

of the narrator, which is one of the hallmarks of the Asiatic or mannerist rhetorician, is a feature of the symbolic or allegorical narrative which should always be taken into account in its interpretation. Failure to recognize this

feature has, as in the case of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, resulted in failure to understand meaning.

CONSTANCE S. WRIGHT

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

this point, see R. Merkelbach, *Roman und Mysterium* (Munich, 1962), pp. 82–83. Similarly, Lucius is identified as a Greek in the proemium and differentiated from Apuleius, but is inconsistently referred to in 11. 27 as a certain poor man

from Madaura, i.e., Apuleius himself. On this point, see A.-J. Festugière, *Personal Religion among the Greeks* (Berkeley, 1954), p. 76.

A NOTE ON PINDAR *NEMEAN* 1. 24–25

λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἐ-
σλοὺς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν
ἀντίον.

Scholars have long engaged in spirited debate over the meaning of this passage. Farnell, citing the authority of Aristarchus as he is represented by the scholia, translates: "it falls to the lot of those who blame the good to be (as it were) bringing up water against smoke."¹ With Von Leutsch and Mezger he interprets ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον as a proverb for futile effort which would be equivalent to our own "to pour oil on fire."² Even Farnell admits that the alleged proverb is a bad one: although a little water will increase smoke, a greater amount will succeed in stifling it.

Bury construes λέλογχε as personal with Chromius as subject: "But he hath won good friends to quell as with water the smoke of envious cavillers."³ The problem posed by this

interpretation is serious but not insurmountable. As Farnell has observed, the natural object of water is fire, not smoke. Thus, we have such wishful translations as "... against the smoking fire."⁴ A solution to this difficulty may be found if we consider that the point which the poet is trying to make is not at all that smoke/envy is to be quelled or extinguished, but that it is to be kept from bursting into flame. So long as envy produces only smoke, it is ineffectual, and the presence of water/friends at Chromius' side keeps it that way. This interpretation accords well with the scholium to Aristophanes *Clouds* 253: τὰ γὰρ μηδενὸς ἄξια καπνοὺς καὶ σκιὰς καὶ νεφέλας ὠνόμαζον.⁵

EDWARD D. LASKY

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1. L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, II (London, 1932), 246.

2. "Oel in Feuer giessen." F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig, 1880), p. 105.

3. J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London, 1890), p. 15. Dissen with Hermann connects μεμφομένοις with λέλογχεν ἐσλοῦς and translates, "Nactus est hospitii liberalitate viros probos adversus obtretractores, ad aquam fumo

obviam ferendam, h. e. quibus uti possit ad restinguendam invidiam." See his *Explicationes ad Nemea* in Boeckh's *Pindari Opera quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1821), p. 354.

4. P. E. Laurent (trans.), *The Odes of Pindar* (Oxford, 1824), p. 244.

5. Also cited by E. von Leutsch, *Addimentorum ad Lud. Disseni in Pindari Carmina commentarium specimen* (Göttingen, 1865), p. 4.