

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](#)



Böhmer's *Sicilian Odes of Pindar Pindars Sicilische Oden nebst den epizephyrischen*. Mit Prosaübersetzung und Erläuterungen, Eduard von Böhmer. Bonn, 1891. 5 Mk.

J. B. Bury

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 05 / May 1893, pp 206 - 208

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197604, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197604

How to cite this article:

J. B. Bury (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 206-208 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197604

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BÖHMER'S SICILIAN ODES OF PINDAR.

Pindars Sicilische Oden nebst den epizephyrischen. Mit Prosaübersetzung und Erläuterungen, von EDUARD BÖHMER. Bonn, 1891. 5 Mk.

THE origin of this work may be traced back, we are told in the Preface, to a Programme which appeared in 1829 at Stettin entitled *Bemerkungen über Pindar* by the author's father, F. Böhrner, and which seems to have attracted considerable attention. Drawn by his father's tract to the study of Pindar, Mr. E. Böhrner attended the lectures of Boeckh in 1849, and has, since that time, constantly occupied himself with the study of the poet, and has formed a Pindaric library which is, I have no doubt, the most complete in Europe. He made a collation of the Medicean MSS. for the *Olympian Odes*, which he placed at the disposal of Bergk, who however wrongly refers to him under his father's name. The present edition of the *Sicilian Odes*—the first work which he has published—thus represents some of the ripe results of a lifetime of familiarity with the poet, and therefore deserves the respectful attention of all students of Pindar.

Mr. Böhrner has aimed above all things at compression. His edition consists of only xx. and 113 pages; one of the chief purposes of the prose translation (printed opposite to the text) is to save the necessity of 'countless notes on construction and meaning.' He has paid special attention to metre on which he has some original views, and gives in his section on *Silbenrhythmus* some useful statistics. His speculations on *Orchestik* are ingenious, difficult and rather daring, but well worth reading.

The Odes are arranged chronologically. In *Pyth.* vi., which comes first, Mr. Böhrner has made two striking contributions to the correction of the text. The opening lines at present appear in our texts thus:

ἀκούσατ', ἧ γὰρ ἐλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας
ἀρουραν ἧ Χαρίτων
ἀναπολλίζομεν κ.τ.λ.

An alternative has no place here, and Mr. Böhrner by writing ἧ Χαρίτων—a change which is really no change—restores the sense. This correction is in my judgment quite certain. The other emendation is, though not certain, at least worthy of consideration. In ll. 47, 48 the MSS. give

νόφ δὲ πλοῦτον ἄγει
ἄδικον οὐθ' ὑπέροπλον ἦβαν δρέπων,

violating the metre in l. 48,—the scheme being

○○○|—○○|—|○○○|—○|×

Böhrner reads

ἄδικον ἧβαῖον οὐθ' ὑπέροπλον δρέπων

'indem er Unrechtes nicht das Geringste noch auch Hoffärtiges pflückt.' For αἶ cp. αἰολεῖ, *Pyth.* iv. 233, Γαῖαόχῳ, *Ol.* xiii. 78. With the treatment of other difficulties in this difficult ode I cannot always agree. Hermann's νάϊον in l. 4 for ναόν seems extremely doubtful. In 12 sqq.—

οὔτ' ἄνεμος ἐς μυχούς
αἰλὸς ἄξιοισι, παμφόρῳ χεράδι
τυπτόμενος.—

four MSS. have ἄνεμοι and τυπτόμενοι, which Mr. Böhrner adopts. I question the phrase ἄνεμοι τυπτόμενοι χεράδι and most editors have found it a stumbling-block. I think we should read (ἄνεμοι and) τυπτομένος, agreeing with μυχούς. The same error occurs in *Nem.* x. 62, where the MSS. have ἦμενος instead of ἡμένος. This solution at once explains the pairs of variants, ἄνεμοι, -ος and τυπτόμενος, -οι. For when the accusative participle was read as a nominative, two courses were open, either to assimilate τυπτόμενος to ἄνεμοι (whence τυπτόμενοι) or to assimilate ἄνεμοι to τυπτόμενος (whence ἄνεμος).

There is another well-known difficulty in l. 46.

τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος
πατρῶν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα,
46 πάτρῳ τ' ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαΐαν ἔδειξεν.

So most texts. But there are two difficulties. (1) The MSS. give ἔδειξεν ἅπασαν, which makes the line too long by —. The question is, Are we to reject ἅπασαν or ἔδειξεν? (2) How is ἐπερχόμενος to be explained? Mr. Böhrner, keeping ἔδειξεν, explains in the usual way, 'und dem Oheim nachstrebend zeigte er sich glänzend.' But it may be gravely questioned whether ἐπερχόμενος can bear such a meaning. And it seems to me (as to Christ) that ἔδειξεν is far more likely to be the adscript than

ἅπασαν. ἀγλαίαν ἅπασαν is a characteristic Pindaric phrase. I fancy that most editors feel this, but keep ἔδειξεν because they regard a verb as absolutely necessary. ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαίαν ἅπασαν can only mean 'traversing a world of splendour,' and thus πάτρῳ τ' remains as the problem demanding solution. I suggest that Pindar here used the genitive form in -ω (which is implied by the dative πάτρῳ), and propose to read :

πατρῶν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα
πάτρῳ τ', ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαίαν ἅπασαν.

'He walked according to the lines marked out by his father and his uncle.'

But if ἅπασαν is original in l. 46, on the other hand πάσαις is surely an 'additamentum' in l. 50. This is one of the most puzzling verses in Pindar. The reading of the MSS.—

τίν τ' Ἑλέλιχθον ὀργαῖς πάσαις ὅς ἱππείαν
ἔσοδον
(μάλα ἀδόντι νόμῳ Ποσειδᾶν προσέχεται)—

gives neither metre nor meaning. The omission of πάσαις rectifies the metre but does not restore the sense. Christ's ὀργᾶς ὅς ἱππείαν ἐσόδων (after M. Schmidt) is perhaps the simplest correction that has been yet proposed, but is, I am sure, not what Pindar wrote. Mr. Böhrmer reads

ὀργαῖς πᾶν ἱππείαν ἐς ὁδόν

'sein Trachten ganz in die Rossebahn,'—a rather halting construction. I submit that it is a mistake to build any restoration of the passage on πάσαις. The corruption lies in ὀργαῖς and πάσαις was introduced to eke out the meaning. I cannot satisfy myself about the restoration; I will only suggest that ὀργαῖς may lurk behind ὀργαῖς.

In *Pyth.* xii. 12 Mr. Böhrmer gives εἰναλία τε Ξερῖφω λαοῖ τε for εἰναλία Ξερῖφω λαοῖσι τε, and in *Ol.* xi. 15 τῶν Ζεφυρίων Λοκρῶν for τῶν Ἐπιζεφυρίων Λοκρῶν, both excellent corrections, though I doubt whether the second be really necessary. In *Pyth.* i. 4 he adopts the form προνομιών, which seems very probable, but it is hard to accept Bücheler's εὐνράπλοις in *Pyth.* i. 92.

In *Ol.* i. 50

τραπέζαισι τ' ἀμφὶ δεύτατα κρεῶν
σέθεν διεδάσαντο καὶ φάγον,

Mr. Böhrmer translates 'um die Tische das

Letzte von deinem Fleisch vertheilt und gegessen,' and explains in his brief note; 'es sei zum zweiten Mal herumgereicht (δεύτερα) und dann noch der Rest, so dass gar nichts übriggeblieben.' It is hard to believe that Pindar meant to insist on three, if not more, dishings-up of the flesh of Pelops. I cannot acquiesce in this interpretation of δεύτατα. A Paris MS. (V) has ἀμφιδεύματα and a Venetian (W) ἀμφὶ δεύματα. I suspect that δεύματα is the right reading and that we have here an unusual word connected with γεύομαι and the Hesychian glosses ζεύσασθαι, δεύσασθαι.

A little further on in the same ode we read of Tantalus :

κόρῳ δ' ἔλεν
ἄταν ὑπέροπλον ἄν οἱ πατὴρ ὑπερ
κρέμασε καρτερὸν αὐτῷ λίθον.

The duplicate pronoun, οἱ αὐτῷ, is strange as there is no point in the emphasis. Mr. Böhrmer translates the text in the only possible way, taking αὐτῷ in close connexion with καρτερὸν, 'einen ihm beharrlichen Stein;' but one still fails to see the point of the limitation. Now it is to be observed that the MSS. all give τάν οἱ, which violates the metre. Hermann restored ἄν. I have no doubt that τ accidentally got into the wrong place and that Pindar wrote

ἄταν ὑπέροπλον, ἄν τοι πατὴρ κ.τ.λ.

'which, as all know.'—In l. 80 Bergk's conjecture ματήρας for μναστήρας is adopted. In 89 ἔτεκε for ἄ τέκε gives an asyndeton which is quite in Pindar's manner. In 104 (πέποιθα δὲ ξένον μή τιν' ἀμφοτέρα καλῶν τε ἴδριν ἄμα καὶ δύναμιν κυριώτερον κ.τ.λ.), where ἄμα καὶ is unmetrical, Mr. Böhrmer makes the striking emendation ἀμάκι καὶ, comparing the form θαμάκι. In 112 he keeps ἀλκᾷ τρέφει 'zur Stärke nährt,' which, I think, is impossible. ἀλκᾷ would have to be either instrumental or dative of interest. I propose ἄλκαρ = 'ut praesidium, munimentum.'

In *Ol.* ii. 6 the MSS. have (Θήρωνα)

γεγωνητέον ὅτι δίκαιον ξένον, ἔρεισμ' Ἀκραγαν-
τος.

Hartung, Mommsen, and Bergk read ὅτι δίκαιον ξένων. But such a use of ὅτις seems extremely doubtful, as Mr. Böhrmer also judges, for he adopts Hermann's ὅπι with Hartung's ξένων. But is not ὅπι for ὀπιδοι as questionable a form as ἐλπί would be for ἐλπιδι or ἐρι for ἐριδι? Surely the obvious emendation is

γεγωνητέον ὀπίδ' ἰ δ' ἰκαίον ξένων,—

a good instance of the omission of one of two identical syllables. In his metrical scheme Mr. Böhmer admits \cup for $_$ in this place. In l. 10 (αἰὼν δ' ἔφεπε μόρσιμος πλοῦτόν τε καὶ χάριν ἄγων) I suggest μόρσιμ' ἐπὶ, if ἐπάγω seems called for; cf. below l. 37.—By the simple change of οὐ τι to οὐ τί, the editor has restored vv. 30 sqq., which now read thus:

ἦτοι βροτῶν γε κέκριται
 πείρας οὐ τί θανάτου,
 οὐδ' ἄσύχιμον ἡμέραν ὅποτε.....τελευτάσομεν.

But it is hard to accept the doctrine of a causal genitive with the perfect passive, which Mr. Böhmer adopts to explain βροτῶν. He cites *Pyth.* ii. 90 στάθμας δέ τινας ἐλκόμενοι περισσῶς ἐνέπαξαν ἔλκος, but surely the causal στάθμας depends in strict grammar on ἔλκος, not on ἐλκόμενοι. Again in *Nem.* iii. 52 (λεγόμενον τοῦτο προτέρων ἔπος) προτέρων depends on ἔπος; and in *Ol.* viii. 43 (φάσμα Κρονίδα πεμφθέν Διός) Διός depends on φάσμα, not on πεμφθέν—the φάσμα is conceived to belong to Zeus. The same explanation applies to *Ol.* ix. 100; and even if the editor's interpretation of *Nem.* i. 8 be correct, θεῶν must depend on ἀρχαί, not on βέβληνται. So too here; βροτῶν is determined not by κέκριται but by πείρας.—In v. 52 Mr. Böhmer reads διφροσινῶν for δυσφροσύναν which is metrically impossible. I

venture to regard Dindorf's δυσφρονῶν as more probable. In 74 the text is altered by punctuating after ὄρμοισι:—

τὰ μὲν χερσὸθεν ἀπ' ἀγλαῶν δενδρέων,
 ὕδωρ δ' ἄλλα φέρβει
 ὄρμοισι. τῶν χέρας ἀναπλέκοντι καὶ στεφάνους

ὄρμοισι is thus taken to mean 'in the havens' of the happy island, whereas, according to the old punctuation, it was explained 'with wreaths.' The following words are explained: 'Von ihnen winden sie Händevolle auch zu Kränzen.' Can χέρας mean 'handfuls'? I should prefer to read στεφάνους with a few MSS. In 97 κρυφόν τε θέμεν ἐσλὸν κακοῖς is read and κρυφόν (*sic*; vulg. κρύφον) explained as an adjective (cf. κυφός), I have no doubt rightly.—In *Nem.* i. 72 Mr. Böhmer reads νόμον with Mommsen. In *Isth.* ii. 10 he accepts Bergk's ἐτᾶς.

Within the limits of this notice I have only been able to deal, and that imperfectly, with one side of this suggestive edition, namely the treatment of the text. I need hardly say that new light is thrown on the interpretation of many passages, where the actual text needs no discussion; and I only hope that Mr. Böhmer will soon permit himself to give us his views on some of those odes of his poet which were composed for other than Western victors.

J. B. BURY.

ISOKRATES UND DIE GESCHICHTSCHREIBUNG.

Vortrag gehalten zu München am 23 Mai 1891 in der vierten allgemeinen Sitzung der 41. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner, von RUDOLF v. SCALA. Leipzig: Teubner. 1892. 12 Mk.

THE most ardent admirer of Isocrates would scarcely venture to maintain that he can be regarded as a trustworthy authority on matters of history, and the author of *Die Studien des Polybios* is as sensible of his shortcomings in this respect as even Busolt himself. Nor does he credit him with philosophical insight, though he has shown both here (p. 6 sqq.) and elsewhere (*Zur philosophischen Bildung des Isokrates, Jahrb. f. Klass. Philol.* 1891, 445–448) that he was not unacquainted with the earlier philosophical systems. But he maintains

that the ability and influence of Isocrates as a politician have been underrated and that as a 'preacher of unity' he is worthy to be classed with such men as Fichte, Machiavelli and Manin. Dr. von Scala adduces (p. 15) as a striking instance of political insight what he elsewhere (*Stud. des Pol.* i. 303) calls the 'marvellously statesmanlike advice' given by Isocrates to Philip (*Philipp.* § 154). It is interesting to notice that this more generous estimate of Isocrates, so different from that of Niebuhr, has the support of such authorities as B. Keil (*Analecta Isocratea*, p. 11) and Holm (*Griech. Gesch.* iii. 448).

But the most important part of this Isocratean 'study' is that which treats of the influence of Isocrates on later writers of history. Greek prose literature has sus-