# PINDAR, *NEMEAN* 1. 24 – SMOKE WITHOUT FIRE

λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἐσλοὺς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν
ἀντίον.

This line has long been a crux in the interpretation of Pindar, and there is still no consensus on its syntax or meaning. The conclusions reached by Stefan Radt (*Mnem.* n.s 19 (1966), 148–74) and Richard Stoneman (*Quad. Urb.* 31 (1979), 65–70) in the most recent studies of the problem are in all respects at variance. The cardinal difficulty of the line is the sense of ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον, which must be elucidated before one can attempt to disentangle the syntax. I believe that previous commentators have overlooked or misapplied crucial parallel passages because of their preconceptions about the nature of the metaphor here.

It is generally accepted that 'smoke' is associated with the μεμφόμενοι, the 'critical', but Wilamowitz,[1] Privitera[2] and Rosenmayer[3] connect it with the ἐσλοί. This is a priori unlikely because all the metaphorical nuances of καπνός are, as we shall see, to some degree pejorative and moreover the application of the metaphor would be very strained, since, as Stoneman notes, 'throwing water against smoke would presumably be thought of as an act of successful extinguishing' – the exact opposite of what the poet wants to say. Rosenmayer's elaboration that the water causes the smoke to increase, or the idea that it hits the smoke and misses the fire, is far too complicated to be read into the simple phrase, and in a case such as this we must seek the most plausible explanation of the text.

The most marked metaphorical connotations of smoke in Greek thought are insubstantiality and futility, especially of words, and G. Perrotta and B. Gentili[4] find the latter to be the point here. 'To bring water against smoke' would then be an image for the futility of the efforts of the envious against Chromius, and it has been suggested that a proverbial phrase underlies Pindar's words. However, the necessary reference to an observable fact of life, such as the intransigent nature of dead horses, is absent. Why should bearing water, as opposed to, say, swords, against smoke symbolise futility?

It remains to agree with Stoneman that 'smoke is an entirely natural parallel for μεμφόμενοι'. He continues, with more precision, 'it represents envy at Sim. 541P, Plut. *Praec. ger. rep.* 804 d, *An seni* 787 c', which is true but scarcely, I think, the whole truth. In his interpretation of ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον he follows the general view that the image is of water extinguishing fire, which represents excellence quenching envy.[5] The fundamental objection to this is that the word is 'smoke' not 'fire'. It is all very well to retort that 'there is no smoke without fire', but this hardly explains why Pindar, in a terse four-word phrase, said 'smoke' when he supposedly meant 'fire'. The resulting image is difficult – one would not 'put out the smoke' in Greek, any more than in English, merely because smoke and fire are commonly associated[6] – and

[1] *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1922), p. 255.
[2] 'Eracle nella prima Nemea', *GIFC* n.s. (3) 24 (1972), 40 and n. 27.
[3] 'The Rookie: A reading of Pindar, Nemean One', *CSCA* 2 (1969), 233.
[4] *Polinnia* (Messina/Firenze, 1966), p. 316 n. 3.
[5] He accidentally says (p. 68) extinguish praise.
[6] The closest these words approach to being interchangeable appears to be B399 κάπνισσάν τε κατὰ κλισίας καὶ δεῖπνον ἕλοντο, where we would say 'lit fires'.

the bringing of water against proverbially insubstantial smoke makes an odd effect. Lasky (*C Ph* 68 (1973), 219) counters that smoke is here specifically the precursor of fire (cf. Alcae. 74 LP paraphrased as ἕως ἔτι καπνὸν μόνο[ν] ἀφίησι τὸ ξύλον, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἕως οὐδέπω τυραν[εὐει], κατάσβετε...) and that envy is to be crushed at birth. Stoneman also feels the weakness: 'Pindar "twists" the metaphor by including a word that has further desired associations: water is used to extinguish fire, but smoke is made to stand for fire because it can be symbolic of envy.' I hope to avoid these difficulties by assuming no more than the words state – that smoke and water are the key factors in the equation.

The identification of smoke with envy and the further introduction of fire into the picture seem largely to derive from the older commentators' use of Plutarch's paraphrase of a simile in Ariston of Chios (v. supra, and add fr. 33. 2). The first and fullest version is as follows: οὔτε γὰρ πῦρ, φησὶν ὁ 'Αρίστων, καπνὸν ποιεῖν οὔτε δόξαν φθόνον, ἢν εὐθὺς ἐκλάμψῃ καὶ ταχέως.... At first there is smoke, but as soon as the fire blazes up it vanishes. This, although a welcome piece of evidence for the association of smoke with envy, represents a completely different idea to that in Pindar, and the opposition of dark smoke and bright fire is the crucial point.

My own answer to the problem is based on the following two passages:

Sim. 541P

> τό τ]ε καλὸν κρίνει τό τ' αἰσχρόν· εἰ δέ
>    . . . (.)]. .αγορεῖ τις ἄθυρον [σ]τόμα
> περι]φέρ[ω]ν, ὁ μὲν καπνὸς ἀτελής, ὁ δέ [
>    χρυ]σὸς οὐ μιαίνετ[α]ι
> ἁ δ'] ἀλάθε[ι]α πα⸜κρατής
> ἀλλ'] ὀλίγοις ἀρετὰν ἔδωκεν ἔχειν

Pind. *N.* 7. 58 ff. esp. 61–3

> ξεῖνός εἰμι· σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον,
> ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς φίλον ἐς ἄνδρ' ἄγων
> κλέος ἐτήτυμον αἰνέσω· ποτίφορος δ' ἀγαθοῖσι μισθὸς οὗτος.

These two passages and *N.* 1. 24 cohere in context. The critical words of the envious assail the reputation of a noble and virtuous man but fail to affect it. In the seventh *Nemean* the poet moves to his patron's defence, also a strong possibility in the present passage, while in Simonides[7] the case is hypothetical and put in a general form. I believe that the same basic metaphor is present in all, with varying degrees of explicitness. The words of the envious seek to blacken, like smoke, the bright reputations of the noble. The poetry of true praise stands against calumny, like water to cleanse. In *N.* 1. 24 the conflict remains potential, with smoke on one side, water on the other, but καπνός can equally well mean 'soot', smoke that has settled (cf. καπνίζω 'blacken with smoke', δύσκαπνος 'smoke-stained'), and to 'bring water against soot' is a practicable activity upon which to found the metaphor.

*N.* 7. 61 ff. is generally translated as follows: 'I shall bring true glory like running water to the man that I love and praise him.'[8] This associates water with true glory and construes, against the run of the words, as if κλέος ἐτήτυμον ἄγων ὥτε ὕδατος ῥοὰς ἐς φίλον ἄνδρα, ⟨αὐτὸν⟩ αἰνέσω. Slater[9] has at least realised that the streams of water represent poetry but, like everyone else, confines the metaphor to the words ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοάς. This is exceedingly weak. Contrast *I.* 7. 17 ff. ἀμνάμονες δὲ

---

[7] The attribution is not certain. Bacchylides is also a possibility.
[8] Bowra (Penguin Classics, 1969).
[9] *Lexicon to Pindar* (Berlin, 1969) s.v. ὕδωρ.

βροτοί | ὅ τι μὴ σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον | κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν ἐξίκηται ζυγέν. This metaphor is considerably more developed, yet has no ὥτε. Water is used to denote Pindar's poetry also at *I.* 6. 74–5 and, with a different emphasis, at *P.* 9. 104. Callimachus takes over the idea, as he does with much else of Pindar's poetics, and elaborates it at *H. Ap.* 110–12. A comparison of *N.* 7. 61–3 with the other water metaphors strongly suggests that Pindar would not baldly say 'as it were streams of water' using ὕδωρ as a fully developed symbol for poetry. The usual interpretation also leaves the two participial clauses σκοτεινὸν ἀπέχων ψόγον, ὕδατος... ἄγων virtually unconnected. Punctuate with a comma after ἄγων and translate: 'I am a friend. Keeping off dark censure by bringing, as it were, streams of water to the man I love, I shall praise his true fame.' (Cf. ὕδωρ φέρειν ~ ὕδατος ὥτε ῥοὰς... ἄγων). The metaphor is essentially identical with that in the first passage, although here the darkening process of φθόνος is not precisely defined but latent in the adjective σκοτεινός, whereas the patron and his reputation are explicitly presented. There is also a strong contrast understood between the falsehoods of ψόγος and the truth of Pindar's eulogy of his patron. The force of ἐτήτυμον is almost predicative here. It is only by warding off the lies of envy that Pindar's praise of Thearion may be genuine. The poetry is streamlined by the omission of antitheses that can be understood from the context.

The passage of Simonides is more general but still has a great deal in common with the Pindaric examples. Although fragmentary, it can be supplemented with a high degree of probability as follows: 'If (someone) speaks (ill), bearing (round) an undoored mouth (i.e. loose tongue), the smoke is ineffective and the gold...is not defiled. (For) Truth is all-powerful. (But Fate) has given excellence to few men....' Smoke unequivocally stands for the words of the detractor, while gold is the reputation of the virtuous man. Once again truth triumphs over calumny. οὐ μιαίνεται confirms that the metaphor is of the smoke of envy 'defiling' the brightness of a noble reputation and provides a solid parallel for my understanding of the two Pindaric passages.

The principal connotations of καπνός and its cognates seem to be darkness and insubstantiality. For the former cf. καπνίζω 'blacken with soot' (Dem. 54. 4), also used intransitively 'be black with soot' (Arist. *Pax* 892); καπνώδης 'dark', 'murky' of colour; Hesych. ψέφος· καπνός; and A. *Ag.* 774, where a light/darkness contrast occurs in the following form: δίκα δὲ λάμπει μὲν ἐν δυσκάπνοις δώμασιν. With regard to the insubstantiality of smoke, it certainly could mean 'empty words' as in Plat. *Rep.* 581 d καπνὸς καὶ φλυαρία, E. *Hipp.* 954 πολλῶν γραμμάτων καπνούς etc. – apart from its more general force, as seen in καπνοῦ σκιά, a proverbial phrase like σκιᾶς ὄναρ, Arist. *Nub.* 320 περὶ καπνοῦ στενολεσχεῖν etc.

Καπνίας, the nickname of the comic poet Ecphantidas, is explained in Hesychius as διὰ τὸ μηδὲν λαμπρὸν γράφειν but is more probably connected with the idea of 'empty words', besides punning κατ' ἀντίφρασιν on his name.

The three passages so far discussed deal with smoke as a metaphorical representation of the action of φθόνος. The underlying conception of envy is as a darkener and defiler, and I propose to analyse several more passages in order to demonstrate this in detail, in the hope of elucidating some unobserved nuances in these pieces and strengthening my principal argument.

There is an enigmatic elegy in the Theognidean corpus which offers a good starting-point (447–52).

εἴ μ' ἐθέλεις πλύνειν, κεφαλῆς ἀμίαντον ἀπ' ἄκρης
αἰεὶ λευκὸν ὕδωρ ῥεύσεται ἡμετέρης·

εὑρήσεις δέ με πᾶσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ὥσπερ ἄπεφθον
χρυσόν, ἐρυθρὸν ἰδεῖν τριβόμενον βασάνῳ,
τοῦ χροιῆς καθύπερθε μέλας οὐχ ἅπτεται ἰὸς
οὐδ' εὐρώς, αἰεὶ δ' ἄνθος ἔχει καθαρόν.

The poem consists principally of three metaphors, whose interconnection I shall attempt to reveal. Firstly, πλύνειν is not used when talking of washing persons but things,[10] so there is very likely a pun on the verb's secondary sense of 'abuse'.[11] The poet is speaking here in his own defence. The metaphor, although different from those previously discussed, has several points of contact. Criticism is a defilement (ἀμίαντον ~ οὐ μιαίνεται) of the poet's character and it is darkening (~ λευκὸν) and as usual ineffective – κεφαλῆς...ἀπ' ἄκρης emphasises how superficially it affects him.[12] As I said above, the poetry can be streamlined by omitting antitheses which can be understood from the context, in this case μίασμα and μέλαν.

The βάσανος metaphor is extremely common as used here. Similar is Bacchylides fr. 14 Λυδία μὲν γὰρ λίθος | μανύει χρυσόν, ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετὰν σοφία τε | παγκρατής τ' ἐλέγχει | ἀλάθεια.... The close connection with the Simonides passage is also obvious. ἐρυθρόν and χροιῆς suggest that a considerable degree of personification is being maintained. So the poet declares that he is untouched by abuse and that his true and noble character is manifest in all his actions.

The key to the final couplet lies in Menander fr. 538 Sandb.

μειράκιον, οὔ μοι κατανοεῖν δοκεῖς ὅτι
ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἕκαστα κακίας σήπεται,
καὶ πᾶν τὸ λυμαινόμενόν ἐστιν ἔνδοθεν.
οἷον ὁ μὲν ἰὸς τὸν σίδηρον, ἂν σκοπῆις,
τὸ δ' ἱμάτιον οἱ σῆτες, ὁ δὲ θρὶψ τὸ ξύλον.
σὲ δὲ τὸ κάκιστον τῶν κακῶν πάντων φθόνος
φθισικὸν πεπόηκε καὶ ποήσει καὶ ποεῖ,
ψυχῆς πονηρᾶς δυσσεβὴς παράστασις.

The image of rust eating into iron to illustrate the action of φθόνος on the soul of an envious man seems to have been proverbial. Cf. D.L. 6. 5 (Antisthenes) ὥσπερ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰοῦ τὸν σίδηρον, οὕτως ἔλεγε τοὺς φθονεροὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἤθους κατεσθίεσθαι...; Basil, *Oratio de invidia* Migne vol. 31. p. 373 init.; and in Latin Hor. *Sat.* 1. 4. 100–101 *Hic* nigrae *sucus lolliginis, haec est* aerugo *mera.* Cf. *Epist.* 1. 19. 28 ff., *A.P.* 330 f., Mart. 10. 33. 5 *versus tincti viridi* aerugine. Both ἰός and *aerugo* denote not only rust on iron but verdigris on copper and so on.

In the last couplet of the Theognidean example, μέλας...ἰός points to the nature of the metaphor. Gold does not oxidise, and the ἰός is black because the darkening of the gold is the point, the obscuration caused by φθόνος, gold representing a good reputation as in Simonides. The metaphor is essentially similar to that in the first three passages discussed.

The Greek examples of the ἰός figure quoted above refer to the effect of φθόνος on the soul of the envious man rather than his victim, but this is only a matter of different emphasis. The concentration is on the failure of φθόνος and its destructive effect on the φθονερός himself. Pindar and the Theognidean poem describe its possible success. φθόνος was a force in human life, affecting φθονερός and victim alike.[13]

[10] A good example of the distinction at Sem. 7. 5W αὐτὴ δ' ἄλουτος ἀπλύτοις ἐν εἵμασιν.

[11] cf. Hesychius πλύνεται· λοιδορεῖται, ὑβρίζεται, LSJ s.v. and Suppl. So Hudson-Williams, who compares the French expression 'laver la tête à quelqu'un' and interprets the first couplet as 'mud won't stick'. Van Groningen denies this, seeing the words as simply referring to a test. What is the point of this outlandish metaphor if not the pun on πλύνω?

[12] Dr Dawe compares κατ' ἄκρης 'utterly' and suggests the sense 'from head to toe' here.

[13] This may be the point of *P.* 2. 76 ἄμαχον κακὸν ἀμφοτέροις διαβολιᾶν ὑποφάτιες. So also H. M. Lee, *Hermes* 106 (1978), 279–81.

In the light of this evidence, consider A. *Ag.* 832–5

παύροις γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ἐστι συγγενὲς τόδε
φίλον τὸν εὐτυχοῦντ' ἄνευ φθόνων σέβειν.
δύσφρων γὰρ ἰὸς καρδίαν προσήμενος
ἄχθος διπλοίζει τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσον.

Here the δύσφρων ἰός is completely identified with φθόνος and, as in the examples above, eats at the heart of the envious man. It is usually taken as ἰός (B) 'venom' rather than ἰός (C) 'rust', but LSJ are probably correct in their conjecture that the two words are in fact the same. εὐρώς in the Theognidean passage is part of an associated metaphor where φθόνος is represented as rotting and decay. The close connection with rusting is self-evident. Cf. Sim. 531P. 4–5 ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον οὔτ' εὐρὼς | οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος, where decay combines with darkness against the eternal memory of the glorious dead of Thermopylae. Cf. P. *N.* 8. 34 (πάρφασις)

ἃ τὸ μὲν λαμπρὸν βιᾶται, τῶν δ' ἀφάντων
κῦδος ἀντείνει σαθρόν.

Note also σήπεται and φθισικόν from the fragment of Menander quoted above. In antithetical contexts, an opposition with immortality may be suggested. Where the φθόνος is directed against a poet, especially an epinician poet, whose boast is to confer immortality through his work, the suggestion is very strong. The cluster of ideas I have indicated in the Theognidean elegy recurs in a difficult passage of Bacchylides (3. 85 ff.):

φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω· βαθὺς μέν
αἰθὴρ ἀμίαντος· ὕδωρ δὲ πόντου
οὐ σάπεται· εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός·
ἀνδρὶ δ' οὐ θέμις, πολιὸν π[αρ]έντα
γῆρας, θάλ[εια]ν αὖτις ἀγκομίσσαι
ἥβαν. ἀρετα[ς γε μ]ὲν οὐ μινύθει
βροτῶν ἅμα σ[ώμ]ατι φέγγος, ἀλλά
Μοῦσά νιν τρ[έφει.]

Here there is no reference to φθόνος, solely to the immortality of poetry, which is the main concern of the latter part of the poem, together with its complementary theme of human mortality. The first three lines consist of symbols (this is the point of φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω) for immortality and the contrast lies between βαθὺς μὲν αἰθὴρ... and ἀνδρὶ δ' οὐ θέμις... 'The deep upper air is unstained. The water of the sea does not rot. Gold is... but it is not lawful for man... to recover rich youth again. The light of excellence, however, does not fail with the mortal body but the Muse nurtures it.' ἀρετά preserved in poetry is untouched by mortal decay. ἀμίαντος passes into οὐ σάπεται and one expects gold, which does not rust or grow dim, to provide the climactic term of the triad. Pindar used it in this way in fr. 222 Διὸς παῖς ὁ χρυσός· κεῖνον οὐ σὴς οὐδὲ κὶς δάπτει (cf. Menander supra). εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός does not make sense, as far as I can see, nor does it fit into the clear train of thought. I suspect that the phrase was originally something like εὔχροος αἰὲ χρυσός (cf. χροιῆς in the Theognidean elegy). I should have thought that this form of ἀεί was admissible. Pindar uses ἀέ at Pyth. 9. 88, both poets have αἰέν and cf. Hdn. Gr. 1. 4. 497L.

Having employed the Theognidean elegy to provide a starting-point for an investigation of a group of associated metaphors, I will leave it with this rough paraphrase:

'Your abuse will leave me untouched.
My true character is manifest in all my acts.
Envy is ineffectual against me.'

It is clearly very similar in thought to the fragment of Simonides. The virtuous man is proof against φθόνος.

The opposition of light and darkness is the primary metaphor of epinician poetry. On the one hand the deed celebrated in poetry, bright and immortal; on the other, the unsung achievement, quenched in obscurity. The message of *N*. 7. 13 ταὶ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαί | σκότον πολὺν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι is frequently repeated. It is the aim of φθόνος to bring about this darkness and, as poetry aims to immortalise, φθόνος brings decay and death. The association of φθόνος with the light/darkness metaphor occurs in a remark attributed to Socrates at Stobaeus 3. 38, τοῖς μὲν διὰ τοῦ ἡλίου πορευομένοις ἕπεται κατ' ἀνάγκην σκιά, τοῖς δὲ διὰ τῆς δόξης βαδίζουσιν ἀκολουθεῖ φθόνος. Just as φθόνος affects the heart of the envious man in the same way as his victims, the φθονερός is as obscure as he is obscuring. Cf. *N*. 4. 37 ff.

> σφόδρα δόξομεν δαΐων ὑπέρτεροι ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν.[14]
> φθονερὰ δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων
> γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότῳ κυλίνδει
> χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν.

*N*. 8. 34

> ἀφάντων (quoted above).

It is possible that the association of darkness and φθόνος is relevant to Stesich. 265P. and Hipponax 122W.

Callimachus brought the φθόνος of specifically literary criticism to life with his personification of it in the coda of the hymn to Apollo. In Pindar there is no unambiguous example of this. Callimachus' attack in *Aitia* fr. 1 on the proverbially φθονεροὶ Τελχῖνες is another case, and his phraseology, as well as several of the metaphors already discussed, is turned to account in Philip LX (Gow-Page, Garland of Philip):

> γραμματικοί, Μώμου Στυγίου τέκνα, σῆτες ἀκανθῶν,
>   τελχῖνες βίβλων, Ζηνοδότου σκύλακες...
> ...τρίβοισθ' εἰς αἰῶνα κατατρύζοντες ἀλιτροί
>   ἄλλων, ἐς δ' ἡμᾶς ἰὸν ἀποσβέσατε.

and Antiphanes IX (ibid.):

> γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη, ῥιζώρυχα μούσης
>   ἀλλοτρίης, ἀτυχεῖς σῆτες ἀκανθοβάται,
> τῶν μεγάλων κηλῖδες, ἐπ' Ἠρίννῃ δὲ κομῶντες,
>   πικροὶ καὶ ξηροὶ Καλλιμάχου πρόκυνες·
> ποιητῶν λῶβαι, παισὶ σκότος ἀρχομένοισιν,
>   ἔρροιτ', εὐφώνων λαθρόδακναι κόριες.

In view of Callimachus' known dependence on Pindar and the deliberately Calli-machean style of these epigrams (the parallels are in Gow-Page), it is not fanciful to view this as a poetic tradition in the treatment of φθόνος.

The cluster of ideas and connotations I have been discussing does not form a system or a group of symbols – context is all-important – but some of them stand in demonstrable relationships to others. Within the primary epinician metaphor of light and darkness is the association of φθόνος with darkness. From darkener in general, it can be seen as a defiler, a 'ruster' and, by a natural progression, decay. As the darkness of 'rust' shades into decay, the gold of a noble character begins to denote immortality.

---

[14] I think ἐν φάει καταβαίνειν means 'walk in glory' rather like διὰ τῆς δόξης βαδίζουσιν quoted above, with καταβαίνειν a strengthened form of βαίνειν. See, however, S. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian*, p. 41.

I believe, then, that ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον means to bring the water of poetry against the defiling smoke of φθόνος. It follows from this that the people 'bringing the water' must be the ἐσλοί,[15] the noble in general and Pindar in particular. Before trying to determine the syntactical relationship between ἐσλούς and ὕδωρ – ἀντίον, it should be stated that there is no pre-Hellenistic[16] evidence for λαγχάνειν with the dative. I had already come to this conclusion when Stoneman drew my attention to W. S. Barrett's lucid examination of the point (*Euripides: Hippolytos*, p. 174). This is a finding of considerable importance because it eliminates several of the traditional solutions to this crux, including that favoured by Radt. The latter provides a catalogue and discussion of almost all the interpretations ever proposed for the line, and this is reproduced in an abbreviated form by Stoneman, who adds that of Benedictus,[17] which he himself approves. The terms of the problem can now be more accurately defined. λαγχάνειν means 'to receive as the result of a distribution', e.g. σωφροσύνην ἔλαχον. By a figure of thought it was also possible to speak of the quality being allotted to the man e.g. ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρους (*Ol.* 1. 53). Consequently, the object of λέλογχε must be either ἐσλούς or the phrase ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον.[18] I am led to believe it must be the former by several considerations. Firstly, the sense of the infinitive phrase which I have suggested above naturally requires ἐσλούς as the subject of the phrase. Also the train of thought from 19 to 32 suggests it, and difficulties about the subject of λέλογχε and the syntactical position of ἐσλούς arise if one prefers the alternative.

The introduction of the gnomic phrase seems rather abrupt to a modern reader because the poet has omitted a step in the development of his ideas which could be taken for granted by an ancient Greek. The thought runs as follows. (i) Chromius is φιλόξενος. His house is thronged with guests. (ii) The rebuttal of φθόνος. (iii) Wealth is to be used freely, in generosity to one's friends, (iv) since death comes to all. Lavish hospitality, for which Chromius was evidently famous (cf. *N.* 9 init.), was the mark of a great man (cf. *P.* 3. 71). It was also conspicuous consumption and would *ipso facto* attract φθόνος, and for this reason, after (i), the thought 'The envious criticise his magnificence' can be easily understood. At 31–2 he returns to the point and elucidates it further (φίλοις ἐξαρκέων ~ φιλόξενος) and we see that 'not hiding great wealth in his halls' and lavish hospitality are one and the same thing.

The subject of λέλογχε is also disputed.[19] Stoneman takes it to be Chromius but is aware of the difficulties attached (70 n. 31): 'It is a little unusual for a personal and so inexplicit reference to Chromius to intrude in a passage largely expressed in general terms; but it can be said that λέλογχε picks up the nearest preceding masculine singular noun (20 ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου), so that the obscurity may only be due to our false feeling for the word λέλογχε.' It seems more difficult than this to me, but the point is one of individual judgement. I suggest as a possibility that ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον effectively stands as subject of the verb, with ἐσλούς as the object, as in ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρους. The use of the infinitive without the article as the subject of the verb is adequately defended by Fraenkel *ad* A. *Ag.* 584, who provides relevant parallels. I would translate: 'It is the lot of the noble to bring water against the smoke of the critical.' The syntactical connection of the dative participle with the rest of the sentence is difficult in any of the interpretations yet offered, and I will deal with it last.

---

[15] I believe *N.* 7. 63 ποτίφορος δ' ἀγαθοῖσι μισθὸς οὗτος is an exact parallel.
[16] Hyp. Dem. *Mid.* 511. 4, *A.P.* 14. 11. 4.                              [17] ad loc. (Saumur 1620).
[18] For such a construction cf. Ω 400, Aesch. *Eum.* 930, Eur. *Tro.* 282.
[19] There is no reason to believe that it could be used impersonally.

The three interpretations which construe λαγχάνειν with the dative may be ruled out at once. Those which remain, apart from my own, are Erasmus Schmid's,[20] 'nactus est bonos ad aquam incendio ferendam contrariam obtrectantibus', and Benedictus',[21] 'est autem fors haec eius ut probos vituperantibus aquam igni ferat contrariam'. Both interpretations have Chromius as subject against the run of the context. The former construes as if λέλογχεν ἐσλοὺς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον μεμφομένοις. This directly identifies the smoke with the carping critics, which is certainly not what we require. It would be impossible to connect ἀντίον solely with μεμφομένοις, as Schmid seems to want, with καπνῷ in the middle, and the possibility of taking both datives with ἀντίον is highly dubious.[22]

The latter interpretation of Benedictus is supported in detail by Stoneman but also seems open to serious objections. He paraphrases: 'Chromius has it as his lot, that he brings "water against smoke" against those who cavil at the virtuous. That is, his excellence is great enough to extinguish envy.' Apart from objections incidentally raised in the course of the previous discussion, ἐσλούς is very awkward because the φθόνος at work here is specifically aimed at Chromius himself and so ἐσλούς = Chromius. It sounds as if Chromius is coming to the defence of others. Secondly, I question the idea that for Pindar excellence, however great, could extinguish φθόνος. There is, however, evidence to show poetry dispelling φθόνος (*N*. 7. 61–3, B. 5. 187 f., 13. 199 f.). Thirdly there are the two datives with ἀντίον.

The syntactical position of μεμφομένοις in the sentence is, as I said, a problem on any interpretation. I should prefer to see some concrete evidence before believing that both datives can be dependent on ἀντίον. A dative of disadvantage is rendered unlikely by the necessity of taking it with the whole of the complex phrase ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον, which already contains a dative. In the last ditch, I would take it to be possessive – the smoke of the critical – because this seems marginally easier, but the question is a difficult one.

Cruces such as this are unlikely to be solved outright except by the appearance of new evidence, and with regard to the metaphor I have suggested a new approach. The problems of the syntax required more rigorous definition and, as far as solutions are concerned, the elimination of the impossible and a more critical examination of the possible, and this was at least the aim of the present article.[23]

*Trinity College, Cambridge*                                    PAUL WARING

[20]  ad loc. (Wittenberg, 1616).
[21]  See n. 15. The interpretation of H. Fränkel is syntactically identical with this.
[22]  Nor is the specific force of λέλογχε clear. Note 'nactus est' in the translation.
[23]  I should like to thank Dr R. D. Dawe of Trinity for his helpful criticism of this paper.