*Classical Quarterly* 56.2 582–665 (2006) Printed in Great Britain 

# SHORTER NOTES

## 'SELF-CONSOLATION' IN THE *ILIAD*

*Malcolm Willcock: in memoriam*

It has long been recognized that the rhetorical structures known formally as *consolatio* and *exhortatio* display, from their earliest appearances in Greek literature, strongly formulaic patterning.[1] And it has also been apparent for a long time that illustrative myth, *paradeigma* or *exemplum*, has an important role to play within these structures.[2] *Paradeigma*, indeed, has been defined[3] as 'a myth introduced for exhortation or consolation'; and the author of that definition has also exemplified the working of exhortation thus: 'you must do this, because X, who was in more or less the same situation as you, and a more significant person, did it'.[4] I would add that consolation and exhortation are not, in practice, quite so strictly distinguished as such generalizing remarks might suggest. Thus the most ancient and primeval instance of the pattern in question, a work-song of women on Lesbos uttered while they ground corn at the mill-stone, runs:

> ἄλει μύλα ἄλει·
> καὶ γὰρ Πιττακὸς ἄλει
> μεγάλας Μυτιλήνας βασιλεύων.[5]
>
> Grind, mill, grind:
> Even Pittacus used to grind,
> The ruler of great Mytilene,

to quote the translation by M. L. West. It would be pedantic to ask whether the hard-working women were consoling themselves for, or exhorting themselves to, their labour with the reflection that even king Pittacus had to toil.

[1] See in particular R. Kassel, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur*, Zetemata 18 (Munich, 1958).

[2] See now the full account in M. Alden, *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad* (Oxford, 2000).

[3] By M. M. Willcock, 'Paradeigmata in the *Iliad*', *CQ* 14 (1964), 140–52.

[4] Willcock (n. 3), 142. For the implication 'a more significant person' cf. e.g. Σ*T Il.* 5.392–4 (2.62 Erbse) [Διώνη] διὰ μειζόνων προσώπων παρεμυθήσατο τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ('consoled': *LSJ* s.v. 2) or Prop. 2.8.39 *inferior* (sc. to Achilles) *multo cum sim vel matre vel armis* (at the end of an *exemplum*). Cf. P. Heyworth, *Otto Klemperer: His Life and Times* (Cambridge, 1996), 2.337, quoting the great conductor's stoical attitude to the fate of his compositions: 'much greater men than myself have had to show even more patience'.

[5] *Carm. Pop.* 869, cited by Fraenkel as mentioned below (n. 13); West's translation is to be found in his *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, 1993), 195. 'The scansion of ' the verb in line 2 'depends on whether it is pres. or imperf.', according to D. A.Campbell ad loc. (*Greek Lyric Poetry*: *A Selection* [London, 1967], 448). In fact, the verb must be 'imperf.', as most scholars have seen, not least in order to fit the logic of the pattern this article is analysing: 'you must do X (sc. now): even Y did X (sc. in the past)'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000553 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It is also well known that the sort of pattern we are looking at occurs as early as the *Iliad*: Achilles' citation of the story of Niobe to Priam at *Il.* 24.601–19 in order to encourage him to eat is probably the most familiar case.[6] There too exhortation is mingled with consolation ('even Niobe ate, though, unlike you, she had lost *all* her children') in the way suggested above. The two passages I wish to discuss now also exemplify what I have been talking about. But, for whatever reason, their careful and idiomatic structuring has been overlooked by Iliadic scholars, even the contributors to the monumental Cambridge commentary.[7]

The first passage I shall be citing is the more complex and elaborate. It is what has been referred to as Agamemnon's *apologia* (*Il.* 19.78–144), delivered to the assembled Greek forces. The king explains how he came to quarrel with Achilles: it was because (vv. 91–3) Ate infatuated him. Nor is Agamemnon Ate's only victim: even Zeus was once seized by this baleful force (vv. 94–6).[8]

When Agamemnon says of Ate and Zeus *κατὰ δ' οὖν ἕτερόν γε πέδησε* (94) he is reflecting perhaps the most common *topos* of all in the literature of consolation: 'you are not the only one to suffer thus'. Compare, to quote but one out of numerous examples,[9] the Chorus' words to Sophocles' Electra: *οὗτοι σοὶ μούναι, / τέκνον, ἄχος ἐφάνη βροτῶν* (153–4). The reason why commentators on the Iliadic passage have not seen this is presumably that the epic instance is somewhat disguised by being addressed, as it were, by Agamemnon to himself rather than, as usual, to someone else.[10] But the process of what we might call *self-consolation* is not without parallel. The *Iliad* itself supplies a further instance at 18.117–26, where Achilles, as we shall shortly see in greater detail, consoles himself and exhorts himself to action by reflecting that even Heracles, greatest of heroes and dearest to Zeus of the sons he had begotten, had finally to die. And I have elsewhere[11] drawn attention to a passage from Attic tragedy where there is a similar instance of self-consolation involving a mythical *exemplum*: Sophocles' Antigone compares herself to Niobe (vv. 823–33).

[6] See Willcock (n. 4), and now the detailed analysis by C. Schmitz, ' "Denn auch Niobe . . . ": Die Bedeutung der Niobe-Erzählung in Achills Rede (*Ω* 599–620)' *Hermes* 129 (2001), 145–56.

[7] Esp. M. W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. V, Books 17–20* (Cambridge, 1991).

[8] On the meaning of *ate* here see most recently Alden (n. 2), 200, n. 54.

[9] For full lists see Kassel (n. 1), 6 and 70–1, and Harder on Eur. *Cresph.* fr. 72 Austin = fr. 454 Kannicht *οὐκ ἐμοὶ μόνῃ βροτῶν / . . . ἀλλὰ μυρίαι.* The precise point of *κατὰ δ' οὖν ἕτερόν γε πέδησεν* in *Il.* 19.94 has not generally been grasped by commentators on, or translators of, the *Iliad* in modern times, but cf. *Σ* bT ad loc. (4.598 Erbse) *τὸν ἕνα τῶν ἐριζόντων ἢ οὐκ ἐμὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερον* and Erbse's own laconic observation (p. 597): '*voce ἕτερον Iovem significat poeta*'. The reference is confirmed by the *ring-composition* (cf. Soph. *Ant.* 949 ~ 986) which operates in this speech, as so often in consolation or exhortation (see, e.g., D. Lohmann, *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* [Berlin, 1970], Index, 299): *ὣς καὶ ἐγών* (134) immediately after the narrative's end chimes with *κατὰ . . . ἕτερόν γε πέδησεν* immediately before its beginning ('I am not alone' ~ 'I as well'). For the required 'perfect' sense of the aorist in *ἕτερον πέδησε* ('at least one other than I *has been* enslaved') compare Eur. fr. 454 Kannicht (cited above for the general consolatory pattern) *μυρίαι / τὸν αὐτὸν ἐξήντλησαν ὡς ἐγὼ βίον* where the verb is equivalent to the genuine perfect in Eur. fr. 1077.1 *πέπονθας οἷα χἄτεροι πολλοὶ βροτῶν.*

[10] Another reason for failure to detect the *topos* is that it here assumes the positive form 'another than I/you has suffered' rather than the more familiar negative form 'you are not the only one to suffer'. For the positive version compare Eur. fr. 1077.1 Kannicht as cited n. 9, *πέπονθας οἷα χἄτεροι πολλοὶ βροτῶν* and the implications of Soph. *El.* 290 *ἄλλος γ' οὔτις ἐν πένθει βροτῶν*; and *Phil.* 680 *ἄλλον δ' οὔτιν' ἔγωγ' οἶδα κλύων οὐδ' ἐσιδὼν μοίραι τοῦδ' ἐχθίονι συντυχόντα θνατῶν*. For *combination* of negative and positive cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 834–5 *οὐ σοὶ τάδ', ὦναξ, ἦλθε δὴ μόνωι κακά, / πολλῶν μετ' ἄλλων δ' ὤλεσας κεδνὸν λέχος.*

[11] See my article 'Sophocles' *Antigone* 823ff. as a specimen of "mythological hyperbole" ', *Hermes* 113 (1985), 247–9. For a comic equivalent of the speaker who takes upon himself the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000553 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the Sophoclean passage, the reason the heroine has to console herself rather than, in the more familiar manner, receive consolation from the Chorus, is that (as I have explained) the poet wishes to maintain the tragedy's pattern of an utterly isolated heroine, whose suffering is not even mitigated by choral remarks of sympathy. In the case of Agamemnon too we can find a motive for his resort to self-consolation. As he himself remarks (vv. 85–6), there is a distinct lack of sympathizers to hand: *πολλάκι δή μοι τοῦτον Ἀχαιοὶ μῦθον ἔειπον, / καί τέ με νεικείεσκον*. The vivid picture of Odysseus and Diomedes, both *limping* to the assembly because their wounds are still paining them (vv. 47–9), reinforces this absence of colleagues ready to console.

But Agamemnon, after a nod to the consolatory *topos* mentioned above, embarks on a full-scale and formal oration.[12] He begins *καὶ γὰρ δή νύ ποτε Ζῆν' ἄσατο* (95). Of the double particle *καὶ γάρ* in general it has been observed[13] that 'these are the words used, from very ancient times, for attaching the *παράδειγμα* to the sentence which is to be illustrated by it, a sentence consisting . . . of an exhortation', and that following 'a general maxim or a piece of advice, a *παραίνεσις*, served from the earliest period of Greek literature to introduce a precedent that was to prove the validity of the maxim or to strengthen the advice'. From the *Iliad* alone we can cite *νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα δόρπου. / καὶ γάρ τ' ἠΰκομος Νιόβη ἐμνήσατο σίτου* (*Il.* 24.601–2) and from the self-consolation of Achilles referred to above *κῆρα δ' ἐγὼ τότε δέξομαι, ὁππότε κεν δὴ / Ζεὺς ἐθέλῃ τελέσαι ἠδ' ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι. / οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίη Ἡρακλῆος φύγε κῆρα* (18.115–17: it has already been observed that 'frequently *οὐδὲ γάρ* has the same function'[14] as *καὶ γάρ*).

Agamemnon continues his *apologia* with these words: (*Ζεύς*) . . . *τόν περ ἄριστον / ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ θεῶν φασ' ἔμμεναι* (95–6). With the particles *καὶ γάρ* behind us we can be said to have entered the formal *exemplum* or *παράδειγμα*, so we may observe that, as I have pointed out elsewhere,[15] superlatives such as *ἄριστον* are perfectly idiomatic in such a context. Note, for instance, *ὅς περ φίλτατος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι* of Heracles at *Il.* 18.118. See also Sappho fr. 16.6–7 *Ἐλένα* [*τὸ*]*ν ἄνδρα / τὸν* [*πανάρ*]*ιστον καλλ*[*ίποι*]*σ' κτλ.* This is very much in keeping with the logic of the *consolatio* or *exhortatio*, which cites specific cases of individuals who were superlative in one sphere or another to ram home its point: 'X, who was in more or less the same situation as you, and a more significant person', to repeat a citation from near the beginning of this note (see above n. 4).

The phrasing of the superlative in the present context may seem eccentric (*φασ' . . . ἔμμεναι*): 'they say that Zeus is best'; but here too an underlying pattern may be at work, especially if we bear in mind the preceding *ποτε* (in *ποτε Ζῆν' ἄσατο*). It has

burden of a rhetorical structure usually associated with the chorus see C. Macleod, 'The comic encomium and Aristophanes' *Clouds* 1201–1211', *Phoenix* 11 (1981), 143–5 = *Collected Essays*, ed. with preface by O. Taplin (Oxford, 1983), 49–51.

[12] On which see my remarks in the article 'Agamemnon's apology and the unity of the *Iliad*', *CQ* 45 (1995), 1–8.

[13] The two quotations which follow come from Fraenkel's commentary on Aesch. *Ag.* 1040 and his *Horace* (Oxford, 1956), 185–6 respectively. *Il.* 19.95 is the first example listed by Fraenkel in his commentary. Note, however, that the combination *καὶ νύ ποτε* is distinctly rare: see West on Hes. *Theog.* 22.

[14] Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1040 (cf. on ibid. 1222). Cf. my 'Homer and Dionysus', *Eikasmos* (Quaderni Bolognesi di filologia classica) 11 (2000), 15–27, esp. 18, n. 16.

[15] See Davies (n. 11), 249, and cf. *Hermes* 114 (1986), 262, n. 23. For a fine Latin example see Catull. 68.136–40 (self-consolation again): *rara verecundae furta feremus herae / . . . saepe etiam* ***Iuno, maxima caelicolum,*** */ coniugis in culpa flagrantem contudit iram / noscens* ***omnivoli plurima furta Iovis***.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000553 Published online by Cambridge University Press

been pointed out[16] just how frequent is the phrase *φασιν . . . ποτε vel sim.* in the introduction of the narrative of an *exemplum* (for the Latin equivalent see e.g. Catull. 64.212 *namque ferunt olim*). Although *φασ' . . . ἔμμεναι* is not identical with this—it does not actually lead into the narrative content of the *exemplum*—an echo of that formula of introduction may be intended.

The very next words of Agamemnon's speech are *ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ τὸν / Ἥρη θῆλυς ἐοῦσα δολοφροσύνηις ἀπάτησεν* (96–7). The logic of this stretch of the argument is that *Zeus too*, or *even Zeus*, mightiest of the gods, was taken in by the deceits of Hera.[17] The closest parallel comes, again, from Achilles' speech of self-consolation: *ἀλλά ἑ μοῖρα δάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλέος χόλος Ἥρης* ( 18.119): Heracles, dearest to Zeus of heroes, was subdued by fate and the anger of Hera.[18] Compare also Alcaeus fr. 38[A] which, again, combines consolation ('we all have to die') and exhortation ('let's drink to forget the fact'): after the idiomatic introductory particles and superlative (*καὶ γὰρ Σίσυφος . . . ἀνδρῶν πλεῖστα νοησάμενος*) we encounter the equivalent of *ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ τόν* with the words *ἀλλὰ καὶ πολύιδρις ἔων* ('cunning though he was, even he had to die'). The passage is inspired by Hes. *Theog.* 614–16 which concludes a section (narrating Prometheus' crimes and punishment) that is neither consolation nor exhortation but can be classed as paraenetic (a cautionary tale) and certainly functions as *exemplum* (note *καὶ γάρ* at its beginning [535]). Here too, idiomatic particles (*οὐδὲ γὰρ Ἰαπετιονίδης ἀκάκητα Προμηθεύς*) lead into the equivalent of the *Iliad*'s *ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ τόν* with the words (*τοῖό γ' ὑπεξήλυξε βαρὺν χόλον*) *ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀνάγκης / καὶ πολύιδριν ἔοντα μέγας κατὰ δεσμὸς ἐρύκει*. For the *Iliad*'s pattern of adversative (*ἀλλ'*) particle followed by *ἄρα* at the relevant stage of the argument compare also *ἦ δ' ἄρα σίτου μνήσατ'* from the Niobe paradigm (24.613).[19]

The main difference between the self-consolations of Agamemnon and Achilles, speeches which have hitherto proved fertile in mutually supporting parallels, is that the former is so much more elaborate and contains an *exemplum* which turns into a full-scale *παρέκβασις* or digression. It is only at the end of this that Agamemnon returns to the framework of his argument and applies its specific case to his own

[16] Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1040–1. For a further Iliadic example cf. 4.374–5 (Agamemnon to Diomedes on the topic of Tydeus) *οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε / ἤντησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον· περὶ δ' ἄλλων φασί γενέσθαι*, where the verb of speaking is combined with the equivalent of a superlative in a manner similar to *Il.* 19.95–6. For the preceding negatives in an *exemplum* cf. Soph. *Phil.* 676–7 *λόγωι μὲν ἐξήκουσ', ὄπωπα δ' οὐ μάλα / . . . ποτε* ~ 680 *ἄλλον δ' οὔτιν' ἔγωγ' οἶδα κλυὼν οὐδ' ἐσιδών*.

[17] The idea 'Zeus too / even Zeus' is particularly common in the context of his falling in love: see Moschus, *Europa* 76 *καὶ Ζῆνα* with Bühler's commentary ad loc. and D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1987), 132. Amusing proof of how soon *καὶ γάρ* (or its equivalent) and this type of *καί* both became stereotyped is Theogn. 1345–6 *ἐπεί ποτε καὶ Γανυμήδους / ἥρατο καὶ* (*τοὶ* Peek *ap.* Young's Teubner) *Κρονίδης*. The *ποτε* here is inappropriately taken to be an example of the 'nostalgic' use of the word by R. Renehan, *Studies in Greek Texts*, *Hypomnemata* 43 (1976), 41f., followed by M. Vetta (ed.), *Theognis. Elegiarum liber secundus* (Rome, 1980), ad loc. Rather, *ἐπεὶ καί* = *καὶ γάρ*, and *ποτε* is idiomatic in such contexts. See, apart from *Il.* 19.95 cited above in the text, such instances as *Il.* 1.260 *ἤδη γάρ ποτ' ἐγὼ καὶ ἀρείοσιν . . . ὡμίλησα* and Aesch. *Ag.* 1040–1 *καὶ παῖδα γάρ τοί φασιν Ἀλκμήνης ποτέ / πραθέντα τλῆναι δουλίας μάζης θιγεῖν* with Fraenkel ad loc. For a Latin example cf. Catull. 68.138 *saepe* ***etiam*** *Iuno* from the self-consolation cited in full above, n. 15.

[18] For the idea 'Heracles too / even Heracles' here implicit see *IG* 14.1806 = 12.2.384.7–8 *καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἀπέθανε* and R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book 1* (Oxford, 1970), on 1.28.7 ('it was a commonplace in consolatory literature to remark that even the greatest men have died') and 2.14 (Oxford, 1978, p. 224).

[19] For the required nuance behind *ἄρα* in these passages see Denniston, *GP* (Oxford, 1954[2]), 36 and 44 ('as it subsequently transpired', 'after all').

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000553 Published online by Cambridge University Press

experience: ὣς καὶ ἐγών . . . / . . . / οὐ δυνάμην λελαθέσθ' Ἄτης , ἣι πρῶτον ἀάσθην (134–6). 'So *I too* (like Zeus) could not escape the attentions of Ate.' Achilles' argumentation, being so much more concise, reaches this conclusion that much more speedily: ὣς καὶ ἐγών . . . / κείσομ' ἐπεί κε θάνω ( 18.120–1). 'So *I too* (like Heracles) shall have to die.'[20] Compare too καὶ νῶϊ in the Niobe paradigm (*Il.* 24.618).

If we look a little more carefully at this last feature, we shall discover with what art the poet has organized his material in *Iliad* 19. Technically speaking, the point of comparison entailed by ὣς καὶ ἐγών resides in the two frequentative verbs: στενάχεσχ' (132) ~ ὀλέεσκεν (135). When we try to tease out the point, we arrive at something like the following: 'just as Zeus successively *kept on groaning* **over Ate's action** (τήν) when he saw Heracles having to carry out labours for Eurystheus; so Agamemnon too, when Hector *kept on slaying* Greeks, **could not forget how Ate had deluded him**.' The artificially contrived parallelism may be compared to the (much simpler) effect at *Il.* 18.114ff., which is achieved merely by repeating one, key, word: 'just as μοῖρα (119) and Hera's anger brought about the death of Heracles; so Achilles too will die if a like μοῖρα (120) is to be his'. The contrived parallelism of the Niobe paradigm is only a little more complex: ἡ δ' ἄρα σίτου μνήσατ' (24.613) ~ καὶ νῶϊ μεδώμεθα . . . / σίτου (24.618). For the parallels thus achieved between *comparans* and *comparandum* we may cite the technique whereby words or phrases are significantly repeated in similes: so, for instance, *Il.* 23.222 and 224 ὡς δὲ πατὴρ οὗ παιδὸς ὀδύρεται ὀστέα καίων / . . . / ὣς Ἀχιλεὺς ἑτάροιο ὀδύρετο ὀστέα καίων.

Both heroes then, as it were, turn from self-consolation to self-exhortation. Achilles prays νῦν δὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀροίμην (18.121) and prepares to rush into battle. Agamemnon says (137–8) ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀασάμην καί μευ φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς, / ἄψ ἐθέλω ἀρέσαι, δόμεναί τ' ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα.

The patterns traced in the two Iliadic speeches which we have been examining may seem relatively trivial and insignificant. But they can be regarded as smaller patterns within larger ones. An expert on ancient Egyptian tales[21] has recently suggested that 'the telling and retelling of misfortune enable people to endure it', and that there is a certain sense in which some of these tales are about 'the value of telling tales'. We see in Homer's epic two central heroes attempting to make sense of their sufferings by setting them in a wider context and imposing a pattern upon them. And the end of each tale issues in a call to activity: consolation becomes exhortation.

## APPENDIX

In the build-up to the first mention of Ate in *Iliad* 19, there is an almost hyperbolic stress on her power (90–1): θεὸς διὰ πάντα τελευτᾶι, / πρέσβα Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἄτη, ἣ πάντας ἀᾶται (the last phrase is repeated to form the end of 129). In view of what has been said above, it might be thought that πᾶς in these lines is equivalent to e.g. μυρίος or πολύς in Eur. fr. 454.2–3 μυρίαι / τὸν αὐτὸν ἐξήντλησαν ὡς ἐγὼ βίον and 1077.1 Kannicht πέπονθας οἷα χἄτεροι πολλοὶ βροτῶν and anticipates ἕτερον in 94. But I think there is a subtler point.

In regular consolations, the power over men of the gods in general and Zeus in particular (e.g. *Od.* 4.237 δύναται γὰρ ἅπαντα or Soph. *El.* 175 ἐφορᾶι πάντα καὶ

[20] The ὣς καὶ ἐγών formula here has some affinities with the οὕτω καὶ σύ formula used to conclude fables: see my observations in 'Homer and the Fable', *Prometheus* 27 (2001), 200, and n. 29.

[21] R. B. Parkinson, *The Tale of Sinuhe and Other Ancient Egyptian Poems 1940–1640 B.C.* (Oxford, 1997), 90.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000553 Published online by Cambridge University Press

κρατύνει) is often stressed.[22] There is a pleasing irony, then, to prefacing the account of how almighty Zeus himself was bamboozled and had the tables turned on him, with a statement of *Ate's power*. (A similar effect of humour obtains in the string of consolations which Dione addresses to Aphrodite at *Il.* 5.385ff., where one goddess consoles another with stories of how gods (as opposed to men) have suffered at the hands of men (as opposed to gods).[23] In another consolatory context, we find Zeus' power referred to thus: ὁ πάντα κραίνων . . . Κρονίδας (Soph. *Trach.* 127), where word-play between participle and patronymic has been suspected.[24] The effect of Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἄτη, ἣ πάντας ἀᾶται would be very similar.

*St John's College, Oxford* MALCOLM DAVIES
Malcolm.davies@sjc.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000553

[22] See further M. Davies, *Sophocles: Trachiniae* (Oxford, 1991), on line 127. The phrasing in the description of Ate's power in *Iliad* 19 is remarkably similar to passages in Greek literature which describe *Zeus'* power: see W. Kiefner, *Der religiöse Allbegriff des Aischylos*, Spudasmata 5 (Olms,1965), 44–5.

[23] See Kassel (n. 1), 71, n. 1: 'die Trostparänese vorausgesetzte Verhältnis Götter-Menschen geradezu umgekehrt'.

[24] See my commentary ad loc. (n. 22).

# 'TELEBOES' AND OTHERS: ON SOME MISTAKEN PROPER NAMES

In *HSCP* 95 (1993), 154 I noted that the wrong form Τηλεβόες (instead of the correct one, which obviously is Τηλεβόαι) is given as a supplement to Pind. fr. 52s.10 in the canonical edition of Pindar's *Fragmenta* by Snell and Maehler, firstly in the fourth revised reprint (Leipzig, 1975), 217, in the *Addenda ad apparatum,* 'adde Τηλεβόες ἀπ]ήλασαν Sn., sc. βόας?' and then again in the fifth revised reprint, the first by Maehler alone (Leipzig, 1989), 62, in the apparatus itself. I wished to mention the mistake, not so much for the sake of hunting errors, although that aim is perhaps not unworthy as such, but rather in order to give an example to future editors of how an elementary mistake may remain unnoticed by all the numerous reviewers of the edition—all too numerous indeed—and even be expressly approved by some, as for instance by L. Lehnus, *Paideia* 31 (1976), 194, and at last may be inherited by other editors, as for instance by G. Bona, *Pindaro, i Peani* (Cuneo, 1988), 280.

As a result of my note, the mistake has finally been corrected by I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans* (Oxford, 2001), 424, app. 10 'Τηλεβόαι ἀπ]ήλασαν Snell (cf. Pavese (1993), 154; sc. βόας?)'. Nevertheless this obscures the facts in favour of Snell, since Snell's supplement is and remains Τηλεβόες, while Τηλεβόαι is my correction. The facts are better represented as 'Τηλεβόες (sic) ἀπ]ήλασαν Snell, Τηλεβόαι corr. Pavese'. I omit Snell's two other mistakes, which I pointed out in the same note.

I found the same remarkable mistake in the well-known edition of Vergil by R. Sabbadini, *Vergili Maronis Opera*, vol. 2, *Aeneis* (Rome, 1937$^2$) 465, in the *Index nominum:* there *Teleboes* (instead of *Teleboae* ) is given as the lemma of the genitive Verg. *Aen.* 7.735 *Teleboum,* thus confusing the first declension with the third.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000553 Published online by Cambridge University Press