

# 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](#)



---

## On Pindar's *Pythian Odes*

J. Arbuthnot Nairn

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 05 / June 1901, pp 246 - 248

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030328, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00030328](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030328)

### How to cite this article:

J. Arbuthnot Nairn (1901). On Pindar's *Pythian Odes*. The Classical Review, 15, pp 246-248  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030328

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

comes explicable. The medley of sources from which the readings are drawn, Aristarchus' commentaries, treatises, the quotations in other commentators, the assertions of the members of his school, is natural if there was in truth no actual edition to be referred to. Otherwise such uncertainty is a mystery. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf's idea (*Hom. Untersuchungen* p. 297) that the unique copy was burnt at Alexandria in 47—a supposition anyhow too arbitrary to be practicable—is useless to explain the difficulties of Ammonius and the appeals to Parmeniscus. Again, though it is unnecessary to press the argument, the labours of Didymus and Aristonicus are much more intelligible on this hypothesis: if there had been an edition, one would have expected them to reproduce it, to republish it; but in fact they write *ὑπομνήματα* of their own to explain the significance of the critical signs (which they assume in the hands of their readers) and to accurately ascertain from all available sources Aristarchus' readings.

However, the language of the scholia is probably too concrete to be got over: *ἐν μέντοι ταῖς ἐκδόσεσι χωρὶς τοῦ ἱ εὗρομεν Δ 3, ἐν ταῖς ἐξηγησμέναις Ἀριστάρχου βαρείας χείρας H 130, ἐν τῇ ἐτέρᾳ τῶν Ἀρισταρχείων εὗρομεν ἐνεῖσιν B 131, κὰν ταῖς διορθώσεσι καὶ*

*ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν οὕτως ἐγγράπτο B 192*, and many other passages can hardly be interpreted except of two actual texts distinct from commentaries and treatises.

The lack of influence of the edition is certain, however we explain it, and the surprise that we in modern times feel at it is due to a false presumption of the relation between grammarians and the publishing trade. The 'supremacy of Aristarchus' existed only for the world of professors, and our idea of it is mainly due to the preservation of so much technical scholastic learning. Outside the school Aristarchus had a vague reputation as a Rhadamanthus or a pedant; no one, antiquarian or poet, seems to have expected to read Homer in a shape arranged by him, and publishers, employers of copyists, producers of books *εἰς πρᾶσιν* (Strabo 609) never heard his name.

Ar.'s edition therefore may have been real, and yet have exercised no effect; the *σχολικὰ ἀγνοήματα* about it may be due to causes natural though past our knowledge; I confess I find the survival of the critical signs, applied to vulgar texts, in the late classical and Byzantine periods, far harder to explain, and a real stumbling block.

T. W. ALLEN.

## ON PINDAR'S *PYTHIAN ODES*.

### Pyth. 2, 5.

THE belief that the victory of Hiero celebrated in the second Pythian was won at Thebes may be traced to a misreading or at any rate misconception of this verse. *ἐν δὲ κρατέων* might have been read *ἐν αἷς κρατέων* referring to *Θηβᾶν* v. 3: diplography with IC and K is familiar. Or again *πόλει* may have been supplied with *ἐν δὲ*. Pindar would surely have made more of his native city in this ode had the victory really been gained in Thebes. We may compare a similar passage in *Isth.* 1, 12, where however the *Ἰολαία* are beyond doubt referred to.

### Pyth. 2, 7 sqq.

*ποταμίας ἔδος Ἀρτέμιδος ἃς οὐκ ἄτερ κείνας ἀγαναῖσιν ἐν χερσὶ ποικιλανίους ἐδάμασσε πώλους.*

The subject to *ἐδάμασσε* is Hiero. The editors take *κείνας* as Acc. Pl. with *πώλους*.

This is surely open to serious objections. The pronoun is quite useless, and unpoetical. Also, I can find no instance of a double description of this nature, pronoun and adjective. Disson has devoted a long and admirable note to '*Adiectiva iuncta et non iuncta copula*' (*ad* Pyth. 9, 6), but no parallel passage can be traced in his list.

I propose to read *κείνας τ' ἀγαναῖσιν* κτλ., taking *κείνας* as a repetition of *ἃς* according to the usual practice of Greek and Latin writers, who prefer the demonstrative to the relative itself when the latter would naturally be continued into the second clause: even in examples such as the present where the case is not altered, though the origin of the construction may be the desire to avoid using the relative twice in different cases.

It is the epithet *ἀγαναῖσιν* which gains most by the addition of *τε*. What force can it have as applied to Hiero? The word is almost a *vox propria* of Apollo and Artemis.

Besides the familiar οἷς ἀγανοῖς βελέεσσιν ἐποιομένη κατέπεφνε, compare Pindar fr. 149 (116) where it is used of Apollo. The 'gentle hands' of the goddess indicate her favour bestowed on Hiero as a charioteer, and Pindar has emphasized this by the words that follow:

ἐπὶ γὰρ ἰοχέαιρα παρθένος χερὶ διδύμα κτλ.

The preposition ἐν also is more naturally used with my reading. Nem. 1, 52 ἐν χερὶ —τινάσσων instead of χερὶ τ. quoted by Gildersleeve is quite different. I prefer to take ἐν as 'reposing on' metaphorically: as we too use the phrase 'in the hands of': Lat. *in manu*. χερὶ διδύμα is now seen to be 'with both hands' according to the first interpretation in Gildersleeve's note.

Pyth. 2, 72 sqq.

I would only say here that Gildersleeve's division of the mysterious latter part of this ode between two speakers or 'voices' though ingenious is not convincing. To take only one example G. assumes γένου' οἷος ἐσσί μαθὼν to stand by itself, spoken by Pindar who is then succeeded by the other speaker as far as καλός. Why should Pindar not utter both sentiments: 'Shew thyself as thou art: true (τοῖ) the monkey is ever fair in the eyes of children, but not in the judgment of a Rhadamanthys'? So with the other breaks. Nor can it be said that the words φίλον εἶη φιλεῖν κτλ. are impossible as put in Pindar's mouth. The poet only expects and himself practises open dealings with friend or foe: for there is openness in the frank declaration that he will stop at nothing to compass an enemy's overthrow. This leads naturally up to εὐθύλῳσσος ἀνὴρ praised in v. 86. Pindar will have none of the smooth-faced flatterers, apparently friends, really cunning 'foxes.'

Pyth. 5, 72.

This passage is famous for its difficulty and for the importance of the issue involved. Was Pindar an Aegeid or not? I do not propose to go into the arguments, which are somewhat meagre, of both sides. Personally I share the view of Studniczka and others (see *Classical Review*, xiv. p. 64), that Pindar was not an Aegeid. But I cannot agree that ἐμοὶ πατέρες in v. 76 should be put in the mouth of the chorus without making a slight but all-important change. The words τὸ δ' ἐμὸν (72) down to μέλος χαρίεν (107) ought apparently to be spoken by the chorus. They are full of references to the special features of Cyrene. Whatever view we take of vv. 72-76 there

can be no doubt that σεβίζομεν in v. 80 is more naturally referred to the people of Cyrene or the chorus at least speaking on behalf of them in the first person. It is possible that all the difficulties of the passage arise from the omission of some mark to shew that Pindar at v. 72 calls on the chorus to sing the praises of Cyrene. Unless, that is, we place 72-107 (the posterior limit is uncertain) in inverted commas we must with Studniczka take ἐμοὶ πατέρες as said by the chorus (not Pindar) without warning, which is contrary to the poet's constant use of the pronoun of the first person. It should indicate *himself*, as the numerous examples in Rumpel shew to demonstration.

The reading in v. 72 of the best MSS. is γαρύε' i.e. γαρύετε the imperative. There can be urged no reason (except with *petitio principii*) for rejecting this. The slight pause after the word was completed and before the words to be spoken by the chorus are resumed in ἀπὸ Σπάρτας is enough to defend the metrical irregularity if any of the *syllaba anceps*.

By the combining of vv. 72-107 into one unit given only as an artistic fiction to the chorus we are enabled to see further into the meaning of vv. 108 sqq. These words commonly taken to apply to Arcesilas the king must refer to Carrhotus the charioteer (v. 26). To point this out will probably suffice: but a comparison of the meanings of 115 sq. according to the old and to my suggested view will strengthen conviction. ἀρματηλάτας has a clear and definite meaning: how can the king be said to have shewn himself a skilful charioteer when Carrhotus has won the victory? Also ἐπιχωρίων καλῶν ἑοδοὶ naturally points to the subject not to the prince. It is one thing for Arcesilas to compete in the ἱεροὶ ἀγῶνες of Hellas, but quite another for him to enter in the lists in Cyrene. Cf. Pyth. 9, 103 of Telesicrates of Cyrene who won ἐν πᾶσιν ἐπιχωρίοις (sc. ἀέθλοις).

Further, as Christ says (Introduction, p. lxxiii), *si quis non solum equos aluerat sed etiam in certamine rezerat, ut Herodotus Thebanus* (Isth. 1, 15) *singulari ille laude ornabatur*. There is no trace of this special distinction in Pindar's language.

Pyth. 6, 48.

ἄδικον οὐθ' ὑπέροπλον ἦβαν δρέπων  
σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων.

I am dissatisfied with the common interpretation of v. 49 which sees in it an allusion to the victor's poetical temperament. The context with v. 47, especially νόφ δὲ πλοῦτον

ἀγει, seems to suggest that σοφία of another kind is meant, 'skill as a charioteer': cf. ἀρματηλάτας σοφός in the passage just considered: also Ol. 9, 107 σοφαί μὲν αἰπειναί, which shews that like ἀρετὰ it is a plastic word. ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων I take to be the same as the Παρνάσιος μυχός of Pyth. 10, 8:

cf. Bacchyl. 4, 14 Κίρρας μυχοῖς. Thrasybulus employs his wealth to further as a charioteer his father's fame: he does not spend it on riotous living (v. 48: cf. Pyth. 8, 89 and Gildersleeve's note).

J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN.

# ON SOPHOCLES ANT. 795 ff.

νικᾷ δ' ἐναργῆς βλεφάρων ἱμερος εὐλέκτρον  
νύμφας, τῶν μεγάλων πάρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαῖς  
θεσμῶν· ἄμαχος γὰρ ἐμπαίζει θεὸς Ἀφροδίτα.

The objections to the mss. text of this passage, as given above, are well known.

The chief are (1) |  $\tilde{\text{πα}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{δ}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ος}} \tilde{\text{ἐν}}$  | represents unmetrically a logaoedic choree, \_ \_; (2) τῶν μεγάλων κ.τ.λ. must mean 'enthroned in sway beside the great laws' (viz. those of obedience to one's father and to the king; both of which love has caused Haimon to violate). But Soph. cannot have meant to speak of the μεγάλοι θεσμοί as enthroned beside ἱμερος (Eros, the god, would in any case be preferable), when he has just said that ἱμερος has vanquished them.

Now, the scribe of L first wrote  $\tilde{\text{πά}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{γ}}\tilde{\text{ος}}$ , then, erasing the letters  $\tilde{\text{ργ}}$ , he made  $\tilde{\text{πά}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{γ}}\tilde{\text{ος}}$  into  $\tilde{\text{πά}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{δ}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ος}}$ . From this it is natural to surmise that he found a  $\gamma$  written either somewhere over  $\tilde{\text{πά}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{δ}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ος}}$  or in the margin, with a mark over  $\tilde{\text{πά}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{δ}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ος}}$  to show for which word the  $\gamma$  was meant. Was not this  $\gamma$  (or  $\Gamma$ ), whether interlinear or marginal, originally meant as a correction of the  $\Pi$  [  $\Gamma$  ] of ΠΑΡΕΡΟΣ? And did not Soph. write τῶν μεγάλων γὰρ, \*Ερος, ἀρχεῖς | θεσμῶν? 'For over the great laws, O Love, thou art lord.' Whenever ἀρχεῖς became ἀρχαῖς, the insertion of ἐν was almost inevitable.

With this reading we also obtain an object for ἐμπαίζει, which was before a desideratum: 'for unconquerable, the

goddess Aphrodite mocks at them (the θεσμοί).

By a similar error in *Ant.* 368 the mss. have  $\tilde{\text{πα}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ων}}$ , of which  $\tilde{\text{γε}}\tilde{\text{ρα}}\tilde{\text{ί}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ων}}$  is a morally certain correction.

Metrically the tribrach γὰρ, \*Ερος will now correspond to the irrational tribrach

$\tilde{\text{φ}}\tilde{\text{ν}}\tilde{\text{ξ}}\tilde{\text{ί}}\tilde{\text{μ}}\tilde{\text{ος}}$  in 787. Irrational tribrachs are not common, but the following cases are to be found in J. H. H. Schmidt's *Die Kunstf. der Gr. Poesie*. (I have not searched the

Euripides volume.) *O.C.* 134  $\tilde{\text{τ}}\tilde{\text{ιν}}\tilde{\text{'}} | \tilde{\text{η}}\tilde{\text{κ}}\tilde{\text{ειν}}$

$\tilde{\text{λ}}\tilde{\text{ο}}\tilde{\text{γ}}\tilde{\text{ος}} | = 166 \tilde{\text{ἀ}}\tilde{\text{λ}}\tilde{\text{α}}\tilde{\text{τ}}\tilde{\text{α}} \tilde{\text{λ}}\tilde{\text{ο}}\tilde{\text{γ}}\tilde{\text{ον}} | : \textit{O.T.} 1210$

$\tilde{\text{π}}\tilde{\text{α}}\tilde{\text{τ}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ι}} \tilde{\text{θ}}\tilde{\text{α}}\tilde{\text{λ}}\tilde{\text{α}}\tilde{\text{μ}}\tilde{\text{η}}\tilde{\text{π}}\tilde{\text{ο}}\tilde{\text{λ}}\tilde{\text{ω}} \tilde{\text{π}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{σ}}\tilde{\text{ι}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{ιν}} = 1219 \tilde{\text{γ}}\tilde{\text{άρ}} | \tilde{\text{ω}}\tilde{\text{σ}}\tilde{\text{π}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}$

$\tilde{\text{ι}}\tilde{\text{α}}\tilde{\text{λ}}\tilde{\text{᾽}}\tilde{\text{μ}}\tilde{\text{ον}} \tilde{\text{χ}}\tilde{\text{᾽}}\tilde{\text{ῶν}}$  (Schmidt, unaware (edn. 1869) of Prof. Jebb's brilliant emendation, writes

$\tilde{\text{ὥς}} \tilde{\text{π}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{ρί}}\tilde{\text{α}}\tilde{\text{λ}}\tilde{\text{λ}}' \tilde{\text{ι}}\tilde{\text{ὰν}} \tilde{\text{χ}}\tilde{\text{ῶ}}\tilde{\text{ων}}$ , scanning |  $\tilde{\text{ὥς}} \tilde{\text{π}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{ρι}} |$  ) :

*O.C.* 1222 |  $\tilde{\text{ὄτ}}\tilde{\text{ε}} \tilde{\text{μ}}\tilde{\text{οι}}\tilde{\text{ρ}} | = 1236 | \tilde{\text{ἀκ}}\tilde{\text{ρα}}\tilde{\text{τ}}\tilde{\text{ες}} | :$

*Ar. Av.* 853  $\tilde{\text{π}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ο}}\tilde{\text{σ}}\tilde{\text{ο}}\tilde{\text{δ}}\tilde{\text{ι}}\tilde{\text{α}} = 897 | \tilde{\text{χ}}\tilde{\text{ερ}}\tilde{\text{ν}}\tilde{\text{ι}}\tilde{\text{β}}\tilde{\text{ι}} | : \textit{Ran.}$

896  $\tilde{\text{σ}}\tilde{\text{ο}}\tilde{\text{φ}}\tilde{\text{ῶν}} \tilde{\text{ἀνδ}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ῶν}} = 993 \tilde{\text{φ}}\tilde{\text{ε}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{᾽}} \tilde{\text{π}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ος}} | \tilde{\text{τὰ}}\tilde{\text{ν}}\tilde{\text{τα}} :$

*Eccl.* 485 |  $\tilde{\text{πὰ}}\tilde{\text{ρ᾽}} \tilde{\text{τοις}} | = 495 | \tilde{\text{ἡ}}\tilde{\text{μ}}\tilde{\text{ας}} | :$

*Plut.* 294  $\tilde{\text{κίναβ}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ωντ}}\tilde{\text{ῶν}} = 300 \tilde{\text{κατὰ}}\tilde{\text{δὰρ}}\tilde{\text{θ}}\tilde{\text{ῖν}}\tilde{\text{τα}}$ .

*Aesch. Suppl.* 635 |  $\tilde{\text{τὸν}} \tilde{\text{ἀχ}}\tilde{\text{ο}}\tilde{\text{ρ}}\tilde{\text{ῶν}} = 648 \tilde{\text{δυσ}}\tilde{\text{π}}\tilde{\text{ο}}\tilde{\text{λ}}\tilde{\text{᾽}}$

$\tilde{\text{μ}}\tilde{\text{η}}\tilde{\text{τον}} : \textit{Pers.} 657  $\tilde{\text{ἀρ}}\tilde{\text{χ}}\tilde{\text{ι}}\tilde{\text{αι}}\tilde{\text{ε}} \tilde{\text{βὰ}}\tilde{\text{λ}}\tilde{\text{ή}}\tilde{\text{ν}} = 665 \tilde{\text{καὶ}}\tilde{\text{ν}}\tilde{\text{α}}$$

$\tilde{\text{τ}}\tilde{\text{ε}} \tilde{\text{κλ}}\tilde{\text{υ}}\tilde{\text{ῖ}}\tilde{\text{ς}}$ .

M. A. BAYFIELD.