

The Text of Pindar, *Olympian* 13.107–108

Nicholas Lane¹

Abstract: This note proposes a new solution to the textual crux at Pind. *Ol.* 13.107–108.

Keywords: Greek literature; Pindar; Textual Criticism.

ὅσα τ' Ἀρκάειν ἀνάκων
μαρτυρήσει Λυκαίου βωμοῦ ἀναξ²

and all those [sc. victories] whose witness will be the Lykaian god's royal altar that rules over the Arcadians³

In the transmitted text line 107 is unmetrical (Ἀρκάειν ἀνάκων contains a superfluous short syllable). ἀνάκ(ων) is the consistent reading of the MSS, whereas some later MSS have ἀρκάκ' or ἀρκάκ for Ἀρκάειν and βωμοῖκ for βωμοῦκ in line 108.⁴ The evidence of these variant readings is ambiguous. They might have arisen from difficulties experienced by Byzantine scribes and scholars understanding the vulgate,⁵ but they might also reflect earlier variant readings in the tradition. Be that as it may, such evidence as exists points the finger of suspicion not at ἀνάκων, but rather at Ἀρκάειν and βωμοῦκ. Gerber has catalogued earlier attempts at restoring sense and metre,⁶ but neither they nor more recent attempts carry much conviction. Having

¹ Correspondence address: njglane@yahoo.com.

² This is the text as it appears in the paradosis. Modern editions either print Bergk's Ἀρκάει βάκκακ (e.g. Puech 1931, 153, Bowra 1947 and Turyn 1952, 69) or obelize ἀνάκων (e.g. Snell and Maehler 1987–1989, vol. 1, 47 and Race 1997, 200). Ferrari 2017, 192/4 obelizes the whole of ἀνάκων ... ἀναξ. Gentili in Gentili et al. 2013, 330 retains Ἀρκάειν ἀνάκων and in 108 prints Lomiento's <Διός> {ἀναξ}, but this is violent and introduces an implausible metrical anomaly whereby – – – must respond with *d* (i.e. – – –) elsewhere in the ode: see Peri 2021, 121. I adopt the metrical symbols of Itsumi 2009, xii–xiii.

³ Tr. Race 1997, 201.

⁴ See Mommsen 1864, 125. There is also confusion about Ἀρκάειν in Σ 152 (= Drachmann 1903–1927, vol. 1, 385.21) regarding the lemma, which appears variously in the MSS as ὅσα τ' Ἀρκάει, ὅσα τ' ἐν Ἀρκάει and ὅσα τ' ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ. The different lemmata in the scholia may indicate that variant readings existed at some stage, which would cast doubt on the paradosis. At any rate, the MSS' unanimity regarding the reading ἀνάκ(ων) gives good reason for resisting the three changes involved in Bergk's Ἀρκάει βάκκακ. (Schürch 1971, 93 suggests that a participle here “klänge hohl”, but he does not explain why and there is no good reason for the suggestion.) Ἀρκάειν is recognised as corrupt by e.g. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1922, 370–371 n. 3 (reading Ἀρκάκ and construing it with βωμοῦκ) and Peri 2021, 20 (obelizing Ἀρκάειν ἀνάκων, where most editors who have obelized have only obelized ἀνάκων). Reluctance to condemn Ἀρκάειν may stem from μαρτυρέω regularly taking acc. + dat., but the verb can take a simple acc. rei (cf. LSJ s.v. I.3).

⁵ But if so, it stands to reason that there would have been more in the way of scholiastic comment on this verse, not to mention alternative interpretations.

⁶ Gerber 1976, 57–58. Subsequent conjectures include Lomiento's (considered in n. 2 above) and Peri's ὅσα τ' Ἀρκάκ ἀνακτος | μαρτυρήσει Λυκαίου βωμοῦκ ἰδών (2021, 120 n. 55). Peri's suggestion is too

regard to where the MS evidence suggests that corruption has occurred, I propose writing ὄσα [sc. ἀεθλα] τ' Ἀρκὰς (iam Wilamowitz) ἀνάκων | μαρτυρήσει Λυκαίου βωμοῦ ἀναξ, i.e. “and all those [sc. victories/prizes] to which the Arcadian Lord presiding over his Lykaian altar will bear witness”.⁷ With this reading Zeus bears witness to the Oligaithidai’s victories generally. ἀναξ combined with ἀνάκων (“the ruler who rules”) would not have been unnatural to the Greek ear.⁸ This and the word order (with the participle separated from the noun with which it coheres by the verb)⁹ emphasize Zeus’ overlordship of the shrine at the summit of Mt Lykaon. The suggested reading assumes shortening of the last syllable of βωμοῦ by epic correption. The phenomenon is rare in *d*, but is nevertheless admitted occasionally and there is no good reason why it should not be here.¹⁰ The corruption to Ἀρκάειν will have arisen because a scribe expected ἀνάκων to govern a noun in the dative case, as it regularly does in Homer. However, elsewhere in Pindar the verb consistently takes the genitive.¹¹ After this initial corruption βωμοῦ was probably attracted into the case of ἀναξ. Deletion of -iv at the end of Ἀρκάειν is a slight change, as is that from βωμόσ to -οῦ.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Aeschylus, *Tragedies*. Ed. M.L. West, *Aeschyli Tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheus*. Ed. corr. Stuttgart/Leipzig 1998.

Bacchylides, *Odes*. Ed. H. Maehler, *Bacchylides: Carmina cum fragmentis*. Munich/Leipzig 2003.

Euripides, *Tragedies*. Ed. J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae*, 3 vols. Oxford 1981–1994.

Oppian, *Cynegetica*. Ed. M. Papatthomopoulos, *Oppianus Apameensis: Cynegetica; Eucenius Sophistes: Paraphrasis metro solute*. Munich/Leipzig 2003.

far from the paradosis to be plausible.

⁷ For a god as king in his own temple, see *Pyth.* 3.27–28 ναοῦ βασιλεύς | Λοξίας; for gods and kings presiding over altars see e.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 372 κρατύνεις βωμόν; Eur. *Supp.* 1 Δήμητηρ ἐστιοῦχ', *El.* 674 Ἦρα τε βωμῶν ἢ Μυκηναίων κρατεῖς.

⁸ The same combination occurs at Opp. *C.* 2.52 οἶος ἔην κάκεινος [sc. ταῦρος] ἀναξ σφετέροισιν ἀνάκων; cf. also Eur. *Hec.* 282 οὐ τοὺς κρατούντας χρὴ κρατεῖν ἄ μη χρεῶν. Instances of βασιλεύς used in conjunction with βασιλεύω are numerous.

⁹ For participles separated by main verbs from nouns they govern in the gen. case cf. e.g. *Pyth.* 3.80 μανθάνων οἶσα προτέρων and *Nem.* 7.12–13 ταῖ μεγάλοι γὰρ ἄλκαί | σκότον πολλὸν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι.

¹⁰ See Maas 1962, 80 (§129): epic correption is found “in Pindar and Bacchylides in the sequence – √ – √ –”. Maas’ observation is not limited to dactylo-epitritic movement, as confirmed by the occurrence of correption outside dactylo-epitritic in the sequence – √ √ – within *rdod* (*Pyth.* 2.39), *tel* (*Pyth.* 2.74), *hepta* (*Pyth.* 8.93), *wil* (*Nem.* 4.46), *gl* (*Nem.* 4.79, *Isthm.* 8.65a) and *hipp* (*Nem.* 7.16). For shortening of -οῦ before a vowel in Pindar, see Clapp 1904, 16, adding Barrett’s supplement at *Nem.* 6.18 ἀπ’ Ἀλφειοῦ <ἀγαγεν>. Instances in *d* occur at *Pyth.* 1.100 -cη καὶ ἔλη, *Nem.* 4.90 παῖ [i.e. -αῖ], ὁ κός (with Mommsen’s correction) and *Isthm.* 1.57 -cίνα καὶ Εῦ-; cf. also Bacchyl. 5.31 νῦν καὶ <ἐ>μοί.

¹¹ Slater 1969, 49 s.v. ἀνάκων cites *Ol.* 6.34, 13.24, *Pyth.* 1.39 and *fr.* 148.

- Pindar, *Odes*. Ed. C.J.T. Mommsen, *Pindari carmina*. Berlin 1864; ed. A. Puech, *Pindare, Tome I: Olympiques*. 2nd ed. Paris 1931; ed. C.M. Bowra, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. 2nd ed. Oxford 1947; ed. A. Tuynr, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Oxford 1952; ed. B. Snell and H. Maehler, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, 2 vols. Vol. 1, 8th ed. Leipzig 1987–1989; ed. W.H. Race, *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*. Cambridge MA/London 1997; ed. B. Gentili, C. Catenacci, P. Giannini, and L. Lomiento, *Pindaro, Le Olimpiche*. Milan 2013; ed. F. Ferrari, *Pindaro, Olimpiche*. 8th ed. Milan. 2017.
- Scholia to Pindar. Ed. A.B. Drachmann, *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, 3 vols. Leipzig 1903–1927.

Secondary literature

- Clapp, E.B. 1904. “Hiatus in Greek Melic Poetry,” *Univ. Cal. Pub. Class. Phil.* 1, 1–34.
- Gerber, D.E. 1976. *Emendations in Pindar 1513–1972*. Amsterdam.
- Itsumi, K. 2009. *Pindaric Metre: The ‘Other Half’*. Oxford.
- Maas, P. 1962. *Greek Metre*. Tr. H. Lloyd-Jones. Oxford.
- Peri, A. 2021. *L’Olimpica XIII de Pindaro: Introduzione, commento e analisi metrica*. Hermes Einzelschrift 121. Stuttgart.
- Schürch, P. 1971. *Zur Wortresponion bei Pindar*. Europäische Hochschulschriften 15.2. Bern/Frankfurt.
- Slater, W.J. 1969. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1922. *Pindaros*. Berlin.

