

near disastrous consequences? Agamemnon might well be inclined to test the mood of the army not only after Achilles' withdrawal but also after his attempt to undermine Agamemnon's authority. Will they still be willing to fight? The chaotic and disorderly shouting that marks their entry into the assembly suggests inner turmoil and lack of discipline (2.86–98). But the quarrel in the previous book has brought to the surface not only the hostility of the two Greek kings but also the possibility of the army's rejection of, or even a rebellion against, Agamemnon's authority. The catastrophic failure of the test exposes the instability of Agamemnon's leadership, which only Odysseus' intervention restores as he rebukes the army: εἰς κοῖρανος ἔστω, | εἰς βασιλεύς (2.204–5).

The initial words of line 191 have, I submit, been overlooked or misinterpreted, because their obvious meaning and correct understanding open a new and unsettling political dimension to the epic and its hero.

University of Virginia

JENNY STRAUSS CLAY

jsc2t@virginia.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838822000520

PINDAR, NEMEAN 1.24*

ABSTRACT

This note considers a Pindaric crux. It argues that Aristarchus' 'solution' should not have been so readily accepted because the evidence can be interpreted differently, giving more satisfactory sense if ἐκλ' ὡς rather than ἐκλούς is read for the manuscripts' ἐκλόσ.

Keywords: Greek literature; Pindar; textual criticism

λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἐκλούς ὕδωρ καπῶ φέρειν
ἀντίον.¹

24 ἐκλόσ (-ὠς ΣΒ): Aristarchus²

It is his lot to bring good men against his detractors as water against smoke.³

ἐκλόσ in the paradosis, while unmetrical and plainly wrong, is at least a natural subject for the verb λέλογχε ('it is a good man's lot to ...'). Aristarchus' change to ἐκλούς,

* I am grateful to James Diggle, Ben Henry and David Kovacs for helpful comments.

¹ Pind. *Nem.* 1.24–5. This is the text as printed in the Budé, OCT, Teubner and Loeb editions.

² Ben Henry points out *per litteras* that the Teubner apparatus criticus (B. Snell and H. Maehler [edd.], *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis. Pars I: Epinicia* [Leipzig, 1987⁸], 104) is misleading in two respects: (i) 'μεμφομένοι Σ¹⁹' suggests that μεμφομένοι appears in the scholia as a graphetai variant, but it does not appear in the scholia at all (H.L. Ahrens, 'Coniecturae Pindaricae', *Philologus* 16 [1860], 52–9, at 55 thought that it lay behind Σ 34c [= A.B. Drachmann (ed.), *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1903–27), 3.16.14–15]); (ii) '(-ὠς ΣΒΔ)' suggests that ἐκλόσ appears in the scholia to MSS B and D, but it does not appear in MSS ΣΔ.

³ Transl. W.H. Race, *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1997), 7.

which assumes an original Doric accusative plural -oc for -ouc, restores metre,⁴ but also produces uncertainty about who or what the subject of λέλογχε is (or whether it is being used impersonally) and who or what its object is.⁵

1. Carey, Kirkwood and Race all favour ‘it is Chromius’ [or ‘his’] lot to ...’, with the subject Chromius supplied from the preceding ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου (20).⁶ However, if Chromius chooses to bring good men against his critics, λέλογχε is not a natural way to say so because the verb implies something outside Chromius’ control rather than a conscious choice.⁷ This approach also requires the audience either to treat ὕδωρ καπνῶ as a metaphor in apposition to μεμφομένοις ἐκλούς or to supply a particle of comparison.⁸ But it is harsh to take ὕδωρ καπνῶ as appositional and this may be why in practice a particle of comparison has often been supplied by commentators and translators.⁹
2. Braswell’s interpretation is more subtle. Like Carey, Kirkwood and Race, he thinks that the subject of λέλογχε is Chromius and that he can be supplied as the subject easily. However, Braswell suggests that the object of λέλογχε is not ἐκλούς (which he construes as the object of μεμφομένοις) but τὰ καλὰ, that is, Chromius’ victory, which he supplies from καλὰ (20).¹⁰ The trouble is that this approach is rather too subtle in expecting the audience to supply not only the subject but also the object of λέλογχε.

⁴ Σ 34b (= Drachmann [n. 2], 3.16.2–8). For other conjectures, see D.E. Gerber, *Emendations in Pindar 1513–1972* (Amsterdam, 1976), 99. B.K. Braswell, *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One* (Fribourg, 1992), 49 provides a bibliography of the discussions of this passage; add P. Hummel, *La syntaxe de Pindare* (Louvain, 1993), 277–8.

⁵ For painstaking discussion, see C. Carey, *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 8, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8* (Salem, NH, 1981), 111–14.

⁶ Carey (n. 5), 112; G. Kirkwood, *Selections from Pindar* (Chico, CA, 1982), 252; Race (n. 3); also A. Verity, *Pindar: The Complete Odes* (Oxford, 2007), 89: ‘It has fallen to him to ...’.

⁷ Moreover, ἐκλούς as object of φέρειν could suggest that Chromius’ motive for surrounding himself with good men is to ‘drown out’ detractors, whereas Pindar does not seem to be suggesting that there is any motive other than the φιλοξενία expected of an ἀνήρ φιλόξεινος, for which Chromius has just been praised (19–24). This is one of four objections made by S.L. Radt, ‘Pindars erste Nemeische Ode: Versuch einer Interpretation’, *Mnemosyne* 19 (1966), 148–74, at 157 = A. Harder, R. Regtuit, P. Stork and G. Wakker (edd.), *Noch einmal zu ... Kleine Schriften von Stefan Radt zu seinem 75. Geburtstag* (Leiden / Boston / Cologne, 2002), 12: ‘wird nur von Dingen gesagt auf deren Erlangung der Mensch keinen Einfluss hat ..., passt also nicht auf das Gewinnen von Freunden durch Gastlichkeit’.

⁸ L.R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, 3 vols. (London, 1930–2), 2.245–6 doubts whether Pindar would ever have said of anyone λέλογχε ἐκλούς as he might have done λέλογχε φίλουσ συμμάχουσ and feels that the two datives give an intolerable phrase if joined without ὥστερ to the same verb (observing that Bury, in his attempt to justify such an approach, could quote nothing ‘so harsh as this’).

⁹ So e.g. Σ 34a–d (= Drachmann [n. 2], 3.15.22; 16.4, 9–10, 16–17 and 17) (ὥστερ ὑπὸ πυρὸς ὕδωρ [a]; ὥστερ καπνῶ ὕδωρ [b, c]; ὅσ ὕδατι καπνόν [b, d]); A. Matthiae, ‘De nonnullis locis Pindari; tum de Babrii fabulis’, *Neues Archiv für Philologie und Pädagogik* 2 (1825), 676–82, at 681 = *Vermischte Schriften* (Altenburg, 1833), 97–8 (ὥστερ ὕδωρ καπνῶ ἐναντίον φέρειν’); J.B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London and New York, 1890), 15 (‘as with water the smoke of envious cavillers’); G. Fraccaroli, *Pindaro, Le odi e i frammenti* (Verona, 1894), 533 (‘Come quei che sul fumo acqua versò’); J.E. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar including the Principal Fragments* (London and New York, 1937), 319 and Braswell (n. 4), 49 (‘like water against smoke’); Race (n. 3) and Verity (n. 6), 89 (‘as water against smoke’); C. Eckerman, ‘Pindar’s *Olympian* 1, 1–7 and its relation to Bacchylides 3, 85–87’, *WS* 130 (2017), 7–32, at 13 (‘as noble men against fault-finders’).

¹⁰ Braswell (n. 4), 49: ‘He [sc. Chromius] has obtained them [sc. τὰ καλὰ, i.e. his victory] as his portion to carry against those who blame the noble like water against smoke.’

3. Following Fennell and Fraccaroli,¹¹ Waring argues that the subject of λέλογχε is ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν | ἀντίον and the object ἐκλούς.¹² But he provides no Pindaric parallels for such a phrase as the subject of the verb, and the suggestion sits awkwardly with the fact that in Pindar the force of the infinitive had become ‘sufficiently deadened to admit the article’.¹³ With Waring’s interpretation μεμφομένους is difficult to explain, as is well illustrated by Kurke’s rendering: ‘To bear water against the soot of those who blame is the task allotted to the noble.’¹⁴ Also against this interpretation is Pindar’s normal use of λαγχάνω with a human or divine subject. Moreover, the penultimate use of the infinitive as the penultimate word in the sentence makes it an unpromising subject.¹⁵ All told, this approach is unconvincing.
4. The latest commentator prefers Radt’s approach, translating ‘e chi biasima i valorosi accade di gettare acqua contro fumo’.¹⁶ The difficulty with this is that the only evidence for λαγχάνω used impersonally with the dative is Hellenistic, as Waring notes.¹⁷ Bringing water to smoke must also on this interpretation be a metaphor for futility, but water is invariably good in Pindar and not something one would expect obfuscating critics to bring to bear on anything.¹⁸

None of the explanations of Aristarchus’ change is entirely satisfactory. However, one might instead interpret the manuscript evidence differently. If one writes λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένους ἐκλ’ ὡς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν | ἀντίον, one may then translate ‘It is his [sc. that of the ἀνήρ φιλόξεινος mentioned in line 20] lot to bring to bear his successes against critics like water against smoke.’¹⁹ This has the following advantages:

1. It provides a connection between what precedes and what follows.²⁰ The singer praises Chromius’ hospitality and sings of his success (19–24). Inevitably, this has the potential to give rise to envious criticism. But Chromius’ lot is to bring to bear his successes against critics as water against fire (24–5). That is

¹¹ C.A.M. Fennell, *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge, 1899²), 10; Fraccaroli (n. 9), 522 n. 2.

¹² P. Waring, ‘Pindar, *Nemean* 1.24 – smoke without fire’, *CQ* 32 (1982), 270–7, at 276.

¹³ B.L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York / Cincinnati / Chicago, 1885), cviii.

¹⁴ L. Kurke, *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Berkeley, CA, 2013²), 120 n. 4. There is no ‘soot’ or ‘of those who blame’ in the text.

¹⁵ Of the twenty-five instances where the subject is clearly identifiable cited by W.J. Slater, *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969), 297–8 s.v. λαγχάνω, only three do not have a human or divine subject, i.e. *Ol.* 1.53 (ἀκέρδεια), 10.88 (πλούτος) and *Pyth.* 2.26 (Διὸς εὐνία). There are better alternative subjects for the verb in those places.

¹⁶ M. Cannatà Fera, *Pindaro: Le Nemee* (Milan, 2020), 29, 274–6. Radt (n. 7), 159–60 argued, following Mezger, that μεμφομένους governs ἐκλούς and is governed by λέλογχε.

¹⁷ Waring (n. 12), 276 with n. 16.

¹⁸ See H. Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, transl. M. Hadas and J. Willis (Oxford, 1975), 460–1 n. 39; also Kirkwood (n. 6), 252 (‘In Pindaric language water is good, not only in the maxim in *O.* 1.1 and *O.* 3.42, but in a passage that provides so close an analogy as to be ... decisive for interpretation [sc. *Nem.* 7.61–3, quoted n. 24 below] ... the metaphor of “quenching smoke” for putting down an evil is clearly an old maxim’). Braswell (n. 4) says that ‘the point of the opposition smoke–water is the simple one that where there is smoke there is fire, and water extinguishes the fire which produces smoke.’ Consideration of the opposite expression, πῦρ ἐπὶ πῦρ φέρειν, which is equivalent to the English ‘add fuel to the flame’, i.e. to make a bad situation worse, supports this approach.

¹⁹ On misdivision as a cause of manuscript errors, see D. Young, ‘Some types of scribal error in manuscripts of Pindar’, *GRBS* 6 (1965), 247–73, at 257–8 = W.M. Calder III and J. Stern (edd.), *Pindaros und Bakchylides* (Darmstadt, 1970), 96–126, at 108.

²⁰ Carey (n. 5), 113 observed that the interpretations which take λέλογχε as impersonal provide a *gnomē* which ‘neither follows from what precedes nor prompts what follows’.

- Chromius' way, but different men have different talents and a man must take the straight path, that is, use the approach that comes most naturally to him (25).
2. It introduces a particle of comparison which is not easily supplied and which alleviates the double dative construction considerably ('brings to bear against critics successes as water against fire').
 3. It avoids any possible implication that Chromius' motive for throwing his doors open to ξένοι might be something other than good old-fashioned φιλοξενία.²¹

The underlying thought is that the best answer to criticism is success itself, because it extinguishes criticism as effectively as water extinguishes fire.²² This provides a similar sense to that desired by Braswell, but it makes what must otherwise be supplied from line 20 express in ἐκλά.²³ There is no difficulty with smoke standing for fire.²⁴ Once Pindar mentions singing of Chromius' victory, it was natural that the counter-effect of praise, φρόνως, should suggest itself (if it is not already implied by μεμφομένοις). Bringing to bear successes is one of various techniques that can be employed to negate criticism, and clearly one that reflects the 'straight road' highlighted by the singer in what follows: τέχνη δ' ἑτέρων ἕτεραι· χρῆ δ' ἐν εὐθείαις ὁδοῖς κτείχοντα μάρνασθαι φραῖ (25).

Ealing, London

NICHOLAS LANE

njglane@yahoo.com

doi:10.1017/S0009838822000507

CONVIVIAL BED-WETTERS: LUCR. 4.1026–9*

ABSTRACT

This note offers a new conjecture on the manuscripts' puri at Lucr. 4.1026 which would identify more clearly the dreaming bed-wetters as well-wined dinner guests.

Keywords: dreams; bed-wetters; textual conjectures

²¹ See n. 7 above.

²² For Pindar's use of ἐκλόν as a substantive, see Slater (n. 15), 202 s.v. ἐκλόος 2b (x 11, unless ἐκλῶν at *Nem.* 8.22 is masc. pl.). Bacchylides has four instances of ἐκθλόν used in this way: 4.20, 5.198, 14.3, 17.132 Maehler. For ἐκλά 'success', cf. *Pyth.* 1.84 ἀκτῶν ... ἀκοῦ κρύφιον θυμὸν βαρύνει μάλιστα' ἐκλοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοις, 8.73–4 εἰ γὰρ τις ἐκλά πέπαται μὴ σὺν μακρῷ πόνῳ, | πολλοῖς σοφὸς δοκεῖ, *Nem.* 5.46–7 χαίρω δ' ὅτι | ἐκλοῖσι μάρναται περὶ πᾶσα πόλις.

²³ W.B. Henry, 'Simonides, *PMG* 541', *ZPE* 121 (1998), 303–4, at 303 n. 2 suggests that water here is metaphorical for Chromius' merits, in particular his hospitality. That is quite possible, but if Eckerman (n. 9) is right that water is symbolic of song, the link between song and success in καλὰ μελπόμενος (20) suggests that the metaphor is directed more specifically to singing of Chromius' victory and hence his success rather than his hospitality.

²⁴ As F. Gedike, *Pindari carmina selecta* (Berlin, 1786), 253 saw, 'Pulcre autem invidia et calumnia comparatur cum fumo, non cum igne, ut occulta invidiorum consilia et studia significantur.' If any distinction is to be drawn between smoke and fire, Pindar may be suggesting that by fighting criticism with ἐκλά Chromius can extinguish it before the fire takes hold. In other words, this form of fighting criticism head on is particularly effective. Smoke can suggest something inconsequential: W.G. Arnott, 'Further notes on Menander's *Sikyonioi* (vv. 110–322)', *ZPE* 117 (1997), 21–34, at 28. The turning of what was fire into smoke may therefore proleptically represent the effect of pouring water on fire, i.e. neutralizing the danger of criticism. Alternatively, Pindar may have chosen smoke for its ability to obscure, which is deleterious to true κλέος: cf. *Nem.* 7.61–3 σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων νόγον, | ὕδατος ὅτε ῥόος φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων | κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω.

* Let me thank the journal's anonymous reader for helpful criticisms and suggestions.