

## ZOOLOGICA PINDARICA

υιὲ Φιλάνορος, ἦτοι καὶ τεὰ κεν,  
ἐνδομάχας ἄτ' ἀλέκτωρ συγγόνῳ παρ' ἐστία  
ἀκλεῆς τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησε ποδῶν,  
εἰ μὴ στάσις ἀντιάνειρα Κνωσίας σ' ἄμερσε πάτρας.

Ol. 12. 13-16

Bowra (*Pindar*, p. 270), referring to the image of the ἐνδομάχας ἀλέκτωρ, and to the striking impression τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησε ποδῶν, states 'Pindar seems to fuse two unusually disparate images into a single result . . . While the shedding of leaves implies that he would have grown old without winning any wide renown, the cock means that such renown as he would have got would have been of little account in the Greek world at large.' Gildersleeve's comment ad loc., 'The τιμὰ thus becomes a flower', implies a similar assumption, that the second image is entirely unconnected with the first. But neither scholar realized that these images are *not* entirely disparate, nor that the comparison to a household cock, whose success and reputation are confined, as we say, 'to its own dung-hill',<sup>1</sup> itself prepares the way for an ambiguous use of κατεφυλλορόησεν; for while we might react to an entirely fresh image of a tree shedding its leaves, a Greek would simultaneously appreciate a sense of the verb applicable to the moulting of a house-bound<sup>2</sup> and unvictorious cock.<sup>3</sup>

According to the text of Arist. *G.A.* 783<sup>b</sup> 18 the verb φυλλορροεῖν can actually be used both of the shedding of leaves and the moulting of birds' feathers: after using φαλακροῦσθαι (of human baldness), φυλλοβολεῖν (of leaves), ἀποβάλλειν τὰ πτερά (of τῶν ὀρνίθων οἱ φωλεύοντες), Aristotle continues κατὰ μέρος μὲν γὰρ ἀπορρεῖ καὶ τὰ φύλλα τοῖς φυτοῖς πᾶσι καὶ αἱ τρίχες τοῖς ἔχουσιν, ὅταν δ' ἄθροον γένηται τὸ πάθος λαμβάνει τὰς εἰρημένας ἐπωνυμίας· φαλακροῦσθαι τε γὰρ λέγεται καὶ φυλλορροεῖν. It is true that Bekker, followed by Aubert-Wimmer, proposed to add to the text <καὶ περορροεῖν> at this point, but there is no lack of evidence for the interchange of terminology of leaves and feathers,<sup>4</sup> and elsewhere (*H.A.* 564<sup>b</sup> 1-2) Aristotle himself recognizes a certain sympathy between birds moulting and trees shedding leaves: the peacock περορροεῖ δὲ ἅμα τοῖς πρώτοις τῶν δένδρων καὶ ἄρχεται αὐθις ἀπολαμβάνει τὴν πτέρωσιν ἅμα τῇ τούτων βλαστῇ, as does Aristophanes (*Av.* 105-6), when Euelpides comments on the apparently sickly condition of the moulting hoopoe: οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τὸν χειμῶνα πάντα τῶρνεα / περορροεῖ τε

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Latin proverb 'gallum in sterquilinio plurimum posse' (Sen. *Apoc.* 7).

<sup>2</sup> The cock is called the συνέστιος ὄρνις (Opp. *Cyn.* 3.118): note the oath πρὸς τῆς Ἑστίας with which a speaker in Anaxandrides, *Tereus* fr.45, reacts when told ὄρνις κεκλήσῃ. For moulting ἐν τῇ φωλείᾳ see Arist. *H.A.* 600<sup>a</sup> 23.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Arist. *H.A.* 601<sup>b</sup> 6 τῶν δ' ὀρνίθων ἐν ταῖς ἀρρωστίαις ἐπίδηλος ἡ πτέρωσις γίνεται· ταράττεται γάρ, and

the more violent defeathering suffered by the 'hen-pecked' Callias in *Ar. Av.* 284-6, where he is alluded to as a defeated fighting-bird (see my note on this passage in *CR N.S.* 17 (1967), 249-50).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. ἀπορρέω of feathers (Pl. *Phdr.* 246 d), leaves (D.22.70), hair (Arist. *HA* 518a 14); ἐκρέω of feathers (*Ar. Av.* 104), hair (Arist. *HA* 518<sup>a</sup> 32); πτίλον, πτέρυξ properly of feathers, but of leaves in Nic. *Ther.* 524, Thphr. *H.P.* 3.9.6; φόβη of both hair, leaves, etc.

καὺθις ἕτερα φύομεν.

One might also reflect that, if Pindar here deliberately uses *φυλλοροεῖν* with some of the implications of *πετρορρυεῖν* of the ignoble fighting-cock, he is simply reversing the allusive ambiguity which he employs in the expressions *περὰ νίκης* (P. 9. 125) and *κυδίμων δέθλων περοῖσι* (O. 14. 24), where *περὰ* = *φύλλα*. For although many commentators since the scholia on the latter passage see additionally, if not exclusively, the metaphorical sense of *περὰ* which one finds commonly enough in *περώω*, *περύσσομαι*, etc.<sup>5</sup> (and L.S.J. render Pindar's expression 'the crown of victory, which lifts the victor to heaven'), the obvious association of the former with the practice of the *φυλλοβολία* must make one agree with Burton<sup>6</sup> that the words 'may describe the actual leaves thrown over the victor, floating round him like feathers, or the leaves of the crown itself, set like the plumage of a bird.'<sup>7</sup>

One final observation on this passage: in discussion of the *ἐνδομάχας ἀλέκτωρ συγγόνω παρ' ἐστία*, I am surprised how commentators seem to pass over the, to me, most obvious point, which relates the comparison to the subsequent allusion to the civil strife which had caused Ergoteles to leave his country and find athletic triumphs abroad. In addition to Bowra (quoted above), both Gildersleeve ('he would have had only homely fame') and Fennell ('I prefer "who fights only in private matches" as being a more appropriate simile for one who would have taken part in regular contests but in the comparatively private arenas of Crete') appear to see a contrast simply between undistinguished local athletic success and an international reputation. I go back to J.W. Donaldson among the English Pindaric commentators to find the correct view (which is even denied outright by Farnell) that Pindar uses the cock as 'symbol of civil war', immersed in which Ergoteles' athletic prowess would have had no opportunity to flourish *at all*. But although he (like other commentators) duly cites the lines from Aesch. *Eum.* 861–3 which link the *ἐνοίκιος ὄρνις* with "Ἀρη ἐμφύλιον, the schol. ad loc. is also worth quoting — *μάχμιον γὰρ τὸ ὄρνεον, τῶν τε ἄλλων ζώων τὸ συγγενὲς αἰδουμένων, μόνος οὐ φεῖδεται*, and it is hardly necessary to mention also the family dispute of Strepsiadēs and Pheidippides in *Clouds* 1427–8,<sup>8</sup> or the sarcastic description of the fussy and boastful Aegisthus in *Agamemnon* 1671. This proverbial aspect of the cock's domestic strife<sup>9</sup> is adequately summed up in Artemidorus 3.5 *ἀλεκτρύονες δὲ οἱ μάχμοι στάσεων καὶ φιλονεικῶν μόνον εἰσὶ σημαντικοί*, and Varro *R.R.* 3.9.6 *ad proeliandum inter se maxime idonei*. As a participant in such civil strife, which his decision to leave Crete in fact precluded, Ergoteles' *τιμά* would have indeed been *ἀκλέης* — unworthy of the *κλυτὸς ὄρνις*<sup>10</sup> itself, which of course the Greeks could use, where appropriate, as a symbol of the

<sup>5</sup> Including Pindar himself — *ὑποπτεροῖς ἀνορέαις* (P. 8.91).

<sup>6</sup> *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford, 1962), p. 59.

<sup>7</sup> For the correlation of evergreen trees and athletic victory, I am reminded of Plutarch's assertion (*Mor.* 723 f) of the recognized superiority of the palm tree over other (apparently) evergreens (*τῶν μὴ φυλλοροεῖν λεγομένων*), such as the laurel, and its consequent association *τῆς νίκης τῷ ἰσχυρῷ*.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Ar. *Av.* 757–9. Possibly relevant is A. *Pers.* 756 *ἔνδον αἰχμάξω* (of the ineffectual braggart Xerxes) which would be peculiarly appropriate in view of the *Περσικὸς ὄρνις* tradition of the cock (see Ar. *Av.* 485 etc.).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Luc. *Pisc.* 34 *φιλονεικότερος τῶν ἀλεκτρύονων*.

<sup>10</sup> Hsch. s.v. Note that the *εὐκλεία* of *θυραῖος πόλεμος* is contrasted to the civil strife of the house-bound cock in the *Eumenides* passage cited above.

proud victor whose glory is crowed out to the world at large.<sup>11</sup>

- (2) τὸν μὲν οὐ κατελέγχει κριτοῦ γενεά  
 πατραδελφεοῦ· ἀλίκων τῷ τις ἄβρὸν  
 ἀμφὶ παγκρατίου Κλεάνδρῳ πλεκέτω  
 μυρσίνας στέφανον, ἐ-  
 πεί νιν Ἀλκαθόου τ' ἀγῶν σὺν τύχῃ  
 ἐν Ἐπιδάυρῳ τε νεότας δέκετο πρὶν·  
 τὸν αἰνεῖν ἀγαθῷ παρέχει·  
 ἦβαν γὰρ οὐκ ἄπειρον ὑ-  
 πό χειρ' [πω] καλῶν δάμασεν.

*Isth.* 8.65a-71.

The problem of the correct reading in the last line of the eighth *Isthmian*, rendered peculiarly difficult by the limited manuscript evidence, and the loss of any scholia, is well known; and recently the acceptance by most editors of the Triclinian ὑπό χειρ' [πω] has been challenged by D.C. Young,<sup>12</sup> who revives Theiler's proposed emendation of the strangely written<sup>13</sup> text of D, ὑπὸ κόλπῳ (though he himself prefers κόλπου) — not however in Theiler's rather bizarre interpretation of Kleandros' abnegation of sexual indulgence inappropriate to a youthful athlete. Instead, with reference to Theocritus 16.16 etc., he takes the κόλπος to be the fold, or pocket, in which money might be hoarded, and interprets (in what he thinks to be 'a brilliant unorthodox image') Kleandros 'did not curb his youth (unspent) in his pocket, ignorant of noble deeds', explaining the metaphor in terms of 'not refraining from *expenditure*' — a theme which he can parallel elsewhere in Pindar's epinician odes. Although, unlike Wilamowitz and others, he sees no 'Unsinn' in ὑπὸ χειρ' itself, Young considers it 'not the kind of word that inspires confidence as an emendation in Pindar in a metaphor', and that κόλπου is 'more appropriate in an image for concealment by humans than a snake or any hole'. Nevertheless, I propose to argue here that Triclinius' χεῖρ, whether or not it is an emendation pure and simple, or with minimal textual authority, has a peculiarly appropriate sense, both as a metaphor in conjunction with ἦβαν, and as a motif in the family history (with its Aeacid associations) of the Aeginetan victor Kleandros, whose very name conjures up the epic world of Homer and the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, which may have influenced Pindar in his choice of the exploits of Achilles as the main mythical theme of this skilful poem. I will also at least suggest how the intrusive and unmetrical πω may have got into the text.

From the earliest example in Homer (*Il.* 22.93-5) χεῖρ, though occasionally used of the hole or lair of other creatures, is pre-eminently the lurking place of

<sup>11</sup> See the many refs. in D'Arcy Thompson, *Glossary of Greek Birds*, pp. 34-6, and my note on Alciph. 3.48 in *CR* N.S. 15 (1965), 261-2.

<sup>12</sup> *AJP* 94 (1973), 319-26.

<sup>13</sup> Although Young, in his detailed description (p.320, n.3) of the appearance of the words in D (based on a xerox of a photocopy), insists that χόα, not χ(α), is to be read, and hence that Triclinius' χεῖρ is

not 'a reasoned conjecture', but 'further perversion of an already corrupt paradosis', he also admits that 'the second letter . . . seems an omicron rather than an iota, but it is so small that it is scarcely visible, and no space shows in its center', and of course subsequent copyists of D had no hesitation in reading it as an iota, while many modern editors have demurred as to which letter was intended.

a snake;<sup>14</sup> and if Pindar used it here, whether because this was its most habitual use, or through the influence of a particularly famous Homeric passage, it is not likely to have had anything other than this specific meaning. Knowing, then, Pindar's methods in the skilful and allusive use of images, which we have noted above in the use of *καταφυλλοροεῖν* of the cock, one would naturally look for something else in the same area which has some particular connection with snakes; and it is surprising, therefore, that the significance of *ἦβαν* has been overlooked. One of the most familiar uses of its opposite, *γῆρας*, is the 'old' skin which a snake sloughs off annually:<sup>15</sup> it is both the standard term<sup>16</sup> in the natural history writers and a favourite metaphor of the poets when describing the renewal of youth, as early as Homer (*Il.* 9.446<sup>17</sup>), *Nostoi* fr.6 (quoted below) and *H. Arph.* 224 (of Tithonus) *ἦβαν αἰτῆσαι ξυσαι τ' ἀπὸ γῆρας* *δλοῖόν* (where, of course, as in Callim. fr.1, the allusion is not to a snake, but to the similar shedding of its old skin by the ageless *tettix*.)

As it is the old skin sloughed, rather than the new skin grown, which is usually mentioned, one might be uncertain, except for the probable analogy, whether *ἦβη* was similarly used of the new skin, were it not confirmed in Nic. *Ther.* 138-9

μηδ' ὅτε ῥικνῆεν φολίδων περὶ γῆρας ἀμέρσας  
ἂψ ἀναφοιτήση νεαρῇ κεχαρημένος ἦβη.

Now, the scholiast on another line of the *Theriaca* (389), where the shedding of the *geras* of the snake called *scytale* is described, actually introduces the word *χειά*<sup>18</sup> in his note, declaring that snakes rub off their old skins as they emerge from their holes:

οὐ γὰρ αὐτὴ ἡ σκυτάλη γεύεται μαλάθρου, ὡς οἱ ἄλλοι, ὅταν, φησὶν, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου περὶ τὰ μέλη φλοῦν ἀποβάλλη, τουτέστι τὸ γῆρας. τὰ γὰρ ἄλλα ἐρπετὰ παραντίκα ἐκ τῶν φωλεῶν ὁρμᾷ ἐπὶ τὴν μάλαθρον διὰ τὸ ἀμβλυωπεῖν, ἧς ἀποτρῶγοντα ὀξυδερκέστερα γίνεται καὶ ὀξυωπέστερα, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν καὶ τὸν φλοῦν, τουτέστι τὸ γῆρας, ἀποβάλλει, παρατριβόμενα κατὰ τὴν ἐξοδὸν ἐν ταῖς χειαῖς.

The same moment is described in schol. Lyc. *Alex.* 793 *γηράσας γὰρ ὁ ὄφης καὶ πρὸς ὀπήν εἰσελθὼν ἀποδύεται τὸ δέρμα.*

The Triclinian text therefore presents a striking (and, I should have thought, characteristically Pindaric) image of Kleandros exulting in his youthful prowess,

<sup>14</sup> Poll. 5.14 *ἰλεοὶ κυρίως μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ὄφρων καλοῦμενοι, ὥσπερ καὶ χειαί, κατὰ δὲ κατάχρησιν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων θηρίων, Hdn. p.603.26 χειά· ἡ κατάδυσσις τῶν ὄφρων.*

<sup>15</sup> The origin is given in the fable of the ass and the snake in Nic. *Ther.* 346-56. Gilbert White's *Natural History and Antiquities of Selborne* contains a notable description of the process.

<sup>16</sup> So that it is enough in the riddling language of Dosiad. *Ara* 14 to call the snake *σύργαστρος ἐκδυγῆρας*.

<sup>17</sup> *γῆρας ἀποξύσας θήσεν νέον ἡβῶντα* (spoken by Phoenix). That this is the origin of the metaphor is recognized by Leaf and

van Leeuwen ad loc. (cf. Taillardat, *Les Images d'Aristophane*, pp. 53). Though not noticed in the schol., it is presumably glanced at by Lycophron, *Alex.* 419, when he alludes to Phoenix as *κουροτρόφον πάγουρον* (cf. Eust. 762.25), since a comparison of snakes and crabs with reference to the *γῆρας ἐκδύνα* theme is common (Arist. *H.A.* 549<sup>b</sup> 27, 601<sup>a</sup> 10, Ael. *N.A.* 9.43, Plin. *N.H.* 9.95, etc.).

<sup>18</sup> The word, though used by the schol., is not found in Nicander himself, unless one accepts in 139 Bentley's *χειῖσιν* for *ὀχεαῖσιν* (one of a number of alternative words for snake-hole in this writer).

and in emulation of his distinguished dead relative Nikokles, emerging like a revitalized snake from its hole, rather than sliding ingloriously into it. Pindar may have been influenced in his choice of *δαμάζω* as the governing verb by the fact that it has associations with *γῆρας*, as in Theognis 173–4 *πενίη πάντων δάμνησι μάλιστα / καὶ γῆρας πολιοῦ*.<sup>19</sup> Incidentally, the theme and language also bear a close resemblance to the words of Pelops in *Ol.* 1,82–4 *τί κε τις ἀνώνυμον γῆρας ἐν σκότῳ καθημένος ἔψοι μάταν / ἀπάντων καλῶν ἄμμορος* (cf. *ἄπειρον καλῶν* of *Isthmian* 8), and it has always seemed probable to me that this unusual metaphor of *ἔψω γῆρας*<sup>20</sup> is also an allusion to the rejuvenation motif associated with the well-known story of Medea and her magical acts, the vocabulary coinciding notably with *Nostoi* fr.6, referred to above in connection with the sloughing of the old skin:

αὐτίκα δ' Αἴσωνα θῆκε φίλον κόρον ἠβώοντα  
γῆρας ἀποξύσασα ἰδύησι πραπίδεσσι,  
φάρμακα πολλ' ἔψουσ' ἐπὶ χρυσείοισι λέβησι.

Now, it seems to me that the prominence given in the last line of the Kleandros ode to the snake metaphor, allied to the theme of the younger generation of a distinguished house conscious of, and aspiring to emulate, the glories of its elders, has a deeper significance in the literary tradition of the Aeacidae; for in spite of the comparatively frequent recurrence of such a theme in Pindar where victories have been achieved in consecutive generations, it is in the Aeginetan odes that Pindar finds its ornate development most congenial, and never more than in the eighth *Isthmian*.<sup>21</sup> In none of the great aristocratic families is the theme of honour transmitted and destiny fulfilled so readily available to a poet, seeking a model example of virtue revealed and glory sought and won, as in the lineage of Aeacus — Peleus — Achilles — Neoptolemus. Earlier in the poem Pindar has described the favours bestowed on the first two by the gods,<sup>22</sup> and the prophecy about Achilles as Thetis' child;<sup>23</sup> and elsewhere<sup>24</sup> he refers to the fated accomplishment of his dead father's unfinished work which brought to Troy Neoptolemus, whose exploits there had clearly been among the most prominent features of the post-Iliadic epic tradition — always with the theme in the forefront of the young warrior matching up to his father's heroic example.

It has always been acknowledged by commentators on this ode that Pindar, in emphasizing Achilles' glorious career fighting for his country and his ultimate death in battle, intended to draw a parallel with the patriotic death in the

<sup>19</sup> Stephanus, *Lex.* s.v. *δαμάζω* col. 884, in quoting epic examples gives *Et alibi δεδημένος γῆραι Edomitus s. Confectus senio*, but I have been unable to trace this quotation.

<sup>20</sup> Cooking and old age are connected in scholiastic explanations of the Homeric *ὠμογέρων* (*Il.* 23.791) *τὸν μὴ καθηψημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ γῆρας*. The metaphor of course could have suggested itself to Pindar in the context of Pelops' own experience in a cauldron.

<sup>21</sup> 'They [the Aeginetans] seem to have been unusually proud of their past and jealous of their reputation . . . In choosing his myths for Aegina Pindar is moved by the desire to show that the glorious past is alive in the present, and descent from heroes makes the Aeginetans what they are' (Bowra *Pindar*, pp. 297–8).

<sup>22</sup> *Isth.* 8.23–4; 38 ff.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* 33.

<sup>24</sup> *Paean* 6.98–104; *Nem.* 7.35–6.

Persian wars<sup>25</sup> of Kleandros' elder cousin Nikokles, with the additional implication that what the poetry of Homer has done for Achilles' fame will be reciprocated by Pindar for his victor's family.<sup>26</sup> But surprisingly no one seems to have thought that, if the similarity of the older representatives, Achilles and Nikokles, is paired off in this way, then the present (and, of course, surviving) victor Kleandros must be seen to have inherited, and to continue to vindicate, the family glory, with his serpentine ἥβη, as the equivalent of the 'new warrior' Neoptolemus.<sup>27</sup> (One notes, incidentally, the prominence given to *youth* earlier in the poem: Κλεάνδρω ἀλκικία τε . . . ὧ νέοι 1-2, νεαράν ἀρετάν 48, ἀλίκων τῷ τις 67, νεότης 68.) I have elsewhere<sup>28</sup> drawn attention to the prominence in the literary tradition of snake imagery in association with the Aeacids in general, and with Neoptolemus in particular: Pindar himself provides a notable example (*Ol.* 8.37 ff.) in the celebrated portent of the three snakes at the time of the building of Troy's walls by Aeacus prognosticating their capture by Neoptolemus, who is represented by the third snake which ἀνόρουσε βοόσας (cf. schol. on 52a-b) — a passage which involves a carefully constructed parallelism between the generations of the Aeacidae and the generations of the young Aeginetan Alkimedon's family, in a manner strikingly similar to that which I argue here for Kleandros' family.<sup>29</sup> Lycophron calls Neoptolemus Σκύριος δράκων (185) or δεινὸς ἄρταμος δράκων (327), and son of an ἀγριὸς δράκων (309); but the most memorable passage of all is, of course, the great scene in Vergil, *Aen.* 2.469 ff., where Neoptolemus is the rejuvenated<sup>30</sup> snake,<sup>31</sup> resplendent in the sunlight after sloughing off his old skin:

<sup>25</sup> There is of course not absolutely certain proof of this, but the conjecture is as old as the schol. on line 12 ἐν τῇ περὶ Σαλαμῖνα ναυμαχία προσήκοντές τινας Κλεάνδρω ἐτελεύτησαν and doubtless something similar would have been said in the missing schol. on the last lines of the poem. If indeed Nikokles had died at Salamis, where, it will be remembered, the Aeginetans had won the prize for valour (Hdt. 8.93), Pindar's use of Aeacid mythology becomes even more striking, when one recalls the tradition, presumably much talked of at the time of his composing the 8th *Isthmian*, that the Aeacidae had themselves appeared at the battle in answer to prayers (Hdt. 8.64, Plut. *Them.* 15).

<sup>26</sup> On this theme, see A. Köhnken, *BICS* 22 (1975) 25-36, whose own earlier interpretation of 67 τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον (which he now rejects) I am more inclined to follow: 'this handing over of a brave man and his achievements to poetry even today brings *fame* (as it formerly did with Achilles)'.

<sup>27</sup> For the significance of the name, see *Cypria* fr. 14, (= Paus. 10.26.4), schol. *Il.* 19.326, Philostr. *Her.* 20.5, Tryph. 54, Cic. *de or.* 2.63, 257, Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 2.263.

<sup>28</sup> 'Trojan Leap and Pyrrhic Dance', *JHS* 87 (1967), 19: cf. B.W. Knox, 'The

Serpent and the Flame', *AJP* 71 (1950), 393 ff. It may be that the *autochthonous* tradition of the Aeacids, derived from the myth of the infestation of Aegina with snakes and repopulation with the Myrmidons ('ant-men'), acted as a stimulus to this motif. The name of Achilles himself has been derived by some etymologists from ἔχις (see *RE* i, col.222).

<sup>29</sup> Especially if A.J. Beattie, in *CR* N.S. 5 (1955), 3, is right in his surmise that Callimachus of *Ol.* 8.82 was the great-grandfather of Alkimedon. Incidentally, any doubts that πρώτοις . . . καὶ τερτάτοις (45-6) reckons the generations inclusively from Aeacus to Neoptolemus should be removed by a comparison with Lyc. *Alex.* where Achilles is called τὸν εἰνδπηχυν Αἰακοῦ τρίτον, a parallel apparently neglected by Pindaric commentators. (See also D.E. Hill in *CR* N.S. 13 (1963), 2-4).

<sup>30</sup> One observes that in the case of neither Neoptolemus nor Kleandros is it literally a question of *their own* revitalization; rather, they are seen as inheritors of a great tradition within consecutive generations of their families.

<sup>31</sup> Knox (loc.cit.) notes other snake terminology at this point of the *Aeneid*, e.g. 'implicuitque comam laeva' (552), when Pyrrhus seizes Priam for the final blow.

qualis ubi in lucem coluber mala gramina pastus,  
frigida sub terra tumidum quem bruma tegebat,  
nunc, positis novus exuviis nitidusque iuventa,  
lubrica convolvit sublato pectore terga  
arduus ad solem et linguis micat ore trisulcis.

(471-5)

It is noteworthy that the chief source of this passage is the simile of *Il.* 22.93 where *χειά* is used of the snake's lair; *nitidusque iuventa* recalls *νεαρῇ κεχαρημένος ἦβῃ* of *Nic. Ther.* 139; and the shedding of the old skin, the eating of herbs, and the effect of the sunlight are all to be found in *Ther.* 389 ff., from which the scholium, which links the *γῆρας* and *χειά*, was quoted above:

οὐδ' ἄρ', ὅταν χαράδρεια λίπη καὶ ῥωγάδα πέτρην  
ἦρος ἀεζομένου ὅπ' ἔρπετ' αἰα φαίνει,  
ἀκρεμόνος μαράθιο χυτὸν περιβόσκειται ἔρνος,  
εὗτ' ἂν ὑπ' ἡελίῳ περὶ φλόον ἄψα βάλλῃ . . . <sup>32</sup>

As to the theme of the younger generation aspiring to emulate the glorious dead, to be proved true offspring of a distinguished race, which Pindar introduces in 66-7 *τὸν μὲν* (sc. Nikokles/Achilles)<sup>33</sup> *οὐ κατελέγχει κριτοῦ γενεὰ πατραδελφεοῦ* (i.e. Kleandros/Neoptolemus), it is hardly necessary to accumulate passages where this characteristically Aeacid obsession<sup>34</sup> dominates the relationship of Achilles and Neoptolemus from Homer onwards — witness Achilles' anxiety to learn of his son's behaviour and Odysseus' reassurance about his exemplary courage in *Od.* 11.429 ff. and Neoptolemus' own constant touchiness about his family honour in the *Philoctetes*,<sup>35</sup> as well as Philoctetes' initial approval, then horror at his apparent abandonment of his principles, and the final accolade *τὴν φύσιν δ' ἔδειξας . . . ἐξ ἧς ἐβλαστες . . . ἐξ Ἀχιλλέως* (1310). Πηλέως γὰρ ἄξια / πατρός τ' Ἀχιλλέως ἔργα δρῶν φανήσεται, declares Andromache of Neoptolemus in *Eur. Andr.* 342-3. Little wonder that the younger Philostratus (*Im.* 10) talks of 'the chorus of poets' who sing how Neoptolemus lived up to his father (*πατρῶξεω*),<sup>36</sup> although others might find it almost tiresome.<sup>37</sup> Characteristically, Vergil makes the most of the Greek

<sup>32</sup> I might take this opportunity of clearing up a textual problem here, unsolved by Lobel and Gow. P.Oxy. 2221 did not read ἄψα in 392, but εP.[ which Lobel thought might represent ἔρνεα, and Gow a mistaken repetition of ἔρπετ' in 390. The solution to me seems to be to read ἔρ[ματα, attested of the coils of a snake only in *Ael. N.A.* 17.37, which was replaced by the more commonplace ἄψα in our manuscript tradition.

<sup>33</sup> Note the force of καὶ (like Achilles) *κεῖνος* (Nikokles) in 65.

<sup>34</sup> It starts with Aeacus himself *ἐσσομένην ἀρετὴν τεκέεσσι φυλάσσων* according to Nonnus 37.588. Isocrates devotes a long paragraph to the theme of Aeacid *arete* in the Evagoras oration (13-19), and it is of interest that the son of this king of Cyprus, who traced his ancestry

back to the Aeacids of Aegina, was also called Nikokles. Plato (*Hipp. Ma.* 286 b) records a tradition about Neoptolemus' anxiety on this subject.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. lines 79-80, 88-9, 356-8, 940, 1284, 1304. The same theme appeared also in *trag. fr. adesp.* 363, which Webster surmises may have come from *Soph. Skyrioi* (note on *Philoctetes* 358).

<sup>36</sup> *πατριάξεω δὲ τὸ πρᾶττεω τι ἐκ τῶν πατρίων ἔθων* (Poll. 3.10).

<sup>37</sup> For a critical reference, cf. Dio Chr. 58.5 on Thetis' influence on the young Achilles *φυσῶσα ἐπὶ τῷ γένει*. A miscellaneous collection of refs. from later literature: Luc. *Salt.* 9, Philostr. *Her.* 20, Tryph. 54, Q.S. 7 *passim*, esp. 703 *οὔτι καταισχύοντα βλῆν πατρός*, Tz. *Posthom.* 531, 552, Auson. 6.9.1.

tradition in his memorably cruel portrayal of 'the rugged Pyrrhus, the Hyrcanian beast', when, after Priam's forlorn complaint

at non ille, satum quo te mentiris, Achilles  
talis in hoste fuit Priamo,

he allows Pyrrhus the savagely sardonic reply, which calculatedly turns the old heroic tradition on its head

referes ergo haec et nuntius ibis<sup>38</sup>  
Pelidae genitori; illi mea tristia facta  
degeneremque Neoptolemum narrare memento.

Having now seen how effective the expression ἦβαν οὐκ . . . ὑπὸ χειρὶ δάμασεν (lit. 'he did not suppress his new skin in his hole') is to celebrate the continued aspirations of this latter-day youthful Aeacid to match in his athletic skills his dead relative, it remains for us to consider how the intrusive πω may have got into the text of *Isth.* 8.71 against both sense and metre. Although the matter is doubtless not susceptible to certain proof, I can at least hazard an explanation germane to the theme which I have developed in this article, namely that a scribe who appreciated the snake allusion in relation to ἦβαν, but was more conversant with the familiar (though often derogatory) literary motif of 'the snake in the grass' than the snake in the *hole*, wrote above this (already corrupted?) word πο or ποι, whence it was incorporated in the text. For such reference

χειρὶ χειρὶ  
in antiquity, cf. 'mala gramina pastus' in the Pyrrhus/snake metaphor of Vergil quoted above,<sup>39</sup> and, in the same author, G. 3.346 'neu dorso nemoris libeat iacuisse per herbas,/cum positus novus exuviis nitidusque iuventa/volvitur [sc. anguis]', *Ec.* 3.93 'latet anguis in herba', *Ael. N.A.* 6.4 (after referring to the 'snake in the hole' simile of *Il.* 22.93) τὰς θανατηφόρους ῥίζας ἐσθίουσι καὶ πῶας μέντοι τὰς τοιαύτας, *Ov. Met.* 11.775 'latens herba coluber' (cf. *ib.* 3.31, *Ep. Pont.* 3.3.102), *Stat. Theb.* 4.97 'liber senio et squalentibus annis/exutus laetisque minax interviret herbis'.<sup>40</sup>

University of Edinburgh

E. K. BORTHWICK

<sup>38</sup> The grisly notion of the dead Priam himself reporting the degeneracy of the latest of the Aeacids to his father Achilles in the underworld may be a black parody of both *Od.* 11.492–540, where Achilles anxiously awaits news of his son's war career, and the end of *Ol.* 8.81 ff., where Pindar piously prays that Angelia, daughter of Hermes, may convey the news of another Aeacid deed of prowess (by his youthful victor Alcimedon) to his dead father, Iphion (a theme he employs also in *Ol.* 14.18 ff.).

<sup>39</sup> *mala gramina* here replaces the κακά φάρμακα of *Il.* 22.94. Eustathius ad loc. records a tradition that the φάρμακον in question was πῶαν τινά . . . χολῆς γεννητικὴν, ἣν ἐσθίων ὄρις εἰς χολὴν ἐρεθίζεται (cf. *Thphr.* *H.P.* 9.8.1 καλοῦσι γὰρ καὶ πῶαν ἕνια τῶν φαρμακωδῶν οἱ ῥιζοτόμοι.) Usually it is μάραθος

which is the plant associated with the sloughing of the old skin and the sharpening of the eyesight (cf. *σμερδαλέον δὲ δέδορκεν Il.* loc. cit.) of the rejuvenated snake: *Nic. Ther.* 32, 391 (both with schol.), *Plut. Mor.* 947b, *Ael. N.A.* 9.16, *Plin. N.H.* 8.99, 20.254, *Phot. s.v. μαράθω*. For grass associated with the act of sloughing itself, Gilbert White's account (loc. cit.) is of interest: 'The reptile . . . had entangled itself intricately in the grass and weeds, so that the friction of the stalks and blades might promote this curious shifting of his exuviae.'

<sup>40</sup> Lactantius ad loc. 'quia deposita pelle dicuntur serpentes in iuventutem redire. herba quaedam dicitur marathos, quam cum comederint, senium deponunt aetatis' (cf. *Serv. on Verg. Aen.* 2.473).