

HUGH LLOYD-JONES

TWO CONJECTURES ON PINDAR'S FOURTH PAEAN (50–3)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 95 (1993) 1–5

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

TWO CONJECTURES ON PINDAR'S FOURTH PAEAN (50-3)

Ian Rutherford has lately been kind enough to allow me an early view of a detailed study of the paean he has been preparing, in which he has discussed the difficult problems of the Fourth Paean in detail. And now Lutz Käppel has published a learned study of the same genre (Paian: Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung (Berlin, 1992), which includes, in its third chapter (p. 87f.), the most detailed commentary on the Fourth Paean so far published. Written for the Ceans to perform at Delos, this poem tells how Euxantios, son of Minos by the Cean princess Dexithea, refused to abandon his rocky native island for the sake of a kingdom in his father's much greater island, Crete. The work of Rutherford and Käppel has stimulated me into making an attempt to solve two major cruces which have puzzled everyone who has had to do with this poem, ever since Grenfell and Hunt in 1908 published Part V of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri and with it P.Oxy. 841, which contains almost all that we possess of it.

Addressing his own mind, i.e. himself, Euxantios tells it to leave alone the cypress, and to leave alone something else which I will not at this point try to translate. Then he says that to him has been given a small... - then follow corrupt words - but that he has no share in mourning or in revolutions:

ἔα, φρήν, κυπάρις-
 κον, ἔα δὲ νομὸν περιδαίων.

ἐμοὶ δ' ὀλίγον δέδοται θα[
 οὐ πενθέων δ' ἔλαχον, (οὐ) στασίων (50-3)

52 e Σ]δοται θα[et Plutarcho (vid. infra) suppl. Blass et edd.pr. Plutarchus, De exilio p.602 F ὧι δ' ἔξεστιν εἰς μικρὰν ἀποβάντι νῆσον οὐ μικρῶν ἀπηλλάχθαι κακῶν, οὗτος ἄθλιός ἐστι μὴ προσλαλῶν ἑαυτῷ τὰ Πινδαρικά μηδ' ἐπάιδων πολλάκις ἐλαφρὰν κυπάριссον φιλέειν, ἐὰν δὲ νομὸν Κρήτας περιδαίων. ἐμοὶ δ' ὀλίγον μὲν γὰρ δέδοται, ὅθεν ἄδρυς, πενθέων δ' οὐκ ἔλαχον στασίων οὐδὲ προσταγμάτων ἡγεμονικῶν οὐδ' ὑπουργιῶν ἐν πολιτικαῖς χρείαις καὶ λειτουργιῶν δυσπαραιτήτων.

νομὸν περιδαίων - the latter word is Hermann's correction of Plutarch's περιδαίων - was taken by the first editors to mean 'the region around Mount Ida'. Grenfell and Hunt were rebuked by Housman, Cl.Rev. 22 (1908) 10 = Classical Papers (1972) II 766 for not knowing that the iota of the word Ἰδη was long, and Wilamowitz, Pindaros (1922), 475 raised the same objection, taking περιδαίων to mean 'ein Revier zwischen Feinden'. Käppel, op.cit., p.124, n.127 rightly objects that the Cretans were not enemies, but when he defends the view of the first editors, quoting as a parallel the variable quantity of the first syllable of χρυρός, he does not convince. The existence of the common noun ἴδη, meaning

'timber', seems to me to supply an extra reason for thinking it must unlikely that the quantity of this particular vowel can vary. Can we find another solution?

The mention of cypress presents no problems; cypress wood 'was highly valued by the Greeks and was widely used in temples' (R.Meiggs, *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (1982), 200), and it was especially associated with Crete. Käppel, *op.cit.*, p. 125, n. 128 quotes other relevant literature, including Hermippus fr.63,14-15 ἡ δὲ καλὴ Κρήτη κυπάριττον τοῖσι θεοῖσιν...παρέχει, where see Kassel and Austin *ad loc.* Rudolf Kassel, whose comments have helped me greatly with this note, draws my attention to Wilamowitz, *Isyllos von Epidauros* (1886), 114, n.8. In a striking passage, Wilamowitz points out how the gods were at first honoured in sacred groves, and later enclosures were given roofs to house their ξόανα. These enclosures were made out of the sacred trees; they were identical, Wilamowitz says, with the ζῴθιοι ναοὶ mentioned in the *Cretes* of Euripides (fr.472 Nauck = 79 Austin = 3 in R.Cantarella, *Euripide: I Cretesi* (1963), 4-8) in a passage quoted by Käppel in the note cited above. The Chorus of initiates of the mysteries of Dionysus, approaching Minos, speaks of temples whose roofs are made of cypress wood. They say:

ἦκω ζαθέουσι ναοὺσι προλιπών,
οἷσι ἀθυγενῆσι τμηθεῖσα δοκός
στεγανοὺσι παρέχει Χαλύβωσι πελέκει
καὶ ταυροδέτῳ κόλλησι κραθεῖσι
ἀτρεκεῖσι ἄρμονοσι κυπαρίσσοι.

What are the 'sacred temples', roofed with cypress wood, from which the initiates have come to address the king? We have seen that Wilamowitz took them to be the earliest sort of temple made of wood. Wolf Aly *ap. H.Verbruggen, Le Zeus crétois* (1981), 203, n. 117 took them to be a kind of monastic cells, which seems improbable. Giovanni Casadio, in the course of an interesting discussion of this fragment in '*I Cretesi di Euripide e l'ascetismo orfico*', *Didattica del Classico* 2 (1990), 281 takes the expression to be a poetic plural, denoting the celebrated shrine of Zeus near the cave on Mount Ida which was an important centre of his worship. He may well be right; but one must bear in mind that in the words of R.F.Willetts, *The Civilization of Ancient Crete* (1976), 112 'the predominantly religious character of Minoan Palaces...would suggest that they were rather temples, or religious houses'. I suspect that Pindar really wrote νομὸν περινάιον, 'the dwellings about the temple'. or 'the temples'. The adjective occurs only once, in an inscription from Phanagoreia on the Asiatic coast of the Pontus (*Inscriptiones Orae Septentrionalis Ponti Euxeni*, ed. B.Latyshev, *I² 1916*, 2, 52), where there is mention of στοὰὶ περινάιοι: cf. Ἀμμωνί καὶ τοῖσι περινάιοις (sc. θεοῖσι) in an inscription of the second century B.C. from Cyrene (*La Parola del Passato* 15 (1960), 295, 21). This mention of temples in Crete, roofed with cypress wood, surely gives some support to the conjecture in the paean which I have proposed.

Of the next two lines (52-3), in Housman's words (*op.cit.*, p. 9 = 765), 'nothing is left but what seems to be a marginal note containing the remains of δέδοται (with θα - or θω - following)'. Grenfell and Hunt with the aid of Blass set out to supply them with the aid of the quotation in Plutarch. As Housman (*l.c.*) observes, 'the correction of the second verse is excellent', and it has been adopted both by Turyn and by Snell and Maehler. But in the first line the supplement of the first editors θά[μνος δρυός, though put in the text by Schroeder in the *editiones minores* of 1908 and 1914 and later by Turyn (1952), will hardly stand; 'the bush of an oak' makes wretched sense. In his supplement of 1923 and his third *editio minor* of 1930, Schroeder abandoned this reading in favour of ὄθεν ἄδρος, conjectured by Reiske in his edition of Plutarch (1774-82). Schroeder glosses this conjecture with the words τουτέστιν εἰ μὴ μέγας πλούσιος παχύς (Hesych.), ἀλλ' εὐπορος καὶ ἰσχυρὸς καὶ εὐάνδρος: this gives a sense - 'from which it is strong' - which is no less feeble than it is cryptic. Not that the expedient of going back from Plutarch to the papyrus and reading θά[μνου or θά[μνων and then adding πέδον (Snell) or μέρος (Erbse), mentioned in the apparatus criticus of the Snell/Maehler edition of 1989, is any great improvement.

Let us examine the whole passage of Plutarch, and study the nature of its corruption, ἔα, φρήν in l. 50 has become ἐλαφρᾶν: confronted with the perplexing ΕΑΦΡΗΝ, the copyist has taken it to be a corruption of a real word, which he has substituted, even correcting the eta of ΦΡΗΝ to a Doric alpha. Then in order to get a verb to govern his accusative, he has inserted φιλέειν. Pindar in fact always contracts εει (see H.L.Ahrens, *Rh.Mus* 2 (1843) 459, cited by Schroeder on *Isth.* 5,48), so that this form is incorrect; but it is clear that we are dealing not with an ordinary accidental corruption, but with the ambitious attempt of an ancient colleague to make sense of a text he could not understand by emendation, a task to which he was unequal. In his corruption of l. 53 we must allow for the possibility of a similar distortion. Housman remarked (*op.cit.*, p. 766) that that line 'ought to be left in this form: ἔμοι δ' ὀλίγον δέδοται μὲν γὰρ ὄθεν ἄδρος'. Can anything be done with this?

The antistrophic passage 21-2 reads:

ἦτοι καὶ ἐγὼ ε[κόπ]ελον ναίων δια-
γινώσκομαι μὲν ἀρεταῖς ἀέθλων.

Presumably, then, the last four syllables of l. 52 made up an iambic metron. The jumble of letters ΟΘΕΝΑΔΡΥC reminds one of the word θέναρ. It is an unusual word, but it occurs twice in Pindar, at *Pyth.* 4,206 d and at *Isthm.* 3/4, 74; see the notes of Braswell on the former and Thummer on the latter passage. The word means 'the palm of the hand', and it can be used metaphorically, as Braswell says, 'of any concave surface'. In the former Pindaric passage νεόκτιστον βωμοῖο θέναρ refers to the hollow space in the surface of the altar where sacrifices were placed; a scholion expresses this by the words τὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ κοίλωμα τὸ ὑποδεχόμενον τὰ θύματα. In the second Pindaric passage Heracles is stated to have gone to Olympus, γαίᾳ τε πάσᾳ καὶ βαθύκρημον πολιᾶς ἀλός ἐξευρών θέναρ. 'Pindar is presumably thinking', Braswell writes (*l.c.*), 'of the shore (-κρημον)

sloping beneath the surface of the water on down (βαθυ-) to the bottom of the sea'. Thummer (1968/9) and Privitera (1982) both follow the scholion ad loc. in taking γαίαια...πάσαια as genitive singular. The former finds it significant that the plural of γαίαια occurs nowhere else in Pindar, although he is restrained from relying very strongly on this argument by his awareness that it is used by Homer. He thinks that θέναια means 'die Fläche des Landes, bzw. die Vertiefung des Landes, insofern als das Land durch Gebirge eingefasst erscheint wie das Meer durch Küsten'; just so Privitera writes 'Riconoscendo a θέναια "cavo, palmo della mano" oltre al significato traslato di "cavità" anche quello di "superficie" (Eracle, del resto, non esplorò la profondità del mare, ma la sua superficie) in nesso γαίαια τε πάσαια καὶ πολιᾶα ἄλλοις ἐξευρών θέναια appare subito plausibile'. But there is no reason to believe that the very distinctive word θέναια can mean no more than 'superficie'. It is not surprising that Pindar mentions that Heracles found out the bottom of the sea, evidently when he built his pillars (see Euripides, Heracles 400-2 with Bond ad loc. and Pindar, Nem. 3,21f. with the comments of H.Erbse, Hermes 97 (1969) 276f. = *Ausgewählte Schriften zur klassischen Philologie* (1979) 108f.); but there is no particular point in saying that Heracles found out the flat part, the non-mountainous part of every land. Like Benedictus (1620), Heyne (1773/1824), Dissen ap. Boeckh (1821) and Hartung (1856), Farnell saw that γαίαια τε πάσαια is accusative plural; so did the modern translators Puech (1923), Lattimore (1947; 2nd. edn., 1976), Conway (1972), Werner (n.d.), and Nisetich (1980).

The word θέναια is surely very well suited to the description of the small amount of flat ground in a mountainous Greek island. A copyist who made ΕΑΦΡΗΝ into ΕΛΑΦΡΑΝ would certainly be perplexed by such a word. Either an omega had already found its way into the text in front of theta, as it well may have done, omega being another rounded letter, or he himself thought of ὄθεν. That left the letters ΑΡ and ἄ δρῦα is just the kind of emendation that may have occurred to the enterprising critic who had already made ΕΑΦΡΗΝ into ΕΛΑΦΡΑ and added φιλέειν. Was it Planudes, who played such an important part in the transmission of the text of Plutarch? N.G.Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (1983), 240 says of what look like Planudes' own emendations in the Anthology that they 'prove that when attempting to deal with corruptions in this type of classical poetry he was quite out of his depth'. In the case of Pindar Planudes would have been even more out of his depth than in dealing with poems in the Anthology; not that the manuscripts which were thought to be Planudean by J.Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (1952), 237-69) exhibit any quite such bizarre conjectures.

μὲν γὰρ θέναια might conceivably be right, but more probably we owe μὲν to Plutarch; it yields a suspect word order, since one would expect it to follow ὀλίγον. It is likelier that Pindar wrote γαίαια θέναια.

Like the others who have tried to solve this problem, I have failed to offer a conjecture which takes equal account of the scholion in the papyrus and the text of Plutarch. My

conjecture, it may be objected, is based solely upon the text of Plutarch; the scholion in the papyrus has]δοται θ_α[(or θ_ω[). If the conjecture is right, therefore, there is something wrong with the text of the scholion. The theta makes one wonder whether the word written or intended was not actually θέναρ; if so, the order of the words have been disturbed.

Christ Church, Oxford

Hugh Lloyd-Jones