

PINDAR, *OLYMPIAN* 2.5–7, TEXT AND COMMENTARY—WITH EXCURSIONS TO ‘PERICTIONE’, EMPEDOCLES AND EURIPIDES’ *HIPPOLYTUS*

I THE CRUX AND THE SOLUTION

In 1998, I suggested a new text for a notably corrupt passage in Pindar’s *Isthmian* 5.¹ This article is in effect a sequel to that earlier discussion. In the 1998 article, I proposed, inter alia, that the modern vulgate text of *I.* 5.58, ἐλπίδων ἔκνις ὄπιν, is indefensible and the product of scribal corruption in antiquity, and that chief among the indefensible products of corruption there is the supposed secular use of ὄπις, as if used to mean something like ‘zeal’. This (as I hope to have demonstrated) is a sense for which there is no good evidence in classical Greek, where ὄπις always has a delimited religious denotation, meaning either (a) ‘gods’ response’, ‘divine retribution’, or else (b) ‘religious awe’ or ‘reverence’ towards the gods, through fear of that response or that retribution. If we discount *I.* 5.58 itself (and likewise the focus of the present article, *O.* 2.6), all the pre-Hellenistic attestations can be straightforwardly listed under these headings: (a) *Il.* 16.388 θεῶν ὄπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες, *Od.* 14.88 ὄπιδος κρατερὸν δέος, *Hes. Theog.* 221–2 θεαὶ . . . | . . . ἄπο τῷ δώωσι κακὴν ὄπιν, *Pind. P.* 8.71–2 θεῶν δ’ ὄπιν | ἄφθονον αἰτέω, *sim. Od.* 20.215, 21.28, *Hes. Op.* 187, 251, 706, along with, seemingly, a fragmentary fifth-century Thessalian verse inscription, *CEG* 1.120.1 Hansen; (b) *Hdt.* 9.76.2 θεῶν ὄπιν ἔχοντας, 8.143.2. In addition, one other instance can be interpreted as either (a) or (b), or in effect both: *Od.* 14.82 (of the suitors) οὐκ ὄπιδα φρονέοντες . . . οὐδ’ ἐλεητῶν.² In all cases, though, ‘gods’ are specified, usually as a dependent genitive with ὄπις, or else separately but in the near context.³ Hellenistic and later occurrences of the word are few, and (as I argued in 1998) hints there of a secular reading can actually be taken to reflect misunderstandings based on, precisely, the early corruption in *I.* 5.⁴

¹ ‘Pindar’s poetry and the obligatory crux: *Isthmian* 5.56–63, text and interpretation’, *TAPhA* 128 (1998), 25–88.

² *Pace* LSJ s.v. (‘in bad sense, as always in Hom.’) and comm.—who all assume sense (a) here, without proper discussion. In any Homeric passage, the word ὄπιδα in itself inevitably invites appeal to (a), the normal usage in Homer, but at 14.82 the parallel structure with ἐλεητῶν, as it emerges, points, at least momentarily, to (b): ‘giving no thought to reverence <for gods> or pity <for men>’. This, notwithstanding the fact that, one line later, retributive gods are invoked, and that, a few lines after that (14.88), the word is clearly to be taken in sense (a), both now and with retrospective implications for 14.82 itself.

³ As at *Hes. Theog.* 221–2, *Hom. Od.* 14.82–8 (cf. n. 2 above), *Hdt.* 8.143.2.

⁴ Silk (1998), 37–8. Hesychius, representatively, has the gloss, ὄπιν: ἐπιστροφῆν—interpreting the problem word as ‘care’, ‘regard’: a (mis)interpretation which, I have suggested, derives directly from the corrupt ὄπιν in the early text of *I.* 5.58 (Silk, *ibid.*). In post-classical usage, the word shows signs of becoming an iconym: Silk (2019), 325–6 with n. 133. Iconyms: page 502 below.

In reviewing the evidence, I noted that the closest thing to an apparent parallel for the supposed secular sense of ὄπις is another corrupt Pindaric sequence, this one in *O.* 2, in praise of Thero of Acragas. After quoting the text as printed by Snell–Maehler (*O.* 2.5–7), I offered some comments on the passage:

Θήρωνα δὲ τετραορίας ἔνεκα νικαφόρου
 γεγωνητέον, ὄπι [sic] δίκαιον ξένων, ἔρεισμι' Ἀκράγατος,
 εὐδούμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολι.

ὄπι δίκαιον ξένων, ‘strict in his reverence towards strangers’ (LSJ): this is indeed the nearest thing to any sort of parallel for secular ὄπις in classical Greek. . . [But] this is only [Hermann’s] conjectural text, rightly described by [one] recent editor [Willcock (1995), ad loc.] as quite ‘uncertain’. All manuscripts (supported by *P.Oxy.* 1614) point us to ΟΠΙ δίκαιον ξένων [which last word Hermann reinterpreted as the now universally accepted ξένων],⁵ and in the Byzantine era, at least, ΟΠΙ was in fact interpreted as ὄπι, ‘voice’, and associated with the preceding word γεγωνητέον (witness the scholiastic glosses ἐμμελεστάτω ἄσματι / ἐν λόγοις / φωνῇ [I. p. 110 Abel]). On metrical grounds this ὄπι (ο ο) can hardly be right, since ο – is required; but then again, the ‘uncertain’ form ὄπι, which is accepted by most modern editors for its supposed metrical value ο – , is nowhere attested with [or, on inspection, without] this value; and a glance at the range of alternative conjectures [Gerber (1976), 32] is enough to dispel any cosy belief that ὄπι, or any part of ὄπις, has even commended itself to all modern authorities on Pindar’s text.⁶

By way of clarification, I would now add that ὄπις itself is not a common word, and is used only in restricted grammatical cases (chiefly the accusative),⁷ which makes the unattested ὄπι/ὄπι still more problematic, while the genitival relationship assumed by

⁵ On the papyrus, see page 505 below; on Hermann’s ξένων, pages 501 and 509 below.

⁶ Silk (1998), 36–7. Turyn’s apparatus criticus indicates that all manuscripts have ὄπι, but G and H have ὄπι *ante correctionem*. This ὄπι was singled out and interpreted as ὄπι by Hermann in 1817. Snell–Maehler elide the facts.

⁷ Outside the accusative, the noun ὄπις (always singular) seems only to have a marginal existence. The word is reliably attested thirteen times in pre-Hellenistic Greek (page 499 above), and sporadically later; of the thirteen attestations, ten are in the accusative form ὄπιν; two others are in the epic variant, ὄπιδα (*Od.* 14.82 and 20.215—so, later, Mosch. 4.117); one other in the genitive, ὄπιδος (*Od.* 14.88). The word is only attested in the nominative, ὄπις, if one accepts Bergk’s conjecture at Tyrtaeus 10.12 West (as I more or less did in Silk [1998], 35: I am more sceptical now) or Meineke’s at Timo Phl. 802.2 *Suppl. Hell.* (not accepted by Lloyd-Jones–Parsons ad loc.), or the same scholar’s proposed emendation in ‘Perictione’ *apud* Stob. 4.25.50 Wachsmuth–Hense, or if one counts the citations in the grammatical and lexicographical traditions (like the Suda’s ὄπις; Silk [1998], 37), along with their congeners in the Pindaric scholia (Silk, *ibid.*). The ‘Perictione’ passage deserves a separate discussion, if only because the conjecture might seem to assume a secular usage: see Appendix A (page 515) below. There is also one apparent—but only apparent—citation of ὄπι in the scholarly literature of later antiquity. In the latest text of Apollonius Sophista, *Lex. Hom.* (first/second century A.D.)—but this ‘latest text’ is Bekker’s text of 1833!—the entry for τρόφι (as in τρόφι κύμα κυλίνδεται, *Il.* 11.307) includes the comment: . . . ὡς ὄπι [sic] . . . ἀπὸ εὐθείας τῆς τρόφ: ‘τρόφι . . . like ὄπι . . . from a nominative τρόψ.’ In itself, this clearly points to a reference to ὄπι, not ὄπι: ὄπι from ὄψ, like (supposedly) τρόφι from τρόψ. Concealed within the ellipses above, however, is a problematic sequence, the substantive part of which actually begins: προενεκτέον δὲ ὡς τρόφι . . . ([‘τρόφι] is to be pronounced like τρόφι . . . [?!]). The text for the entry evidently harbours some corruption, but it is hard to escape the conclusion that Apollonius Sophista, or his source, in essaying a derivation of τρόφι from a nominative **τρόψ (in preference to the established nominative τρόπις), has no good reason to invoke ὄπις at all. Whatever the precise truth here, the entry hardly provides any consequential support for the assumption of a dative ὄπι, from ὄπις—and none at all for the hypothetical ὄπι, because τρόφι is not ο – but (like ὄπι) ο ο. (My thanks to Eleanor Dickey for advice on this passage.)

Hermann's ὄπι . . . ξένων⁸ only serves to highlight the anomalousness of a 'reverence' felt not for mighty gods (θεῶν ὅτιν ἔχοντας, Hdt. 9.76.2) but for vulnerable humans. Traditional Greek respect for strangers/guests indeed reflects, or is correlative to, the ultimate commitment to Zeus *xenios* (πρὸς . . . Διὸς εἰσιν . . . | ξεῖνοι, *Od.* 6.207–8), but feeling, or expressing, ὅτις for *xenoi* is as unlikely in this era as worshipping *xenoi* as gods themselves.⁹

Meanwhile, in an aside in my earlier discussion, I added:

To the crux in *O.* 2.6 I have no solution, but note that, besides importing the *ad hoc* and otherwise unattested form ὄπι, the 'uncertain' text (*coni.* Hermann) offers a sequence, δίκαιον . . . , ἔρεισι' . . . , εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον, which is in effect a triadic structure, ABC τε. Such a structure is not common in any period ('rarely, τε couples the last two units of an otherwise asyndetic sequence': Denniston [1959], 501), and does not seem to occur in Pindar (see Slater [1969], 488–9).¹⁰

For this corrupt passage in *O.* 2, I now propose a solution: not, as it turns out, a new solution. That is: this article will champion and elucidate one of the numerous existing proposals for the passage.¹¹ I start by first assuming the *prima facie* plausibility of Hermann's ξένων, not, indeed, because of its proposed connection with the hypothetical ὄπι¹² but on metrical grounds. In the sequence ξένων ἔρεισι', the final syllable of ξένων must be heavy, (cor)responding to the final syllables of Ἄλφειοῦ (13), φιλεῖ (26), τελευτάσομεν ῥ- (33), πρέπει (46), δεδαϊδαλμένος φ- (53), εὐορκίαις (66), δεινδρέων (73), φυᾶ (86), πόλις φ- (93). ξένων, before ἔρεισι', would be υ υ, whereas ξένων gives the requisite υ -. ¹³ This ξένων, however, is not to be regarded as a textual emendation. It is a recognition that here, as elsewhere in Pindar, we have surviving traces of his use of the pre-Ionic alphabet,¹⁴ in which O is indifferently o or ω. And, as will soon be apparent,¹⁵ Hermann's ξένων is clearly right, as against the substantial implausibility of his ὄπι—a problematic form of a word¹⁶ in a problematic sense—which the discussion that follows will show to be yet more implausible.¹⁷

⁸ Not a problem in itself: cf. (e.g.) τοκέων . . . αἰδῶ (*P.* 4.218).

⁹ In retrospect, one might well think that, as prospective support for the improbable secular ὄπι vulgarly ascribed to *I.* 5.58, *this* improbable ὄπι is actually not secular enough.

¹⁰ Silk (1998), 37 n. 43.

¹¹ Gerber (1976), 32 lists fifteen.

¹² Nor indeed because, in a sequence Θήρωνα . . . ξένων, there would in fact be anything amiss in acclaiming Thero as a 'just host' through the phrase δίκαιον ξένων—a usage that evidently worried at least one ancient commentator (ξενοδοχικόν. ἀντὶ τοῦ δίκαιον καὶ εἰς τοὺς ξένους: οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἦν ξένος, Σ11b, I page 61 Drachmann). The noun ξένος, though commonly signifying 'stranger' or 'guest', is of course also used by classical authors in the sense 'host' (LSJ s.v. A.1.2), as by Pindar himself (e.g. of Hiero, *O.* 1.103).

¹³ The only alternative would be to take ξένων as *brevis in longo*, which is not unparalleled in Pindar (see e.g. Braswell on *P.* 4.184d), but not something to be assumed, and certainly not in ('iambic') mid period, as the relevant syllable would be.

¹⁴ See e.g. Braswell on *P.* 4.14d; Silk (1998), 48.

¹⁵ See pages 504 and 509–10 below.

¹⁶ The form would be paralleled in other comparably shaped words: i.e. as an epicism, like Homeric μήτι, alongside μήτιδι, and Θέτι, alongside gen. Θέτιδος (there is no attested **ἴτιδι, but cf. the -δ-forms of ὅτις cited in n. 7 above: ὄπιδα and ὄπιδος), with μήτιν and Θέτιν corresponding to ὄπι. But with a word so obviously restricted in form (see n. 7), such parallels have little force.

¹⁷ See page 504 with n. 30 below. Hardly more plausible are proposals involving a conjectural ὄπι. Hartung, for instance, proposed ὄπι δίκαιον ξένων, which avoids the hypothetical ὄπι at the cost of a less idiomatic construction, while still retaining the problematic ὄπι itself.

Putting ὄπι aside, now, we can more profitably focus on the issue of the triadic structure, ABC τε. Such a sequence, though it would be rash to call it impossible, is certainly suspect. On closer inspection, though, the sequence is seen to be not ABC τε at all but something even more suspect. The point is that, on reflection, the C (the sequence ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν with which the sentence ends) cannot be regarded as a single phraseological unit, as the attested usage of ἄωτος/-ον makes clear. I have reviewed the usage of this curious word on two previous occasions: in 1974, by way of explaining how limited is its supposed association with ‘flowers’;¹⁸ and in 1983, in a discussion of its iconymic status, as a verse word ‘obsolete in the speech-community’, a word that has ‘lost its denotations’ and has no straightforward reference, but only ‘a few faint scattered connotations’.¹⁹ Let us now reconsider the usage of the word, from yet another perspective.

The word ἄωτος/-ον occurs twenty-eight (or very possibly twenty-nine) times in pre-Hellenistic Greek. In Homer the word is attested five times, with reference to wool or linen cloth: *Il.* 9.661, 13.599, 13.716, *Od.* 1.443, 9.434. The seeming coherence of that usage implies that in ἄωτος/-ον we have a rare example of a subsequent iconym whose original (pre-iconymic) meaning we seem to know²⁰—even if it is not at all obvious that our understanding of the post-Homeric outcomes is thereby enhanced. Those other twenty-three (or twenty-four) occurrences are all fifth-century, twenty of them in Pindar, and in all cases the word is used as if it meant²¹ something elusively complimentary in the range of ‘the best’, ‘the paragon’, ‘the consummation’, ‘the glory’, ‘the glorious product’, ‘the glorious reward’. In all cases, too, the word belongs to a phrase with a dependent genitive noun, as if ‘the paragon *of*. . .’, ‘the glorious product *of*. . .’, ‘the glorious reward *for*. . .’.²²

The occurrences fall into two groups. In the larger group (*a*), the dependent genitive noun signifies a non-personal abstraction, or more concrete entity, indifferently singular or plural, with the genitival relation itself variable: in ‘Antigenes’, 1.3 Page *FGE* (= Simon. 148 Bergk⁴), ῥόδων ἀώτοις; and in Pindar, μουσικῆς ἐν ἀώτῳ *O.* 1.15, ἵππων ἄωτον *O.* 3.4, στεφάνων ἄωτον γλυκύν (Pindar?) *O.* 5.1, χειρῶν ἄωτον. . . ἐπίνικον *O.* 8.75, στεφάνων ἄωτοι *O.* 9.19, ἱερὸν εὐζοίας ἄωτον *P.* 4.131, ἄωτος ὕμνων *P.* 10.53, Ἴσθμιάδων. . . κάλλιστον ἄωτον *N.* 2.9, δίκας ἄωτος *N.* 3.29, γλώσσας ἄωτον *I.* 1.51, ζωῆς ἄωτον. . . τὸν ἄλπνιστον *I.* 5.12, ἄωτον. . . στεφάνων *I.* 6.4, σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον *I.* 7.18, Χαρίτων ἄωτον *I.* 8.16a, μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκύν fr. 52f.59 S–M (= *Pae.* 6). In this group, however, the genitive, though variable, is never partitive. Thus, in *O.* 3.4, for instance, the ἄωτον ‘of the horses’ is not (e.g.) ‘the best of the horses’ but (something like) ‘the glorious tribute to the achievement of the horses’, namely Pindar’s poetic ‘tribute’, while in *P.* 10.53 the ἄωτος ‘of songs’ is (something like) ‘the glorification arising from, or consisting in, this ode’; the ‘Antigenes’ is comparable (‘roses that glorify’).

In the second, smaller, group (*b*), the whole phrase refers to a person or persons; the genitive is always partitive; and the genitive noun itself is always in the plural (or else the noun or the plurality are implicit): in Pindar, ναυτῶν ἄωτος *P.* 4.188, ἠρώων ἄωτοι

¹⁸ Silk (1974), 239–40.

¹⁹ Silk (1983), 311–12 (the quoted phrases) and 316–17 (ἄωτος/-ον); on iconyms, see also Silk (2019), 318–26.

²⁰ Contrast such iconyms as ἀμοιμάκετος: Silk (1983), 328–9.

²¹ With iconyms, one should avoid speaking of *the*, or even *a*, ‘meaning’ without qualification.

²² In Aesch. *Supp.* 666 the genitive is implied (n. 24 below).

N. 8.9, γενναίων ἄωτος fr. 6b(f) S–M, ἄωτος ἠρώων fr. 111a.7 S–M;²³ in Bacchylides, Ἀθανάων <εὔ>ανδρῶν ἱερῶν ἄωτον 23.1 S–M (where ‘Athens’ is in effect metonymic for ‘Athenians’, and the supplement is Lobel’s); and in Aeschylus, ἄωτον (*sc.* Ἀργείων) *Supp.* 666.²⁴ Here, clearly, belongs the instance at *O.* 2.7, πατέρων ἄωτον, while (the probable twenty-ninth attestation of the word) Page plausibly conjectured another instance at Aesch. *Pers.* 978, Περσῶν τὸν ἄωτον.²⁵

The anomalousness of the supposed unitary phrase in *O.* 2, πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν, comes into view when we scrutinize the structures of the phrasing in the post-Homeric passages. In most of the occurrences we find simple two-term phrases, ἄ. + genitive noun, as in δίκας ἄωτος (group [a]: *N.* 3.29) or ναυτῶν ἄωτος (group [b]: *P.* 4.188). In four instances from the first group, ἄ. is additionally qualified by a simple intensifying adjective, hardly descriptive of the purported object (*vel sim.*): ἱερὸν εὐζοίας ἄωτον (*P.* 4.131), Ἰσθμιάδων . . . κάλλιστον ἄωτον (*N.* 2.9), ζωᾶς ἄωτον . . . τὸν ἄλπνιστον (*I.* 5.12), σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον (*I.* 7.18). In (Pindar’s?) *O.* 5.1, the qualifying adjective, in effect intensifying, is marginally more descriptive—στεφάνων ἄωτον γλυκύν—while the same adjective occurs at fr. 52f.59 S–M: μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκύν. In that last instance, one might still see the qualifier as intensifying, though it would make more sense to read it as metonymic (transferred epithet), semantically attachable to the genitive noun: the μέλι is *literally* γλυκύ. In the fragmentary sequence at Bacchyl. 23.1, from the second group, there is another metonymic transference—Ἀθανάων <εὔ>ανδρῶν ἱερῶν ἄωτον—where it is Athens itself that is full of ‘good men’ and the Athenians themselves (implied in the name of the city) who actually are those ‘good men’. Then, in one Pindaric passage from group (a), *O.* 8.75, an adjectival metonymy is operative on a more elaborate basis: χειρῶν ἄωτον Βλεψιάδαις ἐπίνικον—where a ceremonial crown is ‘victorious reward for hands . . .’, that is, (in full) ‘glorious reward for hands that produced victory <in the wrestling competition> for <a new honorand from> the Blepsiad clan’.

The seeming collocation in *O.* 2.7, πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν, is different in kind from any of these instances. The adjective is neither intensifying nor metonymic: it makes a new point, and its referent lies wholly outside the genitive phrase. It is not the ‘fathers’ who make, or keep, ‘the city upright’ but Thero, the honorand and focus of the praise: *he* is ὀρθόπολις. As such, though grammatically and positionally attachable to the ἄωτον phrase, the adjective is logically and semantically separate, and is thus, and would surely be felt as, a separate and self-contained item of praise. In effect, then, the weighty compound adjective ὀρθόπολιν would constitute a fourth, final member of the list: δίκαιον . . . , ἔρεισμι’ . . . , ἄωτον, ὀρθόπολιν. Compare, for instance, the similarly weighty compound adjective that constitutes the final member of a shorter list at *O.* 13.4–5: τῶν ὀλβίων Κόρινθον, Ἰσθμίου | πρόθυρον Ποτειδᾶνος, ἀγλάκουρον. But if ὀρθόπολιν is a separate member, the list as it supposedly stands is now wholly anomalous: ABC τε D—a sequence much more improbable than ABC τε

²³ In these last two cases, sufficient context is lacking to make it entirely certain that the genitives are partitive, but they give every sign of being so.

²⁴ Ἀργείων, implied by ἦβας (663), ἀνδρῶν (659), Ἀργείοις (625).

²⁵ The relative coherence of this group, and especially of the genitival usage in it, raises the possibility that here, as often with iconyms (Silk [1983], 314), some re-etymological association is operative, albeit here one of an unusual kind. Specifically: is ἄωτος in group (b) felt as a quasi-superlative form, on the analogy of the similar-sounding πρώτος in uses like πρώτος ἀνθρώπων πλούτω (Hdt. 7.27.2)? Cf. the discussion of πατέρων ἄωτον, page 511 below.

itself. Is such a counter-intuitive sequence ever attested in classical Greek? There is certainly nothing like it in Pindar, and no sign of anything like it elsewhere.²⁶

The obvious implication is that Pindar's τε does not connect two members (supposedly the last two members) of the list but two items within a single member. That is: the accepted division of phrases is wrong, and the accepted punctuation misleading.²⁷ Pindar's list ends not Ἀκράγαντος, | εὐώνυμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὀρθόπολιν but, rather, Ἀκράγαντος | εὐώνυμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον, ὀρθόπολιν.²⁸ From which it follows that the division assumed for the previous member is wrong as well: so, not. . . ξένων, ἔρεισμι' Ἀκράγαντος, | εὐώνυμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον (where ξένων goes with the as yet undetermined word[s] preceding), but ξένων ἔρεισμι', Ἀκράγαντος | εὐώνυμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον.

All of which leaves us with a shorter problem-sequence to come to terms with: not (let us now confine ourselves to Pindaric capitals)²⁹ ΟΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝΞΕΝΟΝ (that is, following Hermann, . . . ξένων) but a seemingly self-contained phrase, or equivalent, ΟΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ, which (to restate) must be metrically υ – υ – –. Here ὀπί (υ υ, not υ –) is out of the question, while the hypothetical ὀπι, now without an explanatory genitive, is even less plausible than it was with one.³⁰ The solution is to posit a simple scribal slip, ΟΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ > ΟΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ—which, it will become apparent, must have occurred in antiquity itself³¹—and restore the text with a self-contained elliptical clause, ὄπα δίκαιον.

This solution, as I have indicated, has been anticipated in earlier scholarship. Bergk's apparatus criticus, in the second edition of his *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (1853), notes that MS G contains the gloss ('supra') ὄπως, καθώς, on which he comments: 'unde elicias γεγωνητέον, ὄπα [sic] δίκαιον, ξένον vel ξένων ἔρεισμι', Ἀκράγαντος εὐώνυμων τε πατέρων κτλ.'³² Then in Bowra's OCT (1935/47), the apparatus criticus records: 'ὄπα Mair coll. gl. G ὄπως, καθώς'.³³ Although ὄπα (sic) is demonstrably right,³⁴

²⁶ Denniston (1959), 501 notes that 'alternation of copulation and asyndeton' is attested—with lists of names—in Aeschylus' *Persae* (exotic [dis]connections for exotic names?), but I see nothing at all comparable anywhere in the play.

²⁷ It is of course most unlikely that there would have been any punctuation in Pindar's original text: all punctuation is doubtless the product of scribal, or editorial, division in later ages.

²⁸ On the interpretation of this restored sequence, as of the rest of the passage, see the commentary, pages 509–11 below.

²⁹ See page 505 below.

³⁰ ὀπι δίκαιον on its own would have to mean 'observant in reverential fear (*vel sim.*) of the gods'—not impossible but highly improbable on two grounds: (i) although the elite can of course be commended for honouring the gods in suitable rituals (*N.* 11.5–7, *I.* 2.39), reverential fear is not something usually ascribed to a great honorand (contrast *Od.* 6.121, with Hainsworth ad loc.); (ii) if it were, it would in any case call for θεῶν or equivalent in the near context (cf. page 499 with n. 3 above).

³¹ See page 505 below.

³² In Bergk's fourth edition (1878) the apparatus criticus has 'G ὄπως καθώς interpretatur, quasi ὄπα scriptum fuerit', and the apparatus criticus in Schroeder's 1900 revision of Bergk⁴, more expansively, 'mire Germanus ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄπως καὶ καθά, gl. G ὄπως, καθώς, quasi fuerit ὀπη (ὄπα)'. In full, Σ in the 'Germanus' codex (Vindobonensis suppl. gr. 64: thirteenth century) has τὸ ὀπι [sic] ἀντὶ τοῦ ὄπως καὶ καθά, ἢ τῷ ἐμμελεστάτῳ ἄσκατι (I, page 110 Abel), with the relevant part of the gloss presumably derived from G itself or a common source. Unlike G (see page 507 below), 'Germanus' is a strictly secondary witness: Irigoien (1952), 217–19.

³³ Evidently among the unpublished notes left by (A.W.) Mair after his death: cf. Bowra's 1935 preface, page x.

³⁴ In Pindar's text elsewhere, and in various dialect occurrences outside Pindar, recent editors and others often print ὄπα as ὀπα. In this article, I assume ὄπα (like Attic ὀπη) throughout: cf. Lomiento (2007).

neither Bowra nor Bergk thought well enough of it to print it in the text, but Bergk—however unconvinced himself—correctly divined the knock-on effect for the division of the two phrases that follow (albeit not the separate issue about the division of the items at the end of the sentence).³⁵

A few words on MS G: Gottingensis philol. 29 (mid thirteenth century). In his account of the history of Pindar's text, Irigoin ([1952], 170–6) makes it clear that G is an important and independent witness, and that its scholia include 'scholies de type ancien' ([1952], 172, 174), along with additional material from the Byzantine scholar Manuel Moschopoulos ([1952], 172). The gloss under discussion must itself be 'ancien', reflecting an earlier text with ΟΠΑΙ/ὄπα: it is surely inconceivable that any medieval scholar would have independently offered a new gloss, ὄπως, καθώς, on a text with ΟΠΙ (whether read as ὀπι or as ὄπι)—whereas one notes that elsewhere in Pindar a straightforwardly attested (if grammatically rather different) ὄπα attracts the scholiastic gloss ὄπως likewise.³⁶ In the relevant (first) volume of his *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina* (1903), Drachmann makes no mention of G's gloss, though citing G for the lines immediately following.³⁷ In his preface (I, page ix), he explains: 'codicem [sc. G] non totum contuli (quod nunc paenitet)'. Drachmann's relative inattention to G has no doubt contributed to the subsequent inattention to the crucial gloss; it remains regrettable ('quod nunc paenitet').

And now the important evidence of *P.Oxy.* 1614 (= Π¹ in Snell–Maehler: fifth or sixth century A.D.). In the transcription by the editors, Grenfell and Hunt, the relevant portion of this papyrus reads:³⁸

ΓΕΓΩΝΗΤΕΟΝ ΟΠΙ
ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΞΕΝΟΝ
ΕΡΕΙΣΜ' ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΟΣ
ΕΥΩΝΥΜΩΝ ΔΕ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ
ΑΩΤΟΝ ΟΡΘΟΠΟΛΙΝ

Like the medieval manuscripts of *O.* 2, then, the papyrus has ΟΠΙ (and ΞΕΝΟΝ),³⁹ from which it follows that our corruption is early and belongs to the era of undivided capitals. No less noteworthy: from ΕΡΕΙΣΜ' to ΟΡΘΟΠΟΛΙΝ, the word-groupings on the papyrus correspond to those assumed in modern scholarship. That is: the essentially colometric layout of words on the papyrus (presumably Alexandrian in origin) no doubt facilitated erroneous presumptions about sense division—in line with modern (mis)understandings (ἔρεισμι' with Ἀκράγαντος;⁴⁰ ὀρθόπολιν with ἄωτον).

³⁵ Van Leeuwen (1964) mentions the gloss in G, only to dismiss it as inconsequential (page 411: 'We laten de glosse van G: ὄπως, καθώς, die wijst op een lezing ὀπι of ὄπα, als onbelangrijk buiten beschouwing'); this, in the course of an uneventful defence of Hermann's ὄπι. Most editors, including Turyn, Snell–Maehler and Gentili *et al.* (in the 2013 Mondadori edition of *Le Olympique*), simply ignore it altogether.

³⁶ See n. 43 below.

³⁷ As in his apparatus criticus on the scholia to 15d (= *O.* 2.8) καμώντες κτλ.: I, page 63 Drachmann.

³⁸ But in capitals: Grenfell–Hunt transcribe in unaccented minuscules.

³⁹ The papyrus also has δέ (for MSS τε). On the evidence provided by Denniston (1959), 164–5, ABC δέ is even rarer than ABC τε (except where the ABC involves anaphora), and ABC δέ E quite anomalous. Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.6, cited by Denniston ([1959], 165) as a solitary example of δέ linking 'two . . . units in the middle of an otherwise asyndetic series', is quite different: in effect, marking a separate contrast within a longer 'series'. The δέ on the papyrus can safely be ignored as a trivial corruption.

⁴⁰ Ancient scholarship already assumes the association: Σ12a, I, page 61 Drachmann: ἔρεισμι'

What are the palaeographical implications of our restoration? In scribal activity, almost anything can be miswritten as almost anything else, but across the centuries, both in antiquity and later in the Middle Ages, some errors are much more common than others. And AI > I is not especially common, and certainly less common than (for instance) AI > A. Very relevantly, though, given the evident antiquity of the corruption, AI > I is reasonably well attested in ancient capitals (see [i] below). The slip is hardly so complicated as to call for special explanations, but in *O.* 2 more than one such explanation is readily available in the event. The misreading of ΟΠΑΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ as ΟΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ would seem to involve a kind of anticipatory haplography from the syllables immediately following (-ΠΑΙ-ΔΙ-ΚΑΙ- > -ΠΙ-ΔΙ-ΚΑΙ-), while, after γεγωνητέον, a sequence ΟΠΙ (as if ὀπι, ‘voice’) could of course feel speciously natural;⁴¹ then again, ὄπα δίκαιον, though perfectly Greek and eminently Pindaric in spirit, is not familiar as a specifiable Pindaric phrase (see [ii] below).

[i] AI > I. Examples from antiquity, both from papyri and, earlier, from inscriptions, include a range of types and contexts. In Eur. *Bacch.* 1096, for instance, *P.Oxy.* 2223 (first century A.D.) has ΚΡΑΤΙΒΟΛΟΥΣ for ΚΡΑΤΑΙ- (see Diggle, OCT). Compare three non-literary examples from papyri cited by Mayser–Schmoll 1.1² (1970), 86: ΕΓΜΕΤΡΗΣΙ (for -ΣΑΙ), *P.Cair.Zen.* 59317.2 (a letter of the third century B.C.); ΕΛΙΟΥ (for -ΑΙΟΥ), *UPZ* 35.11 (a letter of the second century B.C.); ΑΠΟΣΤΑΤΙΣ (for -ΑΙΣ), *P.Teb.* 888 (a wine account of the second century B.C.). Compare two examples from inscriptions: ΧΑΜΙ (for ΧΑΜΑΙ), *SEG* 26.1115.1 (Megarian inscription from Selinus, early fifth century B.C.), and ΦΙΔΡΙΟΥ (for ΦΑΙΔ-), *SEG* 28.155.8 (Attic inscription, c.300 B.C.). Likewise, for the record, one might note some random minuscule miscopyings (but copyings from uncials?) elsewhere in Pindar: *O.* 9.96, ΛΥΚ<Α>ΙΟΥ, cod. H (see Turyn’s apparatus criticus, on his *O.* 9.103); *P.* 3.78, ΜΕΛΠΟΝΤ<Α>Ι, codd. CV; *P.* 11.57, ΓΛΥΚΥΤΑΤ<Α>Ι (that is, γλυκυτάτα), cod. V.

[ii] Pindar’s ὄπα δίκαιον is an elliptical parenthetical clause, approximately equivalent to the δικά phrase at *P.* 9.95–6, αἰνεῖν . . . | παντὶ θυμῷ σύν τε δικά, or the semantically comparable one-word adverb at *O.* 3.7–9, χρέος . . . | . . . πρεπόντως . . . με γεγωνεῖν: ‘in a way worthy of [the *laudandus*]’, as Verdenius (ad loc.) renders πρεπόντως there. Pindaric praise is required to be, and is often specified as, ‘worthy’.⁴² ὄπα itself is attested as a conjunction elsewhere in Pindar (*O.* 10.56, *N.* 3.25), albeit not in a precisely equivalent construction.⁴³ Pindar has no aversion to the given kind of elliptical clause: compare εἰ δυνατόν at *N.* 9.28. Then, in fifth- and fourth-century Greek in general, the neuter adjective δίκαιον, with ellipse of the copula, is a well-attested usage:⁴⁴ Democr. 265 καὶ γὰρ δίκαιον οὕτως, Eur. *Cyc.* 150 δίκαιον (as a one-word sentence), Hippoc. *Prorrh.* 2.12 Πόττερ καὶ γὰρ δίκαιον οὕτως, Lys. 20.30 ἀλλ’ οὐ δίκαιον, Pl. *Grg.* 463c

Ἀκράγαντος: ἔδρασμα ὄντα καὶ τείχισμα τῆς Ἀκράγαντος. καὶ Ὅμηρος: ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν. Cf. Σ Hom. *Il.* 16.549 Erbse (on Sarpedon as ἔρμα πόλλης): ὄθεν καὶ Πίνδαρος ἐρεῖται Ἀκράγαντος εἶπε τὸν Θῆρωνα. By contrast, apart from G’s gloss, no early scholiastic comment on, or reference to, ΟΠΑΙ/ΟΠΙ is recorded.

⁴¹ With the implication that in antiquity (at least, later antiquity) the corrupt ΟΠΙ was already interpreted as it would come to be in the medieval era (i.e. as ὀπι), although there is no direct evidence for this (n. 40 above)—unless one takes the layout in *P.Oxy.* 1614 as itself evidence.

⁴² See further page 508 below.

⁴³ There is also an ‘exclamatory’ ὄπα at *O.* 10.10–11—which, one notes, is glossed ὄπως; I, page 313 Drachmann (on 14b and 15c) (cf. page 505 above).

⁴⁴ Cf. Kühner–Gerth 1.40–2; Schwyzler (1939–71), 2.623–4.

οὐ γὰρ δίκαιον. Equally well attested is the equivalent usage in dependent clauses with conjunctions equivalent to ὅπα/ὄπη: Timocreon 2 *PMG* ὡς εἰκότως καὶ δίκαιον,⁴⁵ Eur. *Hipp.* 1307 ὅσπερ οὖν δίκαιον, Antipho 3.4.10 ὅσπερ ὄσιον καὶ δίκαιον, Pl. *Leg.* 659b ὡς γε τὸ δίκαιον. Meanwhile, ὅπα/ὄπη itself features in comparable abbreviated clauses with other neuter adjectives: Pl. *Phlb.* 50e ὄπη σοι φίλον, Xen. *An.* 2.1.19 ὄπη δυνατόν, 6.4.3 ὄπη ἐλάχιστον.⁴⁶ Furthermore, in intriguing relation to Pindar's usage, there is a legal formula, attested in Doric treaties recorded by Thucydides, where ὅπα itself introduces a clause with δίκαιον in the superlative. At Thuc. 5.79.3 we find the sequence ὅπα κα δικαιοτάτα κρίναντας τοῖς ξυμμάχοις (the parties agree to 'decree as shall stand most with equity towards the confederates'), and at 5.77.6 ὅπα κα δικαιοτάτα δοκῆ τοῖς Πελοποννασίοις ('as . . . shall by the Peloponnesians be thought [most] reasonable').⁴⁷ Compare (without any form of δίκαιον) this, from the mid fifth-century Gortyn Law Code: ὅπα κα <νύ>νανται κάλλιστα (Solmsen–Fraenkel, 40.12, 31). In Pindar's text, all in all, ὅπα δίκαιον is an eminently plausible sequence; its precise tone and its other implications can be considered in more detail later.⁴⁸

II COMMENTARY

5 Θήρωνα δὲ τετραορίας ἔνεκα νικαφόρου
6 γεγωνητέον, ὅπα δίκαιον, ξένων ἔρεισμή, Ἀκράγατος
7 εὐδυνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον, ὀρθόπολιν.

But Thero, by virtue of his victorious chariot,
Is to be acclaimed, justly, as mainstay of strangers/guests, as paragon
Of Acragas and its/his famous ancestors, as upholder of the city.

The overall logic of the sentence is characteristically Pindaric: in the light of his victory, Thero is to be acclaimed as . . . something else as well: great host, fine representative of Acragas and his family, supreme statesman. 'Pindar sometimes acclaims an athletically successful subject, both as such and also, simultaneously, on other grounds' (Silk [2012], 356–7)—as e.g. at *I.* 1.32–8 (ibid.), *O.* 7.15–17, *O.* 13.1–3, *I.* 2.12–17, *I.* 4.2–3. The ἔνεκα phrase in 5 virtually amounts to 'in the context of', like e.g. the ἔνεκεν at *N.* 10.3: cf. LSJ s.v. ἔνεκα I.2, Gerber on ἔνεκεν at *O.* 1.99 and Slater (1969), 176 on the same passage, s.v. ἔνεκεν.

τετραορίας . . . νικαφόρου: 'victorious chariot' as metonymic inversion for 'chariot victory'—privileging the more concrete (chariot) over the less (victory).

⁴⁵ In a conformation superficially Pindaric: Μούσα . . . | κλέος ἄν' Ἑλλανας τίθει, | ὡς κτλ.—but only superficially, because the κλέος here is the (desired) fame of Timocreon's latest critique of Themistocles (Plut. *Them.* 21).

⁴⁶ Pace Benveniste (1966), 161–5, such elliptical constructions (he calls them 'phrases nominales') are not restricted to 'discours direct' and generalized ('sentencieux') reference. The first claim is refuted by (e.g.) Hippoc. *Prorrh.* 2.12 (above), and the second by (e.g.) Pindar's εἰ δυνατόν at *N.* 9.28 (on which cf. Braswell ad loc.), and the present passage too.

⁴⁷ Transl. Hobbes (1629). Cf. *SGDI* 2501.3 Collitz (Delphian inscription, 380 B.C.): δικαζέω τὰς δίκας ὡς κα δικαιοτάτα γνώμα τὰ μὲν γεγραμμένα κατὰ τὸς νόμος. Cf. also simpler inscriptional formulas like ὡς δικαιοτάτα καὶ εὐσεβέστατα (as in Dittenberger, *Syll.*³ 204.10: Eleusis, 352–351 B.C.); κα(τ) τὸ δίκαιον (as *IG* 9.1² 609, 5–6: Naupactus, sixth/fifth century B.C.); ὡς ἄν δύνωνται δικαιοτάτα (as *IG* 12.9.189, 24: Eretria, mid fourth century B.C.); καθάπερ δίκαιόν ἐστιν (as *SEG* 55 [2005], 1816.67: Egypt, third century B.C.).

⁴⁸ Below, pages 508–9.

Cf., more elaborately, *N.* 1.7 ἄρμα δ' ὀτρύνει Χρομίου. . . ἔργμασιν νικαφόροις ἐγκώμιον ζεῦξαι μέλος ('Chromios' chariot prompts me to yoke a song of celebration for victorious deeds') and, more generally, Pindar's instinct for concrete metonyms: *P.* 1.66 κλέος ἄνθησεν αἰχμᾶς (with 'spear' for 'fighting spirit': Slater [1969], 22, s.v. αἰχμά, *c*); *P.* 9.12 γλυκεραῖς εὐναῖς ('beds' for 'acts of love') (on these two passages, cf. Matzner [2016], 67–8, 60–1). Contrast the 'abstract for concrete' manoeuvres at e.g. *O.* 1.95 (with Gerber ad loc.), *O.* 10.72 (with Verdenius ad loc.).

γεγωνητέον: the earliest datable attestation (476 B.C.) of any verbal form in -τέος/-τέον. Such forms are predominantly Attic and only come into view 'in der attischen Blütezeit': Kühner–Gerth 2.1.447 (see 2.1.447–8; cf. Schwyzler [1939–71], 1.810–11; Moorhouse [1982], 171–2). In Attic the earliest datable uses (467 B.C.) are in Aesch. *Sept.* (499 φυλακτέον, 600 κοιμιστέος), and in Attic tragedy most of the occurrences (like those two) are in dialogue. Outside Attic, uses are rare in verse: Thgn. 689 πημαντέον (earlier than our passage?), Orph. 21.7 DK τλητέα. Non-Attic prose-uses include (e.g.) Hdt. 1.120.6 προοπτέον, Hippoc. *Flat.* 1 ιητέον, Hippoc. *Vict.* 1.27 διακτέον, Hippoc. *Acut.* 18 (= 6 Littré) τιμωρητέον. 'Distinctly prosaic', suggest Buck–Peterson (1944), 530, but the instances in Aeschylus (above) and the common occurrence of -τέον in Sophocles (e.g. *Aj.* 1140 θαπτέον, *OT* 628 ἀρκτέον) and Euripides (e.g. *Hipp.* 491 διυστέον, *Or.* 769 οιστέον: the latter in recitative) indicate that this is a very questionable characterization.

The three accusatives (ἔρεισιμ', ἄσπον, ὀρθόπολις) are governed by γεγωνητέον in the double-accusative construction common with verbs of praise in Pindar's odes: we acclaim *x* as *y*. Likewise, γεγωνέω at *P.* 9.3–4 Τελεσεικράτη. . . γεγωνεῖν | ὄλβιον ἄνδρα, διωξίπτου στεφάνωμα Κυράνας, and similarly (e.g.) αἰνέω at *O.* 4.14–16, ἐπαινέω at *O.* 13.1–3, κελαδέω at *I.* 1.52–4. Commentators and others are reluctant to acknowledge the construction (LSJ is silent in all such cases), seemingly taking the *y* as appositional to the *x* (or to the sentence: cf. e.g. Carey on *P.* 9.3–4, above).⁴⁹ Slater (1969), 105 correctly has 'c. acc. dupl.' for *P.* 9.3 (s.v. γεγωνέω) and (page 275) for *I.* 1.54 (s.v. κελαδέω), but not for the other instances cited above, including our *O.* 2 passage.

ὄπα δίκαιον: as our earlier findings indicate (pages 504 and 506–7 above), the restored phrase, vouched for by the gloss in MS G, is an isolated expression in Pindar, but comparable with (e.g.) the simpler σύν. . . δικά at *P.* 9.96 (αἰνεῖν. . . | παντί θυμῷ σύν τε δικά καλὰ ῥέζοντ'). The sentiment that this particular acclamation is 'worthy' and 'appropriate' is echoed at *O.* 3.9, in the parallel ode for the same victory: πρεπόντως. . . γεγωνεῖν.⁵⁰ In Pindar, 'appropriate' praise for the *laudandus* is frequently signalled as such, as it is again later in *O.* 2 itself: πρέπει τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου | ἐγκωμίων τε μελέων λυρῶν τε τυγχανέμεν (46–7). The principle is asserted in general terms in one of his encomia: πρέπει δ' ἐσλοῖσιν ὑμνεῖσθαι (fr. 121 S–M).

⁴⁹ Carey resists the relationship of ἄνδρα and στεφάνωμα there, partly for lack of a parallel to στεφ. words as honorific metaphors for a man: 'Pindar nowhere terms an athlete "crown of the city".' This is true, and would be highly relevant if one were introducing such a usage in an emendation; but much less relevant in a sound text, the run of which invites the interpretation. For the 'honorific metaphor' itself, cf. Lycurg. *Leocr.* 50 εἰπὼν στέφανον τῆς πατρίδος εἶναι τὰς ἐκείνων ψυχὰς, and cf. Eur. *Heracl.* 839, where τὸν καλλιπαιδα στέφανον is a phrase applied to Heracles' children. Pindar elsewhere does use στεφάνωμα (as opposed to στέφανος) metaphorically in other ways (as at *P.* 1.50: cf. Slater [1969], 472 s.v.).

⁵⁰ See page 513 below.

With the compressed clause, compare εἰ δυνατόν at *N.* 9.28 (with Braswell ad loc.)—another isolated expression in Pindar, like ὄπα δίκαιον here—and the parallel compressions like Xenophon’s ὅπῃ δυνατόν (*An.* 2.1.19) and Timocreon’s ὡς εὐκόως καὶ δίκαιον (2 *PMG*) cited above (page 507). The seeming allusion to legal formulas (ὄπα καὶ δικαιοσύνη . . . : *ibid.*) invests Pindar’s praise of Thero with a distinctive authority: the praise is not just ‘appropriate’ but also, somehow, has the force of law. In Pindar, δίκαια is often associated with praise: cf. again *P.* 9.95–6 αἰνεῖν . . . | σὺν . . . δίκαια (likewise Bacchyl. 13.201–2 αἰνεῖτω σοφὸν ἄνδρα | σὺν δίκαια), along with (e.g.) *O.* 6.12 αἴνος . . . ἐν δίκαια, *N.* 3.29 ἔπεται . . . λόγῳ δίκαια ἄποτος, ἐσλὸν αἰνεῖν. Yet, here it is as if he is insisting on the wider connotations of δίκαια/δίκαιος and specifically on a reciprocal implication that Thero’s own actions and achievements are themselves ‘lawful’ and ‘just’ (note the corollary at *N.* 5.14, αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν ἐν δίκαια τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον).

The tone of the sequence γεγωνητέον, ὄπα δίκαιον is not easy to assess. The -τέον is clearly a modernism,⁵¹ and ὄπα δίκαιον too, to judge from the distribution of comparable examples (pages 506–7 above); as a lexical item, γεγωνέω is standard usage, verse and prose, from Homer onwards (LSJ s.v.). Epicisms abound in Pindar, but one notes the absence of any specifiable epicism here (such as the imagined ὄπῃ would yield: see n. 16 above). Some of the various ellipses in which ὄπα is seen to participate elsewhere look colloquial (καρυξῶ Δικαιοπόλιν ὄπα, *Ar. Ach.* 748), but there is nothing to suggest that here, and the apparent legal associations of ὄπα δίκαιον certainly pull in a different direction. The predominant tone would seem to be one of contemporaneity. Thero, if not exactly, like W.S. Gilbert’s Stanley, a ‘modern Major-General’,⁵² is pre-eminently a great figure of ‘our’ time—but then, this is contemporaneity at once allied to ancestral achievement (εὐδούμων . . . πατέρων).

Beside its role in the immediate context, δίκαιον, at the start of the ode, introduces a theme that plays an important part in the impact of the ode as a whole. In *O.* 2, δίκαια and its cognates recur in a way that links Thero’s beneficence and achievement (celebrated here) with righteous behaviour in this world and the next (ἐν δίκαια τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαια, 16; μείναντες ἀπὸ πάμπαν ἀδίκων, 69), with judgement in the next (κατὰ γὰρ δικάζει τις, 59) and, at the end of the ode, with the importance of poetic propriety in celebration itself (αἶνον ἐπέβα κόρος | οὐ δίκαια συναντόμενος, 95–6). This is the unity of ‘associative co-presence’ so characteristic of Pindar: Silk (2012), 356–64.

ξένων ἔρεισμι: on the reinterpretation of ΞΕΝΟΝ as ξένων, see above (page 501). In Pindar’s epinicians, the proper response to *xenoi* (which would often include the poet himself, as beneficiary of ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου: *N.* 1.19–24) is a constant theme: cf. Pavese (1966), 109 n. 16; Carey (1995), 94–5. Just as, later in the poem, Thero is φίλοις . . . | εὐεργέταν (93–4: cf. pages 511–12 below), so here he is a ‘prop’ or ‘support’ or ‘mainstay’ for *xenoi*. This usage of ἔρεισμα belongs to a series of semi-conventional honorific metaphors, favoured especially by Pindar, but whose original models are πύργος, ἔρκος and ἔρμα in their Homeric uses: Ἀργείοισι | . . . πύργος, of Ajax (*Od.* 11.555–6); ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν, again of Ajax (*Il.* 3.229); ἔρμα πόλῃος, of Sarpedon (*Il.* 16.549) and the Ithacans (*Od.* 23.121). The ‘supportive’ source is sometimes a city (*vel sim.*), sometimes a man (ditto), and in Pindar—distinctively—

⁵¹ And largely Attic—which probably amounts to the same thing.

⁵² Gilbert and Sullivan, *The Pirates of Penzance* (1879), Act I.

the beneficiary may be, precisely, *xenoi*.⁵³ Thus Ἔκτορα . . . Τροίας | . . . κίονα (*O.* 2.81–2) but also τάνδ' ἄλιερκέα χώραν [*sc.* Aegina] | . . . ξένοις | κίονα (*O.* 8.25–7).⁵⁴ Likewise, Thgn. 233–4 πύργος . . . δῆμῳ | . . . ἐσθλὸς ἀνὴρ and Alcaeus 112.10 L–P ἄνδρες . . . πόλιος πύργος, whereas in Pindar the enduring ὄλβος of Battos, more elaborately, is hailed as πύργος ἄσπετος ὄμμα τε φαειννότατον | ξένοισι (*P.* 5.55–7). In the metaphorical uses of ἔρεισμα, the actual recipients of the ‘support’ may themselves be cities or countries, as in fr. 76.2 S–M, Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα (Hellas ‘supported’ by Athens), or else groups of people, as in Eur. *IA* 952, ἔρεισμα βαρβάρων (*barbaroi* ‘supported’ by Mt Sipylus), or as with the ξένων here.⁵⁵ Elsewhere in Pindar, simpler tropes are used to characterize the relation between honoree and *xenoi*: at *P.* 3.71 Hiero is ξείνους . . . πατήρ and at *O.* 13.2–3 the οἶκον of Xenophon of Corinth is ξένοις . . . θεράποντα. Much more flamboyant is Empedocles, fr. 112.3 DK, where—as so often in Pindar—the proper response to *xenoi* is articulated in metaphor, and specifically the Acragantines are called ξείνων αἰδοῖτο λιμένες. In context, the phrase looks remarkably like a response to Pindar’s (Appendix B, pages 516–17 below), and, as such, represents confirmation of our restored text. Further confirmation, it might well be thought, is provided by the fact that, whereas ξένων ἔρεισμα makes a distinctive point in the sequence of commendations, the supposed collocation ἔρεισμι' Ἀκράγαντος would effectively be duplicated by ὀρθόπολιν at the end of the sentence.

In retrospect, it becomes apparent that the parenthetic ὅπα δίκαιον applies, not just to the propriety of praise (γεγωνητέον) but, *apo koinou*,⁵⁶ to the terms of praise now specified, especially the first one, ξένων ἔρεισμι'. The connotations of δίκαιον, that is, remain active, because (as Pindar repeatedly reminds us) ‘supporting’ *xenoi* is itself a matter of δίκαια: *O.* 13.2–7 οἶκον . . . | ξένοις . . . θεράποντα . . . [in Corinth, where] . . . Εὐνομία ναίει κασιγνήτα τε . . . | Δίκαια; *N.* 4.12 δίκαια ξεναρκέϊ; *I.* 9.5–6 οὐ θέμις οὐδὲ δίκαιον | ξείνων ὑπερβαίνοντες. Pindar has not, indeed, invented the association: cf. *Od.* 6.120–1 δίκαιοι ~ φιλόξενοι, Hes. *Op.* 225–6 δίκαια ξείνοις . . . δίδουσιν | ἰθείας καὶ μὴ τι παρεκβαίνουσι δικαίου, Aesch. fr. 196.1–2 Radt ἐνδικώτατον | . . . καὶ φιλοξενώτατον, Bacchyl. 14.23 φιλοξείνου τε καὶ ὀρθοδίκου, Eur. *Alc.* 1147–8 δίκαιος ὧν | . . . εὐσέβει περὶ ξένους.

Ἀκράγαντος | εὐνομίων τε πατέρων: a typically Pindaric kind of double specification, almost a hendiadys; cf. *N.* 5.8 Αἰακίδας ἐγγέγαυρον ματρόπολιν τε, *N.* 9.14 πατρίων οἶκον ἀπὸ τ' Ἄργεος, *O.* 3.38–9 Ἐμμενίδας | Θήρωνί τ' (Thero is an Emmenid).⁵⁷ In all the examples cited, the particle τε isolates, therefore foregrounds, a proper name, as here Ἀκράγαντος: Thero (we are to agree) is the supreme representative of his city, Acragas, as well as of the Emmenids, his clan.

⁵³ Similarly, without metaphor, Pindar presents a *city* (Aegina) as φίλαν ξένων ἄρουραν (*N.* 5.8), while a *man* (the Aeginetan Lampon) inspires warm feelings for his ξένων εὐεργεσίας (*I.* 6.70).

⁵⁴ The alternation between κίονα + gen. and κίονα + dat. here is of little consequence: cf. e.g. the alternation between grammatical cases in ξείναια . . . ἅ τε ξείνοις θέμις ἐστὶν at *Il.* 11.779 and δωρινὴν ἧ τε ξείνων θέμις ἐστὶν at *Od.* 9.268, or between πύργος + dat. (Thgn.) and + gen. (Alc.) in the examples that follow.

⁵⁵ In two Hellenistic poems, Hector is ἔρ. πάτρας (Lycoph. *Alex.* 281–2) and Pan (punningly) ἔρ. πάντων (*Mel. Adesp.* 936.17 *PMG*). On the dating of the Pan poem, see Furlley–Bremer (2001), 1.240–3.

⁵⁶ For a basic inventory of *apo koinou* types, see Des Places (1962).

⁵⁷ For bolder examples (hendiadys proper), see Verdenius on *O.* 3.6, Braswell on *N.* 9.13, Carey on *I.* 8.1; on hendiadys in general, Sansone (1984).

πατέρων ἄωτον: hyperbolic, in so far as, when used of people partitively (above, pages 502–3), ἄ. + genitive plural implies that the subject is one of the plurality: compare the hyperbolic superlatives in Soph. *Ant.* 100–2 (with Jebb ad loc.) or Milton’s ‘fairest of her daughters, Eve’ (*Paradise Lost*, 4.324). The hyperbole is lessened by Ἀκράγαντος—as if ‘the finest representative of Acragas, including his own ancestors’. With Ἀκράγαντος, ἄωτον functions like its counterpart in Ἀθανᾶν. . . ἄωτον at Bacchyl. 23.1; with πατέρων, like ναυτῶν ἄωτος at *P.* 4.188. On the iconym ἄωτος/-ον, its occurrences and its usage, see pages 502–3 above.

ὀρθόπολιν: the adjective goes not (aberrantly) with ἄωτον but (straightforwardly) with the underlying subject Θήρωνας, as the last item in an unconnected (asyndetic) list (pages 503–4 above); similarly *O.* 13.4–5 τὰν ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον, Ἴσθμίου | πρόθυρον Ποτειδᾶνος, ἀγλαόκουρον, where ἀγλαόκουρον goes with Κόρινθον, not with πρόθυρον. The adjective ὀρθόπολις is rare in the extreme: in antiquity only attested otherwise in a Pisidian verse inscription of the Roman era (*BCH* 23 [1899], 302), as a proper name (as in Strabo 7 fr. 16.11 Radt and Pausanias 2.5.8) and with explicit allusion to Pindar in Himerius (*Orat.* 38.75 Colonna) and Libanius (*Epist.* 288.1). Libanius’ reference (τὸν ὀρθόπολιν, εἶπεν ἂν Πίνδαρος) conveniently suggests that the compound was Pindar’s coinage or, at least, effectively his property, with no independent life outside *O.* 2 itself. The first element, ὀρθο-, is verbal in force (Σικελίαν. . . ὀρθώσιν *N.* 1.15, πόλις. . . ὀρθωθείσα *I.* 5.48), like the first elements in ἀρχέπολις (of the nymph Κυράνα: *P.* 9.54), φερέπολις (of personified Τύχα: fr. 39 S–M), ἐρυσίπολις (of Athena: *Il.* 6.305). The parallels are indicative of the high pitch of Pindar’s praise of Thero in this passage.

What follows after ὀρθόπολιν is a celebration of the πατέρων: καμόντες οἱ πολλὰ θυμῷ | ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἴκημα ποταμοῦ. . . (8–9). With ὀρθόπολιν a distinct item in the list, that sequence is seen to involve a very Pindaric dislocation of the relative pronoun from its antecedent. With πατέρων ἄωτον, ὀρθόπολιν | καμόντες οἱ. . . , compare, later in the ode (79–81), Ἀχιλλέα τ’ ἔνεικ’, ἐπεὶ Ζητὸς ἦτορ | λιταῖς ἔπεισε, μάτηρ | ὄς. . . In all such cases, the effect is to highlight the new topic, even at the cost of an abrasive switch (as, strikingly, in the later passage).

III ECHOES

Towards the end of *O.* 2, at lines 93–5, Pindar picks up the topic of Thero’s beneficence to *xenoi*: in a hundred years, no city has produced φίλοις ἄνδρα μᾶλλον | εὐεργέταν πραπίσιν ἀφθονέστερόν τε χερά | Θήρωνος. In passing, one notes the concrete force of Thero’s ‘hand’.⁵⁸ Less noteworthy in itself: the momentary concreteness precisely matches the implicit physicality of ξένων ἔρεισμ’ in line 6. ‘Hands’ are hardly what ‘support’ the *xenoi* there, but ἐρείδειν and χεῖρ are readily associable in Greek usage (ἔρεισμα itself is not common enough to show up the association): *Il.* 5.309 ἐρείσατο χεῖρ; 11.235 ἐπὶ δ’ αὐτὸς ἔρεισε, βαρεῖη χεῖρὶ πιθήσας; *Od.* 11.426 χερσὶ. . . σὺν. . . στόμ’ ἐρείσαι; Hippoc. *Art.* 58 τῇ χεῖρὶ. . . ἐρείδεσθαι, 11 τῇ χεῖρὶ ἐπερείδειν, 52 τῇ χεῖρὶ πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἀπερειδόμενοι. Meanwhile, the φίλοι to whom Thero has shown himself a εὐεργέτας in lines 93–5 doubtless are, or subsume, *xenoi*: cf. *I.* 6.70 ξένων εὐεργασίας ἀγαπάται. The association of ξένος and φίλος is

⁵⁸ Cf. pages 507–8 above.

familiar in Greek usage more generally, from epic-era verse (*Il.* 6.224 ξείνος φίλος; *Od.* 1.313 φίλοι ξείνοι; *CEG* 1.453 Hansen ξένΦος τε φίλος; Ithacan inscription, c.700 B.C.) to classical prose (Xen. *An.* 2.1.5 φίλος καὶ ξένος; sim. Lys. 19.19, Dem. 21.110, Aeschin. 3.224) and Pindar himself (*N.* 5.8, 7.61–3). The echo is hardly perceptible—which tells us what? That, for Pindar, unobtrusive self-echoing is, or may be, a significant mode of composition.

A more consequential example, for present purposes, is provided by the echoes of our passage in the parallel ode, *O.* 3, a second celebration of the victory that is the occasion for *O.* 2. As with at least one other group of related poems in Pindar's epinician collection, private compositional imperatives lead the poet to recall phraseology or verbal sequences from one ode to another, far beyond any question of *Lieblingswörter* or, indeed, random repetition. The case in point is the three *pankration* odes for the brothers Pytheas and Phylacidas, *N.* 5, *I.* 5 and *I.* 6, where the phenomenon is surely beyond dispute.⁵⁹ In particular, *I.* 5, the latest of the three, shows such striking correspondences as these, with the earlier *I.* 6:

Αἰακοῦ παίδων — συμμάχοις⁶⁰ — πόλιν Τρώων — σύν — πέφνον — χαλκοάραν (*I.* 5.35–41)
χαλκοχάρμιαν — σύμμαχον ἐς Τροίαν — πέφνεν δὲ σύν — Αἰακίδαν (*I.* 6.27–35),

‘where the χαλκο- compounds and the noun σύμμαχος (not otherwise attested in Pindar) are distinctive’.⁶¹ With *O.* 2 and *O.* 3, it is impossible to know which ode was composed first, but that hardly matters. The point is that the two commemorations of Thero's Olympic victory contain comparable echoes (‘allusions’ would be an inappropriate characterization)⁶² and that, as will become apparent, the echoes serve to strengthen the case for the textual restoration proposed for *O.* 2.⁶³

There are, of course, substantive elements in common between *O.* 2 and *O.* 3. Not only do the poems celebrate the same victor and the same victory; they share at least one noteworthy mythological connection. Heracles figures in both odes, while, specifically, both the opening of *O.* 2 and the closure of *O.* 3 associate Thero and Heracles as great achievers: Ὀλυμπιάδα δ' ἔστασεν Ἡρακλέης | ἀκρόθινα πολέμου | Θήρωνα δὲ . . . | γεγωνητέον (*O.* 2.3–6); νῦν δὲ πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν ἰκάνων ἄπτεται | οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν (*O.* 3.43–4). Much less striking, no doubt, but much more to the point, is the set of correspondences in the following two passages (the second of which subsumes that same closure), where any overt substantive connection is lacking. The first passage belongs to Pindar's remarkable depiction of the afterlife; the second, to the sequence that begins with Heracles' foundation of the Olympic games and ends with the poet's affirmation of limits:

κενεᾶν⁶⁴ — νέμονται αἰῶνα — ψυχάν, ἔτειλαν — μακάρων — περιπνέουσιν — χρυσοῦ — δενδρέων, ὕδωρ — ὀρθάσι (*O.* 2.65–75)

⁵⁹ Silk (1998), 81–5. On the more overt intertexts between these odes, see Morrison (2011), 238–50.

⁶⁰ σύν μάχαις codd., corr. Bury; Silk (1998), 82 n. 146.

⁶¹ Silk (1998), 81–2.

⁶² Because, as with the echoes in the three *pankration* odes, these hardly operate on a public-perceptible level: cf. Silk (1998), 81–2.

⁶³ As also with *I.* 5: Silk (1998), 83–5.

⁶⁴ Printed as κεινᾶν by most editors.

Ὅρθωσις — πνοιῆς — ψυχροῦ — δένδρα — ἀγῶνα νέμειν — μακάρων τελετάς — ὕδωρ — χρυσὸς — κενεός⁶⁵ (*O.* 3.30–45).

In the *I.* 5/*I.* 6 example, the correspondences largely involve repeated words or word-elements (πέφρον/πέφρην), but also sound-echoes (χαλκοῦραν/χαλκοχάρμαν). So too here we have κενεάν/κενεός but also νέμονται αἰῶνα/ἀγῶνα νέμειν.⁶⁶

In this light, two other—much shorter—sequences have a special relevance. First, we have the correspondence, both in word and sound, between *O.* 2.6–7 Ἀκράγαντος | εὐωνύμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον, ὀρθόπολιν and *O.* 3.3–4 (likewise early in its ode) ὕμνον ὀρθώσις, ἀκαμαντοπόδων | ἵππων ἄωτον, or specifically:

Ἀκράγαντο- — -ύμων — -ων ἄωτον, ὀρθό- (*O.* 2.6–7)

ὕμνον ὀρθώ- — ἀκαμαντο- — -ων ἄωτον (*O.* 3.3–4).

Here, it is arguably no coincidence that in the *O.* 3 sequence the ἀκαμαντο- element (like the echoic Ἀκράγαντο- in *O.* 2)⁶⁷ goes closely with the ἄωτον that follows. In Pindar's authorial-compositional mind, the shape of the phrasing is determinative.

Finally, the early part of *O.* 3, again, has a revealing correspondence, part verbal, part semantic, with the restored phrase that is at the centre of our argument. With γεγωνητέον, ὅπα δίκαιον at *O.* 2.6, compare πρεπόντως. . . γεγωνεῖν at *O.* 3.9.⁶⁸ The latter phrasing emerges from a much more intricate sequence, indeed (*O.* 3.6–9):

. . . στέφανοι
πράσσοντί με τούτο θεόδματον χρέος,
φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοῶν ἀυλῶν ἐπέων τε θέσιν
Αἰνιηδάμου παιδί συμμεῖζαι πρεπόντως, ἃ τε Πίσια με γεγωνεῖν.

The kinship, however, is apparent. Here, as with the ἀκαμαντοπόδων sequence, Pindar's perhaps unexpected compositional habits have given us a correspondence that tends to confirm the plausibility of a corrected text.⁶⁹

King's College London

M.S. SILK
michael.silk@kcl.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Abel, E. (1891), *Scholia Recentiora in Pindari Epinicia* (Budapest).
Benveniste, E. (1966), *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, vol. 1 (Paris).
Buck, C.D. and Peterson, W. (1944), *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago).

⁶⁵ Printed as κεινός by most editors.

⁶⁶ The ὀρθάσις/Ὅρθωσις correspondence might be taken either way, although—whatever the actual etymology of the cult title Ὅρθωσις—the ancients evidently regarded the word as a derivative of ὀρθός: Ὅρθωσις δὲ ὅτι ὀρθοῖ εἰς σωτηρίαν (Σ ad loc., I, page 121 Drachmann).

⁶⁷ The Ἀκράγαντο-/ἀκαμαντο- echo is especially noteworthy in that the two odes in question have quite different rhythmic bases: *O.* 2 is, in Snell–Maehler's phrase, 'ex iambis ortum'; *O.* 3 is dactylo-epitrite.

⁶⁸ Cf. page 508 above.

⁶⁹ Besides the seeming reminiscence of Pindar's ξένων ἔρειπμ' in Empedocles (above, page 510, and Appendix B below), one other possible echo of *O.* 2.6 outside Pindar is worth recording—in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, or its transmission: see Appendix C below.

- Carey, C. (1995), 'Pindar and the victory ode', in L. Ayres (ed.), *The Passionate Intellect. Essays on the Transformation of Classical Traditions Presented to Professor I.G. Kidd* (New Brunswick, N.J.), 85–103.
- Demand, N. (1975), 'Pindar's *Olympian* 2, Theron's faith, and Empedocles' *Katharmoi*', *GRBS* 16, 347–57.
- Denniston, J.D. (1959), *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edn (Oxford).
- Des Places, É. (1962), 'Constructions grecques de mots à fonction double (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ)', *REG* 75, 1–12.
- Drachmann, A.B. (1903), *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, vol. 1 (Leipzig).
- Furley, W.D. and Bremer, J.M. (2001), *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*, vol. 1 (Tübingen).
- Gerber, D.E. (1976), *Emendations in Pindar, 1513–1972* (Amsterdam).
- Giani, S. (1993), *Pseudo Archita, L'educazione morale* (Rome).
- Irigoin, J. (1952), *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris).
- Laks, A. and Most, G.W. (2016), *Early Greek Philosophy*, vol. 5.2 (Loeb Classical Library) (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Lomiento, L. (2007), 'Riflessioni minime sulla logica della congettura in filologia (Pind. *Ol.* 10.10, 11, 55/56)', *QUCC* 85, 57–63.
- Matzner, S. (2016), *Rethinking Metonymy: Literary Theory and Poetic Practice from Pindar to Jakobson* (Oxford).
- Mayser, E. and Schmoll, U. (1970), *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, vol. I.1² (Berlin).
- Moorhouse, A.C. (1982), *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leiden).
- Morrison, A. (2011), 'Aeginetan odes, reperformance, and Pindaric intertextuality', in D. Fearn (ed.), *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry* (Oxford), 227–53.
- Page, D.L. (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge).
- Pavese, C. (1966), 'Χρήματα, χρήματ' ἄνῆρ ed il motivo della liberalità nella seconda Istmica di Pindaro', *QUCC* 1, 103–12.
- Sansone, D. (1984), 'On hendiadys in Greek', *Glotta* 62, 16–25.
- Schwyzler, E. (1939–71), *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich).
- Silk, M.S. (1974), *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* (Cambridge).
- Silk, M.S. (1983), 'LSJ and the problem of poetic archaism: from meanings to iconyms', *CQ* 33, 303–30.
- Silk, M.S. (1998), 'Pindar's poetry and the obligatory crux: *Isthmian* 5. 56–63, text and interpretation', *TAPhA* 128, 25–88.
- Silk, M.S. (2012), 'Reading Pindar', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (edd.), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge), 347–64.
- Silk, M.S. (2019), 'Literary lexicography: aims and principles', in C.A. Stray, M. Clarke and J. Katz (edd.), *Liddell and Scott: The History, Methodology, and Languages of the World's Leading Lexicon of Ancient Greek* (Oxford), 299–329.
- Slater, W.J. (1969), *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin).
- Swain, S. (2013), *Economy, Family, and Society from Rome to Islam: A Critical Edition, English Translation, and Study of Bryson's Management of the Estate* (Cambridge).
- Thesleff, H. (1961), *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period* (Åbo).
- Van Leeuwen, J. (1964), *Pindarus' Tweede Olympische Ode* (Assen).
- Willcock, M.M. (1995), *Pindar: Victory Odes* (Cambridge).
- Wright, M.R. (1995), *Empedocles: The Extant Fragments*, 2nd edn (London).

APPENDIX A: ‘PERICTIONE’ (see n. 7 above)

Meineke’s ὅπως in ‘Perictione’ *apud* Stob. 4.25.50 Wachsmuth–Hense: this is a flowery neo-Pythagorean paragraph on the right treatment of parents by (especially) daughters, written in quasi-Ionic Greek, probably in the second century A.D.⁷⁰ The passage as transmitted is seriously corrupt. Meineke provided various improvements and at least one—*this* one—more questionable adjustment. The relevant sentence, as printed by Wachsmuth–Hense, runs: *θείη γὰρ καὶ καλὴ ὄψις γονέων, καὶ ἡ τουτέων ὅπως καὶ θεραπείη, ὀκόση οὐδὲ ἡλίου οὐδὲ πάντων ἄστρον, τὰ οὐρανὸς ἐναψάμενος ἀμφιχορεύει, καὶ εἶ τι ἄλλο δοκεῖ τις χρῆμα μέζον εἶναι ἐόντων κατὰ θεωρίην.* This, seemingly, is to mean: ‘The appearance of one’s parents is divine and beautiful, and <likewise> our regard and care for them, beyond even <the appearance of> the sun and all the stars that heaven sets alight in its circular dance, or anything else one could imagine as a greater spectacle.’ This ὅπως is Meineke’s conjecture. Of the manuscripts, as the Wachsmuth–Hense apparatus criticus indicates, A (Parisinus: fourteenth century) has (that is, repeats) ὄψις; S (Vindobonensis: eleventh century) and M (Escorialensis: twelfth century) have ἀψις (‘sine acc.’); while Tr. (the sixteenth-century *editio Trincaveliana*) has ἄψις (whether by simple correction of SM or through reference to some additional witness is not clear). By any reckoning, the Greek is intricate, and, among much else, the non-visual-related sequence καὶ ἡ . . . θεραπείη is a noteworthy parenthesis, in that it interrupts a flamboyant visual-centred comparison of ὄψις γονέων and ἡλίου κτλ. The sentence (as indeed the passage more generally) is characterized by wordplay: not only εἶναι ἐόντων but *θείη* first word, *θεωρίην* last. This might seem to support a sequence ὄψις . . . ὅπως; and, if so, we would have an instance of the nominative ὅπως, prospectively in the secular sense (ἐπιστροφή) posited by the likes of Hesychius (see n. 4 above). However, Malcolm Schofield (who has kindly commented on my discussion) advises me that arguably ὅπως here would suggest religious ‘reverence’, in line with *θείη*, and likewise *θεραπείη* religious ‘service’ (as to gods); and he finds the conjectural ὅπως ‘very likely right’ on this basis. He notes: ‘For the divinity of parents in this kind of context, and the requirement to accord them worship, see Stob. 4.25.53, from Hierocles, thought also to be second century A.D.: especially pages 641.3–642.5 Wachsmuth–Hense, where children are to think themselves ζακόρους τινὰς καὶ ἱερέας for the household, as if in a temple.’ As such, the passage would provide no support for secular ὄπως, though indeed it would exemplify the nominative form. That said, one should still note that the conjecture would offer a unique attestation of the nominative in a continuous text (even in later texts); and that there is at least a case for retaining Tr.’s version of SM’s text, ὄψις . . . ἄψις: ‘The appearance of one’s parents is divine and beautiful, and likewise touching and tending them . . .’. Not surprisingly, ἄψις/ὄψις is an attested collocation in philosophical Greek (Arist. *Hist. an.* 535a12–13; cf. Posidonius Phil., fr. 394 Theiler), while here, in an extra bit of wordplay, ἄψις would then be picked up (however inconsequentially) by ἐν-αψ-άμενος. *Non liquet?*

⁷⁰ See Giani (1993), 8–12; cf. Swain (2013), 284–5, 315. The text is unconvincingly taken to be early Hellenistic by Thesleff (1961), 113.

APPENDIX B: EMPEDOCLES' *KATHARMOI* (see page 510 above)

In the opening verses of his *Katharmoi*, fr. 112.3 DK, Empedocles calls the citizens of Acragas ξείνων αἰδοῖοι λιμένες. The phrase impinges as a response to Pindar, to Pindar's characteristic use of metaphor to present the exemplary treatment of *xenoi*, but more specifically to the phrase ξένων ἔρεισμ' in *O.* 2.6. As printed by Wright (1995), 134,⁷¹ the opening six lines of Empedocles' poem run:

ὦ φίλοι, οἱ μέγα ἄστῳ κατά ξανθοῦ Ἀκράγαντος
ναίετ' ἄν' ἄκρα πόλεος, ἀγαθῶν μελεδῆμονες ἔργων,
(ξείνων αἰδοῖοι λιμένες κακότητος ἄπειροι,
χαίρετ'· ἐγὼ δ' ὑμῖν θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκέτι θνητός,
πωλεῦμαι μετὰ πᾶσι τετιμένος, ὥσπερ ἔοικεν,
ταινίας τε περίστεπτος στέφεσιν τε θαλείοις.

The ancient sources for this passage do not indicate that verse 3 belongs to it. The sequence ξείνων . . . ἄπειροι is recorded separately by Diodorus (13.83.2), who ascribes it, as a description of the Acragantines, to Empedocles, and it was inserted in the opening lines by modern editors—hence Wright's brackets. It remains a disputed presence here, although there is no question of misattribution, and the line makes good sense as verse 3.⁷² Assuming that the line is correctly inserted here, we have a striking sequence of seeming echoes or allusions (phraseological and auditory) to Pindar's epinician odes, and specifically to the opening of *O.* 2. [i] With Empedocles' (1–3) Ἀκράγαντος — ἄκρα πόλεος — ξείνων — λιμένες, compare Pindar's ἀκρόθινα πολέμου — ξένων ἔρεισμ', Ἀκράγαντος (*O.* 2.4–6).⁷³ [ii] Empedocles' θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκέτι θνητός (4) reads like a grandiose riposte to Pindar's τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα (*O.* 2.2). [iii] With Empedocles' ὥσπερ ἔοικεν (5), compare the restored phrase ὅπα δίκαιον (*O.* 2.6) itself. [iv] Then, without specific reference to the opening of *O.* 2, Empedocles' τετιμένος . . . στέφεσιν (5–6) is strongly evocative of the τιμαὶ καὶ στέφανοι of Pindaric epinician celebrations (the phrase itself comes from fr. 221.2 S–M). Empedocles, then, presents himself as a revered figure (like Pindar's [ἥρωες] . . . σεβιζόμενοι, *I.* 5.29), graced with garlands like an epinician victor. Very relevantly, Empedocles was a native of Acragas; his grandfather was himself an Olympic victor;⁷⁴ and there are notable eschatological affinities between his *Katharmoi* and *O.* 2.⁷⁵

The Acragantine Empedocles, we may infer, has not only had Pindar in mind, but has also felt it natural to make the opening of his momentous poem, with its momentous opening claims, evoke—and even trump—the majestic opening of Pindar's great tribute to Acragas and the Acragantine Thero. And the sequence of evocations would seem itself to support the placing of ξείνων . . . ἄπειροι as verse 3 of Empedocles' poem,

⁷¹ But with added commas in verse 4; in Wright the fragment is numbered 102.

⁷² Wright (1995), 265–6.

⁷³ For what it may be worth, an anecdote in Diog. Laert. 8.65 (Emped. P19 in Laks–Most [2016], 344–7) credits Empedocles with an epigram devoted to multiple wordplay with ἄκρ- (ἄκρον . . . Ἀκρων' Ἀκραγαντίνων . . . Ἄκρου | . . . ἄκρος . . . ἀκροτάτης). The epigram is printed as 'Empedocles' II by Page (1981), 153–4, who calls it 'plainly spurious' ([1981], 153).

⁷⁴ Emped. P3 in Laks–Most (2016), 328–31; Diog. Laert. 8.51–2.

⁷⁵ See e.g. Demand (1975), 355 n. 38.

just as, reciprocally, that proem supports the textual-critical case for the phrase ζείνων ἔρεισμ' in Pindar's ode.

I observe in passing that in Empedocles' ζείνων αἰδοῖοι λιμένες, the epithet αἰδοῖοι recalls nothing in Pindar, but rather *Od.* 9.268–71, where Odysseus asks the Cyclops for δωτήνην, ἢ τε ζείνων θέμις ἐστίν, referring to Ζεὺς. . . ζείνιος, ὃς ζείνοισιν ἄμ' αἰδοῖοισιν ὄπηδεῖ: it is the ζείνοι who are αἰδοῖοι, strictly, not the λιμένες. And that LSJ s.v. λιμήν unhelpfully cites the Emped. usage under II.2 'gathering-place', rather than (as it surely should be) under II.1 'haven'.

APPENDIX C: EURIPIDES' *HIPPOLYTUS* (see n. 69 above)

At Eur. *Hipp.* 585–7, the chorus hear shouting and—apparently—look to Phaedra, who is closer to the commotion, for enlightenment. The manuscripts at this point offer the hardly credible sequence: σαφές δ' οὐκ ἔχω | γεγωνεῖν ὄπα [or ὄπα or ὄπα] διὰ πύλας ἔμολεν | ἔμολέ σοι βοά. Diggle (OCT) reads: . . . γεγωνεῖ δ' οἶα . . . , accepting a conjecture by Lloyd-Jones (γεγώνει δ') and another by 'nescioquis ap. Valckenauer' (οἶα). Barrett had γεγωνεῖ δ' ὄπα (printed as ὄπαι), where γεγωνεῖ δ' was Murray's suggestion. Whatever else is uncertain here, it can be agreed that the resemblance of γεγωνεῖν ὄπα δι- to the corrected version of Pindar's sequence, γεγωνητέον, ὄπα δι-, is curious. Might there be another reminiscence of Pindar's text here? We know that *O.* 2, to judge from Empedocles' reminiscence, was already established as a classic text (it remained a celebrated and much-cited poem for centuries: cf. the citations listed in Turyn's edition). And Pindar's ode and Euripides' tragedy have just about enough in common to make it possible to imagine that the playwright might have had *O.* 2 in mind while composing the play: specifically, *O.* 2 is a poem celebrating a four-horse chariot victory (τετραορίας, *O.* 2.5), while *Hippolytus* is a tragedy whose climax has its hero destroyed by, precisely, such a chariot (τέτρωρον, *Hipp.* 1229). If ὄπα at *Hipp.* 586 were sound, one would be tempted to hypothesize an unconscious authorial echo of Pindar by Euripides,⁷⁶ prompted, then, by musings on four-horse chariots. But ὄπα is anything but secure in Euripides' text, and (for the record) no other significant correspondences to Pindar's ode present themselves in the play.⁷⁷

Alternatively, if ὄπα has to be regarded as corrupt, but if one could be sure that this is an ancient corruption, one might posit a random scribal reminiscence by an ancient copyist familiar with ὄπα δίκαιον in a copy of *O.* 2—which would of course also provide corroborative evidence that a correct text of Pindar was still current at the time. But one can hardly be sure about the date of the corruption (most inconveniently, a second-century A.D. papyrus version of the passage—*P.Oxy.* 2224—breaks off after γεγω-), and, under the circumstances, random coincidence would seem at least as likely.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ As with Pindar's own reminiscences, there is (whatever else) obviously no *allusion* here.

⁷⁷ One notes, symptomatically, the gulf between the very specific description of the afterlife in *O.* 2.56–80 and the nurse's blunt assertion that no one knows anything about any 'other life' beyond this world (*Hipp.* 195–7).

⁷⁸ My warm thanks to Eleanor Dickey and Malcolm Schofield for helpfully responding to particular questions (see, specifically, n. 7 and Appendix A above). I am indebted also to *CQ*'s referee for several suggested improvements, to Patrick Finglass, as editor of *CQ*, for his tolerance of an awkwardly styled text, and to Nick Lowe for help with Unicode Greek fonts.