

iterum. But the corruption of *iterum* into *oratum* is far from obvious and the resultant word order minimally satisfying, not to mention the aimless emphasis of a second *legatio* imported into a context which allows no reference to a first. This would be condemnation enough were it not for a piece of external evidence which Wagner claimed as support and which therefore deserves our passing attention. In Diodorus Siculus 17. 86. 4 we read: Ταξίλου γὰρ τοῦ βασιλέως προτετελευτηκότος υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Μῶφης διαδεξάμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν διεπέμψατο μὲν καὶ πρότερον πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἐν τῇ Σογδιανῇ διατρίβοντα, ἐπαγγελλόμενος αὐτῷ συστρατεῦν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνταταττομένους τῶν Ἰνδῶν καὶ τότε πρέσβεις ἀποστείλας ἔφησεν αὐτῷ παραδιδόναι τὴν βασιλείαν. If with Wagner we infer from this passage two *legationes*, the genitive absolute with perfect participle (Ταξίλου . . . προτετελευτηκότος) indicates that they both occurred after Taxiles' death; whereas, if in the Metz epitome we have "patre mortuo legatos ad Alexandrum misit iterum," the temporal ablative absolute (*patre mortuo*) makes the presumed second *legatio* occur strictly after Taxiles' death, whence it is fatally implied that the unspecified "first" occurred before Taxiles' death—a time when (it should be added) Mophis would have been in no position to send a *legatio*. Concluding, then, that Diodorus and our epitomator present two different

and not quite reconcilable accounts, we may now with clear conscience reject Wagner's *iterum* and seek a remedy which eliminates the symptoms and cures the ill without damaging side effects. In this sentence *oratum* is stylistically inept; it disrupts syntax, and it contributes absolutely nothing to the sense. By its very nature it cries aloud for deletion, with (it so happens) not only perfect contextual results but also further external justification and full transcriptional probability. The proper parallel to invoke at this point is Curtius 8. 12. 4 f., which plainly gives the same account as our epitome and virtually confirms the proposed deletion: "regnabat in ea regione Omphis (i.e., Mophis), qui patri quoque fuerat auctor dedendi regnum Alexandro et post mortem parentis legatos miserat, qui consulerent eum regnare se interim uellet an priuatum opperiri eius aduentum." It only remains to adduce two passages verbally resembling and shortly preceding § 49—namely, § 42 "*legatos ad Alexandrum . . . mittit oratum, uti ignosceret ipsis*" and § 43 "*ad Alexandrum legatos miserunt oratum, uti ex oppido exire suaque exportare liceret*"—and to observe how understandably a copyist, his mind still dominated by their phrasing, subconsciously interpolated the unwanted *supine*.²

J. M. HUNT

VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY

2. I am most grateful to Dr. Robert Renehan for expert counsel on an earlier version of this note.

"CHIRON'S LAUGHTER" (PYTH. 9. 38)

As he begins to counsel Apollo on the god's plans for Cyrene, Pindar's Chiron laughs in a way which has caught the imagination of scholars but, in a disputed text, has also ultimately frustrated it.¹ In Snell's most recent edition of the *Epinicia*,² *Pyth.* 9. 38–39 read as follows:

1. Cf. Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1922), p. 268, n. 1: "38 steht eine für uns unverständliche Vokabel χλαρόν γελάσσαις. Das war überliefert, denn die Scholien zeigen, dass χλαρόν ein Deutungsversuch der hilflosen Grammatiker war." According to R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford, 1962), p. 43, "the quality of Chiron's smile cannot be determined with any accuracy, as there is no means of discovering exactly what the phrase χλαρόν γελάσσαις . . . can

τὸν δὲ Κένταυρος ζαμενής, ἀγανᾶ χλοαρόν γελάσσαις
ὀφρύϊ, μήτιν ἔαν
εὐθὺς ἀμείβετο.

χλαρόν Nv, χλαρόν Σ: χλοαρόν Schr[oeder].

Χλοαρόν, proposed by Schroeder in 1900, has been widely accepted by subsequent scholars.³

have conveyed in Greek." Cf. W. J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969), p. 546: "χλαρός: sens. dub. ? softly, gaily."

2. B. Snell–H. Maehler, *Pindari carmina* I⁵ (Leipzig, 1971).

3. Cf. the editions of Bowra and Snell; also Burton (*op. cit.*, n. 1), A. S. F. Gow, *CR*, LVIII (1944), 38; C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford, 1964), p. 246; R. P. Winnington-Ingram, "Pindar's Ninth Pythian Ode," *BICS*, XVI (1969), 10.

Turyn, however, prefers *χλαρόν*, the reading of PQ, Σ, accepted by Moschopolus, by the major nineteenth century editions of Boeckh, Schneidewin, Bergk, Fennell, Gildersleeve, and later by Sandys. This reading may be slightly favored on metrical grounds over *χλοαρόν* which requires synizesis, since the dactylo-epitrite verse implies a syllabic sequence — — ∪ — — for the position occupied in Snell's text by *χλοαρόν γελάσσαις*. The alternative MS reading, *χλιαρόν* (BDEV Tricl.), has been generally rejected on semantic or metrical grounds. *Χλαρόν* and *χλιαρόν* were both known to the scholiasts: *χλαρόν γελάσας*: ἤτοι πολὺν, κεχαλασμένον. *χλιδὸν γὰρ λέγουσι τὸ πλήθος* (ἢ προσηγές καὶ ἡδὺν, παρὰ τὸ *χλιαρόν* τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἀπηγνῆ τοῖς ψυχροῖς παραβάλλουσι, τὰ δὲ προσηγῆ καὶ τερπνὰ τοῖς θερμοῖς διὰ τὴν γινομένην διάχυσιν.) οὕτως οὖν ἐπιπολὺν γελάσας· οὐ γὰρ ὡς οἱ σκυθρωπάζοντες συνηγμένας εἶχε τὰς ὀφρῦς. b. ἢ οὕτω· *χλαρόν ἀντὶ τοῦ χλιαρόν καὶ ἡδὺ κατὰ συναίρεσιν*.⁴

Schroeder⁵ justifies his emendation in the following way: *χλιαρόν* "warmly," the reading of the superior codices, is unsuitable to the context, and *χλαρόν* (PQ), "eine ganz singuläre Form," might be explained as the Doric contraction of an otherwise unattested *χλοαρόν* (beside *χλοερόν*, cf. *σκιαρός*, -ερός). Schroeder then cites some uses of *χλοερός* (of *ρόδεα πέταλα* Eur. *Hel.* 243) and *χλωρός* (cf. *χλω-*

ροτέρα . . . *ποιάς* Sapph. Frag. 31. 14; *χλωροὶ ὑπαὶ δέιους* Il. 15. 4), and Hesychius' gloss: *χλοερόν*· *χλωρόν, ὥχρόν, νέον, ἀπαλόν*. He concludes that the phrase *χλοαρόν γελάσσαις* implies "ein farblos 'blasses' Lächeln" and cites with approval Gildersleeve's remarks concerning "the half-smile of the great teacher" (see p. 290; note too that the connotations of "ein farblos 'blasses' Lächeln" and the great teacher's "half-smile" are not necessarily compatible). In the following year Schroeder⁶ extended his defense of *χλοαρόν* by comparing the phrase *χλωραῖς ἐέρσαις* at *Nem.* 8. 40, and, much more cogently, *ἀπαλὸν γελάσας* at *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 281. If we refer again to Hesychius' gloss *χλοερόν* . . . *ἀπαλόν* and recall that, in *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 281, it is *ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων* who is "softly laughing," we have a possible basis for the defense of Schroeder's emendation.

Bowra, however, hears a different resonance: "χλοαρόν suggests the freshness of nature in spring, and this is exactly what the Centaur's smile does."⁷ In this connection we might tentatively cite the "green joys" of Euripides, *ὡς νεβρὸς χλοεραῖς ἐμπαί- / ζουσα λείμακος ἡδοναῖς* (*Bacch.* 866-67).⁸ There are surely those who will remain content to interpret Chiron's smile as "springlike," or his laugh as "soft" (or, with Winnington-Ingram, "hearty"). Such, however, was not the interpretation of the scholiast and it is therefore

connotation of *γελάσσαις* is perhaps more complex than can be implied by a distinction between "smile" and "laugh." There are etymological reasons to suppose that *γελᾶω* may originally have referred to other expressions of serenity and joy (cf. *γελανῆς* at Pind. *Ol.* 5. 2, *Pyth.* 4. 181, of *καρδία, θυμός*; *γελεῖν*· *λάμπειν, ἀνθεῖν* H.; *γαλήνη* ← **γελάνῃ* ap. E. D. Francis, *Greek Disyllabic Roots* [Yale Diss., 1970], pp. 240 f.). Moreover, these emotions are evoked, either directly or metaphorically, by such contexts as *κυμάτων ἀντήρυθμον γέλασμα* (Aesch. *PV.* 90) and *γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθών* (Il. 19. 362; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 40 and West's note *ad loc.*, *Theogony* [Oxford, 1966], 170-71; also W. B. Stanford, *Greek Metaphor* [Oxford, 1936], pp. 114-16). The collocation of *γελάσσαις* with *ὀφρῦς* in our passage might indeed suggest an expression of sparkling merriment rather than an act of laughter. Nevertheless, *γελάσσαις* clearly can mean "having burst into laughter" and it seems somewhat arbitrary to insist that this is not what Chiron did. I therefore adopt this translation with the reservation that it may not fully capture the qualitative nature of Chiron's reaction. In any case, to translate *γελάσσαις* as "sparkling" or "smiling" would not significantly affect my interpretation of *χλαρόν*.

8. Cf. E. R. Dodds' note, *Euripides: Bacchae*² (Oxford, 1960), p. 185.

4. A. B. Drachmann, *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, II (Leipzig, 1910), 226.

5. O. Schroeder, *Pindars Pythien* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1922), p. 82.

6. O. Schroeder, *Pindari carmina* (=T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* [Leipzig, 1923]), p. 249.

7. *Pindar*, p. 246. Bowra, Burton, and Slater (*op. cit.*, n. 1, s.v. *γελᾶω*) all refer to Chiron's "smile," Gildersleeve to his "half-smile," while Sandys translates *χλαρόν γελάσσαις* as "softly smiling" (cf. Schroeder's "Lächeln"). Lexicographers' traditional contrast between *μειδιάω*, "smile" and *γελᾶω*, "laugh" can be nicely illustrated by comparing Sappho's *μειδιάσαι* 'ἀθανάτωι προσώπῳ' (Frag. 1. 14) and *πλάσιον ἄδου φωνεῖ- / σας ὑπακούει / καὶ γελαῖσας ἡμέροεν* (Frag. 31. 3-5, on which see D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* [Oxford, 1955], p. 22: "it is the sound [italics mine, cf. ὑπακούει] of the girl's voice and laughter which disturbs Sappho"). Schroeder, *Pindars Pythien*, p. 82, implies that this distinction is only valid for (Attic-)Ionic since *μειδ(ι)ᾶω* does not occur in Doric and Sappho's *μειδιάσαι* can be explained as an epicism (cf. E. Hamm, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* [Berlin, 1957], p. 121). The fact that *μειδ(ι)ᾶω* may be an (Attic-)Ionic form, however, scarcely guarantees by itself that Pindaric *γελᾶω* can mean "smile" rather than "laugh." The

appropriate to reconsider the readings of the codices.

To extract any meaning from *χλαρόν* which fits the context of our passage seems impossible. Gildersleeve,⁹ while reading *χλαρόν*, cites "the association with *χλιαρόν* 'lukewarm'." In my opinion, the presence of a word meaning "lukewarm" in this passage (either directly or associatively, compare Lattimore's "cool smile") undercuts the sense of *ἀγανᾶ* . . . *ὀφρύϊ* in an inappropriate way. *Χλαρόν*, however, cannot be so lightly dismissed. It is true that Hesychius cites a *χλαρόν* and the glosses he provides (e.g., *ῥυπαρόν*, *λεπτόν*, etc.) are, as Farnell remarks,¹⁰ "all unsuitable to this place." On the other hand, from the standpoint of historical morphology, **χλαρός* could be well explained as the continuation of a *ρό*-adjective formed to the same root as aor. *χαλάσαι*. Compare the formation and contrast the meaning of *σκληρός*: *σκελε-*. The morphological pattern *χαλα-*: *χλα-* is exactly equivalent not only to that of *σκελε-*: *σκλη-* but also to *δαμα-*: *δμα-*, *θανα-*: *θνα-*, *καμα-*: *κμα-*, *βελε-*: *βλη-*, *γενε-*: *γνη-*, *τεμε-*: *τμη-*. (*Χαλαρός* "slack, loose," Hippoc., Ar., etc., cf. *χάλασις* Hippoc., Pl., is probably derived secondarily from the generalized stem form *χαλα-*, as in *χαλάω*, cf. *χαλαίνω* [Hes.] *Scut.* 308, *ἐχάλασα*, *κεχάλακα*). Proto-Indo-European *ró*-adjectives were characteristically formed with zero-grade of the root (cf. Gk. *ἐρυθρός*: Lat. *ruber*: Skt. *rudhira-*; Gk. *λευγαλέος*: *λυγρός*). **Χλαρός* could thus directly continue an inherited **gh₁A-ró-s*.¹¹

It is now necessary (1) to ascertain the most plausible meaning of a form *χλαρόν* in terms of contemporary uses of *χαλάω*, and (2) to show whether this meaning is at least as appropriate to the context of *Pyth.* 9. 38–39—in particular, to the phrase *ἀγανᾶ †χλαρόν† γελάσσαις ὀφρύϊ*—as that of Schroeder's *χλοαρόν*.

Many scholars have noted the exquisitely ironic charm with which Chiron *ζαμενής* replies to Apollo's suggestions. Gildersleeve's note on *χλαρόν* specifically excludes "the 'lively' horse-laugh of the other Centaurs; we have the half-smile of the great teacher." According to Ruck and Matheson,¹² Chiron decides "to indulge the god's amorous fancy." Burton observes "Chiron's eyebrow expressing indulgence as he smiles at Apollo's somewhat fast proposition"; and the context, together with the remarks of the Scholiast (*κεχαλασμένον* . . . *προσηγνές καὶ ἡδύ*), strongly favor the implication of relaxed indulgence. Dissen's early note¹³ is particularly astute: "constat superciliis contractis ostendi iram, deductis tristitiam, remissis hilaritatem. Unde in ficta laetitia Hom. *Il.* XV 102 ἡ δ' ἐγέλασεν / χεῖλεσιν, οὐδὲ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὀφρύσι κυανέησιν / ἰάνθη . . . Ac ni fallor, tota haec phrasid pulcherrima nunc est de habitu leniter reprehendentis et absens severitate." In the Homeric passage Hera's laughter is betrayed by "the lingering signs of anger on her brow."¹⁴ If *χλαρόν* can refer to the *hilaritas* of an uncontracted brow, then its presence in Pindar's text makes excellent sense.

At Ar. *Vesp.* 655 Bdelycleon speaks as follows: *ἀκρόασαί νυν ὦ παππίδιον χαλάσας* ("having relaxed") *ὀλίγον τὸ μέτωπον* (cf. Ar. 383: *οἷδε τῆς ὀργῆς χαλᾶν εἴξασιν*, and Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 6: *ὠκείαν πτέρυν' ἀμφοτέρωθεν χαλάξαις*, of an eagle at rest). "Indulgence" is implied by *χάλα* at Eur. *Hec.* 403: *καὶ σύ, παῖ Λαερτίου, / χάλα τοκεῦσιν εἰκοτῶς θυμουμένοισι* (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 219: *εἰ τοῖσιν οὖν κτείνουσιν ἀλλήλους χαλᾶς*). These connotations of *χαλάω*, if applied to *χλαρόν*, would blend perfectly with the sense of the words which form the rest of the phrase (*ἀγανᾶ* . . . *ὀφρύϊ*, *γελάσσαις*). The sequence *ἀγανᾶ χλαρόν* is especially euphonious. This interpretation of *χλαρόν* accords with that of the scholiast, and it is interesting to note that a connection

9. B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: Olympian and Pythian Odes*² (New York, 1890), p. 342.

10. L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, II: *Critical Commentary* (London, 1932), 203.

11. Cf. R. S. P. Beekes, *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek* (The Hague, 1969), p. 192.

12. C. A. P. Ruck and W. H. Matheson, *Pindar: Selected Odes* (Ann Arbor, 1968), p. 210.

13. *Pindari carmina*, II: *Commentarius* (Gotha, 1830), 311.

14. A. S. F. Gow, "ΟΦΡΥΞ [Theocr. *Id.* xxx 7f.]," *CR*, LVIII (1944), 38.

between *χλαρόν* and *χαλάω* was already perceived by him (cf. *κεχαλασμένον*, above).

Gow (*ibid.*) rejects the view that the eyebrow was a "seat" of emotion and instead believes that *ἀγανᾶ . . . ὀφρύϊ* refers to the eye and not to the brow; contrast *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 278–279: *καὶ πυκνὸν ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ἀμαρύνσων / ὀφρῦς ῥιπτάζεσκεν ὀρώμενος ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα*. As we have seen, however, the expressive eyebrow can certainly represent, if not a "seat,"

at least an index, of emotion, so that Gow's objections remain unconvincing. I therefore suggest that Pindar has knit *ἀγανᾶ . . . ὀφρύϊ* (lit., "with his eyebrows indicating that he was *ἀγανός*") together with *χλαρόν γελάσσαις* by a subtle play of chiasmic syntax in which *ἀγανός* and *χλαρός* modify with equal appropriateness the senses of *ὀφρῦς* and *γελᾶν*. Indeed, note the chiasmic pattern of the whole sentence:

Κένταυρος ζαμενής,¹⁵ ἀγανᾶ χλαρόν γελάσσαις ὀφρύϊ, μῆτιν . . . ἀμείβετο

The phrase *ἀγανᾶ χλαρόν γελάσσαις ὀφρύϊ* might therefore be rendered as "laughing indulgently with gentle gaze."¹⁶

E. D. FRANCIS

YALE UNIVERSITY

15. The sense of *ζαμενής* and thus its relation to *μῆτιν* are debatable. While the scholiast's gloss, *συνετός*, obviously supports a close relationship, *ζαμενής* is often taken to mean "very strong . . . raging" (LSJ; cf. *ζαμενής*: *εὐψυχος, μέγα μένος ἔχων . . . ἄγαν ισχυρός* Hsch.). Schroeder, *Pindars Pythien*, p. 82, however, argues that "violent rage" (cf. *ζαμένῃσι* Hes. *Theog.* 928?) is excluded by the context and Méautis (*Pindare le dorien* [Neuchâtel, 1962], pp. 208–9) translates *ζαμενής* as "plein d'une force prophétique" (cf.

"inspired," Fennell, Gildersleeve, Sandys, "inspiré," Puech). If Méautis is correct, we may assert at least a Pindaric connection between *ζαμενής* and *μῆτις*. This conclusion gains support not merely from the structural arrangement of the rest of the sentence but, more significantly, from a similar collocation of these two words in *Pyth.* 4 where Medea *ζαμενής* (10) prophesies the future (14–56) as the Argonauts listen in silence to her *πυκινὰν μῆτιν* (58).

16. Lit., "having burst into laughter" (cf. n. 7). I think that *χλαρόν* connotes "indulgence" rather than "lack of restraint" for several reasons. For example, comparable uses of *χαλάω* and *χαλαρός* imply "relaxation," rather than "lack of control." Furthermore, the collocation of *χλαρόν* and *ὀφρύϊ* favors our interpretation but has less point if *χλαρόν* is to be translated "unrestrainedly." The scholiast's *πολύ* does not necessarily imply a guffaw.

I thank the late C. M. Dawson and the late Adam Parry for their helpful comments on a previous version of this argument.

A NOTE ON THE DATING OF EURIPIDES' *PHAETHON*

"Wir haben keine Überlieferung über die Abfassungszeit des *Phaethon*." So stated Wilamowitz firmly in 1921.¹ Nonetheless, because of peculiarities in the lyrics of the parodos, the great scholar preferred a *Jugendwerk*.² His case was never convincing, and it was not confirmed when even its propounder confessed that the choriambes were "characteristic for Euripides' last period."³ There was early disagreement.⁴

1. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin, 1921), p. 222 (henceforth *Gr. Vers.*).

2. Thus *Gr. Vers.*, p. 222. See earlier *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin, 1875), p. 158 ("ante 425"); *Hermes*, XVIII (1883), 434 = *KS*, I, 147; and *Berliner Klassikertexte*, V. 2, *Griechische Dichterfragmente: Lyrische und Dramatische Fragmente* (Berlin, 1907), 81. For forty-six years he maintained the view.

3. See *Gr. Vers.*, p. 222.

4. See Schmid-Stählin, *Gesch. der griech. Lit.*, I. 3 (Munich, 1940), 599 with n. 1.

5. J. Diggle, *Euripides: "Phaethon"* (Cambridge, 1970), henceforth Diggle. Verses of the play will be cited by their Diggle numbers.

In an erudite and welcome edition of the play,⁵ Dr. J. Diggle (pp. 47–49) must revive the question. He predictably and curtly discards Wilamowitz.⁶ Indeed he allows only one criterion, Zieliński's Law.⁷ Euripides' iambic trimeters grow progressively more tolerant of resolutions. Diggle rigorously calculates that one-sixth of the trimeters in the *Phaethon* contained resolutions. Hence 16.67% and ca. 420 B.C.; fifteen resolutions in ninety verses. The

6. Diggle, p. 47, where his predecessor is charged with "wanton fabrication." The charge is gratuitous, although I admit that it is fortunate that Wilamowitz' posthumous fame does not rest on his eccentric interpretation of the *Phaethon*. Yet his candid persistence is endearing. "That many have not believed this and will not believe it does not disturb me at all": see *Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin, 1913), p. 38, n. 1.

7. See T. Zieliński, *Tragodoumenon libri tres* (Cracow, 1925), pp. 133–240. Unlike Diggle, Wilamowitz was denied the benefits of this discovery when he sought to date the *Phaethon*.