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Fr. 128c (Thren. 3)\(^1\)

6 ἀ μὲν ἀχέταν Λίνον αἰλινον ὑμνεῖ,
ἀ δὲ Υμέναιον. ἄν ἐν γάμοις χροϊζόμενον
νυκτὶ κἀν πρώται λάβειν ἔχειν ὑμνὸν (οἷς)\(^\dagger\)


Neither ἀ (sc. ἀοίδα)\(^2\) nor Maehler’s ἔχειν ὑμνὸν\(^3\) is a satisfactory subject for λάβειν in this context, and the latter seems a doubtful phrase in itself. The required sense, ‘who died on his wedding night’, is most easily obtained by emending to ἔχειν ὑμνὸν, for which cf. h. Merc. 289 μὴ πῦματον τε καὶ ὑότατον ὑμνὸν ιαδής. ὑμν.- will have intruded from l. 6: cf. N. 4.16, where the transmitted ὑμνὸν is corrected by Bergk to ύιόν\(^4\), ὑμνοῦ having preceded (11).

Fr. 260

5 Ὅδυσσεώς δὲ π[παιδί δικτυ]
κυρώτερο[ι] εἰς σοφίας λόγον
ἀθρόεων αὐ[]

So the lines are printed by Snell and Maehler. But εἰς σοφίας λόγον\(^5\), which editors take to be Pindar’s own, clearly belongs to the citing author, Aelius Aristides\(^6\), who favours expressions of this form, having seven instances of εἰς ὄρετής λόγον alone\(^7\), while Pindar has nothing comparable. The adjective, on which the identification of the papyrus largely depends, may not be his either. If it is, he is more likely to have written simply σοφίας: cf. O. 1.104 δύναμιν κυρώτερον.
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2 Doubtfully proposed by D’Alessio, 112.

3 Printed in his Teubner edition (1989); ἔχειν ὑμνὸν mentioned as an alternative in his article (457).

4 ‘Emendatione palmarì’ (O. Schroeder, ed. maior [1900]); rightly accepted by the most recent editors, M. M. Willcock (Pindar: Victory Odes [1995]) and W. H. Race (Loeb [1997]).

5 I. e. ‘with respect to wisdom’, not ‘as regards the utterance of wisdom’ (W. J. Slater, Lexicon to Pindar [1969] s. v. λόγος B.1.e).


7 1.180 (i.72.18), 390 (i.134.14); 3.148 (i.341.8f.), 178 (i.351.11), 249 (i.377.22); 7.24 (i.609.5); 26.41 (ii.103.17 K.).