

## Three Linguistic Notes on Pindar

By BRUCE KARL BRASWELL, Berlin

Deutsche Zusammenfassung

1. Vorhellenistische Formen von *ἐσπέσθαι*. Seit der Untersuchung Debrunners (1956) herrscht die Meinung, ein außerindikatives *ἐσπέσθαι* sei der griechischen Literatur außerhalb der späten homerisierenden fremd und stamme aus einer Theorie der Alexandriner. Daß die sieben Pindar-Stellen, an denen solche Formen handschriftlich überliefert sind oder konjiziert wurden, außer acht gelassen wurden, erklärt sich durch Otto Schroeders (1900) negative Beurteilung dieser Formen. In Ol. 8.11, 9.83, Is. 5.36, 6.17 sind sie aber sicher richtig. Pindar entnahm sie aus einer zweideutigen Homerüberlieferung und gebrauchte sie als metrische Alternative. Die hellenistischen Dichter bedienten sich derselben Möglichkeit ohne theoretische Überlegung, vermutlich nach pindarischem Vorbild.

2. Die Bedeutung von *ἀμφιπολεῖ* in Py. 4.158. Im Frühgriechischen kann das Alter auf jemanden zukommen, ihn überholen, ergreifen und festhalten, aber kaum ihn begleiten oder sogar pflegen, wie das Verb hier meistens verstanden wird. Pindar gebraucht vielmehr das Bild vom Alter als einer Schale, die, wie bei den Krustentieren, jemanden "umgibt", "umringt".

3. *Πελιαοφόνος*: Ein verkanntes pindarisches Kompositum. In Py. 4.250 wird Medea der Überlieferung nach *Πελιαοφόνος* "die Töterin des Pelias" genannt. Wegen eines falschen Einwandes gegen die Betonung des Kompositums wollte der antike Erklärer Chairis *Πελλιαο φόνος* "der Tod des Pelias" lesen. Die meisten früheren Herausgeber haben diese Lesart, die späteren aber Wackernagels (1913) Konjektur *Πελλιαο φονός* "die Töterin des Pelias" in den Text aufgenommen. Es ist aber nicht nötig, hier ein sonst unbelegtes Nomen agentis *φονός* anzunehmen. *Πελιαοφόνος* ist nämlich keine unregelmäßige Bildung, wie Wackernagel glaubte, sondern ein normales, nach *ἀνδροφόνος* analogisch gebildetes, verbales Rektionskompositum.

### 1. *Prehellenistic Forms of ἐσπέσθαι: A Note on Pindaric Usage*

In his study of the aorist forms of *ἔπεσθαι* "follow", "accompany" A. Debrunner concluded that a non-indicative *ἐσπ-* in Homer is nowhere certain and is in fact foreign to the rest of Greek literature except for that composed in the Homeric manner<sup>1)</sup> and further that

<sup>1)</sup> "*Δέγμενος, ἐσπόμενος, ἄρχμενος*", in *MNHMHΣ XAPIN. Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer*, 1 (Wien 1956), 83. The first modern editor of Homer to remove all non-indicative forms of *ἐσπ-* from the text was I. Bekker in his second edition (Bonn 1858); cf. also his *Homerische Blätter*, 1 (Bonn 1863), 56, n. to l. 36, 118. Most later editors, however, have not adopted his practice. Subsequently these forms have been defended, e.g. by Georg Curtius, *Das Verbum der griech. Sprache*<sup>2</sup>, 2 (Leipzig 1880), 31–32, and, in turn, again impugned, e.g. by A. Nauck, *Mélanges Gréco-Romains* 4 (1880), 323–27.

the false  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi$ - forms in the moods derive from a theory of the Alexandrians which is clearly reflected in Hellenistic poetry<sup>2</sup>). The acceptance of this conclusion in the etymological dictionaries of Frisk<sup>3</sup>) and Chantraine<sup>4</sup>) suggests that it has now won general approval amongst linguists<sup>5</sup>). Long before Debrunner's study Otto Schroeder, following Bekker's lead for Homer, took a similar view when he banned all non-indicative forms of  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi$ - from his *editio maior* of Pindar<sup>6</sup>). That Debrunner did not choose to mention the Pindaric evidence is presumably a result of Schroeder's negative assessment of it, which has in turn found its reflex in the lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones<sup>7</sup>). Since, however, later editors of Pindar, including Schroeder's successors in the Teubner series, B. Snell and H. Maehler, have received the banned forms into their text in as many as three or even four places<sup>8</sup>), it will be useful to reconsider the relevant Pindaric passages with a view to a more comprehensive assessment of Debrunner's conclusions.

There is in fact manuscript evidence for non-indicative forms of  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi$ - in four passages of Pindar, although in none is the testimony of the manuscripts unanimous<sup>9</sup>).

<sup>2</sup>) *Op.cit.*, 82.

<sup>3</sup>) *Griech. etym. Wörterbuch*, 1 (Heidelberg 1973), 544–54, s.  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ .

<sup>4</sup>) *Dictionnaire étymol. de la langue grecque*, 1 (Paris 1968), 361, s.  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ . Earlier Chantraine had accepted non-indicative  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi$ - forms in Homer; cf. *Grammaire homérique*, 1 (Paris 1958), 395.

<sup>5</sup>) For a dissenting opinion v. B. Forssman, *Unters. zur Sprache Pindars. Klass.-Philol. Studien* 33 (Wiesbaden 1966), 3, n. 1.

<sup>6</sup>) *Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig 1900), 41–42, § 91. Schroeder, while mentioning Bekker's rejection of the forms for Homer, does not refer to Nauck's doubts about their legitimacy in Pindar, on which v. *op.cit.*, 325, n. 22 (cf. n. 1 above). In the Appendix (Leipzig 1923), 501–2, to his *editio maior* Schroeder took account of the criticism of U. v. Wilamowitz, *SB Berlin* 1909, 818, n. 1 (= *Kl. Schr.* 6 [Berlin 1972], 328, n. 1) and P. Maas, *Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und Pindar*, 1 (Berlin 1914), 20, but remained unconvinced. The same still applies to his last *editio minor* (Leipzig 1930).

<sup>7</sup>) *Gk.-Engl. Lexicon*<sup>9</sup>, 679, s.  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$  (B).

<sup>8</sup>) Cf. *Ol.* 9.83  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$ , *Is.* 5.36  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota$ , 6.17  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , so Snell (Leipzig 1964) and Snell-Maehler (Leipzig 1971). A. Turyn, *Pindari Carmina* (Oxford 1952) adopts the same readings and, in addition,  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\eta\tau'$  at *Ol.* 8.11. Even C. M. Bowra (Oxford 1947), who otherwise follows Schroeder in this respect, accepts  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  at *Is.* 6.17.

<sup>9</sup>) In the following the Pindaric text is that of Snell-Maehler (1971), whereas the fuller apparatus is based on Turyn.

(1) *Ol.* 8.9–11.

ἀλλ' ὦ Πίσας εὐδενδρον ἐπ' Ἀλφεῶ ἄλσος,  
τόνδε κῶμον καὶ στεφαναφορίαν δέ-  
ξαι. μέγα τοι κλέος αἰεί,  
ᾧτινι σὸν γέρας ἔσπετ' ἀγλαόν.

11 ἔσπετ' ABL<sup>2</sup>, E<sup>pc</sup>?, CO: ἔσπητ' L<sup>1</sup>, E<sup>ac</sup>?, GH Byz.

To the evidence of the manuscripts may be added the paraphrases of the scholia *ad loc.*, which consistently employ the subjunctive even in those manuscripts such as A and B where the indicative now stands in the text: 14a. . . . ᾧτινι ἂν τὸ σὸν γέρας παρακολουθήσῃ, . . . (MS A), 14b. . . . ᾧ ἂν τὸ σὸν κλέος ἐπακολουθήσῃ (MSS BDEQ)<sup>10</sup>. Since Pindar would have written a quantitatively indeterminate E for either E or H<sup>11</sup>), the presence of the indicative form ἔσπετ' instead of the subjunctive ἔσπητ' in some manuscripts need mean no more than that the original text was not transliterated at this point in part of the textual tradition.

As Schroeder pointed out, the use of the indicative in general conditional relative sentences can be paralleled in Pindar: *Is.* 5.8–9 . . . ὄντιν' ἀθρόοι στέφανοι | . . . ἀνέδησαν ἔθειραν<sup>12</sup>). On the other hand, the use of the subjunctive without a modal particle in such sentences is an Homeric construction also found in Pindar: *Ol.* 3.11–13 ᾧ τινι . . . | ἀτρεκῆς Ἑλλανοδίκας . . . | ἀμφὶ κόμαισι βάλῃ γλανκόχροα κόσμον ἐλαίας<sup>13</sup>). Syntactically therefore either the subjunctive or the indicative would be possible here.

Metrically ἔσπητ' would produce perfect responsion throughout the ode, since the anceps syllable in v. 11 (D x e) is elsewhere long. On the other hand, a short anceps in the first triad responding with a long anceps elsewhere is permissible metrical practice in dactylo-epitrites<sup>14</sup>).

<sup>10</sup> *Scholía vetera in Pindari carmina*, rec. A. B. Drachmann, 1 (Leipzig 1903), 241, 2–5.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare. Études et commentaires* 13 (Paris 1952), 22–28, and, more generally, Ed. Schwyzler, *Griech. Grammatik*, 1 (München 1939), 145–48.

<sup>12</sup> See Schroeder (1900), 42, § 91. Cf. also *Ne.* 10.31, *Is.* 2.4, 7.27, and v. further W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (London 1889), 206, § 534.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. also *Ol.* 6.76, 8.23, *Ne.* 9.44, *Is.* 7.19, *Par.* 1.17, and v. further Goodwin, *op.cit.*, 208, § 540.

<sup>14</sup> See W. S. Barrett, *Hermes* 84 (1956), 248–49.

Both *ἔσπητ'* and *ἔσπετ'* would thus be acceptable readings here. There is no particular reason to prefer the indicative, whereas the paraphrase of the scholia and the assumption that Pindar would have wished to produce perfect metrical responsion where possible lend a certain weight to the subjunctive. If our investigation of the other passages of Pindar should show that he did indeed use non-indicative forms of *ἔσπ-*, there would therefore be a definite presumption in favour of the subjunctive in *Ol.* 8.11.

(2) *Ol.* 9.80–83.

*εἶην εὐρησιεπῆς ἀναγεῖσθαι  
πρόσφορος ἐν Μοισᾶν δίφρω·  
τόλμα δὲ καὶ ἀμφιλαφῆς δύναμις  
ἔσποιτο.*

83 *ἔσποιτο* BEFGO: *add. αἰεὶ s. l. C, ἔσποιτ' αἰεὶ A, ἔποιτο HN, Thomas Magister; schol. vet. 122b. . . ἔσποιτο: . . . παρέποιτο . . .*

Schroeder argued that the present tense is required here<sup>15</sup>). However, in the non-indicative moods early Greek uses either the present as at *Il.* 24.149 *κῆρύξ τις οἱ ἔποιτο* or the aorist as at *Il.* 12.350 *καὶ οἱ Τεῦκρος ἄμα σπέσθω*<sup>16</sup>).

Metrically *ἔσποιτο* would produce perfect responsion, whereas *ἔποιτο* would require us to accept an iambus in place of the spondee which occurs elsewhere at this point in the ode<sup>17</sup>).

Although all the manuscripts which contain scholia read *ἔσποιτ-*, they paraphrase it with *παρέποιτο*. This might be taken to support the present optative in the text, but in fact shows no more than that later Greek regularly used the present to emphasize the durative aspect. This explanation receives further confirmation from the unmetrical *αἰεὶ* which has intruded as a gloss into A and C. It was obviously added by someone who felt that the notion of duration was not adequately expressed by the aorist optative that he found in his text.

<sup>15</sup>) See Schroeder (1900), 41, § 91.

<sup>16</sup>) If a real difference was felt, it was presumably in the way the action was viewed: the present emphasizing its continuation, the aorist expressing the mere fact of its occurrence. On the predominance of the aorist optative and its opposition to the present optative in sentences expressing wishes in early Greek v. P. Chantraine, *BSL* 40 (1938), 69–79.

<sup>17</sup>) The short syllable in v. 58 adduced by Schroeder, *loc cit.*, as defence of the one here occurs in a different metrical context and thus provides no support.

With the disappearance of the false linguistic objection to the aorist optative the metrical argument would give a definite preference to *ἔσποιτο* in *Ol.* 9.83.

(3) *Ol.* 10.78–81.

ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἐπόμενοι καὶ νῦν ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν  
νίκας ἀγερώχου κελαδησόμεθα βροντάν  
καὶ πυρπάλαιον βέλος  
ὄρσικτύπον Διός.

78 ἐπόμενοι AEFHCO, schol. vet.: ἐσπόμενοι BGN

Only *ἐπόμενοι* is metrically possible here. The intrusion of the false sigma, which is found, for example, in the text of B but not in the lemma of the scholium in the same manuscript, was possibly caused by an unconscious repetition of the final letter of the preceding word.

(4) *Is.* 5.35–38.

τοὶ καὶ σὺν μάχαις  
δις πόλιν Τρώων πρᾶθον, ἐσπόμενοι  
Ἡρακλῆϊ πρότερον,  
καὶ σὺν Ἄτρείδαις.

36 πρᾶθον ἐσπόμενοι B: πάθον ἐπόμενοι D

Leaving aside the question of the form *ἐσπόμενοι*, there are no linguistic or metrical objections to the text as it stands in B. Th. Bergk in his first edition of Pindar (1843) set *ἔπραθον σπόμενοι* in the text, but then accepted the reading of B in his subsequent editions. Bergk's conjecture would be an elegant way of avoiding the form *ἔσπ-* if it should prove unacceptable for Pindar as a whole. However, in the absence of any contrary evidence we should naturally prefer to retain the *paradosis* as found in B and implied in D, where clearly a simplification of a double consonant pattern has twice taken place<sup>18</sup>).

In three other passages of Pindar non-indicative forms of *ἔσπ-* have been conjectured.

(5) *Py.* 4.38–40.

πέυθομαι δ' αὐτὰν κατακλυσθεῖσαν ἐκ δούρατος  
ἐναλίαν βᾶμεν σὺν ἄλμα  
ἐσπέρας ὕγρῳ πελάγει σπομέναν.

<sup>18</sup>) The scribe of D was especially prone to simplify clusters of consonants; for further examples v. Douglas Young in *Pindaros und Bakchylides: Wege der Forschung* 134 (Darmstadt 1970), 101.

In his critical apparatus to v. 40 Wm. Christ (1896) suggested that we should perhaps read *πελάγει ᾿σπομένην*. Since Pindar could have found ample justification for a form *σπομένην* in his text of Homer (see below), there is absolutely no reason to suppose that he would have considered the aorist participle in *Py.* 4.40 to be subject to aphaeresis<sup>19</sup>).

(6) *Py.* 10.17–18.

*ἔποιτο μοῖρα καὶ ὑστέραισιν  
ἐν ἀμέραις ἀγάνορα πλοῦτον ἀνθεῖν σφίσιν.*

17 *ἔποιτο* codd.: *ἔσποιτο* Moschopulus; schol. vet. 26. *ἔποιτο* . . . : *ἐπακο-  
λουθοίη* . . .

Although a short syllable at the beginning of v. 17 (˘chodim ba) would be metrically unobjectionable, a long syllable would produce perfect responsion. This is presumably the reason why Moschopulus corrected his text to *ἔσποιτο*. If we adopt *ἔσποιτο* at *Ol.* 9.83 (see above no. 2), it would be consistent to adopt it here as well, although few recent editors have done so<sup>20</sup>).

(7) *Is.* 6.16–18.

*ἔγὼ δ' ὑψίθρονον  
Κλωθῶ κασιγνήτας τε προσ-  
εννέπῳ ἔσπέσθαι κλυταῖς  
ἀνδρὸς φίλον Μοίρας ἐφετμαῖς.*

17 *ἔσπέσθαι* Pauw: *σπέσθαι* BD

In v. 17 (-e-D-e) metrical responsion is restored by Pauw's simple expedient of reading *προσεννέπῳ ἔσπέσθαι* for *προσεννέπω σπέσθαι* of the manuscripts. That Schroeder should retain the text of the manuscripts and place an obelus before *προσεννέπω* alleging the verb to be unsuitable in an address to goddesses such as Clotho and her sisters can hardly be ascribed to anything but an unwillingness to accept a clear example to the contrary which spoils his general

<sup>19</sup>) There is in fact no certain instance of aphaeresis in Doric choral lyric; v. A. Lucius, *De crasi et aphaeresi*. Diss. Straßburg (1885), 44, and cf. R. Kühner-Fr. Blass, *Ausführl. Grammatik der griech. Sprache*<sup>3</sup>, 1 (Hannover 1890), 241.

<sup>20</sup>) Most editors before Schroeder, e.g. Erasmus Schmid, Heyne, Beck, Boeckh, Thiersch, Dissen, Bergk<sup>2-3</sup>, Christ, preferred *ἔσποιτο*, but few later ones have adopted it. An exception, however, is Sandys (London<sup>2</sup> 1919).

theory about the absence of *έσπ*- forms in Pindar<sup>21)</sup> and understandably earned Wilamowitz's sharp retort<sup>22)</sup>.

Pauw's *έσπέσθαι* is in fact unavoidable and thus provides the strongest evidence that Pindar used this form of the aorist in the moods of *έπομαι*. Since most recent editors (see note 8 above) have rightly adopted this simple correction, it would not be necessary to discuss it further if there were not dissenters.

L. R. Farnell<sup>23)</sup>, while rejecting Schroeder's spurious argument about the unsuitability of *προσεννέπω*, retained the manuscript reading and thus accepted the responsion of e with d<sup>1</sup> (as we may designate the second half of D here). There are in fact no examples of such a responsion in the whole of the dactyloepitrites of Pindar and Bacchylides<sup>24)</sup>.

More recently E. Thummer, accepting Farnell's false metrical defence of the manuscript reading, went on to object to Pauw's correction on the grounds that it produces an hiatus which cannot be defended by reference to the corresponding one in v. 8, *Ὀλυμπίῳ Ἀίγιαν*, because there it occurs in a proper name<sup>25)</sup>. Such an objection would of course carry weight only if epic correption (Hiat-kürzung) never occurred in Pindar outside of proper names, but as a matter of fact it is freely used in all four possible positions of D ( $\_1^2 \_3^4 \_$ ). For a few examples of it in the fourth short syllable as here cf., e.g., *Ol.* 6.6 *φύγον ὕμνον*, 7.89 *οἱ αἰδοίαν*, 8.16 *γενεθλίω δς*, 53 *έσσεται οὐδέν*, 11.19 *καὶ αἰχματάν*<sup>26)</sup>. There is thus no reason to question Pauw's restoration of *έσπέσθαι* at *Is.* 6.17.

<sup>21)</sup> Schroeder's own conjecture, *παραγορέω σπέσθαι*, only strengthens this regrettable impression.

<sup>22)</sup> *Loc. cit.* (n. 6 above). <sup>23)</sup> *The Works of Pindar*, 2 (London 1932), 359.

<sup>24)</sup> Of the examples of "trochee = dactyl" adduced by Farnell, *op. cit.*, xxiv, only *Py.* 1.37 is relevant to the text here. There Heyne's *στεφάνοισι νῦν* for *στεφάνοισιν* of the MSS not only restores complete responsion, but also provides the necessary subject of *έσσεσθαι*, which in turn allows us to punctuate the sentence in a natural way and thus to avoid the incredible parenthesis favoured by Farnell (*ad loc.*). With the adoption of Heyne's obvious correction all support for the responsion of e with d<sup>1</sup> disappears. On other alleged examples of dactylic elements responding with epitritic ones v. H. Höhl, *Responsionsfreiheiten bei Pindar*. Diss. Köln (1950), 66–69, who rightly concludes (69) "der Ersatz daktylischer Glieder durch epitritische ist an keiner Stelle mit Sicherheit nachweisbar".

<sup>25)</sup> *Pindar: Die isthmischen Gedichte*, 2 (Heidelberg 1969), 102.

<sup>26)</sup> These could be multiplied threefold for this position alone. On hiatus in Pindar v. further E. B. Clapp, *CPCP* 1 (1904), 1–34, who does not, however, distinguish the precise metrical contexts in which it occurs.

Although the legitimacy of the non-indicative *έσπ*- forms in Pindar has been established, the question still remains why he chose to use them. In the Homeric corpus an indicative *έσπ*- is metrically certain in six instances: *Il.* 3.239, 13.300, 492, *Od.* 4.276, 6.164, *h. Merc.* 426. Further, since a non-indicative *σπ*- is metrically certain at *Il.* 10.285 and *Od.* 22.324, the most plausible conclusion to be drawn would be that the *ε*- in *έσπ*-forms is simply the augment<sup>27</sup>). However, Pindar could have found in his text of Homer what might seem to provide instances of the use of both *σπ*- and *έσπ*- forms in the moods. For example, at *Il.* 12.350 (= 363) most manuscripts have *ἄμ' έσπέσθω* with very few preserving the correct reading *ἄμα σπέσθω*. Moreover, ambiguous passages such as *ΓΕΣΠΟΜΕΝΟΙΟ* at *Il.* 10.246 (cf. also *ΔΕΣΠΟΜΕΝΟΙΟ* at 12.395, 13.570) could be read as either *γ' έσπομένοιο* or *γε σπομένοιο*. Indeed ancient scholars were themselves divided as to how the letters should be interpreted, so that we find, for example, Herodian adopting *γ' έσπ*- and Ptolemy of Ascalon *γε σπ*-<sup>28</sup>). It is not surprising therefore that a lyric poet like Pindar would have felt free to use both forms in the moods since this would provide him with welcome metrical alternatives. In fact alternative forms such as *σπομέν*- at *Py.* 4.40 and *έσπομέν*- at *Is.* 5.36 are very much in keeping with the poet's practice of making use of such doublets wherever the language of early Greek epic would seem to provide justification for them<sup>29</sup>).

Since Pindar had already employed both *έσπ*- and *σπ*- forms in the non-indicative moods of the aorist of *έπομαι*, we need not suppose with Debrunner (cf. above with n. 2) that the false *έσπ*-forms in Hellenistic poetry derive from any particular theory of Alexandrian scholars. It is true that Apollonius Rhodius always uses non-indicative forms of *έσπ*- to the exclusion of the *σπ*- ones and always in contexts in which they are metrically necessary<sup>30</sup>).

<sup>27</sup>) The aorist indicative *έσπ*- represents in fact an original *\*έ-σπ*- with secondary aspiration from *έπομαι*; v. Frisk and Chantraine, *opp.citt.*, s.v. (notes 3–4 above).

<sup>28</sup>) See Hdn. Gr., *Reliquiae*, ed. A. Lentz, 2 (Leipzig 1868), 70, 23–27, and Ptol. Ascal. *apud sch. A Il.* 10.246 (3, 47, 77–78 Erbse). Cf. also H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien. Zetemata* 24 (München 1960), 419.

<sup>29</sup>) On Pindar's use of double forms cf. in general Wm. v. Christ, "Zum Dialekte Pindars", *Philologische Kleinigkeiten der XLI. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner* (München 1894), 41–46, and for further examples of doublets v. the appendix to my commentary on *Py.* 4 (forthcoming).

<sup>30</sup>) Cf. 1.103, 470, 3.35, 615, 4.434. At 1.470 there is no need to adopt Spitzner's conjecture *Ἰδέω γ' έσπομένοιο*, as does H. Fränkel (Oxford 1961),

This could reflect a grammatical theory, but it is more likely to be an example of the preference of Hellenistic poets for less common forms<sup>31</sup>). That literary tradition rather than theoretical considerations influenced the use of *έσπ*-forms in Hellenistic (and later Greek) poetry is a reasonable supposition which receives further support from the fact that Callimachus employs both the forms *σπομένης* (fr. 260.61 Pf.) and *έσπόμενοι* (*Ap.* 55)<sup>32</sup>). The practice of the Hellenistic poets is in fact best understood as a reflex of the apparent ambiguity of the Homeric usage as it was exploited by Pindar to provide useful metrical alternatives of the same non-indicative aorist forms of *έπομαι*.

since the MS reading *Ἰδεῶ έσπομένοιο* is adequately protected by 1.103 *Πειρίθῳ έσπόμενον*; v. further V. Schmidt, *Sprachl. Untersuchungen zu Herondas*, Berlin 1968, 73, n. 104. On Apollonius' use of a present *έσπεται* (4.1607) v. G. Marxer, *Die Sprache des A. R. in ihren Beziehungen zu Homer*. Diss. Zürich (1935), 12, who does not, however, mention that *έσπεται* occurs as a variant at *Od.* 4.826 in a number of MSS. (In general, it should be added, Marxer did not take into consideration the possible influence on Apollonius' language of innovations by Pindar and other post-Homeric poets; on this deficiency cf. R. Pfeiffer, *Hist. of Classical Scholarship*, [1] [Oxford 1968], 146, n. 6.) This may well have been Apollonius' justification for the use of such a present. In any case, later poets in the epic tradition, e.g. Oppian, Pseudo-Oppian, Dionysius Periegetes, Quintus Smyrnaeus, Nonnus, use it freely; for examples v. Nauck, *op.cit.* 325, n. 21 (cf. n. 1 above).

<sup>31</sup>) On Apollonius' relative lack of interest in problems of language and textual criticism v. H. Erbse, *Hermes* 81 (1953), 163–96, esp. 190. The preference of Apollonius and other Hellenistic poets for less common forms has rightly been stressed in a number of recent studies; cf. e.g. G. Giangrande, *QUCC* 15 (1973), 73–81.

<sup>32</sup>) A. Ardizzoni, *RFIC* 95 (1967), 44, has argued that because Callimachus used *σπ*- at fr. 260.61 it is very probable that he wrote *δὲ σπ*- at *Ap.* 55 and not *δ' έσπόμενοι*, the almost unanimous reading of the MSS. (Pfeiffer, quite rightly, includes no variants at this point in his apparatus, but Otto Schneider reports H as having *δπόμενος*, which led Meineke to conjecture *δὲ σπόμενοι*. However, the reading of H is obviously a simple mistake for *έσπ*- and has no independent worth.) The certain occurrence of the *σπ*- form in the one passage is not, however, sufficient reason to doubt the *paradosis* in the other, since Callimachus had precedent for the use of both forms. It is in keeping with the learned tradition of Alexandrian poetry that an apparent innovation could be justified by the practice of earlier poets (cf. n. 30 above). Likewise there is no reason to doubt that Pseudo-Oppian (*C.* 2.204, 3.167) is in the same tradition when he precedes *έσπ*- in the moods by *γ'* or *δ'*. We may add that Oppian (*H.* 3.141, 4.64, 411, 5.545) has only the form *έσπ*- and this always at the beginning of a verse; cf. also D. P. 685 *έσπομένους*, [Orph.] *L.* 100 *έσπέσθαι*, 143 *έσπομένω* (all at the beginning of a verse). Metrically necessary too is Mosc. *Eur.* 147 *καὶ έσπομένη*.

We may now assert with confidence that, although Debrunner was right in denying the existence of a non-indicative *έσπ-* in Homer, his assumption of an Alexandrian theory to account for its presence in Hellenistic poetry has proved entirely unnecessary, since Pindaric usage would have provided ample justification for the new forms. Our conclusion therefore not only disposes of the inaccurate account of the historical development of *έσπέσθαι*, but also allows us to vindicate the Pindaric *paradosis* where it has correctly preserved non-indicative forms of *έσπ-* or where they are clearly implied by it. Future editors of Pindar should accordingly adopt without hesitation *έσπητ'* at *Ol.* 8.11, *έσποιτο* at *Ol.* 9.83, *έσπόμενοι* at *Is.* 5.36, and *έσπέσθαι* at *Is.* 6.17. In addition, they would do well to give serious consideration to *έσποιτο* at *Py.* 10.17.

## 2. *What Old Age does: the Meaning of άμφιπολεϊ at Py. 4.158*

At *Py.* 4.157–58 Pindar lets Pelias excuse himself in advance from undertaking the dangerous expedition he is about to propose to Iason by saying *άλλ' ήδη με γηραιόν μέρος άλικίας | άμφιπολεϊ· σόν δ' άνθος ήβας άρτι κυμαίνει*. Modern commentators have consistently failed to explain what *άμφιπολεϊ* means here. Elsewhere (*Ol.* 12.2, *Py.* 4.271, *Ne.* 8.6) Pindar uses the verb in the familiar sense “attend”, “tend to”, “take care of”<sup>33</sup>). But what would it mean to say that already old age “attends” Pelias<sup>34</sup>)? One of the

<sup>33</sup>) The meaning of *άμφιπολεϊ* in P. Oxy. 1792, fr. 51.2 (not included in Snell-Maehler [1975]) cannot be determined. J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London 1890), 151, *ad loc.*, maintained that at *Ne.* 8.6 *άμφιπολεϊν* not only means “to serve as an *άμφίπολος*”, but also “suggests the notion of hovering around”. The sch. *ad loc.* do in fact paraphrase the verb with *περιπέπλησαν*; v. *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, rec. A. B. Drachmann, 3 (Leipzig 1927), 141,9. However, this implication, if really meant to be felt, is secondary and should not be pressed, since in any act of attendance there is necessarily some sense in which the attendant moves about the object of his care.

<sup>34</sup>) Cf. *The Odes of Pindar*, transl. . . . by C. M. Bowra (Harmondsworth 1969), 196. Most other modern translators are too general here to allow us to be sure just how they understand *άμφιπολεϊ*, but cf. notes 35 and 39 below. For the expression *γηραιόν μέρος άλικίας*, i.e. *τό γήρας*, cf. e.g. *h. Cer.* 399 *ώρέων τρίτατον μέρ[ος]*, i.e. a third of the year, *Py.* 4.65 *όγδοον . . . μέρος Άρκεσίλας*, i.e. Arcesilaus is eighth in line, 12.11 *τρίτον . . . κασιγνητάν μέρος*, i.e. Medusa (for another interpretation v. A. Köhnken, *BICS* 25 [1978], 92–93, who, however, has not convinced me that we should abandon either the traditional punctuation or Boeckh's *άνυσσεν*).

very few modern commentators who provides any help at all at this point compares S. *OC* 7–8 *στέργειν γὰρ αἰ πάθαι με χῶ χρόνος ξυνῶν | μακρὸς διδάσκει*<sup>35</sup>). However, the notion of time (or old age) being present with a person is not the same as that of its being in attendance on someone. The idea that old age “attends” or “cares for” a person is odd, to say the least, and apparently unparalleled in Greek.

In Homer and other early Greek poetry old age (*γῆρας*) can “come upon” a person: *ἔπεισω* (*Il.* 1.29), *ἐπὶ . . . | ἵκετ’* (*Od.* 8.226–27), *ἐπὶ . . . ἰκάνει* (11.196), *ἔλθῃ* (13.60), *ἐπὶ . . . ἵκηται* (*Hes. Th.* 604)<sup>36</sup>; it can “chase” him: *ὀπάζει* (*Il.* 4.321, 8.103); it can “overtake” him: *ἔπι . . . ἔτετμε* (*Od.* 1.218); and it can “stand beside” him: *παρίσταται* (*h. Ven.* 245). Then it can “lay hold” of him: *κατὰ . . . ἔμαρψεν* (*Od.* 24.390), *μέμαρπεν* ([*Hes.*] *Sc.* 245); it can “press down” upon him: *τείρει* (*Il.* 4.315), *ἐπείγει* (23.623)<sup>37</sup>, *κατὰ . . . ἔπειγεν* (*h. Ven.* 233), and it can eventually “enfold” him: *ἀμφικαλύψει* (*h. Ven.* 244). Thereafter it can be said to “hold” him: *ἔχε* (*Il.* 18.515), and, in fact, to “bind” him “hand and foot”: *κατὰ . . . ἔχει χειρᾶς τε πόδας τε* (*Od.* 11.497). Exceptionally old age did not “lie upon” the golden race of men: *ἐπῆν* (*Hes. Op.* 114), whose limbs remained unencumbered by it until they died peacefully as in sleep, but otherwise old age is something you have to “bear”: *ἔχεις* (*Od.* 24.250). If you want to get rid of it, you would have to “strip” or

<sup>35</sup> Cf. C. A. M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge 1893), 199–200, *ad loc.*, who presumably understood the verb in the same sense in which Bowra did. (For the Sophoclean image cf. *h. Ven.* 244–45 *γῆρας . . . | . . . τό τ’ ἔπειτα παρίσταται ἀνθρώποισιν*.) Other commentators are noticeably reticent here. However, C. T. Damm, *Versuch einer prosaischen Uebersetzung der griech. Lieder des Pindar*, 2 (Berlin 1770), 68–69, does gloss his translation (“aber mich hat nun schon derselbe Theil des Lebens in seiner Gewalt, der das hohe Alter heisset”) with “Er hat mich gleichsam in der Kur und Pflege” (n. 81).

<sup>36</sup> M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1966), 333, *ad loc.*, takes *γῆρας* as accusative citing in support *Od.* 19.367–68 *ἀρώμενος εἶος ἰκοιο | γῆρας τε λιπαρόν*, but there old age is conceived of as a positive goal (as, e.g., at *h. Ven.* 106, *Pae.* 6.116–17), which is not the case in the passages referred to above. In any case, the construction at *Il.* 1.29 and *Od.* 13.59–60 are unambiguous instances of *γῆρας* used as the subject of a verb of coming, so that there is no reason to assume an accusative construction at *Hes. Th.* 604 or, as West does, at *Od.* 8.226–27 and 11.196 as well.

<sup>37</sup> There is no need to discuss the variants found in the MSS or reported by the scholia here and in a few other passages cited above, since in none do they affect the basic sense.

“thrust” it “off”: ἀποξύσας (*Il.* 9.446), ξῦσαί . . . ἄπο (*h. Ven.* 224), ἀποξύσασα (*Nosti*, fr. 6.2 Allen), ἀπωσαμένη (*h. Cer.* 276).

In the fifth century and later the image of throwing off old age is still current; cf. e.g. *Ar. Pax* 336 τὸ γῆρας ἐκδύς, *Lys.* 670 (lyr.) κάποσεισασθαι τὸ γῆρας τόδε, *Call.* fr. 1.32–36 Pf. ἐγ]ώ δ' εἶην οὐλ[α]-χύς, ὁ πτερόεις, | . . . ἵνα γῆρας . . . | . . . | ἀθθι τὸ δ' ἐκδύοιμι, τό μοι βάρος ὄσσον ἔπεστι | τριγλώχιν ὀλοῶ νῆσος ἐπ' Ἐγκελάδω<sup>38</sup>). Behind the notion is of course the Greek use of γῆρας to refer to the “skin”, “exoderm”, “shell” which some animals such as the snake (cf. *Arist. HA* 549b26, *Nic. Th.* 31,137, sch. *Nic. Th.* 389, *Dosiad. AP* 15.26.14), the lizard (cf. *Antig. Mir.* 20), the crab and other crustaceans (cf. *Arist. HA loc.cit.*, 601a17, *Thphr.* fr. 177 W.), or the cicada (cf. *Call. loc.cit.*) periodically cast off.

The ancient Pindaric scholia *ad loc.* in fact understood ἀμφιπολεῖ at *Py.* 4.158 in the sense of “surrounds”, “encompasses” when they paraphrased the verb with περικυκλοῖ καὶ περιέχει<sup>39</sup>). Although this would fit well the notion of γῆρας as an excrescence (and thus suggest that Pindar is using ἀμφιπολεῖν as an equivalent, e.g. of ἀμφικαλύπτειν in *h. Ven.* 244 cited above), it still remains to account for how ἀμφιπολεῖν could be used with this meaning. In fact, Pindar is obviously employing the verbal element -πολεῖν in its literal sense of “go”<sup>40</sup>). Hence, if, for example, ἀμπολεῖν at *Ne.* 7.104 means “to go over again”, i.e. “to repeat”, then ἀμφιπολεῖ can here just as well mean “go around” or, in the case of something that can extend itself, “surround”. Although ἀμφιπολεύειν (the epic form of ἀμφι-

<sup>38</sup>) At *B.* 3.88–89 πολίων π[αρ]έντα | γῆρας, however, the thought is presumably not one of dropping or getting rid of old age that covers a person but rather of avoiding it. On the literary use of the image of thrusting off old age v. further J. Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane*<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1965), §§ 53, 66, and cf. E. K. Borthwick, *CQ*, n.s., 26 (1976), 201. F. Preisshofen, *Unters. zur Darstellung des Greisenalters in der frühgriech. Dichtung. Hermes-Einzelschr.* 34 (Wiesbaden 1977), cf. esp. 111–18 (“Motive bei der Beschreibung des Greisenalters”), does not discuss this important image in early Greek descriptions of old age.

<sup>39</sup>) *Ed. cit.*, 2 (Leipzig 1910), 135,15. This explanation of the scholia is reflected in some early translations, e.g. “circumdat” (Erasmus Schmid), “continet” (Boeckh), and, possibly, in some later ones, e.g. “holds in its toils” (Conway).

<sup>40</sup>) On the meaning and development of the deverbative πολεῖν and its compounds v. H. J. Frisk, *Griech. etym. Wörterbuch*, 2 (Heidelberg 1973), 500–1, s. πέλομαι, and P. Chantraine, *Dict. étym. de la langue grecque*, 3 (Paris 1974), 877–78, s. eadem v.

πολεῖν)<sup>41</sup>) is already restricted in Homer to the specialized sense “to go around in attendance”, “attend”, “take care of”, the original meaning is still found in Emp. *Vorsokr.* 31 B 41 ἀλλ’ ὁ (sc. “Ἥλιος) μὲν ἀλισθεῖς μέγαν οὐρανὸν ἀμφιπολεύει, S. *OC* 678–80 (lyr.) ἐν’ ὁ βακχῶ-|τας ἀεὶ Διόνυσος ἐμβατεύει | θεαῖς ἀμφιπολῶν τιθήναις “where the reveller Dionysus ever treads moving about with the goddesses who nursed him”<sup>42</sup>), and A. R. 4.1541–47 ὡς δὲ δράκων σκολιὴν εἰλιγμένος ἔρχεται οἶμον, | . . . | ὧς Ἄργώ, . . . | ἀμπεπόλει δηναῖον ἐπὶ χρόνον. Likewise, the literal meaning in a passive sense “gone around”, i.e. “frequented”, “thronged”, is present in Pindar’s use of the adjective ἀμφίπολος at *Ol.* 1.93 τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων (sc. Pelops) πολυξενωτάτω παρὰ βωμῶ, which the sch. 149 b explains as τὸν περιπολούμενον, διὰ τὸ ἐν μέσῃ εἶναι τῇ πόλει<sup>43</sup>). In the case of περιπολεῖν, we may add, the meaning always remained general<sup>44</sup>). Thus Pindar makes Pelias say here that old age is already “going around” him, i.e. “encompassing” him like a crust which binds and confines him. This provides a clear and meaningful contrast to the opposed image of Iason’s youth, the flower of which “is just now swelling”, i.e. bursting its bounds.

### 3. Πελαιοφόνος: A Neglected Pindaric Compound

At *Py.* 4.250 Pindar describes how Iason, after having slain the serpent guarding the Golden Fleece, κλέψεν . . . Μήδειαν σὸν αὐτᾶ τὰν Πελαιοφόνον “stole away Medea with her own help, the killer of Pelias”. This is evidently the text as it was known in antiquity and which has been transmitted to us with slight variations in the majority of the medieval manuscripts<sup>45</sup>). The first to question the

<sup>41</sup>) Although first attested later (in Pindar, but not first in *Ne.* 8.6, *pace LfgrE*, 683, *s.v.*, which presumably accepts Gaspar’s improbable, early dating to 491) the original form was doubtless -έω with -εύω representing the form lengthened for metrical convenience; v. P. Chantraine, *Gram. homérique*, 1 (Paris 1958), 368.

<sup>42</sup>) For the use of the comitative dative without a preposition in conjunction with a verb of motion cf. e.g. *Od.* 11.160–61 ἦ νῦν δὴ Τροίηθεν ἀλώμενος ἐνθάδ’ ἰκάνεις | νηὶ τε καὶ ἐτάροισι, and v. R. Kühner-B. Gerth, *Ausführl. Gram. der griech. Spr.*<sup>3</sup>, 1 (Hannover 1898), 434, and Ed. Schwyzer, *Griech. Gram.*, 2 (München 1949), 162.

<sup>43</sup>) *Ed. cit.*, 1 (Leipzig 1903), 49, 2–3.

<sup>44</sup>) Cf. e.g. S. *OT* 1254 ἀλλ’ εἰς ἐκείνον περιπολοῦντ’ ἐλεύσσομεν “. . . at him as he moved about”, E. *IT* 84 (= 1455) περιπολῶν καθ’ Ἑλλάδα, [E.] *Rh.* 773 λέσσω δὲ φῶτε περιπολοῦνθ’ ἡμῶν στρατὸν.

<sup>45</sup>) For a full account of the variants here v. the apparatus criticus *ad loc.* in C. I. Tycho Mommsen, *Pindari Carmina* (Berlin 1864), 201.

text was the Aristarchean Chaeris who is reported by the scholia *ad loc.* to have wished to read not the compound *Πελιαοφόνον*, which, it is implied, was the reading he found in his text, but two separate words *Πελίαο φόνον* “the death of Pelias”<sup>46</sup>). His objection does not seem to have been to the compound as such but to its accentuation as a paroxytone<sup>47</sup>). But why not the compound? Presumably because Chaeris thought that the compound, which in his view should be oxytone, would mean “the killer of Pelias”, whereas the meaning he assumed here (for whatever reason) was “the death of Pelias”, which, according to him, would have to be written as two words *Πελίαο φόνον*. That this was Chaeris’ motive receives confirmation from the remark of Didymus, which is also reported by the scholia *ad loc.*, that we should either write *Πελιαοφονόν* in the sense “the killer of Pelias” or *Πελιαοφόνον* in the sense “the death of Pelias”<sup>48</sup>). Apparently Didymus did not choose between the alternatives. If Medea is here called “the death of Pelias”, then Chaeris was of course less wayward than Didymus in wishing to write *Πελίαο φόνον* rather than *Πελιαοφόνον*. If, on the other hand, Medea is called “the killer of Pelias”, then both were wrong in thinking this could be expressed by *Πελιαφονόν*, since ancient grammatical theory prescribed paroxytone accentuation for *-φονος* and other such compounds when they are used to express an action, i.e. when they are used, e.g. as agent nouns<sup>49</sup>). The only real alternative among

<sup>46</sup>) *Sch. vet. in Pindari carmina*, rec. A. B. Drachmann, 2 (Leipzig 1910), 158, 20–22: 446. *Πελιαοφόνον: ὁ Χαῖρις οὐ βούλεται συνθέτως ἀναγινώσκειν Πελιαοφόνον. ἐκ γὰρ δυοῖν τελείων ἐστὶ τοῦ Πελίαο καὶ τοῦ φόνου.*

<sup>47</sup>) *γίνεται δὲ τοιαύτη συνθέσις, ὡς μεταβάλλεσθαι τὸν τόνον*, *ed. cit.*, 2, 158, 22–159, 1. Although it is not entirely clear from the scholium, this is presumably the reason which Chaeris himself gave for rejecting the compound. Since the text as we have it does not necessarily reproduce Chaeris’ actual words, Richard Berndt was doubtless right in not including this sentence in his edition of the fragments, *De Charete, Chaeride, Alexione grammaticis eorumque reliquiis*, 1. Diss. Königsberg (1902), 45, fr. 18.

<sup>48</sup>) *ἦτοι οὖν, φησὶν ὁ Δίδυμος, προενεκτέον τὰν Πελιαοφονόν ὀξυτόνως, ἢ ἡ φονευτικὴν ἢ παροξυτόνως, ἥτις ἦν τοῦ Πελίου φόνος*, *ed. cit.*, 2, 159, 1–3. The scholium is slightly elliptical, but there can be little doubt that we should understand the alternative as *ἢ προενεκτέον τὰν Πελιαοφόνον παροξυτόνως κτλ.* This was rightly understood, e.g. by Tycho Mommsen, *loc. cit.*, and A. Turyn, *Pindari Carmina* (Oxford 1952), 105; cf. Turyn’s apparatus *ad loc.*: *Πελιαοφονόν vel Πελιαοφόνον* Didymus.

<sup>49</sup>) See Hdn. Gr., *Reliquiae*, ed. A. Lentz, 1 (Leipzig 1867), 234, 29–235, 18, and [Arc.], ed. E. H. Barker (Leipzig 1820), 91, 1–6 (= *Ἐπιτομή . . . Ἡρωδianoῦ*, ed. Moritz Schmidt [Jena 1860], 104, 13–18). On Pseudo-Arcadius cf. R. Pfeiffer, *Hist. of Classical Scholarship*, [1] (Oxford 1968), 179 with n. 1.

these possibilities is therefore between Chaeris' *Πελίαο φόνον* "the death of Pelias" and *Πελιαοφόνον* of the *paradosis*, which could only mean "the killer of Pelias".

The *paradosis* was retained by some early modern editors, notably by Erasmus Schmid<sup>50</sup>). Not surprisingly Heyne preferred to read *Πελίαο φόνον* with Chaeris, although he had to admit that "τὰν Πελίαο φόνον, sc. γενομένην", was not an easy construction<sup>51</sup>). Boeckh, in turn, defended the use of *φόνος* as a feminine by reference to *Ar. Th.* 535 τὰττην . . . τὴν φθόρον, and *E. IA* 793 (lyr.) τὰν . . . γόνον (both used of women)<sup>52</sup>). This seems to have established *Πελίαο φόνον* as the accepted reading throughout the nineteenth century<sup>53</sup>).

At the beginning of this century Jacob Wackernagel denied that the use of *γόνος* and *φθόρος* as feminines when applied to women is comparable to the use of *φόνος* here<sup>54</sup>). Even if we should admit that Medea could be called the "death of Pelias", what we would expect, it should be added, is not *φόνος* with the genitive (τὰν Πελίαο φόνον, sc. γενομένην) but with the dative as in *Il.* 16.144 (the Pelian spear of ash was given to Achilles' father) φόνον ἔμμεναι ἠρώεσσιν (cf. also *Od.* 21.24, *E. Tr.* 813 [lyr.]). In short, *Μήδειαν . . . τὰν Πελίαο φόνον* "Medea . . . the death of Pelias" is rightly suspect and, as we have seen, was in origin presumably no more than a personal preference (for some unknown reason) of the ancient critic Chaeris.

Wackernagel, rejecting Chaeris' emendation, proposed, independently it would seem, the solution which Gildersleeve had already

<sup>50</sup>) ΠΙΝΔΑΡΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΟΔΟΣ . . . ([Wittenberg] 1616), *Py.*, 168, but cf. 214, *ad loc.* (IA. 8).

<sup>51</sup>) Cf. *Pindari Carmina*, 1 (London 1824), 234, apparatus *ad loc.* (= Göttingen<sup>3</sup> 1798–99): "Πελίαο φόνον usque ad Schmidium editum. . . At male habet vel sic . . ."

<sup>52</sup>) *Pindari Opera*, 1, 2 (Leipzig 1811), 470–71.

<sup>53</sup>) Only B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The Olym. and Pyth. Odes* (New York 1890), 300, *ad loc.*, seems to have had doubts: "We expect φόνον like τροφόν". Although he accepted *E. IT* 793 as a parallel for use of φόνος, he admitted that "her . . . the death of Pelias' seems violent".

<sup>54</sup>) *Glotta* 4 (1913), 243 (= *Kleine Schriften* [Göttingen 1953], 1200): "... γόνος bezeichnet . . . das Ergebnis des Verbalbegriffs, also 'das Erzeugte'. Diese Parallele hilft also für φόνος nicht weiter, aber auch φθόρος paßt nur scheinbar. Wo ein Agens durch ein Abstraktwort bezeichnet, also mit seiner Tätigkeit identifiziert wird, geschieht es, wenn sein Sein in eben dieser Tätigkeit aufgeht. . . . Pindar will aber doch von Medea nicht sagen, daß sie nichts anders tut als morden; er bezeichnet sie nur als Urheber eines bestimmten einzelnen Mordes".

suggested (cf. n. 53): to read *φονόν* “killer” on the analogy of other oxytones such as *ἀοιδός*, *ἀρχός*, *τροφός* (the first and last also used as feminines), etc., which are not only verbal nouns, but also designate an agent<sup>55</sup>). However, *φονός* “killer” is otherwise unattested in the whole of Greek literature. That it is a possible word is suggested by the analogy with *τροφός*, etc., and by the exact correspondence with the Vedic cognate *ghaná-* cited by Wackernagel. Nevertheless, the fact that a word is theoretically possible in no way proves that it would ever have actually been used. If Pindar’s chorus sang *τὰν Πελῖαιον φονόν*, would the listeners have understood that *φονόν* was an otherwise unknown agent noun? They would probably have thought that the performers had made a mistake in accentuation<sup>56</sup>). We may therefore be confident that Wackernagel’s correction *Πελῖαιον φονόν*, which has been adopted by almost all subsequent editors, should be rejected, if for no other reason, as being unlikely to have been understood by Pindar’s audience<sup>57</sup>).

Having eliminated Chaeris’ *Πελῖαιον φόνον* and Wackernagel’s *Πελῖαιον φονόν*, we are left with *Πελῖαιοφόνον* of the *paradosis*. This is a word which we may be sure would have been easily understood as “the killer of Pelias”. Pindar uses other *-φόνος* compounds at

<sup>55</sup>) *Op.cit.*, 242 (= *Kl. Schr.*, 1199). Wackernagel also maintained, first, that the part of the Pindar scholium quoted in n. 47 above was out of place and, secondly, that the part quoted in n. 48 was wrong because Didymus could not have seriously considered an anomalous form such as *Πελῖαιοφονός* so that his alternatives were between *Πελῖαιον φονόν* and *Πελῖαιον φόνον*. However, first, there is no reason to doubt that the sentence *γίνεται . . . τόνον* fits the context since it reports Chaeris’ reason for not wishing to read the compound. Secondly, the fact that a form is anomalous is certainly no proof that an ancient scholar could not have considered it. On Didymus’ notorious “lack of common sense” cf. R. Pfeiffer, *op.cit.*, 276 (n. 49 above). Accordingly, there are no grounds for doubting the scholium as we have it or for thinking that Didymus ever considered the reading *Πελῖαιον φονόν*.

<sup>56</sup>) That Greek audiences were sensitive to such nuances is shown by the well-known story of the actor Hegelochus who in speaking E. *Or.* 279 *ἐκ κνυμάτων γὰρ ἀθῆς ἀὶ γαλήν’ ὄρω* inadvertently pronounced *γαλήν’* (neut. pl.) “calm” as *γαλήν* “weasel” to the delight of the comic poets who repeatedly parodied it thereafter; v. sch. *ad loc.*, ed. E. Schwartz, 1 (Berlin 1887), 126, 23–127, 17, and cf. W. B. Stanford, *Aristophanes: The Frogs* (London 1958), 99–100, *ad vv.* 303–4.

<sup>57</sup>) The correction was not adopted by Sandys (London 1915, 1919<sup>2</sup>) who printed Chaeris’ *Πελῖαιον φόνον*. Cf. also Ed. Schwyzler, *Griech. Gram.*, 2 (München 1949), 614: “*Μῆδειαν . . . , τὰν Πελῖαιον φόνον* Pind. P. 4, 250 (kaum *φονόν* ‘Mörderin’ zu schreiben)”.

*Py.* 4.252 *ἀνδρο-* (an Homeric epithet; cf. *Il.* 1.242, etc.) and at *Ne.* 6.40 *ταυρο-*. His use of a proper name as the first element would have been justified by *Ἀργειφόντης* (*Il.* 2.103, etc.), which was, rightly or wrongly<sup>58</sup>), understood by some ancient readers (cf. e.g. sch. bT *Il.* 2.103, Apollod. 2.1.3) as “the slayer of Argus”<sup>59</sup>). Since *ἀνδρεῖφόντης* (*Il.* 2.651, etc.) is used in Homer as a doublet of *ἀνδροφόνος*, the use of *-φόνος* as a second element with a proper name as the first element would have presented no difficulties for Pindar, as it obviously did not for Euripides who used compounds such as *Γιγαντοφόνος* (*HF* 1193) and *Γοργοφόνος* (*Ion* 1478, fr. 985 N.). This type of compound remained very much alive in Greek so that we find later, e.g. *Κενταυροφόνος* (Theocr. 17.20), *Μηδοφόνος* (Loll. Bass. *AP* 7.243.2), *Ἰνδοφόνος* (Nonn. *D.* 14.294, etc.), and even a *Χριστοφόνος* (Bas. *Spir.* 25, *PG* 32, 112b, Gr. Nyss. *Steph.* 2, *PG* 46, 724d; cf. also *Χριστοφόντης* at Gr. Naz. *Carm.* 2, 1.11.1545, *PG* 37, 1136a). Moreover, the use of *Πελιαφόνον* as a feminine presents of course no problems; cf., e.g. *γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων* two verses later.

One objection, however, remains to be considered. Wackernagel ruled out *Πελιαφόνος* on the grounds that a compound consisting of an agent noun with a genitive object as the first element would be anomalous<sup>60</sup>). Such a compound would indeed be irregular, but in fact we need not regard the first element of *Πελιαφόνος* as an original genitive. It is much more likely that when Pindar formed the new compound he did so on the analogy with *ἀνδροφόνος*, so that *Πελια-* represented for him the stem comparable to *ἀνδρ-* and *-ο-* the “Kompositionsvokal” as it tended to become in Greek<sup>61</sup>). That *-ao-* did not undergo contraction was simply a matter of the immediate metrical requirement. In other words, *Πελιαφόνος* is a perfectly normal dependent compound (verbales Rektionskompositum) in which a verbal final element (here an agent noun) governs a

<sup>58</sup>) Cf. Hj. Frisk, *Griech. etym. Wörterbuch*, 1 (Heidelberg 1960), 130–31, s.v., P. Chantraine, *Dict. étym. de la langue grecque*, 1 (Paris 1968), 103, s.v., and M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford 1978), 160, ad v. 68, with pp. 368–69.

<sup>59</sup>) Cf. also E. Risch, *Wortbildung der hom. Spr.*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin 1974), 32, n. 28: “*ἀνδρεῖφόντης* beweist nur, daß der Dichter, der dieses Wort gebildet hat, *ἀργειφόντης* als ‘Argostöter’ aufgefaßt hat, vgl. En. *Λυκο-*, *Βελλερο-*, *Πολυφόντης*”. Further suggestions on *Ἀργειφόντης* by H. Koller, *Glotta* 54 (1976), 211–15.

<sup>60</sup>) *Op.cit.*, 243 (= *Kl. Schr.*, 1200).

<sup>61</sup>) See further A. Debrunner, *Griech. Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917), §§ 129–32.

nominal first element (here an accusative). With that disappears the last objection to the sonorous Pindaric compound *Πελαιοφόνος* which was in fact preserved by the *paradosis* and should now after its long, unjustified neglect be duly restored to our texts.

### Πρόφασις und kein Ende (zu Thuk. I 23)

Von ALFRED HEUBECK, Erlangen

Die monographische Behandlung des Begriffs *πρόφασις* in der griechischen Literatur bis zum Ende des 5. Jh. durch H. R. Rawlings III<sup>1)</sup> stellt zweifellos eine wichtige Station in der seit mehreren Dezennien mit zunehmender Intensität geführten Diskussion dar: Rawlings hat die bisherigen Versuche, mit *prophasis* zurechtzukommen, nicht nur gewissenhaft und ziemlich vollständig<sup>2)</sup> registriert sowie ihre Vorzüge und Schwächen einem gesunden kritischen Urteil unterzogen, sondern auch mit eigenem originellem Ansatz ganz wesentlich zur Klärung grundsätzlicher Fragen beigetragen<sup>3)</sup>. Wir verzichten hier auf eine vollständige Nachzeichnung

<sup>1)</sup> A Semantic Study of Prophasis to 400 B.C., *Hermes-ES* 33 (1975).

<sup>2)</sup> Auf eine nochmalige Aufzählung kann an dieser Stelle verzichtet werden; verwiesen sei nur auf Arbeiten, die R. nicht bzw. noch nicht hat berücksichtigen können: Ch. Schäublin, Wieder einmal *πρόφασις*, *MH* 28, 1971, 133–144; H. Jones, Homeric Nouns in *-sis*, *Glotta* 51, 1973, 7–29, bes. 26; R. Robert, Prophasis, *REG* 89, 1976, 317–342; A. A. Nikitas, Zur Bedeutung von *πρόφασις* in der altgriechischen Literatur (I), *Abh. Ak. Mainz* 1976: 4. Besonders die letzte Arbeit ist wichtig; sie birgt Interpretationen aller Belegstellen von *πρόφασις* bei Homer, Hesiod, Theognis, Ibykos, Pindar, Sophokles, Euripides, Aristophanes und Herodot; in einem II. Teil sollen Thukydides und das Corpus Hippocraticum untersucht werden. Nicht allen Deutungen wird man voll zustimmen können; gewisse Bedenken ergeben sich bei Herodot I 156. 1; 94. 1; VI 13. 2; 49. 2; VII 229. 2.

<sup>3)</sup> Auf Einzelheiten soll hier nicht eingegangen werden; nur auf einige Seltsamkeiten in der den griechischen Zitaten beigegebenen Übersetzungen sei nebenbei aufmerksam gemacht. S. 57: Demokrit 68 B 117: . . . βαιὰ γὰρ φρονήσει τύχη μάχεται, τὰ δὲ πλείστα ἐν βίῳ εὐξύνετος ὀξυδερεκίη κατινύνει „ . . . humble(?) *τύχη* contends with reason, and on(?) most occasions in life, intelligent and quick-sighted(?), it(!) sets things straight“. In der Tat: dieser Passus ist der Aussage des Thukydides I 140.1 (*ἐνδέχεται . . . αἰτιᾶσθαι*) inhaltlich nächstverwandt, aber nur, wenn er richtig verstanden ist (s. die Übersetzung bei Diels-Kranz). — S. 66: Thuk. II 13.1: *τοιαύτας ἔχοντες προ-*