

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](#)



Pindar *OL.* 4. 10 and the Intransitive Use of “Oxein.”

W. A. Oldfather

The Classical Review / Volume 24 / Issue 03 / May 1910, pp 82 - 83
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00044668, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00044668

How to cite this article:

W. A. Oldfather (1910). Pindar *OL.* 4. 10 and the Intransitive Use of “Oxein.”. *The Classical Review*, 24, pp 82-83 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00044668

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

PINDAR OL. 4. 10 AND THE INTRANSITIVE USE OF 'OXEIN.'

'MIRA et incredibilia commenti sunt interpretes ut genitivum explicarent. Nihil opus his machinis,' remarked G. Hermann apropos of this passage, and certainly any explanation of ὀχέων as a genitive labours under serious difficulties. Pauw suggested that it depends on φάος or κῶμον, Heimsoeth, Mezger, and Rumpel preferring the former, Hermann, Boeckh (Comm.), Dissen, Christ, Gildersleeve, and Fennel the latter. Both strain even Pindar's elastic language, and neither gives a quite satisfactory meaning. The Scholiasts vary between construing ὀχέων with κῶμος = ὕμνος, and supplying ἐπί, and Heyne adopted the latter interpretation, yet it is highly doubtful whether ἐπί could be so understood, and the same objection applies to Bergk's suggestion παρά, making the phrase (παρ') ὀχέων depend upon φάος. Boeckh (not. crit.) would explain ὀχέων as genitive after ἵκει on the analogy of ἄπτεσθαι, but he abandoned this view himself later, and it would doubtless be hard to find another advocate for it. Wiske-mann puts a comma after ἵκει, and makes ὀχέων depend on ἐλαία, getting a possible meaning indeed, but producing an intolerably harsh construction. Mingarelli took ὀχέων as the pres. ptcp. of ὀχέω = vehens, ferens, with φάος as its object; the position of γάρ, however, makes such a construction impossible.

Yet ὀχέων is not the only difficulty. The θ' after χαρίτων has been a puzzle, and accordingly has been deleted by all the editors down to Schröder, who very properly retains it, for it has the very best MSS. authority (the γ' in A and the δ' in V are clearly emendations), and the old Scholiasts could only say ὁ δὲ τέ σύνδεσμος περυσός. Boeckh well observed 'particula connectiva post χαρίτων . . . unde in optimos venerit libros, non video, nisi ab ipso profecta poeta.' He, however, excluded it, because he could not believe possible the changes by which alone as he thought it could be explained—i.e. Ὀλυμπιονικᾶ, or κᾶν (though the latter was adopted by Bergk in his first edition).

Nor can the θ' be a relic of *ἑκέητι*, for traces of *F* in the text of Pindar are very uncertain things (cf. Schröder *Proll.* pp. 8. 14). Schröder's defence of θ' in his text 'idque intellege' I confess I do not understand. If he means 'Olympionicum, id est, hanc pompam,' he should perhaps cite parallels.

My own explanation of the passage is as follows: Ὀλυμπιονίκαν is a substantive and refers to Psaumis (for the omission of the article cf. O. 11. 7 Ὀλυμπιονίκαις and O. 13. 1 Τρισσολυμπιονίκαν . . . οἶκον); θ' connects Ὀλυμπιονίκαν and κῶμον; χαρίτων ἑκέητι goes closely with κῶμον (for the Graces represented as especially overseeing choruses and the singing of the ἐπινίκιον see Christ's notes on O. 4. 10, and P. 9. 1; cf. I. 5. 21); ὀχέων is the pres. ptcp. of ὀχέω in the intrans. meaning 'ride' (for ἵκει ὀχέων cf. O. 6. 48, ἐλαύνων ἵκετο). From the archaeological point of view there is no difficulty, as, although there is no record elsewhere of a κῶμος driving to the scene of song in chariots (there is no need of assuming a single chariot as did Boeckh and Dissen to refute Heyne), there is no reason why that might not have been done, especially as Psaumis clearly made the celebration of this victory an occasion of extraordinary display. The only serious question, I apprehend, is whether ὀχέων can be so employed. Taking first the strongest evidence for such a usage, we find in Xen. *Hipp.* 4. 1 Ἐν γε μὲν ταῖς πορείαις αἰεὶ δεῖ τὸν ἵππαρχον προνοεῖν ὅπως ἀναπαύσῃ τῶν ἵππων τὰς ἑδρας, ἀναπαύσῃ δὲ τοὺς ἵππους τοῦ βαδίζειν, μέτριον μὲν ὀχοῦντα, μέτριον δὲ πεζοποροῦντα.

It is true many take ὀχοῦντα as causative here (Sturz, *L. and S.*, Dindorf in the *Thes.*, Schneider), but if so, πεζοποροῦντα must likewise be causative, which is really to force the passage unduly. Pape was right in taking ὀχοῦντα here intransitively, and the passage must be translated: 'The hipparch must be careful to relieve both horse and man, now riding, and now walking,' and though this may not be the most logical form of expression it would pass

muster in any except the most pedantic literature at any period. This one passage is sufficient to establish the usage; but there is corroborative evidence. *ὀχεῖσθαι*, if found as a genuine passive, would prove that *ὀχεῖν* might be used in the transitive sense of ride or drive, precisely as the middle *ὀχεῖσθαι*, and if so used transitively, of course it could appear in the active forms also *intransitively*. Now in K 402 = P 76 we have of the horses of Achilles:

οἱ δ' ἄλεγχοι
ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι δαμήμεναι ἢδ' ὀχεῖσθαι,
ἅλλω γ' ἢ Ἀχιλλεῖ.

The only natural interpretation here is to take *ὀχεῖσθαι* as a genuine passive, as Eustathius did very distinctly on K 404, p. 814, 34 ff., and on P 77, p. 1096, 15 ff. To interpret it as is commonly done, e.g. by Ameis-Hentze, 'in freiem Anschluss an die bisher gehende Konstruktion, so dass als Subject nicht mehr die Rosse, sondern die Männer gedacht sind,' is intolerably harsh and unnatural. The simple meaning of the line is—'it is difficult for these horses to be broken and driven by mortals.' Eustathius does not stand alone in considering such a construction possible, as Apollonius (*Lex. Hom.* s.v. *ὀχεῖν*) has no hesitation in writing *ὀχεῖσθαι ὑπὸννεότητος*, the same phrase appearing in the Schol. to Od. A 297, while the Scholiast on Eurip. *Hipp.* 214 writes *ὑπὸ μανίας ὀχοῦμενον*.

The active *ὀχεῖν*, to drive, ride upon, in the metaphorical sense of bear sway over, seems to appear only in Lycophron, 722 ff.:

ἄκτῃν δὲ τὴν προὔχουσαν εἰς Ἐνιπέως
Λευκωσία ῥιφέῖσα τὴν ἐπώνυμον
πέτραν ὀχῇσει δάρον,

where the old metaphrases both gloss with *νῆσον ἐποχῇσεται*. The causative *ὀχῶ* in Aristophanes, *Ranae* 23, also points in this same direction, as *ὀχέω* = ride (causative) necessarily presupposes *ὀχέω* = ride (intransitive).¹

Thus it is in no way forcing the meaning of the verb *ὀχεῖν* to translate it ride. The whole passage would then run in translation: 'Now therefore, O son of Kronos, who holdest Aetna the wind-beaten deadfall that crushes ravening Typhon of the hundred heads, receive thou the Olympian victor, and, for the Graces' sake, this revel band, the glory of far-prevailing deeds of valor, late come; for it draweth nigh riding in chariots, this revel band of Psaumis, who, crowned with the Pisan olive, hasteneth to raise up glory unto Kamarina.'

W. A. OLDFATHER.

The University of Illinois.

¹ Less certain, though in my opinion very probably correct is Dindorf's suggestion that in the phrase *νηπίδας ὀχεῖν* of Od. A 297, the noun is in the genitive, after the analogy of the familiar genitives with *ἐπιβαλεῖν*.

NOTES

TWO TEXTUAL NOTES ON HORACE.

(a) *Sat.* I. i. 108, 9:

Illuc, unde abii, redeo, qui nemo ut avarus
Se probet ac potius laudet diversa sequentis.

THERE can be no question that 'unde abii' refers back to the beginning of the *Satire*—the occurrence of the phrase 'laudet diversa sequentis' in both places is sufficient to prove this, quite apart from the general sense. This being so, there should be no reasonable doubt that the

Codex Blandinius Vetustissimus is right in reading 'qui' (which does not appear in the other MSS.), corresponding to 'qui fit,' the opening words of the *Satire*. The difficulty is to find a verb for it. It cannot go with 'probet' and 'laudet,' as this involves placing 'ut avarus' between commas, which gives an entirely wrong sense. The only alternative is to understand 'fiat' with 'qui'; but this is almost impossibly harsh. Is it not possible that the word 'fiat' should really be expressed? Room can be found for it by omitting 'illuc,'