

**Zeitschrift:** Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique  
**Herausgeber:** Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique  
**Band:** 31 (1985)  
  
**Artikel:** Emendations in the Odes of Pindar : an historical analysis  
**Autor:** Gerber, D.E.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660688>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 21.05.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# I

D. E. GERBER

## EMENDATIONS IN THE ODES OF PINDAR: AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

I begin with some statistics, statistics which pertain exclusively to the odes and to the 1980 Teubner edition of Snell-Maehler. According to the colometry of that edition there are 3437 verses in the 46 odes. Of these 3437 verses, only 1327 totally escape any emendation whatsoever. The remaining 2110 verses have been subjected to approximately 6750 emendations, an average of well over three emendations per verse emended or an average of almost two emendations for each verse in the odes. Such statistics would suggest that any apparatus criticus to the odes would be rather lengthy, but in the apparatus to the 1980 Teubner edition, which I think most would agree is the best text presently available, the number of emendations printed and specifically designated as such is only 430, and of these at least 160 consist of minor changes which have no bearing on syntax or meaning. The commonest involve alterations such as  $\mu\nu$  to  $\nu\nu$ ,  $\alpha\rho\alpha$  to  $\eta\rho\alpha$ , dropping of the augment, etc. It should be noted, however, that there are a further 201 emendations printed in the text without any indication in the apparatus that they are in fact emendations. Of these, 106 involve accentuation, breathing, the

digamma, iota subscript, and  $\nu$  ἐφελκυστικόν, and probably need not be mentioned in the apparatus, but some at least of the remaining 95 deserve to be recorded, a topic I shall come back to later. If, however, we leave aside these 201 unrecorded emendations, which, as I have said, have no bearing on syntax or meaning, we are left with about 270 significant or relatively significant emendations actually printed in the Teubner text, 270 out of a total of 6750 which have been made from the time of the Aldine edition in 1513 to the present day.

Let us now look at the major contributors to this total of 6750 and see what impact they have made on the Teubner text. If we restrict ourselves initially to those who made 100 or more emendations, their impact can be readily seen from the table given below.

These 19 scholars account for 4561 out of the total of 6750 emendations proposed. Except for Bornemann and Schroeder, all are essentially scholars of the 19th century or earlier, but lest the impression be given that 20th-century scholars are reluctant to emend, it should be noted that there have been about 135 emendations proposed from 1945 to the present.

The figures given in the table are, I hope, accurate so far as the Teubner apparatus is concerned, but how accurate is the apparatus itself? I would argue that there are about 60 passages where the apparatus is in need of revision with regard to the emendations printed or recorded. In most instances it is simply a matter of correctly identifying the scholar who first made the emendation. Pindarists have been rather lax in living up to Pindar's own pronouncement,  $\alpha\pi\alpha\nu \delta' \epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma \xi\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$ , for there are 249 emendations which have been made more than once without any awareness being shown that the emendation had already been made. In fact at least 10 of these 249 have been made three times and there are actually three which

## SCHOLARS WHOSE EMENDATIONS EXCEED 100

<i>Name</i>	<i>Total number of emendations proposed</i>	<i>Number of emendations printed and recorded in S-M</i>	<i>Number of emendations printed, but not recorded in S-M</i>	<i>Number of emendations recorded, but not printed in S-M</i>
Bergk	818	26	8	12
Hermann	388	52	14	13
Schmid	322	60	39	3
Hartung	313	6		
Bornemann	307			
de Pauw	264	16	4	2
Mommsen	239	30	6	5
Boeckh	228	60	24	8
Schroeder	211	31	45	15
Heyne	210	18	12	4
van Herwerden	195	1		
Schwickert	188			
Ahlwardt	169	3		
Christ	142	3	1	4
Schmidt	126	1		1
Bothe	120	2	1	2
Rauchenstein	113			
Kayser	107	1	1	3
Mingarelli	101	8	4	1

have been made four times.<sup>1</sup> Of the remaining passages where the apparatus is in need of revision, some contain misleading information and a few are totally wrong.

This is not the place to list all the examples where the *πρῶτος εὐρετής* has been wrongly identified, but I will men-

<sup>1</sup> O. II 63; IX 76; I. III/IV 64. For full bibliographical details here and on other passages cited in this paper, I refer the reader to my *Emendations in Pindar: 1513-1972* (Amsterdam 1976).



tion that if such corrections were made, Ahlwardt's name would appear nine times in the apparatus instead of three times, the names of Schwickert and Bornemann would appear twice and once respectively instead of being completely absent, and an obscure Scottish Pindarist, Alexander Negrís, who edited Pindar in 1835 and made 62 emendations, would have his name recorded three times. In *P. V* 118 and *N. XI* 13 Snell-Maehler print emendations made by Hartung, but both were actually first made by Negrís, and in *N. VI* 61 Wilamowitz' proposal to emend μέν to μόν was first suggested by Negrís. In fact, I have not found any editor of Pindar who shows any awareness of Negrís at all.

Examples of misleading information in the apparatus fall into three categories. In the first category I would place those examples where two or more scholars proposed the same emendation at the same time or almost the same time, but only one is named. An instance of this is *P. IX* 79 where the apparatus records an emendation made by Ahrens in 1843, but Schneidewin made the same emendation in the same year and therefore deserves equal credit.

In the second category I would place a passage such as *N. X* 72. The MSS read ἄμα δὲ κέοντ' and Snell-Maehler print ἄμα δ' ἐκαίοντ', attributing the emendation to Erasmus Schmid. This is inaccurate on two counts. Ceporinus was actually the first to correct the accentuation of ἄμα to ἄμα, Schmid then went a step further and corrected the verb, but wrote δὲ καίοντ', and it was Boeckh who restored the augment, reading δ' ἐκαίοντ', the text which Snell-Maehler print. Although it is obvious that the major emendation was made by Schmid, it is at best misleading to mention only Schmid in the apparatus. A similar example occurs in *I. I* 26 where the MSS read πένταθλον and Snell-Maehler print πενταέθλιον, attributing the emendation to Boeckh.

Boeckh, however, actually emended to πεντάθλιον and Mommsen was the first to read πενταέθλιον with synizesis. Both Boeckh and Mommsen deserve credit for the emendation, and elsewhere Snell-Maehler sometimes give joint credit. An example is *I. VI 41* where the MSS read ἀντεΐνας and Snell-Maehler print ἀνατεΐναις, attributing the emendation to both Schmid and Boeckh. This is correct, since Schmid read ἀνατεΐνας and Boeckh corrected the ending to -αις.

In the third category I would place a passage such as *P. VI 50*. At the end of the verse the MSS read the accusative singular ἰππεΐαν ἔσοδον and Snell-Maehler print the genitive plural ἰππιῶν ἑσόδων, attributing the emendation to Moriz Schmidt. But Schmidt not only emended to ἰππειῶν rather than ἰππιῶν, he also proceeded immediately to reject his own proposal and to put forward a different emendation altogether, one which retained the accusative singular. It seems to me that when an emendation is attributed to someone who proposes it *exempli gratia* and then rejects it, some indication of this is called for in the apparatus. In any event, the first who actually proposed ἰππιῶν ἑσόδων was Bergk in his fourth edition. An even more striking example occurs in *N. VI 60* where the MSS read the nominative Ἀλκιμίδας and Snell-Maehler print the vocative Ἀλκίμιδα, attributing the emendation to Hartung. But Hartung retained Ἀλκιμίδας and explicitly states that in his opinion it is clear from the scholia that Ἀλκιμίδας, not Ἀλκίμιδα, is the reading of the MSS. The first to emend to the vocative was Bergk, although he accented it as a paroxytone and it was Turyn who was actually the first to print Ἀλκίμιδα with proparoxytone accent. It seems to me, therefore, that Bergk and Turyn are much more deserving of having their names recorded in the apparatus than Hartung.

Examples of totally erroneous information in the apparatus of Snell-Maehler are few in number. In *I. VII 29*

the apparatus states that the text printed incorporates Hartung's transposition of αὔξων ... ἀστῶν to ἀστῶν ... αὔξων, but the printed text is actually the text of the MSS, not Hartung's transposition. Either the text printed has to be changed or the colon in the apparatus has to be deleted. In *N.* VII 31 the emendation δοκέοντι is attributed to Fennell and Lobel. It is possible that Lobel suggested this to Snell orally or by letter, but I can find no evidence that the emendation was ever made by Fennell. In any event, the first to propose δοκέοντι was Hartung. In *P.* IX 105 the apparatus states that Erasmus Schmid emended to παλαιὰ δόξα, but Schmid actually proposed παλαιῶν δόξα. In *N.* IX 41 the apparatus attributes ἐνθ' Ἀρέας to Bothe and ἐνθα Πέας to Boeckh, but Bothe suggested both readings, actually preferring the latter. In *I.* VII 8-9 the apparatus attributes the deletion of ὄτ' in both verses to Schmid, but Schmid deleted only the second ὄτ' and it was Benedictus who deleted the first.

While we are still on the topic of the Snell-Maehler apparatus, I should like to draw attention to two further points. The first pertains to the emendation of μιν to viv. The MSS are divided on this word, sometimes unanimous in reading μιν, sometimes unanimous in reading viv, and sometimes reading both.<sup>2</sup> Ahlwardt emended one μιν to viv and Boeckh and Mommsen emended the rest, and Snell-Maehler are probably right to prefer the Doric viv to the Ionic μιν. For some reason, however, perhaps simply an oversight, they retain μιν in *O.* VII 70 and *P.* III 29, even though the first was emended by Mommsen and the second by Boeckh. The name of the scholar who first emended μιν to viv is recorded in the apparatus, but once again there are

<sup>2</sup> On μιν and viv in the papyri of Pindar and Bacchylides, see W. S. BARRETT, in *Dionysiaca. Nine Studies in Greek Poetry by former pupils presented to Sir Denys Page on his seventieth birthday* (Cambridge 1978), 19 n. 29.

two passages, *N.* III 11 and *N.* VII 84, where the emendation is printed without any indication that it is an emendation. Curiously enough, Turyn's apparatus also contains two, though different, omissions. When the MSS are unanimous in reading  $\mu\nu$ , Turyn retains it, except for *O.* III 28 and *I.* VI 50 where he prints  $\nu\nu$ , similarly without any indication that it is an emendation.

This leads into my second point, the question whether the Teubner apparatus is detailed enough. My personal preference is for an apparatus like that in Schroeder's *editio maior* of 1900, but it is undoubtedly true that many of the MS aberrations and a great many of the emendations reported by Schroeder can be legitimately passed over in silence.<sup>3</sup> The difficulty is to decide where to draw the line. What, for example, should one say in an apparatus about  $\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\gamma\nu\mu\iota$ , one of Pindar's favourite verbs? The MSS are unanimous in spelling it with an iota, but Schroeder emends to epsilon iota in every instance except in the second aorist passive and in the form  $\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\gamma\omega$ . Snell-Maehler, on the other hand, follow Schroeder's spelling only for the present, imperfect and aorist active, and never indicate in the apparatus that they are departing from the reading of the MSS. It seems to me that such departures should be made known to the reader, probably not in every instance, but in the preface or in an appendix.

It is in dialectal forms that the Teubner apparatus is especially deficient or inconsistent. Why, for example, mention in the apparatus to *O.* VI 58 that Turyn corrected  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  of the MSS to  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  when the same type of emendation is frequently printed elsewhere without any

<sup>3</sup> I am particularly impressed by the apparatus in G. Aurelio PRIVITERA's *Pindaro: Le Istmitiche* (Milano 1982). It contains no tacit emendations and the bibliographical details are sufficient to enable one to locate the source of the emendation concerned.



indication that it is in fact an emendation?<sup>4</sup> Why mention that in *I.* IV 57 ἡμερώσαις is Schroeder's emendation of ἄμερώσαις when ἡμερον is tacitly printed for ἄμερον of the MSS in *O.* XIII 2 and *P.* III 6? Why mention that in *P.* V 114 ποτανός is Heyne's emendation of ποτηνός when νάποινον is tacitly printed for νήποινον in *P.* IX 58? Why mention that some MSS read βλεφάρων in *O.* III 12 when in *N.* VIII 2 γλεφάροις is tacitly printed for βλεφάροις of the MSS? Such inconsistencies are misleading, since they prompt the reader to assume that if nothing is said in the apparatus, the text printed must be that of the MSS. False confidence in the trustworthiness of the MSS is increased by tacitly printing Φερσεφόνας for Περσεφόνας in *I.* VIII 55, ὄνυμ' for ὄνομ' in *N.* VI 49, φρασίν for φρεσίν in *P.* III 59, ἥρωας for ἥρωας in *N.* IV 29, ἀπὸ κείνου for ἀπ' ἐκείνου in *O.* XIII 76, etc. None of the examples cited, and many more could be added, affects the sense in the slightest, but they do have a bearing on Pindar's language and for that reason it seems to me that the reader should be informed to a greater degree than he is of what is an emendation and what is not.

Let us now leave the topic of the Teubner apparatus and look primarily at those who made the largest number of emendations in the text of the odes, concentrating on the significance of their emendations and, where possible, the rationale used in arriving at them. I shall procede essentially in chronological order. The first commentary on Pindar was by Erasmus Schmid in 1616, but prior to this there were six editors who made alterations to the text. The *editio princeps* of 1513, a product of the printing-house of Aldus Manutius but whose text was probably established

<sup>4</sup> On the question whether -ας should ever be defended in the aorist participle in Pindar, see B. K. BRASWELL, "Color Epicus in Pindar: A Falsely Assumed Type", in *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in honour of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico 1984), 33-36.

by Marcus Musurus, contains only a very few, unimportant emendations and is therefore of little significance for our purpose. Just two years later, however, there appeared in Rome a much superior edition by the Cretan scholar, Zacharias Callierges.<sup>5</sup> This contains 61 emendations, 5 of which are printed in the Teubner text and assigned to him, together with a further 4 minor alterations tacitly printed. One of Callierges' emendations, that of ὄποις to ὄπος in O. VI 77, has been confirmed by *POxy.* 1614. A still better edition was made in 1526 by the Swiss scholar, Jacob Ceperinus. This contains 33 emendations, 4 of which are printed in the Teubner text and assigned to him, together with a further 4 tacitly printed. The remaining editors, Brubachius (1542), Morelius (1558), and Stephanus (1560),<sup>6</sup> are of less importance, the three combining for a total of 58 emendations, 7 of which are printed and assigned to them, with a further 10 tacitly printed.

The first truly important Pindaric scholar was Erasmus Schmid (1560-1637), professor of Greek and Mathematics at Wittenberg. Of his 322 emendations, 60 are printed and assigned to him, 39 are tacitly printed, and 3 are mentioned. He devoted considerable attention to metrical matters, but as everyone is aware, no one in this period had a proper understanding of Greek lyric metre. Because of his errors in this area, many of his emendations are obviously unnecessary and consequently deserve no mention in any apparatus. Most of these errors derive from his belief in a much stricter responsion between stanzas than is now accepted. I give only one example as an illustration. The first line in the strophe and antistrophe of *N. I* consists of a

<sup>5</sup> On the Aldine edition and that of Callierges, see J. IRIGOIN, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris 1952), 399-420.

<sup>6</sup> Five editions followed that of 1560, in some of which additional emendations were made. My total of 58 includes the emendations found in his various editions.



common dactylo-epitrite series, an initial long followed by a cretic, link syllable and second cretic. In every stanza except the first, the link syllable is long, the practice most commonly found, but in verse one the link syllable is short, and so Schmid emends σεμνόν with its final short syllable to σεμνοῖ, genitive with elided omicron. If, however, emendations of this kind are subtracted from the rest and disregarded, many of those that remain are sufficient evidence of Schmid's superior understanding of Pindar's language.

For more than a century and a quarter after Schmid there appeared only two editions of Pindar, that of Benedictus in 1620 and the Oxford edition of 1697 by Richard West and Robert Welsted. Neither is of much importance for our purpose, Benedictus contributing 23 emendations, 4 of which are printed and 2 mentioned, and the Oxford edition contributing 17, one of which is printed.

It is with the Dutchman, Jan Cornelis de Pauw, that we come to the first scholar after Schmid who is of any real significance for the history of emendations in Pindar. His commentary, without text, appeared in 1747, two years before his death, the last in a long series of publications on a wide variety of authors. He took violent objection to Schmid's metrical analysis of Pindar, frequently ridiculing him for his *ineptiae* and calling him a "child" (*puer*) in matters of metre. De Pauw, however, deserves as much scorn himself as he heaps upon Schmid, for in contrast to Schmid's unwillingness to allow any freedom of response, he goes to the other extreme, even to the point of introducing a tribrach into the dactylo-epitrite metre. In addition, he frequently resorts to that most over-worked of emendations, the elided γ', in order to make the text conform to his metrical principles. De Pauw is also prone to introduce Doric forms such as τῆνος for κῆνος and -ω for -ου in the genitive, emendations which all subsequent editors have rightly ignored. A faulty appreciation of poetic ima-

gery is an additional source of unnecessary emendations. To give only one example, consider his treatment of O. VI 55, ἀκτῖσι βεβρεγμένος. Because ἀκτῖνες are devoid of moisture, he cannot imagine that Pindar would have combined such a word with βεβρεγμένος, and so he emends ἀκτῖσι to ἄκραισι, "moistened by the tops of violets", i.e., "by violet-flowers". Since there is moisture in the petals of flowers, the participle βεβρεγμένος is no longer offensive to de Pauw's poetic 'sensibilities'. Of his emendation de Pauw says "nihil signatius aut exquisitius". In spite of these eccentricities, however, he shows occasional flashes of genius.<sup>7</sup> Of his 264 emendations, a total which omits his dialectal emendations and his worst metrical absurdities, 16 are printed and assigned to him, 4 are tacitly printed, and 2 are mentioned. In addition, de Pauw wins the rare distinction of having one of his emendations confirmed by a papyrus-discovery. His emendation of γᾶς to μέγας in O. II 76 is the reading recorded in *POxy.* 2092. It is ironic, or perhaps poetic justice, that as a result of the papyrus-discovery de Pauw's name has now disappeared from the apparatus on this passage.

I turn now to a somewhat shadowy, but not unimportant, figure for the text of Pindar, Giovanni Luigi Mingarelli (1722-1793), an abbot and teacher of Greek at Bologna. In 1772 he published a 61-page book entitled *De Pindari odis coniecturae*, which in spite of its title is primarily a study of Pindaric metre and contains only a few emendations of O. XIV. It is clear from his preface, however, that over the years he had jotted down a number of emendations and that he resisted the pleadings of a friend

<sup>7</sup> A similar assessment is made by Ed. FRAENKEL, *Aeschylus Agamemnon* I (Oxford 1950), 44: "Pauw, a very unpleasant character, was in the habit of making a fool of himself, though he did not invariably do so", and in note 1 on the same page: "Even in Pindar, where Pauw's name has become a byword, some of his suggestions are valuable."

to publish them. He states that he now finds more pleasure in sacred than in secular studies, that his emendations are not worthy of being published, and that he does not even remember where the pages are on which he wrote out his emendations. It was only after repeated requests from his friend to publish at least a specimen of his observations on Pindar that he agreed to write the present book. Heyne, in the preface to the first volume of his work on Pindar, gives high praise to a book by Mingarelli which he calls *Conjecturae de Pindari metris*. I can find no reference anywhere else to a book by this title and I suspect that it is actually the same book as that mentioned above. It seems, however, from Heyne's preface that he corresponded with Mingarelli and that the latter sent his emendations to Heyne. Presumably Mingarelli had now found the misplaced pages which he mentioned in his preface. Unfortunately, Mingarelli's handwriting was very difficult to read and Heyne's eyesight was failing, with the result that Heyne was able to record in his notes only some of these emendations. He states, however, that he deposited Mingarelli's correspondence in the university library at Göttingen and Dr. Bruce Braswell has kindly informed me that it is still there.

Mingarelli's emendations, as recorded by Heyne, total 101, of which 8 are printed and assigned to him, 4 tacitly printed, and one mentioned. Mingarelli, like de Pauw, proposed one emendation that has been confirmed by a papyrus. His transposition of ἅντα σκοποῦ to σκοποῦ ἅντα in *N. VI 27* now appears in *PBerol.* 16367, but in contrast to their treatment of de Pauw, the Teubner editors record both Mingarelli and the papyrus. Mingarelli had a better understanding of Pindaric metre than either Schmid or de Pauw and he rarely proposed emendations that are as absurd as some of de Pauw's. Rather surprisingly, he praises de Pauw for his "keen discernment" (*emunctae ... naris*), though he admits that some of de Pauw's emen-

dations are not convincing. Perhaps his judgement of de Pauw is coloured somewhat by a sense of Christian generosity.

The most important figure after Schmid for the text of Pindar is Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729-1812), professor at Göttingen and a prolific writer on a wide variety of Greek and Latin authors and subjects. He was the first to combine text, translation, commentary and scholia. His three volumes on Pindar were first published in 1773 and an enlarged edition appeared in 1797-99, and this in turn was revised and enlarged by G. H. Schaefer in 1817. Heyne proposed 210 emendations, of which 18 are printed and assigned to him, 12 tacitly printed, and 4 mentioned. Subsequent scholars have been a little unkind in their assessment of Heyne's skill as a textual critic. To name only two, Wilamowitz asserts that for Heyne "grammar and language were subsidiary" and Sandys considers him "comparatively weak in textual criticism".<sup>8</sup> Such assessments are probably accurate in the sense that Heyne was more concerned than his predecessors with non-linguistic aspects of the classical world. He was, for example, the first to lecture on archaeology at Göttingen. But even if he cannot be called a textual critic of the first rank, his emendations of Pindar are seldom absurd. He was judicious in his use of the scholia, as his emendations of *P.* XI 10 and *N.* XI 42 illustrate, he recognized the presence of haplography in the MSS and thus made convincing supplements in *P.* I 37 and *I.* II 9, and his appreciation of poetic style prompted him to emend passages where one noun had two or more epithets, while another had none, as in *I.* II 7 and *I.* IV 56.

Heyne entrusted the metrical details of his work on Pindar to Gottfried Hermann (1772-1848) and it is to him

<sup>8</sup> U. von WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *History of Classical Scholarship*, transl. by A. HARRIS (London 1982), 102; J. E. SANDYS, *A History of Classical Scholarship* III (Cambridge 1920), 40.



that I now turn. Hermann, professor of rhetoric and of poetry at Leipzig, devoted himself primarily to the study of metre and grammar, and his views in these areas exerted tremendous influence for many years. Unlike most of the other Pindarists mentioned in this paper Hermann never edited the poet nor did he write a commentary on him, but in a great many short works, extending from his mid-twenties to his death, he dealt with the text of an enormous number of passages. His emendations total 388, of which 52 are printed and assigned to him, 14 tacitly printed, and 13 mentioned. Wilamowitz comments that Hermann's "contributions to textual criticism show a combination of boldness and luck in conjectural emendation".<sup>9</sup> Boldness, of course, is not necessarily a virtue in itself, but in the hands of Hermann it manifests itself much more often in emendations that are at least possible than in those that are absurd. Some of his emendations, and *P.* IV 255 is an especially good example, smack of true genius. Hermann was particularly adept at detecting errors in the MSS caused by transposition of words or syllables, by faulty division of letters, and by the loss or incorrect insertion of particles. Some, however, of his emendations printed in the Teubner text are not universally accepted and many of the others consist of minor alterations that do not affect the sense or grammar. Hermann was also more prone than most to change his mind, presumably because he published on Pindar all his scholarly life, and a large number of his 388 emendations consist of second, and usually better, thoughts. The total is therefore somewhat misleading and the percentage of emendations accepted to emendations proposed would be even higher if one were to count only his second attempts at emending a passage.

<sup>9</sup> U. von WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *op. cit.*, 110.

Before I turn to the third giant of this period, brief mention should be made of a much lesser figure, Friedrich Heinrich Bothe (1770-1855). In 1808 he published a German translation of the *Olympian odes* together with notes on all the odes, in the course of which he made 120 emendations. Only 2 are printed and assigned to him, along with one tacitly printed and a further 2 mentioned. Bothe also edited Homer, Horace, Phaedrus and all the Greek and Roman dramatists. Of these editions Sandys remarks that "there is a lack of critical method, but there are many excellent emendations".<sup>10</sup> The latter part of this statement may be true for the other authors mentioned, but it cannot be said of his work on Pindar. Many of his emendations are the result of a faulty understanding of Pindaric metre and others show a poor appreciation of lyric style. To give only one example, he emends σκιαρᾶν in *O.* III 14 because σκιαρόν appears four lines later.

In Hermann's slightly younger contemporary, August Boeckh (1785-1867), professor at Heidelberg and then for many years at Berlin, we meet a scholar unrivalled before or since in importance for the study of Pindar. Though less interested in textual criticism than Hermann, he nevertheless made a total of 228 emendations, of which 60 are printed and assigned to him, 24 tacitly printed, and 8 mentioned. This puts him well behind Hermann in terms of the number of emendations made, but ahead of him in terms of the number of emendations adopted. In spite of this, however, he was a more conservative textual critic than Hermann and none of his emendations matches the sheer brilliance of some of Hermann's. The vast majority involve dialectal alterations or minor changes prompted by a better understanding of Pindar's metre. When comparing him with Hermann one should also remember that whereas

<sup>10</sup> J. E. SANDYS, *op. cit.*, III 103.



Hermann occupied himself with Pindar all his life, Boeckh's massive work on Pindar was completed in 1821, 46 years before his death, and during those last 46 years he devoted himself primarily to other topics.

In 1820, one year before the last volume of Boeckh's *Pindari opera* appeared, his contemporary, Friedrich Wilhelm Thiersch (1784-1860), professor at Munich, produced an edition of Pindar, together with a German translation and explanatory notes, in two volumes. Thiersch made only 62 emendations, but 6 are printed and 2 are mentioned. His emendations are similar in nature to those of Boeckh, neither brilliant nor absurd.

The same year, 1820, saw a critical edition of Pindar's odes by Christian Wilhelm Ahlwardt (1760-1830), professor at Greifswald. He made 169 emendations, of which only 3 are printed and assigned to him. If, however, the *πρῶτος εὑρετής* were identified more accurately, his name would be recorded in 6 other places, 3 times as the author of an emendation printed and 3 times as the author of an emendation mentioned. Although he was occasionally capable of a clever emendation, such as his *ἄγε* for *ἀλλά* in *O. XIII 114*, his metrical expertise was so abysmal that many of his emendations are ludicrous. He frequently accuses Boeckh of metrical incompetence in a manner reminiscent of de Pauw's scornful treatment of Schmid, but anyone who maintains that *τετραορίας* (*O. II 5*) cannot be quadrisyllabic through synizesis or who emends *ἔχει δ' ἀπάλαμον* in *O. I 59* to *ἀπάλαμον δὲ ἔχει metri causa*, need not be taken seriously in metrical matters.

Karl Ludwig Kayser (1808-1872), professor at Heidelberg, published his *Lectiones Pindaricae* in 1840, and in this, as well as in 3 lengthy reviews between 1844 and 1868, he made 107 emendations. Of these, one is printed and assigned to him, one tacitly printed, and 3 mentioned. Although occasionally capable of making a clever emen-

dation, he is frequently guilty of emending on the basis of an unjustified inference from the scholia or as the result of an incorrect appreciation of Pindar's poetic practice. As an example of the latter, his failure to realize that Pindar often uses a generalizing plural with reference to the victor led him to emend σοφοί in *O. V* 16 to σοφός, an alteration which necessitated two additional emendations in the same line.

Rudolf Rauchenstein (1798-1879), for many years Rector of the school at Aarau in Switzerland, wrote a number of books and articles on Pindar, in the course of which he made 113 emendations, the majority appearing in two pamphlets published in 1844 and 1845. Of these, not a single one is printed or even mentioned in the Teubner edition. This is slightly unfair, however, since Rauchenstein was actually the first to propose the text printed in *N. V* 43 and attributed there to Wilamowitz and Turyn. But even though most of his emendations are rightly ignored, it should be noted that he tends to concentrate on especially difficult passages where the text is often still problematic. Also, unlike many others, he discusses most of the passages in considerable detail and even if the conclusions reached are not convincing, the discussions themselves are sometimes useful.

In Johann Adam Hartung (1802-1867) we meet a textual critic somewhat similar to de Pauw, though less offensive in his manner. Like the emendations of de Pauw, those of Hartung are often nothing short of perverse, but occasionally he too had flashes of genius. He made 313 emendations, most of which have been consigned to the oblivion they deserve, and even of the 6 that are printed in the Teubner text and assigned to him, 2 were actually made by an earlier scholar as well (*P. V* 118; *N. XI* 13), one was not made by Hartung at all (*N. VI* 60), and one is reported as being printed in the text, but is not (*I. VII* 29).

The one who outstrips all others in the number of emendations proposed is Theodor Bergk (1812-1881). A student of Hermann and son-in-law of Meineke, he taught at Marburg, Freiburg, Halle and finally at Bonn. Bergk published four editions of Pindar from 1843 to 1878, in the course of which he made 818 emendations, more than twice as many as his closest rival and former teacher, Hermann. Of these, only 26 are printed and assigned to him, 8 tacitly printed, and 12 mentioned. With each succeeding edition of Pindar Bergk increased the number of emendations, often suggesting several for a given passage. Very few in fact appear in all four editions. Bergk frequently saw difficulties where none exists and his contributions to an establishment of the text of Pindar are much less significant than they are for the text of the other lyric poets. Most of Bergk's emendations of Pindar that have been accepted are of a minor nature and few affect the sense.

In many respects a more significant figure for the text of Pindar is Tycho Mommsen (1819-1900). His edition of 1864, with its extraordinarily detailed record of the reading of the MSS and of previous emendations, is still indispensable today. It is, however, more important for the information it provides than for Mommsen's own emendations. For although he made 239 emendations, 30 of which are printed and assigned to him, 6 tacitly printed, and 5 mentioned, 16 of the 30 involve merely the change of  $\mu\nu$  to  $\nu\nu$ . Some of his emendations, such as those in *O.* I 48 and *P.* IV 246, give evidence of a more judicious use of the scholia than is found among many other critics.

Moriz Schmidt of Jena (1823-1888) is said by Sandys to have shown "a special aptitude for conjectural emendation"<sup>11</sup> in his work on Pindar, Sophocles and Horace. This may be true for Sophocles and Horace, but it is not

<sup>11</sup> J. E. SANDYS, *op. cit.*, III 153.

for Pindar. Only one of his 126 emendations is printed in the Teubner edition and that, as I mentioned earlier, is an emendation that he proposed only to reject in favour of something different.

Wilhelm Christ (1831-1906), professor at Munich, edited Pindar in 1869 and again in 1896, this time with a commentary. In these two editions he made a total of 142 emendations, of which 3 are printed and assigned to him, one tacitly printed, and 4 mentioned. Many of his emendations are only tentatively proposed and not actually printed in his own text. For the most part they are unimpressive, though seldom absurd.

The end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century witnessed two textual critics of Pindar who fortunately never went so far as to produce an edition. The one, Johann Schwickert, made 188 emendations, the other, Ludwig Bornemann, made 307.<sup>12</sup> Neither receives any mention in the Teubner apparatus, and not surprisingly, since they are the two most perverse textual critics Pindar has ever been subjected to. Yet even they on rare occasions deserve mention. In *O. XIV* 12 the Teubner text prints the emendation αἰέναν for ἀένναν of the MSS and attributes this to Schroeder, but Schwickert made it earlier and many years before him Mingarelli had proposed it as a possibility. There are in addition two emendations in the apparatus, but not printed, one by Post in *O. IX* 76 and the other by Turyn in *P. IV* 184, the former of which was first made by Schwickert and the latter by Bornemann.

Only slightly less perverse is the Dutchman, Henricus van Herwerden (1831-1910). He made 195 emendations of Pindar between 1870 and 1901, and of these only one is

<sup>12</sup> Bornemann was born in 1855, but I have not been able to find the date of his death or the dates for Schwickert. The latter's emendations cover the period 1875-1898 and the last year for Bornemann's emendations was 1928.



printed, that of τάν for τᾶς in *N.* IV 67. He frequently emends where emendation is unnecessary and where the text is problematic his attempts at restoration are often eccentric.

Vastly superior to the last three is Otto Schroeder (1851-1937). In 1900 he published his *editio maior* of Pindar. Although not a commentary, its critical notes are so detailed that it frequently takes on the function of one. Schroeder made 211 emendations in this edition and in subsequent *editiones minores*. Of this total, 31 are printed and assigned to him, 45 are tacitly printed, and 15 mentioned. Among those tacitly printed are 12 passages where the Teubner text adopts Schroeder's spelling of μείγνυμι over μίγνυμι of the MSS. Many of his emendations involve orthography rather than meaning or syntax.

The illustrious Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848-1931) made 69 emendations of Pindar between 1879 and 1922. Of these, 15 are printed and 24 are mentioned. This is an unusually high ratio of emendations accepted or mentioned to emendations proposed, but I suspect that if they had been made by a less distinguished scholar, the ratio would be lower. Some of those printed do not seem to me to be particularly convincing (*e.g.*, *O.* VI 43; *P.* X 69; *N.* I 66; *I.* V 58) and I would not be surprised if subsequent Teubner editions continued the trend seen in the 1980 edition, i.e., of transferring more emendations from the text to the apparatus.

I conclude this survey with the Polish scholar, Alexander Turyn (1900-1981), a professor at the University of Illinois from 1945 until his death. Turyn made 40 emendations in his 1948 edition of Pindar, 10 of which are printed and 7 mentioned. Of the 10 printed, half involve alteration of -ας to -αις in the aorist participle, and most of the rest are simply improvements of the emendations of others. Several more of Turyn's emendations, however, seem to me to be

at least worthy of mention in the apparatus (*e.g.*, *O.* III 35; *P.* IV 225; *P.* VII 9; *P.* X 69) and his judicious choice of MS readings and previous emendations makes his edition one of the finest we have.



## APPENDIX

I list below those emendations which have appeared since the publication of my *Emendations in Pindar: 1513-1972* (Amsterdam 1976) and those which I overlooked at that time. I wish to record my gratitude to Luigi Lehnus for informing me of some omissions in my book.

- O. I 59: ἐμπεδόμοχθος C. del GRANDE, *Filologia minore* (Milano & Napoli 1956; <sup>2</sup>1967), 345 (2439).
- O. II 45: Ἀδρασιδῶν C. O. PAVESE, "Le Olimpiche di Pindaro", in *QUCC* 20 (1975), 65-121 (75).
- O. II 56: φέγγος, εἰ δέ νιν A. HURST, "Observations sur la deuxième Olympique de Pindare", in *ZAnt* 31 (1981), 121-133.
- O. III 3: virgulam post ὀρθώσαις delevit R. RENEHAN, *Studies in Greek Texts* (Göttingen 1976), 50-53.
- O. XIII 3: θεράποντ', ἀγγνώσομαι A. WASSERSTEIN, "A gamma in Pindar, *Ol.* 13.3", in *CQ* 32 (1982), 278-80.
- O. XIII 107: Ἀρκάσι Πανός vel post Nairn πατρός L. LEHNUS, "Pindaro, *Olimpica* 13, 107-8", in *RFIC* 107 (1979), 276-78.
- P. I 2: τεῖς ... ἀρχάν S. G. KAPSOMENOS, "Τὸ προοίμιο τοῦ πρώτου Πυθιονίκου τοῦ Πινδάρου", in *EEThess* 12 (1973), 303-17.
- P. I 12: λῆμά τε, κῶμα Kapsomenos *supra*.
- P. I 17: λίκνον ἔθρεψεν πολuwονύμου ἄντρου R. J. WALKER, *Anti Mias. An Essay in Isometry* I (London 1910), 25.
- P. I 23-24: ὄρφνα συστροφὰς ... κυλινδομένας S. G. KAPSOMENOS, "Ein Zeugnis des Favorinus über Pindars Beschreibung des Aetna-Ausbruches", in *Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella* II (Catania 1972), 557-72.

- P. II 82: ὁμῶς U. von WILAMOWITZ, "Hieron und Pindaros", in *SPAW* 53 (1901), 1314.
- P. IV 18: θοᾶς ἀνία τ' ἀντ' ἐρετμῶν δίφρους γε A. ARDIZZONI, "Note sul testo di Pindaro", in *GIF* 26 (1974), 252-62 (252).
- P. IV 109: λυγραῖς A. ARDIZZONI, "L'animo 'bianco' di Pelia? (Pind. *Pyth.* IV 109)", in *Helikon* 13-14 (1973-74), 377-82.
- P. IV 178: πέμψε O. SCHROEDER (ed.), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis selectis* (Lipsiae 21914).
- P. VI 50: ὀργᾶς δς ἱππειᾶν ἐσόδων proposuit simulque reiecit M. SCHMIDT, *Pindar's Olympische Siegesgesaenge* (Jena 1869), xcv.
- P. IX 36-37: interrogationis punctum etiam post προσενεγκεῖν posuit C. CAREY, *A Commentary on Fives Odes of Pindar* (New York 1981), 76.
- P. XI 54-57: ἀμύνονται ἄτα· εἴ τις ... ἀπέφυγεν, μέλανος <ὁ> (cum Bergk) δ' ἐσχατιὰν καλλίονα θανάτοι' (cum Shackle) ἔσχεν G. PINI, "Osservazioni sulla *Pitica* XI", in *SIFC* 44 (1972), 197-220 (198-206) — φθονεροὶ (vel φθονεραὶ) δ' ἀμύνονται ἄται, εἴ τις ... ἀπέφυγεν, μέλανος δ' ἐσχατιὰν καλλίονα θανάτου ἔσχεν J. PÉRON, "Le thème du Phthonos dans la XI<sup>e</sup> Pythique de Pindare (v. 29-30, v. 55-56)", in *REA* 78-79 (1976-77), 65-83 (72-83).
- P. XII 10-11: virgulam post καμάτῳ delevit et virgulas post λειβόμενον et ἄυσεν inseruit A. KÖHNKEN, "Two notes on Pindar", in *BICS* 25 (1978), 92-96.
- N. I 37: ὥστ' vel ὦτ' ("come chi non sfugge") G. A. PRIVITERA, "Tre note alla prima Nemea (vv. 18, 37, 64)", in *Hermes* 103 (1975), 285-92 (287-89).
- N. I 63-66: ὅσσους δὲ ... αἰδροδίκας καὶ τίνα ... στείχοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον φᾶσέ νιν δώσειν μόρον Privitera *supra* pp. 289-92.
- N. IV 14-15: virgulam post κε delevit et post καθαρίζων inseruit M. C. LANDRETH, "The Position of the Particles ἄν and κε(v) in Pindar", in *Eranos* 76 (1978), 13-18 (15-16).
- N. IV 58: χρησαμένου A. KÖHNKEN, *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (Berlin 1971), 200-3.
- N. VI 7: πότι A.-I. SULZER, *Zur Wortstellung und Satzbildung bei Pindar* (Diss. Zürich 1961), 24.

- N. VII 33: βοαθέων Carey (*supra* sub P. IX 36-37), p. 150 — τεθνακότων Βοαθόων, τοῖ ... μόλον L. WOODBURY, "Neoptolemus at Delphi: Pindar, *Nem.* 7.30 ff.", in *Phoenix* 33 (1979), 95-133 (106-7).
- N. VIII 10: ἀναξείαις? K. STEGMANN VON PRITZWALD, *Zur Geschichte der Herrscherbezeichnungen von Homer bis Plato* (Leipzig 1930), 83.
- N. VIII 40: αὔξεται δ' ἀρετὰ χλωραῖς ἐέρσαις ὥς ὅτε δένδρεον ᾗσσει C. CAREY, "Pindar's eighth Nemean Ode", in *PCPhS* 202 (1976), 26-41 (35).
- N. X 41-42: ὅσαις ἵπποτρόφον ἄστν τό <δε> θᾶλε <πεντάκις> Κορίνθου R. MERKELBACH, "Der Anlass zu Pindars zehnter Nemea", in *Le monde grec. Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Bruxelles 1975), 94-101 (100-1).
- I. I 25: καὶ <ρ> ὁπότε λιθίνοις G. A. PRIVITERA, "A proposito di Pind. *Isthm.* I 25", in *GIF* 30 (1978), 267.
- I. IV 68: virgulam post γίνεται delevit A. KÖHNKEN recensens Gerber in *Phoenix* 31 (1977), 265-68 (267).
- I. VII 29: αὔξων ... ἄστῶν J. A. HARTUNG (ed.), *Pindar's Werke* IV (Leipzig 1856).
- I. VIII 40: φαμέν? G. A. PRIVITERA (ed.), *Pindaro. Le Istmiche* (Milano 1982), 131.
- I. VIII 70: ὑπὸ κόλπῳ (cum Theiler) vel potius ὑπὸ κόλπου David C. YOUNG, "The Text of Pindar Isthmian 8.70", in *AJPh* 94 (1973), 319-26.
- Fr. 37: Πότνια Θεσμοφόρε χρυσάνιόν <θ' ᾗ ... πόσιν λαχοῖσα (post W. J. SLATER, in *GRBS* 12 (1971), 145 n. 17: "Why editors emend to χρυσανίου I do not know. We can supply πόσιν λαχοῖσα as easily as "Αἰδου δάμαρ.") L. LEHNUS, "Contributo a due frammenti pindarici (frr. 37 e 168 Snell<sup>3</sup>)", in *SCO* 22 (1973), 5-18 (5-11).
- Fr. 52 f, 139: ἀμέτερον W. M. CALDER III, "Pindar, *Paeon* 6.102 (=139)", in *AJPh* 98 (1977), 350.
- Fr. 52 s, 6: ἀμπλακ[ E. W. WHITTLE, in H. FRIIS JOHANSEN & E. W. WHITTLE (edd.), *Aeschylus. The Suppliants* II (Copenhagen 1980), 185.

- Fr. 94 a: vide L. RODI, "Il primo partenio di Pindaro (Pap. Oxy. IV, 659 Grenfell-Hunt = fr. 94 a Snell-Maehler)", in *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardiszoni* II (Roma 1978), 771-88.
- Fr. 94 b, 19-20: ὠκύαλον πόντου ῥιπὴν ἐμάλαξεν G. FRACCAROLI recensens B. P. GRENFELL & A. S. HUNT, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part IV (London 1904), in *RFIC* 33 (1905), 364-67 (366) — ὠκύαλον πόντου ῥιπὴν τε ταράξῃ L. R. FARNELL (ed.), *The Works of Pindar* II (London 1932), 428 — ὠκύαλον <βίη> ῥιπὴν <ἐπαίξας> I. CAZZANIGA, "In Pindari fragm. 94 B Snell (P.Oxy. 659, II 18-20)", in *PP* 33 (1978), 292-93.
- Fr. 94 b, 61: ἀνῆκεν O. SCHROEDER recensens B. P. GRENFELL & A. S. HUNT, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part IV (London 1904), in *BPhW* 24 (1904), 1473-79 (1477).
- Fr. 94 b, 66: Δαμαίνας πᾶ[τε]ρ, ἡ[...(.)]οι (ἡ[σύχ]ω?) L. LEHNUS, "Da una nuova ispezione di P.Oxy. IV 659 (Pindaro, Parthenia)", in *MPhL* 2 (1977), 227-31.
- Fr. 124 a, 3: γε Ardiszoni (*supra* sub P. IV 18), pp. 259-62.
- Fr. 168 b, 3: πυρὶ δεῖπνον σώματα L. LEHNUS, "Spigolature callimachee e neoteriche", in *PP* 30 (1975), 291-300 (294-95) et "Pindaro Fr. 168(b).3 Snell-Maehler e Callimaco *Victoria Berenices* Fr. B II 24 Livrea", in *Anagennesis* 1 (1981), 249-53.
- Fr. 169: vide L. CASTAGNA, "Pindaro, Fr. 169 Sn.<sup>3</sup>: interpretazione e proposta di datazione", in *SIFC* 43 (1971), 173-98.
- Fr. 169, 21-22: ὠμοτατᾶν vel λαβροτατᾶν] (hoc iam Pavese) ἵππῳ[ν μαινομ]έναν φρέ[να τέρπειν] H. LLOYD-JONES, "Pindar Fr. 169", in *HSCP* 76 (1972), 45-56 (51-52).
- Fr. 169, 29: τε pro δέ? Lloyd-Jones *supra* p. 52.
- Fr. 169, 41: παῖδ' Ἀ[ρεως Lloyd-Jones *supra* p. 53.

## DISCUSSION

*M. Lloyd-Jones:* It is interesting to compare the body of emendations on Pindar with that of emendations on Aeschylus and Sophocles; in the case of Aeschylus comparison is made easier by the existence of the repertory of conjectures of Wecklein, supplemented by Dawe. My general impression is that far more emendations, in proportion to the amount of text preserved, have been made on the texts of the tragedians. Certain scholars who, though by no means always successful in conjecture, have made some plausible emendations on the texts of tragedy, have achieved less with that of Pindar; for instance Bothe, Hartung, M. Schmidt, Herwerden and even Bergk. Gerber has rightly pointed out that Wilamowitz was less effective in the emendation of the text of Pindar than the current Teubner text might lend us to suppose.

*Mme Lefkowitz:* Could you describe some of the principles that should be followed in the next edition of Pindar? Would Privitera's Pindar serve as a model?

*M. Gerber:* Yes. As I said p. 7 n. 3, I find his apparatus excellent. His apparatus also shows that it does not need to be lengthy in order to include all deviations from the mss. Fortunately, the text of Pindar is not very corrupt and as a result the apparatus does not have to list a large number of emendations.

*Mme Bernardini:* Dal momento che è stata ricordata con accenti giustamente elogiativi l'edizione delle *Istmiche* di G. A. Privitera, colgo l'occasione per comunicare che è ormai in fase di avanzata preparazione, per la medesima collana, anche quella delle *Pitiche* a cura di B. Gentili con la collaborazione di G. Cerri, P. Giannini e della sottoscritta.

Sono d'accordo con il Professore Gerber che l'edizione di A. Turyn offre un apparato più ricco e più utile per il lettore di quella teubneriana dal momento che fornisce un quadro più completo degli emendamenti



proposti. In qualche caso, tuttavia, essa va sottoposta ad un'attenta revisione proprio per inesattezze nella registrazione di questi ultimi. Se consideriamo l'esempio di «misleading information» classificato dal Professore Gerber sotto la prima categoria, cioè *P. IX 79*, ci accorgiamo che è vero che nell'apparato di Snell-Maehler è menzionata solo la correzione ἔγνων fatta da Ahrens nel 1843, ma in quello di Turyn è registrata solo quella di Schneidewin fatta nel medesimo anno. L'apparato dovrebbe essere: ἔγνων codd: corr. Schndw. et Ahrens.

Quanto all'alternanza μιν, viv, è probabile che Pindaro abbia usato la forma dorica viv, ma quando i codici sono concordi nel dare μιν, è preferibile mantenere tale forma come fa Turyn piuttosto che cambiarla sempre in viv come fanno Boeckh e Mommsen, oppure comportarsi come Snell-Maehler che preferiscono viv a μιν, ma che, come abbiamo visto, non sempre in proposito forniscono un apparato esauriente. In *P. IX 123* per avere una visione dettagliata l'apparato sarà: μιν codd.: μέν Boeckh, μιν retinuit Turyn.

Vorrei aggiungere, infine, un'osservazione sugli emendamenti fatti per non contravvenire al criterio delle responsioni: quando la responsione impura è attestata concordemente dalla tradizione manoscritta ed essa viene a buon diritto conservata nel testo, è opportuno che il lettore sia succintamente informato delle altre prese di posizione in merito, dal momento che si tratta di un fenomeno sporadico, anche se non infrequente negli epinici di Pindaro.

*M. Köhnken*: I should like to stress the importance of conciseness in the apparatus criticus. As it is up to the editor to tell the inessential from the essential should he not confine himself to the name of the critic who made the essential alteration or correction? Thus in the case of *N. X 72* only the name of E. Schmid should be given (as in the text of Snell-Maehler), and minor rectifications made by others be omitted. Otherwise the apparatus would be unduly inflated.

*M. Gerber*: I agree that conciseness is necessary, but so is the truth. It is only partially true to say that Schmid is responsible for the text printed in *N. X 72* and the reader could be made aware of this by an



apparatus which in this instance need not record all the details, but which might say something like "Boe. *post* Cep. *et* Schmid".

*Mme Bernardini*: Un'eccessiva concisione può andare a detrimento della chiarezza e della completezza di informazione. L'apparato deve orientare il lettore e fornirgli gli elementi per poter decidere a sua volta. In tal senso è molto utile un tipo di edizione 'aperta' che faccia il punto anche sulla critica congetturale fornendo la documentazione delle varie proposte e non solo il risultato della selezione fatta dall'editore. Anche l'atteggiamento nei confronti della registrazione di alcuni fatti dialettali dovrebbe ottemperare allo stesso criterio di utilità documentaria. È buona norma far conoscere di volta in volta qual'è la posizione dei mss. per forme come il part. aor. -ας, -αις o il part. pr. f. -ουσα, -οισα per le quali è utile conoscere il comportamento della tradizione manoscritta.

*M. Köhnken*: While it is certainly right that the 'ratio of emendations' by Wilamowitz accepted in modern editions would be lower if they had been made by a less distinguished scholar, occasionally his suggestions should be examined more closely than they currently are. Thus I believe he is right to question the mss.-tradition ἀκοά in *P.* IX 78, and probably correct in replacing it by ἀκόνα (referring to *O.* VI 82 and *I.* VI 73). There are two points to be made here, one of meaning and one of syntax:

1) Wilamowitz objected against the meaning that has to be assumed for ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς by those who defend the mss.-tradition (cf. e.g. *O.* Schroeder, *Pindars Pythien* [Leipzig 1922], *ad loc.*: "solches Können (des Dichters) — ein ἀκρόαμα für die Kenner...", or, more recently, R. W. B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* [Oxford 1962], 43 "the adorning of a few themes among many *is what men of culture like to hear*": my italics). There seems to be no parallel in Pindar or elsewhere for ἀκοά (ἀκουή) in the sense assumed here (Burton's paraphrase rather presupposes something like σοφοῖς ἀκοᾶς ἄξιον; contrast *P.* I 84 and 90, the only parallels for the word in Pindar, and ἀκουή in Homer);

2) The infinitive-clause which depends on ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς (77: βαῖα δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν) evidently refers to the poet (it is his task to

ποικίλλειν) and not to the manner in which the audience receives his poetry (e.g. David Young, in *CLAnt* 2 [1983], 158 f., whose translation of the paradosis ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς, "hearing for the wise", p. 158, seems to be at variance with his own paraphrase, p. 159, "The good poet chooses just a little to ποικίλλειν, even when there is much to say").

Thus ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς, which could only refer to the audience, and the dependant infinitive-clause, which refers to the poet, are syntactically incompatible. The overall sense required by the infinitive ("It is the task of the poet to...") is obtained by Wilamowitz' conjecture ἀκό<v>α σοφοῖς ("the artful presentation of a few items from among long stories is a whetting stone for poets"). Scholars criticizing Wilamowitz seem to miss his point ("die Tätigkeit des Schmückens kann nun und nimmer eine ἀκοὰ sein", *Pindaros* [Berlin 1922], 264) and fail to explain the syntactical strangeness of the transmitted text. Pindar likes blending his metaphors and sometimes presents us with an extremely unorthodox word-order but he is not guilty of offending against basic rules of grammar and syntax.

*M. Gerber*: I am inclined to agree with you that Wilamowitz' emendation is correct. It is easy to imagine that a scribe, faced with the striking metaphor of ἀκόνα, might well have thought it an error for ἀκοά or that he carelessly wrote ἀκοά because that is what he expected to find in his text.

*Mme Bernardini*: Le argomentazioni addotte dal Professore Köhnken a favore di ἀκόνα del Wilamowitz non mi sembrano del tutto convincenti. Non vedo la necessità di correggere il termine ἀκοά che è nei mss. e che non crea alcuna difficoltà per il senso. In primo luogo esso non trova un ostacolo, ma anzi una conferma in *P.* I 84 e 90 in cui, come ben intende il Boeckh, connota l'atto dell'udire da parte dei cittadini e si specifica come un ascolto che concerne la lode grazie all'aggiunta di ἐσλοῖσιν ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίοις nell'un caso e ἀδείαν nell'altro. In secondo luogo l'uso del termine ἀκοά è del tutto pertinente nel passo della *P.* IX dal momento che il discorso riguarda il rapporto del poeta con il suo pubblico (σοφοί). Il significato di "ascolto per i saggi" è confortato da

O. II 85 dove συνετοί definisce coloro ai quali la propria parola è diretta. La poesia laudativa presuppone infatti un uditorio di φρονέοντες che intendano ciò che dice il poeta, come si deduce da Bacch. 3, 85. Neppure sul piano sintattico la costruzione pindarica mi sembra poi così ardata.

*M. Vallet:* J'interviens avec prudence dans ce dialogue consacré à l'histoire des corrections proposées au texte de Pindare et aux règles à suivre pour une future édition critique. Je voudrais simplement poser une question sur un point de détail, qui soulève, me semble-t-il, un problème de méthode.

Douglas E. Gerber a rappelé le problème que pose le vers 41 de la IX<sup>e</sup> Néméenne. Pindare vient de rappeler les exploits anciens de Chromios à la bataille de l'Héloros.

40: ... βαθυκρήμνοισι δ' ἄμφ' ἄκταϊς Ἐλώρου,

41: ἔνθ' Ἀρέας πόρον ἄνθρωποι καλέοισι ...

Comme je le souligne, moi aussi, dans le texte de mon exposé, l'expression ἔνθ' Ἀρέας pose un problème que j'estime insoluble. Il ne peut s'agir, vu le contexte, que d'un endroit bien précis de la région de Syracuse, et plus exactement de la vallée de l'Héloros, dont on sait à quel point elle est encaissée. De toute façon, le texte n'a aucun rapport ni avec le 'passage de Rhéa' (Aeschyl. *Prom.* 837), qui désigne la mer Ionienne, ni avec Arès. Alors? Voici ma question: est-il raisonnable, plutôt que d'avouer notre ignorance concernant un nom propre, de multiplier les propositions et corrections qui ne peuvent qu'égarer le lecteur, et notamment l'historien, lequel risque, à son tour, sans vérifier le texte, de se lancer dans des hypothèses pour 'expliquer' (*sic!*) des conjectures que rien ne justifie?

*M. Gerber:* But surely it is incumbent upon an editor to point out, as the Teubner edition does, that the words in question, especially since they present a problem, may be explained in different ways.

*M. Reverdin:* Le scholiaste a tout dit sur ce passage: ἄδηλον, εἴτε Ἀρείας εἴτε Πείας λεκτέον (*Schol. ad N. IX* 95 c, III p. 160 Drachmann).

Aussi longtemps que l'épigraphie ou un texte nouveau ne nous révélera pas un lieu-dit syracusain dont le nom coïncide avec un de ceux que les mss., y compris la scholie, nous donnent, il est inutile d'épiloguer!

*M. Hurst:* A la lumière de l'exemple cité parmi les conjectures de Pauw (p. 11), on pourrait se demander dans quelle mesure il est possible d'identifier les courants poétiques contemporains du critique et qui influencent ses conjectures. R. Pfeiffer a indiqué cette voie pour un passage de Callimaque (*JHS* 75 [1955], 69-73 = *Ausgewählte Schriften* [München 1960], 148-158). Qu'en est-il aujourd'hui? En outre, hors du champ de la perception poétique, mais dans les habitudes de la discipline, n'accordons-nous pas un peu trop d'autorité au 'témoignage papyrologique', comme s'il était infaillible?

*M. Gerber:* I agree that it is wrong to accept blindly papyrological evidence, but in the instances I have cited, and others could be added, the ms. tradition offers a text which is either defective or in some way improbable. In such instances, when one finds in a papyrus a text corresponding to an emendation, it seems reasonable to state that the papyrus confirms the emendation.

*M. Reverdin:* Mon intervention porte sur un point de détail: je saisis l'occasion pour donner des renseignements précis sur les éditions genevoises de Pindare, dont aucun des éditeurs modernes ne me paraît avoir une connaissance assurée.

La 'petite' édition des Estienne a connu cinq, voire six éditions. C'est une édition in-16, dont le tome I contient les odes de Pindare et le tome II, des poèmes, odes et fragments de huit autres poètes lyriques. Elle a paru pour la première fois en 1560 chez Henri Estienne à Genève (Henri Estienne n'a jamais imprimé ailleurs qu'à Genève; l'indication «Paris?» du Pindare de Snell est donc fallacieuse). Dans la seconde édition, de 1566, les changements sont minimes: quelques corrections, quelques adjonctions. La troisième édition, de 1586, est plus intéressante en ce sens qu'elle contient des notes critiques d'Isaac Casaubon, qui avait épousé cette année-là la fille d'Henri Estienne (Casaubon était alors



professeur de grec à l'Académie de Genève, sa ville natale). Ces notes n'ont pas été rééditées.

Henri Estienne est mort en 1598. Son fils Paul a repris l'édition du 'petit Pindare', qui a paru en 1600 (editio IIII), en 1612 (editio V) et en 1626.

Ce Pindare de 1626 est le dernier livre imprimé à Genève par des Estienne, où ils ont produit près de 300 titres depuis l'arrivée de Robert Estienne, en 1551; mais elle pourrait bien n'être qu'un nouveau tirage de la précédente, voire l'utilisation de feuilles non vendues, avec une nouvelle page de titre\*.

Le Pindare in-4 de 1599 n'appartient pas à cette série. Il en diffère par le texte et par la présence des scholies. C'est le premier ouvrage imprimé par Paul Estienne sur les presses de son père, décédé, on vient de le voir, l'année précédente. Paul Estienne — il le dit dans son épître dédicatoire à Jacques Bongars, historien et érudit protestant — a bénéficié pour ce Pindare de l'assistance de son beau-frère Isaac Casaubon qui faisait alors un gros effort — assorti d'une généreuse abnégation — pour remettre à flot la *domus stephanica*, qui avait cruellement souffert, à partir de 1585, des voyages et des absences continuels d'Henri Estienne, qui se comportait en tyran et interdisait à quiconque de travailler sur ses presses et dans sa bibliothèque, comme en font foi plus d'un passage des *Ephémérides* de Casaubon, des *Registres du Conseil de Genève* et des *Registres de la Compagnie des pasteurs*.

En terminant, je me permets d'insister fermement sur le fait que tous les livres imprimés par Henri Estienne l'ont été à Genève, et que la mention «Paris» ou «Paris?» qu'on trouve dans nombre de préfaces des éditions modernes est erronée.

M. Gerber m'a d'autre part paru ignorer l'existence d'un autre 'Pindare' genevois du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle: celui de 1599.

\* D. E. GERBER, *Emendations in Pindar: 1513-1972* (1976), mentionne aussi une édition de 1624. Si elle existe vraiment, ce que j'ignore, ce serait aussi, très vraisemblablement, un tirage de celle de 1612, et non une édition à proprement parler.