

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 *Olympian Odes*

J. Arbuthnot Nairn

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 01 / February 1901, pp 10 - 15
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00029346, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00029346

How to cite this article:

J. Arbuthnot Nairn (1901). On Pindar's *Olympian Odes*. The Classical Review, 15, pp 10-15
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00029346

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ON PINDAR'S OLYMPIAN ODES.

Ol. 1, 62-4 [the numbering of Gildersleeve's edition for Olympians and Pythians has been followed in this paper: *i.e.* of course, the left hand (Böckh's) numeration].

νέκταρ ἀμβροσίαν τε
δῶκεν, οἷσιν ἄφθιτον
ἔθεσαν.

The antistrophic verse (75) demands a trochee at the beginning of 64. 'It is better to admit a tribrach [ἔθεσαν εἰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] than to accept the MS. θέσαν, or Mommsen's θέν νιν, although we miss an object.' So Gildersleeve. But according to the most recent edition of Pindar, that of Otto Schröder in Teubner's series—which, though apparently a fifth edition of Bergk's work on Pindar completed under Schröder's guidance, is virtually independent of Bergk's influence—the *optimi libri* have θέσαν αὐτὸν, while θέσαν αὐτὸν is only given by *pars Thomm(anorum)*, *i.e.* of the interpolated codices influenced by Thomas Magister.

θήκαν has the support of Rauchenstein: Comm. Pind. II. 11. According to Rumpel's Lexicon, however, we have no instance of this form. The ordinary alternation of ἔθηκα: ἔθεμεν is observed throughout: θηκάμενος is not enough as evidence that Pindar could violate in *this* verb the settled prerogatives of strong and weak Aorist forms: while to my ear at least θήκαν after δῶκεν (v. 63) is unpleasantly cacophonous. This is intensified by the form προήκαν, v. 65, as Schneidewin saw.

The other suggestions may be seen in Schröder's note to the passage. Remembering that the number of uncial corruptions in the MSS. of Pindar is considerable, a state of affairs which the papyrus of Bacchylides has more recently illustrated, I propose a reading which seems to satisfy the conditions of the problem at least as well as any already put forward: viz.

οἷσιν ἄφθιτόν F'
ἔσαν.

F for Fe has disappeared from view in the text *für sich*: but αὐτὸν faithfully represents it. Similar subsidence of this pronoun is familiar in the text of Homer, but without the gloss. ἔσαν from ἔζω = κτίζω may be supported by ἔσαντο in Pyth. 4, 204, where the explanation of the scholiast is ἔκτισαν.

Finally, the passage Pyth. 9, 63, which is at first sight parallel and in favour of some

form of τίθημι, when examined is seen to be different:

νέκταρ ἐν χεῖλεσσι καὶ ἀμβροσίαν στάξοισι,
θήσονται τέ νιν ἀθάνατον κ.τ.λ.

There θήσονται is to be taken in the sense of 'give him a name,' familiar in tragedy. It may have been a false interpretation of that passage, however, which led Ahrens to propose the ridiculous reading θήσαν (*lactabant*) in Ol. 1. 64.

Ol. i. 103 sqq.

πέποιθα δὲ ξένον
μή τιν' ἀμφοτέρα καλῶν τε Φίδριν ἄμμε καὶ
δύναμιν κυριώτερον
τῶν γε νῦν κλυταῖσι δαιδαλωσέμεν ὕμνον πτυχαῖς.

ἄμμε is a correction for metrical reasons of the MSS. ἄμα. In support of it may be cited the corruption of ἄμμε to ἄμα at Ol. 9, 106. Sch. Vet. has πέπεισμαι ἀκριβῶς μηδένα μ' ἔτι φίλον τῶν νῦν ἀνθρώπων ἐγκωμιάσαι: where the aorist Inf., probably a mere mistake for ἐγκωμιάσειν as so often, gives no support to Mommsen's view that δαιδαλωσέμεν is aorist; nor again is ἄμμε supported by the previous words of the Scholiast. It is not at all probable that Pindar should after the emphatic ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι κείνον of v. 100 with its correspondence in prominence of the singer and the king, weaken his claims on his patron by sharing them in the next clause with the whole chorus.

There is yet another word confused in the MSS. of Pindar with ἄμα, viz. ἀμφί. See Nem. 9, 52, where the reverse corruption of ἄμα to ἀμφί points to the form ἀμᾶ (AMA I to AMΦI) on which cf. Schröder's introduction, p. 37. ἴδριν ἀμφί καλῶν¹ for the more familiar ἴδριν καλῶν is not unlike the use in Ol. 12, 8 σύμβολον—πιστόν ἀμφί πράξιος ἐσομένης εὔρε θεόθεν, where to our grammatical sense ἀμφί would be better absent, and in a prose author would probably have succumbed to the knife of a physician of Cobet's school. The uses of ἀμφί, evidently a favourite with Pindar, can be most conveniently studied in Rumpel: the present passage is not as striking in its divergence from the noun as many where the dat. occurs.

This leads me to speak of Ol. 1, 113 where a syllable is wanted to complete antistrophic

¹ I find that Maur. Schmidt has conjectured ἀμφί already: but he couples ἀμφί καὶ δύναμει (which he reads for δύναμιν).

correspondence at the beginning of the line. It seems to me that Schröder is right in reading ἀμφ' ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι, not ἐπ' ἄλλοισι of the *codices interpolati*. He compares ὅσα δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις Nem. 2, 17, and τὰ μὲν ἀμφὶ πόνους ὑπερώτατα Nem. 8, 4: also the paraphrase of ἀμφὶ by ἐπὶ at Ol. 9, 14 may be used, in case ἐπὶ is as Schröder thinks a genuine mark of antiquity and not as I prefer to believe itself an interpolation. Here again the form AMAI is to be posited as the preliminary stage of the corruption: the similarity of AMAI to AΛΛ[OICI then led to the disappearance of the preposition. The faintness of meaning inherent in ἀμφὶ furthered this: contrast Ol. 7, 80 κρίσις ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις with Pyth. 4, 253 ἐνθα καὶ γυίων ἀέθλοις ἐπέδειξαντο κρίσιν ἐσθᾶτος ἀμφίς. Here the only change needed is the restoration of the active ἐπέδειξαν: cf. Nem. 11, 14 ἐν τ' ἀέθλοισιν ἀρστυῶν ἐπέδειξεν βίαν. Κρίσιν before Ἔσθᾶτος presents no difficulty, and the word is not at all likely to be due to a corrector of e.g. *Fiv'*, of Kayser, Christ, and Gildersleeve. I would only suggest, comparing Ol. 3, 21 μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἀγνὰν κρίσιν, that we should interchange the terminations of γυίων and ἀέθλοις, a common resource of criticism and one well justified by facts.¹ Then too I find some plausibility in the belief that γυίων came in through a misunderstanding of the force of ἐπέδειξαν (really = *παρέσχον*) which is faithfully mirrored in the middle. From this point of view I think Kayser's ἐπέδειξαντο *Fiv'* represents well enough the conception of the passage formed by ancient critics. Thus Sch. ἐπέδειξαντο τῶν μελῶν τὴν ἀνδρείαν καὶ τὴν κρίσιν (i.e. probably τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀνδρείαν. Compare for the use of καὶ = *id est*, Lehrs' Pindar-Scholien). Before dismissing Pyth. 4, 253 on which I may now say,

Ἦ ρ' ὦ φίλοι κατ' ἀμεισίπορον τριόδον
ἐδινήθην
ὄρθᾶν κέλευθον ἰὼν τόπριν,

I should like to remark that ἐσθᾶτος ἀμφίς most probably means according to one view of the Scholiast τῆς ἐσθῆτος χωρὶς, *τουτέστι γυμνοί*. There is clear point in mentioning this, for it was only possible in certain places e.g. Doric states, for the presence of women to be permitted in spite of the lack of the διάζωμα. Now Ol. 4, 24 shews that

garlands were given to the victors on this particular occasion. That 'clothing' of any kind was a prize in addition is a mere unsupported inference of the Scholiast: ἢ τὸ ἐπαθλον ἐσθῆς. We are plainly not at liberty to compare the ψυχρᾶν εὐδιανὸν φάρμακον αὐρᾶν of Ol. 9, 104 (1) because this was an institution peculiar to Pellene, and (2) because there was a special reason for the institution of a prize so bizarre, viz. that the games at Pellene were held *in winter*. (Sch. ad loc. ἐν Πελλάνη χλαῖν' ἐδίδοτο τῷ νικῶντι χειμῶνος ὄρα). But there is another passage which throws some light on Pindar's intention when he emphasizes this point, that the competitors were naked. Pyth. 9, 115 *sqq.* shews that girls even were allowed to be present at the games in *Cyrene*, as one of the institutions perhaps of the Ἰλλίς στάθμα (Pyth. 1, 62). One of the Argonauts who competed in the games at Lemnos before Lemnian women was the ancestor of the kings of *Cyrene* (v. Pyth. 4 *passim*). It is clear to me that Pindar is finding mythological support for the custom as practised at *Cyrene*, of admitting women. Taken this way the words ἐσθᾶτος ἀμφίς bear (to the *συνετοί*) a clear sign of Pindar's manner. Aesthetical criticism is dangerous in these odes; but the thought of the Argonauts racing one another for overcoats is a decided fall below the epic dignity of Pyth. 4. At *Pellene* the prize was probably regarded as a piece of comicality.

I have in the foregoing laid no stress on the entire absence of proof that ἀμφίς ever did equal ἀμφί. Rumpel cites no other example of the word in Pindar, nor can I find any evidence elsewhere of the assumed meaning. Thus to Dissen's 'ἀμφίς pr. *seorsim non dixit Pindarus*' the *tu quoque* 'ἀμφίς pr. ἀμφὶ non dixit Pindarus aliusue quisquam' is too tempting to be avoided.

Ol. 2, 65. The peculiar reading *ταμίους* of BD^s for *τιμίους* in the strange phrase *παρὰ μὲν τιμίους θεῶν* is not enough to build conjectures upon. It probably is a mere variant spelling of *τιμίους*, i.e. *τειμίους*, as we see by comparing *κρασόνων*, D's reading at N. 10, 72 for *κρεισ(σ)όνων*. Written in ligature ζ as ς (ει and ευ) were often confused with δ. The latter confusion is better known, and has been treated by Cobet: an example in Pindar is at Ol. 2, 90 where A has *εὔμαχον* for *ἄμαχον*.

Ol. 2, 86 *sqq.* In attempting to say anything new on this passage, I fear I am aspiring *Zeὺς γενέσθαι*. But it seems to me that a correction of three letters will restore an intelligible construction to these verses.

¹ Cf. Agamemnon 649, Dindorf: *χειμῶν' Ἀχαιοῖς οὐκ ἀμήτητον θεῶν* (*Ἀχαιῶν -θεοῖς M.*).

σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φύᾱ
μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι
παγγλωσσία κόρακες ὡς ἄκραντα γαρύετον
Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον.

We are met at the outstart by a cloud of witness: γαρύετον libri c. Scholl. et testimonius (Aristid. ii, 34 D, Theophyl. Bulg. Epp. 6 p. 12 Meurs., Greg. Cor. p. 218) omnibus. So Schröder. The use of the dual for the plural is not tolerable, as Gildersleeve rightly says. In the theories which introduce now Simonides and Bacchylides, now Corax and Teisias as Pindar's rivals, I for one can put no belief. But with a reading of such antiquity as γαρύετον, and with such persistence in the MS. tradition, the ordinary methods of criticism are not likely to lead us to a definite conclusion. We can alter the text as we please, but we cannot explain how, in our opinion, the corrupt reading found its way into the text. All I aim at is to shew that there was once a variant reading, with all the marks of genuineness. In Simplicius' commentary on Aristotle's De Caelo (the passage and reference, p. 42, 17 Hbg., I take from Schröder) we find these words: κόραξ, μᾶλλον δὲ κολοῖός, ἄκραντα γαρύμενος Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον. Schröder says merely non refragatur, i.e., lectioni γαρύετον. But surely the Middle γαρύμενος in a prose writer ought to be clear evidence that the quotation is following very closely the words of the original. The participle in Simplicius is required by the turn of the sentence: restoring the indicative, we light upon γαρύεται which Tycho Mommsen had already adopted, accepting the construction as *Schema Pindaricum*. Now we cannot argue that γαρύεται if original was replaced by γαρύετον in order to get rid of this *Schema*, for the construction is a favourite with the old interpreters, as even a casual survey of the Scholia will shew. Why then was γαρύεται not kept? I can suggest two reasons: (1) The use of the Present Middle may have seemed impossible to a scribe familiar with the frequent active form. The case of the Future at Isth. 1, 34, where we have γαρύσομαι without any variant is different, on account of the common occurrence of Future Middle with words of hearing, seeing, &c., while αἰῶδω but αἰέσομαι may have exercised an influence. This analogy indeed is recognised by Gildersleeve as an agent in the formation of γαρύσομαι (Introduction p. cii.: he cites the list in Rutherford's New Phrynichus p. 383).

(2) There may have been a misreading

of the abbreviation for the termination—τα. as—τον.¹

This may be thought mere speculation; but what are we to make of the rest of Simplicius' quotation? The use of the singular in κόραξ μᾶλλον δὲ κολοῖός is very remarkable, considering the unanimity of ancient scholars in regarding the enemies of the eagle as a *flock* of crows, or as Simplicius would prefer, jackdaws, the noisier bird (cf. κολῳός in Homer). This indeed is at first sight the intention of the poet.

The picture of 'the eagle (Pindar) sitting quiet and disdainful on the sceptre of Zeus,' seems to gain by contrast with the numbers of his ineffective assailants: cf. Soph. Aias v. 171, of the lesser birds in the presence of the μέγας αἰγυπῖός. Yet the custom of poets varies. Thus Theocritus can in contrasting similarly rival claimants to poetic merit say (7, 41)

βάτραχος δὲ ποτ' ἀκρίδας ὡς τις ἐρίσδω.

So Vergil with his *Argutos inter strepere anser olores* (Ecl. 9, 36). If then both these varieties can exist, we may expect to find cases where only *one* of *each* class is used to point the contrast.² What if we have such a case before us? A slight correction must then be made: for κόρακες read κόρακος, a side-form to κόραξ as φύλακος to φύλαξ cett. The construction is then seen to be μαθόντες δὲ... (γαρύνονται) ὡς κόραξ γαρύεται, and another of the examples of *Schema Pindaricum* disappears. I speak of course with reference to the reading γαρύεται not γαρύετον: assuming, however, that the existence of the reading γαρύεται is proved from Simplicius we must bear in mind the results which an apparent example so early in the collected poems would have on the criticism of following passages. I have little doubt that such readings as ἀρχαὶ for ἀρχὰ, Ol. 11 (10), 6, (where see Gildersleeve's note) are largely due to the syntactical irregularity which the passage under consideration presented even while γαρύεται was still read; the corruption

¹ Cf. the reading of B in 91-2 τανύσας αὐδάσομεν for αὐδάσομαι; also of Codex D at Isth. 1, 15 καὶ τανὺν for καὶ τὰ: that is, the abbreviation for ον, has been wrongly added. I do not lay stress on the frequent corruption of neuter adjectives used adverbially from pl. into sg. as at Pyth. 10, 63: it may be due to other causes.

² Cf. Fulgentius, *Mythology*, i. 13: *cornus secundum Pindarum solus inter omnes aves sexaginta quatuor significaciones habet vocum*. This is put as Frag. 285 (with a query) in Schröder. The conjecture of Welcker that Ol. 13, 99 is referred to (by a corruption of κάρκος to κόρακος?) is very wild. I see no reason to suppose Fulg. to be mistaken.

of *κόρακος* to *κόρακες* removed the only means by which the construction could be maintained as regular. It is certainly a remarkable fact that in the first case where *Schema Pindaricum* could be assumed (with the reading *γαρύεται*) there should now be no trace in the Scholl. of its being invoked as a *θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς*. This can only be due to a very early corruption of *γαρύεται*, on the lines suggested above. I should not consider as equally probable a suggestion to which Bergk's reading *γαρύετων*, '*garrulant licet*,' might give birth: viz., that *γαρύετον* came from the imperative (with which Schröder compares *ἴων* for *ἰόντων*, Aesch. Eum. 32) by the depravity of the *μεταγραφάμενοι* (see Christ on these passages: Ol. 6, 97; 14, 12. Pyth. 1, 69; 3, 60. Nem. 1, 24; 7, 83. Isth. 1, 26).

Ol. 2, 107-8: said of *κόρος*:

τὸ λαλαγήσαι θέλων κρύφον τε θέμεν ἐσλῶν
καλοῖς
ἔργοις· ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν·
ἐκείνος ὅσα χάσματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηνεν,
τίς ἂν φράσαι δύναίτο;

We should certainly read *καὶ κείνος* with Mommsen for *ἐκείνος* in v. 99. *ἐπεὶ* is used merely to introduce a new aspect of Hiero's generosity, and affects equally all that follows: cf. Nem. 4, 31. *ἀπειρομάχας ἑὸν κε φανείη λόγον ὁ μὴ συνιείς· ἐπεὶ ῥέζοντά τι καὶ παθεῖν ἔοικεν*. The Paratactic construction is frequent in Pindar: a notable instance is Ol. 10, 11. *sqq.* (where the doubt as to the reading does not touch the point at issue). The MSS. of the better class have *κάκεινος*, the *interpolati* present *ἐκείνος*. I am not quite satisfied however with the construction *κρύφον θέμεν ἔργοις* though adopting in the main the necessary corrections of Aristarchus. The verb should I think be *ἐπιτιθέναι* not the simple *τιθέναι*: cf. the adjective *ἐπίκρυφος* which Pindar uses at Ol. 8, 68. Kaibel has proposed *ἔργοις ἔπ'· εἰ ψάμμος κ.τ.λ.* which is very harsh, though the use of *εἰ* is idiomatic: cf. Ol. 1, 77, Nem. 7, 86. It would be preferable to read *ἔργοις ἐπιψάμμος κ.τ.λ.* with Asyndeton. Dissen has an *eccursus* (II) in his edition on the subject of Asyndeton where instances can easily be found of the abrupt manner in which Pindar turns to a fresh topic. The end of an ode is frequently marked by Asyndeton: cf. Ol. 3 and 13. For the Anastrophe of *ἐπὶ* cf. *χαίταισι ζευχθέντες ἐπὶ στέφανοι* Ol. 3, 6: also P. 5, 124. *δόμεν - ἐπι = ἐπιδοῦναι*. At Bacchyl. 7, 8. Blass prints *νείμης ἐπι* for *ἐπι-νείμης*.

Ol. 8, 54, sq.

εἰ δ' ἐγὼ Μελησία ἐξ ἀγενείων κῦδος ἀνδρα-
μον ὕμνω
μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος.

κῦδος ἐξ ἀγενείων is often taken to mean 'glory derived from beardless youths.' But comparing the phrases *κῦδος ἀνδρῶν* Ol. 9, 88, and, for the use of the preposition, *κῦδος ἐξ ἀμφικτιόνων* Pyth. 4, 66, we ought more probably to take the phrase as 'glory won at the expense of beardless youths.'¹ So in Latin *triumphare de aliquo*. This has the advantage of making *ταύταν χάριν* below somewhat easier. This is usually paraphrased by *τοιαύτην*, 'the same kind of honour as Alcimedon': as however Alcimedon himself won against *ἀγένειοι*, we have to separate *ταύταν χάριν* decisively from *ἐξ ἀγενείων κῦδος* lest a wrong (*ex hypothesi*) meaning of the latter phrase should be suggested. It is preferable to assume a meaning for v. 54 which will lead more naturally up to what follows. *ταύταν χάριν* then means 'the same kind of victory' viz. over *ἀγένειοι*, referring back to v. 54. We could also take v. 54 to mean 'a victory won in the past by Melesias.' *ταύταν χάριν* is then this same victory. This does not seem so good, for apart from other points *φθόνος* in v. 55 is naturally the jealousy excited by Melesias' success as a trainer, not that engendered by his past exploits as a competitor in the games, which as the whole passage shews had more or less passed out of the memory of the Aeginetans. Finally, there is no reason to doubt with Christ (p. lxxv) that a distinction was made between *παῖδες* and *ἀγένειοι*: cf. Blass Bacchylides² p. lxxv. Ol. 9, 13 *sqq.*

οὔτοι χαμαιπετέων λόγων ἐφάψεαι
ἄνδρὸς ἀμφὶ παλαίσμασιν φόρμιγγ' ἐλελίζων
κλειῶς ἐξ Ὀπόεντος, αἰνήσαις ἔ καὶ νιόν.

A striking instance of the perpetuation of error is seen in the interpretation of v. 15 here. Following the lead of the Scholiast all modern editors take *εἰ* to be the city of Opus. *νιόν* then has to accept the meaning of 'citizen' 'son of the state, his mother.' As confidently as possible one may assert that this sense of *νιός* is impossible. It must mean 'son' in the natural and primitive sense: *filiius*. *εἰ* then is clearly Ephar-mostus, the victor on this occasion, the date

¹ It is perhaps worth while pointing out that *συλαθεὶς ἀγενέων* in Ol. 9, 90 means 'deprived of the beardless, his prey.' For the savage tone of boyish exultation cf. Gildersleeve on Ol. 8, 69.

of which is recoverable from the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. ii. as 468 B.C.

This error has had considerable effect in determining the relations of the second person celebrated in the ode, Lampromachus (v. 90) to Epharmostus. The Scholiast on that verse simply says that Lampromachus was a kinsman of Epharmostus. This was no more than the circumstances of the ode made probable of themselves. Now we have, apart from the statement of v. 15 above, other indications of a limiting kind. In v. 67 we find *θερὸν υἱὸν* used in such a way as to be significant of one or other of the victors; while the parallel of Achilles and Patroclus in v. 82 *sqq.* shews that ties of special closeness held the two together. It is not unnatural to assume that Lampromachus was first the *παιδικὰ* of Epharmostus, who subsequently adopted him as his son. It would be, I fear, *ἐχθρὰ σοφία* to see in the words *Θέτιος γόνος* in v. 82 a trace of a Mezgerian resporsion to *θετὸς υἱός*. The word *γόνος* is corrupt, a trochee being needed. Hartung has already suggested *γ' υἱός*, and though Gildersleeve may be right in thinking *γ'* 'a poor piece of patchery,' yet its presence may be a finger-post to guide us in the way. Otherwise we may as well read *κούρος* as any other of the words proposed.

Ol. 13, 40 *sqq.*

ἐν δ' ἀμφιάλοισι Ποσειδάωνος τεθμοῖσιν
Προιδῶρω σὺν πατρὶ μακρότεραι
Τερψία θ' ἔψοντ' Ἐριτίμω τ' ἄουδαί.

The Scholiast has preserved the true reading in the last verse instead of the curious corruptions *τέρψιες* and *ἐρίτιμοι*. We are prepared then to give ear to any further counsel with which he may favour us. Indirectly he does help us by his note on *Προιδῶρω σὺν πατρὶ* in which he mentions that the sons of Terpsias were Eritimus and Namertidas, while Ptoiodorus was the father of Thessalus, father of Xenophon the victor: according to others Namertidas was another name of Eritimus, who became the father of Autolyceus. In the face of this confused statement editors have usually recoiled. There are two names included in it which Pindar does not mention explicitly, and for which no niche has been found. But on closer inspection we see that the construction is really *Προιδῶρω ἔψονται σὺν πατρὶ* (on the tense I shall speak presently). There is no case in Rumpel of *ἔπεσθαι* taking *σὺν* besides the dative (cf. the later *συνέπεσθαι*), and the suspicion arises that it is a mistake to connect *σὺν* with the verb at all. *σὺν πατρὶ* sc.

Προιδῶρου is to be taken separately, and very possibly the Scholiast's Namertidas may have been, in the account from which he derived his list of names, the father of Ptoiodorus. With this theory of course goes the demolition of the belief that the father of Thessalus, and grandfather of Xenophon, was Ptoiodorus.

It is a certain advantage to have four persons at our disposal instead of three, for the passage being obviously in *crescendo*, we now distribute more than seven victories over these four, not as formerly three. Failure to observe that Pindar is thus ascending in the scale of glory won has led to various views about *μακρότεραι* other than the simple and true one, that of Dissen, which makes *μακρότεραι*—*ἀουδαί* the outward emblem of 'more numerous victories.' Certainly *μακρότεραι* cannot mean 'too long,' a 'self-check' as Gildersleeve thinks. The climax does not come until v. 45. *ἔσποντο* is required, finally, as a correction of *ἔψοντ'* (Bothe).

Ol. 13, 107.

ὄσα τ' Ἄρκας ἀνάσσω
μαρτυρήσει Λυκαίου βωμὸς ἀναξ.

The MSS. have *Ἄρκασιν ἀνάσσω*, where the second word is clearly a gloss on *ἀναξ*. Of the conjectures made already Christ's *Ἄρκασιν ἴστωρ* (cf. Ol. 9, 98), and Mommsen's *Ἄ. ἄσσω* please me most: in the latter it is the sense and not the closeness of the *ductus* of the interpolated *ἀνάσσω* that is to be approved. Christ's reading however is more satisfactory. The word *Λυκαίου* does not seem to have been noticed. I find it taken as an *ethnicon*, *Διὸς* being supplied. Is this possible? In the absence of proof I should prefer to take the word from *Λύκαιον* (the mountain) making the genitive depend on *ἀναξ* 'lording it over Lycaeum' *i.e.* 'towering over L.' This would explain how *ἀνάσσω* came to be taken as a rendering of *ἀναξ* instead of some more lucid word, as *ὕψηλός*. Plainly *ἀναξ* was thought to govern *Λυκαίου*. The name of the mountain occurs at Nem. 10, 48 unless the *τέμενος* of the god is there meant.

The alternative to Christ's *ἴστωρ* and the construction and meaning which I assign to *Λυκαίου* is to regard the lost word in the first line as a noun other than proper on which *Λυκαίου* now an *ethnicon* depends. I say 'noun other than proper' because neither *Διὸς* nor *Ζηνός* will satisfy the metre. Now at Nem. 5, 10 we find *πὰρ βωμὸν πατέρος Ἑλλανίου στάντες i.e. Διὸς Ἑλλανίου*. I propose to insert *πατρός* after *Ἄρκασι*. Written

προς this would become unmeaning and be omitted. It may be observed that prepositions are exposed to various dangers in the MSS. of Pindar as may be seen from Schröder, p. 10. An instance of a prep. omitted in the archetype (so Schröder) and in Codex A is at Ol. 8, 40 ὄρουσε A for

ἀνόρουσε the true reading: cf. also [ἐκ] διδάσκησεν Pyth. 4, 217 Ambr. [*προς*]βάλλοντα Pyth. 4, 271 Ambr. while at Pyth. 9, 62 the missing syllable has been similarly supplied, <προς>θηκάμεναι (others καθηκ.).

J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN.

NOTES ON EURIPIDES.

THE numeration is that of Kirchhoff's text, which has been the basis of my work. My plan has been the same which I follow in all authors,—to read a plain text first, and then, after making what I can of it myself, to turn and see what others think. Hitherto I have been content to compare Kirchhoff's notes and Paley and Nauck's text; and their omissions have sometimes led me to publish as my own conjectures made already—even by Musgrave and Hermann long ago. But that has done no harm, since Dr. Wecklein has undertaken, and nearly completed, for Euripides what he has performed for Aeschylus, the immense task of collecting all conjectures and assigning them to their original inventors; in which he may be relied upon for the most scrupulous accuracy. Considered even from this point of view alone—for the body of suggestion it contains—his work is of incalculable help to students; I cannot sufficiently express my grateful sense of the service he has done for both these authors. His text gives also more perfect collations of the MSS., which I have consulted, and the next time I read Euripides it will be with Dr. Wecklein's text; but at present I have only had leisure to consult it for these new contributions. Many of mine, as usual, I have found anticipated; but a few of these, not being generally accepted, are mentioned here with the name of their originator for the sake of the consideration they may claim from coincident opinion.

Except to critics, it might seem ungraceful to welcome a new text by proposing alterations in it, but critics know how the effect of any marked advance is to quicken and help them in removing blemishes that still remain. The few small suggestions on Sophocles dispersed among these notes are chiefly the result of studying the text published by Sir Richard Jebb in 1897 on the completion of his great edition. It leaves but scanty grains for others to glean after;

there is nothing among mine so good as Prof. Tyrrell's ἀλλ' εἰ θελόντων γ' in *O.C.* 590 or his ἐπιὼν in 145 f.

ALCESTIS (with Wecklein 1899).

The earlier lyrics in this play have been grievously interpolated. So far as metre goes, this is my view of the original:

- 218 ἰὼ Ζεῦ πᾶ τις ἂν πόρος κακῶν
γένοιτο καὶ λυσις τύχας
220
ἕξεισι τις; ἢ τέμω τρίχα καὶ
μέλανα στολμόν πέπλων
223 ἀμφιβαλώμεθ' ἦδη;
= 232 παπαῖ ὦ παῖ Φέρητος οἶοι
234
ἄρ' ἄξια καὶ σφαγῶς τάδε καὶ
πλέον ἢ βρόχῳ δέρην
οὐρανίῳ πελάσσαι;

In 218 I write πᾶ τις ἂν or πᾶ τίς ἂν . . . ejecting πῶς which is an explanation of πᾶ¹ (schol. τίς ἂν πόρος τῶν κακῶν ἡμῖν γένοιτο ἢ πῶς ἢ ποῦ).—In 220 = 234 it seems to me that the metre was either ἄ πάρα κοιράνοισιν as 223, 225, 265 (and this accounts best for the MS. ἄ πάρεστι κοιράνοισι), or ἄ κοιράνοισι πάρεστι as 263. But what Musgrave conjectured, ἄ πάρεστιν κοιράνοισι = ξας δάμαρτος σᾶς στερεῖς is quite foreign to this metre—or I would invite those who approve it to produce a parallel.

- 228 πόριζε δὴ πόριζε· καὶ πάρος γὰρ
τοῦδ' ἐφεύρες, καὶ νῦν
λυτήριος ἐκ θανάτου γενοῦ
= 242 βόασον ὦ στέναξον ὦ Φεραία
χθὼν τὰν ἀρίστην
γυναῖκα μαραινομένην νόσῳ

¹ So in *Philoct.* 334 where L gives ποῖ δε βάση· πῶς δέ μοι τὰν γεῦθεν... the original I suppose was πᾶ δέ... βάση; *Hec.* 1059 πᾶ βῶ;