

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](#)



Buray's Nemeax Odes of Pindar *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*, edited with Introductions and Commentary, by J. B. Bury, M.A, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. London; Macmillan and Co. 1890. 12s.

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 07 / July 1891, pp 305 - 308

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00179077, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00179077

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 305-308 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00179077

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

III § 29 *ut vid.*, *B* (immort. *FP*) || 25 potest *om. P* || nullum aeternum—igitur omne animal (*v. 27*) in *ras. A*² || 26 ad accipiendam—omne animal *om. B*¹ || fruendam *A*²*B*²*C**F**M**P**V*¹

ferendam *A*³*V*² || 27 dissolui~~bi~~***li *A*¹ dissolubile *A*²*B*¹*C**P**V*¹ || necesse—enim] necesset enim *B*¹ ||

P. SCHWENKE.

(Continuabitur.)

BURY'S NEMEAN ODES OF PINDAR.

The Nemean Odes of Pindar, edited with Introductions and Commentary, by J. B. BURY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. London; Macmillan and Co. 1890. 12s.

THE editor of this volume exhibits in a singular degree the originality and the versatility that we so often find in the foremost scholars of the University of Dublin. He has already made his mark as the historian of the later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene, but instead of resting on the reputation he has attained in that department of study, he now appears in a new light as an editor of Pindar. There is hardly a page of his work on the *Nemean Odes* which does not give proof of critical acumen, scholarly insight and literary skill; and, if we sometimes feel that he has strayed too far into the domain of fancy instead of keeping within the borders of fact, we can almost forgive the fault (if fault it be), in our gratitude for the fresh interest with which he has handled many a familiar problem of Pindaric interpretation.

Nevertheless, we feel bound to admit that a continuation of Professor Gildersleeve's admirable commentary, or an edition of the *Nemeans and Isthmians* on the same general lines as that scholar's edition of the Olympian and Pythian Odes, would have been still more welcome. The editor appears to have taken no notice of Professor Seymour's *Selected Odes of Pindar* (1882), or Croiset's *La Poésie de Pindare* (1886), while the way in which he mentions Cookesley's edition in the Preface leaves on the reader's mind the erroneous impression that it was confined to the Olympian and Pythian Odes.

As regards his relation to his other predecessors, he justly acknowledges the merit of Dr. Fennell's 'sound work' as an editor of Pindar, while he also pays a special tribute to the value of his 'learned essay on the pentathlon.' He rejects the theory of West-

phal, that the poems of Pindar are framed on the lines of the *nomos* of Terpander. This theory was accepted and worked out in elaborate detail by Mezger in the commentary which he published in 1880. Mezger's own contribution to the investigation of the structure of the Pindaric ode was the discovery of the poet's practice of repeating 'some particular word in the same verse and foot of different strophes' or epodes, and of indicating thereby 'some connexion in thought between two separated parts of the ode.' This law of verbal responsions is accepted without reserve by Mr. Bury, who has carried the principle still further by showing that, besides these formal and emphatic responsions, the poet often indicates the train of his thoughts by verbal echoes in any portion of his poem independently of the metra. The habit of listening for these echoes has apparently produced in Pindar's latest interpreter an almost undue susceptibility to the effects of sound, even in cases where the sound is suggestive of something completely outside the poem itself. Thus in a passage in the Eighth *Pythian*, written in honour of an Aeginetan, soon after the conquest of Aegina by Athens (B.C. 457), he finds what he describes as 'an interesting instance of an etymological allusion.'

The victor who had won his laurel wreath in wrestling had thrown four competitors; and of these defeated men it is said that they did not return home to be welcomed by the smiles of their mothers, *κατὰ λαύρας χορῶν ἀπάροι πτώσσοντι συμφορᾷ δέδαγμένοι*, 'they cover aloof from dances, in lanes.' The expression is strange; but it wins significance if we suppose that one at least of the wrestlers was an Athenian, and that *λαύρας* alludes to the silver mines of Laurium—*Λαυρίον* being really a diminutive of *λαύρα*. The suggestion, then, covertly expressed is this: an Aeginetan has vanquished an Athenian in wrestling; well, let the Athenian skulk in those mines, the source of the strength of his countrymen.'

Now, there is nothing to prove that there was a single Athenian competing in this particular contest. But, even assuming

there was, there is something exceedingly odd in the notion of the Athenians hiding themselves in their silver-mines in their mortification at an Aeginetan victory. Again the mines were worked by slaves. Why should the defeated competitors (who were necessarily free men),—why should their friends or countrymen, ‘skulk in the mines’? And how can Laurium be ‘a diminutive of *λαύρα*’? A hillside pierced by a multitude of shafts and passages cannot be described with accuracy as a little *λαύρα*. And, lastly, why should the Greek for Laurium be printed *Λαυρίον*, instead of *Λαύριον* or (better still) *Λαύρειον*?

Similarly, in *N.* ii 14, Ἔκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν is fancifully interpreted: *heard Ajax like a rushing wind*; Aias by virtue of his name being conceived as a blast (*ἄημι*), and this although Pindar elsewhere finds in Αἴας an echo of *αιερός*. In the present passage, though the editor believes ἄκουσεν to be sound, he suggests ἔκουσεν (= ἐκόησεν from *κοῶ* = *αἰσθάνομαι*). Again, in *N.* vi, we are told that Pindar is playing upon the names of *ἔρα* and *αἴα*, that *ἔρατά* and *ἔρνεα* have a mysterious connexion with *ἔρα*, and that even *δασκίους* contains the Earth-omen of *Dâ* or *Dâmâtêr* (Demeter). So also, in *N.* vii 37, in the description of the return of Neoptolemus, ‘*he missed Scyrus* strongly suggests deviation from a paved road, a *ὁδὸς σκυρωτά*’!

The *Introduction* is divided into three chapters, (1) *The Interpretation of Pindar*, (2) *The Construction of the Pindaric Ode*, and (3) *The Text*. At the end of the first chapter, we have a striking description of the Hellenic spirit as embodied in the poems of Pindar:—

A divinity crowned with flowers is a happy image for the spirit which presided over ‘the delightful things in Hellas’ and illuminated Pindar’s imagination. By the shores of the midland sea, not yet ‘dolorous,’ were raised, under a really benignant breath, palaces of music, shining afar, and statues of ivory and gold. Haggard forlorn faces, wizened forms did not haunt the soul, nor were there any yearnings to heavenward, Grace, which maketh the ways of men soft, (O. i 30) being arbitress there with undivided right and ‘crowned with flowers’ in those bright pagan borders.

Such a trivial word as ‘really’ (a word that occurs far too frequently in this book) is perhaps out of place in such a context; and the description as a whole is not distinctively suggestive of the spirit of Pindar. It recalls far more the general tone and even some of the phrases of Schiller’s *Götter Griechenlands*, e.g.

‘Schöne Welt, wo bist du? Kehre wieder,
Holdes Blütenalter der Natur,’ &c.

The chapter *On the Text* incidentally describes Moschopoulos and Triclinius as ‘students of the fifteenth century.’ It would be more correct to place them in the early part of the fourteenth century. Manuel Moschopoulos, a pupil and friend of Maximus Planudes, and a contemporary of Thomas Magister, lived under the second Emperor in the dynasty of the Palaeologi, Andronicus II (1282—1328); similarly Demetrius Triclinius who lived (probably at Constantinople) in the beginning of the fourteenth century, was one of the most eminent scholars in the age of the earlier Palaeologi. Mr. Bury has apparently confounded the date when these scholars actually lived with the century in which most of the extant MSS of the ‘Triclinian’ and ‘Moschopulean’ recension were copied. Towards the close of the same chapter, the study of Pindar’s verbal responsions suggests to the editor an alteration in the Tenth *Pythian*, l. 38, Μοῖσα δ’ οὐκ ἀποδαμει τρόποις ἐπὶ σφέτεροισι. *τρόποις* is here altered into *πρόποις*, ‘echoed in *πρέπει* (l. 67). *πρόπος* is formed from *πρέπω*, as *τρόπος* from *τρέπω*. *πρόποις* is interpreted to mean *rites* or *solemnities*. The word is not to be found in any of the lexicons,—not even in Hesychius. *A propos* of this rash innovation, the editor discusses the principles underlying all such proposals for the correction of ancient texts, and sums up in favour of this particular suggestion; but he frankly admits that different minds will always estimate differently the amount of evidence required to render such a conjecture probable.

Mr. Bury has introduced not a few conjectures of his own in the text of this edition. It is only fair to say that in textual criticism he resolutely sets his face against merely plausible guesses which fail to explain the origin of the corruption. Accordingly many of his emendations, even when they fail to command our consent, are instructive as examples of a generally sound critical method. The principal alterations which I have observed are the following.

In *N.* i 48, he proposes ἐκ δ’ ἄρ’ ἄπλατον πέλος (for βέλος or δέος) πλάξε γυναῖκας. πέλος is ‘related to *πέλωρ*’, and Hesychius has πέλος· μέγα, τεράστιον. In l. 66, πώσειν (Aeolic for *πίσειν*) μόρον, instead of δώσειν, ‘would give many of them a draught of direst doom to driuk.’ In l. 46, accepting a conjecture by Schmidt, he prints ἀγχομένοις δὲ χρόμος (for χρόνος) ψυχὰς ἀπέπνευσεν μελέων ἀφάτων, ‘as they were throttled, the breath of life left their unutterable limbs in a gurgling hiss.’ For *χρόμος* see Hesychius.’

As it is not likely that any large number of those who use this edition will have Hesychius at hand, his evidence (such as it is) should have been set forth in full thus:

χρόμαδος· κρότος, ψόφος.

χρόμη· φρουαγμός, ὄρημ, θράσος.

χρομοῖς· χρεμετισμοῖς.

χρόμος· ψύχος (!)· ψόφος ποιός· οἱ δὲ χρεμετισμοῖς.

In iii 56, he reads ἀγλαόκρανον Νηρέος θύγατρα (for ἀγλαόκολλον or ἀγλαόκαρπον), three mss having ἀγλαόκαρνον.

In iv 65–68, the marriage of Peleus and Thetis is thus described:

ἔγαμεν ὑψηθρόνων μίαν Νηρείδων

εἶδεν δ' εὐκυκλον ἔδραν,

τὰς οὐρανοῦ βασιλῆες πόντου τ' ἐφεξόμενοι

δῶρα καὶ κράτος ἐξύφαναν (for ἐξέφαναν)

ἐγγενὲς αὐτῶ

(‘wove, as their gifts, a web of sovereignty to devolve upon his race’).

Mr. Bury might have defended his ingenious proposal by quoting Catullus 64, 303 where the gods are similarly described as taking their seats at this marriage, *niveis flexerunt sedibus artus*, while the *Parcae* spin the thread of destiny (cf. ἐξύφαναν) for Peleus and Thetis, singing as the refrain of their song: *currite ducentes subtemina, currite fusi*.

In iv 93, he prints τὸν Εὐφάνης ἐθέλων γεραῖος προπάτωρ | αἰέσεται φθιμένοις (‘of whom E. will be full fain to sing to the dead’), instead of the unmetrical line ὁ σὸς αἰέσεται, παῖ. In l. 91 τὰ δ' αὐτὸς ἂν τις ἰσῆ (subj. of ἴσαμι), instead of ἂν τις τύχη.

In v 43, the mss. have: ἦτοι μεταίξαντα καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει κείνον ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος Πύθειας. Mr. Bury's text is: Ἰσθμοὶ τ' αἴξας ἄντα· καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει κείνον ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα.

In vi 6, for πότημος ἄντων ἔγραψε δραμεῖν ποτὶ στάθμαν, Mr. Bury prints πότημος ἀναξτίν' ἔγραψε κτλ. In l. 18 ἔρνεα πρώτος <ἔτοσσαν> ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ. In l. 50 ρεῖκος Ἀχιλεὺς φᾶνε χαμᾶζε καβὺς ἀφ' ἀρμάτων. In l. 64 ἴσον σποῖμι (for εἰσοιμι).

In vii 19, θανάτου πάρος ἅμα (for παρὰ σᾶμα) νέονται, ‘hie together to the presence of death.’ l. 22 ποτατᾶ <μυῖ> μαχανᾶ (for τε or γε). In l. 31, a difficult passage is thus punctuated and translated: τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται, ὃν θεὸς ἀβρὸν αὖξει λόγον τεθνακότων βοαθῶν, τοὶ παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλλου μόλον χθονός, ‘but those have honour, whose fame a god causes to wax fair and fine, even the dead warriors, who came to the great navel of large-bosomed earth.’ l. 36, ἴκοντο δ' εἰς Ἐφύραν πλάγεντες (2 aor. of πλάζω), ‘driven from their course.’ l. 68,

μαθὼν δέ τις ἀνερεῖ (for ἀν ἐρεῖ), εἰ παρ' μέλος ἔρχομαι ψάγιον ὄραον ἐννέπων.

Εὐξενίδα πάτροθε Σώγηνες, ὑπομνῶ μὴ τέρμα προβάς ἄκονθ' ὄτε χαλκοπάραρον ὄρσαι θοὰν γλώσσαν, ὃς ἐκ σ' ἔπεμψεν (for ἐξέπεμψεν) παλαισμῶτων ἀχένα καὶ σθένος ἀδιάντων, αἰθωνα πρὶν ἀελίω γυῖον ἐμπυσεῖν (vii. 70).

This difficult passage is translated and explained as follows: ‘Sogenes, of Euxenid clan, I swear that I overstepped not the line when I propelled thy swift tongue like a bronze-tipped spear which released thy neck and thews from the sweat of the wrestling-bouts, ere thy body met the rays of the burning sun’... ‘An opponent of Sogenes transgressed the line beyond which he should have stood and was disqualified from event, in which perhaps he hoped to win. He consequently retired from the competition and Sogenes was released from the necessity of contending with an additional adversary, probably a dangerous adversary, in the wrestling.’

In l. 85, Mr. Bury proposes ἐτᾶ for ἐμᾶ. In viii 2, παρθενηῖος νέος for ἄτε παρθενηῖος. *lb.* 40 ὡς ὅτε δένδρον οἶνας (for αἰσσει). In ix 24, σχίσαις... κρύψ' ἄνδρ' ἄμ' ἵπποις (for κρύψεν δ' ἄμ' ἵπποις). In ix 47 οὐ πόρσω <πόρος τις> for οὐκέτι (or ἔστι) πόρσω.

x 5, πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ Ἴω κτίσειεν (for κατώκισθεν) ἄστη. l. 37, ἐφέπει for ἔπειτα. l. 41, νικαφορίας γὰρ ἑταῖς Προΐτιο τὸδ' ἵπποτρόφον ἄστν θάλρηεν for ν. γ. ὄσαις ἵπποτρόφον ἄστν τὸ Προΐτα. l. 48, παρ Διὸς θῆκε δόμῳ (for δρόμῳ). l. 60, ἀκά for αἰχμᾶ. l. 75, θερμὰ τέγγων δάκρυ ἅμα στοναχαῖς for θερμὰ δὲ τέγγων δάκρυα στοναχαῖς. l. 84, αὐτὸς οἰκεῖν αἶτος Οὐλύμπον θέλεις for αὐτὸς Ὀλυμπον ἐθέλεις. In xi 13, περαμεύσεται (for παραμεύσεται, and *ib.* 17, ἐπαινέσθαι for αἰνεῖσθαι. It is impossible to discuss all these suggestions in the present notice, but some of them deserve the careful consideration of all who are interested in the restoration of the poet's text.

In an author like Pindar, the criticism of the text and the interpretation and illustration of its meaning are almost inextricably intermingled, and the present editor has wisely made no attempt to separate these two elements in his commentary. It would be easy to quote from his pages numerous examples of perspicuous translation as well as of lucid exposition, e.g. the note on *N.* i 24, λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένους ἐσθλοὺς ἕδωρ καπνῶ φερεῖν, ‘But he hath won good friends to quell as with water the smoke of envious cavillers’; also that on vii 93, ἐπεὶ τετράοροισιν ὄθ' ἀρμάτων ζυγοῖς ἐν τεμένεσσι δόμον

ἔχει τοῖς, ἀμφοτέρας ἰὼν χειρός, 'For he hath his house at the precincts of thy temples, which face him, like the yoke-arms of a four-horsed chariot, on either hand as he goeth forth.' In ii 10, ἔστι δ' ἐοικὸς ὄρειαν γε Πελειάδων μὴ τηλόθεν Ὀαρίων' ἀνεῖσθαι ('It is meet that the Mountaineer (Orion) should rise at no long distance from the Mountain Maids, the Peleïads'), the mention of the Pleiads is ingeniously explained as an allusion to the seven victories won by the Timodemidae at Nemea. The parallel passages quoted in the commentary are judiciously selected and are generally sufficient for their purpose. But on *N.* iv 18, λιπαρᾶν—Ἀθανᾶν, one misses a reference to the well-known fragment of Pindar preserved in the *scholia* on Aristophanes: ὦ τὰι λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ ἀοιδίμοι, Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα, κλειναὶ Ἀθῆναι. Again, the twice-repeated comparison between families that are distinguished in alternate generations and fields that are productive in alternate periods of time (*N.* vi 9 and xi 40), might have been illustrated by a somewhat less familiar passage in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, ii 15 § 3, φορὰ γὰρ τίς ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς γένεσιν ἀνδρῶν ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ χώρας γιγνομένοις, καὶ ἐνίοτε ἂν ἡ ἀγαθὸν τὸ γένος, ἐγγίνονται διὰ τινος χρόνου ἄνδρες περιττοί, κάπειτα πάλιν ἀναδίδουσιν.

Mr. Bury's first thoughts are sometimes better than his second, ψεύδει γὰρ ἠπίνοια τὴν γῶμην. Thus in *N.* i 13, σπείρει νῦν ἀγλαίαν τινὰ νάσῳ, σπείρειν is naturally understood as *spargere* and the line is thus translated: 'fling then something of beauty over the island.' In an additional note it is suggested at some length that σπείρειν may originally have meant 'to set in order, to range' and we thus get a new rendering: 'twine a bright wreath of song for the island.' But by the time the editor reaches l. 18 πολλῶν ἐπέβαν καιρὸν οὐ ψεύδει βαλῶν, which he interprets, 'I have found meet matter for many praises without flinging one false word,' he has his misgivings as to his 'somewhat bold explanation of σπείρειν,' and virtually withdraws it.—(αἱ γὰρ τρίται που φροντίδες σοφώταται). It would surely have been better to strike out the additional note altogether. It ends with a misprint, εἶρε for εἶρε. Such misprints, however, are exceedingly few, as the book has been printed with commendable care by the Cambridge press. The only slips worth noticing are on *N.* x 29 (p. 203) *tenere* (for *temere*) *precor* as

a translation of *παρατεῖσθαι*, and on the very next page: 'Dissen owns that *ἔπεσθαι* with a dative *verisimile non est*.' Either 'dative' is a mere slip of the pen for 'accusative,' or it may be conjectured that the original note in Mr. Bury's manuscript ran as follows: 'Dissen owns that *ἔπεσθαι* <with an accusative, in the same sense as *ἔπεσθαι*> with a dative, *verisimile non est*.' If so, this is an interesting instance of 'parablepsia' on the part of a modern compositor, who is apt to make mistakes that are sometimes analogous to those of an ancient copyist.

It is a matter of surprise that an editor of the *Nemean Odes* should have not thought it worth while to supply us with an introductory account of the Nemean Games. He says nothing of the scene of the contest, which is so admirably described in Clark's *Peloponnesus* (pp. 60–64). He never discusses the identification of the plant which supplied the victor's crown. He is content to render σέλινον by the customary and merely conventional equivalent, 'parsley' (*petroselinon sativum*); whereas there is every reason to believe that it is the 'wild celery' (*apium graveolens*). Both plants belong to the same tribe, the *umbelliferae*; 'parsley' and 'celery' are both derived ultimately from σέλινον; but any one who examines the coins of Selinus, as figured in Imhoof-Blumer's *Tier und Pflanzenbilder* ix 9–12, vi 8, and elsewhere, will recognise that it is the 'wild celery,' with its leaves parted into three portions with irregularly serrated edges, that most closely resembles the plant on the coins.

These, however, are unimportant omissions in a work that, in spite of many extravagancies of fancy, attains on the whole, a high standard of completeness. At the close of the Ninth *Nemean* the poet prays that 'by the aid of the Graces, he may shoot very near to the mark of the Muses.' We may be permitted to borrow the language of the editor's criticism on this passage when we add that it appears to be characteristic of Pindar's latest exponent, to desire, like Pindar himself, 'not perfection, but only a close approach thereto; yet if we judge that' in a work of undoubtedly lofty aim he has shot very near to the mark, 'we shall hardly transgress seriously the limit of even Greek moderation' (p. 106).

J. E. SANDYS.