The Text of Pindar, Isthmian 8.21

Nicholas Lane

Abstract: This note proposes a conjecture at Pind. Isthm. 8.21.

Keywords: Greek literature; Pindar; Textual Criticism.



cè δ' ἐς νᾶςον Οἰνοπίαν ἐνεγκών κοιμᾶτο, δῖον ἔνθα τέκες

Αἰακὸν ...1

"but you he brought to the island of Oinopia and slept with you, and there you bore divine Aiakos"²

ERMANN, MAAS, BARRETT AND ITSUMI all recognised that the preferred colometry and metre (combining \$1\$ and \$2\$) requires emendation of vv. 21 and 42 to yield a short syllable where the paradosis has (εὐθ)ὺc (X-) and (ἐνεγκ)ών.³ Their answer, and in my view it must be right, is to read εὐθὺ (Hermann) at v. 42.⁴ However, at v. 21 the solution is "far from simple".⁵ The conjectures to date that seek to repair this are ἔνεγκε, κοιμῷ τε (Hermann), φέρων (or ἄγων) ἐκοιμᾶτο and ἔνεικ' ἐκοιμῷ τε (Bergk), ἔνεικεν, Αἴγινα (Maas), κομίξατ', Αἴγινα (Barrett) and ἔνεγκε λέκτρονδε (Itsumi). I follow Hermann, Maas and Itsumi in supposing that the starting point is to read ἔνεγκε, or perhaps better ἔνεικε, 6 to supply the requisite short syllable. The indicative also produces a more vivid 'bringing' of

¹ Pind. *Isthm.* 8.21–22. The text printed is that of Snell-Maehler 1987–1989, vol. 1, 158.

² Tr. Race 1997, 207.

³ For discussion, see Maas 1914–1921, vol. 2, 16 n. 2 (§6), Barrett 2007, 192–193 and Itsumi 2009, 342–343. Carey 1981, 190 considers εὐθὺ "unnecessary ... because syllaba anceps is established at v. 21". But it is not really 'established' at v. 21. Barrett found the long syllables, i.e. with εὐθύc and ἐνεγκών, 'disturbing' and Itsumi maintains that this colometry "demands short, instead of anceps, at the third position of the 'iambic metron'" so that vv. 21 and 42 "must be emended". At any rate, elsewhere in *Isthm*. 8 this position is *brevis in longo*.

⁴ Barrett 2007, 192 observed that εὐθὺς ... αὐτίκ' is inferior to εὐθὺ ... αὐτίκ' because in the former one or other of the words is redundant whereas in the latter εὐθὺ is 'unambiguously local'.

⁵ Barrett 2007, 192 (Itsumi 2007, 342 considers it "not so easy").

⁶ ἔνεγκε is attested at Bacchyl. 17.62 Maehler, but Pindar's preferred form appears to be ἔνεικε: cf. *Ol.* 3.14, 9.59; *Pyth.* 9.6, 53

the nymph to the place of Zeus and Aegina's union. But when it comes to what to do with κοιμάτο I would suggest a different remedy. Good sense and metre could be obtained by writing $c \dot{\epsilon} \delta$ ' èc νάcον Οἰνοπίαν ἔνεικε καὶ μ<ν>άτο, "and he brought you to the island of Oinopia and courted you". This would result in a euphemistic phrase of the sort detected by the scholia. The separation of ἔνθα from νάcον Οἰνοπίαν by a brief καί-clause should be unobjectionable. ἔνεικε καὶ μνάτο cohere closely and at *Olympian* 7.70–71 ἔνθα is separated from νάcoc by a longer τε-clause. μνάτο can be construed with $c \epsilon$ as object and this would solve the syntactic difficulty presented by κοιμάτο. The corruption would be readily explicable as a combination of misdivision and omission of nu. The corruption would be readily explicable as a combination of misdivision and omission of nu.

 $^{^7}$ Carey 1981, 190 dismisses Hermann's κοιμᾶ as "impossible, as κοιμᾶω means 'put to sleep', which is not what Zeus did". This objection also rules Bergk's ἔνεικ' ἐκοιμᾶ τε out. Bergk's alternative φέρων (or ἄγων) ἐκοιμᾶτο would be an instance of *lectio facilior*. The address to Aegina introduced by Maas and Barrett perhaps gains some support from Σ 45a (= Drachmann 1903–1927, vol. 3, 273.4–5) cè δè, ω Αἴγινα, φηςίν, but the scholiast could equally have been clarifying cè δ'. The address is not all that likely palaeographically (as Barrett concedes), but it is also arguably laboured, superfluous after mention of the synonymous Οἰνοπίαν, and it leaves the actual union unmentioned rather than euphemised (contrary to Σ 45a [= Drachmann 1903–1927, vol. 3, 273.7–8] εὐφήμως ... εἶπε τὸ κοιμᾶτο). Itsumi's proposal lacks palaeographic plausibility.

⁸ The form μνᾶτο occurs at Hes. fr. 37.5, 204.1, 41, 45, 54 M-W and with the augment at Hes. fr. 204.56 M-W and Hdt. 1.205.3. Pindar uses μναστήρ in the sense 'courting'; see Slater 1969, 337 s.v. a. He also seems to have used μνάομαι in the sense 'court' (fr. 210 Maehler) and whether μνώμενοι there was part of the actual fragment or not (as Wilamowitz held), there is no reason for thinking that Pindar would not have used the verb in this sort of context. For this coordination (verb + verb), in place of subordination (part. + verb), in Pindar see Ol. 1.51 διεδάσαντο καὶ φάγον and Pae. 5.36 (= fr. 52e.36 Maehler) ἕλον καὶ ἔνασσαν.

 $^{^9}$ The anonymous referee for *Eranos*, to whom I am grateful for several helpful comments, suggests that μνᾶτο could be explained as a reference to the special attention bestowed by Zeus on the island on which the ode was performed. A close parallel is *Pyth.* 9.53, where Apollo's removal of a nymph to another land is presented by Cheiron as a form of civilized marriage (πόcις ἵκεο in v. 51), in contrast to what the god initially contemplated.

¹⁰ See Young 1965, 252 (= 1970, 102) for instances of the consonant nu omitted and 257–258 (= 1970, 108) for misdivision in Pindar's MSS.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Pindar, *Odes and Fragments*. Ed. B. Snell and H. Maehler, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, 2 vols. Vol. 1, 8th ed. Leipzig 1987–1989.

Scholia to Pindar. Ed. A.B. Drachmann, *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, 3 vols. Leipzig 1903–1927.

Secondary literature

Barrett, W.S. 2007. *Greek Lyric, Tragedy & Textual Criticism: Collected Papers.*Assembled and edited by M.L. West. Oxford.

Carey, C. 1981. A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8. Salem NH.

Itsumi, K. 2009. Pindaric Metre: The 'Other Half'. Oxford.

Maas, P. 1914–1921 Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und Pindar. 2 vols. Berlin.

Race, W.H. 1997. Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments. Cambridge MA/London.

Slater, W.J. 1969. Lexicon to Pindar. Berlin.

Young, D. 1965. "Some Types of Scribal Error in Manuscripts of Pindar," *GRBS* 6, 247–273 (= Calder III, W.M., and Stern, J. (eds). 1970. *Pindaros und Bakchylides*. WdF 134. Darmstadt).