The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Bury's *Isthmian Odes* of Pindar *The Isthmian Odes* of Pindar. Edited with Introduction and Commentary, by J. B. Bury, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. Macmillan & Co. 1892. 10s. 6d.

W. R. Hardie

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 09 / November 1892, pp 388 - 389

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186664, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186664

How to cite this article:

W. R. Hardie (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 388-389 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186664

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BURY'S *ISTHMIAN ODES* OF PINDAR.

The Isthmian Odes of Pindar. Edited with Introduction and Commentary, by J. B. BURY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. Macmillan & Co. 1892. 10s. 6d.

It is difficult for the reviewer to give a fair impression of a book like Mr. Bury's. The materials for a commentary accumulate by degrees: a new editor skilfully reviews and combines them, with improvements of his own. He performs a substantial service to his author. But if at the same time he proposes some questionable novelties—and especially if these novelties involve principles of interpretation—it is almost inevitable that the controversy thus excited will throw into the shade the general merits and qualities of his work. Mr. Bury published in 1890 an edition of the *Nemean Odes*, which was remarkable for the application in detail of a theory of significant verbal echoes. This was not exactly a novelty. The idea belongs mainly to Metzger. But Mr. Bury applied it in a different way: not to the detection of the transitions of the Terpanthian Nome, *κατατροπά, ὀμφαλός* and the rest, but to the determination of the general drift and current of Pindar's thought.

In his new volume, Mr. Bury adheres to this theory, but with large modifications: he has, in fact, modified it so considerably that a further movement in the same direction would be fatal to it. He now admits that the curious echoes and coincidences of phrase which he detects were not meant to be perceived by the original audience. 'They are invisible signals which the student discovers only by curious attention, and which do not, and are not meant to, contribute to the artistic effect of the poem. They are like the names of the figures in vase-paintings. The names are in the picture, but not of it. In the same way it might have seemed desirable to make provision for transmitting the interpretation of the hymns, in which the bearings of the myth were not always evident even at the second glance—nay, were sometimes, one might think, scrupulously concealed—through some device of clues or hints contained in the poem itself, yet not belonging to it.' The *Odes* of Pindar might conceivably be given before a modern audience by a real chorus, trained

by a διδάσκαλος who had deciphered the poet's secret signals. But that alternative is not very likely to be realised. Or the modern reader may have the verbal coincidences pointed out to him by an editor, in which case he admittedly gets a different impression from that which was made upon Pindar's original audience. It would seem therefore that, for the literary or artistic appreciation of the poetry, the modern reader need not concern himself with these signals at all. It is a mistake to look at a picture through a microscope. At all events he will do well to wait till specialists have agreed in recognising some signals that are certain. Many of Mr. Bury's are by no means convincing: e.g. the connexion between *ἄλός* in Str. 3 l. 3, and *ἀλι-ερκέα* in Antistr. 1, l. 3, in the first *Isthmian Ode*. 'The sea which wrecked the ships of Asopodorus is the sea which was associated with the triumph of Herodotos.' Greek poets mention the sea frequently, and the word *ἄλς* and its compounds are adapted for certain places in the verse and not for others. To the naked eye, there is no more emphasis on *ἀλιερκέα* here than on the similar epithet in Horace's 'bimarisve Corinthi moenia.'

There is much sound and careful work in Mr. Bury's commentary. But when he attempts to rival Mr. Verrall in giving a quite new account of familiar words, his success is at least questionable. On the well-known passage in *Isthm.* iii. (l. 46), where Pindar speaks of the suicide of Ajax

μομφὰν ἔχει παίδεσσω Ἑλλάνων

we are told that ἔχει is the imperfect tense of χέω 'to pour' and that the words mean: 'the blood he shed was drops of blame for all the Hellenes'! Surely the old view is quite simple and satisfactory, that μομφὰν ἔχει means 'holds blame for,' that is, 'brands with blame' or 'remains a standing reproach to the Hellenes, who failed to appreciate Ajax at his true worth. On the words which follow

ἀλλ' Ὀμηρός τοι τετίμακεν

Mr. Bury's note is not very instructive. 'It is probable, as Bergk thinks, that

Arctinus, the author of the *Aethiopis*, in which the story of the *δπλων κρίσις* and the death of Ajax was told, is meant, and not the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. (Mr. Bury need not have made his note German in style as well as in substance.) 'Homer' did not 'give honour to' Ajax by relating his suicide: the only reason for thinking that '*Ὁμηρος*' means, or includes, the *Aethiopis*, is that one of the most glorious deeds of Ajax was related in that poem—the rescue of the body of Achilles; and even so the inference is unsafe, for it depends upon taking *πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετάν* to mean 'recounted all his achievements' and not merely 'vindicated his valour to the full.' Another of Mr. Bury's new ideas (Intr. p. 9) is that in *Ol.* ii. 1 *ἀναξιδόρυμγες ὕμνοι* means 'hymns that awake the lyre.' '*ἀναξιδόρυα*,' he says, 'the only other compound of the kind is explained by Hesychius ἡ ἀνάγουσα δόρυα' (Demeter). But, granted the infallibility of Hesychius, Mr. Bury does not really succeed in showing that *ἀνάγειν φόρυμγα* is a likely expression, and he forgets proper names like Anaxilaus and Anaxidemos, which can scarcely mean 'ὁ ἀνάγων τὸν δῆμον.'

Mr. Bury does not profess to have made any independent study of the MSS.—Tycho Mommsen's vast labours have rendered that excusable in a later editor, though there is still a great deal to be done in editing the scholia. Sometimes Mr. Bury prints in his text a conjecture by some other scholar, sometimes one of his own. For example, in v. 46 he adopts Bergk's *ξυνόδαμον*, in vii. 30 he reads with Mommsen *ἔρισας, Ποσειδᾶν* (vocative). Plausible conjectures of his own are v. 59 *βαί' ἐν βραχίστοις*, vii. 68 *γεραῖρέ μιν θ'*. But his text is on the whole fairly conservative.

In metrical matters, there is nothing to praise. English editors too often are content to copy out the lucubrations of some one German writer—and it is sometimes a German who is far from being a prophet in his own country! Mr. Bury's evil genius

has led him to select M. Schmidt as his guide and philosopher *in re metrica*. The aberrations of this authority are most clearly exhibited on pp. 90—91. If one may 'assume a pause equivalent to a foot at the beginning of v. 1, and a pause of the same kind at the end of v. 4'—why, then, anything may be shown to correspond to anything, and 'palinodic symmetry' may be detected in the braying of a donkey! It is equally futile to discuss in the abstract the question whether a trochee may be resolved, or a spondee take the place of a dactyl, or be represented by $\cup\cup$ (Intr. p. xxxvii.). Such things are possible in some kinds of verse, and not in others. They are possible in some places of the same verse, and not in others. Thus $\cup\cup$ is intelligible enough as the second foot in a trochaic tetrameter: but we should be surprised to find it as the last in a heroic hexameter! On p. xxxviii. Mr. Bury says he is 'impenitent as to the correction of *Nem.* x. 5 (*πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ Ἴὼ κτίσεν ἄσση*),' which he put forward in his *Nemean Odes*. But the instances on which his 'impenitence' is based are drawn from a quite different kind of metre. He does not produce the only evidence which would have any bearing on the question, namely, an instance of $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ occurring instead of $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$ in 'dactylo-epitrite' measures such as Pindar writes.¹ *Θήβας ἐκτέταμαι φοβερὰν φρένα δείματι πᾶλλων* in *Oed. Tyr.* is better than Mr. Bury's instances. But even that is inconclusive. The metre is dactylo-trochaic, but of a different type from Pindar's. I suggested in the *Classical Review* some time ago that in the passage in question Pindar may have written *πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ κατενάσσατο φάσση* (the subject of the verb being Argos). This is metrical, and accounts for the corrupt *κατ'έκισθεν*. I have not yet experienced the pangs of remorse.

¹ A reviewer in the *Speaker* (Aug. 20, 1892) has already called attention to this point.

W. R. HARDIE.

GRAVES'S THUCYDIDES. BOOK V.

The Fifth Book of Thucydides, edited with notes by C. E. GRAVES, M.A. Macmillan. 1891. pp. ix. 276. 3s. 6d.

MR. GRAVES is a teacher of much experience and the present volume, which 'is planned

on the same lines' as its predecessor, will be found as useful as the same editor's Book IV. to fifth form masters. The explanatory notes are generally scholarly and sound, and the passages cited from Latin authors lend an additional interest to the grammatical