Aṯrt.[9] But the root atr in Ugaritic means 'to go',[10] just as it does in Hebrew (ashr, as in Asherah[11]). Thus, Aṯrt ym means, 'she who goes upon the sea'.[12]

In other words, if (as seems reasonable and is accepted by many) Kretschmer is correct, not only are Aphrodite and Asherah (Athirat) often the same goddess in terms of their roles, functions and characteristics, but they may actually have the same name ἀφρ/ὀδίτη (Aṯrt ym).[13]

University of Illinois, Urbana HOWARD JACOBSON

doi:10.1017/S0009838814000822

[9] The notion that ym here could be 'day' and refer to a solar deity (so T. Binger, *Asherah* [Sheffield, 1997], 42–5; also W.G.E. Watson, *UF* 25 [1993], 431–4) has no persuasive force. See also Hadley (n. 5), 40.

[10] See G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition* (Leiden, 2003), 126.

[11] See Köhler–Baumgartner (Leiden, 1995), 94.

[12] See Albright (n. 8), 121, 'The Lady Who Treads on the Sea' or 'The Lady Who Traverses the Sea'. See also Hadley (n. 5), 50 and W.A. Maier III, *Aserah: Extrabiblical Evidence* (Atlanta, 1986), 194–5. But S.A. Wiggins, *A Reassessment of 'Asherah'* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1993), 192–3 is somewhat sceptical.

[13] The chronology of the development of the goddess' name in the Semitic and Greek versions I cannot determine.

TWO TEXTUAL NOTES ON PINDAR'S EIGHTH *NEMEAN**

πολλὰ γὰρ πολλᾷ λέλεκται, νεαρὰ δ' ἐξευρόντα δόμεν βασάνῳ
ἐς ἔλεγχον, ἅπας κίνδυνος· ὄψον δὲ λόγοι φθονεροῖσιν,
ἅπτεται δ' ἐσλῶν ἀεί, χειρόνεσσι δ' οὐκ ἐρίζει.
κεῖνος καὶ Τελαμῶνος δάψεν υἱόν, φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις.

21. ὄψον δὲ λόγοι BD : δὲ λόγοι om. Triclinius
φθονεροῖσιν BD : φθόνῳ εἰσίν Vauvilliers (vel potius φθονερῷ 'ισιν)

I translate: 'For many things have been told in many ways, but to give novel things, when one has found them out, to the touchstone | For testing is pure danger: words are an *amuse-bouche* to the envious, | And it fastens on good men always, not taking issue with inferiors. | That too gnawed at Telamon's son, had him writhing on a sword.' The difficulty presented by the transition in 22 from the plural 'the envious' to the singular subject 'it' will be obvious. However, some commentators, including Mezger,[1] Fennell[2] and Bury,[3] have assumed that φθόνος can be supplied as the subject of ἅπτεται in 22 from φθονεροῖσιν in 21, and the modern texts of

* I am grateful to Professors James Diggle and David Kovacs, as well as the anonymous reader of *CQ*, for helpful comments on a draft of this note.

[1] F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig, 1880), 328.

[2] C.A.M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge, 1889[2]), 103: 'For the extraction of φθόνος from φθονεροῖσιν cf. Soph. Aj. 201 [*sic*] νόσου from νοσήσαν [*sic*].' The reference seems to be to νοσήσας at *Aj.* 207, but Fennell leaves it to the reader to extract what support he can from the cross-reference.

[3] J.B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London and New York, 1890), 153.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000834 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pindar – Bowra, Puech, Turyn and Snell–Maehler – do not mention the possibility of corruption in 21.[4]

A few have been prepared to note the difficulty and even to try to correct it. Thus, Heyne commented on ἅπτεται: 'sc. ὁ φθόνος: aut etiam ὁ φθονερός: ex φθονεροῖς. Durum hoc; melior tamen ratio haud suppetit.'[5] Farnell admitted that the supplying of the noun φθόνος from the adjective φθονεροῖσιν is 'a strange freedom of style',[6] and in his collection of Pindaric emendations Gerber lists various attempts to address the difficulty.[7] The most recent commentator, W.B. Henry, comments that 'φθόνος is required as subject in 22f. ... , and it is very doubtful whether it could be supplied without warning from φθονεροῖσιν. ... even if κεῖνος followed immediately on φθονεροῖσιν, I doubt whether φθόνος could be understood.'[8] That Aesch. *Pers.* 13 protects the text here, as some commentators have claimed following Dissen, is doubtful.[9]

In the eighteenth century Vauvilliers suggested at different times two possible remedies, one introducing correption[10] and the copula (εἰσίν), the other, φθονερῷ ᾽ισιν, a violent aphaeresis alien to the Doric dialect.[11] It is perhaps surprising that Vauvilliers did not suggest ὄψον δὲ λόγος φθονερῷ ᾽στιν, but the singular noun following πολλὰ γὰρ πολλῷ λέλεκται would be unnatural and it would still entail an aphaeresis unparalleled in Pindar (or Bacchylides).

Henry argues that φθονεροῖσιν could have been a gloss,[12] and he adopts Vauvilliers' φθόνῳ εἰσίν.[13] While a scribe faced with φθόνῳ εἰσίν might conceivably have been

[4] C.M. Bowra, *Pindari carmina* (Oxford, 1947[2]); A. Puech, *Pindare. Tome III: Néméennes* (Paris, 1952[2]); A. Turyn, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis* (Oxford, 1952); B. Snell and H. Maehler, *Pindarus* (Leipzig, 1987[8]). By contrast, O. Schröder, *Pindari carmina* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1923), 321 did note some conjectures in his apparatus.

[5] C.G. Heyne, *Pindari carmina cum lectionis varietate et adnotationibus. Nova editio correcta et ex schedis Heynianis aucta*, 3 vols. (London, 1824), 1.421.

[6] L.R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, 3 vols. (London, 1930–2), 2.306.

[7] D.E. Gerber, *Emendations in Pindar 1513–1972* (Amsterdam, 1976), 118. In addition to the conjectures of Vauvilliers cited in the apparatus above, Gerber records conjectures changing ὄψον δὲ λόγοι (λόγω/λόγῳ Pauw, ὄψον λόγιοι Bergk, δ᾽ ὄαρος Stone), and subject and word order (ὄψον φθονεροῖσι δὲ μόμφοι/μόμφος Christ, ὄψον φθονεροῖσι δὲ μομφαί Herwerden).

[8] W.B. Henry, *Pindar's Nemeans: A Selection* (Munich and Leipzig, 2005), 80.

[9] Cf. A.F. Garvie, *Aeschylus: Persae* (Oxford, 2009), commenting on Aesch. *Pers.* 12–13 πᾶσα ... ἰσχὺς Ἀσιατογενής: 'That the subject [*sc.* of βαΰζει] can be Ἀσία, understood from Ἀσιατογενής, is highly improbable.'

[10] Cf. B.K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin and New York, 1988), on *Pyth.* 4.5(c): Pindar freely admits epic correption 'in all four places within the hemiepes (D, i.e. – ⏑[1] ⏑[2] – ⏑[3] ⏑[4] –) in dactyloepitrites, but avoids [it] elsewhere (very rare in d[1] and d[2] and totally absent from epitrites'). Vauvilliers' φθόνῳ εἰσίν would introduce correption at Braswell's position 4 in the hemiepes in dactyloepitrites and thus would be acceptable.

[11] Cf. R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, rev. F. Blass, 2 vols. (Hanover and Leipzig, 1890[3]), 1.241. Even in tragic iambics, where prodelision is not uncommon, it seems to be restricted mainly to ἐστί (see J. Diggle, *Studies on the Text of Euripides* [Oxford, 1981], 33: 'Denniston's suspicion that the only part of εἰμί which suffers prodelision in tragic iambics is ἐστί is almost true; but there is the solitary ποῦ ᾽στον at S. *OC* 1107').

[12] I do agree with Henry's diagnosis that 'φθονεροῖς might well have been written above φθόνῳ as an explanation'. However, I find it difficult to see how it would then have been 'mistaken for a correction of φθονωιεις and placed in the text'. It seems to me more likely that φθονεροῖς explained something which it then simply dislodged without the intermediate stage of 'correction'.

[13] Vauvilliers actually retracted his original conjecture in favour of the impossible φθονερῷ ᾽ισιν (cf. J.-F. Vauvilliers, *Traduction poétique des odes les plus remarquables de Pindare* [new edn, Paris, 1859], 281–2). (Professor Diggle also justly asks, *per litteras*, why the prodelided form would not be ᾽σιν instead of Vauvilliers' ᾽ισιν.) I say impossible because I have not been able to find a single example of εἰσί prodelided anywhere in early or classical Greek. Had it appeared, it would have

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000834 Published online by Cambridge University Press

confused and written φθονεροῖcιν, it seems doubtful that Pindar would have felt the need for a copula here. There are various reasons for thinking this:

1. As a general proposition, in a short statement like this the copula is superfluous. This applies especially to Pindar, an author who favours concision.
2. In Pindar short sentences (containing about six words or fewer) introduced by the particle δέ tend not to include a verb, and certainly not εἰμί without it having emphatic force. I list the following examples: *Ol.* 1.33–4 ἁμέραι δ' ἐπίλοιποι | μάρτυρες cοφώτατοι, 1.113 ἐπ' ἄλλοιcι δ' ἄλλοι μεγάλοι (text uncertain), 4.25 χεῖρες δὲ καὶ ἦτορ ἴcον, 8.59–60 τὸ διδάξαcθαι δέ τοι | εἰδότι ῥᾴτερον· ἄγνωμον δὲ τὸ μὴ προμαθεῖν, 13.47–8 ἔπεται δ' ἐν ἑκάcτῳ | μέτρον· νοῆcαι δὲ καιρὸc ἄριcτος; *Pyth.* 1.59 χάρμα δ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον νικαφορία πατέρος, 1.98–9 τὸ δὲ παθεῖν εὖ πρῶτον ἀέθλων· | εὖ δ' ἀκούειν δευτέρα μοῖρ', 2.56 τὸ πλουτεῖν δὲ cὺν τύχᾳ πότμου cοφίας ἄριcτον, 3.104–5 ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖαι πνοαί | ὑψιπετᾶν ἀνέμων, 9.76 ἀρεταὶ δ' αἰεὶ μεγάλαι πολύμυθοι; *Nem.* 1.25 τέχναι δ' ἑτέρων ἕτεραι, 1.54 εὐθὺc δ' ἀπήμων κραδία κᾶδοc ἀμφ' ἀλλότριον, 2.16–17 Ἀχάρναι δὲ παλαίφατον | εὐάνορες, 4.91 ἄλλοιcι δ' ἄλικεc ἄλλοι, 8.42 χρεῖαι δὲ παντοῖαι φίλων ἀνδρῶν, 8.45 κενεᾶν δ' ἐλπίδων χαῦνον τέλοc, 10.29–30 πᾶν δὲ τέλοc | ἐν τὶν ἔργων, 10.72 χαλεπὰ δ' ἔριc ἀνθρώποιc ὁμιλεῖν κρεccόνων; and *Isthm.* 7.43 δαίμων δ' ἄϊcoc.[14] In each of these examples the verb (normally the copula) must be supplied.
3. The only exceptions I have been able to find where Pindar employs εἰμί in such sentences are *Ol.* 7.53 ἦν δὲ κλέοc βαθύ and *Nem.* 1.10–11 ἔcτι δ' ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ | πανδοξίαc ἄκρον. In both the verb is emphatically placed at the beginning. Here it is ὄψον that is emphatic.
4. Pindar shows a marked preference for the Doric 3 pers. pl. form ἐντί. I find ten instances of ἐντί and only one of εἰcί in Pindar.[15] This tends to suggest that had Pindar used the copula here he would have been more likely to use ἐντί.

None of these stylistic observations is conclusive, but considered together I maintain that they make Vauvilliers's conjecture rather unlikely.

Instead, I suggest that φθονεροῖcιν probably started out life as a gloss on φθονέοντι,[16] and that the point the gloss sought to clarify was that it is a dative participle used indefinitely (the type of people who are envious). It might be objected that glossing φθονέοντι with a plural adjective like φθονεροῖc is unnatural, but in fact it would readily have conveyed the type of people indicated by the indefinite expression and it is easier to write φθονεροῖc than φθονερῷ τινι.

been unlikely to do so in Doric because of that dialect's avoidance of aphaeresis (cf. n. 11 above). Vauvilliers' reason for retracting his original suggestion seems to have been a lack of manuscript authority (perhaps an odd reason given the paucity of manuscripts transmitting the *Nemeans*), whereas with his second proposal he felt that he had 'obtenu le double succès et d'avoir corrigé le texte et de l'avoir conservé'.

[14] Different editors punctuate differently. I have taken the punctuation in Snell–Maehler (n. 4) as standard.

[15] 'Εντί at *Ol.* 9.104, *Pyth.* 4.139, 5.98, 9.39, *Nem.* 1.24, 6.45, 9.32, *Isthm.* 2.30, frr. 123c.2 and 223 S–M; εἰcί at *Pyth.* 5.116.

[16] On the unarticulated substantivized participle as a form of Pindaric brachyology, see Braswell's introduction to his commentary on *Pyth.* 4 ([n. 10], 32–3) and his note on *Pyth.* 4.180(c) ναιετάοντεc ('The use of a substantivized participle without the definite article is an archaic feature of Greek found in high poetry ...'). Further instances of the dative participle used in this way by Pindar include e.g. *Ol.* 10.90 (θνᾴcκοντι), *Pyth.* 10.67 (πειρῶντι) and *Nem.* 7.75 (νικῶντι).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000834 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A possible trace of the original might be found in the scholia. The scholiast on *Nem.* 8.35 (= Drachmann 3.143.28–144.4)[17] refers to τοῖc φθονεροῖc and οἱ φθονεροί, whereas the scholiast on *Nem.* 8.37 (= Drachmann 3.144.5–6) explains the apparent ellipse with the comment ἀπὸ τῶν φθονούντων ἐπὶ τὸν φθόνον μετήγαγε τὸν λόγον ('[Pindar] has transferred the subject from those who envy to envy itself'). It is possible, I suggest, that the reason for the scholiast's use of a participle (instead of writing ἀπὸ τῶν φθονερῶν) is that the text before him contained a participle and that the plural participle resulted from the scholiast correctly understanding φθονέοντι indefinitely.[18]

From φθονέοντι in 21 the subject of ἅπτεται in 22 is naturally supplied as φθονέων. The indefinite φθονέων is the opposite of the description of Hieron at *Pyth.* 3.71 (οὐ φθονέων ἀγαθοῖc), or of Damophilus at *Pyth.* 4.285 (οὐκ ἐρίζων ἀντία τοῖc ἀγαθοῖc). This also provides what most critics take for granted as present in *Nem.* 8 but which is actually only implied without being present, namely an express allegation that it was an envious person (Odysseus, perhaps, or the Danaans more generally) who brought about Ajax's downfall.

ἀλλὰ κελεύθοιc 35 (60)
ἁπλόαιc ζωᾶc ἐφαπτοίμαν, θανὼν ὡc παιcὶ κλέοc,
μὴ τὸ δύcφαμον, προcάψω. χρυcὸν εὔχονται, πεδίον δ' ἕτεροι
ἀπέραντον, ἐγὼ δ' ἀcτοῖc ἀδὼν καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι,
αἰνέων αἰνητά, μομφὰν δ' ἐπιcπείρων ἀλιτροῖc.

38. ἀδὼν B ἀδῶν D : ἀδὼν Tr.
καλύψαι Wackernagel : καλύψαιμ' BD

The singer explains that he wants to leave his children a good reputation after he has died. Some people, he says, pray for gold and others for unlimited land, but he prays to be pleasing to his fellow citizens by praising what should be praised and sowing censure on sinful things. In his Loeb Race translates the words καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι 'until I cover my limbs with earth'.[19] But καί does not mean 'until' and this seems a particularly unlikely prayer immediately after he has expressly wished to leave his children a good reputation after his death.

The transmitted text, καλύψαιμ', is certainly corrupt: elision at period-end is a contradiction in terms since what follows period-end is by definition not in synaphaea with what precedes it. In most texts Wackernagel's conjecture is adopted. I think that there are reasons for resisting this. The words καὶ χθονί might be taken with ἀcτοῖc, i.e. 'but I pray, having pleased my fellow citizens and country, to hide my bones ...', but this seems unnatural both from the perspective of word order and because καλύψαι (as opposed to, say, θάψαι) requires something like χθονί to explain that burial is meant. If καὶ χθονί is taken with γυῖα καλύψαι, this requires καί to be explained and to do so requires special pleading. Wackernagel's conjecture, while superficially attractive, actually creates more problems than it solves.[20]

I suspect that what Pindar actually wrote was ἀδεῖν ... καλύψαιc and that the infinitive and participle were switched because a scribe was confused by the Aeolic form of

[17] A.B. Drachmann, *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1903–27).
[18] If the point needs illustrating, one can see how a singular participle in the text might be discussed in the plural in the scholia from e.g. *Ol.* 5.7–8, where νικάcαc prompts discussion by the scholiast (on *Ol.* 5.16 [= Drachmann 1.143.13–14]) of οἱ νικῶντεc.
[19] W.H. Race, *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1997), 91.
[20] Neither Wackernagel, nor Henry (n. 8) in his commentary, discusses how καί functions if the former's conjecture is admitted to the text.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000834 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the participle. Once καλύψαιc had been corrupted to καλύψαιμ', the change from ἀδεῖν to ἀδὼν would have been an obvious 'correction'.[21] Ἐγὼ δ' ἀcτοῖc ἀδεῖν καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαιc gives the sense 'but I pray to please my fellow citizens even after hiding my limbs in the earth', the καί being taken with the participial phrase χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαιc.[22] This way Pindar's wish to leave his children a good reputation after his death is reinforced and the καί has its function restored.

Ealing, London NICHOLAS LANE
nick.lane@mishcon.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838814000834

[21] The reading ἀδῶν in D might have resulted from an original ἀδεῖν.
[22] For καί meaning 'even' modifying participles in Pindar, cf. *Isthm.* 4.31 ἔcτιν δ' ἀφάνεια τύχαc καὶ μαρναμένων and 8.60 ἐcλόν γε φῶτα καὶ φθίμενον ὕμνοιc θεᾶν διδόμεν. The latter is an apt parallel for both syntax and subject matter.

PERSAE LINES 270–1 AND MS LAMBETH 1203

In his recent edition of Aeschylus' *Persae*[1] Garvie prints the second strophe of the amoibaion

ὀτοτοτοῖ, μάταν
τὰ πολλὰ βέλεα παμμιγῆ 270
γᾶc ἀπ' Ἀcίδοc ἦλθεν, αἰαῖ,
δᾴαν Ἑλλάδα χώραν.

Ototoi! In vain did those many weapons, mixed together, come from the land of Asia – alas – to Greece, a hostile country.

In his apparatus on 270 and 271 Garvie reports ἦλθ' (or ἦλθεν) ἐπ' αἶαν δῖαν (or δίαν) from all the manuscripts and scholia except for Lambeth 1203 with δάιαν. In his commentary he says, 'δᾴαν, attested only in cod. Lambeth 1203 (according to Blomfield), gives excellent sense, and, when there are already three occurrences of the word in this *epirrhema*, one can hardly object to a fourth'.[2] He explains his rejection of αἶαν δῖαν because αἶαν χώραν is an awkward tautology, and the Homeric formulaic adjective δῖαν is unconvincing here, while West's Δίαν ('the land of Zeus') would be an allusion unlikely to be clear to the audience and with no obvious dramatic point.

I concur entirely with Garvie's stylistic judgement – indeed the repetition of such a thematic word is very much in keeping with the style of this amoibaion. The problem is with the supposed manuscript authority.

I have examined Lambeth 1203, by kind permission of the Lambeth Palace Librarian. It is relatively unusual in that it contains only *Persae*, and not the other plays of the Byzantine triad; *Persae* is bound together with Dionysius Periegetes, in a quite different hand. It was dated by Turyn[3] to the fourteenth or fifteenth century, but

[1] A.F. Garvie, *Aeschylus Persae with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 2009), 13–14.
[2] Garvie (n. 1), 152–3.
[3] A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of Aeschylus* (New York, 1943), 121.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000834 Published online by Cambridge University Press