PINDAR, *NEMEAN* 9.17

ἀνδροδάμαν δ' Ἐριφύλαν, ὅρκιον ὡς ὅτε πιστόν, 16
δόντες Οἰκλείδαι γυναῖκα, ξανθοκομᾶν Δαναῶν ἦσαν μέγιστοι <– ◡ –>
καί ποτ' ἐς ἑπταπύλους Θήβας ἄγαγον στρατὸν ἀνδρῶν αἰσιᾶν
οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν

16 ἀνδροδάμαν δ' J. G. Gurlitt, *Deutsches Museum* (1786), 1.353, n. 7: ἀνδροδάμαντ' fere codd. 18 αἰσιᾶν Tricl.: αἰσιῶν B, om. D

Various supplements have been proposed for this lacunose text, but none has established itself. The omission is likely to have occurred at the end of 17, as Hermann suggested: the line-end there corresponds to the end of a manuscript colon, a particularly vulnerable place.[1] We should not exclude altogether the possibility that something has fallen out rather in the next line, and that καί ποτε should be placed accordingly at the end of 17: then we could have at the start of 18 for example ἐσλὸν ἐς ἑπταπύλους Θ. (Boehmer) or ἑπταπύλους κριτὸν ἐς Θ. (E. Schmid). But Pindar avoids placing short open vowels at verse-end. There are a few cases involving final cretics,[2] but in view of the general tendency, it seems best not to add to their number.

One popular way of supplying the missing syllables has been to insert a substantive in agreement with μέγιστοι (for example Bergk's λαγέται), or (with καί ποτε placed at the end of 17) an adjective in agreement with στρατόν (see above), but neither word particularly calls for expansion, and μέγιστοι at least is better left without.[3] Boeckh instead proposes for the end of 17 <δὴ τόθεν>, to be taken with what follows, but this cannot be right. A definite 'from that moment', as at Aesch. *Ag.* 220 (τόθεν),[4] could hardly be followed in the same sentence by the vague ποτε; nor would it be sufficiently clear that the words supplied begin a sentence.[5] Boeckh's supplement was suggested by the scholiast's ἐντεῦθεν δὴ καὶ εἰς τὰς Θήβας ποτὲ τὰς ἑπταπύλους στράτευμα ἤγαγον (sch. 41, 3.155.8–9 Dr.), but ἐντεῦθεν δή 'next' is a standard prose expression, and need not correspond to anything in the poetic text: the scholiast simply felt the need to give an indication of the sequence of events,[6] something which the transmitted text strangely fails to provide.

There is no reason to think that the scholiast had a fuller text than the manuscripts exhibit, but his honest attempt at paraphrase may still be helpful. The subject of 16–17 is given in sch. 35d, reasonably enough, as οἱ περὶ Ἄδραστον (155.7), but the subject of 18–19, we read, is οἱ περὶ Ἀμφιάραον καὶ Ἄδραστον (sch. 41, 155.10). It is by no means clear that Pindar could expect such a shift to be understood. We require an explicit indication of Amphiaraus' participation in the enterprise: without such an indication, the reference to his death at 24–7 below comes in very abruptly. It would

[1] Cf. now my note on *Nem.* 6.17–18 (*Pindar's Nemeans: A Selection* [Munich and Leipzig, 2005], 58).

[2] See M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 61, referring to an unpublished paper by W. S. Barrett.

[3] See Braswell's commentary for parallels.

[4] Boeckh himself (in the critical notes to his large edition, 1.2.550) explains his supplement as meaning '*hinc igitur*, hoc est, ob potentiam ex coniunctione virium natam maximam', but this seems impossible. It is not supported by the examples of τόθεν at Aesch. *Pers.* 100 and Bacchyl. 5.197 (the latter added by Braswell), both 'thence'.

[5] Hartung indeed takes the phrase with what precedes: but then it is mere padding.

[6] Cf. C. L. Kayser, *Lectiones Pindaricae* (Heidelberg, 1840), 85.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also be helpful to have the sequence of events indicated, as it is in the scholium. I should supply at the end of 17 <σὺν δέ οἱ>, comparing for the expression *Ol.* 13.87 σὺν δὲ κείνωι καί ποτ'. The pronoun in this place could in theory be taken to refer to Eriphyle rather than to Amphiaraus, but I am not troubled by this: as W. J. Slater says (*Lexicon to Pindar* [Berlin, 1969], s. v. ἕ 2), 'the reference of οἱ must always be deduced from sense alone'. Slater adds that 'οἱ does not follow prepositions', but it is found after ἐπί at *Pyth.* 1.7–8 κελαινῶπιν δ' ἐπί οἱ νεφέλαν | ἀγκύλωι κρατὶ . . . κατέχευας: joining ἐπί with κρατί alone (so Slater s.v. ἕ 2.b) would produce an improbably harsh construction. The phrase σὺν δέ οἱ appears to be attested first in Herodotus (6.90, 7.58.1).

Oxford W. B. HENRY
w_b_henry@yahoo.co.uk
doi: 10.1017/S0009838806000280

TWO CONJECTURES ON THE *SUPPLICES* OF EURIPIDES

295 ἀλλ' εἰς ὄκνον μοι μῦθος ὃν κεύθω φέρει

Soph. *OT* 991, τι δ' ἔστ' ἐκείνης ὑμὶν ἐς φόβον φέρον; , is cited by Collard in support of μοι here (a *datiuus commodi*, allegedly).[1] However, the construction there is different: ὑμίν can be taken with ἔστι. Here there is nothing but ὄκνον for μοι to latch onto. It cannot go with μῦθος because μοι as an enclitic will tend to cohere with what precedes it.

Professor Diggle observes, *per litteras*, that μοι here gains some support from Soph. *OT* 519–20, οὐ γὰρ εἰς ἁπλοῦν / ἡ ζημία μοι τοῦ λόγου τούτου φέρει, and that the stress on self seems appropriate. But in that Sophoclean example μοι seems to be a possessive dative making the punishment personal to Creon, whereas μοι is superfluous to ὄκνον here.[2] In my view there is no need for Aethra to stress that her concealed μῦθος leads to hesitation *for her*. The fact that she is concealing it rather presupposes that the hesitation is hers.

I am inclined to write ἀλλ' εἰς ὄκνον τοι κτλ., thereby removing the need to explain the unusual μοι, giving the ordinary absolute usage of φέρω,[3] and throwing a natural emphasis on the hesitation Aethra's unspoken word engenders.[4]

[1] C. Collard, *Euripides'* Supplices (Gröningen, 1975).

[2] None of the other examples cited by Bruhn, *Anhang* (Berlin, 1899), §247.26, is quite equivalent.

[3] Cf. LSJ s.v. VII.1. *CQ*'s anonymous reader cites Hdt. 6.42.1 and 4.90.1 as possible examples of ἐς + accusative and φέρειν standing near datives which depend on them, but the first example is much like Soph. *OT* 991 in that the dative may go with ἐγένετο (note the chiasmus ἐγένετο . . . Ἴωσι, . . . τοῖσι Ἴωσι ἐγένετο, which further suggests that Ἴωσι should not be taken with ἐς νεῖκος). Although the anonymous reader accepts that Hdt. 4.90.1, ὁ δὲ Τέαρος λέγεται . . . εἶναι ποταμῶν ἄριστος τά τε ἄλλα τὰ ἐς ἄκεσιν φέροντα καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀνδράσι καὶ ἵπποισι ψώρην ἀκέσασθαι, is 'less certain still', I do not think the datives ἀνδράσι and ἵπποισι can depend on τὰ ἐς ἄκεσιν φέροντα because the point of καὶ δὴ καὶ is to distinguish the river's other healing qualities from its particular excellence in curing scurvy for men and horses.

[4] See examples of ἀλλὰ . . . τοι at Denniston, *Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954²), 549.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000280 Published online by Cambridge University Press