PINDAR FR. 104b SNELL

TOWARDS the end of Plutarch's treatise *de Pythiae oraculis* (409 b 29) Theon quotes a short passage of verse but does not identify its author. The fragment is now customarily printed among the remains of Pindar's *Parthenea*, most recently by Snell:[1]

> προβάτων γὰρ ἐκ πάντων κελάρυξεν,
> ὡς ἀπὸ κρανᾶν φέρτατον ὕδωρ,
> θηλᾶν γάλα· τοὶ δ' ἐπίμπλαν ἐσσύμενοι πίθους·
> ἀσκὸς δ' οὔτε τις ἀμφορεὺς ἐλίννεν δόμοις,
> πέλλαι γὰρ ξύλιναι πίθοι ⟨τε⟩ πλῆσθεν ἅπαντες.

1 πρὸ πάντων: Leonicus   3 θέλεον: Wil.   ἐπίμπλων: ἐπίμπλαν Naber, ἐπίμπλεν Wil.
5 ξύλινοι: Wil. ⟨τε⟩ Schwartz

Pindaric authorship was first proposed by Schneidewin[2] in 1834 and has since been widely accepted. Wilamowitz[3] argued in its favour and, according to Farnell,[4] 'we may be sure the verses are Pindar's'.

The recent history of this fragment, however, is not entirely straightforward. In 1834, the year of Schneidewin's proposal, Bergk[5] ascribed the verses to tragedy. On the other hand, nine years later, in the first edition of *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*,[6] he printed it among Pindar's *fragmenta incerta* (no. 150): 'pindarica . . . sunt haec apertissime', a comment which aroused Schneidewin's fury: 'Die sache ist richtig, aber das konnte wohl bemerkt sein, dass ich schon im j. 1834 die worte als Pindarisch in ausspruch genommen hatte.'[7] In his second edition,[8] disdaining and hardly answering Schneidewin's extensive charges, Bergk unobtrusively transferred the fragment—no longer 'apertissime Pindaricum'—from Pindar's works to *MEΛH: fragmenta adespota* (no. 88) with a reference to 'Schneidewin, qui Pindaro tribuit'.[9] Schroeder, following Wilamowitz, returned it to Pindar with some misgivings as fr. 104b.[10]

[1] B. Snell, *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* ii³ (Leipzig, 1964), 94. The following corrections and additions to Snell's apparatus should be noted: v. 1 codd. κελάρυξεν, v. 2 codd. κρηνάων: κρανᾶν Bergk, v. 3 codd. θήλεον (not θέλεον): θηλέον Page; ἐπιμπλαν (not ἐπίμπλαν) Naber, ἐπίμπλαν Schroeder. I thank A. T. Cole, Warren Cowgill, and C. M. Dawson for their helpful comments on a previous version of this argument.

[2] *ZfA* i. 433 f.; cf. *Pindari Carmina* (Gotha, 1843), fr. 182ᵈ, 330.

[3] 'Lesefrüchte XXXII', *Hermes* xxxiv (1899), 223 f. (repr. *Kleine Schriften* iv [Berlin, 1962], 64-6).

[4] *The Works of Pindar* ii: *Critical Commentary* (London, 1932), 426. Cf. O. Schroeder, *Pindari Carmina* (= *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*⁵, Leipzig, 1900), 423 f., J. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar* (London, 1915), 562 f., A. Puech, *Pindare* iv (*Collection Budé*, Paris, 1923) 235, C. M. Bowra, *Pindari Carmina* (Oxford, 1947), fr. 93, A. Turyn, *Pindari*

Carmina (Cracow, 1948), fr. 108. Not all editors express Farnell's assurance. Puech, for instance, writes: 'je crois prudent de rester dans le doute', and the fragment is asterisked by Schroeder and Snell. None of these editors, however, relegates the fragment to a section of *dubia*.

[5] *Anacreontis Carminum Reliquias edidit T. B.* (Leipzig, 1834), vii f.

[6] Leipzig, 1843, pp. 266-7 (hereafter abbr. *PLG*).

[7] *Beiträge zur Kritik der Poetae Lyrici Graeci, edidit Theodorus Bergk* (Göttingen, 1844), 8.

[8] Leipzig, 1853, pp. vii f. The motto to Bergk's *Praefatio* reads: ἀνδρῶν δικαίων χρόνος σωτὴρ ἄριστος.

[9] In *PLG*³ (Leipzig, 1866; cf. *PLG*⁴, 1878, the edition commonly cited), it became fr. adesp. no. 90.

[10] Loc. cit.: 'Pindarus si carminis auctor est . . .'; cf. B. Forssman, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars* [= *Kl.-Phil. Stud.* 33] (Wiesbaden, 1966), 160 n. 4. Schroeder's partial

Scepticism has been recently voiced by Denys Page[1] who, like Bergk, considers the passage to be melic. Although Farnell (loc. cit.) asserts that 'the style is obviously Pindar's—no one but he would use the phrase οὔτε . . . δόμοις', in Page's opinion the verses are 'unworthy of Pindar'. Such differences of editorial judgement are, of course, far from unparalleled, but it is surprising to note that during the long dispute regarding the authorship of this fragment, one fact has apparently been passed over in silence: the verses as they appear in the Plutarchan manuscripts include not a single trace of distinctively Doric (or Aeolic) dialect. While one might argue that modern emendations have restored a Pindaric text corrupted either by Plutarch or by his tradition, it is worth questioning the evidence on which these changes could be considered necessary or advisable.

The argument for Pindaric authorship has been conducted not on the basis of dialect but on that of style, metre, and context. Contextual arguments have concerned the original occasion of this piece. Snell entitles the fragment ΔΑΦΝΗΦΟΡΙΚΟΝ ΕΙΣ ΓΑΛΑΞΙΟΝ.[2] The reasons for this decision are familiar enough: Plutarch (loc. cit.), our only source for these verses,[3] introduces their otherwise unidentified citation as follows: οἱ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸ Γαλάξιον τῆς Βοιωτίας κατοικοῦντες ἤσθοντο τοῦ θεοῦ[4] τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ἀφθονίᾳ καὶ περιουσίᾳ γάλακτος. In the Ambrosian Vita[5] we are told that Pindar had a son, Daiphantos, ᾧ καὶ δαφνηφορικὸν ᾆσμα ἔγραψεν. Linking these two references with a quotation from Proclus' Chrestomathy,[6] Wilamowitz confidently acclaims the fragment as Pindaric and Farnell comments that 'it is not likely that anyone in Boeotia save Pindar wrote Partheneia for this [sc. the Galaxian] service'.

Two aspects of Farnell's remarks require consideration. In the first place the assertion that our fragment derives from a Partheneion is far from self-evident. There is no reference to maidens either in the fragment or in its immediate context. Τοὶ . . . ἐσσύμενοι (v. 3) is masculine and whether τοὶ

uncertainty is also reflected in his 1930 Teubner edition, which presents the passage between fragments 99 and 104c without specific enumeration.

[1] *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford, 1962), 528, fr. adesp. 79 (cited, but presumably not accepted, by Snell). Cf. J. M. Edmonds, *Lyra Graeca* iii (London, 1940), anon. fr. 74, 450–1, who cites the Pindaric ascription (giving Schroeder the credit).

[2] Cf. Schneidewin (*Pindari Carmina*, loc. cit.): 'referenda autem haec videntur ad carmen daphnephoricum Apollini Galaxio certo tempore a Boeotis oblatum', and Wilamowitz, Farnell, Schroeder, and Turyn locc. citt.

[3] The uniqueness of Plutarch's testimony raises a familiar problem. If we had to rely exclusively on Pausanias, for example, we would have no way of knowing that the Spartan inscription which he reports at 5. 24. 3 (= *IG* v. 1. 1562 Olympia, v B.C. init.) contains the form ἰλήφω and not ἰλά(ϝ)ῳ, the expected Doric form, recorded by Pausanias (cf. E. D. Francis, 'Greek

Disyllabic Roots', Yale diss. 1970, 266 f.).

[4] While τοῦ θεοῦ, in a discourse on the Pythian oracle, is likely to refer to Apollo, Bergk (*PLG*[1] 267) suggests Dionysus as equally possible and Sandys accepts this latter identification without comment. The fact that Apollo and Dionysus shared Delphi may have encouraged this suggestion. Moreover, Dionysus is known as a milker of lions (cf. Alcm. 56 *ap.* Athen. 11. 498 f., also Aristides, *Or.* 41. 7) but emendation of codd. πρὸ πάντων to λεόντων is less attractive than Leonicus' προβάτων. Προβάτων in turn seems to exclude a reference to lions. The gender of τοὶ . . . ἐσσύμενοι can hardly designate the Bacchantes associated with the Dionysian ritual. Farnell is therefore probably correct in rejecting a Bacchic interpretation especially since Photius may offer corroborative evidence for the cult of Apollo Galaxios.

[5] A. B. Drachmann, *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina* i (Leipzig, 1903), 3.

[6] *Ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* 321 b 29 f.: παρέπεμπον δὲ τὴν δαφνηφορίαν εἰς Ἀπόλλωνος Ἰσμηνίου καὶ Γαλαξίου [Marcianus: χαλαζίου A].

refers to men or to people (without regard to sex) is totally unclear; at least it cannot refer exclusively to maidens. Perhaps it was this potential discrepancy which led Wilamowitz, without comment, to emend τοί to ταί while maintaining ἐσσύμενοι. In terms of Wilamowitz's earlier discussion of alleged 'two-termination' participles,[1] ταὶ . . . ἐσσύμενοι would not necessarily be ungrammatical. Nevertheless I accept Barrett's recent rejection[2] of Wilamowitz's conclusions regarding 'two-termination' participles and therefore also reject his change of τοί to ταί. (A further change of ἐσσύμενοι to ἐσσύμεναι would be entirely arbitrary.) Secondly, Farnell's implication that the poet of this allegedly Galaxian *Maidens' Song* was necessarily a local one bears little scrutiny. Denys Page[3] has convincingly demonstrated Alcaeus' profound awareness of the significance of Apollo's return to Delphi described in Himerius' paraphrase (*Or.* 14. 10 f. = Alc. ᾱ 1 [c]). It is therefore unnecessary to insist that only a Boeotian poet could have celebrated Apollo's Galaxian epiphany. I suggest that the connections drawn by Wilamowitz and his followers between the citations from Plutarch, Proclus (*ap.* Photius), and the Ambrosian *Vita* are altogether inconclusive.

The metre of the fragment appears to be Aeolic, though its precise analysis is disputed. While Pindaric editors customarily print five verses, Page tentatively follows Bergk in presenting a sequence of nine glyconics and pherecratics arranged in couplets.[4] The unusual order of their sequence, however, weakens this version as a possible improvement on the more conventional arrangement in Snell's text, which may be analysed as follows: (v. 1) glyconic and reizianum, (v. 2) choriamb and reizianum (or two adonics, or, with codd. κρηνάων, choriamb and pherecratic), (v. 3) telesillean (or glyconic, with codd. θήλεον) and telesillean, (v. 4) glyconic and iambic tripody (or lyric iambic trimeter?), (v. 5) glyconic and reizianum. Plutarch's manuscripts read ἐλίννυε δόμοις in the second half of v. 4 and the phrase has been variously emended.[5] In addition and perhaps in preference to ἐλίννεν δόμοις, the main possibilities are telesillean ἐλίννεν ἐν δόμοις (Schroeder, assuming -ῠ-[6] and codical haplography) or δόμοισιν ἐλίννε(ν), or Page's pherecratic ἐλίννε δόμοισιν (assuming -ῡ-).

Wilamowitz observed (op. cit. 224 and n. 2) that such patterns were compatible with the metres of Pindar's 'Aeolic' poems. 'Aeolic' metres were, however, also used in Ionic lyric, notably by Anacreon and certain of his

---

[1] *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Berlin, 1891), 230–1 ad v. 1103.

[2] *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964), 366–8, with extensive bibliography; cf. E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus: Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1950), ad v. 562. Puech prints τὸν, which seems totally meaningless.

[3] *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), 244–52, esp. pp. 248 f.

[4] T. Bergk, *Anacr. Carm. Reliq.*, viii. Page's edition reads:

> προβάτων γὰρ
> ἐκ πάντων κελάρυξεν, ὡς
> κρανᾶν φέρτατον ὕδωρ
> θηλέον γάλα· τοὶ δὲ
> πίμπλων ἐσσύμενοι πίθους·
> ἀσκὸς δ' οὔτε τις ἀμφορεὺς
> ἐλίννε δόμοισιν·

πέλλαι γὰρ ξύλιναι ⟨καὶ⟩
πίθοι πλῆσθεν ἅπαντες.

The sequence is [pher.], glyc., pher., pher., glyc., glyc., pher. (on the scansion of ἐλίννε, see below), pher., pher.

[5] 'Ελίννυσ' ἐν Schneidewin 1834, ἐλίνν' ἐν id. 1843, ἐλίννε δόμοις Bergk 1843, ἐλίνν' ἐν id. 1853. On Schroeder's ἐλίννεν ἐν δόμοις, see below.

[6] The regular quantity of -ῠ- in the present–imperfect stem of ἐλινύω is ambiguous but was probably short (cf. W. Schulze, *Quaestiones Epicae*, [Gütersloh, 1892], 343). Outside the present system, the stem was ἐλῑνῡ-. 'Ελῑνύεσκεν at Ap. Rh. 1. 589 beside impf. ἐλῑνῦον (ibid. v. 862) could be explained as due to metrical lengthening. These considerations may slightly favour a scansion of ἐλίννεν as ∪—∪⌣.

followers. The metrical evidence is therefore indecisive and cannot of itself be cited to justify a specific ascription to any one of the three literary dialects in which 'Aeolic' metres were employed.

Under these circumstances it is worth reconsidering the dialect of the transmitted text. Codd. κρηνάων (v. 2) provides a good starting-point. Although no one has argued that the underlying dialect of this fragment is literary Doric (or Aeolic), all texts since 1834 have implied such an assumption by printing κρανᾶν.[1] Κρηνάων, however, is Epic; it is attested at Hes. *Op.* 758. The Attic–Ionic vocalism of κρην- and the Epic (Aeolic) suffix -άων are unparalleled in Pindar. When the fragment was ascribed to literary Doric, κρηνάων was accordingly emended to κρανᾶν. These observations raise an important question of method. If it can be shown that the dialect of this fragment is consistently Ionic (with Epic influence), editorial tampering requires special caution in view of the fact that the evidence for Pindaric (or Aeolic) provenance remains inconclusive. Unless any stronger evidence can be developed there may be little justification for emending κρηνάων. If, however, a more strictly Ionic form is required, then κρηνέων (implying a pherecratic) or κρηνῶν (implying a reizianum, compare emended κρανᾶν) offer plausible choices.[2]

Before proceeding to a discussion of θηλᾶν, ἐπίμπλαν, and πλῆσθεν, one may note that literary Ionic is also suggested by κελάρυξεν[3] and ὕδωρ. Κελαρύζω, attested in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 11. 813, 21. 261, *Od.* 5. 323), is not found again until Theocritus, in a passage (*Id.* 7. 137) with other Homeric reminiscences.[4] Even if the emendation to κελάρυξεν is correct, the ξ-aorist would be normal in Epic for a verb of this type and thus provides no evidence for Doric. Τοί (v. 3) is similarly ambiguous in that it occurs in both Doric and Homeric dialects. The long υ- of ὕδωρ (v. 2) is, however, unparalleled in Pindar, who on twenty-three occasions uses the form with short ῠ-. Puech and Schroeder both note the discrepancy and Schulze argues convincingly that this 'productio' is a well-established characteristic of Ionic diction.[5]

Snell accepts Wilamowitz's emendation θηλᾶν (for codd. θήλεον) in v. 3. Wilamowitz did not explain the form, but, according to Schroeder and Turyn, he evidently regarded it as the contraction of an unattested *θηλάεν. Fatouros,[6] however, lists θηλᾶν as the genitive plural of θηλή 'teat'. We may doubt that this was Wilamowitz's intention, for the reason that yet another genitive plural (cf. προβάτων ἐκ πάντων . . ., | ὡς ἀπὸ κρανᾶν . . ., | θηλᾶν γάλα) would be stylistic-

---

[1] Schneidewin's κρανέων of 1834 is an implausible hybrid with a Doric stem and Ionic suffix.

[2] Emendation may be unnecessary since, as Chantraine observes (*Grammaire homérique*, i [Paris, 1958], 201), 'la forme en -άων qui est le type morphologique des vieilles formules apparaît prépondérante. Elle est sentie comme archaïque par les aèdes.'

[3] -ξεν Schneidewin, Bergk, Bowra, Turyn, Page, Snell; -ζεν codd., Wilamowitz, Schroeder, Sandys, Puech. It may be argued that the impf. κελάρυζεν is stylistically more appropriate than the aor. -ξεν.

[4] Cf. A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* ii² (Cambridge, 1952), 164, 166 f. on vv. 135, 137, 144 f.

[5] Op. cit., 437 f. (cf. Chantraine, op. cit., 104). E. Hamm (*Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* [Berlin, 1957], 41) accounts for occurrences of ὕδωρ in Aeolic lyric as borrowings from Epic: 'keine metrische Notwendigkeit liegt vor bei πέράτων . . . und ὕδωρ* . . . dieses in der 4. Zeile der sapphischen Strophe, die sich besonders oft an Hexameterschlüße anlehnt' (cf. E. Risch, 'Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Alkaios', *Mus. Helv.* iii [1946], esp. 254 f.). The metrical restriction is valid since in Sappho 2. 5 (the first line of a stanza) ὕδωρ is iambic. As Page remarks (*Sapph. and Alc.*, 287), ὕδωρ is 'alien to the Lesbian dialect'.

[6] *Index Verborum zur frühgriechischen Lyrik* (Heidelberg, 1966), 171.

ally cumbersome. Schroeder rejects θηλᾶν on the following grounds: 'θηλάεις mihi quidem . . . de ubere quam de lacte videtur aptius dici'. A more serious objection can be raised from the standpoint of metre. By substituting disyllabic θηλᾶν for trisyllabic θήλεον Wilamowitz has altered the metre from glyconic and telesillean to a pair of telesilleans. The presence of an initial glyconic in vv. 1, 4, and 5 offers some support for its probable existence in v. 3. Codd. θήλεον presents considerable difficulties but it is hard to understand how θηλᾶν, a nonce-form of dubious meaning, contributes to their resolution.

Syntactic and semantic considerations exclude the possibility that codd. θήλεον is the third person plural imperfect of θηλέω, and its accentuation likewise indicates that it was not intended as a neuter singular participle agreeing with γάλα. With the apparent exception of Page, scholars have therefore interpreted θήλεον as a neuter adjective derived analogically from the feminine θήλε(ι)α (: θῆλυς, cf. Schroeder, loc. cit.). If θῆλυς belongs etymologically with θάλλω (cf. θηλέω 'bloom, be abundant'), its vocalism is (Attic-)Ionic for Doric (or Aeolic) θάλεον (cf. aor. θάλησε(ν) Pi. N. 4. 88, 10. 42; pf. τέθαλε Pi. fr. 129. 7, B. 10. 40 Sn., Sa. 2. 9 LP). If it is connected with θηλή (f.) 'teat', as has been generally assumed, the -η- is pan-Greek.[1]

The Greeks themselves apparently considered θῆλυς and θάλλω closely connected. This popular etymology seems to be implied by the coexistence of θῆλυς ἐέρση (Od. 5. 467) and τεθαλυῖα (τ') ἐέρση (Od. 13. 245), potentially functioning as formulaic variants. At [Hes.] Sc. 395 θῆλυς ἐέρση has become the πόσις καὶ βρῶσις of the τέττιξ. Paley's astute gloss (ad loc., θῆλυς· θάλλειν ποιοῦσα) can be supported by reference to Eustathius 1599. 25 (ad Il. 8. 324: θηλύτεραι δὲ θεαί): ἄλλως δὲ θηλύτεραι γυναῖκες κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς αἱ εὔκαρποι καὶ πολυφόροι. ὅθεν καὶ "θῆλυς ἐέρση". ἡ τοῦ εὐκαρπεῖν καὶ πολυφορεῖν αἰτία. ὅθεν καὶ Καλλίμαχος "θηλύτατον πεδίον" [= fr. 548 Pfeiffer] λέγει τὸ πολύγονον.[2] Although θήλεον could thus conceivably mean θάλλειν ποιοῦν, its reference to γάλα, except as a transferred epithet, is rather remote. The secondary meaning of θῆλυς, namely, 'soft, gentle' (cf. θηλείαις [sc. παρειαῖς]· ἁπαλαῖς Schol. ad Call. Hymn. 2. 37, ὕδωρ θῆλυ καὶ μαλακόν Thphr. CP 2. 6. 3) can possibly be traced to contexts such as γυναῖκες θηλύτεραι[3] (Hom. +, cf. θηλύνω) but is not especially appropriate to the fragment under discussion. If θῆλυς at Od. 5. 467 can be paraphrased as θάλλειν ποιοῦσα or μαλακή, its meaning is entirely ironic: together with a blowing ψυχρὴ αὔρη and κακὴ στίβη, the early-morning dew would scarcely foster Odysseus' physical well-being. On the other hand, τεθαλυῖα (τ') ἐέρση at Od. 13. 245 seems to connote 'plenty' and it may plausibly be argued that θῆλυς ἐέρση has a similar sense. (Cunliffe in fact glosses both θῆλυς and τεθαλυῖα as 'copious'.) Regardless of the etymological meaning of θῆλυς in the phrase θῆλυς ἐέρση, coexistence with τεθαλυῖα (τ') ἐέρση might well support its interpretation as 'abundant dew'. If θήλεον can represent the neuter of θῆλυς, then θήλεον γάλα could mean 'abundant milk', a translation which certainly fits the context. Θήλεον has also been translated as 'milk of the dams' (Sandys, cf. 'de leurs mamelles' Puech). While 'abundant milk' may make

---

[1] Hj. Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch i (Heidelberg, 1960), 671 (cf. θήλειαν Pi. O. 3. 29).

[2] Pfeiffer (ad loc.) also quotes νήσων ἔπι θηλυτεράων, v.l. in Schol. AT ad Il. 21. 454, Et. gen. B. v. θηλυτεράων (= EM 450. 56) . . . ἢ θαλλούσων ἢ εὐκάρπων, and Il. 9. 577:

πιότατον πεδίον (cf. Callimachus' θηλύτατον πεδίον).

[3] On the etymological function of -τερος in this formation see E. Benveniste, Noms d' agent et noms d' action en indo-européen (Paris, 1948), 117 f.

better sense than 'female milk', it is unnecessary to pursue this semantic argument since an important morphological consideration seriously weakens the traditional interpretation of θήλεον.

Θῆλυς is attested as a two- and three-termination υ-stem adjective throughout the Greek tradition. LSJ 798 cites θήλεα etc. as the normal Ionic feminine form in Herodotus and the Hippocratic corpus (cf. θήλεας Il. 5. 269).[1] The neuter θῆλυ, although understandably less frequent than the feminine form, is nevertheless well attested. We are therefore being invited to suppose that Pindar has replaced the regular θῆλυ by an otherwise unattested θήλεον, formed *metri gratia* on the basis of an Ionic θήλεα (: ntr. nom. pl. θήλεα?, beside acc. sg. θήλειαν Ol. 3. 29). Even if we emend θήλεον to θήλειον, the development is theoretically possible, but unlikely.

On the other hand, Page's reading of paroxytone θηλέον is attractive and involves merely a change of accent. As a present participle to θηλέω, θηλέον is morphologically impeccable. (It is also phonologically Ionic so that Page's juxtaposition of κρανᾶν and θηλέον, not θάλέον, represents a striking inconsistency from the standpoint of dialect.) Since θηλέω, however, commonly refers to luxuriant growth, and particularly to vegetation,[2] θηλέον might be considered semantically inappropriate as an epithet of γάλα. On the other hand, the analogy of τέθηλα, meaning not only 'thrive' (of plants and people) but 'be abundant' (of banquets), suggests that θήλεον could have a connotation similar to that of Epic τεθαλυῖα at Il. 9. 208: (ἐν . . . ἔθηκε) . . . ῥάχιν τεθαλυῖαν ἀλοιφῇ (cf. Od. 13. 410: . . . τρέφει τεθαλυῖαν ἀλοιφήν, 11. 415: . . . εἰλαπίνῃ τεθαλυίῃ, and note θῆλυς ἐέρση, above).

Θάλειον is a form which would obviously be appropriate on morphological, semantic, and metrical grounds. The adjective θάλεια commonly occurs in the Epic tradition with reference to 'plenteous' banquets (cf. Od. 3. 420, 8. 76, 99, Hes. Op. 742). It is also attested in Ionic lyric (θάλειαν ἑορτήν An. 410. 2 Page). Pindar uses it (N. 10. 53: ἀγώνων | μοῖραν . . . θάλειαν) in the sense of 'prosperous', but a phrase θάλειον γάλα would seem to have even more in common with the frequently occurring Epic context (cf. τεθαλυῖα). Moreover, Empedocles provides us with a parallel for a thematic neuter formation: θαλείοις στέφεσιν (112. 6 Diels; LSJ 782 wrongly identifies θαλείοις as 'masc.'). To observe that a thematic neuter θάλειον may be built to a feminine θάλεια is not inconsistent with strong reservations regarding the plausibility of deriving θήλεον from θήλε(ι)α. The feminine θάλεια is isolated in that no certain masculine or neuter forms of the type *θάλυ(ς) are recorded; a secondary, thematic formation could readily fill this paradigmatic gap and is actually attested in Empedocles. On the other hand, the commonly occurring υ-stem inflection of θῆλυ etc. would be likely to inhibit the formation of a thematic neuter. If θήλεον in this fragment is such a form, it is without parallel. Nevertheless, despite the attractiveness of θάλειον, the basis for its corruption as θήλεον remains somewhat obscure and Page's θηλέον should probably be preferred. One fact, however, is clear: Plutarch's text provides no trace of specifically

---

[1] On the more frequent Homeric occurrence of θήλεια etc., see Chantraine, op. cit. 252.

[2] Cf. Pi. N. 4. 88: θάλησε Κορινθίοις σελίνοις, Il. 1. 234-6: τόδε σκῆπτρον . . . | οὐδ' ἀναθηλήσει, Od. 5. 73-4: ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμῶνες

μαλακοὶ ἴου ἠδὲ σελίνου | θήλεον, Sa. 2. 9-10: ἐν δὲ λείμων ἱππόβοτος τέθαλεν | ἠρίνοισιν ἄνθεσιν . . . , but also Pi. N. 10. 41-2 (of Argos): νικαφορίαις γὰρ ὅσαις Προίτοιο τόδ' ἱπποτρόφον | ἄστυ θάλησεν . . .

non-(Attic–)Ionic dialect since θήλεον (: θήλεα) and θάλειον are indecisive, and θηλέον (: θηλέω) is strictly (Attic–)Ionic.

From the standpoint of Greek dialectology, the most crucial form in this fragment is ἐπίμπλων (v. 3, codd: ἔπιμπλαν Naber,[1] ἐπίμπλεν Wilamowitz, ἐπίμπλαν Schroeder), for which Schroeder's emendation has been widely accepted.[2] Schroeder defends ἐπίμπλαν by referring to ἀμπιπλάντες at N. 10. 57. From the paroxytonesis we might suppose that Schroeder intended ἐπίμπλᾶν with long -ᾱ-, presumably representing the contraction of thematicized -αον (Attic–Ionic -ων) rather than athematic inflection with a long vowel root shape extended to the third person plural. On the other hand, this was apparently not Schroeder's intention, since his metrical analysis, like those of Puech and Turyn who also read ἐπίμπλαν, identifies -ᾰν as a light syllable with short -ᾰ- where a long vowel is also metrically possible. The accentuation of ἐπίμπλᾰν is thus somewhat obscure. If Schroeder and his followers intended Doric accentuation we would expect them to explain the convention and employ it consistently throughout their editions. The same observation applies to Wilamowitz's ἐπίμπλεν, where the length of -ε- is unambiguous. It is remarkable that paroxytone ἐπίμπλαν has been so tenacious in editions of Pindar and that Naber's earlier and more comprehensible ἔπιμπλαν has been largely passed over in silence (except by Snell, who misprints its accent).

Before choosing between the codical reading ἐπίμπλων, which implies an uncontracted ἐ-πίμ-πλα-ον, and the various emendations, one should consider the dialect evidence for the stem formation of the present system of πίμπλημι.

(1) *Attic–Ionic.* An Attic–Ionic stem πι(μ)πλη- is attested in 3 sg. πι(μ)πλῆσι (Hes. *Op.* 301) and impv. ἐμπίμπλη (Ar. *Av.* 1310). A 3 sg. ἐμπιπλέει (Hdt. 7. 39. 1) and a 2 sg. ἐμπιπλεῖς (Hp. *Morb.* 2. 14) perhaps imply a thematicized present -πιπλέω which could be based on πι(μ)πλη-. A 3 pl. πι(μ)πλᾶσι (*Il.* 21. 23) and impv. πί(μ)πλα (Xenarch. fr. 3)[3] require a πι(μ)πλα- stem form, thematicized in πι(μ)πλῶσαι (Hp. *Epid.* 6. 8. 7, cf. ἰστῶσι Ctes. *Pers.* 6, ἀφιστῶσι ibid. 52). Thematicized πιμπλάω became frequent in Plutarch, Diodorus, and Dio Cassius. Πι(μ)πλεῖσαι (ptc., Hes. *Th.* 880) either represents a generalized πι(μ)πλη- with shortening by Osthoff's Law, or an actual stem πι(μ)πλε-. Since no trace of forms like 1/2 pl. *πί(μ)πλημεν, *πί(μ)πλητε is attested in Greek, we may posit a stem πι(μ)πλε- which in turn indicates that Ionic (thematicized) -πιπλέω* might be based on a pl. *πί(μ)πλεμεν etc. as well as on a sg. πί(μ)πλημι.

(2) *Aeolic.* An Aeolic 3 pl. πίμπλεισι has been postulated on the basis of πίμπλεισιν in Alcaeus (*P. Oxy.* 10. 1234. 2. 2 = 72. 4 LP).[4] Thus, according to Hamm,[5] 'πίμπλεισιν geht . . . vielleicht auf *-ēnti zurück, πίμπλε- ist Nachbildung zu τιθε- usw.'. Although the syntactic function of πίμπλεισιν in the fragment is unclear, most attempts to interpret the passage have assumed that

---

[1] *Mnem.* n.s. xii (1884), 40.

[2] ''Ἐπίμπλαν certe legisse Plutarchus videtur', a statement for which Schroeder offers no corroboration. Cf. the editions of Sandys, Puech, Bowra, Turyn, Snell, and Pohlenz–Sieveking's Plutarch text; note, however, that Page reads unaugmented πίμπλων with the codical suffix -ων.

[3] This form is queried by Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* i (Munich, 1939), 689; cj. πίμπλη LSJ 1405.

[4] Cf. LSJ 1405, Bechtel, *Griechische Dialekte* i (Berlin, 1921), 28; Thumb–Scherer, *Griechische Dialekte* ii (Heidelberg, 1959), 101.

[5] *Op. cit.* 124 n. 293.

πίμπλεισιν is the third person plural of a finite verb.¹ Like Hesiodic πι(μ)πλεῖσαι, Alcaeus' πίμπλεισιν therefore presupposes either a stem form πιμπλε- or a generalized πιμπλη-.²

(3) *Doric.* The most straightforward explanation of Sophron's ἐμπίπλη (fr. 49) is that it continues a full-grade stem form (cf. Aristophanes' ἐμπίμπλη, above). The only possible evidence for a Doric stem πι(μ)πλᾱ- derives from Pindaric ἀμπιπλάντες and the form in the fragment *sub iudice.* Since the contraction of -αο- as -ω- is pan-Greek,³ ἐπίμπλων could theoretically be Doric or Aeolic. No evidence for a stem shape πιμπλα-, however, exists in Aeolic. Unless ἀμπιπλάντες represents an indisputably Doric formation, the likelihood that ἐπίμπλων, ἔπιμπλαν, ἐπίμπλᾶν, or a putative ἐπίμπλᾶν should be attributed to Doric is seriously weakened.

At first sight ἀμπιπλάντες (*N.* 10. 57) might indeed seem to offer support for a Proto-Greek stem form *πι(μ)πλᾱ̆-. In this case Sophron's -πίπλη could also be interpreted as a contraction of *-πλα-ε (cf. Dor. τιμῆ: Att. τιμά impv.). On the other hand, the context in which ἀμπιπλάντες occurs, namely πότμον ἀμπιπλάντες ὁμοῖον (referring to the Dioskuroi),⁴ suggests the reworking of an Epic formula; compare πότμον ἀναπλήσαντες (*Il.* 4. 170, 11. 263, also Hom. οἶτον ἀναπλῆσαι and similar expressions in Herodotus). It is therefore uncertain whether ἀμπιπλάντες reflects a genuinely Doric stem formation and the whole phrase should probably be interpreted as an Epicism with ἀμπιπλάντες based on the model of ἵστημι: ἵσταμεν: ἱστάντ-.

On this evidence we may tentatively conclude that the singular stem πι(μ)πλη- is panhellenic.⁵ Πι(μ)πλη- is attested in Attic–Ionic and Doric, and perhaps implied by Aeolic. A plural stem πι(μ)πλα- is Homeric and Attic, and implied by Ionic and Koine πιμπλάω. If one explains Pindaric -πιπλα- as an Epic form, the sole evidence for a non-Attic–Ionic stem πι(μ)πλᾱ̆- derives from the conjecture of modern scholars in a highly controversial passage where codd. ἐπίμπλων is completely comprehensible. A plural πι(μ)πλε- is not clearly attested since Lesbian and Hesiodic πι(μ)πλεντ-* can continue a generalized πι(μ)πλη-, and thematicized πι(μ)πλέω can be based on a singular πι(μ)πλη-. No definite evidence exists outside Attic–Ionic for a plural stem πι(μ)πλᾱ̆-. It has therefore been argued that the alternation πλη-: πλε- should be reconstructed for Proto-Greek and that πλη-: πλᾰ- is an Attic–Ionic innovation based on the model of ἵστημι: ἵσταμεν.⁶ Ἐπίμπλων can thus be interpreted as a con-

---

¹ As Lobel remarks (*ΑΛΚΑΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΗ* [Oxford, 1927], 27), 'lectio nonnullis locis incertissima'. The text is printed with more confidence in Lobel-Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* ad loc. and Page (*Sapph. and Alc.*, 171 f.) offers a brief commentary. His translation of πίμπλεισιν as 3 sg. '[he] fills' (cf. J. M. Edmonds, *Lyra Graeca* i [London, 1928], 367) is, however, not likely to be correct (cf. τίθησι at Alc. 36. 23 L = *Berl. Kl. Texte* v (2). xii. 2).

² Schwyzer (op. cit. 798) cites a Lesbian impv. πίμπλη for which there is no clear textual support.

³ Cf. C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects*² (Chicago, 1955), 37; M. Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*² (Paris, 1955), 235–6.

⁴ One may possibly compare the unusually abundant use of Epic dialect in Alcaeus' *Hymn to the Dioskuroi* and Page's comments ad loc. (*Sapph. and Alc.*, 266). On the function of Epic in Lesbian poetry see Page (op. cit. 65 f. on Sa. 44) and the references to earlier discussions which he cites (esp. Lobel, *Σμ.* xxv f., *Αμ.* x f.).

⁵ As de Saussure already asserted in *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes* (Leipzig, 1878), 14.

⁶ Francis, op. cit., 260 f., esp. 271, also J. Kuryłowicz, *L'Apophonie en indo-européen* (Wrocław, 1956), 205 n. 49, and R. S. P. Beekes, *The Development of Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*, (The Hague, 1969), 246. Attempts to justify Naber's

traction of *ἐπίμπλαον, a regular Ionic third person plural from πιμπλάω (cf. τιμάω : ἐτίμων), a form implied for Ionic and Koinē. The motivation for a redactional change of -ε- (or -ᾰ-) to -ω- in this form is less than clear, and once again one may question the need for emendation.

Πλῆσθεν (v. 5) may be readily understood as an Epic form. Sigmatic forms of πί(μ)πλημι (aor. ἔπλησα, fut. πλήσω, aor. pass. ἐπλήσθην) frequently occur in Attic–Ionic and Koine, but relevant evidence from other dialects is restricted to choral lyric in Attic tragedy.[1] Such examples of πλη-σ- can be plausibly interpreted as intrusions from the Attic dialect. The third person plural suffix of πλῆσθεν is not exclusively Doric or Aeolic but is also common in Ionic poetry.[2]

To conclude that this fragment may belong to the corpus of Ionic lyric is congruent with the most self-consistent account of the dialect of its textual tradition. Since Pindar characteristically employed Ionic and Aeolic as well as Doric forms in his work, it would obviously be senseless to insist that he did not write a poem whose diction is not homogeneously Doric. On the other hand the burden of proof surely rests with an editor who wishes to claim that this fragment was written by Pindar and that Plutarch has Ionicized its dialect. The traditional assumption that the fragment derives from an otherwise lost Δαφνηφορικόν written by Pindar for his son is based on the most tenuous evidence. If one may venture an additional stylistic judgement, Pindar fr. 104b Snell is not, pace Farnell, particularly distinguished poetry. From a stylistic standpoint the juxtaposition of ἐπίμπλαν . . . πίθους (v. 3) and πίθοι πλῆσθεν ἅπαντες (v. 5), taken together with the p-alliteration of v. 5, might evoke bustle and excitement, but the effect seems somewhat laboured. At any rate it is not easily reconciled with Farnell's convictions about the 'obviousness' of Pindar's stylistic presence or justified by Schroeder's fanciful exegesis (op. cit. 423): 'malui . . . poetam in lactis affluentia describenda ipsum quoque verbis quasi abundantem agnoscere'. Schneidewin's influential attribution is at best unprovable and most probably erroneous.

Yale University   E. D. FRANCIS

ἐπίμπλαν as a poetic Doricism based on the model:

(Dor.) 3 pl. impf. ἴσταν   :   ptc. ἰστάντ- ::
                      x   -πιπλάντ-
                    (as in ἀμπιπλάντες)

where x = ἐπι(μ)πλαν (: Attic–Ionic ἐπίμπλασαν, X. *An.* 1. 5. 10), or Wilamowitz's ἐπίμπλεν (leg. ἐπίμπλεν) after ἐτίθην : (ἔ)τιθεν (Pi. *P.* 3. 65) are rendered unnecessary if one accepts that the grounds for attributing this fragment to a poet writing in Doric (or Aeolic) are insufficient. On the other hand, if emendation is required to accommodate a Doric (or Aeolic) provenance, the otherwise unattested ἐπίμπλεν represents the correct dialect form.

[1] e.g. πλησθῆναι S. *Ant.* 121, ἐμπλησθῶ E. *Hec.* 1072 (cf. ἔπλησε E. *Or.* 1363, πλήσαιμι E. *IA* 234, ἐπλήσω S. *OC* 528).
[2] The extensive Homeric evidence is discussed by Chantraine (op. cit. 472 f.).