

Pindar, *Pythian* 8. 95-6*

Hugh Lloyd-Jones

One of Addi Wasserstein's finest writings is an article in the *Bulletin de l'Association Budé*, Quatrième Série, Numéro 2, 1969, 189f., in whose ten or so pages he contrives to give the reader more help in understanding early Greek religion than he might have got from reading many large volumes. After discussing (197f.) the saying of the Sophoclean Theseus to the aged Oedipus that he knows he is a man, and has no greater share than Oedipus in tomorrow (*O.C.* 567-8), and comparing the words of Odysseus in the scene in which he prevents Agamemnon from dishonouring the corpse of his own great adversary, Ajax (*Ajax* 1332f.), he writes: 'Cependant, ce qu'ont en commun les scènes dans *Oedipe à Colone* et dans *Ajax*, ce n'est pas seulement l'affirmation de la valeur humaine, mais aussi l'insertion émouvante de cette affirmation dans l'expression constante de l'impuissance de l'homme'. 'Nous décelons dans *Oedipe à Colone*', he writes later, 'comme dans *Ajax* un mélange ou même une fusion de pessimisme et d'optimisme, pessimisme en ce qui concerne la *destinée* humaine, qui n'est contrôlée ni par la volonté ni par l'action humaine, ni, finalement, par une correspondance entre nos choix moraux et le caractère de ce qui nous arrive; optimisme, d'autre part, concernant les potentialités de la *nature* humaine. Si l'homme n'est pas, dans la tragédie sophocléenne, "the master of his fate", il est, décidément, "the captain of his soul"'. It seems appropriate, in honouring the man who wrote these words, to offer him an attempt to improve the understanding, or at least to grasp the syntax, of a passage near the end of what is probably the latest poem of Pindar that has come down to us, which provides a striking parallel to the thoughts expressed in the Sophoclean scenes which he has illuminated.

ἐφάμεροι· τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὐ τις; κλιᾶς ὄναρ
ἄνθρωπος.

That is how almost all editors since Boeckh have printed lines 95-6 of the Eighth Pythian Ode, written in 446 BC for the Aeginetan boy wrestler Aristomenes.¹ Yet the manuscripts of Pindar read ἄνθρωποι. So do the scholia here (ed. Drachmann ii, p. 218, 21 [cf. p. 219, 2]), the scholia in cod. D of *Nem.* 6, 4 (ed. Drachmann iii, p. 102, 19-20); the scholia on Sophocles, *Ajax* 125 (ed. Papageorgiu, p. 12,6) and on *O.T.* 1186 (ib., p. 206,9); the *Suda* s.v. ἀνύπαρκτον (ed. Adler i, α 2786, p. 251, 5). ἄνθρωπος is read by the scholia on *Nem.* 6, 4 in cod. B (ed. Drachmann iii, p. 102, 20); Plutarch, *Consol. ad Apollon.* 6 p. 104 b;

* I am obliged to Mrs. M.C. Howatson and to Professor Bernard Williams for their valuable assistance.

¹ ἐφάμεροι rather than ἐπάμεροι: see Braswell on *Pyth.* 8, 130 (d).

Tzetzes, *Chil.* 4, 774 Leone; id., *Epist.* 19, ed. Pressel 22; Eustathius, *Il.* 757, 52. Heyne (first 1773; revised by Schaefer, 1817; English translation of revised edition, 1824) and Tycho Mommsen (1864; ed. min., 1866) seem to be the only two scholars in the last two centuries who have read ἀνθρωποι.

The second of the two explanations of this passage given in the scholia (ii p. 218, 17 f.) takes ἐφάμεροι as a vocative; this view is taken by Dissen in his commentary of 1830 (p. 299), who writes, *Fac esse nominativum, et ieiuna fient quae sequentur*. The only argument which I have found to have been levelled against this view is that of Fennell (i, 1879, p. 228), who objects against it (and also, unreasonably, against the first explanation given in the scholia, which is discussed below) that 'neither takes the first δὲ into account, which shows that ἐφάμεροι is a sentence'. This is not true; Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd. ed., p. 189 writes 'when a sentence opens with a vocative, δέ is often postponed, and follows the first word in the main body of the sentence'; among the examples which he quotes are *Pyth.* 4, 59 ὦ μάκαρ υἱέ Πολυμνάστου, cè δ', *Pyth.* 1, 67 Ζεῦ τέλει, αἰεὶ δέ, and *Pyth.* 5, 45 Ἀλεξιβιάδα, cè δ'. It may, however, be objected that an address to men in general would come abruptly, and might not easily be understood; if Pindar had intended this, one might have expected him to write ὠφάμεροι, with crasis.

The first explanation in the scholia (p. 218, 17f.) reads as follows: τῶν ἐφημέρων ἀνθρώπων τί ἂν τις εἴποι ὅτι ἔστι τις, ἢ πάλιν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι; ταχέως μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἔστι τις οὗτος, ταχέως δὲ ὅτι οὐδεὶς, διὰ τὴν μετάπτωσιν τῶν πραγμάτων. διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐπιφέρει ὅτι κκιᾶς ὄναρ ἀνθρωποι, εὔ τῆι ἐμφάσει χρώμενος, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι τοῦ ἀσθενεστερον. οὐ γὰρ οἶον ἀνθρώπου ὄναρ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ κκιᾶς ἀνθρώπου. Note the plurals τῶν ἐφημέρων ἀνθρώπων and κκιᾶς ὄναρ ἀνθρωποι: the author of the scholion clearly read ἀνθρωποι. But how did he construe the sentence?

One way of doing so might be to take ἐφάμεροι as being accompanied by an ellipse, either of the first or of the third person plural of the verb 'to be'. That is the view that has been taken by almost all the few commentators who have confronted the problem. Metzger (1880, p. 408) followed Fennell in taking ἐφάμεροι as a sentence. Schroeder (*Pindars Pythien*, 1922, 75-6) remarked that there cannot be ellipse of ἐς μέν, since 'die 1. Person steht weder vorher (βροτῶν [1.92]) noch nachher (ἀνδρῶν)'; presumably he thought that there was ellipse of the third person. Farnell in his commentary of 1932 (p. 200) thought that 'it is either a separate sentence, ἐς μέν or εἰςί being understood (but one cannot quote a quite parallel example in Pindar), or it is a participial sentence, ὄντες being understood, attached to the following words with a slight displacement of δέ = ἐπάμεροι δὲ ὄντες τί τις, τί δ' οὐ τις; the first rendering is more weighty and impressive'.

As to the former possibility, Farnell's statement in parenthesis is surely justified, only it does not go far enough. I know of no passage in any early Greek author in which a whole sentence consists of a single adjective to which one is supposed to supply a verb; also, it seems to me that on this view the sense would not immediately be grasped. Still more improbable, it seems to me, is the second view, which Farnell does not support by any parallel.

Must one then return to the view that ἐφάμεροι is vocative? There is a third possibility, which is that the manuscripts are right in reading ἄνθρωποι, and that the passage contains a parenthesis.

'In der chorlyrischen Wortstellung', writes F. Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*, 1922, p. 107, 'findet sich ferner zuerst das Einrahmen mehrerer Wörter zwischen Artikel (oder Attribut) und Hauptwort, das in der ganzen antiken Dichtung dann so auffällt... So ist es den Chorlyrikern möglich, ein Mosaik von Worten zu schaffen, wo jedes Wort als Klang, als Ort, als Begriff nach rechts und links und über das Ganze hin seine Kraft ausströmt, ein Minimum in Umfang und Zahl der Zeichen, ein Maximum an Energie der Zeichen'. The examples with which Dornseiff illustrates these observations do not contain parentheses in the strict grammatical sense, for in each case the words between article or attribute and subject form part of the same sentence with that article (or attribute) and subject, and not a sentence interposed between them. Parenthesis in this general stylistic sense is common in Pindar; rarer is parenthesis in the strict grammatical sense, defined by B.K. Braswell, *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*, 1988, p. 95 as 'one used to insert an additional thought into the midst of another sentence, the construction of which is not influenced by it'.

The prevalence and the significance of parenthesis in early Greek literature has been well brought out by E. Schwyzer, 'Die Parenthese im engern und im weitern Sinne', *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1939, *Phil.-Hist. Kl.* and id., *Griechische Grammatik* ii, 705-6. Further, Braswell, loc. cit., has listed parentheses in the strict sense that are to be found in Pindar. The relevant ones must be set out below:

1. *Pyth.* 4, 23f.:

...ξείνια....Εὐφamos..
δέξατ' — αἰσίαν δ' ἐπί οἱ Κρονίων
Ζεὺς πατὴρ ἔκλαγξε βροντάν —,
ἀνίκ' ἄγκυραν ποτὶ χαλκόγενυν
ναῖ κριμνάντων ἐπέτοσσε.

2. *Ol.* 8, 25f.:

τεθμὸς δέ τις ἀθανάτων καὶ
τάνδ' ἄλιερκέα χώραν
πανοδαποῖσιν ὑπέστασε ξένοις
κίονα δαιμονίαν —
ὁ δ' ἐπαντέλλων χρόνος
τοῦτο πράσσων μὴ κάμοι —
Δωριεῖ λαῶι ταμειουμέναν ἐξ Αἰακοῦ.

3. *Pyth.* 10, 43f.:

θρασεῖ-
αι δὲ πνέων καρδίαι
μόλεν Δανάας ποτὲ παῖς — ἀγεῖτο δ' Ἀθάνα —
ἐς ἀνδρῶν μακάρων ὄμιλον.

4. *Nem.* 2, 22f.:

· · ·
 ἐν ἐκλοῦ Πέλοπος πτυχαῖς
 ὀκτῶ στεφάνοις ἔμιχθεν ἤδη,
 ἑπτὰ δ' ἐν Νεμέαι — τὰ δ' οἴκοι μάσσον' ἀριθμοῦ —
 Διὸς ἀγῶνι.

5. *Nem.* 10, 45f.:

ἀλλὰ χαλκὸν μυρίον οὐ δυνατόν
 ἐξελέγχειν — μακροτέρας γὰρ ἀριθμῆ-
 ραι σχολᾶς —
 ὄν τε Κλείτωρ καὶ Τεγέα καὶ Ἀχαιῶν
 ὑψίβατοι πόλιες
 καὶ Λύκαιον παρ Διὸς θῆκε δρόμωι,
 σὺν ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικᾶσαι σθένει.

6. *Nem.* 11, 33f.:

συμβαλεῖν μὲν εὐμαρὲς ἦν τό τε Πεισάνδρου πάλαι
 αἶμα' ἀπὸ Σπάρτας — Ἀμύκλαθεν γὰρ ἔβα σὺν Ὁρέστει,
 Αἰολέων στρατιὰν χαλκευτέα δευρ' ἀνάγων —
 καὶ παρ' Ἴσμηνοῦ ῥοᾶν κεκραμένον
 ἐκ Μελανίπποιο μάτρωος.

Braswell cites also Bacchylides 8, 19f.:

γαῖ δ' ἐπισκῆπτων χέρα
 κομπάσομαι — σὺν ἄλα-
 θεῖαι δὲ πᾶν λάμπει χρέος —
 οὔτις ἀνθρώπων κ[αθ' Ἑλλα-
 νας σὺν ἄλικι χρόνων[ι
 παῖς ἐὼν ἀνὴρ τε π[λεῦ-
 νας ἐδέξατο νίκας.

Braswell observes (p. 96) that 'although the parenthesis is commonly introduced ... at a pause within the sentence which frames it (and to which it is normally linked by a particle, e.g. δέ or γάρ), it is occasionally found without a pause, as at *Pyth.* 10, 45 and *Nem.* 2, 23'. In none of the cases listed does the parenthesis begin after only one word, but this is hardly a strong objection; one may compare *Iliad* 4, 286f., where the parenthesis follows σφῶι μὲν, and Tyrtaeus fr. 11, 1 West, ἀλλ' — Ἡρακλῆος γὰρ ἀνικῆτου γένος ἐστέ — θαρσεῖτ', Solon fr. 4a West, γινώσκω — καί μοι φρενὸς ἔνδοθεν ἄλγεα κείται — πρεσβυτάτην ἐσορῶν γαῖαν Ἰαονίης κλινομένην, Anacreon fr. 13 (= *PMG* 385), 5 ἠδ' — ἔστιν γὰρ ἀπ' εὐκτίτου Λέεβου — κτλ., and other instances.

I do not believe that the word ἐφάμεροι can make up a whole sentence on its own, neither do I think that that word is likely to be a vocative. ἄνθρωποι can very easily have been corrupted into the number of ὄναρ, the word that immediately precedes it.

In *PBA* 68, 1982, 161 = *Academic Papers* I, 1990, 78, n. 1 I proposed to read:

ἐφάμεροι — τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὐ τις; κκιᾶς ὄναρ —
ἄνθρωποι.

To this Professor Bernard Williams objected that on this reading 'κκιᾶς ὄναρ has to be the answer to the questions that precede it in the parenthesis', and that 'this greatly weakens the questions, which get their power from the fact that they have no answers'. One might reply that κκιᾶς ὄναρ is an emphatic and effective answer; but there is another stronger objection, which is that these words can answer the first question, but cannot so easily answer the second and are not so easily understandable when the second question is interposed. I do not altogether rule out this way of punctuating; but I now prefer to print the text like this:

ἐφάμεροι, — τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὐ τις; — κκιᾶς ὄναρ
ἄνθρωποι.

With this punctuation κκιᾶς ὄναρ repeats and strengthens ἐφάμεροι, being linked with it asyndetically. It cannot be objected that on this view one would expect ὄναρ to be plural; compare Sophocles, *Ajax* 125-6:

ὄρω γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν
εἶδωλ', ὅσοι περ ζῶμεν, ἢ κουφήν κκιάν.

In that passage, as in Pindar, the meaning is not that men's moods vary, but that their life is brief, evanescent, insubstantial, vulnerable, so that it supports M.W. Dickie, *Illinois Classical Studies* 1, 1975, 7f. in his refutation of Hermann Fränkel, *Wege und Formen des frühgriechischen Denkens*, 1960, 2nd. edn., 22f. More than one scholar has indicated disagreement with Dickie's article, but so far as I know none has given a full statement of his reasons.

But can a metrical objection be levelled against reading ἄνθρωποι? Epic correction is by no means uncommon in Pindar, but rare, if it exists at all, unless the syllable corrected is preceded or followed by a naturally short syllable.² Five possible instances have to be considered:

1) *Ol.* 14, 1 - 2: here Snell/Maehler prints:

Καφικίων ὑδάτων
λαχοῖσαι αἶ τε ναίετε καλλίπωλον ἔδραν...

Hermann in the dissertation on Pindar's metres which he appended to Heyne's edition (1799: see pp. 137-8 of the third volume of the London reprint [1824] of G.H. Schaefer's revision of Heyne) kept the paradosis, making the first line end with λαχοῖσαι. Boeckh (1811) eliminated the hiatus by emending to λαχοῖσαι: he made the first line end with αἶτε (*sic*); Dissen (1830) followed him. Bergk (1842) preferred to remove the hiatus by emending αἶ τε to ταῖ τε: in this way he could, like Hermann, make the second line a phalaecean. Tycho Mommsen (1864) kept the manuscript text, making the first line end with ὑδάτων, quoting *Pyth.* 8, 96, along with two less relevant passages, as parallel; he was followed by Fennell (1879; 1893) who printed a long first line ending with ἔδραν.

² This was pointed out to me by Mrs. M.C. Howatson; its rightness was confirmed by my own investigation. W.J. Verdenius on *Ol.* 14, 2 (*Commentaries on Pindar* i, 1987, p. 107) thinks that the correction can be sufficiently defended by citing that of καὶ at *Pyth.* 8, 28; he attributes Bergk's conjecture ταῖ τε to Boeckh.

But Christ (1896), Schroeder in all his editions (ed. maj. 1900; three Teubner editions, 1908, 1914, 1930), Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, 1921, p. 314, and Turyn in his editions of 1944, 1948 and 1952 all preferred Bergk's conjecture ταί τε, objecting, presumably, to the correption. But the conjecture created awkward metrical problems. Christ and Schroeder, like Bergk, printed in the strophe:

Καφικίων ὑδάτων λαχοῖσαι
ταί τε ναίετε καλλίπωλον ἔδραν

and in the antistrophe:

<ῶ> πότιν' Ἀγλαία φιλησί-
μολπε τ' Εὐφροσύνα, θεῶν κρατίστου...

But surely the aneeps in mid-word in the antistrophe does not commend this arrangement. Wilamowitz printed

Καφικίων ὑδάτων λαχοῖ-
σαι ταί τε ναίετε καλλίπωλον ἔδραν

He took this as an iambic pentameter; but his view that the poem is in iambics with a slight admixture of dochmiacs and aeolics can hardly be sustained. Turyn, like Fennell, prints everything from Καφικίων to ἔδραν in a single line, which he interprets as an acephalous Sapphic hendecasyllable followed by a phalaecean; the acephalous Sapphic hendecasyllable is surely a trifle bizarre.

Snell in his Teubner editions from 1953, and now Snell-Maehler, follows Mommsen in keeping the paradosis, ending the first line with ὑδάτων. Snell's description of the metre as a choriambic dimeter and an iambic metron followed by a glyconic and a bacchius seems to me the likeliest; it fits well into his interpretation of the stanza as aeolic. But one can hardly feel sure of the correption; and since this is the only parallel of any significance, I must admit that a certain fragility attaches to my preference for ἀνθρωποι. None the less, I find it very hard to believe that ἐφάμεροι can constitute a sentence on its own.

2) *Isth.* 1, 15 - 6:

.....ἐθέλω

ἢ Καστορείωι ἢ Ἰολάοι' ἐναρμόξαι νιν ὕμνωι

We cannot be absolutely sure that this is not merely a case of hiatus, but more probably it is a correption. M.L. West, *Greek Metre*, 1982, p. 15, n. 22 can cite no other apparent instance of hiatus in Pindar, except in the case of words originally beginning with digamma.

3) *Nem.* 3, 39:

καί ποτε χαλκότοξον Ἀμαζόνων μετ' ἀλκάν
ἕπετό οἱ, οὐδέ νιν ποτε φόβος ἀνδροδάμας
ἔπαυεν ἀκμάν φρενῶν.

Speaking of epic correption in early poetry in a general way, West, *op. cit.*, p. 11 says that 'the shortened syllable is practically always preceded or followed by a naturally short syllable'. That is the case here, but this fact hardly diminishes the force of the example.

4) The same may be said of the next case, that of *Pyth.* 8, 28:

τὰ δὲ καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἐμπρέπει

5) *Fr.* 140 b, 2"

ἄοιδ[ἄν κ]αὶ ἄρμονίαν

West, *op. cit.*, p. 11, n. 17 warns us that this case rests on a supplement; but what other supplement is possible? This is another example that must be reckoned with.

It seems we must conclude that though epic correction is rare in Pindar its occasional occurrence has to be admitted.

From Douglas Gerber's invaluable book *Emendations in Pindar, 1513-1972*, 1976, 87 I have learned that two scholars have tried to deal with the problems of this passage by emendation. F.H. Bothe, *Pindar: Zweiter Theil, Bemerkungen über Pindars Werke*, 1808, 153 placed a comma instead of a full stop after $\sigma\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$ and read $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ ('entspricht dem $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ ὀλίγωι'). L. Bornemann, *Philologus* 50, 1891, 233 read $\sigma\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu$. I doubt if anyone will wish to revive either of these conjectures.

Wellesley, Massachusetts