exercise.

Extra euntem da, aurei / Coli coniunx Amphi-/ trites, meorumque hymnorum auge delectabilem Florem.

**Manuscript:**

**Biography:**
Faustus Sabaeus (or Sabeus) was born at Chiari in the province of Brescia in ca. 1475. Brought to the Vatican Library by Pope Leo X, in 1533 he checked the inventory compiled by Nicolaus de Maioranis. He travelled widely in Europe in search of manuscripts and books, and edited the first editions of Arnobius, *Adversus nationes* and Minucius Felix. Sabaeus was the author of five books of *Epigrammi* (Rome, 1556), and died at Rome in 1559.

**Bibliography:**

8. Jacobus Laureus

Jacobus Laureus published a translation of Aelian’s *De varia historia* at Venice in 1550, adding a Latin hexameter version of Pindar’s *Pythian* 3 at the end, with no preface or dedication. There is not a particularly strong link between the work of Aelian and *Pythian* 3, though *De varia historia* does contain a few anecdotes pertaining to the Olympic games, others about Hiero of Syracuse, and perhaps most relevant, the first anecdote in book 9, which states that Simonides and Pindar were the house-guests of the tyrant of Syracuse.

The publication of a text by Pindar in sixteenth-century Italy is, however, an extremely rare event; after the two editions of the Greek text at Venice and Rome in 1513 and 1515, we find no imprint in either Greek or Latin dedicated exclusively to the *Epinicia* throughout the whole century, unless we count the
“pirated” reproduction, with false typographical details, of the complete Sudorius translation (Paris, 1582; see I.16). In just two cases—this one and that of Minturno (see I.13)—does a single ode, translated into Latin, turn up in a work of another author.

In the dedicatory letter of his Aelian translation to Marco Antonio Justini-ano, Laureus writes that he was urged to undertake it by Franciscus Robortellus, the famous humanist from Udine, but makes no reference to the Pindar transla-tion he chose to add.

The title of the ode, *In Hieronem celete*, derives from printed editions: the Aldina runs τῷ αὐτῷ, κέλετι (p. 79), while the Zwingli-Ceporinus edition gives the more explicit title ΤΩΙ ΑΥΤΩΙ ΙΕΡΟΝΙ, ΚΕΛΕΤΙ (p. 109).

Since the translation is in hexameters, unlike previous translations, it cannot be literal; it does, though, appear faithful and not without elegance.


[Expl.]: (ibid.) Nihil enim ait ex omni parte beatum esse, idque et exemplis et sententiis comprobatur.

*Translation*. [Inc.]: (fol. 97r) In Hieronem Celete. / Quam vellem, (si fata sinant effundere tales / Ore preces) iterum ad superos Chirona reverti / Saturno, et nympha genitum, summumque tenere / Pelion, umbrosis ubi quondam val-libus errans / Horrendum visu monstrum mortalibus esse / Auxilio herbarum succis, et caule solebat. . . . .


*Edition:*


Digital copy: Münchenener Digitalisierungscentrum (MDZ), BSB. Another digital copy, in color and of higher quality, may be found in Google Books.
Biography:
About Jacobus Laureus (Lorio, Jacopo: Thesaurus CERL: cnp01221496), a native of Udine, we have little information other than the fact that he labored on Aelian’s *De varia historia*, which he also published in an Italian translation (1550, Venice, per Bartolomeo Cesano). He was presumably born in the 1520s or 1530s.

Francesco di Soldo Strozzi, in the preface to his Italian translation of *Thucydidides* (Venice, 1564), thanks “Jacopo Laurio da Udine” for his advice, qualifying him as “giovane gentilissimo, nutrito e allevato del continuo negli esercizi della lingua Greca.” He may have been a pupil, or perhaps only a friend, of Robortello, and was on good terms as well with Giovanni Battista Ramusio and Paolo Manuzio and in correspondence with Pier Vettori.
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9. Ioannes Alexander Rondinelli – Giovanni Alessandro Rondinelli

Florence, Bibl. Riccardiana, 2550 (a miscellany comprising fascicles of varying format and provenance, numbered individually, with a continuous modern numeration at the foot of the page) contains a Latin translation of the *Olympians* with this subscription: “A Ioanne Alexandri Rondinelli traducta fuerunt 1555.”

The miscellany also contains the following works in Italian by the same author: a partial translation into blank verse of the first book of the *Iliad*, a sketch for a tragedy, and a signed and dated tragedy, *Favola d’Ulisse*.

The Pindar translation (fols. 36r–76v in the older numeration) begins with line 26 of the first *Olympian*, but there is no sign that any leaves have been lost; fols. 77r–83r of the fascicle are blank. There are running headers at the top of the pages, *Pindari* on the left and *Olimpia* on the right. The translation of the *Olympians*, and that of the *Iliad* that precedes it, appear to be private exercises by the young Rondinelli.

The translation, in prose and faithful to the layout of the cola, is meant to be *ad verbum*, but tends to stray into paraphrase. There is no division into strophes, although the translator was aware of their existence, for at the head of *Ol*. 14 a note reads: “qui habet unam strophem.” Attention is drawn to the sententious lines by quotation marks in the margin. Variants, or glosses introduced by *idest*, are frequently inserted between the lines, or in the text. The odes are unnumbered, but are preceded by the traditional titular formulas, modified in a few cases, for example *Ol*. 8 “Alcimedonti Palesti et Thimosteni Palesti et Melisio”; *Ol*. 9 “Agesidamo Locrensi Epizefriro, qui vergunt ad occasum, Puero pugili.”

The document is of interest as evidence that, although censorship may have prevented Pindar from seeing print in Italy, he did have a circulation there, probably as a school text.

Manuscript:
Florence, Bibl. Riccardiana, 2550 (Kristeller, Iter 1.220).

Biography:
Giovanni (or Giovanni Alessandro) Rondinelli (1535–92: Thesaurus CERL: cnp01273773), a Florentine man of letters and political figure of a certain prominence in the later sixteenth century, was a member of the Accademia della Crusca and a friend of Pier Vettori and the other Tuscan letterati of the time. We have no information about his cultural formation. He held many public offices and was made governor of Arezzo by Grand Duke Francesco de’ Medici. Government service did not keep him from the cultivation of letters; his unpublished tragedies in Tuscan verse were praised by Leonardo Salviati. Numerous Orazioni did reach print (funeral orations for the death of Charles IX of France; for the death of Catherine de’ Medici, etc.). His Relazione sopra lo stato antico e moderno della città di Arezzo was reprinted at Arezzo in 1755.
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10. Michael Neander
a. Aristologia Pindarica

Michael Neander defines his Aristologia Pindarica (Basel, 1556) as a school text meant to facilitate the reading of Pindar, even by beginners. On this account, Neander selected the parts of each ode which he judged most important and reproduced them in Greek with a facing literal translation in Latin and an apparatus of commentary in which, in line with the precepts of Erasmus (De ratione studii), parallel passages from other ancient authors are adduced for comparison.
There is a batch of introductory matter: a dedicatory letter *Consulibus et Senatoribus* of Neander’s city; Greek verses *ad scholae Othonianae Iuventutem* by Charles Utenhove; a text in Greek verse by Neander, *De Hymnis Pindaricis*, addressed to the head of the school, Valentinus Trozendorfius; *Ode 4.2* by Horace and a poem in Sapphics by Melancthon (a curious paraphrase of the Horatian ode); and finally two lives of Pindar, the first taken, according to the marginal note, from the ninth dialogue of Lilio Gregorio Giraldi’s *Historia poetarum* (Basel, 1545), along with the usual accounts of the Olympic games and the sites where they were held.

In his dedicatory letter, Neander highlights the conduct of the ancients and their moral advantage over modernity: lofty examples of virtue and honesty were set before youth and relayed by poets, Pindar above all. The poet extols the virtue, the strength, the religiosity, and the honesty of the winners of the contests, who were rewarded only with olive crowns, for victory brought neither riches nor power, but an honored name and eternal fame for the winners and their families. Neander insists that young Greeks, unlike moderns, were educated in accordance with these ideals, and preferred eternal glory won through virtue to wealth. Hence the Pindaric odes transmit a magnificent moral lesson to young students. Neander then speaks of the literary qualities of the *suavissimus et sapientissimus* poet, praising his abundant and felicitous wordhoard, the gravity of his *sententiae*, the splendor of his rhetorical figures, all joined to a profusion of historical and mythological references. His obscurity is willed, according to Neander, to arouse the curiosity of readers, entice them, and thus instruct them. In his texts, Pindar also prepares humans for the vicissitudes of life, and treats of God, of providence, of the rewards of the blessed and the pains of the damned, urging them to imitate antique virtue. While mentioning the familiar parallel between the psalmist David and Pindar, he does not endorse it, adhering basically to the view of his master Melancthon as well as Peucerus and for that matter Erasmus, in stressing the divine inspiration of the Psalms on one hand, and the beauty and educational utility of Pindar’s odes on the other.

Neander ends with a profession of gratitude to Erasmus and especially to his master Melancthon, whose precious aid he has often received; his debt to Johannes Lonicer is also recorded. And the translation of Neander does indeed often stick closely to that of Lonicer, sometimes merely altering the word order.

*Dedication* (ed. of Basel, 1556). *Amplissimis atque sapientissimis viris D.D. Consulibus et Senatoribus in inclyta Lignitia suis Dominis atque patronis colendissimis S.D.* [Inc.]: (fol. a2r) *Pindarum Lyricum poetam, vatem castissimam et sapientissimum, vetustissimum quoque, clarissimi Domini, intelligere volenti in primis opus est ut prius diligenter cognitam habeat, quae apud bonos authores de veterum Graecorum seu certaminibus, seu ludis, literarum
monumentis ad posteritatem prodita sunt. … (fol. a3r) Voluerunt itaque veteres, nobis longe sapientiores magisque dediti honeste ac fortiter factis, hac ratione suam iuventutem ab iis quae minus recte et laudabiliter solent fieri in vita, abducere: et viam qua perveniri solet ad virtutis aeternum decus, eidem ostendere. In qua re honestissime posteritati consulere conati sunt. Ei enim viros tradere voluerunt, quorum cum virtutibus, sapientia ac consilio respublicae laudabiliter constituerunt: tum etiam iuventuti exemplum proponerent, in quod insipiceret, vitam quoque suam, mores et studia ad idem instituere posset. … (fol. a3v) Non enim certamen tunc erat de potentia, non de opibus, non de mundi regnis, sed de gloria, sed de nominis honesta aeternaque laude et memoria. … (fol. a6r) Eos nunc viros, qui in his quatuor Graeciae ludis victores, coronam et victoriam adepti essent, celebrat Pindarus, poeta Lyricus ut suavissimus et sapientissimus, ita quoque caeterorum Lyricorum facile princeps optimus, seu spiritus magnificientiam, seu suententiam gravitatem spectes, seu eloquentiam beatissima rerum verborumque optima ubertate exultantem consideres, seu etiam antiquissimas et memoratu dignas Graecorum historias attendas: in quas, dum studio quodam singulari ab ipsis victorum rebus in singulis prope hymnis digreditur, volens eos potius a progenitoribus, commendatos efficere omnibus, quam non sine nota adulationis turpissima ipsorum virtutes laudibus vehere: quod tamen foecundissima brevitate super haec omnia facta, solet fidelissime, multas historias antiquas a nemine similiter proditas recitare. Eas dum plerumque tegit et ornat fabulis, vel quia veterum reges et principes noluerunt perferri ad populum sua quaedam arcana: vel etiam quia ex veteri quadam consuetudine omnium poetarum, dulci figmento, sub quo veritatem aliquam abscondit, lectorem attrahere, et attractum deinde retinere et docere voluit, ut in verso dicitur: Et prodesse volunt, et delectare poetae. Singulos et omnes diligenter instituit de rebus omnibus, de quibus doceri homines debent, et quae in hominum communi vita evenire possunt, de Deo, de providentia, de pietate, poenis impiorum apud inferos, et gaudio piorum in campo Elysio, seu beatorum insulis: in quibus vivere et laetari canit Achillem, Cadmum, et alios heroas, viros praestantes, qui virtute et vitae integritate gavisuti sunt. … Concionatur ubique hominum conatus sine Deo, eiusque auxilio, omnes esse irritos. Eam doctrinam crebro repetit, et inculcare (fol. a7r) nunquam desinit: non ignarus scilicet, quam soleant sibi placere homines in rebus secundioribus, admiratione propriae suae virtutis, pietatis, fortitudinis, eruditionis et sapientiae. … (fol. β2r) Eum authorem etiam ex nostris quidam tanti fecerunt, et adhuc faciunt, ut fateri non dubitarint, se eius lectione plus teneri et affici quam nulla quantumvis docta lyra Davidica, in qua Christum personat, et in saltem decachordo ab inferis excitat resurgentem. Id argumentum de Christo, quamvis nemo Lyricorum, seu Simonides, seu Bachylides, seu Alcaeus, seu Serenus, cum lyrista Davide commune unquam habuerit, quod ratione sine patefactione divina id mysterium (quod

Translation. Olympicorum Hymni primi argumentum. (p. 25) In hoc hymno Pindarum prae dicat Hieronem . . . [Inc.]: (p. 27) [Ol. 1.28–36] Mirum profecto (videri potest) / Quod saep e hominum mentem / Magis quam verus sermo / Varis varie gatae mend aci is / Fabulae decipiant . . . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 135) Dei hono rant cantores / Quis autem rursus audiat alium po etam / (omnibus Homer us suffic it / Hic cantorum optimus) ex me tamen portabit nihil.

Pythiorum Hymni primi Argumentum. (p. 136) Hieronem Syracusanum, quem et prima Olympicorum celebravit, hac rursus . . . [Inc.]: (p. 137) Aurea cithara Apollinis / Et violacea caesarie praestantium / Consona Musarum possessio, / Te quidem audit basis, laetitia / principium. . . . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 271) Sed veniet tempus / Illud, quod et illi qui a spe exciderat / Contra eius sententiam alterum quidem / (Non speratum) dabit, alterum vero (speratum) negabit.
Nemeorum Hymni primi Argumentum. (p. 270) Laudat Pindarus in primo hoc hymno Chromium Aetnaeum . . . [Inc.]: (p. 271) Est sane infelicitate / gloriae et existimationis summa . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 327) Lucri modum venari, decorum est. / Amorum quos consequi nequeas vehementi/iores insanae sunt.

Isthmiorum Hymni primi Argumentum. (p. 326) Herodotum Thebanum ab Isthmia victoria a comparatione laudat. [Inc.]: (p. 329) [Isth. 1.5] Nihil est amabilius et charius / Inclytis parentibus bonis. . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 375) [Isth. 8.57–61] luxtum tumulumque / Heliconiae virgines / Astiterunt, lamentumque / Multae famae superfuderunt. / Visum est itaque superis, / Bonum virum et defunctum iam / Hymnis deorum (Musarum) commendare.

Edition:
1556, Basileae (Basel): per Ludovicum Lucium, Anno Salutis humanae M.D.L.VI. Mense Augusto BAV; BL; BNF.
Digital copy: Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

At the end of the Greek-Latin edition of the *Idylls* of Theocritus prepared by Neander ([Leipzig], 1596), there appears the Greek text of the fourth *Pythian* with his Latin translation and commentary. The ode is labelled *Argonautica* in the title, and is followed by the specification that the commentary is a transcription of Neander’s orally delivered lessons: *Cum expositione Grammatica de ore Michaelis Neandri excerpta*. From the dedicatory epistle to the volume to Guilielmus Budaeus we learn that Neander’s lectures on this ode had been greatly appreciated by Budé and his fellow students, who had taken the master’s words down on paper; this circumstance, together with the urging of other friends, had finally convinced Neander to publish the text.

The ode is preceded by *Prolegomena in Pindarum* (a compressed reprise of the information supplied in the front matter of the *Aristologia*) and followed by the commentary, entitled *Annotationes Neandrinae*. The Greek text is printed on the verso of the leaves, with brief linguistic notes in the margin, while the Latin translation appears on the recto, with the commentary following at the end.

The translation is literal, but more elegant than the one in the *Aristologia*. Neander maintains the same number of lines in every strophe, but not always the same position of the words; often a brief gloss is given in parentheses.

*Dedication* (ed. of [Leipzig], 1596). Praestantissimo iuveni pietate, doctrina et summo ingenio Guilielmo Budaeo in Academia Basiliensi modo literas eruditas et medicinam discenti suo Φιλτάτῳ S.D. [Inc.] (fol. 2r) Cum enarrarem aliquando, Wilhaelme suavissime γενναῖα κεφαλή, tibi et commilitonibus aliquot tuis, eruditis et praestantibus iuvenibus, Argonautica Lyricorum principis Pindari, memini adeo tibi probari quae tum de ore meo exceptisses, ut omnia digna
existimares, quae cum multis communia fient. Etsi vero tum inter occupatio-
nes minus cogitate et elaborate dicta nullo loco haberem, tamen cum nuper Bas-
laea tuas ad me suavissime scriptas acciperem, quibus videbaris poscere signum
et testimonium aliquod mei in te veteris studii, amoris quoque et benevolentiae
pioris, et tum forte se offerrent quae tum converteras, digesseras et exposueras.
Accederent etiam aliorum hortationes qui existimarent pagellas Pindaricas,
tametsi a me iam pridem abiectas, utiles nihilominus futuras dissertibus putavi
esse producendas. Cum illis adiunxi etiam expositionem Grammaticam Idyllio-
rum / Theocriti exceptam [sic] itidem aliquando de nostris praelectionibus ab
adolescente nostro alumno, tui ubique similimo [sic], quod est nostri amantissi-
mo et studiosissimo, sedulo in omni officio ingenioso et erudito . . . [Expl.]:
(fol. 3r) 17 Ianuarii Anni 1592. Т. χρήσει καὶ κτήσει non amplius Neander sed nunc
etiam Dei indebita misericordia Gerander.

Prolegomena in Pindarum Neandri. [Inc.]: (fol. 154r) Pindarus, patre
Scopelino tibicine natus, Thebanus fuit, popularis Herculis et Bachi, duorum
celebratissimorum principum, unde et Dircaeus cygnus vel orlo a poetis nun-
cupatur. . . [Expl.]: (fol. 157r) Illis ludis praefecti fuerunt Amphictiones sive
judices delecti ad illam rem ex praecipuis urbibus Graeciae qui et de certatori-
bus pronunciabant aliquos victores declarabant et praemia pro meritis cuiusque
distribuabant.

Argumentum quarti hymni Pythiorum. [Inc.]: (fol. 157r) Supplicat Pinda-
rus in hoc hymno Arcesilao Cyrenaecorum regi, ut transfugae Demophilus, qui ex
urbe Cyrene Libiae seditione quadam orta profugerat, ignoscat. . . [Expl.]: (fol. 158r) Ac est hic hymnus omnium Pindaricorum Epiniciorum longissimus
et praestantissimus, cum fere alias certe et docta confertaque brevitate Lyrica
carmina gaudeant. Ac quae Orpheus poëtarum vetustissimus et sapientissimus
qui et eius profectionis comes et socius fuerat, et pleraque quae Argonautis acci-
derant coram oculis spectaverat, et Apollonius Rhodius in Argonauticis suis
tradiderunt, Pindarus veluti brevi fasce singula et universa in hoc suo quarto
Pythiorum hymno studuit complecti.

Translation. Arcesilao Cyrenaec curru vincenti Hymnus Pythiorum Pindar-
icorum quartus. Strophe I. vers. 14. [Inc.]: (fol. 159r) Hodie quidem oportet te
apud amicum virum / Regem stare equestris Cyre-/ nes ut choros – ducente cum
Arcesilao, / O Musa, Apollini debitus / Pythonique augeas flatum (secundum)
hymnorum / Ubi quondam aurearum / Iovis aquilarum adsestrix / Non absente
Apolline, / Existente, sacerdos (Pytiae) / vaticinata est, habitatorem Battum / (futurum)
faecundae Libyae sacram / Insulam (Theram) ut relinquent / Condat equestrem / Civitatem (Cyrenem) in candida mamma. . . . [Expl.]: (fols.
18r–183r) Neque alicui damnum dans, illaesus / Vero ipse (quoque ut sit) a civi-
bus et ut / Narret qualem o Arcesilae / Invenerit fontem divinorum carminum /
recens (in) Thebis hospitio exceptus (a Pindaro). Finis.
Edition:

Digital copy: Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg.

Biography:
See CTC 7.175.
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11. Petrus Angelius Bargaeus (?) – Pietro Angéli or Degli Angéli

Modena, Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, lat. 1077 (a J 5.16), a voluminous untitled codex from the second half of the sixteenth century copied by the same hand throughout, contains a Latin translation of Theocritus (comprising the texts now regarded as apocryphal), the tragedies of Sophocles, and the odes of Pindar. Kristeller (Iter 1.383) tentatively proposes the authorship of Petrus Angelius Bargaeus.

The old manuscript catalogue of the holdings of the Biblioteca Estense identifies him as “Angéli, Petrus” and gives the codex the title Opera omnia, evidently on the basis of the name that appears in the initial leaves. For to the beginning of the codex has been added an unnumbered bifolium (a gathering of two leaves) in which is preserved a text in Italian with this title and incipit: Canzone al crucifixo di Pietro Angelio Bargeo (fols. [2v–3r]), [Inc.] “Supremo sol, che con tua santa luce.” No work of this title is listed among the printed books. Two different hands appear on these leaves: the first, identical to the one that copied the rest of the codex, wrote only the word “Canzone,” and the text down to line 15. The second has completed the wording of the title and the authorial identification, and written the remainder of the text. In the last leaves of the manuscript, fols. 429v–432r, there appears another text in Italian, in blank hendecasyllables, with the title Vide pagina septima: it proves to be an Italian translation of the third Idyll of Theocritus, the Latin translation of which does indeed appear at fol. 7v. At fol. 70r there appears another Theocritan text translated into Latin distichs, “Furtivus fugeret nuper cum mella Cupido,” and also followed by an Italian version, “Amore l’altro giorno se n’andava.” These materials are all copied by the same hand that wrote the rest of the manuscript.
Bargaeus was a man well-versed in the ancient languages, who taught at Reggio Emilia and Pisa, composed several translations from the Greek, and wrote verse in Latin and Italian. Among his Poemata omnia (Florence, 1568) may be found versions in Latin of Greek epigrams and poems of Theocritus (In Adonis obitum, ex Theocrito), and a long elegy composed in Greek. His Latin translation of the Stratagemata of Polyenus, found in Pisa, Biblioteca Universitaria, 245, is unpublished. He stated that he was the author of a translation of De elocutione by Demetrius Phalereus, but did not publish it because of the publication of Pier Vettori’s edition with commentary. His rendering of the Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles into Italian was printed repeatedly (from 1588 to 1748).

The manuscripts of the works of Bargaeus are found in Pisa, Biblioteca Universitaria, manuscripts 244 and 245; traditionally described as autograph copies, they have in my view been copied by more than one very similar hand. Some portions might however be autograph, for example the leaves in manuscript 245 that contain books 7–12 of the Syrias, which present many corrections and interlinear variants. Other pages, too, contain notes or corrections attributable to this hand. The writing of the Modena manuscript is certainly contemporaneous and highly similar, as is the material aspect of the three manuscripts located in Modena and Pisa: they would appear to have issued from the same source.

The canzone that appears in the initial leaves of the Modena manuscript might also be adduced in favor of Bargaeus’ authorship. The first hand continues through the whole manuscript: it commenced to copy the canzone without giving the author’s name (as an author himself obviously might), the name being added later by the second hand. Yet all these circumstances are insufficient to guarantee that the translations in this codex were made by Bargaeus.

Moreover, comparison of the Latin translation of the poem on the death of Adonis, then considered the work of Theocritus, which appears at fol. 54r–v of the Modena manuscript, with the one printed among the Latin poems of Bargaeus (Florentiae [Florence], 1568, 292–93) offers no corroboration. The version in the manuscript is *ad verbum* and maintains the customary correspondence between the stichs, while the one in print, in elegant hendecasyllables, is much freer. Equally uncorroborative is a close comparison between the Italian translation of Edipo Tiranno in print and the Latin translation present in the Modena manuscript. It remains the case that Theocritus and Sophocles were authors well known to, and frequented by, Bargaeus. Pindar, in contrast, is absent from his Latin and Italian poetry in print; but we know how much suspicion an interest in Pindar might attract in Italy at that time. So overall, the attribution of the Pindar translation in the Modena manuscript to Bargaeus remains probable, but unproved.

It is independent of any of the translations published anywhere in the sixteenth century. All the texts in the manuscript are in fair copy, and sometimes
corrected or completed by interlinear and marginal readings, and scattered explanatory notes, all in the same hand.

This version does not aim at literary elegance; it is literal and seeks to respect the position of the words in the Greek text, which obviously deranges the Latin syntax to the point of making the meaning impossible to grasp in places without recourse to the Greek. Thus it would seem to be work done for instructional purposes. Surprisingly, the odes bear no sign of division into triads (at the beginning of Pyth. 1 only, we read Conversio, but no division follows). Ol. 1 and 2 are written without a break, but from Ol. 3 on brief titular formulas appear.
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Manuscript:
Modena, Bibl. Estense Universitaria, lat. 1077 (a J 5.16), s. XVI second half, fols. 301r–429r (Kristeller, Iter 1.383).

Biography:
Petrus Angelius Bargaeus (Pietro Angéli or Degli Angéli, from Barga) was born in the Tuscan town of Barga on 22 April 1517. He began the study of the classical languages with his uncle Cristoforo, then with Romolo Amaseo at Bologna. He was a military man in his youth, and travelled widely; in 1546 he began teaching, first at Reggio Emilia (1546–49), then at Pisa until 1586. The numerous editions of his works, which were also printed abroad (in some cases prior to appearing in Italy) attest to his reputation among his contemporaries. He had numerous international contacts: one text, printed at p. 309 of his Poemata omnia (Florence, 1568), shows that despite the troubles and the barriers thrown up by the age, he was able to have books sent to him from Switzerland. Bargaeus was a member of the commission charged with revising Torquato Tasso’s Gerusalemme Liberata; in 1588 he became Consul general of the Accademia Fiorentina. He was a friend of Benedetto Varchi, Pier Vettori, and Giovanni Della Casa. Bargaeus died at Pisa on 29 February 1596.

Works:
Bargaeus published verse in Latin (Cynegetica, Carminum libri II, Eglogae III, Lugduni [Lyons], 1561; Poemata omnia, Florence, 1568; Rome, 1585) and Italian (Poesie toscane, Florence, 1589). The first two books of his long Latin poem Syrias came out in 1582 (Paris) and 1585 (Rome), with the complete work appearing at Florence in 1591. In prose he wrote many orations and works of erudition, like the treatise Quo ordine scriptorum Historiae Romanæ monumenta sint legenda, included in the multi-author work De philologia, studiis liberalis doctrinae (Leiden, 1696).

Bibliography:
At the start of the second part of this miscellaneous codex in Hamburg, there is this indication: “Anno 1553 30. octobris. Ex praelectione matutina Domini Philippi collectanea ὑπομνημάτων in Pindari odas.” The notes, running from pp. 373 to 379, contain the first lectures from a morning course on Pindar delivered by Philip Melancthon, in parallel with a course on Thucydides. A brief accessus opens by attributing a preference for Pindar’s odes, when set against the Psalms, to the Italian humanist Lazzaro Bonamico (1477–1552), an anecdote subsequently recycled by Melancthon with Poliziano as the protagonist (see below). The customary information about Pindar and the Olympic games follows, with the rubrics in a Latin that sometimes wobbles: “Quid proprie discendum est ex Pindaro”; “Qui sint Homeri coectaneis”; “Explicatio ode Horatio lib. 4 Carminum.” At pp. 377–79 there appears a Latin translation of Ol. 1.1–36, with scattered marginal notes. There are many cancellations, rewritings, and interlinear or marginal additions in smaller writing, with callouts in the text. The notes break off shortly below the middle of p. 379 and the following page is blank. The translation is the one published in 1558, with a few variants, mostly errors (e.g.: videas per videris; celebravimus per celebrabimus; Libii per Lydii) and many lacunae, even empty spaces, in the antistrophe and in the few lines of epode that appear. These point to the difficulties encountered by the taker of the notes. As with Melancthon’s prose translation printed in 1558, no reference is made to the tripartition of the text. Accessus (Cod. Philol. 166, pp. 373–77). Anno 1553, 30 Octobris. Ex praelectione matutina Domini Philippi collectanea ὑπομνημάτων in Pindari Odas. [Inc.]: (p. 373) Non volo uti alia [commemoratione in cass.] praefactione nisi illa <interl. usitata> commemoratione <marg. sin. quam soleo vobis recitare de> Lazaro Bonamico profess. in Italia, qui ante annum est mortuus. Cum in comparatione de Psalterio Davidis quomodo sibi placeret, respondit bene sibi placere graves illas sententias de providentia, de iustitia . . . Sed enim magis sibi placere Pindarum qui eadem tractat, de providentia, de iustitia, de vera honestate, et carminibus luculentissimis, et ornatus involuta fabulis, et pulchris hymnis. . ./. . . [Expl.]: (p. 377) Dixi de commonefacto argumento, quod sit de condonata iustitia, de providentia, de vita honesta, de modestia. Translation. [Inc.]: (p. 377) Primae odae versio. Optima res est aqua, Aurum excellit in superbis divitii sicut excellit fulvus ignis nocte, sed si certamina narrare cupis, o anime, non aliud sole videas ardentius astrum in die per desertum aethera, neque olympico agone praestantiorum alium celebravimus. . ./. . . [Expl.]: Decet autem homines de diis honesta dicere. [blank space] Fili Tantali, ego te laudabo aliter quam priores.
Manuscript:
Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibl., Cod. philol. 166 (misc.), s. XVI (date of translation 1553), 373–79. (See Kristeller, Iter 3.563a; CTC 8.164–66).

b. Edition of 1558

As the notes from Melancthon’s Pindar lectures in Hamburg reveal, he taught Pindar to his students in 1553, and it will presumably not have been the only occasion on which he did so, given the educational importance attached to the study of Pindar at that time in Protestant schools.

His translation of the odes was published at Basel in 1558. In the titular formula of the Olympians we read that the printed text is ex praelectione, meaning it was taken from Melancthon’s lectures, although whether it was transcribed by a pupil or reworked by the author himself we do not know. It is highly likely that his son-in-law Caspar Peucerus took care of both the text and the printing, since he signs the dedicatory letter. The decision to delegate these cares to another would attract veiled disapproval from Henricus Stephanus (see I.14 below).

In the dedicatory letter, Peucerus goes straight to the point: sacred writings, divinely inspired, must be distinguished from all other writings. He then launches a polemic against those who—and here he names Poliziano, but adds that the view is widely shared—put literary texts and sacred texts on the same plane. Poliziano, it is claimed, while acknowledging the importance of the moral precepts, the erudition, and the elegance of the Psalms, concluded that in Pindar all of that was present too, but set forth with greater elegance and splendid examples. Peucerus concurs about the morality and elegance of Pindar’s poetry, but emphasizes that the wisdom of the Psalms is of a different, and incomparable, order, since they guide man toward God.

Let us read Pindar, writes Peucerus, for the abundance of historical information unrecorded elsewhere that he supplies; for the exotic fabulae of the mythology with which he adumbrates moral teachings; for the golden sententiae he elegantly inserts: for this was how the ancients transmitted their sagacity, through historical narratives and moral precepts. The examples of virtue and the moral lessons spur the souls of readers to good behavior, the more so if these lessons are expressed with sweetness and splendor, as in the poetry of Pindar, which, as Horace says, soars above mundane circumstances. Young men must therefore read these charming texts, the wisdom of which has been recognized in every age, even by Alexander the Great who, when ordering his men to raze the city of Thebes to the ground, famously spared just one house—the one in which Pindar had been born. Peucerus concludes that the youth of his time must also be made acquainted with Pindar, and that this Latin interpretation, which perfectly renders the sense while avoiding all that might generate obscurity, is offered to them to ease their access to the Greek.
The juxtaposition of the Psalms and Pindar, originating with Jerome in his *praefatio* to the book of Job and in other works (see *Fortuna*, Latin Literature), had been adduced for the first time by Zwingli in the dedicatory epistle to the Basel edition of 1526 (see I.c below). Erasmus had taken a firmly opposed stance in the *Dialogus Ciceronianus* of 1528 (“confer psalmos nihil humani spirantes cum Pindaricis adulationibus,” *Opera omnia*, 1.2, 644). The converse preference for Pindar over the Psalms attributed here and elsewhere to Poliziano is not to be found anywhere in the writings of the Florentine humanist, but it does turn up often in those of Melanchthon and his students. In a letter to Adam Crato (Crafft or Krafft) of 1553, Melanchthon states that the anecdote was told him by Poliziano’s student Dionysius Capnio (Dionysius Reuchlin, nephew of the great humanist Johannes Reuchlin and a member of a family related to Melanchthon):


The same anecdote featuring Poliziano, accompanied by the same considerations, is reported by Paulus Dolscius (a pupil of Melanchthon) in the *Epistola nuncupatoria* to his translation of the Psalms into Greek elegiac distichs (Basel, 1555), and is printed in the same volume of the *Corpus Reformatorum* (vol. 8, 341–43). The editors, though, maintain that the author of this epistle is not Dolscius but Melanchthon himself.39 That the letter of Dolscius, or the one by Peucerus in the Pindar, are the work of Melanchthon, is an unproved claim; but it is certain at any rate, as the notes in the Hamburg manuscript indicate, that they do convey the ideological ground of his reading of Pindar. The adversarial alignments of the age (and not just in literature), make it probable that those who exaggerated the juxtaposition of Pindar and the Psalms, and scandalously suggested that illustrious Graecists like Buonamico or Poliziano had actually ranked Pindar first, did so for a purpose: to rob the juxtaposition of its force (without mentioning Zwingli) and insist on the radical aloofness of the sacred writings from pagan

---

39 See *Corpus Reformatorum*, vol. 8, 341: “Melanthonem esse auctorem huius Dolsci epistolae testatur Mylius in chronolog. Libror. Melanth. ad ann. 1555, neque est quod dubitemus, quam idem Melanthonem alii fecisse sciamus, ut Hofmanno, Vito Theodoro, Dolscius vero eius discipulus fuerit.”
literature. This was the stance of Erasmus, Melancthon and his disciples Peucerus and Dolscius, and also Neander (see I.10 above and I.e below).

As Peucerus states, the prose translation offered here, with no marks distinguishing the strophes, is focused on rendering the meaning. Abandoning the impossible aspiration to translate while retaining the position of the words or at least the number of cola, which often made the literal translations incomprehensible if unattended by an adequate paraphrase, Melancthon manages to render the sense of the text elegantly without straying too far from the Greek. But this option will be subjected to veiled criticism from Henricus Stephanus in the preface to his bilingual edition of 1560 (see I.14 below).

At the end, following the translation of Pindar, there appears a brief biography *ex Suida et Volaterrano*, rounded off with the opinions of Quintilian (*Inst. Or. 10.1.61*) and Horace's ode 4.2.


---


Pindari Nemea. Ode I. Chromio Aetnaeo. [Inc.]: (p. 82) Ortygia, in quam effunditur Alpheus, Syracusarum decus, et cubile Dianae, Deli soror, a te hymnus incipit dicere laudem velocium equorum, in gratiam Iovis Aetnaei, qui currum agitat Chromii, et iungit encomium victoriae in Nemeis. . . . . / . . . [Expl.]:


Edition:
1558, Basileae (Basel): per Ioannem Oporinum. BL; Cambridge University Library; Munich, BSB.

Digital copy: Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.
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13. Antonio Sebastiani (Antonio Minturno)

Antonio Sebastiani, known as il Minturno, inserted a translation of the first Olympian into his treatise De poeta (Venice, 1559). In book 5, on the lyric genre, he reviews various subgenres and indicates the best models for imitation. The primary one, for Minturno, is Pindar.

The version is presented as a juvenile exercise: verti enim adolescens per ludum. Executed in Latin verse, it succeeds in creating a perfect metrical calque of the original: the text, in 188 lines subdivided into four regular triads consisting of Conversio, Reversio, and Epodus, not only yields the same number of lines as the original, it scrupulously respects the metrical structure as well. A few techniques associated especially with Pindar, like synaphy and hyperbaton, also appear. The numerous constraints notwithstanding, the Latin is flowing and
elegant. The text of Pindar is that of the Roman edition of 1515, and the metrical interpretation is based on the ancient metrical scholia included in the Romana, with very few departures.

Minturno introduces his translation as follows (pp. 394–95): Ac tametsi neminem esse putat Horatius, qui non frustra conetur illum aemulari, si quis tamen in animum induxerit, ut velit eundem scribendi modum imitari, quod hac aetate audio non deesse, qui moliatur, ne desit quo quidem ille utatur tanquam exemplo, in medium afferam primum illum ex Olympiis carmen. In quo vertendo (verti enim adolescens per ludum) qua caeteri saepe utuntur libertate, si mihi id quoque licere sum arbitratus, praesertim cum in versu trochaico semel pro trochaeo spondeum (quod ipse Pindarus non fecit) secundo posuerim loco, obsecro ne vitio vertatis. Nam quod syllabae inter se divisae, aut potius a verbis abscisae videantur, quorum priores finem versus expleant superioris, subsequentis initium caeterae faciant, nihil profecto mirum. Cum Horatius non semel in hoc idem inciderit, ut “Ocium bello furiosa Thrace, / Ocium Medi pharetra decori / Grosphe, non gemmis, neque purpura ve- / Nale nec auro.” Nec mirandum sit, quod conversiones plerunque clausulas habeant ita imperfectas, ut quae pars orationis, sive membrum, sive circuitus, sive incisio, non est antegredientis fine conversionis absoluta, absolvatur initio consequentis, cum vel Epodo non usquequaque sententia claudatur.

Translation (A. Sebastiani Minturnus, De poeta, [Venice, 1559], 394–97).


Edition:

Biography:
Antonio Sebastiani, known as il Minturno, was born at Minturno (in the province of Naples) in 1500. He studied there and then at Naples with Agostino Nifo; elected to the Accademia Pontaniana in 1526, he was a tutor to members of the Pignatelli family until 1544. In 1551 he went to the University of Pisa, and
subsequently to Rome, summoned by Pope Julius III who made him bishop of Ugenta in Calabria (1559) and then of Crotone, where he remained until his death in 1574. His treatises *De poeta* (Venice, 1559) and *L’arte poetica* (Venice, 1563) are significant contributions to the sixteenth-century debate on Aristotle’s *Poetics*. He also wrote poetic works in Latin and Italian.

**Bibliography:**


14. Henricus Stephanus – Henri Estienne

In 1560 the most successful sixteenth-century translation of Pindar, that of Henricus Stephanus, was published at Geneva. Four further editions followed before 1600, and four more in the early decades after 1600. There were also editions by his son Paulus that utilized the same translation (see b. below).

The work is dedicated with great deference to Melancthon, in acknowledgment of a letter from him exhorting Stephanus benevolently to promote the study and publication of Greek texts. Stephanus thanks Melancthon and notes that he has already edited Diodorus Siculus [Geneva, 1559] and will soon publish Xenophon [Geneva, 1561], in addition to the bilingual Pindar he now offers him. Pindar is a poet he has always loved, even more so when he read him in the Melancthon translation. While lauding the Melancthon translation, Stephanus adverts to a difference: whereas his translation, planned for classroom use, will be literal, Melancthon’s does not render the text word for word, although it does convey the sense. Regret is expressed that Melancthon had not been able to supervise the work of the printshop personally because of his numerous commitments, and had not even submitted an autograph manuscript to the typesetter.

Stephanus adds that he has always regarded *ad verbum* translation, especially of poetry, as a tree without leaves, but has opted for it in this case in order to help learners, especially beginners, since they will be able to compare the Latin with the Greek original word for word. In the companion volume, Stephanus declares,
he has published and translated all the texts he could find of the eight other lyric poets, and expresses the hope that the gift will not be unpleasing to Melancthon, even though he (Stephanus) would have wished to offer him something more worthy, as testimony of his esteem and friendship; but he who gives all he possesses merits gratitude in any case. (See Fragmenta below for the Pindar fragments.) Stephanus ends with the wish that God may permit Melancthon, now very old, to enrich the republic of letters with his work for many years to come.

To the dedication are appended a few texts: Horace, ode 4.2, lines 1–27; and three Greek epigrams (AP VII, 34 e 35; XVI 305).

The Latin translation is in prose, and corresponds to the author’s profession of strict literality; the Greek text is printed en regard, so that young students may move from one to the other with ease; even the impagination attempts, as far as possible, to respect the correspondence between Greek text and Latin translation.

A few diacritics are employed in the translation: incomplete square brackets indicate that which the translator has added with respect to the original Greek; the asterisk marks textual variants or at any rate cruxes in the text; and, following a custom inaugurated by the Zwingli edition of Pindar, the sententiae are set off by double quotation marks in the outside margin, on both right and left.

At the end a few texts of use for teaching purposes appear: two lives of Pindar, the first Scholiis Graecis praefixa, the second ex Suida; two texts dealing with Pindar’s meters, De strophis, antistrophis et epodis, ex prolegomenis scholiorun in Pindarum and Aliter de iisdem. The appendix concludes with the life of Pindar by Lilius Gregorius Giraldus (Lilio Gregorio Giraldi), taken from the ninth dialogue of his Historiae poetarum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum dialogi decem (Basel, 1545).

\[a. \text{The original version}\]

Dedication (ed. of [Geneva], 1560). Henricus Stephanus Philippo Melanchthoni S.P.D. [Inc.]: (p. 3) Redditae mihi nuper tuae literae fuerunt, Philippe, (literarum et literatorum decus) non solum humanitatis plenae, sed insigne etiam tuae erga me propemodum paternae benevolentiae indicium praebentes. Quibus quod me ad promovendum Graecae linguae thesaurum vehementer hortatus es, currenti (ut aiunt) calcar addidisti: quod autem et tu et Ioachimus Camerarius vestrum mihi de opere illo consilium aperuistis, hoc sane pacto longe planiorem facilioremque meo cursui viam patefecistis. Sed eum (ne quis tarditatem pedum aut segnitiem in causa esse putet) crebra remorata sunt hactenus remoranturque etiamnunc diverticula. Sic autem appello ea praesertim quae Graecorum scriptorum editio mihi affert avocamenta. Ea autem qualia quantaque esse soleant, nuper declaravit editus a me Diodorus Siculus, declarabit propediem (Deo favente) Xenophon, / declarat iam nunc lyricorum princeps

Translation. Pindari Olympia. Ex nova interpretatione, eaque ad verbum. Hieroni Syracusano, equo celete victoriam adepto. Ode I. [Inc.]: (p. 9) Optima quidem est aqua, et aurum (velut ardens ignis noctu) excellit eximie inter superbificas divitas: at si certamina narrare cupis, anime mi, ne iam sole contempleris aliud splendidius astrum, lucens interdiu per desertum aetherem: neque Olympico certamen praestantius dicemus, unde celeberrimus hymnus contextur doctorum ingeniis, ut decantent Saturni filium, venientes opulentam et beatam Hieronis domum: *iustum qui regit sceptrum in divite pecoris Sicilia, decerpens quidem summitates ex singulis virtutibus: resplendet autem et musices in flore, qualiter ludimus frequenter nos viri circa mensam iucundam. . . . . [Expl.]: (pp. 157–59) Negros muros habentem domum Persephonae vade Echo, patri nobile ferens nuntium, Cleodamum ut intuita filium, dicas quod ei iuvenilem / (p. 159) in finibus illustris Pisae coronavit inclytorum certaminum pennis caesariem.

Pindari Pythia. Hieroni Aetnaeo Syracusano, curru victoriam adepto. Ode I. [Inc.]: (p. 159) Aurea cithara Apollinis, et nigrum capillitium habentium
Musarum consona possessio, quam audit quidem rhythmus, laetitiae initium / (p. 161) et parent cantores signis [tuis] quum choris praeuentium proemiorum praeludia facis, et cuspidatum fulmen extinguis aeterni ignis, dormitque sub sceptro Iovis aquila, velocem alam utrinque laxans, *dux avium nigramque nubem (palpebrarum suave claustrum) super aduncum eius rostrum infundis. 

.../. ./. [Expl.]: (p. 345) Quod si qua felicitas inter homines [est] non sine labore existit: sed eam ad exitum perducet aut hodie [aut postea] deus. Certe fatale decretum non evitabile: sed erit id tempus quod alicui quum desperationem immiserit, contra opinionem hoc quidem dabit, illud autem nondum.


Editions:


1567, Antverpiae [Antwerp]: ex officina Christophori Plantini. A reprint of the 1560 edition. In the dedicatory letter, “Philippo Melanchthoni” is abbreviated...
to “P. M.” The Greek text and that of the Latin translation are laid out in two columns on the same page, but apart from this (elegant) change of impagination, the rest is identical. BAV; BL; BNF; Milan, Bibl. Naz. Braidense; Toronto, Thomas Fisher Lib. Digital copy in Google Books.


b. The edition of Paulus Stephanus and Isaac Casaubon (1599)

Paulus Stephanus, while continuing to supervise reprints of his father’s translation alone, also prepared a new edition of Pindar in 1599 with input from the great Graecist Isaac Casaubon. While retaining the same translation he added an edition of the scholia vetera as a commentary on all the odes, and the scholia recentia on the Olympians, attributed to Demetrius Triclinius. This is the third edition of the scholia, following the Romana of 1515 and the Francofurtina of 1542. The latter is the base text for this edition by Paulus Stephanus.

In the dedication to Iacobus Bongarsius (Jacques Bongars, CERL: cnp01162784), Paulus Stephanus stresses that the texts have been revised, observing that in prior editions there were cases where text and corresponding scholium might present variant readings, and often enough gross errors. He adds
that he left the whole task of revision to his brother-in-law, Isaac Casaubon. But the biographical literature states that Casaubon had left Geneva for Montpellier in 1596, so the task may have been interrupted by his departure and published later. Casaubon had already collaborated on the third Pindar edition of Henricus Stephanus ([Geneva], 1586) with some observationes that deal with difficult passages (pp. 411–14).

The apparatus from the editions of Henricus Stephanus appear at the beginning, combined with that from the edition of Frankfurt 1542. Following the Olympians (at pp. 129–82), the scholia recentia are printed in Greek, again in a text derived from the 1542 edition. A detailed metrical analysis (in Greek) precedes every ode. As mentioned, the translation is that of H. Stephanus, so it is not reproduced here.

Dedication (ed. of [Genève], 1599). Nobilissimo viro Iacobo Bongarsio P. Stephanus. [Inc.]: (sig. ηιii) Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, inquit hic noster Pindarus, vir clarissime, nempe quod sit elementorum praecipuum; deinde metallis omnibus aurum ubi praetulit, solis etiam inter astra splendorem praecedere contendit . . . / (sig. ηjiiv) Quot autem mendis scateat vetus quae extat editio, nosti, opinor, optime, quae saepe aliter in textu, aliter in scholiis scriptum habet; circa nomina propria raro sibi constans, circa distinctiones depravassimia, et quae versus hinc inde citat corruptissime. Nonnulla certe menda quom in margine annotata haberem, de quibus olim collatum a me fuerat cum affini coniunctissimo Isaaco Casaubono, re nuper ipsi ac recens communicata, quia mihi spem suarum observationum fecit, sub ipsius incudem omnia remisi: quarum fruitionem lectori, / (sig. ζ 3) ubi primum dabitur, non invidebo. [Expl.]: Tu modo circa scholiasten nostrum, corruptissime inquam a veteri illo exemplari exhibitum, hac nostra editione multis in locis emendationem, nobis facilis esto, dulcis amor Musarum; atque huc interdum a tot et tantis negotiis regedere, et quam Olympiada decertare iuvet, delige. Vale. Tui observantissimus P. Stephanus.
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15. Nicolaus Selneccerus

Daniel Selneccerus published the treatise on classical meters composed by his father Johannes Selneccerus, *Brevis et utilis libellus prosodiae*, in 1568, at the latter’s suggestion. It is dedicated to his fellow student Fridericus Vuidebrandus Jr., and contains the Pindaric *sententiae* collected by another family member, the celebrated theologian Nicolaus Selneccerus, a pupil of Melanchthon. Various texts follow the dedicatory letter: poems by Fridericus Vuidebrandus and I. Lauterbachius, and three texts in prose by Melanchthon, Ioachim Camerarius, and Iacob Miclylus.

The *sententiae* are printed in Greek. They are not translated literally, but paraphrased, in line with criteria established by Melanchthon, who preferred a free rendering of the sense rather than strict adherence to the letter. Some are merely commented on, with frequent citations from Horace; in one case the Latin translation is augmented by a version in German.

**Titlepage.** *Brevis et utilis libellus prosodiae, olim scriptus in usum discen-tium rationem recte et eleganter scribendi Graecos et Latinos versus. Dicta Pin-darica Graeca, olim puerili studio collecta, cum brevi explicatione et indicatione sententiae cuiuslibet dicti, autore Nicolao Selneccero.*

**Dedication** (ed. of Leipzig, 1568). Daniel Selneccerus, Optimae indolis et spei puero Friderico Vuidebrando, Viri claris. D. M. Friderici Vuidebrandi vatis praestantissimi, filio, condiscipulo suo carissimo, S. D. [Inc.]: (p. 2) Cum parens tuus, Friderice carissime, Vir clarissimus, suo quodam iure editionem huius libelli, quem tibi mitto, a patre meo flagitaret, nulla alia de causa, nisi quod iudicaret, hunc libellum, quem a patre meo ante annos quatuordecim in / gratiam et usum Iohannis Rudingeri, Vratislavensis patricii, piae memoriae, (cuius immaturum obitum, addita insigni cum ingenii, tum virtutum ipsius praedicatione, saepe pater meus deplorat) scriptum esse accepit, tibi, cui ille donaretur, non fore infrugiferum, pater meus qui tuo parenti ratione, seu potius religione amicitiae sanctae, piae, arctae et firmae, denegare nihil potest, me iussit, ut ad te ego hunc qualemcunque Prosodiae libellum dono mitterem. . . . Adiungi autem pater voluit formulam versificationis, ut vocant, iuxta quam et iudicini et memoriae
causa institueremus nostrae puerilis doctrinae exercitia, adiumento assumto ex libello versuum sententiosorum edito, diligentia et studio M. Bartolomaei Schonborn, Viri doctiss. et veteri amicitia utriusque nostrum / parentibus conjunctissimi, ad quos nostrum erit addere ex lectionibus nostris plures Poetarum flosculos, conduceentes doctrinae et virtutis studio. Dicere profecto non possum, quam delectetur exercitio illo versificandi pater meus, cum suavitate et elegantia illius ipsius exercitii, tum motus auctoritate D. Philippi, sanctiss. praeceptoris, beatæ memoriae, cuius recordatione exhilaratur ipse, quoties exercitii huius mentio fit. Sententias etiam ex Pindaro olim Vuitebergae collectas tibi pater donari voluit, suas una recitatas tantum ordine, non servata triernionum, aut carminis Lyrici ratione, de qua alias pater meus disseret, tibi mitto . . . [Expl.]: (p. 4v) Lipsiae, mense Novembri, durante adhuc συνόδῳ κριτικῇ, cuius catastrophe ut sit laeta et κουρότροφος, totis pectoreibus / Deum precari debemus. / Iterum vale. / M. D. LXXVIII.
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16. Nicolaus Sudorius – Nicolas Le Sueur
The translation by the Frenchman Nicolaus Sudorius marks a turning point in the sixteenth-century reception of Pindar: it is the first complete Latin translation in verse; it is unconnected with the realm of classroom instruction, and
gives primacy to the purely literary aspect, being directed at cultivated contemporaries; it is published in a country with a linguistic heritage flowing directly from Latin and is not the work of a Protestant; and finally, the author is a servant of the state, not a professional man of letters.

The enterprise took close to a decade to complete, from the first edition of the *Olympians* in 1575 to the comprehensive edition of the odes in 1582; that the author pursued it to the end would seem to verify that it was well received. In his various dedications Sudorius illustrates the aspects that ought to give this new public reason to welcome Pindar, especially the dedicatees, the king and senior members of the state apparatus: poetry confers immortality on the deeds of men, hence the ancient kings and emperors gave hospitality to poets (the dedication to Henri III in the complete edition of 1582); poetry has always been loved by great heads of state, who were often poets themselves (the dedication of the *Olympians* to Christophe de Thou); in Pindar’s poetry may be found lessons pertaining to good government and the practice of all the virtues (the dedication of the *Pythians* to Christophe de Thou); the ancients educated youth in both mind and body, and Pindar exalts these values (dedication of the *Nemeans* to Phillipe Hurault de Cheverny); just as the ancient victors were crowned with various tree branches, the dedicatee merits wreathes of olive and laurel for his varied literary activity (dedication of the *Isthmians* to Guy Du Faur de Pibrac).

As Sudorius himself states in his prefaces, he did not aim to translate *ad verbum*, but tried instead to preserve the spirit of Pindar, expressing him in Horatian language and meters; he has labored to make the Latin elegant and proper, dismissing all the previous translations, in which, he writes, Pindar was always made to speak Greek in Latin words, creating a monstrous hybrid. The best definition of the aspirations of Sudorius is found in an epigram of Federicus Morel in the 1582 edition: “Voces, Flacce, tuae; res est tua, Pindare, tota.”

The Sudorius translation was warmly greeted by contemporary men of letters, as we see in the verses of Jean Dorat at the end of the *Olympians* and those of Jonathas Petit and Federicus Morel at the end of the edition of 1582. In 1578 Ronsard addressed a laudatory sonnet to him.

*a. The edition of the Olympians, 1575*

This imprint launched the project of Sudorius. The novelty of the work, and the author’s unusually high social status, are evidenced by the dedication to Christophe de Thou, *premier président* of the Parlement de Paris, the high court of the realm. Sudorius underlines how the greatest political figures of Antiquity did not disdain to read the poets, and often to write verse themselves. This is the case of De Thou himself, occupied for many years in the administration of the realm, yet a student of ancient poetry, and the author of excellent verse. But if the poets enjoy wide admiration, the men of letters who comment on and translate
them do not enjoy the same prestige; yet we must not forget the extent to which the Romans studied the Greek authors, and also translated them. Many great Greek poets have been turned elegantly in Latin, but Pindar has had a different fate, for his grandeur was such that no Greek or Latin dared to follow him. One characteristic of his excellence is his frequent *excursus*, which Sudorius is at a loss whether to excuse, or praise: they often interrupt the discourse or dilate on secondary themes, for example when praise is directed to the home city of the victor instead of to the victor himself. But such digressions are proper to lyric poetry, and praise of cities has relevance inasmuch as they have shown their capacity to raise strong and virtuous men.

At the end, Sudorius comments on his own translation. It is significant that he uses the term *exprimere*, not *transferre* or a similar word: as he observes, he has not thought it necessary to include a Latin equivalent for every word of the Greek, but has chosen rather to reproduce Pindar’s thought in words and verse that conform to Latin elegance.

The translation in print corresponds to the author’s stated intention: the meters used are Horace’s, and the Horatian ode selected as a model is indicated at the start of each text (often ode 1.9). The style register is also elevated, echoing Horace especially, but other Latin poets as well. More than a translation, what we have is a transposition of Pindar’s general sense into the world of Latin poetry, with the consequent loss of many characteristic particulars, and the advantage of an impressive formal brilliance.

The translations are followed by the *Argumenta odarum* (preceded in the case of the fifth and eighth odes). The volume ends with several poetic compositions by Sudorius and others: an epitaph for the death of Charles IX, and a text in hexameters dedicated to Sudorius himself under the name “Nicolaus Suaerus,” composed by G. Valens Guellius (probably Germain Vaillant de Guélis, CERL cnpo0982251), a future bishop of Orléans and a refined man of letters. The final piece is an elegy in praise of the translation by Io. Auratus (Jean Dorat), lauding Sudorius for having undertaken a task hitherto unattempted: he did not fear the surge of the Pindaric torrent, nor rely on failing Daedalian wings; his wings were powerful, and with his verses he has lifted the victors above the stars.

*Dedication* (ed. of Paris, 1575). Ad amplissimum virum Christophorum Thuanum, in intimo Consilio Regis Consiliarium et Parisiensis Curiae Primum Praesidem, N. SVD. P. [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) Solonem Atheniensem, Vir amplissime, non solum prudentem Legislatorem, sed egregium etiam Poetam suisse scripta eius abunde testatur: quorum nonnulla, quasi e communi illo bonarum litterarum naufragio servata, ad nostram usque aetatem permansere. . ./. (fol. 3v) Qvod si alii poetae Graeci, ut Sophocles, Euripides, Homerus, Theocritus, elegantiae, gravitatis, et doctrinae ergo aliquando Latinitate donati sunt, Pindarus certe poeta huiusmodi est, ut in civitatem Romanam summis praemii
propositis, ulbro etiam allici et invitari debeat. Etenim, quemadmodum Quintilianus ait, spiritus magnificentia, sententii, figuris, rerum ac verborum copia, et veluti quodam flumine eloquentiae perfect, ne quis eum unum ex omnibus Poetis Graecis et Latinis sequi hactenus aut / imitari auderet. Duo sunt omnino in hoc vate excellenti, quae nescio an excusare, an vero potius profiteri, laudare, et praedicare debeam: Unum, quod saepe instituto sermone abrupto, et plane derelicto, in aliarum rerum magnarum certe, et cognitione dignarum, vacua spatia libere vel potius licenter excurrit; Alterum, quod sumpto sibi et proposito victore aliquo, diutius nonnunquam in patria illius, quam propria et peculiari virtute laudanda immoratur. Verum enimvero longiusculas illas digressiones, quas Graeci ἐκβάσεις appellant, et a Pindaro, et a caeteris Lyricis, Dithyrambicisque poetis usurpatus fuisse existimemus: partim ut hoc genere scribendi lectorum fastidium vitarent, partim ut diversarum rerum, sententiarum, historiarum, fabularum coacervatione, furoris et cuiusdam divini afflatus opinionem sibi in vulgus artificiose quaerarent. In civitatum vero et populorum encomia et laudes Pindarum propensiorem, et quodammodo effusiorem esse oportuit. Quod veteri Graeciae instituto in certaminibus, ludisque publicis, non solum victores praemii affici solerent, sed etiam victorum civitates, urbesque coronari, quae viros fortes et egregios, et laude dignos protulissent. Nos vero in hoc Poeta exprimendo non omnia eius verba reddere et referre necessarium nobis esse duximus, sed eius tantummodo sententiam, mentemque complecti his versibus et verbis, quae non a linguae Romanae usu, et Latini sermonis nitore abhorrerent. [Expl.]: (fol. 4r) Quicquid autem a nobis hac in re praestitum est, quod sentio quam sit exiguum, tibi potissimum dicare et consecrare opportunum visum est, cuius in nos nullo nostro merito egregiam semper humanitatem experti sumus.


Edition:
b. The edition of the Pythians, 1576

A year after the publication of the translation of the Olympians, Sudorius printed his version of the Pythians, also in Horatian meters. The preface, addressed as before to Christophorus Thuanus, reprises a theme familiar from previous translations, the morality of Pindar, especially his utility for the correct exercise of civic duties. Sudorius stresses that the ancients invented not just remedies for the ills of the body, but for those of the spirit as well. It was a task for philosophers and poets; Homer in particular offered mankind shining examples of the triumph of virtue over vice. While he may hold the first place, the second belongs to Pindar; in his odes he exalts good government, temperance, and fortitude in bearing pain; they contain all that is needed to train youth in good customs.

But there is more to Pindar than just the obvious moral themes; in his verse there is such splendor, gravity, and magniloquence that Horace properly compares them to an impetuous torrent that carries all before it. Nor should Pindar’s ability to describe things so vividly as to set them practically before our eyes, like a painting, be overlooked. An example is the description of Mount Etna in the first Pythian. All these qualities have impelled Sudorius to rescue such beautiful poems from the shadows, and bring them back into the light, with a slightly free rendering of the difficult passages.

To the objection that the task has detained him from his high institutional responsibilities, Sudorius responds that the reading and translation of Pindar are not alien to his duties, are indeed most helpful in carrying them out. He reaffirms that he has opted for a free translation, on account of the different nature of the Greek and Latin languages, whereas others have forced the Greek writers to speak Greek in Latin vocables, and in focusing narrowly on each and every syllable, have strayed far from the meaning.

As with the Olympians, Horatian meters are used and the Horatian ode imitated is cited at the start, and as before, the Argumenta odarum and some Latin verse by Sudorius form an appendix.

Dedication (ed. of Paris, 1576). Ad amplissimum virum Christophorum Thuanum, in intimo Consilio Regis Consiliarium et Parisiensis Curiae primum Praesidem, Praefatio Nicolai Sudorii in Pythia Pindari e Graeco sermone in Latinum conversa. [Inc.]: (fol. 2r) Cum antiquis illis et heroicis temporibus (Vir amplissime) humanum genus nullis adhuc libidinum et voluptatum pra-vis oblectationibus deditum esset, sed frugaliter, sobrie et naturae convenien-ter viveret, pauci admodum, ut Plato scribit, in civitatibus medici erant: atque ii corporum morbos simplici quadem et aperta et minime subtili ratione curabat . . . Sici autem statim initio ab hominibus ingenio praestantibus facilis illa et minime curiosa corporum medicina inventa est quam doctissimus vir
Hippocrates ἀρχαῖην ἰητρικὴν appellat, sic etiam aegritudinum animi multa olim ab excellentibus viris remedia quaesita et comparata sunt. Quae omnia antiquitas uno Philosophiae nomine comprehendit. Atque haec ipsa philosophia a poetis omnium primis exculta et tractata est. . . / (fol. 3v) Longum esset si recensere vellem ut semper apud Homerum dissimilia vitae morumque instituta dissimiles quoque exitus et praemia poenaeve consequantur. . . Post illum autem omnis poeticae facultatis et elegantioris doctrinae authorem antiquissimum, facile doctorum omnium iudicium secundum Pindarum locum obtinuit, qui cum in ea tempora incidisset, quibus in Graecia egregia paucorum hominum virtus adversus infinitam Persarum multitudinem enituisse dicitur, immensam illam et infinitam eloquentiam suam totam in magnorum et excellentium virom perpetua commendatione ac laude consumpsit. Quod si singularum eius odorum materiam et argumenta diligentem / excutias, hanc de optimo reipublicae statu, illam de temperantia et continentia, aliam de dolore fortiter tolerando conscriptam invenies: caeterisque scriptorum omnibus nihil fere nisi grave et serium et iuventutis moribus conformandis valde necessarium contineri. . . Atque haec quae diximus in rebus ipsis elucent, in verbis autem et numeris Pindari tantum est splendor, tanta gravitas, tanta sublimitas et grandiloquentia ut eum non immerito Horatius violentissimi torrentis more incitatum ruere, omniaque sibi obvia rapere secum et auferre dixerit. Non praetereunda est hoc loco Aristotelis verissima sententia, qui in libro de arte poetica scribit, excellentis poetae summum artificium esse, τὰ πράγματα τίθεσθαι πρὸ ὀμμάτων, hoc est, omnia ita luculente describere, ut quae narratur non recitari, sed potius fieri coram gerique videantur. Huius tam egregij operis sibi gloriam et palmam suo quodam iure Thebanus vates vindicat: argumento est locus ille primae Pythiorum Odae, in quo montis Aetnae, illa aetate insignis, fumi atque ignes certis temporum vicibus distincti, non tam commemorantur, quam quasi in tabula effecti pictique proponuntur . . . / Quod vero in uno tantummodo ingeniosissimi poetae carmine ostendimus, id per alios omnes hymnos aequaliter sparsum et diffusum reperietur. Quae omnia cum apud me saepissime reputarem et considerarem, opera pretium me facturum existimavi si poema longe pulcherrimum ex obscurissimis antiquitatis tenebris eruerem, et adhibita paulo liberior ac fusiori difficilium locorum interpretatione in lucem solemuque proferrem. Nec vero defuturos arbitror qui me (quoniam in literis aetatem agere decrevi) ad studia quadem poetici fabulis severiora revocent, nostramque operam et industriam, si qua est, melius multo in iure civili illustrando quam in poeta dithyrambico imitando collocari potuisse existimem. Verum enim vero, ut personae quam sustinemus nonnulla alia magis convenire et congruere fatemur, et ne illa ipsa aliquando attingere liceat, minime nobis interdictum putamus: sic Pindaricam poesim tot rerum gravium et magnarum cognitio abundantem, ad vitae communis usum spectare in primis et pertinere arbitramur.
Expl.: (fol. 5r) Scio equidem, et ingenue prae me fero, non me singula curiose authoris verba quasi appensa et adnumerata reddidisse. Sed culpam hac in re, si qua nostra est, hi facile excusabunt qui utriusque linguae proprietatem, conditionem, et quasi genium novere. Tanta enim illarum inter se diversitas et differentia est, ut qui singulas Graeci scriptoris voces interpretari velit, ineptissime in Latino sermone Graece loqui cogatur: et dum syllabis adhaeret et affixus est, a sententia sensuque authoris longissime aberret. Atque utinam (Vir amplissime) caeteros omnes tam aequos laboris nostri iudices et aestimatores habeamus, quam anteas fore crediderit, si more Graecorum te sibi in Gallia προστάτην et patronum peregrinus incola delegisset.


Edition:
1576, Lutetiae (Paris): ex officina Federici Morelli Typographi Regii. (Pythians). BNF. Digital copy in Google Books (lacking pages 6r, blank, and 6v, containing the beginning of the translation of Pythian 1):

c. The edition of 1582

In this year Sudorius brought out his complete verse translation of Pindar, augmented by a commentary on the Nemeans. It incorporates the preceding editions of Olympians and Pythians, with their original titlepages and the original pagination (but with the date altered to 1582). There follow, with a new titlepage and new continuous pagination, the Nemeans, the Isthmians, and the commentary on the Nemeans.

The work opens with a solemn Praefatio to the king of France, Henri III, which reworks a Pindaric commonplace frequently employed when addressing those in power: poets, in singing the deeds of great men, consecrate them to immortality. In ancient times there existed writers who conferred eternity on great accomplishments, like Pindar. Orpheus immortalized the voyage of the
Argonauts; Homer, the Trojan War; Herodotus, the wars of the Greeks and Persians; Virgil, Augustus and the birth of Rome. Hence the great emperors loved to surround themselves with poets who would record their deeds, as did Alexander the Great. Ancient Gaul too had its bards, who sung the feats of heroes, and Charlemagne himself is said to have collected and published ancient Gallic poems for the people to sing. The enterprises of François I and Henri II, kings of France, were extolled by poets, but in the vernacular language. Latin is employed somewhat less in France—hence Sudorius may be pardoned for having dared to write in his own mediocre Latin. He has nevertheless given himself over fully to the enterprise, hitherto unattempted, of interpreting Pindar in Latin, both because his odes set forth fundamental moral examples, and in order to make his sublime poetry accessible to all. Thus, having presented individual books to leading personalities of the kingdom, he has seen fit to dedicate the complete work to the king.

As noted, the first part of the volume reprints the *Olympians* of 1575 and the *Pythians* of 1576. The *Nemeans* are introduced by a *Praefatio* addressed to another important figure, the chancellor Philippum Huraltum Chivernium (Philippe Hurault de Cheverny, son-in-law of Christophe de Thou, who had died that year). It takes education for its theme, with numerous examples drawn from Greek and Latin writers. Education in ancient Greece was superior to modern education because it conjoined body and mind, and Pindar made himself the herald of these values. At the end there is a digression on the origin of the Nemean games.

The *Isthmians*, which are preceded by a brief dedication in elegiac verse to Guy Du Faur de Pibrac, a president of the Parlement de Paris and man of letters, which recalls the wreaths, made of various tree branches, that consecrated the winners at the Olympic games, and likens them to the leaves of olive and laurel deserved by the dedicatee for his oratorical and poetical activity. The commentary on the *Nemeans* (see I.f below) follows, and the book concludes with a few poems in praise of Sudorius by Jonathas Petit and Federicus Morel.

*Praefatio in opera Pindari* (ed. of Paris, 1582). In opera Pindari Praefatio ad Invictissimum et potentissimum Principem Henricum, Christianissimum Galliarum et Poloniae Regem. [*Inc.*]: (fol. *IIr*) Quantum momenti antiquitas esse existimaverit, Rex Christianissime et invictissime, ad hominum vitam regendam, moresque conformandos in gravi quadam et severa scelerum flagitiorumque vituperatione: recte autem et sapienter et fortiter factorum commendatione luculenta, satis indicant funebres illae orationes olim in clarorum et illustrium virorum exequiis haberi solitae, quae antiquissimis Graecorum legibus institutae sunt et Romanorum moribus / ita solemniter usurpatae, ut saepe ipsi imperatores Romani gentium omnium terrarumque domini, minime augusto illo maiestatis suae fastigio indignum esse duxerint: quibus in imperio successerant, eorum
vitam resque praeclare et feliciter gestas principali facundia exornare: sed Enco-
miorum omnium sive ea mortuis fatoque defunctis, seu viventibus, tribuenda
sint, duo quodammodo genera constitui possunt: quaedam enim pedestri et
soluta oratione explicantur, quaedam vero carminibus et modis, numerosisique
vocibus, quasi invecta et incitata violentius et vehementius ad hominum aures
sensusque perferunt. Prioris generis Panegyricas orationes multas, et graeca
lingua et latina sane pereleganter scriptas legitimus: sub posteriori continentur
Homerici omnes, Pindaricique hymni, quibus in theatris Graeciae, et celeberr-
is quatuor conventibus, saepissime decantatis, nihil quondam erudita illa natio
nec attentius ne libertius audivisse dicitur. . . / Ac nescio quo fato id accidisse
dicam, Rex Christianissime et invictissime, ut quibus saeculis famosissima bella a
potentissimis Regibus aut populis terra marique gesta sunt, iisdem etiam Poetae
excellentes paene divinitus excitati, et omnibus ingenii dotibus a natura subor-
nati extiterint ad eas res quae tum gerebantur versibus decorandas et in aeternam
posteritatis memoriam propagandas. . . / (fol. *IIIv*) Pindarus ipse, quem non
immerito Horatius vatem ab Homero secundum constituit, lyricis numeris et
carminibus suis fertur per universas nationes et gentes incredibilem quandam
atque inauditam ne libentius audivisse dicitur. . . . / Ac nescio quo fato id accidisse
dicam, Rex Christianissime et invictissime, ut quibus saeculis famosissima bella a
potentissimis Regibus aut populis terra marique gesta sunt, iisdem etiam Poetae
excellentes paene divinitus excitati, et omnibus ingenii dotibus a natura subor-
nati extiterint ad eas res quae tum gerebantur versibus decorandas et in aeternam
posteritatis memoriam propagandas. . . . / (fol. *6v*) . . . Carolus Magnus graeca latinaque lingua eruditus, nec Hebraicarum lit-
terarum ignorar, duo in orbe terrarum maxime insignia Gymnasia, Bononiense
scilicet et Lutetianum, instituit, eaque undique accersitus et / liberalissime invi-
tatis ingenuarum artium literarumque omnium magistris et doctoribus instruxit
et exornavit. Nec desunt etiam qui scribant illum ipsum tot imperii regnique
negotiis maximis implicitum et occupatum, antiquissima quaedam Gallorum
carmina, quibus priscorum Regum Ducumque res illustissimae celebrabantur,
emendasse et publice cantanda postea in vulgus edidisse. . . . sed latino sermone /qui hodie omnium latissime diffusus, nullis regionum aut gentium finibus et ter-
minis circumscribitur, multi ex Italis, pauci ex hominibus nostris vates egregii
excellentioresque floruerunt: quo facilius opinor mihi illi veniam daturi sunt qui
in caeteris quidem artibus et scientiis mediocratam tolerabilem esse credunt,
in versibus vero quidquid paulum paulum absumo gradu decesserit, continuo ad
inum vergere et delabi existimant. . . . / Quidquid tamen ex illis quasi altissimo
cinere abditum a nobis erui aegreque et laboriosi excutienti potuit, id omne
in hanc Pindaricae interpretationem nulli nec veterum nec recentium scripto-
rum tentatam libentissime contuli: partim quod in his libris veterum Heroum
insignia cuncta facinora virtutesque ad imitandum propositas et utilia pleraque
vitae praecepta contineri videbamus: partim quod huius authoris gravissimi sty-
lim sententiarum sublimitate rerumque antiquitate inobscuratum, atque / ideo
ab illius cognitione iucundissima plures abalienatos intelligebamus. Nec vero mihi
absurdum visum est perpetuam quandam fortitudinis laudem Pindaricis hymnis
expressam tibi, Rex Christianissime et invictissime, uni omnium nostrae aetatis principum longe fortissimo, et in vario bellorum, praeliorum, victoriarumque genere exercitatissimo, dedicare et consecrare. A quo quidem proposito ne me id quidem deterruit, quod iam universi operis singulos libros primariis regni tui viris devoveram: cum enim illi ipsi togatorum Galliae principes maxime et natura et fortuna et voluntate tui sint, aequum mihi visum est Carmina iam illis donata et dedicata in augustae quoque Maiestatis tuae dominio censeri. [Expl.]: (fol. *8r) Sed iam tempus est me ad institutum, susceptumque munus accedere, si prius tamen Deum optimum maximum sancte oravero, obtestatusque fuero, ut te diutissime regno Francorum salvum, incolumem, florentemque conservet, utque prudentissima consilia et magnanimos conatus tuos semper exoptatus, et felix, et vere Christianus exitus consequatur.

(For the Olympians and the Pythians, see a. and b. above)

Dedication of the Nemeans. Nicolai Sudorii praefatio in Nemea Pindari, ad amplissimum virum Philippum Huraltum Chivernium Galliarum Procancellarium. [Inc.]: (fol. 2r) Quum Plinius in libris naturalis historiae conqueritur, Vir amplissime, proventum agrorum suo tempore minime ubertati superiorum aetatum respondere: tantam tamque insignem mutationem non exhaustae et quasi effoetae soli naturae, sed cultorum socordiae et negligentiae imputat. Sic etiam, si quis diligentius inquirat, cur nostri temporis homines ab illa decantata et celebrata veterum virorum excellencia longissime absint, intelliget tandem non vim ingeniiorum vetustate et quodam temporum senio defecisse aut elanguisse: sed disciplinam et institutionem iuventutem, quam Graeci παιδείαν / appellant, claritudinis et perfectionis omnis originem fontemque esse: quo praeciso vel averso virtutem ipsam in hominibus paulatim exarescere et aboleri necesse sit. . . . / (fol. 6v) victores victorumque urbes publicis coronis exornabantur . . . Quoniam tamen antiqui coronarum illarum quas diximus, ut folia, sic decus et gloriam brevi fluere et marcessere videbant, statuas autem multis casibus deiici aut deteri et absumi vetustate, ideo prudentes olim victores excellentium Poetarum ingenia sibi conciliabant, ut eorum carminibus hymnisque egregiis sempiternae hominum memoriae commendarentur. Talem olim Pindaros operam, victoribus multis illustribus navavit in Olympiis et Pythiis, quae nos antea Latinitate donavimus. Nemea autem ea ipsa Latinis versibus utcunque explicata tibi potissimum dedicanda censuimus, Vir amplissime, qui quidem multorum errore neglecto, humanitatis studia quasi vana et inutilia deridentium, semper tibi ad excellentem ingenii iudiciique vim adiumenta doctrinae et eruditionis adiicienda existimasti: atque hac veluti duplici anchora utens, prudentissimus gubernator, quamvis in
summis temporum nostrorum tempestatibus et fluctibus, navim tamen reipublicae salvan incolumenque praestas, praestabisque in posterum cum incredibili quadam et immortalui tui commendatione et gloria.


Dedication of Isthmians. Ad Ornatissimum V. Vidum Fabrum, Sanctioris Regis Consilii Consiliarium et Curiae Parisiensis Praesidem, N. S. [Inc.]: (fol. 34v) Isthmia iure tibi Praeses damus inclyte, nam qui / Pisaeo quondam pulvere victor erat / Palladiam retulit laetus nil praeter olivam . . . . . [Expl.]: Non tibi danda modo unius praeconia frondis / Nam crines nunc haec, nunc tegit illa tuos.

Translation. Isthmia Pindari latino carmine reddita per Nicolaum Sudorium, Inquisitionum Praesidem. Herodoto Thebano Ode praemium. Quae incipit, Μάτερ ἐμα, τὸ τεὸν χρύσασπι Θήβα. [Inc.]: (fol. 35r) Armata Thebe, chara parens, tui / Quicquid negoti est collocos res supra / Curas et omnes, idque leni / Mente velim ferat aquea Delos. . . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 52r) Felicis patriae pluribus accolis / Fusis in stadio fortiter Isthmio / Expertisque manus intolerabiles, / Non huic dissimilis sanguine proximus / Cliander, soboles inclyta, cui pares / (fol. 52v) Annis, o Danai, texite myrteum / Velamen capitis, sertaque mollia, / Partam ob pancratii nuper adoream / In campis Ephyrae: terra sed hunc pries / Famosa Alcathoi gensque Epidauria / Frangentem iuvenes viderat aemulos, / Quae se cuncta simul vatibus offerunt / Commendanda bonis praelia: non enim / Cliander viduus laudibus, aut piger, / Aetatem latebris text iteribus. Finis Isthmiorum.

d. Paris, BNF, lat. 8450.

The manuscript contains the Latin translation of the Nemeans and the texts that accompany it in the imprint. There is also an ode to Henri III. Blank spaces have been left for the Greek letters, which have not been entered. The text otherwise conforms to the edition of 1582.
Editions:
1697, Oxonii (Oxford): e theatro Sheldoniano. This is a variorum edition that, along with much else, prints the Sudorius translation beside the Greek text, the scholia, and a literal paraphrase. The Sudorius translation is given in full and without alteration. Digital copy in Google Books.

Doubtful edition:
1582, Venetiis (Venice): combeis sumptibus. (Probably a later false imprint: Sebastiano Combi was active in Venice from 1592 until 1608; cf. G. Borsa, Clavis typographorum librariorum Italiae 1495–1600 (Aureliae Aquensis, 1980). BAV; Cambridge, Univ. Lib.
1598, Venice. This edition has not been located; it is reported by Graesse, Trésor de livres rares, vol. 5, 296.

Biography:
Nicolaus Sudorius (ca. 1545–94; CERL Thesaurus cnp01236383: Le Sueur, Nicolas), a jurist and student of the classics. Born to a family of the Parisian bourgeoisie, he became conseiller of the Chambre des Enquêtes of the Parlement de Paris on 2 March 1564, and later president. He died in May 1594. In addition to the Pindar translation, he was the author of encomiastic Latin verse dedicated to important personages, and the treatise Disputationum civilium liber (Paris, 1578).
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17. Aemilius Portus – Emilio Porto

After publishing the commentary of his father Francesco ([Geneva], 1583), Aemilius Portus, who had become professor of Greek at Heidelberg, published in 1598 in that city a Latin translation of the Epinicia with the Greek text en regard.

The dedication takes the form of an epigraph to Ioachimus and Philippus Camerarius; the appendix is an array of texts, almost all of which had appeared already in the edition of Henricus Stephanus (Geneva, 1560 and after), although in Greek, with a facing Latin translation: Pindari vita scholiis graecis praefixa; Aliter ex Suida; De strophis, antistrophis et epodis; Aliter de isdem; Pindari Vita ex Lili Gregorii Giraldi; Horatius, ode 4.2 and a few Greek epigrams of Antipater.
The translation aims to be as close as possible to the original, often retaining the position of the words, to the evident detriment of the Latin syntax and at times to sheer comprehension; whatever was not in the Greek is set in italics. This Latin version certainly appears very similar to the equally literal version of Henricus Stephanus; even the Greek text, apart from isolated interventions, appears the same.


_Translation._ Pindari Olympia. [Inc.]: (p. 1) Hieroni Syracusano, equo singulare victoriam adepto Ode I. Optima quidem _est_ aqua, aurum vero ardens ignis ut elucet noctu, _sic_ inter superbas divittias longe elucet. Si vero certamina narrare cupis, chara anime, ne amplius sole contempleris aliud splendidius astrum, lucens interdiu per desertum aetherem . . . . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 48) Nigros muros habentem _ad_ Proserpinae domum vade, Echo, patri nobile ferens nuncium, Cleodamum ut intuita filium dicas quod ei iuvenilem in finibus illustris Pisae coronavit inclytorum certaminum pennis caesariem.

Pindari Pythia. [Inc.]: (p. 48) Hieroni Aetnaeo, Syracusano, curru _victoriam adepto_ Ode I. Aurea cithara Apollinis et nigrum capillitium habentium Musarum comes possessio: quam audit quidem rhythmus, laetitiae initium, parent vero cantores signis _tuis_, quum choris praeuentium hymnorum praeludia facis leviter pulsata . . . . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 108) Certe fatale decretum non _est_ evitabile: sed erit id tempus quod quum aliquem in desperationem immiserit, contra opinionem hoc quidem dabit, illud vero nondum.

Pindari Nemea. [Inc.]: (p. 109) Chromio Aetnaeo Ode I. Respiramen magnificum Alphei, inclytarum Syracusarum germen, Ortygia, cubile Dianae, Delis soror, _a_ te suaviloquus hymnus aggregitur exponere laudem procellipedium magnam equorum, Iovis Aetnaei in gratiam . . . . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 151) A Iove autem homines certus non sequitur exitus, sed tamen in superbis incedimus et animos _attollimus ac superbe vivimus_, opera multa molientes, vincita sunt enim impudenti spe membra, providentiaeque longe remoti sunt fluxus Lucrorum autem opportet certum modum venari. Desideria enim _rerum_ ad quas perveniri non potest, _sunt_ acrior insania.

Pindari Isthmia. [Inc.]: (p. 152). Herodoto Thebano Ode I. Mater mea aureo clypeo insignis Theba, ponam tuum negotium vel ante occupationem _meam_, ne mihi aspera succenseat Delus, in quam sum effusus _toto animo_. . . . . . . [Expl.]: (p. 176) Eum profecto non dedecorat eximii genus patruui, coaetaneorum ideo aliquis nectat coronam myrti splendidam Cleandro ob _victoriam_ pancratii si-
quidem eum Alcathoi certamen cum felici sorte et in Epidauro iuventus antea exceptit: quem laudandum culibet viro strenuo praebet pubertatem enim non expertem praeclarorum facinorum sub latibulo consumpsit.
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Commentaries
a. Theodorus Gaza

Theodorus Gaza’s commentary on the Olympians, delivered orally during his lectures at Ferrara in 1446–49, has reached us through the notes that one of his students, Ludovico Carbone, took down and perhaps reworked (to what extent we do not know) about thirty years later in Padua, Biblioteca del Seminario Vescovile, 692 (see I.1 above). From the beginning down to Ol. 2.65 the recollectae have an ordered structure: a portion of the text of manageable length is selected, the Latin paraphrase is given, and the most significant Greek lemmata are explained. Following Ol. 2.65 the Greek lemmata from the text are replaced by the nominative forms, or, in the case of verbs, the first person of the present indicative; then, often, only the direct translation of the lemma into Latin is given. There are frequent interlinear additions and marginal notes in the same hand.

In Carbone’s recollectae the Pindaric text, the Latin version, and the exegetical notes are often fused into a seamless whole. Still, since the aim of Gaza’s
instruction was to teach his pupils Greek through the reading of Pindar’s Olympians, there are notes of an etymological and grammatical character that stray from the strict exegesis of Pindar. There is no introduction on the life and works of Pindar, only a brief initial statement giving the titles of the four groups of odes a locis appellatae and then a rapid account of the Olympians and the Olympic games.

The instruments used by Gaza are the scholia, the Etymologicum Magnum, and a few grammatical texts; the recollectae also show a close relationship to the commentary of Moschopoulos (see Fortuna above)—basically the same instruments Gaza might have used in teaching young Greek students at Constantinople. But there are also to be found elements that innovate with respect to the Byzantine exegetical tradition, elements that may perhaps be attributed in part to Ludovico Carbone, or to the cultural climate of Ferrara at mid-Quattrocento. The most striking innovation is the attempt to assess the rhetorical element present in the Epinicia: the articulated structure of Pindar’s odes, comparable to encomia in prose, deserved careful attention. Gaza’s attitude to ancient pagan mythology is also of interest: he confines himself to supplying the data essential for understanding the text, and often states resolutely that Pindar placed no faith in the myths, employing them merely as poetical ornaments. The praise of the novelty of his song which Pindar professes at Ol. 9. 73–74, is thus portrayed as an explicit rejection of the pagan fabulae: the songs of Pindar are more novel and better because truer, in that they reject mythology, or else openly denounce its falsity.
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b. Stephanus Niger – Stefano Negri

Stephanus Niger, a pupil of Demetrius Calcondyles, became professor of Greek at Milan in turn, and delivered lectures on Pindar there from 1516 to 1520. Witness to this is borne by his Praefatio in Pindarum (Milan, 1521), which ends with his commentary on the first lines of Ol. I. The remainder of the commentary has not been transmitted, but we may assume that the course dealt exclusively with the Olympians.

This inaugural oration begins with a preamble, derived from Plato, on poetry understood as furor (fury) and divinus afflatus (divine inspiration). Niger goes on to praise its civilizing function, and stresses that the works of poets who have sung of the virtues and magnanimous deeds of the ancients, as Pindar has, ought to be read and studied by boys, so that, spurred to emulation, they too may perform similar deeds. Niger then defines the six parts of his accessus: the life of the poet, the title of the work, the quality of the poetry, the intentio, a description of the structure of the work, and finally the exegesis.

This oration contains the first life of Pindar in Latin, and had a certain influence on later scholars, especially through the second edition of Basel, 1532. Niger makes use of material that had appeared in Greek in the Roman edition of 1515, clearly identifying sources that are less clearly identified there: Pausanias, Plutarch, and Philostratus, authors he knew well from having read and translated them himself. Moving on to discussion of the work, Niger illustrates the titles of the four collections with relevant antiquarian and mythographical references; he dwells on Pindar’s meter, observing that the tripartition is consequent upon the movements of the chorus, and that the cola consist of widely varied meters. He then lists the feet used by the lyric poets, on the basis of Hephaestion, and adds brief biographies of the eight other lyric poets. Niger stipulates that the intention of Pindar’s poetry is to confer immortality on the poet and on those whom he praises, and to exhort all to virtue; he emphasizes as well the importance of the union of poetry and music, both in Greek and Christian literature. Finally he sets forth a brief argumentum of the first ode, and in his commentary on the
expression **optima est aqua**, which occurs in the first lines, launches an excursus in which he reviews the opinions of the Greek philosophers on the importance of the various elements: an exegesis already present *in nuce* in the scholia, but which he amplifies and deepens. The pedagogical objective of this procedure likely lies in the desire to display Greek culture as an organic and coherent whole: the reading of a poem of Pindar is not an end in itself, but might suggest links to music, mythology, ethics, and natural philosophy.


*Præfatio*. Præfatio in Pindarum Poetam Eminentissimum a Stephano Nigro in Publico Gymnasio Mediolani habita. [Inc.]: (fol. 79r) Quanto quamque assiduo semper cultu celebrata fuerit Poetica, candissimi auditores, cum ex aliiis quam plurimis argumentis, tum vel maxime ex hoc colligere unicuique facillime licet quod veteres (ut inquit Strabo) poetiam inam primam quandam esse Philosophiam perhibuerint quippe quae a teneris nos unguiculis ad vivendi rationem perducat, mores atque affectus edoceat, quaeque gerenda declinande sint quodam cantus suavitate praecipiat. Hinc factum est ut a posterioribus soli poetae sapientes fuerint existimati nec mehercle immerito. . . Omnes itaque insignes poetae non arte, sed divino afflatu praeclara ista poemata canunt, et ut Corybantes non sana mente saltant, ita neque egregii Carminum modulatores sana mente hos cantus effingunt: verum ubi in harmoniam rhythmumque insurgent furoreque correnti Bacchantur . . . (fol. 79v) Quo circa minime mirari opor- tet quotiens Orpheus vetustissimae religionis conditor saxa ac silvas materna arte ad se traxisse rapidosque fluminum lapsus moratus dicitur: cum homines bestiarum more passim in agris vagantes sibique ferino vitam propagantes, nihil animi ratione omnia viribus administrantes non modo pietatis ac Iusticiae, verum coeterarum quoque virtutum ignaros meliflua orationis suavitate victricia facundia eo compulerit: ut in unis habitare moenibus pulchrum, ius aequabile ac leges servare honestum. Pietatem in deos ac parentes colere sanctum arbitrentur, ad diversasque vitae rationes subito mutata vivendi consuetudine traduci aequo animo patarentur. . . . (fol. 80r) Sunt igitur observandvi poetae ac colendi: eorumque poemata legenda in primis pueris atque ediscenda qui priscorum virorum ac virtute præstantium res gestas carmine prosequuti sunt, ut puer virtutis aemulatione accensus praeclara maiorum facinora imite- tur; inter quos Pindaros ὁ μεγαλοφωνότατος maxime recensendus est . . . In sacris graecorum certaminibus versatus est: quorum victores eo prosecutus est
carmine ut ubique aureus, ubique divinus appareat nusquam non supra huma-
nam conditionem sese extollat et usque quaque eximius ac mirabilis existat . . .
Sed quid ego in Pindaro laudando diutius immoror, ad quem pro dignitate ac meritis exornandum altero mehercule opus esset Pindaro. Itaque me ad gram-
maticorum praeccepta convertam a quibus librorum interpretes admonentur sex
iis esse in primis animadvertenda qui aliquem sibi authorem sumunt interpre-
tandum: poetae vitam; operis titulum; carminis qualitatem; scribentis intentionem;
librorum numerum et omnium postremum explanationem. Quare cum
Pindarum nobis sumpserimus interpretandum ab eius vita exordium summa-
mus necesse est. (fol. 80v) Natus est Pindarus (ut Suidas ait) Thebis Boeotiiis
patre Scopelino vel ut aliis placet Daiphante sive Pagonide, matre Myrto, Sexa-
gesima sexta olympiade. Myrtdios mulieris discipulus fuit, Simonidi quoque
operam dedisse fertur; quo autem tempore Xerxes in Graeciam expeditionem
fecit quadragesimum agebat aetatis annum. Habuit fratrem Erontionem et fil-
um Diophantem filiasque Protomachen et Eumetim. Extremum autem obiit
diem in Theatro cum Theoxenia se dilecti genibus petiisset ut quod
homini optimum esset sibi daretur. Fama est (inquit Plutarchus) iis qui a Boeo-
tiis ad Apollinem missi fuerant, ex Pindari mandato quid homini optimum esse
sciscitantibus, Promantin, hoc est Pythiam, respondisse quod et ipse minime
ignorat: si eorum quae de Trophonio et Agamede litterarum monimentis man-
data sunt, ipse author est, quod si periculum facere concupiscit, haud multo post
id exploratum fore. Quae cum audivisset Pindarus ad obitum spectantia exem-
plio coepit considerare, nec multo post decessit. Paus. libro. ix. Pindarus, inquit,
divino poeta ingenio, cum adulescentulus adhuc Thebis aestivo tempore Thes-
pias proficisceretur meridiano caloris aestu usque adeo afflictus oppressusque
est, ut lassitudine ac somno obrutus paululum extra viam prostratus quieverit,
ad cuius dormientis labra advolantes apes melificaverunt: quod certissimum
suavissimi cantus praesagium Pindaro fuisse perhibetur. Unde minime mirari
opert quod in Philostrati imaginibus legitur Pana, μουσικότατον θεόν, Pindari
cantibus usque adeo oblectatum fuisse, ut cum primum Pindarum ad scriben-
dum animum appulit, choreas sibi carissimas neglexisse et quicquid a Pindaro
componeretur cecinisse dicatur. Coeterum cum eius nomen per universam
Graeciam celeberrimum haberetur ad summum gloriae culmen Pythia (fol. 81r)
evexit. Praedixit enim Delphis ut omnium quae Apollini offerebantur primiti-
harum aequa Pindari portu [sic] impenderetur. Aiunt praeterea Pindaro iam
senescenti Proserpina per quietem obversatam fuisset et quam plurimos canere
assuetae, dormienti adstitit hymnumque in Proserpinam cecinit: quem ipsa
expecta statim conscrispsit, in quo sunt et alia Plutonis cognomina et χρυσήνιος.
Stadium est Thebanis ante Praetidas portas, ut idem Paus. author est, transeuntibus autem stadium occurrit hippodromus in quo Pindari extat monimentum, cuius vestigia domus ultra directe visuntur. Scripsit autem multa dorica lingua. Alexander cum Thebas deleret Pindari stirpem ac penates incolumes servavit, ut testatus Plut. . . . (fol. 85r) Tanta enim est odarum facultas et robur ad incitandos comprimendosque ac sedandos animos, ut Pythagoras nos admonet ne ullam mane negotium prius aggrediamur quam asperitatem quandam ex recenti adhuc e somno excitatione mentibus nostris atque animis insidentem, rythmicis atque harmoniacisque cantibus excusserimus, quo sinceriores ac placidiores ad diurnas actiones praeparentur. Euclides quoque in musicis ait deos etiam nostras facilius exaudire preces si hymnis harmoniacisque cantibus eorum opem imploremus. Quo factum est: ut sacrae Christicolarum litterae per pientissimos ac sapientissimos viros compositis affluant, qui singulis diebus in suppliciis deorum pientissime ac suavissime canantur: quos musices Flores ipse Pindarus appellat. . . . (fol. 87r) Reliqua nunc est sola explanatio: quam non prius aggrediemur quam huiusce primae odes argumentum a nobis fuerit enarratum. Hiero, Syracusarum rex . . . Ἀριστον μὲν ὕδωρ. Variae sunt philosophorum de rerum origine opiniones. Thales Milesius . . . (fol. 87v) omnia ex aqua oriri atque in aquam resolvi dicit, quod genitale omnium semen liquidum sit . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 88r) frigidissimi etiam fontis meminit Homerus, quem ait aestivo tempore grandini ac nivi similem fluere.
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c. Huldrichus Zvinglius – Huldricus (Huldrych, Huldreich, Ulrich) Zwingli

On 24 February 1526 Andreas Cratander published the third edition of Pindar at Basel, the first from outside Italy and the one that laid the basis for the poet’s fortune throughout Europe. The Greek text was edited by Iacobus Ceporinus (Jakob Wisendanger), a good Graecist and Hebraist who was robbed of the chance to see it in print by an early death the previous December at the age of just twenty-six.

While the Greek text is not distinguished by outstanding merits, borrowing the Aldine text of 1513 with occasional corrections by Ceporinus, the fortune and the cultural impact of this edition were assured by two texts of Zwingli included in it: a prefatory epistle to the students of the *Collegium Trilingue* of Basel and another at the end addressed to the *candidus lector*.

The prefatory epistle has great importance, because it supplies the theoretical justification for Zwingli’s decision to promote the status of Pindar: a recuperation that will spill over from the realm of pure erudition onto the terrain of Europe’s confessional conflict. It begins with a paraphrase of the first part of Horace’s ode 4.2, the verb *aemulari* replaced by the verb *commendare*. Zwingli acknowledges that even to praise Pindar and recommend that he be read, let alone to emulate him, is a challenge. The task is to follow the Theban poet wherever the voice of his lyre takes us, whether to the heights of heaven or to the depths of the underworld; waxen wings like those made by Daedalus will certainly not serve the purpose. To Zwingli it seems immodest even to have to urge the reading of a poet “lyricorum omnium, dicerem libentius poetarum, facile principem” (from Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 10.1.61); he is writing only at the friendly insistence of Ceporinus.

The life of Pindar “ex Suida” that follows is very summary; erudite details are bypassed and space is given to moral considerations; Zwingli’s interest in Pindar is not dictated by historical or literary motives. In his eulogy of the poet, the strengths illustrated are those that impose themselves on others: “Fuit Pindarus non minus dextero ac sancto, quam erudito amoenoque ingenio.”
The erudition and pleasingness of the poet are demonstrated through an acute rhetorico-stylistic analysis. Such is his erudition that he himself declares that he cannot be understood without adequate guidance. His wordhoard is not vulgar, but taken from the sublime part of the style register; and when he does use common terms, Pindar is capable of rendering them sublime. The pleasure offered by reading Pindar arises out of his ability to renew the antique without any loss of its natural majesty. Pindar always employs choice and noble expressions, a sign of great poetic technique and above all, a lofty moral sensibility. In his poetry there is nothing that jars, and in precisely this lies his celebrated *dexteritas*: Pindar is a paladin of virtue, dexterous enough to bend poetic discourse to a higher morality that borders at more than one point on that of Christianity.

The rest of the epistle is devoted to bringing out how much that is “Christian” may be found in Pindar. His polytheism is only apparent, for such is his natural religiosity that he himself does not really seem convinced of the existence of the gods (an observation present in Gaza as well, see I.1 above), and indeed at times he even attains to the representation in his verse of “unicam istam divinam coelestemque vim.” The giving of various names to the sole God may be imputed to rhetoric and the poetic style.

With the *sanctitas* of Pindar illustrated, Zwingli sets out to prove the specific utility of reading the Theban poet. The argumentation is forceful: no other Greek author is of help in the exegesis of the sacred texts, especially if one wishes to penetrate to the depths of the “abstrusissimas Hebraeorum cantilenas ac hymnos,” such as the Psalms and similar texts that, for erudition, gravity, and pleasurability do not appear inferior to Pindar or other pagan authors. The Psalms are poetic texts and are not to be explicated by arbitrarily utilizing other scriptural passages that bear no relation to them; they can, however, be adequately understood if read in relation to other poetic texts, like the Pindaric odes. Welcome, then, to the reading of Pindar, and let the protests of those unspecified critics who accuse him of spreading the plague of paganism come to nothing; of the poet who stands closer than any other to the holy scripture Zwingli will have more to say in his postface. The absence of any mention of the name or the writings of Saint Jerome (see *Fortuna*, Latin Literature) in this prefatory text is remarkable, for it was he who first and most famously compared Pindar to David and the *Epinicia* to the Psalms.

The concluding epistle or postface opens with a moving funeral elegy for the young Ceporinus, laid low by overwork. After urging young people not to overdo the effort of study so as not to damage their health, as Ceporinus had done, Zwingli addresses the theme he had set for himself: that of the utility of Pindar for the comprehension of the sacred texts. He begins by complaining of the inadequacy of the Septuagint, the standard Greek version of the Bible, which he demonstrates by citing a number of passages, then procedes to consider the
Latin translation of several Pauline terms from the New Testament which can be understood better with the aid of Pindar. He states that the range of examples would be infinite if he could remember all that had come to his notice during the lectures of Ceporinus, then adduces all that are necessary for his purpose. In Ephesians 4, 28 κλέπτειν should not be translated *furari* but rather *fraudare*, the meaning it bears in Pindar; in the same letter, 5, 4 εὐτραπελίαν signifies not *urbanitatem*, but *scurrilitatem*, as it does “apud hunc nostrum.” Zwingli proceeds to apply the same method to several further locutions. After these textual analyses he brusquely terminates the comparison (*Quid pluribus opus est?*), asserting that everything in the Theban poet “plurimum prodest ad veri honestique usum.” Finally, Zwingli exhorts the reader to continual study of Pindar, for there is no one as useful to mankind as a good poet.

**Dedication:** (ed. of Basel, 1526). Linguarum Candidatis Huldreichus Zwinglius Sal. [*Inc.*]: (sig. *2r) Pindarum quisquis studet, ut ab Horatiano carmine ordiar, commendare, ceratis Daedali pennis nititur, optime lector. Quum enim laudem eius a coeli plaga inferorumque abyssis, quo lyrae ipsius vox penetravit, colligere necessarium sit, non feret alarum mitis cerae glutino concinнатum opus, nec superum ardores, nec inferorum faces. Unde qui tam immanem glorian complecti tentabit, vetro daturus est nomina ponto. Equidem inguenae fater Lyricorum omnium, dicerem libentius poetarum, facile principem, indignum esse ut alterius, quam summi alicuius, eloquentissimique viri praeconio laudetur, nedum nostro, cui vix tantulum suppetit, ut altissime positum poema suspicere queam. Quum vero Iacobus Ceporinus, homo ad nihilum aliud natus quam ad eruendos illustrandosque tum vetustissimos, tum eruditissimos autores, tanta inustitia urgeret, ut suo nomine in Pindari Olympica, Pythia, Nemea et Isthmia, quae Cratander, homo vigilantissimus, excuderat, praefarer, non debui optimo viro negare quod tantopere orabant, etiamsi non ignorarem cui me ludibrii aleae committerem. . . / (sig. *2v*) redigemus et nos Pindari nostri vitam in compendium ex Suida. . . / (sig. *3r*) . . . aliorum operum eius nomina, si placet nosse, e Suida petenda sunt. Fuit Pindarus non minus dextero ac sancto quam erudito amenoque ingenio. Eruditio autem tanta fuit hominis, ut hac in re nemo videatur ei anteferendus esse, quod istae victoriae probant, in quibus alicubi subindicat sua non temere citra interpretem intellectum iri. Utitur ille aut non vulgaribus verbis, sed de sublimi petitis: aut si utitur, sublimia reddit. Quod magnifice de illo praedicat Horatius, quum canit Dircaeum olorem multa aura vehi. Horum autem verborum tam docta est apud illum compositio, tam tersa contractatio ac munditiae, ut quicquid illis aut addas aut adimas, pecces in eruditionem ipsam: semper cadit illi feliciter Iovis tessera. Amoenitatem vero quis digne laudabit? Exoleta novat, reficit, ac oculos velut praesentia subicit; priscis honorem ac maiestatem induit, praesentia non supra modum extollit, neque invididiosius deprimit. Quis cultus similium ac dissimilium? quanta
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sanctissimae aetati simile, de quibus post libri calcem paucula dicturi sumus . . .


Epistola Candido Lectori. Huld. Zving. candide lect. [Inc.]: (sig. φr) Nolui, candide lector, funestam reddere orationem quam Pindari victoriis praefixi, quo tibi laeta manerent omnia; nunc autem quod dicturus sum usui futurum esse spero. Jacobus Coeporinus, homo monstrose laboriosus, qui dum viveret hoc extorserat ut me pollicerer in Pindarum praefaturum, antequam id praestarem, spiritum effudit, mense Decemb. anni M.D.XXV. . . / (sig. φv) Debent ergo huius exemplo boni studiosique tum iuvenes tum adolescentes valetudinem curare. . . Attigeramus autem in epistola praeloquentia nonnihil de vetustate, quod illa quiddam peculiare habuerit, quod hic hic noster commodum prae se ferat. Offendimus innumera in sacris literis apud septuaginta, ut nunc habent Graecae literae, nonnihil diversum in sensum, ut videtur, translata quum / (sig. φ2r) tamen diversitas alicubi non sit, sed verborum mutata, vel exoleta significatio. Exempla quaerendi non fuit locus; unum et alterum tamen dicam. . . Adduce-mus nunc quaedam quae apud hunc nostrum discus aliam aliquando habuisse significacionem; vel certe latius patuisse infinita habituri si licuisset per ocium repetere quae observaveramus dum Coeporinus praelegerat. . . / (sig. φ3r) Quid pluribus opus est? nullus Pindaro apex inconsulto excidit, nullus non plurimum prodest ad veri honestique usum. . . /[Expl.]: (sig. φ[4]) Innocens hominum genus est bonus poeta, ac mortalibus nihil aequae utile. Malignos istos maledicos et non tantum malos, sed etiam pessimos poetas, qui scurrarum more omnia proscindunt, omnia infestant, bene nata ingenia dehonestant, non commendo, sed veluti pestem humanae vitae fugiendam esse censeo. Vale, lector mi, Pindarumque versato nocturna, diurnaque manu, et ubi haec nostra boni consulueris, honestissimis tuis deliciis laetus fruitor. Ex Tiguro Calendis Martiis. M.D.XXVI. Finis.

Edition:
1526, Basileae [Basel]: per Andream Cratandrum. BAV; BNF; Milan, Bibl. Trivulziana. Digital copy: Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

Biography:
Huldricus (Huldrych, Huldreich, Ulrich) Zwingli, the famous Swiss Reformer born 1 January 1484 at Wildhaus, had a good humanist education, studying at Basel, at Bern with Heinrich Wölfin, and at Vienna. He was greatly
influenced by Erasmus and the writings of Pico della Mirandola. All his works are in the field of theology and had great importance for Protestantism in Switzerland. There is no record of his involvement in any other classical edition except the 1526 Pindar. He took an active part in the religious struggles of the age and died in the battle of Kappel on 11 October 1531.

**Bibliography:**


d. Joannes Lonicerus – Johannes Lonicer

The commentary of Lonicer first appeared alongside the second edition of his translation (Basel, 1535, see I.6b above). The notes to each ode are preceded by a statement of the argument of the ode; in the case of the first ode, readers are referred to the *Pindari Encomium* for information on the poet’s life and works. There follows a discussion *Quid sint Olympia et unde*. There is a brief notice of metrics, *ut posthac non sit opus de eis quicquam porro dicere*, which basically dwells only on the reasons for the tripartition (linked to the singing and the movement of the chorus) and nothing else; the reason given is the impossibility of analyzing lines that vary continually, without any regulation (“lege solutis”: Hor. *od.* 4.2, 11–12). Lonicer concludes that if a strophe has, say, seventeen lines, these are composed in seventeen different ways.

The commentary, printed in blocks following brief blocks of text with call-outs in the form of superscript letters, is very rich. The lemmata cited, or the relevant paraphrases, are enclosed in parentheses.

The Greek text, which does not appear in the volume (it is that of the Zwingli edition; Basel, 1526) is never discussed. The scholia are cited often from the Roman edition of 1515, which Lonicer evidently consulted as he worked. He dwells on lexical explanations and etymologies, but gives much space to erudite information of a historical, geographical, and mythological kind (in the last
case the notices are long enough to form genuine *excursus*). He adduces parallel passages, sometimes quite lengthy ones, from Greek authors, often with a Latin translation, and from Latin authors; Homer is cited frequently. Rhetorical figures are identified and glossed. A curious feature is the listing of the epithets attached to the most important gods. Some of Pindar’s *sententiae* are interpreted in a “Christian” sense, for example the note to the final part of the last *Pythian* included below.

*Commentary* (ed. of Basel, 1535). Pindari Olympia. Hieroni Syracusio, qui celete victoriam obtinuit, ode prima . . . Enarratio [Inc.]: (p. 1) Pindari Lyricorum principis vita, patria, genus, monimenta, in encomio eius principio sunt explicata, quare nihil opus est pluribus de iisdem verba facere . . . (p. 3) Quid sint Olympia et unde. Olympia, multitudinis numero, solemnium apud Graecos ludorum nomen est . . . [Expl.]: (p. 4) Verum haec de origine Olympiorum, de quinquennali eorum spatio et praemio victoriae (quae fuit ex olea corona, ut posthac in Pindaro audiemus) sufficiant. (p. 4) Argumentum primae Olympiacorum odae [Inc.]: Generis est epidictici prima Olympiorum Ode, in laudem Hieronis Syracusanorum regis conscripta . . . [Expl.]: (p. 4) Quid vero alios quosdam peculiariter hymnos aediderit, ut in encomio Pindari annotatum, magis Odarum nomenclatura mihi arridet. (p. 6) De ternario sectionum Pindari. [Inc.]: De Strophe, Antistrophe et Epodo nonnihil dicendum, ut posthac non sit opus de eis quicquam porro dicere. . . . [Expl.]: (p. 7) Ideo Aristophanicae sectiones recte κώλα vocantur, quandoquidem tot generibus carminum constent, quot versus habent, utpote Strophe 17 colon, versus habet 17, legibus 17 compositos. Verum de Pindaricis metrorum generibus alias θεοῦ διδόντος agetur.


chorum ducentis saltum intelligit per basin poeta. . . . [Expl.]: (p. 304) p. (Quod si qua felicitas). Infortunium quod Midae inter canendum accidit, hic diluit. Si quis, inquit, non statim fortunatus fiat, propterea non despondeat animum: potest enim Deus quando voluerit, perfundere vel nihil tale opinantem felicitate. Pulcherrima certe sententia quam ideo producit, quod praeter spem fracto calamo, victoriam Midas obtinuerit, ut Scholia adseverant. Porro haec sententia bene Christiana, ac in totum theologica est, qua humanas actiones et opera fatot divinæ providentiae subdita omnino docet. Hac veluti gemma et clarissima stella hanc ultimam odon finit σὺν θεῷ. Enarrationum Io. Loniceri in Pindari Pythia finis οὐκ ἂνευ θεοῦ.


quod Aesculapii ara illic assiduo sacrorum et victimarum sanguine maderet. Enarrationum Io. Loniceri in Pindari Isthmia finis.

*Biography and Bibliography:*

See I.6 above.

e. Michael Neander

*a. Aristologia*

In his *Aristologia Pindarica* (Basel, 1556), Neander not only includes the Latin translation of the chosen passages, he publishes marginal comments keyed to the text by letters of the alphabet. The notes to the Greek text are linguistic or grammatical in kind, while those to the Latin text often include a further paraphrase, occasionally in German, cite analogous proverbs in the case of *sententiae*, and supply references to parallel places in other authors, though the places themselves are seldom cited. In the dedicatory letter (discussed in I.10a above) Neander emphasizes the usefulness of these comparisons with analogous passages in ancient authors for the better understanding of Pindar, recalling what Erasmus had had to say about this procedure in his *De ratione studii*.

The notes are very brief, and only have interpretative weight in a few cases; for example, at p. 57, in connection with Pindar’s affirmation *Multae mihi sub cubito acutae sagittae*, we read “Non cuivis sua patere dicit Pindarus, sed intelligenter duntaxat. Est autem Pindarus obscurus et difficilis in multis locis, propter varias historias, in quibus creber, sed brevis est. Plerunque enim in victorum genealogiis recensendis eas vix per nubeculam saepe ostendit. Saepe quoque allegoriis multa involvit, saepe multa vix per transennam indicat. Hoc tamen ita facit, ut a decoro nunquam recedat. In lucem autem ideo omnia non profert, ne quando progenitores victorum magnis calamitatibus saepe immersi fuerunt, plus perturbet hymnis suis quam exhilaret, quorum encomia canit, victores.” For Neander, unlike Lonicer, no special moral integrity is evidently required in order to penetrate Pindar’s obscurity, but a wide historical and erudite culture is.

The commentary includes ample historical *excursus*, more frequently in the early portion of the work: at pp. 41–57, in relation to the description of the next world in the second *Olympian*, there is a long discussion with quotations from Plato, Plutarch, and Lucian; at pp. 71–76 (Ol. 6) long selections from Plutarch’s life of Romulus are transcribed; at pp. 113–29 (Ol. 12) likewise from *Historia Croesi* by Herodotus; at pp. 173–77 (Pyth. 4) *Aurei velleris historiae argumentum*, with the lists of the argonauts according to Orpheus and Apollonius of Rhodes; at pp. 213–27 (Pyth. 5) an excursus *De Polycrate Samio tyranno*; at pp. 251–55 (Pyth. 9) the story of Cleisthenes, from Herodotus; and so on. Unlike the commentary of Lonicer, which was his model, as we have seen, for the translation,
Neander shows no interest in mythology, preferring the gnomic or historical aspects of the odes.


*Edition:*

See I.10a above.

*b. Pyth. 4*

At the end of his edition of the *Idylls* of Theocritus with translation and commentary ([Leipzig], 1596), Neander adds the Greek text of the fourth *Pythian* with a facing Latin translation and commentary (see I.10b above). In the left margin of the Greek text there appear brief linguistic notes, with the full commentary following under the title *Annotationes Neandrinae*. Notes of a geographical and historico-mythological kind are numerous, and the figures of rhetoric are pointed out. Brief summaries of the text, introduced by “sensus est,” also appear. At the start of strophe 4 there is a summary of the adventures of the Argonauts. Citation of other ancient authors is very rare. The Greek lemmata are followed by a parenthesis in roman typeface. Neander had given much space to this ode in his *Aristologia*, inserting a long excurus on the voyage of the argonauts into his commentary there. As noted above concerning the translation, the commentary too is different and more complete.

*Commentary* (ed. of Leipzig, 1596). In quartum Pythiorum Pindaricorum hymnorum Annotationes Neandrinae. [*Inc.*]: (fol. 182v) Σάμερον) Exordi-tur hymnum ab Apostrophe ad Musam, quam iubet suum hymnum Arcesilao
offerre, praedicare et commendare et magni apud eundem facere, αὐξῆς inquit. Ἐκεῖ ἀντίτις laetanti propter victoriām.../. . . [Expl.]: (fol. 196r) Ἐξενιδθείς cum ad me e Libya profectus, inquit Pindaros, pateret a me hanc commendationem, quam tamen ut clementer legas obnixe peto. Finis.

Edition:
See I.10b above.

Biography and Bibliography:
See I.10 above.

f. Nicolaus Sudorius – Nicolas Le Sueur

Sudorius’ commentary on the Nemeans accompanies his translation of Paris, 1582, discussed in I.16c above.

The decision to comment only on the Nemeans has no obvious explanation: he may at an early stage have planned to print the Nemeans separately (like the Olympians 1575 and the Pythians 1576), with these notes attached, then abandoned that project in favor of the complete edition of 1582, where the commentary is subjoined at the end, after the Isthmians.

The lemmata, in italics, are taken from the Latin translation; the notes contain a wealth of historical, geographical, and mythological clarification, with relevant sources cited in support. A rationale for the translation is occasionally provided, for the most part based on the ineluctable rules of the Latin language. Linguistic observations and textual discussion are entirely and understandably absent, given that Sudorius had aimed at a free translation.


*Edition:*
See I.16c above.

*Biography and Bibliography:*
See I.16 above.

g. Franciscus Portus

*a. The Dresden Manuscript*

Dresden, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Db 95, all in the same sixteenth-century hand with later titulature and numeration, preserves the commentary of Franciscus Portus on *Olympians* 1–4. It is found at fols. 1r–27r, preceded by a later title, “Francisci Portae Cretensis Notae in Pindari Olympiaca.” After a few blank leaves there follow “Notae in Aeschyli Prometeum Vinctum” at fols. 29r–53r, presumably also by Portus. There are more blank leaves, then scattered notes at fols. 54v–55r.

These are certainly not notes taken during lectures by Portus. The copy is fair, without corrections or revisions, executed by an able hand in a rapid personal cursive, with many abbreviations: it looks like a fair autograph copy.

The commentary on the first six *Olympians* is the same as the one that appeared in print ([Geneva], 1583) after the death of Franciscus Portus, but is not quite identical: some of the notes are longer, and in some cases the manuscript
reading appears preferable to the one in print, or at least equally tenable. This, then, is an important witness deserving attentive consideration from any future editor of the commentary on the Olympians by Franciscus Portus.

Translation (Dresden, Staats- und Universitätsbibl., Db 95, fol. 1r–27r). Πινδάρου ὀλύμπια [Inc.]: (fol. 1r) Ὀλύμπια, ludi Olymp. dicuntur ab Olympia, agri Pisani parte, in qua templum Iovis Olimpii erat, et ante templum lucus oleastro consitus: iuxta lucum, stadium, et circus in quo fiebant ludi, qui genere neutro numero plurali olympia dicuntur ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀλυμπιακοὶ ἁγῶνες. Ὀλύμπια autem ut διονύσια, λήναια, ἀνακαλυπτήρια, Δία, etc. id genus nomina festivitatum et certaminum solent Graeci pluraliter neutro genere efferre. Inscriptio autem istorum ludorum sumpta est ab ipsis ludis, ut laudationes eorum qui in ludis olympiacis vicerunt, habeant inscriptionem Olympia, et qui in Pythiis, Pythia, et sic de reliquis.

‘Ιέρωνι συρακοῦσιὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς ‘Ιέρωνα συρακούσιον.

Κέλλετι, addendum extrinsecus νικήσαντι, i. qui vicit cellete, hoc est, quo singulares nam equestre certamen duplex erat, alterum fiebat synoride, i. bigis. Synoris enim biga e duobus equis non pullis, sed adultis significat, alterum cellete, i. quo singulari. . . . [Expl.]: (fol. 27r) σὺν δὲ φιλοφρονίαις, optat ut Agesiae laudatio grata et cara contingat Hesioni regi. Ἀγαθαὶ δὲ πέλοντ’, perinde ac in tempestate bonum est si navis duabus anchoris sit deligata, ita bonum et salutare est si quis ad varios fortunae casus duplex nitatur patria: est autem pro bella defensio Agesiae qui dici poterat incerta esse patria. ποντόμεδον, merito Neptunum praecatur cuius erat nepos Agesias.

Manuscript:
Dresden, Staats- und Universitätsbibl., Db 95 (Kristeller, Iter 3.376b).

b. Edition 1583

In 1583, two years after the death of Franciscus Portus, his son Aemilius published his commentary on the odes of Pindar.

The edition commences with a solemn dedication to several senior magistrates of the Republic of Bern, in which Aemilius extols ancient culture, citing Pindar as the worthiest example; he lauds the poet’s capacity to represent virtue, and emphasizes the natural religiosity that makes him a pious poet, if not a Christian one. On this account it is fitting that the exposition of such a poet should be offered to men who are lovers of virtue, as are the dedicatees. A brief life of Pindar, and a Greek epigram by Isaac Hortusbonus (Isaac Casaubon) follow.

The commentary on each ode begins with a brief summary, and the following notes often translate or paraphrase the text as well. Rhetorical features and syntactic forms are highlighted through close annotation and discussion.
Parallel passages from Greek and Latin authors are sometimes adduced, some
of them little known. The scholia are seldom drawn upon; Lonicer, identified
as “interpres latinus,” is from time to time made the target of polemical obser-
vations. No interest is shown in the moral aspect, or in mythology: the myths
are dismissed as “nugae” and consequently there are no moralizing or allegorical
interpretations.

Dedication (ed. of [Geneva?], 1583). Illustrissimis, ac benignissimis celeber-
rimae Bernensis Reip. Dominis, Dominis suis plurimum observandis, Aemilius
Francisci Porti Cretensis F. salutem, et foelicitatem perpetuam. [Inc.]: (fol. *2r)
Ea vis est virtutis, Illustriss. ac benigniss. Domini, ut illos, in quibus insignes,
et eximias animi dotes videmus esse, perpetuo suspiciamus, maximisque laudi-
bus efferamus. . . . (fol. *3v) Hoc igitur alendae sapientiae studium Illustriss.
ac benigniss. Domini, quo vos flagrare persuasum habeo, fecit ut istos parentis
mei commentariolos in Pindarum, Lyricorum principem, qui varias variorum
hominum virtutes carmine suo celebrat, amplitudini vestrae dicare sim ausus.
Hic unusquisque tamquam in lucidissimo speculo suas virtutes, quibus divinitus
est ornatus, et splendidida praemia, quae virtutum studiosis dantur, maxima cum
voluptate contemplari potest. hic nullus suspicioni, nullus assentationi locus:
sed praecipua facinora praecelar ornantur laudibus. Quare dignus est hic / Poeta,
quem legant, et voluent omnes: sed ii potissimum qui magnos honores gerunt.
Licit enim verum illum Deum, quem nos Christiani veneramur, non cognorit,
aliquam tamen divinam naturam, quae cuncta crearet, esse credidit, de qua non
solum pie loquendum sed etiam pie sentiendum dixit. . . . . . [Expl.]: (fol. *4v)
Interea vero Deum Opt. Max. suppliciter orabimus, ut vestrae dignitatis excel-
lentiam magis, et magis augeat, vestraeque Reip. sanctum imperium perpetua
foelicitate muniat. Valete Illustriss. ac benigniss. Domini, et me in eorum numero
ponite, qui vestri splendoris amplitudini penitus sunt addicti. Datum Lausannae
Idibus Februarii 1583.

Commentary. Francisci Porti Cretensis, Commentarii in Pindari Olympia.
[Inc.]: (p. 5) ΟΛΥΜΠΙΑ, ludi Olympiaci dicuntur ab Olympia, agri Pisani
parte, in qua templum Iovis Olympii erat, et ante templum locum oleastro con-
situs: iuxta lucum, stadium, et Circus in quo fiebant ludi, qui genere neutro
numero plurali olympia dicuntur ánti tov ὀλυμπιακοὶ ἀγώνες. Ὀλύμπια autem ut
dionysia, λήναια, παναθήναια, ἀνακαλυπτῆρια, Δία, et caetera id genus nomina
festivitatum et certaminum solent Graeci pluraliter genere neutro efferre.
Inscriptio autem istarum laudationum summptae est ab ipsis ludis, ut laudationes
eorum qui in ludis olympiacis vicerunt, habeant inscriptionem Olympia, eorum
qui in Pythiis, Pythia, et sic de reliquis. Ἡρωνι συρακουσίῳ ἀντι τοῦ εἰς Ἡρωνα
συρακούσιον.

Κέλετι, addendum extrinsecus νικήαντο who vicit Celete, hoc est, equo
singuli nam equestre certamen duplex erat, alterum fiebat Synoride, i. bigis.
Synoris enim bigas e duobus equis non pullis, sed adultis significat alterum celete, i.e. equo singulari. . . . . . 

Expl.: (p. 61) Κλῦτ’, audite me petentem, ut carminibus his meis favetatis, eaque grata, et Asopicho victori, et aliis efficiatis. Σὺν γὰρ ὑμῖν, vestro enim numine, o gratiae, iucunda ac suavia omnia accident mortalibus in terris, diis etiam immortalibus in caelis.

Pythia. Ode I. [Inc.]: (p. 62) Hieronem Syracusanum quem prima Olymporum Oda laudavit, hac item Pythiorum celebrat, sic 26 et 27 Pythiade, vicit Celete, 29 curru, haec itaque victoria iam laudatur. Primo loco laudat et extollit Poesim ab eius vi et potestate, quam tantam esse dicit, ut valeat restinguere deorum iram, et mulcere ac delectare eorum animos. Itaque secundo loco hortatur latenter Hieronem ad Poetarum Lyricorum studium; Principes enim qui Poesi delectantur, illustres fieri, qui minus, eos in tenebris et perpetuo silentio iacere demonstrat. . . . Ἐρυσέα, Citharam alloquitur Poeta, eamque hortatur ut praeeat choro, et carminibus quae in honorem Hieronis est dicturus, id autem ita dictum, propterea quod qui Choream ducebat, pulsabat primum citharam, deinde canebat et saltabat, quem reliquus Chori caecus sequebatur canens et ipse, saltansque. . . . . 

Expl.: (p. 109) Ἀναγκαῖον λέχος, coactum connubium necessarium. Ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀλβῶν, inter certandum Midas fractis tibiis desperavit de victoria: et tamen vicit, hoc igitur innuit Poeta, sed transfert ὑπόθεσιν ad θέσιν.

Nemea. Ode I. [Inc.]: (p. 110) Ludi isti, τὰ Νέμεα, funebres ludi erant: qui ab Argivis instituti fuisset dicuntur in honorem Archemor Lyncuri filii: alii eos institutos fuisset credunt ab Hercule, aut a Melorcho, cuius filius a Leone interfectus fuit, sed qui in Archemori memoriam eos referunt, rei huius originem sic explicant. . . . Ἀμπνευμα σεμνὸν Ἀλφεοῦ, Chromius erat auriga Hieronis; is erat eius artificii peritissimus, et cum haberet unde, coepit et ipse carmine. O Ortygia, abs te duco initium carmine, O Ortygia, abs te duco initium carmine, hoc Ortygia Deli, hoc Epitheto. . . . . 

Expl.: (p. 144) Ἀλλ’ ἔμπαν, et tamen animos attolimus, et multas res affectamus; est obiurgatio. Δέδεται γὰρ ἀναιδεί, quia speramus earum eventum temere. Προμαθείας, quamquam abest providentia. Ροαί, guttae semina. Κερδέων δὲ χρη. parainseis, vero modus tenendum est in rebus: mera enim est insania ea concupiscere, quae assequi non potes.

ambitiosus. Laudat Herodotum a patria, et a gente Dorum, erat enim Thebanus. ... Māter ēmā, quia et ipse erat Thebanus. Θῆβα χρύσαισι: ἐπὶ τῆς ἡρωίδος κατά τὸν εξήγη, ἢ ἄσωποῦ καὶ μετώπης τῆς λάδωνος.

Θῆσομαι ὑπέρτερον ἁγχόλιας, anteponam rem tuam meis occupationibus. ... [. . . [Expl.]: (p. 163) Ἀνέδειξαν, fecerunt innotescere. Σφετέραν: ἀποστροφή ad victorem. Τὸ καὶ νῦν, itaque nunc etiam Musae canunt Aeacidas et Aeginetas. ἐπίλογος.

Edition:

Biography:
See CTC 2.198; 7.116.

Bibliography:

h. Benedictus Aretius – Benedikt or Benedicht Marti or Marty

The most complete Pindar commentary of the sixteenth century is undoubtedly the Commentarius absolutissimus of Benedictus Aretius, a well-known Calvinist theologian. The sole edition ([Geneva], 1587) is posthumous by thirteen years, and no textual note informs us about the origin of these pages, which might lie in notes taken down by one or more students, or in an authorial autograph. The confused state of the punctuation and the elementary, quasi-oral syntax make it highly probable that the first hypothesis is the correct one.

We do not know who the editor was: the edition commences with a few prefatory lines, “Typographus Lectori,” in which the commentary is described as the one in which all the difficult places are explained and all the mythological tales are narrated, with a continuous analysis of the arguments, the frequent digressions proper to the dithyrambic style, and the golden sententiae, such that no requirement for understanding an admittedly difficult author has been left unmet.

This commentary probably goes back to the decade 1553–63, when Aretius was professor of Greek and Hebrew at the Academy of Bern, before starting to teach theology. We have no information of other works by Aretius in the classical field: all his known works are on religious topics.

This is a truly monumental commentary, one that flows very evenly: running headers appear only from the Pythians on; the author does not introduce himself, nor make personal remarks of any kind. The front matter consists of a long accessus (with no title or internal subdivision), rich in quotations from the numerous sources drawn upon, that opens with a list of all the ancients who
bore the name Pindar; and a very detailed life subdivided by rubrics in the margin: Patria, Parentes, Studia, Praeceptores, Liberi, Pietas, Synchroni (meaning the contemporary poets, Aeschylus, Bacchylides, Simonides). On Pietas, the author states that although the ancient sources claim that Pindar honored the gods, and he obviously did so in obedience to traditional customs, his writings testify that he acknowledged a single eternal mind governing all things. His death in the lap of the youth Theoxenus (a detail censured by almost all previous scholars) is recorded, with the comment that it was just that such a placid death should befall one who in life had softened souls with his song. The repeated defeats suffered by Pindar at the hands of Corinna are also cited, but are attributed to the inexperience of the judges.

The most novel part with respect to the other sixteenth-century commentaries lies in a detailed list of all the individuals of Antiquity, Greek and Latin, who wrote about Pindar, either for praise or blame. The works are listed following the Suda. The writer then quickly moves on to the qualitas scripti (that is, what is signifies to be lyrikos) and the matter of the odes and their main argument: praise of the victors at the games.

Every ode is expounded first in its parts (after the customary acknowledgement of the triads, the cola are said to be versus variis legibus constantes). All the available historical information about the dedicatees is given. The notes that follow are often very full and erudite in character, illustrating geographical terms and historical and mythological individuals. Rhetorical figures are identified, and there is frequent discussion of the genuine significance of Greek terms, often taking a stance opposed to that of Lonicer (e. G. Ol. 1, epod. 1; p. 29). Where necessary, there are even translations from Greek into German. Some long excursus stray far off topic: see for example at p. 79 (the final part of Ol. 4) on the causes of white hair.

Letter to the reader: (ed. of [Geneva], 1587). Typographus Lectori. (Inc.): (p. 2) Accipe, lector, Commentarios in Pindarum, quos tibi nunc primum offero, quibus loci difficiles explanantur, historiae et fabulae quas Poeta obiter attingit, quibusque non cognitis subinde lectori haerendum esset, fuse et dilucide explicantur, cum perpetua ἀναλύσει argumentorum, et digressionum, quibus hoc poema, nequaquam humi repens, sed dithyrambico more assurgens, refertum est, atque adeo insignium sententiarum, quibus thanquam stellis ornatum et distinctum est, ita ut qui hos Commentarios habuerit, ad gravissimum nec ita pervium authorem intelligendum, nihil propemodum sit desideratus. Vale.

Accessus. Commentarii in Pindarum. [Inc.]: (p. 3) Honoratus ille Servius, cuius laus praecipua est inter Grammaticos, in explicandis auctoribus, sex observanda esse docet: Auctoris vitam. 2. titulum operis. 3. qualitatem scripti. 4. Scribentis intentionem, seu consilium auctoris. 5. Numerum librorum et 6. Explanationem. Quae nos in suscepta Pindari enarratione etiam observabimus
paululum mutato ordine. Nam priora quinque membra in προλεγομένοις plerunque explicari solent et quanquam lucem non mediocrem afferant, nihil tamen ad expositionem auctoris faciunt, aut certe parum. Ultimum vero membrum, hoc est, Explanatio, propria est interpretis. Itaque sic iudicare debemus duplicem esse considerationem susciendam interpreti: prior generalis est, unde καθολικὴ nominari potest: in hac sunt hi praecipui loci, quis, quid, cui, quomodo scripserit. Posterior cura specialis est, quae continent verborum contextus ἐξήγημα, in quo praecipua interpretis dexteritas et ingenium requiritur. Priorem igitur partem iis debemus locis, de quibus iam admonuimus. . . ./ . . [Expl.]: (p. 18) Ex his sumemus Argumentum, Genus, propositionem, partes: et cur primum occupet locum haec ode.

Commentary. [Olympiae] [Inc.]: (p. 18) Hieron. Fuit hic Syracusius Rex seu Tyrannus, Dinomenis filius: Fratres habuit Gelsonem Polybulum et Thraisybulum. Filium patris nomen Dinomenem. Virum exitisse et liberalem et fortem, aliisque virtutibus praedium, auctores sunt: maxime Aelianus lib. 9, ca. I, v. h. refert φιλέλληνa fuisse, magnificisse παιδίαν, hoc est eruditionem, item προχειρότατος eis τὰς εὐεργεσίας, etc.


In Pindari Nemea. [Inc.]: (p. 367) In Pindarica periodo sequuntur Nemei ludi: de his iam actu explicabimus διὰ βραχέων, quo authore sint instituti; in cuius gratiam; ubi; quo praemio certarint victores; quando item celebrata sint illa spectacula; qualeque antiquitus institutum fuerit hoc certaminis genus.

.../... [Expl.]: (p. 485) Verum per se elegans gnome est et digna observatione sententia: simile est Latinorum, Nitimur in vetitum, cupimusque negata. Rei amor prohibitae, aut illicitae, vel natura impossibilis, multo vehementior est, quam is amor qui licitus et concessus est; ut re cupita potiri possit, Furoris fit; quod licet ingratum est, ut ait ille quod non licet acrius urit. Recte ergo nominat ὀξυτέρας μανιάς, vehementiores insanias; furores amorum ἀποροσίκτων, quos consequi nescias, quam eorum quos assequi possit. Finis Nemeorum.

In Isthmia Pindari ὑπομνήματα. [Inc.]: (p. 485) Inter periodica certamina ultimum locum tenent Isthmiaci ludi; de his paucis agemus, antequam ad hymnos Pindarii perveniamus: ac pro more nostro explicanda erunt ista, a quo instituti hi ludi; in cuius gratiam; quando celebrati; quis honos victori habitus; ac siquid in his memoratu dignum acciderit, de quibus διὰ βραχέων agemus, si prius de voce et eius origine admonuerimus. .../... [Expl.]: (p. 558) Χεία latibulum, φωλέος, ἢ τῶν ὀφεων κατάδυσις, serpentum lustrum, a verbo χείω, quod est χωρῶ capax sum, aut abscondo, quod inertes et laborum impatientes facere solent. Cleander ἐν χειά non latuit: ergo fuit φιλόπονος: hinc ad victorias pervenit, ergo laudandus est. Finis commentariorum in Pindarum.
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i. David Chytraeus – David Kochhafe

In 1596 the Lutheran historian and theologian David Chytraeus published an unusual Pindaric volume, very probably as an offshoot of his teaching at
Rostock. The title page is the best statement of the content of the work: “Ex Pindari odis, excerptae genealogiae Principum Veteris Graeciae, et Gnomae illustres de Deo, Providentia, Justitia, Modestia, et variis vitae humanae casibus, studio Davidis Chytraei.” Following the argument, the volume does indeed contain the genealogiae and the sententiae from Ol. 1, with the Latin translation of the same ode by Menradus Moltherus (see I.4 above). The arguments, genealogies, and sententiae from all the other odes follow, without either text or translation. Several notable sententiae are given in Greek and translated into Latin. Particular attention is focused on the genealogies of the most important individuals, which are often reconstructed in minute detail, with full-scale genealogical trees, but the apparatus for some odes amounts to no more than a few lines.

The book opens with a Latin elegy (fol. A2r–v), “Cl. V. Laurentio Rhodomanno Vati, Vates Martinus Braschius S. D.,” in which praise of Pindar and of the now aged but still vigorous Chytraeus is supplemented by praise of the dedicatee. The short accessus emphasizes that the purpose of every ode is to extol the virtue of the winner, the importance of his family and its ancestors, and his city of origin. Pindar adorns all this with the gravest moral sententiae, illustrated with appropriate historical examples. There follows a brief biography and a description of the Olympic games.

At the end there is a summary of what it contains, ending with the affirmation that Pindaric morality, albeit highly praiseworthy, is the natural morality instilled into every man, for Pindar, like all the wise pagans, knew not the Christian religion. Thus they err who compare the odes of Pindar to the Psalms of David, or even rank them higher (on this see Melancthon, I.12 above).

In the final leaves appears a dedicatory epistle of Chytraeus to Paulus Schedius Melissus (the Rhenish poet Paul Schede Melissus), qualified as Germany’s sole modern Pindar (verum et unicum Germaniae nostrae Pindarum), who had published a collection of verse in Paris (1586) and had sent them to him as a gift. The volume closes with a Greek epigram and Latin translation, In statuam Pindari (= AP, 2.382–87 i.e. Christod. Ecph. 382–87; see F. Tissoni, Cristodoro. Un’introduzione e un commento [Alessandria, 2000], 243–45).


Commentary. [Inc.]: (fol. A5r) Prima oda celebrat victoriam Hieronis, principis Syracusani, sed huic intexit historiam Pelopis, proavi materni Herculis, in cuius honorem Olimpicus Agon primum institutus erat. . . . Genealogia Pelopis, qui ad Alphaeum fluvium Pisae, in Elide, habitavit et sepultus est. . . . (fol. [A6r]) Gnomae et Noemata praecipui. Ei δὲ θεόν ἀνήρ τις ἐλπεταί τι λαθεμέν ἔρων,
ἁμαρτάνει. Si Deum, homo faciens aliquid (sceleratum) sperat se posse latere, errat. . . . [Expl.]: (fol. G') iatὰ δ’ἔστι βροτοῖς σὺν γ’ ἐλευθερίᾳ καὶ τά. Χρῆ δ’ ἀγαθὰν ἐλπίδ’ ἀνδρὶ μέλειν. Sed salva libertate (salva Republica) hominibus sanabilia sunt et haec (mala quae accidentur et) bona spes retinenda est (opertet virum retinere spera bonam).
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See CTC 8.168.

II. Fragmenta

Translations

1. Henricus Stephanus – Henri Estienne

The edition of Pindar prepared by Henricus Stephanus in 1560 (see I.14 above) comprised two volumes: the first, described above, presented his Latin translation of Pindar with the Greek text en regard. Volume two offered a collection of fragments of the lyric poets, again with facing Latin translation.

Although it was volume two of a single edition, it has its own title page, which allowed it an independent circulation to some extent: Carminum Poetarum nouem, lyricae poeseωs principum, fragmenta. Alcaei, Anacreontis, Sapphus, Bacchylidis, Stesichori, Simonidis, Ibyci, Alcmanis, Pindari. Nonnulla etiam aliorum. Cum latina interpretatione, partim soluta oratione, partim carmine. Anno M.D.LX. Excudebat Henr. Stephanus, illustris viri Huldrychi Fuggeri Typographus.

There is however no independent preface, for that need was met in volume one. The volume opens with a poetic composition, an ode in Horatian meters composed by Stephanus in praise of the brothers Marcus and Johannes Fugger. Next, at p. 7, we find the life of Alceus, taken from the compilation of
Lilio Gregorio Giraldi. The section dedicated to the fragments of Pindar is at pp. 344–77. The volume closes with a postface by Stephanus, addressed to “readers attentive to poetry” (poetices studiosis lectoribus), pp. 427–30, in which he explains the criteria guiding his collection. He asserts that he is the first to assemble a collection of fragments of the lyric poets, which had previously only been quoted in the works of other authors, and states that he has not dared to make textual emendations, being well aware of the risks of doing so in the case of difficult authors who wrote in very complicated meters. He has merely inserted an asterisk beside readings he regards as erroneous or problematic, in the hope that other scholars may be inspired by his work to advance the task of emending the text. Several of the very few interventions Stephanus does make concern the Greek text of two fragments of Pindar.

Though Stephanus had the work of no predecessor to build on in assembling a collection of Pindar fragments, his pioneering effort is a sturdy one. There are forty-six fragments in total, and in some cases he gives the different versions reported by different authors. For the sake of completeness I supply the complete list, indicating the ancient author in question and the work in which the fragment is cited, the number of the fragment in the edition of Snell-Maehler, and the Pindaric work to which it belonged in the view of modern scholarship.

D. H. Comp. 22 (= fr. 75 Sn.-M.) – Dithyrambi;
D. H. Dem. 7 (= fr. 52k Sn.-M.: verses 1–10; 13–20) – Paeanes;
Ath. XI 30 (= fr. 70b Sn.-M.: verses 1–3) – Dithyrambi;
Str. X 3, 13 (= fr. 70b Sn.-M.: verses 8–11) – Dithyrambi;
Scholia Aristophani (Av. 927) et Pindari (p. II 127) (= fr. 105a Sn.-M.) – Hyporchemata;
Pl. Grg 484 B (= fr. 169a Sn.-M.) – Incertorum librorum;
Pl. R. 331A (= fr. 214 Sn.-M.) – Incertorum librorum;
Pl. R. 365B e Cic. Ad Att. XIII 38 (= fr. 213 Sn.-M.) Incertorum librorum;
Plu. 120C (Cons. ad apoll. 35) (= fr. 129 Sn.-M.) – Threni;
Plu. 116D (Cons. ad apoll. 28) (= fr. 35b* Sn.-M.) – Hymni;
Plu. 1130C (De lat. viv 7) (= fr. 129 Sn.-M.) – Threni;
Ath. XII 7 (= fr. 43 Sn.-M.) – Hymni;
Plu. 783B (An seni... 1) e 975D (Soll. Anim. 23) (= fr. 228 Sn.-M.) Incertorum librorum;
Plu. 704F (Qu. Conv. 7, 5, 2) (= fr. 140b, verses 13–15 Sn.-M.) Incertorum librorum;
Plu. 365A (Is. Osir. 35) (= fr. 153 Sn.-M.) Incertorum librorum;
Plu. 349C (Glor. Ath. 7) (= fr. 78 Sn.-M.) – Dithyrambi;
Plu. 451D (Virt. Mor. 12) (= fr. 234 Sn.-M.) Incertorum librorum;
The fragments are listed both in the order of the source authors, and in the order of the source works, where Stephanus was able to establish that; the ensemble that results is thus somewhat disorderly. Almost all the fragments are given a facing Latin translation, composed by Stephanus ad hoc. His versions are exclusively in prose and aim to give the letter of the text, without stylistic elaboration, but always comprehensibly. An exception is the modern fr. 129 Sn.-M., transmitted with variants in two different works of Plutarch, the *Consolatio ad Apollonium* and *De latenter vivendo*. For the first, Stephanus gives the translation of Stephanus Niger, for the second that of Erasmus. Another noteworthy exception is the handful of fragments not translated: within this restricted group the modern fr. 122 Sn.-M. stands out. The fragment belongs to an encomium directed to Xenophon of Corinth, who had donated some slave girls for service
as sacral prostitutes in the temple of Aphrodite at Corinth. It is not unlikely that
the fragment remained untranslated because of its scabrous nature. In other
cases, a few fragments may not have been translated simply because of lack of
space on the facing page (see pp. 368–69).

Pindari Carmina. Apud Dionysium Halicarnasseum in libro De structura
verborum (p. 345). [Inc.]: Adeste ad chorum caelestes, et inclytam immittite
gratiam Dii, frequentem qui urbis umbilicum thure perfusum in sacris Athenis
teritis, elegansque loco aprico situm forum . . . [Expl.] (p. 377) per caelum, astro-
nomiae dans operam, et omnium omni ex parte naturam perscrutans.
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