SHORTER NOTES

PINDAR, OLYMPIAN 2.100*

ABSTRACT

This note questions the transmitted word order at Pind. Ol. 2.100 and proposes a transposition to remove short open vowel at verse end.

Keywords: Greek literature; Pindar; metre; textual criticism

ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφευγεν, καὶ κεῖνος ὅcα χάρματ' ἄλλοις ἔθηκεν, τίς ἂν φράςαι δύναιτο;¹

for grains of sand escape counting, and all the joys which that man has wrought for others, who could declare them $?^2$

100

Ol. 2.100 ends with δύναιτŏ, a short open vowel at verse end ('SVE'). However, '[SVE] is avoided by Pindar in a way which it is not by ... other poets',³ and none of Pindar's other forty-one epinicians closes with SVE.⁴ Barrett identified this as one of four instances of SVE in verse endings shaped ... $\simeq \circ - -.^5$ The others are Moîcă (*Nem.* 6.28), τραφέντǎ and τυχοῖcǎ (*Isthm.* 8.16 and 8.36). They do not occur at stanza end, and two appear where text and colometry are insecure.⁶ One may accept SVE at the end of *Ol.* 2.100 as a metrical anomaly, but the last epode of *Olympian* 2 is very corrupt and line 100 may be too. SVE could be eliminated simply by reversing the *ordo verborum* and writing τíc äν δύναιτο φράccαι; Transposition of adjacent words and singling of double consonants are both common kinds of scribal error.⁷ The form φράccαι is Pindaric since he uses double *sigma* forms of -ζω verbs freely where it is metrically convenient to do so.⁸ The proposed transposition has the incidental benefit

* I am grateful to Professor James Diggle and to CQ's reader for helpful comments.

¹ Pind. *Ol.* 2.98–100. This is the text printed in modern editions including those in the Budé, OCT, Teubner and Loeb series.

² Transl. W.H. Race, *Pindar: Olympian Odes. Pythian Odes* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1997), 75.

75. ³ W.S. Barrett, *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism* (Oxford, 2007), 174. M.L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 61 notes that observation of Pindar's avoidance of SVE goes back to F. Vogt, *De metris Pindari quaestiones tres* (Diss., Strasbourg, 1880).

⁴ I exclude the spurious *Olympian* 5 and the fragmentary *Isthmian* 9. Bacchyl. 1 ends with SVE, but he is markedly more tolerant of SVE; according to West (n. 3), based on figures communicated to him by Barrett, in Pindar's epinicians SVE occurs 'once in twenty [*sc.* verses] where the period ends in $- - - \|$, and with other rhythms once in 120'.

⁵ (n. 3), 184.

⁶ On the difficulties presented by *Nem.* 6 s6–s7 (6.28 = s6), see K. Itsumi, *Pindar Metre: The* 'Other Half' (Oxford, 2009), 111–32; at *Isthm.* 8.16 the manuscripts have $\tau \rho \alpha \phi \epsilon \nu \tau'$, and $\tau \rho \alpha \phi \epsilon \nu \tau \sigma \alpha \phi \epsilon \nu \tau'$.

⁷ D. Young, 'Some types of scribal error in manuscripts of Pindar', *GRBS* 6 (1965), 247–73, at 255–6, 265 = W.M. Calder and J. Stern (edd.), *Pindaros und Bakchylides* (Darmstadt, 1970), 96–126, at 106, 116.

⁸ For this verb, see φράccατε (*Pyth.* 4.117); for other -άζω verbs, see ὅπαccαι (*Isthm.* 8.39), ἀνέχαccαν (*Nem.* 10.69), δαμάccαις (*Ol.* 9.92), δάμαccας (*Pyth.* 8.80), ἐδάμαccε (*Pyth.* 2.8), πέλαccεν (*Pyth.* 4.227) and ὅπαccεν (*Isthm.* 7.38). Young (n. 7) identifies instances where some

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association.

457

of giving the same word order, with the infinitive following δ ύναμαι, as similar rhetorical questions.⁹

Ealing, London

NICHOLAS LANE njglane@yahoo.com doi:10.1017/S0009838823000010

HERODOTUS 1.51.3*

ABSTRACT

This article presents a new conjecture on Herodotus 1.51.3.

Keywords: Herodotus; textual criticism; anacoluthon; conjecture

καὶ πίθους τε ἀργυρέους τέσσερας ἀπέπεμψε, οἳ ἐν τῷ Κορινθίων θησαυρῷ ἑστᾶσι, καὶ περιρραντήρια δύο ἀνέθηκε, χρύσεόν τε καὶ ἀργύρεον, τῶν τῷ χρυσέῳ ἐπιγέγραπται Λακεδαιμονίων φαμένων εἶναι ἀνάθημα, οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγοντες. ἔστι γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο Κροίσου, ἐπέγραψε δὲ τῶν τις Δελφῶν Λακεδαιμονίοισι βουλόμενος χαρίζεσθαι.

Hdt. 1.51.3

The participles $\varphi \alpha \mu \acute{\epsilon} v \omega v$ and $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \circ v \tau \acute{\epsilon} \varsigma$ produce a clear syntactical discontinuity, and the phrase $\varphi \alpha \mu \acute{\epsilon} v \omega v$ $\acute{\epsilon} i v \alpha i$ $\dot{\alpha} v \acute{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha$ is rather abrupt. Solutions so far proposed are as follows. Replacing $\varphi \alpha \mu \acute{\epsilon} v \omega v$ $\acute{\epsilon} i v \acute{\omega} v$ $\acute{\epsilon} \kappa \acute{\epsilon} i v \omega v$ (Jackson, *probante* Wilson) resolves both problems and is palaeographically plausible. Nevertheless, the sentence becomes less concise because $\varphi \alpha \sigma i$ refers to the opinion of a third party, which in this case does not seem necessary. Abicht tried to preserve the transmitted text by adding only the pronoun $\sigma \varphi \acute{\epsilon} \omega v$ after $\varphi \alpha \mu \acute{\epsilon} v \omega v$, so that the newly resulting possession to the Lacedaemonians becomes clearer. More recently, Madvig's conjecture $\tau \acute{\omega} v \tau \acute{\varphi} \chi \rho \upsilon \sigma \acute{\epsilon} \omega \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha i \Lambda \alpha \kappa \epsilon \delta \alpha \mu \omega v \acute{\omega} \omega v \epsilon \acute{\epsilon} v \alpha i \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha$, où $\kappa \dot{\circ} \rho \theta \acute{\omega} \varsigma$

 9 Isoc. Paneg. 114.3 τίς ἂν δύναιτο διεξελθεῖν;, Dem. 36.44.11 τίς ἂν δύναιτο ἐφικέςθαι;, Anaxil. fr. 22.2 PCG τίς ἂν δύναιτο ... φράςαι;, Philo 2.176.1 τίς ἂν δύναιτο ... ἐμφῦςαι;, Lib. Or. 24.39.5 τίς ἂν δύναιτο διελθεῖν;, Ep. 1321.2.1 τίς ἂν δύναιτο cryᾶν κτλ.;. The sole exception prior to the fifth century A.D. is at Ath. Deipn. 1.18c-d ὥςτ' "οὐδ' ἂν κολομβῶν εἰς κολομβήθραν μύρου" [Alexis, fr. 301 PCG] ἀρκεῖcθαί τίς ἂν δύναιτο, φηςίν 'Ἀλεξις, but W.G. Arnott, Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary (Cambridge, 1996), 793 considers that the words after μύρου imply that the citer has 'either unmetrically transposed the last four words of the fr<gment>... or so paraphrased or garbled his source that reconstitution of Alexis' original text is impossible'.

* I dedicate this contribution to my students of the course on Herodotus given at the University of Tübingen in the summer of 2022.

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

458

manuscripts have single for double *sigma* at *Pyth.* 4.7, 5.71 and *Nem.* 5.54; one may add *Ol.* 9.8, *Pyth.* 4.227, *Nem.* 10.69 and *Isthm.* 8.39. *CQ*'s reader observes that one can easily imagine how $\varphi p \dot{\alpha} c \alpha \alpha$ was corrupted to $\varphi p \dot{\alpha} c \alpha \alpha$ and the infinitive then transposed before $\delta \dot{\nu} \alpha \alpha \tau \sigma$, either on purpose (to mend the metre) or by accident.