

One interpretative difficulty typically cited in the analysis of *Nemean 6*, which Pindar composed, perhaps in 465 BCE, for the wrestling victory of Alkimidas of Aigina, is the correct identification of the victor's family members. Praxidamas, the grandfather of the victor, is identified as the son of Sokleidas (20-21). Are Kallias and Kreontidas, who are named and whose victories are described in lines 34-44, Sokleidas' two remaining sons, alluded to but left unnamed earlier in lines 23-24? A conclusive answer cannot be known because Pindar does not explicitly identify these two men and because independent epigraphical and literary evidence is lacking. Nevertheless, Christopher Carey has argued for this identification, basing his argument on "chronological considerations," and on "Pindar's deployment of proper names when dealing with relatives of the victor" (Carey, *CQ* 1989, 7). Carey, however, barely touches on "the long interval between the enumeration of the sons in 23f. and the naming and praise of the remaining two in 34ff.," which fact, he acknowledges, is "[t]he reason for the general failure of modern scholars to recognize Kallias and Kreontidas as the remaining sons of Sokleidas" (9). Carey simply notes that Pindar frequently interrupts catalogues of victories in order to avoid monotony, and he cites parallels without any discussion (9; cf. Gerber, *HSCP* 1999, 60-61).

While I agree with Carey's thesis, I think additional persuasive evidence for this identification can be adduced by analyzing *Nemean 6*.15-44 as a strategy of praise for victorious *brothers*. Praise of a victorious father or son is relatively unproblematic because the victory of the father is a joy for the son, and the victory of a son augments the glory of his father. The nearly contemporary victories of brothers, however, present a rhetorical difficulty: Pindar is caught between the imperative to praise the collective achievement of the victor's *oikos* and the necessity of avoiding invidious comparisons between the achievements of individual brothers. Pindar's praise for other sets of brothers (the sons of Lampon [*I.6, I.5*], the Emmenids [*O.2, I.2*], the Deinomenids [*O.1, 3; P.1, 2, 3*], and the Meidylids [*P.8*]) offers only partial parallels with *Nemean 6* because the circumstances of praise differ. More illuminating parallels occur in the inscriptions for a trio of victorious brothers whose statues are included in a group dedicated by Daochos at Delphi between 336-32 BCE (Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger* 1972, #43-45). Despite the fact that these inscriptions post-date *Nemean 6* by about 130 years, they illustrate the difficulties inherent in the praise of victorious brothers and offer some perspective on and parallels to Pindar's strategy of praise in *Nemean 6*: Pindar deliberately avoids, by use of the "superlative vaunt" (Race, *Style and Rhetoric* 1990, 78, and *TAPA* 1987, 138-39), direct comparison of victories which differ in prestige and number, and, at the same time, he depicts each victory as a necessary and unique contribution to the *oikos*' superlative number of boxing victories (24-26). Thus, this paper contributes not only to Pindaric prosopography, but also to an understanding of how Pindar negotiates the multiple, and sometimes conflicting, claims to praise of the victor and his *oikos*.