Some Types of Scribal Error in Manuscripts of Pindar

Douglas Young

The mediaeval paradosis of Pindar's Odes offers some contrasts with the tradition of Aeschylus in the Oresteia, which I analysed recently in GRBS 5 (1964) 85-99. Whereas the Oresteia paradosis offers rather numerous examples of graphical confusions deriving from the uncial stage of transmission, the earlier extant manuscripts (veteres) of Pindar provide comparatively few indubitable instances. To be sure the oldest extant Pindar manuscript, B (Vat.gr.1312), though hard to date, even approximately, by its writing, seems to be nearly two centuries younger than M of Aeschylus; and the Pindar scholia derived from antiquity were substantially more bulky than those of Aeschylus: so that scholars of the eleventh and twelfth centuries had more resources by which to amend the Pindar text, and in fact this seems to have undergone a good deal of contaminative correction. The veteres, with the possible exception of B, are all later in date than the activities of such scholars as the Tzetzes brothers and Eustathius. Nonetheless, some uncial errors survive in them.

As a basis for study of variants I took the group of manuscripts selected by Sir Maurice Bowra in his widely current edition, in which he followed largely the work of Schroeder: namely ABC D E G V, with less frequent citation of F I M N O P Q T and U. To Bowra's variants I added those given by A. Turyn, and a few of those noted by J. Irigoin in his Histoire du texte de Pindare (Paris 1952).

Some uncial errors concern the round forms of epsilon, theta, omicron and sigma, €ΩOC. For example, at P 4.63 B1 offers δυσερόου for the correct δυσερόου, showing that a Θ had been misread as €. At N 7.6 the correct ζυγένθε the became in the MSS ζυγόν θε', in part probably from misreading of uncial € as Ο, together with verbal associations. At P 3.80 B's ἐπίσεται for ἐπίσεται exemplifies misreading of round sigma Σ as uncial €. This happened, too, in POxy. 1614 at O 6.90, ἐσαι] €Ε€ι.

One or two variants among ancient Testimonia attest uncial confu-
sions: at N 2.11 Crates’s variant θερείαν for ὅρειαν may spring from misreading of round uncials; and at I 1.68 Chrysippus’s ἀλαοίσι for ἀλλοσι exemplifies the mistaking of Λ for Α.

The Pindaric paradosis, like the Aeschylean, manifests occasional confusion of sigma and gamma, which occurs in uncials but could also happen in some minuscule scripts, especially around A.D. 1300: e.g. P 1.10 καταγχόμενος ] καταγχόμενος περίγεγκε; N 3.5 σέθεν ] γέθεν D; I 1.34 αἶθαν ] αἶγαν D; I 1.21 γεύμενοι ] σεύμενοι D; N 11.18 μελιγδοῦ-ποισι ] μελιςδοῦποισι B. It may be noted that some of these are in the two less read and less edited books of odes, Nemeans and Isthmians, which had not been so much worked over by eleventh and twelfth century scholars.

Some confusions of gamma, pi and tau are more likely to come from the uncial stage than the minuscule. At N 11.35 D has ἀνίκτων for the correct ἀνίκων. At N 7.33, for the manuscripts’ γὰρ I would read πῶρ (Hermann took παρά from the scholia). At N 3.6 the development from πράγος to D’s πρῶτος may have been through an intermediate uncial πράτος, with Τ for Γ. N 1.16 σεύρε ] ἔγειρε shows a double uncial confusion: round sigma was read as round epsilon, and πι as gamma. A somewhat rare uncial error appears at N 11.33 μῶν ] λίαν veteres. Here uncial M has been misread as Αλ, presumably after some fading of the ink. At P 2.78 B absurdly has τὶ δὴ οἴ for τελέθει. On the whole, the scribe of B was a faithful copyist without ecdotic mentality; and the ultimate source of the corruption was probably somebody’s misreading of uncial Λ as Δ. At I 8.77 D’s curious χῶα πῶ may derive from Theiler’s reading κόλπω: if so, it is a case of uncial Λ being taken as Δ. I find astonishing the scarcity and dubiety in Pindar of examples of confusion among the uncial letters Α Δ Μ Ν, which are so often sources of error in other traditions. At N 11.18 we find D has λαὐδαλ-θέντα for δαὐδαλθέντα. This could be uncial error but may be ana­grammatism. Again, types of alpha, delta and lambda are liable to be confused even in some minuscule writings.

In considering errors caused in part by optical confusions in minuscule letter-forms, one must usually take account also of contributory influence from the copyist’s thinking. Sometimes “ear” mistakes through errors in vocalisation operate simultaneously, e.g. where beta becomes upsilon, as at O 2.86 λάβρον ] λαῦροι Α E prim.; O 8.36 λάβρον ] λαῦρον ACV; P 2.87 λάβρος ] λαῦρος BDG; P 3.40 λάβρον ] λαῦρον BE; P 4.244 λαῦροτὰτάν ] λαῦροτάταν E; N 8.46 τε λάβρον ] τελαῦρον B;
In these beta becomes upsilon partly, or mainly, through the Byzantine assimilation in pronunciation of beta to the consonantalized upsilon in the diphthong, but there is also a graphical factor, through that form of minuscule beta that is often made like an upsilon with a final tail. This type of beta can also approximate to a form of kappa, confusion of which is partly responsible for the corruption at N 9.33, where κλέπτεται became D's βλέπτεται.

In some of the ill-formed minuscule hands of the Palaeologan renaissance one finds forms of beta and rho somewhat similar, whence perhaps the corruptions in D of δεδρ' to δεδβ' at N 11.35 and of εβαυ to ἐπαυ at I 4.40. On the other hand, it is probably an "ear" mistake whereby beta and mu are exchangeable, e.g. P 3.34 Βοιβιάδος] μοιβιάδος B; O 9.8 μέλεσου] βέλεσου E γρ. V; N 6.51 καββάς] καμβάς B.

In the thirteenth century particularly a high gamma sometimes has a loop at the foot and resembles a form of minuscule delta in which the foot is skimpily written but the top is given a big flourish to the right. This graphical tendency may partly account for the corruption of ὅγ' to ὅσ' at O 10.45 (in O) and P 2.41 (in E); but confusions of particles are common enough anyway.

Exchangeability of a minuscule type of kappa with mu seems indicated by N 3.9, D's ἀκάς for ἀμάς; N 3.41, D's ἀτρεμεῖ for ἀτρέκεῖ; N 10.4, D's κακρᾶ for μακρᾶ.

Resemblance of the type of nu on a leg to a rho may have influenced the corruptions at P 10.52 ἀλκαρ] ἀλκᾶν D Eṣυρ G and at O 10.43 ἀρ'] ἀν A. The minuscule nu not on a leg is often interchanged with upsilon, e.g. I 6.9 κατασπένθεν] κατασπενθεῖ D; N 10.47 οντε] οὔτε D; N 11.20 πάτραν τ'] πατραντ' D; P 1.79 εὐδρόν] εὐδρόν C; N 7.8 εὐδόξας] εὐδοξος D; N 9.15 καππάει] καππάνει D; I 7.51 εὐανθεία] εὐανθεία D.

Confusions occur of pi and tau, e.g. P 8.44 ἐπιτρέπει] ἐπιτρέπει DV; O 3.4 ποι] τοι D; N 9.24 παμβίας] ταμβία D; N 9.38 παρπλίδιον] παρπλίδιον D; I 4.71 ἀνατελλόμενα] ἀνατελλόμενα D. One may also note confusions arising from the combinations ΠΠ and ΠΤ, as at O 16.69 ἄν' ἰπποιοι] ἰανίπποιοι A; P 4.201 ἐνίπτων] ἐν ἰπποις C prim.; N 9.22 ἰππείοις] ἱππείοις D. There is a form of minuscule pi that is apt to look as if it starts with a ligatured sigma, and this can give rise to confusions, as at N 10.32 ἰσπατον] ἱστατον D; N 7.26 ἐπαξε] ἐσπαξε D.

The ligature sigma+ tau may be mistaken for a simple tau, as at N 2.10 ἐστι] ἐτι TU; N 9.47 οὔτε ἐστι] οὐκέτι B. Conversely, a tau can give rise to the ligatured sigma+ tau, as at O 2.70 ἐτειλαν] ἐστειλαν
vett. An odd case is I 7.43, where Mss offer ἄιστος for ἄιρος. An ill-written sigma seems to have been misread as a delta at I 7.36, where D has ἐλπίδων for ἐλπίσων. A phi turned into a theta at N 8.26 in D, with ψάφοις for ψάφοις. Theta can develop to sigma+theta, as at O 1.92 κλιθεῖς ] κλἰθεῖς E; N 7.93 ἀθ’ ] ἀθ’ B, though here there is also an element of trivialization.

An interesting class of error comes from confusion of the ligature epsilon+upsilon with a type of minuscule alpha, as at P 4.203 ἐξεινοῦ ] ἐκεινοῦ CD; N 1.14 ἐνκάρπου ] ἀκάρπου D; N 5.27 ξυνάνα ] ξυνεύνα B. Ligatures starting with alpha and epsilon can be confused, e.g. O 11.8 ἐγκειται ] ἐγκειται Mss; P 1.34 ἀρχομένους ] ἐρχομένους C; P 8.6 ἐρξει ] ἔρξει V.

The use of a compendium for πατρὶ has caused an error at O 10.86, where C wrote πριν, derived from the antigraph’s πρι, but later corrected it. Errors can arise from an antigraph’s abbreviation, e.g. at N 10.48, where D’s λυκαί must come from misinterpretation as an accent of the oblique stroke standing for the terminal -ov in the antigraph’s writing of λύκαιον; and at I 5.44, where the text’s νάσον appears in D in the form νάσι. Here the antigraph’s abbreviating stroke for -ov has been misread as an iota.

There are a few examples of minor dittography, e.g. O 2.63 βιοτοῦ ] βιοτοῦν C; P 8.67 ἐκόντι ] ἐκόντιν G; N 10.69 ἑφορμαθεὶς ] ἑφορμα-μαθεὶς B; N 11.26 ἐνόστη” ἀντιπάλων ] ἐνόστησαν’ ἀντιπάλων D.

A curious case is N 7.88, φιλήσαντ’ ] φιμίσαντ’ D. It recalls an error in the early tenth century Ms A of Theognis, at 1377, where we find φιμον for φίλον. It seems that the attachment of the minuscule lambda to the following letter made it look like μι. In order that this result should have been reached in D’s φιμίσαντ’, some ancestor must have made an itacist error, iota for eta, and the minuscule λι had then been read as μι. Here we have a two-stage corruption, which is comparatively rare in any paradosis, though would-be emenders frequently assume them.

Aural confusions are common, arising from the copyist’s mental self-dictation, concurrent with the process of interpreting the group of letters in his antigraph and writing it down in the apograph. Most of these “ear” mistakes affect vowels and diphthongs, and many of them are classifiable as itacism. Confusion of iota and eta is frequent, as at O 4.13 ἦκε ] ἦκε AD; O 5.10 ἦκεν ] ἦκεν A; P 4.126 ἦκε ] ἦκε B; P 6.43 παρίκει ] παρίκει DG; O 3.45 μι ] μιν AB; P 6.54 τρητον ] τρίτον
V prim.; O 6.69 κτίσῃ | κτήσῃ N; O 9.45 κτίσασθαν | κτήσασθαν pler.;
O 10.25 ἐκτίσατο | ἐκτήσατο C prim.; O 13.83 κτῆσαν | κτήσαν vett.;
P 6.50 τίπν | τίν N; O 4.35 θηγέμεν | θηγέμεν D.

Iota and the sound ei may be interchanged, as at N 7.25 ιδέμεν |
εἰδέμεν MSS; N 6.20 τρεῖς | τρις MSS. Iota and upsilon become confused,
e.g. τυν at P 6.19 (B) and P 9.6 (B corr. D G); P 3.21 φῦλον | φῦλον
E prim.; P 5.8 μετανίσεαι | μετανίσεα E; P 5.112 ὄρνιξ | ὄρνιξ D, DG,
and in due course ὄνιξ Ὅ. Upsilon can become eta, P 8.41, ζ's ἐληθὸν
from ἡλθὸν. One finds confusion of ε, ο, ν, η, υ with some strange
results, as N 9.49 ἀοιδᾷ | αὐδᾷ D; P 9.36 κλήταν | κλειτάν pler.; P 11.32
κλειταῖς | κλειταῖς V; O 7.48 ἀπύρως | ἀπεύρως A; O 6.1 εὐτείχει |
eὐτείχει C; P 5.85 ἑνδυκέως | ἑνδίκεως E; P 10.52 χειράδος | χειράδος V;
N 1.17 ἱππαιχμον | ἱππαίχμον D; I 6.23 ἥθε | ἥθε MSS; N 7.47 πολυθύτης |
pολυθύτης D; N 8.33 ὁμόφωτος | ὁμόφωτος B; N 9.23 ἔρεισάμενοι |
ἐρωσάμενοι D; N 9.24 νεογυίου | νεογυίου D; I 4.66 ὀπίει | ὀπίει D; |
P 9.32 κεχὼμανται | κεχώμανται D; P 5.12 τοι | τι CV; P 5.12 δὲ τοι |
δ' ἐν BDEG; I 7.44 δ τοι | δτι D.

The assimilation in sound of αι and ε leads to further confusions, as
N 10.2 ὄμνειτε | ὄμνειται D; I 8.69 γεραίρετε | γεραίρεται D; P 2.4
βάσσαιοι | βάσσαι C; O 3.17 ἔτει | ἔτει D1; P 4.233 ἔολει | ἐολεὶ MSS;
O 10.73 παραὶθῆξε | παραὶθῆξε ABO; O 12.12 πιαθαμβαται | παιδ' ἐμεθα
A; O 13.79 δ' δ' | δαὶ CD prim., δὲ BD prim.; P 3.81 δαίονται | δέονται E;
I 5.38 πιαδθεν | παιδθεν D; N 3.75 αἰῶν | ἀιῶν B; καὶ | καὶ at O 1.82 |
(C prim. E), O 6.6 (A), O 10.20 (pler.), P 3.111 (C1 V).

Aural confusions in the sounding of consonants are fewer than those
involving vowels and diphthongs; but they do occur, as at O 13.7
ἁμότροφος | ἁμότροφος pler.; O 9.2 κεχλάδος | κεκλάδος A. There can
be confusion of liquids, as in P 2.80 ἐρκος | ἐλκος C1; P 4.65 μέρος |
μέλος C prim.; P 3.9 πρίν | πλὴν E. Miscellaneous errors include O 8.44
βαρυγιοῦπου | βαρυγιοῦπου A; N 11.26 ἀμπλάκιον | ἀμβλάκιον B; O 14.2
cαλλίτωλον | καλλίβωλον C prim.; P 4.24 ἀγκυραν | ἀγκυραν D prim. E;
O 11.16 ἐγγυασαι | ἐγκυασαι EO.

Clusters of consonants were liable to be simplified by the scribes,
thus: O 1.53 λέογυχε | λέογυχε CENU; O 2.87 παγιλωσίς | παγιλωσία
D, παγιλωσία C prim.; O 7.31 παρεπλαγφαν | παρέπλαγαν D; P 1.1
φόμυγξ | φόμυξ D; P 3.22 παπταινε | παπταίνει C; P 4.72 ἀκάμπτοι |
ἀκάμπτοι C; P 4.176 φορμικτά | φορμικτά BDEG; P 8.31 φθέματε |
θέματε E; P 12.31 ἀελπτία | ἀελπτία B; N 9.52 βεμπλέκτοι | βεμ-
πλέκτοι D; I 2.8 ἀγυρφθείσαι | ἀγυρφθείσαι D; I 2.39 προσέπτυκτο ]
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Less commonly a scribe might complicate further a consonantal cluster, e.g. O 7.2 κακλάξιοναν] κακλάξιοναν A; 12.18 ἀμερεῖ ν; P 4.14 ἀλπλάκτου ΒΓ] ἀλπλάγκτου ΕΥ, ἀλπλεγκτού Κ; 7.22 αἰμόν] αἰςχθιον D.

Consonants specially liable to drop out were μυ and νυ, but they were about equally liable to intrude erroneously. For loss of μυ consider O 8.44 πεμφθεῖν] πεμβθεῖν C; 9.73 ἔμβαλεν] ἔβαλεν Β; P 3.108 ἀμφέσαντ''] ἀφέσαντ' V; 4.62 ἀμφανέν] ἀφανέν C; 10.27 ἀμβατός] ἀματὸς V; N 8.30 ἀλεξιμβρότω] ἀλεξιβρότω D; 5.65 σύμπεμφον] σύμπευφον B. Contrariwise νυ is added at O 4.9 ὑβρίμοιν] ὑβρίμοιν ΚΕΥ; P 4.237 ἀφωνητῷ] ἀμφωνητῷ C; N 10.74 φρίσουσαν πνοᾶς] φρίσουτ'] ἀμπνοὺς Β; 1.61 ἔσορεν] ἐμπορεῖν B.

Examples of the loss of νυ are somewhat more numerous: O 10.51 νῦνυνος] νῦνυνος (-νος) vett.; 10.64 εὐθὸν τόνον] εὐθοτονον ΜΣΣ; 12.2 Ἰμέραν] Ἰμέρα πλερ.; 13.46 ποντίαν] ποτίαν ΒΓ ΑΡΙΜ.; P 4.27 ἀναπάσαντες] ἀσαπάσαντες V; 5.33 δώδεκα'] ἀν δόμων] δωδεκαδόμων CEΥ; δωδεκα δόμων BDΓ; 5.40 ἀνδριάντ'] ἀδριάντ'] CV; 9.41 ἀμφαδὸν] ἀμφαδόν ΜΣΣ; 10.57 Ἰπποκλέαν] Ἰπποκλέα πλερ.; N 5.52 πῦκταν] πῦκτα D; 6.41 ἀν'] ἀν V; 7.65 πέποιθ'] ἐν τε] πепοιθέ τε D; I 4.7 ἄν'] ἄν D; I 8.69 ἀν νόπος'] ἀνάπος D; I 1.25 ὅποτ'] ἐν'] ὅποτε ΜΣΣ. At N 8.44 D offers πίσταν, Β πίστα, and perhaps one should read μαστεῖν δὲ καὶ τέρψις ἐν δόμαι θέσαι πίστ'] ἀν. Aorist infinitive with ἂν depending on a verb of wishing is found at Thuc. 7.61 and Ar. Νυβ. 1130.

To compensate for their omissions of an occasional νυ, the scribes insert one wrongly about as often, as at O 1.59 ἀπάλαμον] ἀπάλαμον vett.; 10.80 πυρπάλαμον] πυρπάλαμον Κ; 8.16 πρόφατον] πρόφατον vett.; O 9.65 ὑπέρφατον] ὑπέρφατον V; 2.51 ἐκαμψε'] ἐκαμψε C; P 4.72 ἀκάμπτοις] ἀκάμπτοις πλερ.; 4.126 Ἀμιθάν] ἀμιθάν B; P 10.17 Κλωταιμήστας] κλωταιμήστας ΜΣΣ; N 10.6 ὑπερμήσταρα] ὑπερμήσταρα D; N 3.50 ἑθάμβεν] ἑν θάμβεν D; N 4.77 πάτραν ἐν'] πάτραν νν MΣΣ; N 10.64 ἐμήσατ'] ἐμήσατ C, ἐμήσατ B; P 10.54 ἄλλον'] ἄλλον τ'] E; 11.39 μὲ'] μὲν ΕΥ; P 4.198 ἀντάισε'] ἀντάνυσε C ΑΡΙΜ.; P 5.50 πετόντεσων] πετόντεσων E; I 7.41 ἐπειμὶ'] ἐπεὶ μὼ D; N 3.30 μᾶτενε] μᾶντενε D.

Omissions of whole words and longer passages are noted in Pindar,
as in other authors. The book of *Isthmian Odes* is incomplete, an extra fragment of a further ode being found only in the manuscript D. Most of the omissions are of small words, for example 20 omissions of τε or τ’, 13 of δε or δ’, 8 of καλ’, and 14 of other particles; 17 of εν and 9 of other prepositions; 9 of articles; 9 of pronouns. These figures are unlikely to be complete, because editors do not always report every trivial omission. For example, of the 13 omissions of δε or δ’ I do not find any in the *Nemeans* or *Isthmians*. But the relative frequency of omission of particular words or types of word is not likely to be seriously misleading.

Connective particles are particularly liable to be omitted, especially τε or τ’, dropped 20 times: at O 1.41 (pler.), O 1.79 (U), O 1.87 (CN), O 2.83 (N), O 5.7 (G), O 6.17 (A), O 6.43 (A), O 8.77 (B), O 10.43 (C), O 10.93 (GNO), O 13.106 (G), P 2.41 (G), P 4.135 (B), N 1.56 (U), N 4.19 (D), N 6.39 (B), N 7.22 (Mss), I 4.15 (D), I 4.77 (Mss), I 8.41 (D).

The 13 omissions of δε or δ’ are at O 2.2 (CDG), O 2.5 (A), O 4.6 (C), O 7.11 (A), O 7.61 (N), O 7.64 (N), O 9.89 (A), O 10.69 (EF), O 10.76 (E), O 10.99 (Mss), P 3.39 (D), P 8.13 (V), P 11.54 (V). It may be noted how rarely these omissions occur in all our manuscripts: so that the considerable totality of omissions must be seen in perspective. Taken as a whole, the Pindar paradosis for the *Odes* is sound and dependable. Schroeder correctly called it "satis bonam librorum Pindaricorum condicionem" (Preface to his third Teubner edition [1930]).

The 8 omissions of καλ’ occur at O 7.26 (A), O 9.68 (D), O 10.15 (EF), O 12.13 (O), P 2.50 (D), P 10.15 (EF), P 10.46 (E), N 1.30 (U).

There are 4 omissions of μέν, at O 7.73 (B), O 13.104 (G), P 1.22 (V), P 8.64 (V); 2 of γάρ, at O 6.54 (C), N 3.3 (D); 2 of τοι, at O 9.21 (A) and P 3.85 (CEV); one of ἀν at O 11.20 (Mss); 3 of κεν (ν), at O 1.109 (CD), P 3.76 (E), P 10.29 (Mss); and 2 of γε, at P 3.98 (D) and N 10.33 (D).

Haplography accounts for three omissions of εν: at O 4.26 (AN), O 7.12 (pler.), and N 3.38 (Mss). Fourteen unmotivated omissions of εν occur at O 9.76 (CO), O 9.86 (N), O 10.82 (NO), O 13.33 (E), O 13.47 (C), P 2.65 (E), P 3.64 (vett.), P 3.90 (E), P 4.16 (DG), P 4.223 (C), P 11.46 (vett.), N 1.69 (Mss), N 3.72 (V), I 5.5 (D). ες is omitted 4 times, at O 8.47 (B), O 10.12 (G), P 1.70 (pler.), P 10.30 (G); σήν twice, at P 11.20 (V) and N 10.38 (Mss); and there is one omission of each of the following prepositions: ἄπο P 8.41 (V); ἐπί O 8.84 (C); and μετά O 2.34 (E).

Parts of the definite article are omitted thus: δ at N 3.75 (Mss);
Pronouns omitted are: ἐν Ὀ 8.16 (BG); σὲ 4 times, at Ὀ 12.16 (pler.), ὘ 2.66 (Mss), ὘ 4.1 (E) and Ὕ 5.43 (Mss); μοῦ Ὀ 10.34 (D); ἔνα, by haplography, at Ὀ 1.37 (Mss); τις Ὀ 8.8 (V); and τι Ὀ 1.28 (B) and Ὀ 8.77 (B).

Monosyllabic words omitted are οὐ at ὘ 14.13 (Mss), ὘ 12.3 (D) and Ν 3.1 (BV); and ξενιά at ὘ 4.141 (C').

Disyllabic words omitted are Ὄ 10.97 (V) ἔθνος; Ρ 4.132 (E) λόγον; Ν 11.41 (B) πλούτω; Ὀ 4.34 (B) ἀκρόν; ὘ 6.45 (C) αὐτὸν; Ὀ 1.44 (V) ἔξω; ὘ 2.59 (E) ἰδή; ὘ 4.64 (pler.) ὄτε; Ὀ 2.27 (E) φιλεῖ; Ὀ 11.57 (pler.) ἔσχεν; Ὀ 8.14 (Mss) βλέπεις. Uncertain disyllables are omitted at Ὀ 2.10 and Ὀ 6.36 by the Mss there. Haplography accounts for loss of ἄλλοις at Ὀ 1.47 in B before ἄλλοις, and for loss of ἔτι at Ὀ 10.69 (Mss). The other omissions are not obviously explicable.

Trisyllabic omissions include: Ρ 4.180 (B'DG) βεμέθλοις; Ὀ 12.7 (vett.) Παργόνων; Ν 1.52 (vett.) φάσγανον; Ὕ 11.1 (V) ἀνθρώποις, by homoeoarcton; ὘ 6.51 (G') γενεὰν; Ρ 3.42 (F) βαρείας and Ρ 4.231 (C) χρυσέω, both by homoeoteleuton; Ρ 5.118 (Mss) ὄμοια (for which the manuscripts have an inadequate stopgap, ὅ); Ν 9.18 (D) ἀλαῖν; Ν 6.25 (Mss) πλεόνων; Ὀ 10.35 (V) ὄπισθεν; Ὀ 11.10 (Mss) ὄμοιας; Ρ 11.49 (V) ἠλεγξαν. At Ν 6.17 the manuscripts omit a trisyllabic verb, perhaps ἀπαγε, which could have been lost by homoeoarcton. An uncertain trisyllable is omitted by all at Ν 9.17, and a quadrisyllable at Ν 10.84.

Omissions of more than one word include: Ο 2.58 (N) ταδὲ Διός; Ο 3.35 (Ν) σῶν βαθυζώνων; Ρ 8.24 (D) δ' ἔχει; Ρ 4.2-3 (D) Ἰαθμίοις, ὄμετέρας; and Ρ 6.52 (D) δν αἰτεῖς. Two lines are omitted by Δ at Ν 11.22-23.

In rough compensation some, and rarely all, of the Mss contain additions to the text. Most of these are of small words, in the same categories as those omitted. For example, there seem to be some 21 additions of τε or τ'; 20 of δ' or δ'; 12 of ἐν; and 6 of καὶ. The motivation of the addition is usually clear enough from the context; occasionally it is to avoid hiatus at a place that the copyist did not realise to be a verse-end, where hiatus is licit.

Additions of τε or τ' occur at Ο 3.94 (A), 6.55 (A), 6.68 (pler), 6.100 (C), 7.10 (Ν O), 8.47 (A), 9.80 (A), 10.9 (AC), 13.29 (O), 13.115 (Mss), 14.5 (C); Ρ 1.70 (DGV), 4.97 (Ε), 9.14 (Ε), 9.101 (vett.), 10.38 (D), 10.58 (B); Ν 1.37 (Mss), 7.19 (Mss), 10.48 (vett.); Ρ 8.27 (D).
The 20 additions of δε or δ are found at O 1.71 (vett.), 2.2 (AEV), 6.72 (pler.), 6.74 (Mss), 9.86 (D), 10.51 (C), 10.71 (Mss), 13.97 (Mss); P 2.72 (Mss), 2.89 (vett.), 3.105 (Mss), 4.55 (Mss), 4.179 (Mss), 8.43 (vett.), 8.77 (vett.); N 1.4 (U), 3.72 (Mss), 6.8 (Mss); 8.37 (B); I 5.54 (Mss).

Six additions of καί are seen at O 1.108 (E), 9.57 (A); P 4.182 (E), 5.69 (Mss), 8.88 (B), 10.5 (E).

There are 5 additions of γε or γ’: O 6.50 (A), 6.100 (A); P 3.88 (Mss); N 3.53 (Mss); I 5.2 (Mss). Additions of μέν occur thrice: O 4.28 (A), 10.91 (vett.), 12.5 (G). One finds γέφ added at O 8.65 (A) and ἀν at N 6.50 (Mss).

The 12 additions of ἐν were noted at O 2.61 (B), 2.62 (Mss), 12.18 (A), 13.107 (B), 14.17 (Mss); P 1.35 (DEG), 3.102 (BDEG), 4.65 (BDG), 8.28 (pler.), 11.57 (Mss); N 1.63 (Mss), 3.46 (Mss).

Seven other prepositions are found added, among them ἐς thrice: at O 6.23 (B); P 4.129 (pler.), 5.77 (pler.). The other instances are: ἀνά P 11.56 (DEGN); ἀπό O 10.67 (B); ἐκ I 8.58 (Mss); ἔπι I 7.36 (Mss); παρά O 3.9 (B); σώ P 11.53 (Mss). Among articles and pronouns added are τοῦ O 13.18 (N); τῶν O 8.86 (C); τὶς N 7.16 (Mss); τὶ I 6.42 (Mss). Monosyllables added are ὡς P 1.32 (D); ὃ N 9.31 (D); Ἰεν ὡς O 7.49 (Mss), clearly a gloss; παῖς O 2.77 (Mss), from the scholia; χρῆ P 11.42 (Mss), to make sense after the misdivision at 41 of τὸ δὲ τεῶν into τὸ δὲ ἐτεῶν.

Disyllabic words added are O 7.81 (G) ταῦτα; O 9.83 (A) ἀἰ; O 13.52 (F) λέγων; I 4.35 (vett.) τέλος; I 4.64 (vett.) δί; O 4.11 (D) ὑμνοῦν; O 8.9 (A) ἔχων, the result of the scribe’s taking the vocative ἐλος for an accusative; P 6.50 (Mss) πάσας, an error through somebody’s having interpreted ὘ΡΓΑΣ as the noun ὃγαῖς instead of the verb ὃγαῖς.

Trisyllables added include P 1.92 (Mss) πετάσως; P 6.46 (Mss) ἀπάσαν (cf. the addition of πάσας four lines later); O 1.73 (V) καλέων; O 2.62 (A) ἄμοιθον (a gloss); O 13.107 (B) ἄρατο; O 9.99 (A) μέμικτα, after ἀγλαται, by memory of O 1.91. The quadrisyllable Ἡρακλῆς is added at O 10.25. In about half of these additions an ecdotic or a glossing mentality is clearly at work. The addition or substitution of glosses will be discussed later.

The faithful but uncritical scribe of B has several double writings: of one word at N 9.33; 3 words at N 7.30; 4 at N 9.49 and 4 at N 9.53; 7 at N 7.31f; and 16 at I 4.48. These are all in the less worked over Nemeans and Isthmians.

Transpositions of word-order occur in the manuscripts, the great
majority being of pairs of words immediately adjacent: these can be listed briefly by mentioning the words of the correct text, as editors reconstitute it, followed by the sigla of manuscripts that transposed the words. O 3.29 ἑλαφος θήλειαν CN; O 6.82 λυγράς ἀκόνας Bergk, to avoid hiatus, as in the Mss; O 7.93 'έχει θαλίας Α; O 7.94 μια μοίρα pler.; O 8.43 φάσμα λέγει O; O 10.22 παιδοί τινες DEGV; O 10.35 'Επείων βασιλείας BDEGV; O 10.79 νίκας ἀγεράχων O; O 13.22 ἐν δὲ ] δ' ἐν N; P 2.52 παρέδωκε' ἐμὲ δὲ ] παρέδωκε δ' ἐμὲ E; P 2.78 μάλα τοῦτο CV; P 4.171 τρεῖς ἀκαμαντομάχαι C; P 4.280 μέγαρον Βάττου Mss; P 5.23 οὲ μῆ Mss; P 5.70 Ἅργει τε ] τ' ἄργει V; P 6.44 νῦν δὲ Mss; P 8.97 φήγος ἐπεστῶν Mss; P 11.34 γέροντα ξένον Vett.; N 6.27 ακοποῦ άντα Mss; N 7.4 ἀδελφέαν ἔλαχομεν B; N 7.43 δὲ περισσὰ Mss; N 7.81 θρόνων ὑμνῶν pler.; N 8.31 ἐν πολυφθόρισι Mss; N 10.48 χειρῶν τε D; I 1.47 ἄλλοις ἄλλοις D; I 4.70 τέκε οἱ Mss; I 4.73 τέρμι' ἄθλων ] ἄθλων τέρμα Mss; I 7.8 πυκναῖς, Τείρεσιο ] τείρεσιο πυκναίς Mss; I 8.41 χέιρας 'Άρει D.

I 8.36 γόνων ἀνακτα πατρός τεκεῖν of the Mss should not be transposed, with Ahlwardt, for the text will scan as a glyconic, either with double short base, or by lengthening the -ov, as Fennell allows.

A few transpositions involve more than pairs of juxtaposed words: O 1.65 προῆκαν νῦν ἀθάνατοι οἱ ] οἱ προῆκαν νῦν ἀθάνατοι vett.; P 1.42 αοφοὶ καὶ χεροὶ ] χεροὶ καὶ αοφοὶ C; P 9.24 παῖδον ἐπὶ γλεφάρως γνών ] γνών ἐπὶ βλεφάρως παῖδον V; N 7.37 πλαγχθέντες δ' εἰς 'Εφύραν ίκοντο ] ίκοντο δ' εἰς 'Εφύραν πλαγχθέντες Mss. At P 12.29 F and V ante corr. write the phrase ἦτοι σάμερον δαίμων after the word χρόνος, which is the eighth word later.


Patronymic endings are apt to go wrong, as at P 5.28 Βασιδάν ] βασιδαν vett.; N 4.47 Τελαμωνίας ] τελαμωνίδαι V; N 8.12 Πελο-πηνίαι ] πελοπηνίάι MSS; I 6.38 Ἀμφίτρυνιάδαν ] ἀμφίτρυνιάδαν B; I 8.56 Ἀτρείδαιοι ] ἀτρείδαιοι MSS. At N 6.31 Didymos had a variant, Βοδίδαιοιν, for Βασισίδαιον of the paradox, which raises a query.

A large number of variants arise from scribal preferences in spelling and in the choice of dialectal variant forms. It is of little interest to detail such variants as those at P 1.85 κρέσσων, κρείσσον, κρείσσων, representing different attempts to interpret Pindar's original ΚΡΕΣΣΩΝ. Collators commonly neglect the Atticisations that appear in the manuscripts. Since Pindar was partly educated at Athens, one cannot be sure that he never used an Atticism. After all, it would be genuine Panhellenism to mix dialects, even if the lyric diction had long been dominated by Aeolic, Doric and West Greek influences. Some Ionic forms may be epicisms. On the other hand, hyperdorisms present some interest, e.g. O 13.50 μάτιν ΝΟ; O 13.67 φώνασε ΜSS; P 1.20 τιθάνα C; P 3.7 ὀρῶν B; P 4.270 ἰατὰρ E; I 1.3 θάσομαι D. Scribes are capricious in switching between shorter and longer forms of dative plurals, e.g. O 7.34 χρυσάεας ὑπεράτ[ειας] Mss; O 7.57 ἄλμυροίς [ἀλμυροί] pler.; O 8.26 παντοδαποῖον ἰατερός pler. Dialect is more consistent in the papyri than in the mediaeval manuscripts.

The scribes' tendency to normalize or trivialize is not uniform, and sometimes they slip in a more poetic or dialectally recondite form, e.g. an Aeolic participle in -αῖς for -ας; G has -ας. The bewildering variety of their practices may be illustrated by a more or less random selection of collation variants: O 9.83 ἢλθον [ἡλθον] vett.; P 3.99 ἢλθον [ἡλθον] CV; O 10.91 ἔρξας ὑπεράτ[ειας] A; O 11.10 πραπίδεσσων πραπίδεσσων C; O 10.36 στερε[ῷ] στερε[ῷ] NO; O 10.24 θέμιτες [θέμιτες] A; O 14.12 αἰέναν [ἀέναν] Mss; O 14.5 ύμιν ὕμιν Mss; P 1.92 εὐτράπλοισ] εὐτραπέλοισ pler.; P 2.16 χρυσοχαίτα χρυσοχαῖτα vett.; P 2.49 τέκμαρ τέκμωρ C V1; P 2.79 ἄχοιοσ] ἄχοισας B; P 2.95 λακτίζεμεν] λακτιοδέμεν CV; P 3.14 ἀκερεκόμῳ BCV ἀκερεκόμῳ DEG: Pindar has the first


Comparatives and superlatives are misapplied at O 2.62 ἀπονέστερον] ἀπονέστατον C; O 7.26 φέρτατον] φέρτερον A; P 11.52 μακροτέρῳ] μακροτάτῳ DG; N 1.11 μεγάλων] μεγίστων DV.

Loss of augment sometimes occurs in Mss: O 5.5 ἐγέραρεν] γέραρεν pler.; O 6.78 ἐδώρησαν] δώρησαν pler.; O 10.47 ἐθηκε Byz. ἐθηκε Mss (perhaps licit in syncopated iambic dimeter); N 10.70 ἡλάσε] ἠλάσε D.

Inflectional endings are liable to be changed, sometimes clearly under the influence of the context, but elsewhere from no discernible cause. A change of gender often results, as at O 6.14 φαιδίμος φαιδίμους EN; O 6.17 ἀμφότερον ἀμφότερα N; P 4.79 ἀμφότερα ἀμφότερον pler.; I 1.6 ἀμφότεραν ἀμφότερος D; O 7.81 κλεινῇ κλεινῷ A; O 9.79 δαμασιμβρότου δαμασιμβρότας B; O 9.100 πολλοὶ πολὺ A prim.; N 11.6 πολλὰ πολλοὶ B; O 9.108 τοῦτο τοῦτον C; O 10.58 πρῶτὰ πρῶτος B, πρῶτα D; O 14.22 νέων νέον B; P 1.35 φερτέρου φερτέρα DV; P 1.82 μεῖών μεῖον C; P 2.79 βαθῶν βαθῶ MSS; P 3.100 ἀθανάτα ἀθάνατος E; P 5.122 μέγας μέγα V; P 11.58 κράτιστον κρατιστῶν pler.; N 8.18 ποντία ποντίῳ D; N 9.8 αὐτάν αὐτὸν MSS; N 10.41 ὅσαις ὅσοις D; N 10.78 ἀντίος ἀντία B; I 7.36 ἐσχάταις ἐσχάταιοι D; Ν 4.20 τῷ τὴν B; I 8.71 τὸν τὸ D; N 3.68 τάνδε τάδε D; P 6.21 τὰ τὰν MSS; N 2.2 τὰ τὸ TU; P 10.64 ὀσπερ ὀσπερ E.

One notes some examples of change from neuter plural to neuter singular or the reverse: O 1.52 ἀπορὰ [ἀπορον] vett.; N 3.45 ὅσο [ὅσον MSS; P 4.31 δεῖν’ δείσον D; O 7.45 ἀτέκμαρτα ἀτέκμαρτον MSS; P 10.63 ἀτέκμαρτον ἀτέκμαρτα I. It is odd that dative singulars turn into plurals six times, and the contrary process occurs once: O 7.79 θεῶ θεῶς A; O 10.21 παλάμις παλάμιοι AC; O 10.41 ἀβουλία [ἀβουλίας] vett.; N 4.37 ἐπιβολίαν ἐπιβολίαις V; O 10.62 ἀρματὶ ἀρμασίν B; P 10.27 αὐτῷ αὐτοῖς pler.; N 10.8 βέλεσον βέλει D.

Confusion of the endings -οις and -οι occurs: O 2.45 δόμοις δόμοι A; O 14.23 εὐδόξους εὐδόξοι MSS; P 9.78 σοφοῖς σοφόι B; I 1.5 ἀγαθοὶ ἀγαθὸν D; P 1.66 πολέμοιο πολέμου MSS. Change of government of a preposition is noted twice: O 6.40 λόχαιμα ὑπὸ κυνάεις λόχαιμα ὑπὸ κυνάεις A; O 8.48 ἐπ’ ἰσθμῆ ποντία ἐπ’ ἰσθμὸν ποντίαν D prim. E.

Other changes are too random to classify: O 1.24 εὐάνορι εὐάνορος v.l. in ACN; O 1.114 βασιλεύσι] βασιλεύ D; O 2.27 Ζεὺς [ζεῦς G; O 2.46 ἔχοντα ἔχοντι pler.; O 3.4 Μοῖα Mοία] μοῖαι C; O 3.42 αἰδοίεστατον αἰδοίεστατος A; O 5.4 Καμάρινα καμάριν vett.; O 6.75 πρῶτοι ]
In the inflections of verbs a good many changes occur in tense, at a few places one can see scribes conflating variants that may have been in the relevant antigraph: O 13.52 Κορίνθω [κορίνθω] NO, κορίνθων ou G; P 5.49 μνημή [μνημήν CV, μνημήν B, μνημή D, μνημίαν G; N 3.47 σώματα [σώματι D, σωμάτι B, N 6.19 'Ἰαθμοὶ [Ἰαθμῷ B, Ἰαθμοῦ D; N 6.56 παντὶ] παντὸς D, conflating παντὶ with a variant παντὸς; N 7.41 κτέαν' ἄγων] κτέατ' ἄγων D, suggesting that his antigraph had κτέατ' ἄγων.
Some changes of verbal inflection affect mood, including hac vice the infinitive and participle: O 1.100 στεφανώσαι; στεφανώσαι B; O 2.21 πέμπῃ [πέμποι C, πέμψῃ A; O 2.17 δύνατον δύναται E; O 6.102 παρέχοι] παρέχει G; O 6.69 κτίσῃ κτίσει B, κτίσει E; O 6.76 ποιιστάξῃ ποιιστάξει ABEN; O 7.42 θέμενοι θέμεναι O; O 8.11 ἐσπερ’ ἐσπερη’ D, ἐσπερην D; I 3.18 διεστίχων διεστίχων MSS; I 4.80 κωμάξομαι κωμάξομαι B; I 5.13 ἀκοῦῃ ἀκοῦσῃ D; I 5.57 καταβρέχει καταβραχεὶ D; I 6.53 κέκλευ κέκλετ’ MSS.

Though in general, as is well known, and exemplified by inflectional changes, the ends of words are more liable to be corrupted by scribes than the starts, yet there is a contrary tendency in regard to prepositions dropped from or added to verbs and other classes of word. Loss is commoner than addition, as witness: O 2.92 ἔνορκιον ] ἕρκιον C; O 8.40 ἀνόρουσε ] ἀνόρουσε Α; O 9.58 ἀναρπάζων ] ἀναρπάζω AV; P 1.26 προσδέσθαι ] ἰδέσθαι V; P 4.25 ἐπέτοσε ] ἐτοσε E; P 4.217 ἐκδιδάσκησεν ] διδάσκησε CV; P 4.271 προσβάλλοντα ] βάλλοντα CV; P 5.107 ἐπαινεύοντι ] αἰνεύοντι vett.; P 10.32 ἐσελθὼν ] ἐλθὼν DG; P 10.60 ὑπέκνιξε ] ἐκνίξε Mss; N 4.61 ἔφερεν ] ἔφερε D; N 7.12 ἑνέβαλε ] ἑβάλε Mss; I 6.56 ἀναγήσασθ’ ] ἀγάνησασθ’ Mss; I 8.3 ἀναγείρετω ] ἀγείρετω D; I 8.34 ἐπάκουσαν Triclinius ] ἕκουσαν D, defended by Farnell as a molossus responding to a choriamb. Examples of addition of a preposition in composition are: O 10.87 τὸ πάλιν ] τοῦμπαλιν vett.; O 10.93 πνεύμας ] ἐμπνεύμας NO; P 1.45 ἀντίνοις ] ἐναντίον C; P 4.285 ἐφίζω ] ἐφείζω C; N 7.41 ἔγουν ] ἀνάγουν D.

Copyists are liable to error in both elision and non-elision. Sometimes they elide a vowel before an initial syllable where a digamma has been lost or where Homer allows hiatus and Pindar imitates Homer.

At O 6.30 παῖδ' ἱσπλόκαμον vett. and I 7.23 δ' ἱσπλοκάμοισι Mss, the elisions arose through loss of initial digamma, and, in light of the possibility of resolved syllables in a strophic responson, all is well if we read παῖδα ἱσπλόκαμον and δὲ ἱσπλοκάμοισι.

Errors of non-elision include: O 13.7 ταμ' ] ταμία Mss; O 13.52 ψεύσομ' ] ψεύσομα vett.; P 3.63 ἐναι' ] ἐναιεν vett.; I 2.40 ὑπέστειλ'] ὑπέστειλεν vett.; P 8.100 κἀγαθῶ ] καὶ ἀγαθῶ vett. is an example of non-crasis.

Erroneous singling or doubling of consonants contributes some wrong words and unmetrical forms to the Pindar paradosis, as P 4.7 κτίσσειν ] κτίσσειν BCV, whence κτήσσειν D; N 1.60 ἕκκάλεσαν ] ἔκκαλεσαν B; N 2.23 δ' ἐν Νεμέα [ δ' ἐνεμέα D; N 5.52 Χάρισσων ] χάρισων Mss; N 10.75 τέγνων ] τέγνων D; O 4.9 ἰππον ] ἰππον A Cae V; O 10.14 μέλει ] μέλλει BCV; O 13.71 τόσα ] τόσα pler.; P 3.25 λήμα ] λήμμα CD; P 4.71 ἄλοις ] ἄλλοις D; P 4.195 ἄματα ] ἄματα B; P 5.71 ἐνασεν ] ἐνασάν D.


pler. ἀστεί becomes ἀστεί at O 10.86 (Mss) and P 10.54 (pler.) and ἀστεί at I 4.20 (B). τοστε becomes ποστε at P 2.89 (D) and τοστε becomes ποστε at I 2.6 (B). P 9.112 ποστε [τοστε] τε V; N 9.13 ποστε τε D; P 9.33 νυν μέν DG; N 11.17 μέν μέν Mss; O 9.10 τοστε δ G; P 1.74 δ] δς E.

Connectives are particularly liable to be confused, especially unexpectedly. δε or δ' became τε or θ' at O 13.107 (C), P 11.28 (D), N 10.56 (D), and in CNO at O 10.97, 13.3 and 13.29. It became γαφ at O 2.22 (A), καδ at O 10.69 (A), γε at P 4.211 and P 3.36 in C, δ at N 1.58 (TU), and δη at P 11.25 (vett.). δη became δε at N 10.75 (Mss) and N 5.15 (D). τε or τ' became δε or δ' at O 2.10 (ACD), O 11.19 (EF), O 13.37 (CNO), O 13.103 (CNO), O 13.111 (O); γε at P 9.63 (E), and τοι at O 13.11 (B). ουδε became ουστε at O 14.8 (Mss) and I 8.62 (D). P 6.10 ουστε [ου πλερ.; ου 11.21 ουστε] ουδην A; O 11.18 μητε] μηδεν Mss. μεν became μαν at P 4.50 (vett.), N 2.14 (vett.) and O 13.104 (NO), μεν] μαν at O 2.25 (C), and δε (by a polar error) at P 6.23 (V). μαν became μεν at N 10.29 (Mss), O 13.104 (NO), N 9.39 (D), N 1.69 (TU), and became καδ at I 4.37 (D). P 10.58 καδ] τε vett.; P 4.277 καδι] δη V; O 3.43 γε] δη AD; O 13.65 γε] τε C; I 8.11 γε] τε D. At I 2.24 (D) and P 4.87 (C) τι is reported as becoming τοι. Conversely, τοι became τι at O 8.59 (BE), P 1.87 (E), and N 3.76 (D). τοι became τε at O 7.93 (A) and P 5.122 (V).

268 TYPES OF SCRIBAL ERROR IN MANUSCRIPTS OF PINDAR


Finally, here are confusions where two or more syllables have been affected in disyllabic or longer words: O 2.14 κόμισον] κόσμησον T; O 2.63 ἀκμᾷ] ἀλκᾷ B; O 2.69 ἐκατέρωθι] ἐκάτερθε C; O 2.77 ὑπέρτατον] ὑπατων vett.; O 3.32 θαύματε] θάμβατε A; O 5.26 κτέασι] κτεάν σι A; O 6.91 ἀγαθεγκτων] ἀφθόγγων A; O 6.97 μολπα] πολλαὶ C; O 7.57 βέθεσιν] βέθεσι Q; O 8.87 ἄχων] ἄχων A; O 10.49 ἀνάκτων] ἀθανάτων C; P 1.26 προσώπου] πυθόθαι DEG; P 1.79 εὐθείαν] εὐανδρὸν B; P 1.92 εὐστάτου] εὐστατεῖος C; P 2.43 ἀνθρώποις CV; P 2.59 κτέασι] κτεάσι CV; P 2.92 μητρον] μηχανώτα σι B; P 3.76 πότον] πότρον CV; P 4.106 κοιμίζου] κοιμίζων B; P 4.113 μίγα] μετὰ B, μέγα E prim., μέσα C prim.; P 4.213 διτάτων] δικτήτων BDEG; P 4.263 διτάτου] διτόμου CV; P 4.271 τρώμαν]
Spelling blunders and miscellaneous confusions that result in more or less nonsense may be noted here and there in the sixteen manuscripts considered: they help to complete the picture of the scribes' propensities and general reliability or otherwise, which varies with individuals. O 1.27 ἑκατομένον | κεκατομένον N; O 1.34 μάρτυρες ] μάρτυροι D (after ἐπίλουσα); O 1.50 ἀμφὶ δεύτερα ] ἀμφὶ δεύτερα V prim., ἀμφὶδευρα Athenaeus; O 1.86 ἐφάπαξ ἐφάπαξ E; O 2.53 δεδαιμονέοις ] δαιδαλμέοις DEG; O 2.65 τιμίοις ] ταμίοις B; O 2.73 χερσόθεν ] χρυσόθεν DE prim. (under the influence of χρυσόθ 72); O 6.62 Ὄλυμπιάς ] ὄλυμ B1; O 6.40 κυκνεάς ] κυκνεάες C; O 6.97 ἑφέρπον ] εὐφέρπον O; O 6.103 εὕθυν δὲ πλάον καμάτων ] εὕθυν πλάον καμάτων δ᾽ A; O 8.41 Ποσειδάν ] ποσείδαν E; O 9.2 κεχλαδόως ] κεχλαδῆς E; O 9.14 ἐλελίζων ] ἐγχελίζων G, perhaps thinking of cels for lunch; O 10.16 ἐν Ὀλυμπιάδι νικῶν ] ἐν ὄλυμπιανικῶν Α; O 12.19 λουτρά | λουτράν Α (Νυμφᾶν precedes); O 13.26 γένοιο ] μένοιο B; O 10.85 φάνεν ] φάνα G, φάναι E, φάναι E, conflating the variants; O 13.20 ἔντεσον ] ἐντεσῆι N; O 13.72 ἐδοξέων ] ἐδοξέων E; O 13.78 δαμασκάφρονα ] δαμασκάφρονα O; P 1.30 γαίας ] γαῖη D; O 1.69 ἀγητῆρ ] ἀγηστῆρ DGV; P 4.25 ἐπέτοσεν ] ἐποσσε B1; P 4.133 παρεκοινάθ'] πᾶσι κοινάθ BCIV; P 4.136 ἐρασιπλοκάμου ]


The Pindar paradosis seems not to have suffered severely from the intrusion of glosses by addition or substitution. The additions of τις N 7.16, Ζεύς O 7.49, παίς O 2.77, χρή P 11.42, δι I 4.64, ἀπασαν P 6.46, πάσας P 6.50, πετάσαις P 1.92, in all older Ms's, and of Ἠρακλῆς O 10.25 in all but A, derive mainly from ancient editorial rather than strictly glossing activities. But at O 11.15, for Zeφυρίων most Ms's write τῶν ἐπιζεφυρίων, clearly a gloss, just as at O 10.13, where A and B have ἐπιζεφυρίων for Zeφυρίων.

At O 2.52, the true reading may be ἀφροσύναν, supported by POxy. 2092, and the manuscripts' δυσφροσύναν may derive from an old gloss.
on that. At O 9.102, A's ἀρέσθαι gets some support from Aristides's error ἀρέσθαι, and the reading ἀνελέσθαι of most of the veteres may derive from a gloss, ἔλεσθαι, made compound by dittography from the end of the preceding word, ἀφονοιαν.

Some individual Mss have gloss additions. At O 4.11, D adds ὅμοιον after κῶμοι. At O 2.62, A writes ἀμομχον after ἀπονέστερον. At P 8.92, Q adds χρώνῳ after ὀλίγῳ. Among the confusions of longer words the main candidates for the status of substituted glosses are B's μηχανών-ται for μητίονται at P 2.92 and C's τράμια for τρώμαν at P 4.271. At P 4.71, P’s δεσμοῖς replacing ἀλοιας is a clear example of gloss substitution. Not very doubtful is μερος substituted for γέρας at O 7.68 in A and C, and in B as a γρ(άφεται) variant. In T at O 13.108 βωμὸς has been extruded by δῖος, a gloss on Λυκαίων. At O 3.9, for πρεπόντως, B writes Θήρωνος, plainly derived from a gloss on Αὐνασιδάμων παιδι earlier in the line. At P 5.62, T writes for μη ταιμίς the curious mixture μη τὰ τῶ μια, having wrongly copied in from its antigraph the article τῷ added over ταιμίς.

There are in the paradosis a few readings that look less like glosses than like possible author's variants. At O 2.27, after the end of the strophe, we find the veteres offering the phrase φιλέοντι δὲ Μοῖσαι. Aristophanes had athetized it, according to the scholiast in A, and it is clearly extra metrum. Either it arose from some reader's marginal noting of a parallel passage, or else it could have come from Pindar's original draft. In specifying the deities who showed affection for Semele he might have thought of starting his antistrophe with a reference to the Muses, and written down φιλέοντι Μοῖσαι. He then abandoned that idea, and went on to write of Semele's sister Ino, with the words, at 28, λέγοντι δ’ ἐν καὶ θαλάσσῃ. Some later copyist of Pindar's holograph read the cancelled words, and copied them with the more or less automatic addition of a δὲ to avoid asyndeton. Whatever the source of the error, it is a proof of the conservativeness of copyists that it should have survived past the age of the Tzetzes brothers.

There is an interesting variant at N 5.52, where the better manuscript B offers the text

\[
\ldots \phiθέγξαε \ ἐλείν \ 'Επιδαύρῳ τριπλόαν
\nuκώντ' \ ἀρετάν, \ldots
\]

D, independent and usually inferior, offers διπλόαν, which is hardly
likely to arise from mere scribal confusion of mind, though that cannot be excluded. In the same ode, at 29, B offers

\[\text{ψευσταν δὲ ποιητόν συνεπαξε λόγον,}\]

where D writes the perfectly possible variant \(\text{συνέπλεξε}\). It could, of course, arise from corruption of \(\text{ΣΥΝΕΠΑΞΕ}\) to \(\text{ΣΥΝΕΠΛΑΞΕ}\) in uncial, altered to \(\text{συνέπλεξε}\). But perhaps D at 29 and 52 has Pindar’s first thoughts, and B his corrections, on being informed of a further victory at Epidaurus for which occasion the ode might have been revived.

There is a curious group of variants at N 3.56, where Pindar tells of Cheiron supervising the marriage of Thetis. Recent editors print

\[\text{νύμφευσε δ’ αὐτής ἀγλαόκολπον} \]
\[\text{Νηρέως θύγατρα, ...}\]

\(\text{ἀγλαόκολπον}\) appears in B in linea and, according to Turyn, perhaps in D ante correcturam. Also attested is \(\text{ἀγλαόκαρπον}\) by B supra, perhaps D ante correcturam (again according to Turyn), and by Triclinius. It could be derived from \(\text{καρπός}\) (B), “wrist”. D post correcturam offers \(\text{ἀγλαόκρανον}\), which would be a \(\text{ hàρακα}\), “with glorious head”, in contrast to the Homeric epithet for her, \(\text{ἀργυρόπεζα}\), “with silvery foot” (or “slipper”). The less reputable manuscript V offers in linea \(\text{ἀγλαόκαρπον}\), a variant of D’s final reading, and writes above the odd word \(\text{ἀγλαόκολπον}\). As candidates for author’s variants perhaps we should take seriously \(\text{ἀγλαόκολπον}\) and \(\text{ἀγλαόκαρπον}\), which might have been Pindar’s first thought, in the sense “fair-wristed”, later dropped because his hearers would be likely to take it in the sense “with glorious crops”, which would not suit Thetis.

Aristarchos is the authority for an interesting variant at P 3.43, where Apollo is rescuing the babe Asklepios from the cremation of Koronis. The paradox offers us

\[\text{ἀς φάτο βάματι δ’ ἐν πρώτῳ κιχῶν παιδ’ ἐκ νεκροῦ} \]
\[\text{ἀρπασε...}\]

But the scholiasts say that Aristarchos read \(\tauριτάτω\). This would be, they claim, a paraphrase of Homer’s verse about Poseidon, ll. 13.20,

\[\text{τρὶς μὲν ὀρέξατ’ ἰὼν, τὸ δὲ τέτρατον ἰκετὸ τέκμωρ, ...}\]

In fact, if Pindar were imitating that, he would rather have written \(\tauτριτάτω\): therefore the scholiasts’ reference to Homer is probably
erroneous. But they are right in remarking ἐστὶ δὲ σεμνότερον καὶ πρέπον τῷ θεῷ τὸ ἄμα τῷ πρῶτῳ βάματι ρύσασθαι τὸν παῖδα. Clearly Aristarchos’s variant is less effective poetically. But whence did he derive it? It is an unlikely corruption for a scribe to make. Moreover, it raises a metrical question of responson. The resolution is licit if what it is now fashionable to call “dactylo-epitrites” are really a type of Aeolic metre, polyschematist choriambics, which is indeed suggested by the fact that both Pindar and Bacchylides admit in them the Aeolic colon called “Pherecratean.” Perhaps the most likely solution is that Pindar first wrote πρινάτω and later thought of the more sweepingly swift and hyperbolic πρῶτῳ.

In the third Nemean, at 75, Aristarchos supports B in reading:

εἷς δὲ καὶ τέσσαρας ἀρετὰς

θνατὸς αἰῶν [αἰῶν B], φρονεῖν δὲ ἐνέπει τὸ παρκεῖμενον.

“And mortal life drives four virtues (like a chariot team), and bids us think thoughts appropriate to the time present.” But D and V offer what may be an author’s variant, <δ> μακρὸς αἰῶν, “a full lifetime, the full span of life.” Neither θνατὸς nor μακρὸς is a probable copyist’s error for the other. Farnell correctly defends the view that Pindar is thinking of the four virtues “of the old popular morality inherited by Plato, courage, temperance, justice, wisdom.” Probably Simonides’s τετράγωνον (fr. 4 Diehl, 37 = 542 Page) relates to the Pythagorean reformulation of the same traditional view that the perfectly virtuous man is a “square.” Pindar’s image of the chariot team of virtues anticipates in part Plato’s image in the Phaedrus (246) of the soul’s chariot pair. But what would be the point of Pindar’s changing from θνατὸς to μακρὸς, if indeed he did so? It is rational enough to speak of a human life driving a team of virtues, but by changing to μακρὸς Pindar gains emphasis for the thought that a full span of life is desirable to realize adequately all the four virtues.*

* For helpful criticisms of a draft of this paper I am greatly obliged to Professor Kenneth J. Dover and Mr Nigel G. Wilson.