CrossMark

to provide a plausible object for ἴcχει.[16] Whereas ῥόμβοc conveys the wrong sort of movement and a sound which eagles do not make, ῥοῖβδοc denotes precisely the right movement and noise to describe the attack which the fox fends off. What Pindar is referring to is the moment at which the eagle strikes, as it adjusts its wings with a flutter and folds them so that it can tear into the victim with its beak and talons while avoiding damage to its wings. By reading ῥοῖβδον a noun is introduced which aptly describes the sound and motion of an eagle swooping to attack the fox, and which avoids the problematic manuscript reading. Pindar uses the word ῥοῖζοc,[17] and there is no reason why he should not have used ῥοῖβδοc too.[18] ΠΟΜΒΟΝ (or Attic ΠΥ̓ΜΒΟΝ) and ΠΟΙΒΔΟΝ look and sound similar enough to have been confounded by a scribe.[19]

Ealing, London NICHOLAS LANE
njglane@yahoo.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838820000646

TEXTUAL NOTES ON PINDAR'S ELEVENTH *NEMEAN**

I

εἰ δέ τις ὄλβον ἔχων μορφᾷ παραμεύσεται ἄλλους,
ἔν τ' ἀέθλοισιν ἀριστεύων ἐπέδειξεν βίαν,
θνατὰ μεμνάσθω περιστέλλων μέλη,
καὶ τελευτὰν ἁπάντων γᾶν ἐπιεσσόμενος.
ἐν λόγοις δ' ἀστῶν ἀγαθοῖσί νιν αἰνεῖσθαι χρεὼν
καὶ μελιγδούποισι δαιδαλθέντα μελίζειν ἀοιδαῖς.[1]

κύμβαχον δέμας· (of Oenone throwing herself from the towers of Troy in grief); Lucill. *Anth. Pal.* 11.106.3–4 καὶ τάχ' ἂν ἐρροίζητο δι' αἰθέρος, εἰ μὴ ἀράχνῃ | τοὺς πόδας ἐμπλεχθεὶς ὕπτιος ἐκρέματο (of Chaeremon floating in the air in an accidental ὑπτιασμός).

[16] As the instances of ῥοῖβδοc, ῥοίζημα and ῥοῖζοc cited in n. 15 (of birds rending each other with their talons [Soph. *Ant.* 1103–4], agitating the air [Ar. *Av.* 1182–3] and even shaking a ship's sails [Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.1253]) show.

[17] Lobel's conjecture at *Dith.* 4(a).7 Maehler, where the papyrus preserves]οῖζον. van der Weiden (n. 10), 167 (on *Dith.* 4[a].7 Maehler, ῥ]οῖζον ..[) comments: 'in this context, probably of a fight between Hector and a Greek, ῥοῖζοc is best interpreted as the whirring sound of an arrow (cf. *Il.* 16, 361 [sc. cκέπτετ' ὀϊcτῶν τε ῥοῖζον καὶ δοῦπον ἀκόντων]), a javelin etc'. The swoop of an eagle could be described in terms similar to a whirring arrow, which would be a reason for considering ῥοῖζον as a possible alternative correction here. However, I suspect that it would have been much less likely than ῥοῖβδον to become corrupted to ῥόμβον.

[18] The appearance of the cognate ῥοίβδηcιc within a choral lyric passage of Euripides (*IA* 1086) provides support for this.

[19] I am obliged to Roger Dawe, James Diggle and David Kovacs for commenting on an initial draft of this note, as well as to *CQ*'s anonymous referee for salutary criticisms of the final draft.

* I am grateful to Professor David Kovacs and to *CQ*'s anonymous referee for helpful comments on a draft of these notes.

[1] The text of *Nem.* 11 printed in these notes is that of W.B. Henry, *Pindar's Nemeans: A Selection* (Leipzig, 2005), 19–21. Otherwise, citations of Pindar are from B. Snell and H. Maehler, *Pindarus*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1987[8]–9).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000658 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Loeb translates lines 15–16 'let him remember that mortal are the limbs he clothes and that earth is the last garment of all he will wear'.[2] It is debatable whether τελευτάν is an adverbial accusative with ἁπάντων added as a qualifying genitive,[3] as it seems more natural to take the phrase as a simple apposition to γᾶν.[4] But there is a real difficulty in that τελευτὰν ἁπάντων could be taken to indicate that death is 'the end of everything' (or 'of all men') and that contradicts indications elsewhere in Pindar that death is not, or at least not quite, the end.[5]

It is a central concern of epinician poetry that death should not result in ἀρετά being forgotten.[6] Praise and song are the best antidotes and thus in lines 17–18 Pindar advocates the need for praise from one's fellow citizens and celebration in song. Phonetic equivalence might have caused a scribe to write ἁπάντων for ἄφαντον, and if so the person in question is at risk of putting on the earth as 'an obscure end' (in apposition to γᾶν).[7] The danger of a τελευτὰ ἄφαντος provides a suitable motivation for the reflection on the need for praise and song (17–18).[8]

II

ἀλλὰ βροτῶν τὸν μὲν κενεόφρονες αὖχαι
ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἔβαλον, τὸν δ' αὖ καταμεμφθέντ' ἄγαν 30
ἰσχὺν οἰκείων παρέσφαλεν καλῶν
χειρὸς ἕλκων ὀπίσσω θυμὸς ἄτολμος ἐών.

[2] W.H. Race, *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1997), 127.

[3] So e.g. C.A.M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge, 1899[2]), 138 (on 16, τελευτάν); J.B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London and New York, 1890), 222 (on 15); Henry (n. 1), 126 (on 16, τελευτὰν ἁπάντων). E.B. Clapp, 'Pindar's accusative constructions', *TAPhA* 32 (1901), 16–42, at 35 treats this instance as an adverbial accusative where the apposition is still felt.

[4] So W.J. Verdenius, *Commentaries on Pindar*, 2 vols. (Leiden / New York / Copenhagen / Cologne, 1987–8), 2.103–4 (on 16, τελευτάν), citing *Isthm.* 3.7 as an example of such 'emphatic' nominal apposition. To that instance may be added *Pyth.* 9.23–5 τὸν σύγκοιτον γλυκύν | … | ὕπνον, *Nem.* 1.70 ἡσυχίαν καμάτων μεγάλων ποινὰν … ἐξαίρετον and *Isthm.* 8.1–4 λύτρον εὔδοξον καμάτων | … | κῶμον.

[5] Cf. especially H. Lloyd-Jones, 'Pindar and the after-life', in O. Reverdin and B. Grange (edd.), *Pindare* (*Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique* 31) (Geneva, 1985), 245–83 (= *The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones: Greek Epic, Lyric and Tragedy* [Oxford, 1990], 80–105, with an addendum at 105–9).

[6] For song conferring immortality in Pindar, cf. Verdenius (n. 4), 1.51 (on 11, ζωθάλμιος) and add to his examples *Ol.* 11.4–6, 6.56–7, *Pyth.* 1.92–4, 3.110–15, 5.46–9, *Isthm.* 2.28–9, 5.24–8, 8.56a–8 and fr. 121 Maehler; for discussion, cf. G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* (rev. ed., Baltimore and London, 1999), ch. 10; B. Currie, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford, 2005), 344–405, especially 345–8 and 403–5; and A.C. Sigelman, *Pindar's Poetics of Immortality* (Cambridge, 2016).

[7] Pindar uses ἄφαντος three times elsewhere (*Ol.* 1.46, *Pyth.* 11.30, *Nem.* 8.34). For the meaning 'obscure', cf. P.J. Finglass, *Pindar: Pythian Eleven* (Cambridge, 2007), 101 (on 30, ἄφαντον). For the association of Ἀΐδας and ἰδεῖν, cf. G.A. Gazis, *Homer and the Poetics of Hades* (Oxford, 2018), 36–40. Pindar describes Tartarus as ἀφανής at fr. 207 Maehler, perhaps with the same association of death and invisibility in mind.

[8] This recurring Pindaric motif is sometimes joined with approbation of leaving a good reputation for one's offspring: cf. e.g. *Ol.* 5.22–3, 10.91–6, *Pyth.* 11.55–8, *Nem.* 7.98–101, 8.35–9, *Isthm.* 6.10–16. On the close link between lines 15–16 and 17–18, highlighted by δέ (17), cf. Verdenius (n. 4), 2.103 and 2.104 (nn. on 15, θνατά and on 17, δέ).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000658 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The text of lines 31–2 is suspicious for the following reasons:

1. While it does not provoke scholarly comment, ἰcχύν (31) needs, but lacks, a qualifier to make it clear that the man in question doubts *his own* strength. Most pass over this, quietly supplying ἑάν or ἑαυτοῦ.[9]
2. ἐών (32) is also problematic. θυμὸc ἄτολμοc already governs one strong participle, ἕλκων (32), and ἐών dilutes its impact. The expression is arguably stronger without ἐών and is weakened by the apparent afterthought of the additional participle 'being'.
3. Normally there would be nothing amiss about describing καλά achieved abroad as οἰκεῖα in the sense 'one's own'.[10] However, the obvious connection of οἰκεῖοc with οἶκοc makes its application to the underachievement of a stay-at-home somewhat unfortunate.

These problems indicate corruption. Better sense can be achieved at the slight cost of writing:

τὸν δ' αὖ καταμεμφθέντ' ἄγαν
ἰcχὺν οἰκείαν παρέσφαλεν καλῶν
χειρὸc ἕλκων ὀπίccω θυμὸc ἄτολμοc ἐῶν.

I translate: 'But by a faint heart, that drags him back by the hand, a man who doubts his own strength is deprived of the achievements that are *his*.' The man doubts his own strength, as one would expect. With the breathing mark and accent altered, the participle becomes a possessive that gains in rhetorical strength by separation from the noun it modifies.[11] The phrase ἰcχὺν οἰκείαν is also particularly apt to describe the strength of someone who does not prove it abroad. οἰκείαν could easily have become corrupted to οἰκείων by attraction into the case of καλῶν beneath ἀγαθῶν (30) and above ἕλκων (32).[12]

III

ἀρχαῖαι δ' ἀρεταί
ἀμφέροντ' ἀλλαccόμεναι γενεαῖc ἀνδρῶν cθένοc·
ἐν cχερῷ δ' οὔτ' ὢν μέλαιναι καρπὸν ἔδωκαν ἄρουραι,
δένδρεά τ' οὐκ ἐθέλει πάσαις ἐτέων περόδοις
ἀλλ' ἐναμείβοντι.

[9] F. Gedike, *Pindari carmina selecta cum scholiis selectis suisque notis* (Berlin, 1786), 259 (on 40 [= 30]) is an exception: 'τὸν δ' αὖ, καταμεμφθέντ' ἄγαν ἰcχὺν (sc. ἑαυτοῦ)'.

[10] Cf. LSJ s.v. οἰκεῖοc III. This is the only sense in which Pindar seems to use this adjective: cf. W.J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969), 375 s.v. οἰκεῖοc (citing three instances including the present one).

[11] For similar separation of possessive adjectives from their noun, cf. e.g. *Isthm.* 8.28–9 ἄλοχον εὐειδέα θέλων ἑκάτεροc | ἐὰν ἔμμεν (another example where the separation and position of noun and adjective are emphatic), *Ol.* 9.112 Αἶαν, τεόν τ' ἐν δαιτί, Ἰλιάδα, νικῶν ἐπεcτεφάνωcε βωμόν, *Isthm.* 1.58–9 Πρωτεῖλα, τὸ τεὸν δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀχαιῶν | ἐν Φυλάκᾳ τέμενοc cυμβάλλομαι, 6.33–5 cφετέρας δ' οὐ φείcατο | χερcὶν βαρυφθόγγοιο νευρᾶc | Ἡρακλεής, 6.42–3 εἴ ποτ' ἐμᾶν, ὦ Ζεῦ πάτερ, | θυμῷ θέλων ἀρᾶν ἄκουcαc.

[12] As *CQ*'s anonymous referee points out, the Alexandrian colometry would have been more conducive to the corruption envisaged with all three words standing second in line.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000658 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Loeb translates lines 37–8 ‘The talents of ancient time produce their strength in alternating generations of men.’[13] Pindar seems to be saying that the same ancient ἀρεταί do not appear in every generation, but they resurface in some.[14]

Insufficient attention is paid to what is actually changing, ἀλλαccόμεναι (38): is it ἀρεταί or γενεαὶ ἀνδρῶν? Fields do not always produce crops nor plants perfumed flowers. Some γενεαί (38) are vigorous, others less so. They change, ἐναμείβοντι (42). If the ἀρχαῖαι ἀρεταί change, they will be new, not ἀρχαῖαι: calling them ‘ancient’ is a way of conveying their continuity.[15] Editors nevertheless seem content for the ancient virtues to be portrayed as mutable, since they leave the participle ἀλλαccόμεναι in agreement with ἀρεταί.

Comments made elsewhere by Pindar about φυά (which includes inborn ἀρεταί) tend to confirm that he thought that their inherent nature does not change. A picture of ἀρεταί as unchanging, consistent intergenerationally and long-lasting emerges from a few passages: e.g. *Ol.* 11.19–20 τὸ γὰρ ἐμφυὲc οὔτ᾽ αἴθων ἀλώπηξ | οὔτ᾽ ἐρίβρομοι λέοντες διαλλάξαιντο ἦθοc (the nature of a species does not change); 13.13 ἄμαχον δὲ κρύψαι τὸ cυγγενὲς ἦθος (it is impossible to hide one’s inherited nature, that is, it stays the same and keeps on resurfacing); *Pyth.* 8.44–5 φυᾷ τὸ γενναῖον ἐπιπρέπει | ἐκ πατέρων παιcὶ λῆμα (that is, sons display the same qualities as their fathers through φυά);[16] *Nem.* 3.32 παλαιαῖcι δ᾽ ἐν ἀρεταῖc γέγαθε Πηλεὺc ἄναξ (Peleus rejoiced in ancient ἀρεταί, that is, by implication they remained the same); *Isthm.* 2.44; 4.4–5 αἶcι [*sc.* ἀρεταῖc] Κλεωνυμίδαι θάλλοντες αἰεί | cὺν θεῷ θνατὸν διέρχονται βιότου τέλοc (that is, the Cleonymidae always flourish through or with the same ἀρεταί).

If *Nem.* 3.74–5 ἐλᾷ δὲ καὶ τέccαρας ἀρετάc | ‹ὁ› θνατὸc αἰών refers to the four canonical virtues, their finite number adds to the impression that they are unchanging. Pfeijffer argues against understanding the reference there as one to a ‘tetrad’ of virtues, largely on the basis of the absence of evidence for such a list prior to Pindar,[17] but it may not be right to reject the possibility that it might.[18] More generally, one may also compare the metaphorical usage of ἄρουρα of a woman who receives seed and bears fruit, as at *Pyth.* 4.254–7 καὶ ἐν ἀλλοδαπαῖc | cπέρμ᾽ ἀρούραιc τουτάκιc

[13] Race (n. 2), 129.

[14] For discussion of Pindar’s ‘definite’ ideas on ἀρετά, cf. S.D. Sullivan, *Psychological and Ethical Ideas: What Early Greeks Say* (Leiden / New York / Cologne, 1995), 163–70; cf. also I.L. Pfeijffer, *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean V, Nemean III & Pythian VIII* (Leiden / Boston / Cologne, 1999), 188–90 (on 53, ἀρετάν).

[15] The use of ἀναφέρω could also indicate that the ἀρεταί are the same here since the verb can mean ‘repeat’, implying that the object is the same. LSJ s.v. II.10 gives Pl. *Ti.* 26a as the earliest instance of this meaning, but perhaps this represents an earlier example. On the voice of ἀμφέροντ᾽, cf. Verdenius (n. 4), 2.110 (on 38, ἀμφέροντι), who argues cogently that it is active. If, however, it is passive (i.e. ἀμφέρονται elided), that can mean ‘revive’ (cf. LSJ s.v. II.7) and this would still indicate that the virtues are the same old virtues coming back to life.

[16] Pindar frequently depicts grandfathers, fathers and sons displaying the same ἀρεταί and the great heroes are depicted as children with the same ἀρεταί that they display in adulthood: e.g. *Nem.* 1.43–7 (Heracles); *Pyth.* 9.84–7, *Nem.* 3.43–52 (Achilles). These factors contribute further to the picture of ἀρεταί as unchanging.

[17] Pfeijffer (n. 14), 639–43.

[18] Cf. H. North, ‘Pindar, *Isthmian*, 8, 24–28’, *AJPh* 69 (1948), 304–8 and A.P. Burnett, *Pindar’s Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina* (Oxford, 2005), 149–51, especially 150 n. 40 (‘the notion of four cardinal virtues was becoming popular, as evidenced by Pindar’s play between the numbers three and four’). The finale of *Pyth.* 6 involves three of the traditional canon of four, but replaces bravery with piety: prudence (47); justice and temperance (48); piety (50–1).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000658 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ὑμετέρας ἀκτῖνος ὄλβου δέξατο μοιρίδιον | ἅμαρ ἢ νύκτες· τόθι γὰρ γένος Εὐφάμου φυτευθὲν λοιπὸν αἰεί | τέλλετο.[19] This further suggests that it is more likely that Pindar was thinking of the γενεαὶ ἀνδρῶν as vegetal here.

Various indicators therefore make it unlikely that the ἀρεταί are being likened here to ἄρουραι (40) and δένδρεα (41).[20] If, as seems more probable, the γενεαὶ ἀνδρῶν change, a slight alteration should be considered to read ἀρχαῖαι δ' ἀρεταί | ἀμφέροντ' ἀλλαξομέναις γενεαῖς ἀνδρῶν σθένος, that is, 'The ancient virtues repeat their strength in the alternating generations of men'.[21] The sigma could easily have lapsed from the paradosis.[22] With the dative ἀλλαξομέναις the expression is more balanced (each noun in the sentence being preceded by and having its own qualifier) and the continuity of ἀρεταί (emphasized by ἀρχαῖαι) is maintained.

Ealing, London NICHOLAS LANE
njglane@yahoo.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838820000658

NICANDER'S JAUNDICE*

At *Alexipharmaca* 472–5, Nicander compares the sea hare to the cuttlefish and describes the latter's defensive mechanism of ink emission before turning to a symptom of sea hare poisoning, a change of skin colour:[1]

> οἷά τε σηπιάδος φυξήλιδος ἥ τε μελαίνει
> οἶδμα χολῇ δολόεντα μαθοῦσ' ἀγρώστορος ὁρμήν.

[19] For the metaphor in tragedy, cf. J. Diggle, *Euripides: Phaethon* (Cambridge, 1970), 123 (on 154); on the human reproductive process compared to ploughing and planting fields more generally, cf. B.K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* (Berlin and New York, 1988), 352 (on 255[b], ἀρούραις).

[20] So e.g. L.R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, 3 vols. (London, 1930–2), 2.328 (on 38–42). At *Nem.* 6.8–11 τεκμαίρει {δὲ} καί νυν Ἀλκιμίδας τὸ συγγενὲς ἰδεῖν | ἄγχι καρποφόροις ἀρούραισιν, αἵ τ' ἀμειβόμεναι | τόκα μὲν ὧν βίον ἀνδράσιν ἐπηετανὸν ἐκ πεδίων ἔδοσαν, | τόκα δ' αὖτ' ἀναπαυσάμεναι σθένος ἔμαρψαν the participles both clearly refer to ἄρουραι and are envisaged as the generations of Alcimidas' family: cf. D.E. Gerber, 'Pindar, *Nemean* Six: a commentary', *HSPh* 99 (1999), 33–91, 52 (on 9–11) ('What distinguishes both these passages [*sc. Nem.* 6.9–11, 11.37–43] from the multitude whose theme is the fluctuation of success and failure, happiness and grief, etc., is that here the fluctuation occurs by generations') and Henry (n. 1), 57 (on 9–11).

[21] Some translate as if ἀλλαξομέναις were in the text: e.g. J. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar* (rev. ed., London, 1937[2]), 433 ('But the virtues of olden time yield strong men, as their progeny, in alternate generations'); F. Nisetich, *Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore, 1980), 289 ('But ancient qualities put forth their strength in alternate generations of men'); Race (n. 13, quoted above).

[22] Cf. D. Young, 'Some types of scribal error in manuscripts of Pindar', *GRBS* 6 (1965), 247–73, at 261 (= W.M. Calder III and J. Stern [edd.], *Pindaros und Bakchylides* [Darmstadt, 1970], 96–126, at 112) on the liability of inflectional endings to corruption as a result of context or for no apparent reason.

* My thanks go to *CQ*'s anonymous reader for some useful suggestions, to the editor Patrick Finglass, and to the organizers of the Graduate Work in Progress seminar at Oxford where I presented an earlier version of this note.

[1] The sea hare is normally identified with *Aplysia depilans*: D.W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Fishes* (London, 1947), 142–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000658 Published online by Cambridge University Press