

# Notes on the Text of Pindar

*Douglas Young*

## I

### On the Alleged Three Mediaeval Metagrammatisms

IN HIS *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris 1952), J. Irigoin consecrates a chapter (XI, pp. 123–134) to his theory that the text of the odes underwent in the Middle Ages three successive transliterations or metagrammatisms from uncials to minuscules. If true, this would be most unusual for a pagan author, for a pagan text normally was transmitted through a single metagrammatism. Irigoin writes (p. 125): “Les fautes graphiques causées par la confusion des lettres onciales ne sont jamais nombreuses. Pour la recension ambrosienne, dans le texte des *Olympiens*, une faute est certaine: O 10.51 ΕΑCAC: ΕΑCAC: une autre faute se retrouve dans quelques manuscrits de la recension vaticane: O 6.180 ΑΕΖ’: ΔΕΖ’: c’est probablement, dans ces manuscrits, une correction indépendante de la recension ambrosienne; la prière de demande (δίδοι) se termine par l’offrande de l’ode (ἐμῶν δ’ ὕμνων δέξ’ εὐτερπὲς ἄνθος).” (Note that Irigoin cites by cola: the Bowra line references are O 10.43 and O 6.105).

Now the corruption of ἄεξ’ to δέξ’ at O 6.105 occurs not only in A, the leading manuscript of the so-called “Ambrosian” recension, but in L M N and O *post corr.* Certainly the confusion of *lambda* and *delta* is a common uncial error; but it can also occur in a purely minuscule ambience, e.g. at Theognis 847, where N writes δὰξ for the word λὰξ in its minuscule antigraph, D. In that place there may be some unconscious association of thought, namely rhyming, an occasional source of error in copying. Irigoin himself notes (p. 125) that the scribes’ sense of the context may have influenced the corruption of ἄεξ’ to δέξ’ at O 6.105. The other corruption on which he founds, that of ἔλσας to ἑάσας at O 10.43, need not have arisen through visual confusion of uncial letters:

it could spring from mere trivialisation, the substitution of a commoner word of similar appearance. Collation of the Pindar text in A shows that it is frequently a careless apograph: e.g. at O 4.8 A writes the trivial ἵππον for ἵπον; at O 6.91 ἀφθόγγων for ἀγαφθέγκτων; at O 7.59 χλωρᾶν for χώρας. At O 10.98 A offers ἀναπλάσσει for ἀναπάσσει, and such an error would more readily arise in uncials; but even so it would not help towards proving a separate transliteration for A, because five other manuscripts offer the same error.

It seems, then, that there is no adequate basis for Irigoín's theory that A is the product of a separate and belated transliteration from uncials to minuscules in the later thirteenth century (p. 246). Irigoín writes of "L'abondance, dans le manuscrit A, des fautes dues à la confusion des lettres onciales . . .", though he had previously written (p. 125) that "Les fautes graphiques causées par la confusion des lettres onciales ne sont jamais nombreuses." It is a pity that Irigoín did not list the allegedly abundant uncial errors he found in A, which I myself cannot find in the text. Irigoín does not even list many errors from the scholia of A, and he himself admits (p. 125): "mais on sait que, jusqu'à la fin du X<sup>e</sup> siècle, les scholies ont été volontiers écrites en petite onciale." Thus uncial errors in scholia, in A or other Mss, can derive from eleventh or twelfth century scribal work on Mss all derived from a single transliteration of the text and scholia in the later stages of the Photian renaissance, say around A.D. 1000.

It is of dubious help to Irigoín's thesis to remark (pp. 246f) that the Theocritus text K, bound with A of Pindar, derives from a separate transliteration: ". . . le même *Ambrosianus* C 222 inf., avec le sigle K, tient une place analogue dans l'histoire du texte de Théocrite; il remonte à une translittération distincte . . ." Irigoín refers to C. Gallavotti, *Theocritus*, pp. 243–245. Gallavotti remarks that the hand of Theocritus K in the volume is that of the accompanying Aristophanes text, but different from that of Pindar A. Gallavotti gives only three readings suggestive of uncial errors in K. One is Theocr. 15.68: δμωὰ for ἀμῶν, which could originate from uncial AMΩN being misread as ΔMΩA, by a double error. But one should note that the Theocritus Mss G and P have the reading δμωῖς; and both this and K's δμωὰ could have arisen from a gloss (meaning 'servant-girl') on the preceding word *Εὐνόα*, which gloss had supplanted ἀμῶν in later copying. In Theocritus epigram 11.4 K's error ἀλιμωνως for the correct δαιμονίως is shared with the Perusine Mss and thus cannot prove a separate meta-

grammatism of K. Thirdly, Gallavotti cites from Simias *Securis* 6 K's variant *δυσηλεῆς* for *δυσκλής*. This could arise from an uncial confusion of *eta* and *kappa*, but confusions occur also of minuscule forms of these letters. In this connection one may note that at Pindar O 6.98, for *εὐηράτους* we find *εὐκράτους* in A, and in N and O by their first hands. In A it is a *γρ(άφεται)* variant. One must reckon with the possibility that the transliterated archetype, or master-copy, of all our extant Pindar Mss had some variants in its text, apart from those in its scholia. Even were the thesis valid that K of Theocritus derived from a separate metagrammatism, substantially more evidence would still be needed to make attractive Irigoin's theory that A of Pindar stemmed from a late thirteenth century metagrammatism.

Irigoin's contention receives no support from the Aeschylus text (A) that accompanies K of Theocritus and A of Pindar. Study of the beautiful collation by Dr Roger D. Dawe shows no sign of separate metagrammatism of Aeschylus's A, but reveals some indications of its antigraph's having been minuscule: e.g. at *Septem* 759, for *πίτνον* A offers *πίτυον*, and at *Persae* 922 for *ἐγγαίαν* one finds *ἀγγαίαν* in A and three other Mss.

Irigoin's case for there having been a third mediaeval transliteration of Pindar, that of his "recension vaticane raccourcie," (p. 127), seems also to be inadequate. Apart from two examples in the scholia, which, as said above, are not helpful because scholia continued to be written in uncials after the text had been transliterated into minuscules, Irigoin cites only one text variant to prove his thesis: *P* 3.27 *μηλοδόκω*] *μηδοδόκω*. This is in C *ante corr.* E G V<sup>2</sup>. It might be an old uncial error that had been corrected in the rest of the family of Mss descended from the single metacharacterized copy of the Photian renaissance; but it might also exemplify a common type of error in minuscule copying, whereby a scribe anticipates a syllable, here writing in second place the syllable *δο* due to come in third place. Alternatively, the repetition of the vowel *omicron* brought with it a repetition of the second consonant accompanying it: schematically C<sub>1</sub>V<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>V<sub>1</sub>> C<sub>2</sub>V<sub>1</sub>C<sub>2</sub>V<sub>1</sub>. Or again, to pursue Irigoin's own argument elsewhere (p. 125) about the influence of context on the scribe's mind, note that in *P* 3.27 the next word is *Πυθῶνι*, so that a scribe might well have written *μηδοδόκω* through some latent notion of the Medes at Delphi, as described by Herodotus. At any rate, the miswriting of *μηλοδόκω* as *μηδοδόκω* will not go far to establish Irigoin's thesis of a third mediaeval

metagrammatism of Pindar. In general, to demonstrate more than a single transliteration from uncials to minuscules of any classical text one would require to see a sizeable constellation of indubitably uncial errors in the text; and for Pindar none such is visible.

Irigoin further theorizes that there was an ancient metagrammatism of Pindar into the Ionic alphabet (pp. 22–25). On this G. P. Goold writes (*TAPA* 91 [1960] 284): “The evidence adduced is pitifully trivial.”

THE UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

*February, 1966*

## II

## Word-division at Verse-end in Pindar

MODERN EDITORS follow August Böckh in removing, by what they consider emendation, the examples of word-division at verse-end offered by the Pindar paradosis. Doubts about the justification for their proceedings arose strongly in my mind when considering a particular instance, at N 10.41f, where Böckh's *Emendationsversuch* involved the assumption of a complex series of transpositions, which moved Hermann to protest. The paradosis there runs:

ὀμμάτων. νικαφορίαις γὰρ ὄσαις ἵπποτρόφον ἄστν τὸ Προί- 41  
 τοιο θάλησεν Κορίνθου τ' ἐν μυχοῖς, . . . 42

The transmitted text makes good sense and scans correctly, but the word-division Προί-|τοιο at the verse-end broke the rule of Hephais-  
 tion, πᾶν μέτρον εἰς τελείαν περατοῦται λέξιν, "Every measure (of  
 verse) ends in a complete word or phrase." Böckh therefore elaborately transposed the words, and altered one, to run:

ὀμμάτων. νικαφορίαις γὰρ ὄσαις Προίτοιο τόδ' ἵπποτρόφον 41  
 ἄστν θάλησεν Κορίνθου τ' ἐν μυχοῖς, . . . 42

Böckh here assumed that his order A B C D had been corrupted in the paradosis into C D B A, and that the word τόδ' had been altered to τό. He claimed (I,329) that he could show many examples in Pindar of disturbed order of words, but in fact he cites none so complicated as he assumes here.

Hermann himself permitted Pindar to divide a word at the end of a verse, but at I 8.42f he removed an example by re-writing a passage, his motive being to secure exact responsion with other strophes—what Wilamowitz (*Pindaros* 9) was later to term the "petitio principii strengster metrischer Gleichmässigkeit." At I 8.42f the paradosis runs:

τὸ μὲν ἐμὸν πηλεῖ θεά-  
 μοιρον ὀπάσαι γάμου  
 αἰακίδα γέρας, . . .

Hermann altered that to read:

τὸ μὲν ἐμόν, Πηλείϊ γέρας θεόμορον  
ὀπάσσαι γάμου Αἰακίδα, . . .

Hermann here assumes, in the last six words, that his order ABCDEF had been transposed in the paradosis to the order ACDEFB, with the second word, *γέρας*, transposed to sixth place. Something similar occurred at O 10.73, where N transposes the word *μέγαν* to follow *εὐωπίδος* five words later. But Hermann's change of order also involves two further changes, *θεάμοιρον* to *θεόμορον* and *ὀπάσσαι* to *ὀπάσαι*. These are small changes, indeed, but more than is needed. D's text can stand, with the single change of *θεάμοιρον* to *θεάμορον*, in this form:

τὸ μὲν ἐμόν, Πηλείϊ θεάμορον ὀπά-  
σαι γάμου Αἰακίδα γέρας.

That scans as 4th paeon+ 1st paeon+ resolved diiamb, followed by glyconic, which responds satisfactorily to the corresponding verses in other strophes.

Before considering other places where the Pindar paradosis exhibits word-division at verse-end, it may be noted that Böckh allows Pindar to elide at verse-end and to divide phrases, for instance by separating a preposition at verse-end from the noun it governs in the next verse, or by putting at the start of a verse an enclitic word leaning back on a word at the end of the preceding verse.

Böckh rightly stresses Pindar's taste for what we call *enjambement*, used for emphasis, e.g. at O 2.92–95, with its culminating phrase:

. . ἄνδρα μᾶλλον εὐεργέταν πραπίσιν ἀφθονέστερόν τε χέρα  
Θήρωνος.

Here the name of Theron is first word of the epode, and Pindar stops abruptly after it, to give emphasis. Likewise, at P 2.72f he sets an emphatic word at the start of a new triad, thus:

καλός τοι πίθων παρὰ παισίν, αἰεὶ  
καλός.

Sir Maurice Bowra remarks (*Pindar* [1964] 319) that “for the greater part of his career Pindar made his syntactical units run counter to his metrical, presumably because he saw the poem as a whole and did

not wish it to fall into separate and easily distinguishable sections.” It is perfectly in keeping, therefore, with that vision of the ode as a whole to reinforce *enjambement* with elision, as occurs notably at O 3.25f:

δὴ τότε ἔς γαῖαν πορεύεν θυμὸς ὄρμαιν’  
Ἰστρίαν νιν.

“Straightway his spirit was eager to bring him to the Danubian land.” On this place Böckh remarks (I,318): “Versum exire posse in vocabulum apostropho mutilatum certum est ab aliis poetis, estque unum in Pindaricis exemplum certissimum Ol.III,26, ubi vox ὄρμαιν’ in fine antistrophae posita est.” Modern editors seem to prefer A’s commoner word ὄρμα, which has the disadvantage of requiring πορεύεν to be taken in an unparalleled intransitive sense.

At N 8.37ff the paradosis gives us

χρυσὸν εὔχονται, πεδίον δ’ ἕτεροι  
ἀπέραντον, ἐγὼ δ’ ἀστοῖς ἄδων καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαιμ’,  
αἰνέων αἰνητά, μομφὰν δ’ ἐπισπείρων ἀλιτροῖς.

Böckh, and later Bergk, printed the elided καλύψαιμ’, and those with whom the Muses are not angry can see how much more emphatic is Pindar’s first person optative than the “immendation” by Wakefield, καλύψαι, which depends on a supplied εὔχομαι.

Other examples of elision at verse-end affect particles, as at P 4.179f:

ταχέες δ’  
ἀμφὶ Παγγαίου θεμέθλοισ ναιετάοντες ἔβαν.

Böckh keeps the δ’, which is needed to avoid an unsuitable asyndeton. At I 6.31–32:

πέφνεν δὲ σὺν κείνῳ Μερόπων τ’  
ἔθνεα καὶ τὸν βουβόταν . . .

Böckh keeps the τ’, but prints it at the start of a new verse, thus: τ’ ἔθνεα. It means ‘both’, and is desirable, though not necessary. At I 8.19f the witness is D, which offers:

πατρὸς οὐνεκα δίδυμαι γέγοντο θυγατέρες, Ἀσωπίδων θ’  
ὀπλοτάτα, Ζηνί θ’ ἄδον βασιλέϊ. [Read τε ἄδον, E. Schmidt.]

One may keep D's dual, and its  $\theta'$  as an example of appositional  $\tau\epsilon$  (cf. Denniston, *Greek Particles* 502,e): "... because they were born twin daughters of their father, and the youngest pair of Asopides, and they pleased King Zeus." At *I* 8.34f the manuscripts have  $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\pi\epsilon\ \delta'$  |  $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\ \Theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\iota\varsigma$ , ... The connective is needed. Böckh comments (I,318): "insititiae possunt particulae videri; nolui tamen in re ambigua mutare quidquam."

With the conservative caution of the august Böckh here one may contrast the radical dogmatism of the venerable Paul Maas, in *Greek Metre* (tr. Lloyd-Jones [Oxford 1962] §139, pp. 87f): "Elision at the end of the line is avoided . . . there is none in Pindar (on the interpolation of these particles see O. Schroeder, *Pindar*, 1900, 9 . . .)." Maas says nothing about the two clear cases of elision of non-particles, *O* 3.25  $\acute{\omega}\rho\mu\alpha\iota\nu'$  and *N* 8.38  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\psi\alpha\iota\mu'$ . Yet he writes deprecatingly (p. 92) about "a metric which, in order to impose its laws, has to change the style for the worse or do violence to the transmitted text," and again "the metre of a poem is nothing apart from the poetry it is there to serve." On poetic grounds the  $\acute{\omega}\rho\mu\alpha\iota\nu'$  and  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\psi\alpha\iota\mu'$  offered by the paradosis are greatly preferable.

Böckh defends Pindar's practice of allowing an enclitic at the start of a new verse, thus dividing the phrase to which it belongs, e.g. *N* 4.63f:

. . .  $\acute{\omicron}\nu\chi\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\xi\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$   
 $\tau\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu\ \sigma\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ . . .$

and *I* 8.10f:

. . .  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   
 $\gamma\epsilon\ \tau\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\nu\ . . .$

Böckh also condones Pindar's setting a preposition at a verse-end and the noun it governs at the start of the next verse, as at *O* 13.112f, where Böckh accents

. . .  $\kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$   
 $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\delta'$   $\acute{\epsilon}\ddot{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ . . .$

Pindar is also willing to leave other prepositive words at verse-end, like  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ ,  $\eta'$  and  $\kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}$ . For examples:

*O* 10.18:  $\textit{Ἴλα φερέτω χάριν}$   
 $\textit{Ἀγησίδαμος, ὡς}$   
 $\textit{Ἀχιλεὶ Πάτροκλος.}$



P 9.99: παρθενικαὶ πόσιν ἦ  
υἱὸν εὖχοντ',

O 14.5: κλυτ', ἐπεὶ εὖχομαι. σὺν γὰρ ὑμῖν τὰ τερπνὰ καὶ  
τὰ γλυκέ' ἀνεταί πάντα βροτοῖς,

O 9.65: ὑπέρφατον ἄνδρα μορφᾷ τε καὶ  
ἔργοισι.

Fr. 36.16 Bowra: Θραϊκίαν γαῖαν ἀμπελόεσσάν τε καὶ  
εὐκαρπον·

In view of such phenomena, and of Böckh's conservative respect for the textual facts regarding elision at verse-end and the separation of enclitics and prepositions, it is curious that he allowed himself to override the textual data in the matter of word-division at verse-end, in deference to Hephaestion's dogma that every *metron* ends in a complete word. That was in 1811. Contrast the words written in 1962 by the Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, Hugh Lloyd-Jones, in his preface to his translation of Maas's *Greek Metre*: "Ancient theories about Greek metre are of little or no value; and modern theories are valuable only in so far as they are grounded upon the evidence of the texts."

What, then, is the evidence of the Pindar manuscripts in the matter of word-division at verse-end? I am here understanding verse-end as that established by the occurrence of hiatus or *syllaba brevis in longo* in some stanza of the ode. The case of N 10.41, Προί-|τοιο, has already been discussed, and the case of I 8.42 ὀπά-|σαι, where both have been removed in modern texts by the combined assumption of transposition of words and corruption. There is another example at P4.211f where the best manuscript, B, offers the perfectly appropriate reading:

ἔς Φᾶσιν δ' ἔπειτ' ἀν-  
ἦλυθον, . . . [ἐνήλυθον G<sup>2</sup> C V, ἐν | ἦλυθον E]

ἔπειτεν ἦλυθον of G<sup>1</sup> and the later Mss H and φ is preferred by Böckh and modern editors. At O 6.53 the majority of the *veteres* offer ἀλλ' ἐγ-|κέκρυπτο γὰρ σχοίνῳ . . ., which Böckh changes to ἀλλ' ἐν | κέκρυπτο to avoid the word-division at verse-end. At N 8.40f the para-

dosis offers the division of a non-compound word at verse-end, thus:

αὔξεται δ' ἀρετά, χλωραῖς ἐέρσαις  
ὥς ὅτε δένδρεον ἀῖσ-  
σει, σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν ἀερθεῖσ' ἐν δικαίῳις τε πρὸς ὑγρὸν  
αἰθέρα.

ἀῖσ-|σει scans right, with Homeric initial long *alpha*, and makes good sense; but Böckh, to conform to Hephaestion's dogma, alters to

ὥς ὅτε δένδρεον ἄσσει,  
<ἐν> σοφοῖς ἀνδρῶν . . .

In view of the lability of ἐν, this is not a difficult change, were any needed.

At *I* 6.7ff we find:

εἴη δὲ τρίτον  
σωτήρι πορσαίνοντας Ὀλυμπίῳ Αἴγιναν κατα-  
σπένδειν μελιφθόγγοις αἰοδαῖς. [B. κατα-|σπεύδειν D]

“And may it be ours, preparing a third bowl for the Olympian Saviour, to honour Aigina with libations of honey-voiced songs.” *κατασπένδω* occurs in an appropriate sense at *Eur. Or.* 1239, *δακρύοις κατασπένδω σε*. Böckh's *κάτα | σπένδειν* is termed by Fennell a “metrical tmesis.” The sense would be “. . . to pour libations (*absolutely*) over Aigina.”

At *I* 3.18, if one takes *I* 3 as having the same colometry as *I* 4, the view adopted by Turyn and Snell, then we find a compound word divided at verse-end, thus:

αἰῶν δὲ κυλινδομέναις ἀμέραις ἄλλ' ἄλλοτ' ἐξ-  
άλλαξεν. ἄτρωτοί γε μὰν παῖδες θεῶν.

Turyn avoids word-division by running the two verses into one. Snell prints ἐξ as a separate word at the end of the verse. Bowra writes the compound as a single word, and makes one long verse in *I* 3, while dividing the end of the epode into two verses in *I* 4.

That makes, then, a total of seven places where manuscripts offer apparent word-division at verse-end by Pindar. Three of them are of un-compounded words, *Προί-|τοιο*, *ὀπά-|σαι*, *ἄισ-|σει* and four of compounds, *ἀν-|ήλυθον*, *ἐγ-|κέκρυπτο*, *κατα-|σπένδειν*, *ἐξ-|άλλαξεν*. Only one involves a proper name. To remove the divided simple

words from the verse-end involves somewhat more surgery than is needed for the compound forms.

Now Böckh had to defend himself against an accusation by the reviewer G. F. Grotefend, that he had been guilty of *petitio principii* in emending away examples of word-division at verse-end. See Böckh's excellent polemic, *Narratur historia litis de vocabulis inter duos versus non dividendis motae nuperrime* (in *Pindari opera* I [1811] 324ff). Hermann too objected in particular to the violent transposition assumed in Böckh's emending away of the divided *Προί-|τοιο* (*apud* Böckh, *op.cit.* I,329). Indeed, Böckh himself had earlier been disposed to allow word-division for proper names and compounds. But later he wrote (I,85): "nunc et perfectiorem video esse Pindarum, quam qui hoc potuerit sustinere et pauca exempla, ubi divisum poterat vocabulum videri, certa sublata sunt emendatione." He claimed that only four cases needed emendation, and he asks (I,313): "Quis vero ob quaternos locos in tam corrupto scriptore hoc praeceptum damnaverit, nisi rei criticae imperitus, quum praesertim coniecturae, quibus in iis usi sumus, non admodum sint audaces?"

Now there are in fact seven cases requiring emendation, not four; and we have only four of the seventeen books of Pindar known to antiquity. If we had all seventeen, we might expect to find, not the seven cases of our four books, but perhaps twenty-eight cases of word-division at verse-end. It may be thought unscientific to emend away these seven cases, even if most of the emendations are slight. Moreover, we must remember Böckh's defence of cases of elision at verse-end, and of separation of enclitics and prepositions from the rest of the phrase in which they form part. In general, it may be considered that Pindar's usages at verse-end in these regards fit in perfectly with his zeal for *enjambement*.

Moreover, though in 1811 Böckh could excusably write of Pindar as "tam corrupto scriptore," today, thanks to the labours of Mommsen, Schroeder, Turyn, Snell and others, we can see that the *paradosis* is substantially very sound.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

February, 1966

## III

## Emendations and Defences of Readings in Pindar

FROM ANALYSIS of errors in sixteen manuscripts it appears that a comparatively small proportion involve more than one syllable and that they are classifiable into types that recur frequently. The following attempts to emend apparently corrupt places proceed, in principle, on the basis of making the minimum change from the paradosis.

Non-elision is an occasional source of corruption, and may have caused the trouble at *I* 8.44, where the paradosis is:

*ὄν τ' εὐσεβέστατόν φασιν Ἰαολκοῦ τράφειν πεδίον.*

The metre is Aeolic, and the final verse of the strophe elsewhere consists of iambic metron+ 2nd paeon (= resolved bacchius)+ polyschematist choriambic dimeter. A satisfactory responsion (with bacchius for resolved bacchius) results from eliding *φασιν* to make the verse

*ὄν τ' εὐσεβέστατόν φασ' Ἰαολκοῦ τράφειν πεδίον.*

The textual problem at *I* 4.50 perhaps derived from an error in inflection, the change of *θηρᾶ* to the *θηρᾶν* of the paradosis. The gentlest medicine seems to be to read:

*τόλμα γὰρ εἰκὼς*  
*θυμὸν ἐριβρεμετᾶν θηρᾶ λέόντων* 50  
*ἐν πόνῳ, μῆτιν δ' ἀλώπηξ, . . .*

“For like in spirit to the boldness of roaring lions he goes hunting in the athletic contest, but in cunning a vixen . . .”

At *N* 4.16 one might re-interpret *ῥυμνον* of the paradosis as *ῥυμνων* and make the passage run:

*εἰ δ' ἔτι ζαμενεῖ Τιμόκριτος ἀλίῳ*  
*σὸς πατὴρ ἐθάλπεται, ποικίλον κιθαρίζων*  
*θαμά κε τῷδε μέλει κλιθεῖς*  
*ῥυμνων κελάδησε καλλίνικον . . .*

“If your father Timokritos were still being warmed by the powerful sun, with variously wrought accompaniment on the lyre he would often have reclined and celebrated with this strain of hymns the glorious victor . . .”

At P 6.14 τυπτόμενοι of the paradosis could be re-interpreted as τυπτομένω, used in the *Ab Vrbe Condita* construction, giving this sentence:

τὸν οὔτε χειμέριος ὄμβρος, ἐπακτὸς ἐλθῶν 10  
 ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας  
 στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος, οὔτ’ ἄνεμος ἐς μυχοῦς  
 ἀλὸς ἄξιοισι παμφόρῳ χεράδει  
 τυπτομένω.

“It (Pindar’s treasury of songs) neither a wintry downpour, arriving as the inbrought (= mercenary, hostile) brutal army of a thundering cloud, nor a wind shall drive into the recesses of the brine with the smiting of the all-carrying scree.” Pindar, familiar with Delphi, had the image of a scree-slope being set in motion by heavy rain or squalls.

At O 1.87 manuscripts give us, and editors accept,

ἔδωκεν δίφρον τε χρύσειον πτεροῖσιν τ’ ἀκάμαντας ἵππους.

I have always been sceptical about the notion that Poseidon gave Pelops winged horses to compete with Oinomaos. It would look so visibly unfair. Also, the wings would not help unless the horses soared into the air, in which event the car would capsize. I suggest that a *nu* has fallen out and we should read

ἔδωκεν δίφρον τε χρύσειον πτέρνοισιν τ’ ἀκάμαντας ἵππους.

This would make a licit form of glyconic, followed by a polyschematist choriambic dimeter catalectic. At Theognis 551 the epithet of horses, ταχυπτέρνοισι, ‘swift-heeled,’ is trivialised in some *deteriores* to ταχυπτέροισι.

A syllable has dropped out at N 4.62 in the word offered by the paradosis as θρασυμαχᾶν. I would amend to θρασυμάχανος, referring to Peleus, as at O 6.67 the same epithet applies to Herakles. The passage would then go:

πῦρ δὲ παγκρατὲς θρασυμάχανός τε λεόντων  
 ὄνυχας ὄξυτάτους ἀκμάν  
 τε δεινοτάτων σχάσαις ὀδόντων . . .

“Boldly resourceful, having subdued all-mastering fire and the exceedingly sharp claws of lions and the strength of their dreadful teeth . . .”

The problem of gloss substitution is raised by O 1.63f, where the *veteres* offer, unmetrically, οἷσιν ἄφθιτον θέσαν αὐτόν. Much favour has been accorded to Mommsen’s proposal to read οἷσιν ἄφθιτον θέν νιν. Mommsen’s assumption would be that his θέν νιν was glossed by θέσαν αὐτόν. It might, however, be a gentler medicine to write οἷς ἰν ἄφθιτον θέσσαν and assume that ΟΙΣΙΝ, written continuously, was taken as οἷσιν and αὐτόν added for an object, with singling of the sigmas of θέσσαν.

There is a related problem at N 4.68, where the paradosis offers, unmetrically, δῶρα καὶ κράτος ἐξέφαναν ἐς γενεὰς αὐτῶ. For most of the past four centuries the learned seem to have been content with Fulvio Orsini’s ἐς γένος αὐτῶ; but corruption of ἐς γένος to ἐς γενεὰς is not very likely. I suggest that αὐτῶ is a gloss, and that the true reading might be ἐς γενεὰς οἱ or ἰν. ἰν (ἰν) is not necessarily reflexive, cf. C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago 1955) §118.4; §121. Maas restores it at N 7.98 in a similar context where divine favour is sought for a man and the generations of his posterity.

A crux at N 6.43 may derive from confusion caused by a gloss. The paradosis offers, unmetrically in 43:

βοτάνα τέ νίν ποθ’ ἄ λέοντος  
† νικάσαντ’ ἔρειψε† δασκίους 43  
Φλειοῦντος ὑπ’ ὠγγύιους ὄρεσιν.

Hermann produced acceptable metre by writing

νικῶντ’ ἤρεφε δασκίους . . .

The assumption that νικῶντ’ ἤρεφε was corrupted to νικάσαντ’ ἔρειψε involves a double change of tense. Change of tense is indeed a common enough phenomenon, but two adjacent changes would be unparalleled in Pindar. It occurred to me that Pindar might have written νίκας ἄνστεφε (= ἀνέστεφε), “wreathed for a victory,” and that somebody glossed ἄνστεφε by ἔρειψε, so that in uncials some copy appeared

ΕΡΕΨΕ

to a later copyist to present ΝΙΚΑΣΑΝΣΤΕΦΕ. Taking ἔρειψε as a correction for what he read as στέφε, he then made ΝΙΚΑΣΑΝ into the participle νικάσαντ’. Misdivision would thus be an additional factor.

Misdivision may have led to the crux at *N* 4.90.

τὸν Εὐφάνης ἐθέλων γεραιὸς προπάτωρ  
† ὁ σὸς ἀείσεται, παῖ †

90

Pindar is excusing himself for not writing a special ode for the deceased Kallikles (80), maternal uncle of Timasarchos. At 90 he perhaps wrote ὁ σὸς ἀείσ' ἔτι, παῖ. "Old grandfather Euphanes, who is still alive, celebrated him (Kallikles) with a will in song."

Misdivision in uncials could have led to the crux at *I* 6.46, in the prayer of Herakles for the baby Ajax:

τὸν μὲν ἄρρηκτον φυάν, ὥσπερ τόδε δέρμα †μίμνοι† περιπλανᾶται  
θηρός, ὃν πάμπρωτον ἀέθλων  
κτεῖνά ποτ' ἐν Νεμέᾳ.

Stephanus proposed *με νῦν*, but its corruption to *μίμνοι* would be hard to explain. Perhaps the paradosis arose from misdivision of the uncials representing *δέρμ' ἄμ' ἐμοῖ*. ΔΕΡΜΑΜΕΜΟΙ could have been divided as ΔΕΡΜΑ ΜΕΜΟΙ. Then, having regard to the frequent resemblance of the narrow uncial *epsilon* to an *iota*, a scribe might go from what looked like ΜΙΜΟΙ to ΜΙΜΝΟΙ. In any event, this corruption seems to involve two stages, as a few do.

Visual confusion and misdivision in uncials may be invoked also in solution of the difficulties at *O* 13.114, presented by the words of the paradosis ἀλλὰ κούφοισιν ἐκνεῦσαι ποσίν. Assuming that an uncial *mu* has been misread as double *lambda*, and that two words have been read as one, I would print the passage thus:

καὶ πᾶσαν κατὰ  
'Ελλάδ' εὐρήσεις ἐρευνῶν μάσσον' ἢ ὡς ἰδέμεν  
ἄμα. κούφοις ἴν ἐκνεῦσαι ποσίν.  
Ζεῦ τέλει', αἰδῶ δίδοι  
καὶ τύχαν τερπνῶν γλυκεῖαν.

114

Pindar has uttered a wishful allusion, at 105ff, to Xenophon's hopes for future Olympic victories and then gone on to catalogue miscellaneous victories of the Oligaitheadai. Summing them up, he reverts to Xenophon's hopes, thus: "And all over Hellas, if you seek, you will find (their victories) more numerous than can be taken in together at a glance. May he (Xenophon) come swimmingly out with his nimble

feet. . . .” In an ode for a *stadiodromos*, a reference to nimble feet is more probably to those of the victor than to those of the poet, the assumption in Maas’s conjectures, ἄγε κούφοισιν ἐκνεύσω ποσίν. The accusative and infinitive of prayer at 114 seems to suit the context.

Dropping of a letter in uncials may explain the crux at O 1.104, where the paradosis runs:

πέποιθα δὲ ξένον  
μή τιν’ ἀμφότερα καλῶν τε ἴδριν † ἅμα † καὶ δύναμιν κυριώτερον  
τῶν γε νῦν κλυταῖσι δαιδαλωσέμεν ὕμνων πτυχαῖς. 105

The metre needed is: trochaic dimeter+ polyschematist choriambic dimeter+ anaclastic dochmius. For metre a gentle medicine is Wilamowitz’s ἀμᾶ, but in sense it is superfluous with ἀμφότερα. Logically, it would imply that Pindar could find somebody either (1) ignorant of καλά and stronger than Hieron, or (2) expert in καλά and equally powerful with Hieron. Pindar is likely to have conveyed his compliment on the lines of that paid to Theron in O 2.92ff, where we find two comparatives co-ordinated:

. . . αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόῳ,  
τεκεῖν μή τιν’ ἑκατόν γε ἐτέων πόλιν φίλοις ἄνδρα μᾶλλον  
εὐεργέταν πραπίσιν ἀφθονέστερόν τε χέρα  
Θήρωνος.

In O 1.104, to balance the comparative *κυριώτερον* there is needed a comparative in the corrupt place, after *καλῶν τε ἴδριν*, where the older mediaeval Mss offer ἅμα καὶ and later Mss had ἄλλον καὶ (Triclinian) or ἄλλον ἢ (Moschopoulean). Metre and sense are well satisfied if one writes 104 thus:

μή τιν’ ἀμφότερα καλῶν τε ἴδριν μᾶλλον καὶ δύναμιν κυριώτερον . . .

“I am sure that I shall not adorn with noble folds of hymns any other friend, among men now living, who is, in both respects, more expert in fine things and in power more authoritative.”

The first half of a polyschematist choriambic dimeter can have four long syllables. For five long syllables successively in a verse of Pindar cf. O 9 epode 5 (Snell); P 5 strophe 7 (Snell); and for six longs P 8 epode 6. Cf. Corinna 1 Page (= *Poetae Melici Graeci* [Oxford 1962] 654) col. iii 18, 23, 28, 32; also Sophocles *El.* 121, 122; *Phil.* 204.



The Triclinian and Moschopoulean ἄλλον may descend from original μᾶλλον, which at the uncial stage had lost its initial *mu* in the collocation ΙΔΡΙΝΜΑΛΛΟΝ. ΑΛΛΟΝ, misread as ΑΜΟΝ, might have given rise to ἄμα as an attempt to emend. Possibly the variants ἄλλον and ἄμα stood in the first minuscule copy of the Photian renaissance, and thence travelled to separate branches of the family.

From attempts to mend faults in the paradosis I proceed to attempts to defend some places.

At *P* 2.11 editors print θ' ἄρματα, the reading of the manuscript E and the Roman edition. But one may consider the variant τ' ἄρματα, offered by *C prim.* D G and V. There is a word ἄρμα (B) in LSJ, apparently derived from ἀραρίσκω and meaning 'union, love.' It is a Delphic word, and thus not unsuited to Pindar, who frequented Delphi, for use in a Pythian ode. The sentence would run thus:

. . . ξεστόν ὅταν δίφρον  
ἔν τ' ἄρματα πεισιχάλινα καταζευγνύη  
σθένος ἵππιον, . . .

"whenever he joins together a polished chariot and the strength of horses into unions that obey the reins" (= chariot-teams). At *N* 7.83 editors print Hermann's text:

βασιλῆα δὲ θεῶν πρέπει  
δάπεδον ἂν τόδε γαρυέμεν ἀμέρα  
ὀπί.

But D offers θεμερᾶ, B θαμερᾶ, and the true reading may be θεμερᾶ ὀπί. Hesychios glosses θεμερός with βέβαιος, σεμνός, εὐσταθής. One may compare Aesch. *PV* 134 τὰν θεμερῶπιιν αἰδῶ. But the metrical problem is not easy. Snell thinks the line (epode 4) is analysable as glyconic+cretic, the glyconic having a tribrach ending. But, comparing the iambic metra at the ends of lines 1, 2 and 7 of the strophe, it seems as if epode 4, and epode 3, can be analysed as glyconic (with final anceps) + diiamb. If so, D's reading might stand as an example of choriamb equivalent to diiamb.

In *N* 6 elisions at 13b and 50b have troubled the learned with metrical perplexities. Snell describes the metre as: "aeolica, dimetra, choriambica ad dactylos vergentia." Perhaps we should run together what in modern editions are the last two lines of the strophes and antistrophes, and regard them as constituting polyschematist iambo-

choriambic tetrameters, based on a rhythm equivalent to the choriamb, thus:

*νῦν τε πέφαντ' οὐκ ἄμμορος ἀμφὶ πάλα κυναγέτας.*

(choriamb+ ionicus a maiore+ choriamb+ diiamb)

*νεῖκος ἔμπεσ' Ἀχιλλεύς χαμαὶ καββάς ἀφ' ἀρμάτων.*

(ditrochee+ antispast+ molossus+ diiamb)

At N 6.35 a boxer is described in the paradosis of the *veteres* as *χείρας ἱμαντωθεῖς*, which Triclinius changed *metri gratia* to *χείρας ἱμάντι δεθεῖς*. The assumed corruption does not seem plausible. What is the metre? Turyn noted: "Discriptio metrica non paucis locis dubia est." Snell's description is: "aeolica, dimetra, choriambica ad dactylos vergentia." In other strophes verse 6 runs:

— ∪ ∪ — | ∪ ∪ — — || — ∪ ∪ — | ∪ ∪ ∪ — —

We seem to be confronted with a pair of polyschematist choriambic dimeters. If so, then *ἱμαντωθεῖς* would scan, on the assumption that a molossus — — — can respond to an Ionicus a minore ∪ ∪ — —. Hesychius has the verb *ἱμαντώω*, 'furnish with straps,' the sense required.

At O 10.46, where Heracles is laying out the Olympian precinct, the *veteres* offer:

.. περὶ δὲ πάξαις Ἄλτιν μὲν ὄγ' ἐν καθαρώ  
διέκρινε, τὸ δὲ κύκλω δάπεδον  
θῆκε δόρπου λύσιν, . . .

46

Some Byzantine of the Palaeologan age altered 46f to

διέκρινε, τὸ δὲ κύκλω πέδον  
ἔθηκε δόρπου λύσιν, . . .

But how likely is it that *πέδον* would have been corrupted to *δάπεδον*? Now it may be remembered that, in Aesch. PV 829, the paradosis offers . . . *πρὸς Μολοσσὰ δάπεδα*, which Paley retained, allowing the initial alpha in *δάπεδα* to be scanned long. If the same prosody obtained here, line 46 would scan as 3rd paeon+ 4th paeon+ cretic, ∪ ∪ — ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ — | — ∪ —, which would be an acceptable respension to other strophes.

Once again the basic soundness of the Pindar paradosis in the *veteres* appears from close examination.