

A GAMMA IN PINDAR, *OL.* 13. 3

Τρισολυμπιονίκαν
 ἐπαινέων οἶκον ἥμερον ἀστοῖς,
 ξένοισι δὲ θεράποντα, γνῶσσομαι
 τὰν ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον, Ἴσθμίου
 5 πρόθυρον Ποτειδᾶνος, ἀγλαόκουρον·
 κ.τ.λ.

Thus we read these lines in the manuscripts and in the printed editions (with minor variations that are irrelevant to our present purpose); thus the lines were read in the Middle Ages¹ and, perhaps,² already in antiquity.

In the text, as we have it, γνῶσσομαι is not easily understood. The interpreters are divided into two groups:

(a) those who understand γνῶσσομαι *causative*, i.e. = 'I shall make known', vel sim.³ Thus understood the word would fit into a sentence that could, conceivably, make sense: 'Through my poem I shall make Corinth known'. However: could anyone have imagined the need for this? (N.B.: the word would mean 'make known', and only that, and certainly not 'glorify'). In any case, it would not be Greek. At least the word does not seem to be recorded in this *causative* sense.⁴

(b) others explain γνῶσσομαι = 'I shall get to know, I shall visit' vel sim.⁵ This would adequately translate the word, but the sentence would not seem easily to fit together; and this not so much because we would have complete nonsense, but rather because the sentence would be trivial and banal, a superfluous and indeed disturbing expression of an improbability. Are we to understand that Pindar, in the middle of the sixties of the fifth century (464 B.C.), had never visited Corinth?⁶

There is a further point to be considered: γάρ in the sixth line can hardly mean that

¹ Eustathius in Dionys. Perieg. 1, C. Müller, *Geogr. Gr. Min.* II, pp. 216–17: ... Πίνδαρος μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἐπαινεῖν ἀεθλοφόρον τινὰ Κόρινθιον παροιμιάζεται ὅτι Ὀλυμπιονίκην ἐπαινῶν οἶκον γνῶσσομαι ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον κ.τ.λ.

² I say 'perhaps'; for it is not certain that the scholiast (see below, n. 3) is explaining γνῶσσομαι.

³ e.g. Σ: εἰς γνῶσιν ἄξω; and Boeckh ad *Ol.* 6. 82–91: 'γνῶναι manifeste causativum est, apertum facere, ut γνῶσσομαι *Ol.* 13. init. et verbum ἀναγιγνώσκω'. Dornseiff 1921: 'will ich kenntlich machen'. Dissen is, of course, right in saying: 'γνῶσσομαι active pr. notam faciam, celebrabo, ut vulgo explicant, sine exemplo est, nec aptum rei, neque enim recte Pindarus dicere potuit, se notam facturum cantu Corinthum, quasi ante eum nondum innotuerit eius laus in tot victoriis ludicris reportatis'.

⁴ LSJ: 'causal, make known, celebrate' is supported only by our passage. There is no need to take γνῶναι in *Ol.* 6. 89 in a causative sense as Boeckh does (cf. n. 3).

⁵ e.g. Dissen: contemplabor; Christ: recognoscā, visam; L. R. Farnell: I will get knowledge of, I will become familiar with...; de Jongh: adibo et visitabo; Sandys: I shall take knowledge of...; and Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1922 (Pindaros): 'Das kann nicht sein εἰς γνῶσιν ἄξω καὶ ὑμνήσω, das heisst ich werde kennen lernen, und dann muss man den Dichter beim Worte nehmen: er hat für Korinth noch niemals gedichtet, keine Beziehungen dahin gehabt' (pp. 371–2). Strangely, Schadewaldt, *Pindars Olympische Oden* (Frankfurt/Main, 1972), translates: 'will ich erkennen...', while in his notes he writes: 'dass er [Pindaros], wie er im Prooimion selber sagt, auch die Stadt Korinth weit kenntlich machen will...' (p. 94).

⁶ The date 79th Olymp. = 464 B.C. we owe to the scholiast, and it is confirmed by Diodorus Siculus (9. 70. 1), Dion. Halic. (*Ant. Rom.* 9. 61. 1), Pausanias (4. 24. 5) and Eusebius (*Chron.* 1. 204 Schoene).

here we are told the reason why the poet wanted to visit (get to know) Corinth. Rather, the lines 6 to 8 are clearly meant to give the reason for the praise of the city. γνῶσμαι, or better the word which should stand here, having been replaced by γνῶσμαι, would then continue and develop the sense of what is expressed by ἐπαινέων, repeating it, even though in a different way – and with reference to the city and not, like ἐπαινέων, to the family.

Hence I propose:

Τρισολυμπιονίκαν
ἐπαινέων οἶκον ἤμερον ἀστοῖς,
ξένοισι δὲ θεράποντ', ἀγγνώσμαι
τὰν ἀλβίαν Κόρινθον, Ἴσθμίου
5 πρόθυρον Ποτειδάνος, ἀγλαόκουρον·
κ.τ.λ.

‘As I praise the house thrice victorious at Olympia that is kindly to its fellow citizens and renders service to strangers, I shall also include in the proclamation of the victor the name of his city, blessed Corinth...’

At the public proclamation of the victor his name was called out, the name of his father, and that of his city. Thus, here, ἀναγιγνώσκειν may be used analogously to other compound verbs with ἀνα- descriptive of the proclamation of the victor by the herald. Compare: Pindar, *Pyth.* 1. 32 Πυθιάδος δ' ἐν δρόμῳ κάρυξ ἀνέειπέ νιν. Cf. also schol. ad *Pyth.* 1. 30; and also *Ol.* 5. 8, where the scholiast paraphrases Pindar's ἐκάρυξε with ἀνεκήρυξεν. And in the same scholium: ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἀγῶνι οἱ νικῶντες καὶ ἀπὸ πατέρων ἀνηγορεύοντο καὶ ἀπὸ προγόνων καὶ πόλεων κ.τ.λ. and later: ὁ γὰρ νικῶν πατέρα καὶ πατρίδα ἀνακηρύσσει. Cf. also *Pyth.* 10. 9. See also Sophocles, *El.* 693

ὠλβίζετ' Ἀργεῖος μὲν ἀνακαλούμενος
ὄνομα δ' Ὀρέστης, τοῦ τὸ κλεινὸν Ἑλλάδος
Ἀγαμέμνονος στράτευμ' ἀγείραντός ποτε...

(with the notes of Schneidewin-Nauck⁷ and Jebb; also Wilamowitz on Euripides, *H.F.* 961). Compare Demosthenes, *De corona* 319 (νικῶν ἀνηγορεύετο) and Aristophanes, *Plut.* 585 (ἀνεκήρυττεν... τοὺς νικῶντας). An echo of this sense of ἀναγιγνώσκειν is perhaps to be found in Pindar, *Ol.* 10. 1; and so also *Isthm.* 2. 23 (cf. schol. ad loc.).

The emendation proposed here requires no more than the insertion of the single letter Γ, the loss of which could easily be caused by haplography. On the assumption of *scriptio plena* we should only have to suppose that an Α was lost in the same way.

ἀγγνώσμαι = ἀναγνώσμαι (apocope and assimilation). Examples of apocope and, where necessary, various forms of assimilation abound in Pindaric texts, both in the case of the truncated preposition standing by itself, and in that of the element ἀν- before certain consonants in compound words. Here are some examples:

Ol. 11. 8: ἄγκειται Byz. (ex ἀνάκειται Σ^a; ἔγκειται codd.)

Isthm. 5. 18: Φυλακίδ' ἄγκειται Maas (e Σ); φυλακίδα κείται codd.

Pyth. 4. 9: ἀγκομίσαι

Paean 7. 12: ἀγ κορυφάν (P.S.I. 2. 147: αγ κ[ορυφαν; P. Oxy. 5. 841: ἄν κορυφάν).

Compare also: GDI 1, 1365 (Epirus): ἀγ Κόσσωι; and Hermann's attractive conjecture (Aesch. *Suppl.* 550) ἀγ γύαλα (thus, e.g., Wecklein 1902; Weil; Mazon; Murray. But see also Wilamowitz 1914 ad loc.). It is to be noted that the mechanism

⁷ Zur öffentlichen Verkuendigung gehoert Nennung des Namens, des Vaters, der Heimat... ἀνακαλούμενος wie sonst ἀνειπεῖν, ἀνακηρύξαι.'

of corruption assumed in the correction proposed by Maas in *Isthm.* 5. 18 (see above) is very similar to that postulated in our passage, with the single difference that in the latter the corruption, if corruption there is, was even simpler: in both cases the alpha with which the verb begins is wrongly attached to the preceding word, where an alpha is elided; in both cases a gamma becomes free, meaningless and therefore lost. In our case the mistake may additionally have been facilitated by the fact that the gamma destined to be lost was followed by another gamma.

A possible objection against postulating a future form⁸ of the verb ἀναγινώσκειν loses much of its force when we consider that the same objection would be valid for γινώσκειν too. But it might be argued that there exists a weightier difficulty: in spite of the relatively large number of examples of apocope plus assimilation in the text of Pindar there does not seem to be any other example of the special combination αγγ- for αναγ-. This is not a real difficulty; for there are other phenomena of a similar kind for which there are only one or two illustrations in Pindaric texts;⁹ and some of these owe their origin to conjecture:

ἀνακ- > αγκ- (see above): four occurrences, of which two are restored by conjecture, viz. *Ol.* 11. 8 and *Isthm.* 5. 18; and in *Paeon* 7. 12 the reading αγ is attested only in one of the two sources; the other offers αν (see above)

αναμ- > αμ (sic) two occurrences (of which one ex coniect.):

Pyth. 1. 47 ἀμνάσειεν Boeckh ex coniect.

Pyth. 4. 54 ἀμνάσει

(ἀμμείνας, codd. *Pyth.* 6. 31, was corrected already by Triclinius to ἀναμείνας and by Boeckh to ἀναμείναις.)

Jerusalem

A. WASSERSTEIN

⁸ The future form of this verb is not attested in the text of Pindar.

⁹ Slater and Rumpel assume that the apocope (and where necessary the assimilation) of ανα- is limited to those cases where it is followed by κ χ δ τ ν π. But this limitation is not only in need of supplementation (β and μ are omitted: cf. ἀμβασε *Pyth.* 4. 191 and ἀμνάσει *Pyth.* 4. 54); it cannot be regarded as a valid generalisation. It is, after all, not the expression of a natural law; it reflects no more than the formation of the textual material as considered by Rumpel and Slater.