PINDAR, OLYMPIAN 2.5–7, TEXT AND COMMENTARY—WITH EXCURSIONS TO ‘PERICTIONE’, EMPEDOCLES AND EURIPIDES’ HIPPOLYTUS

I THE CRUX AND THE SOLUTION

In 1998, I suggested a new text for a notably corrupt passage in Pindar’s Isthmian 5.¹ This article is in effect a sequel to that earlier discussion. In the 1998 article, I proposed, inter alia, that the modern vulgate text of I. 5.58, ἔλπιδον ἔκκινσ’ ὀπίς, is indefensible and the product of scribal corruption in antiquity, and that chief among the indefensible products of corruption there is the supposed secular use of ὀπίς, as if used to mean something like ‘zeal’. This (as I hope to have demonstrated) is a sense for which there is no good evidence in classical Greek, where ὀπίς always has a delimited religious denotation, meaning either (a) ‘gods’ response’, ‘divine retribution’, or else (b) ‘religious awe’ or ‘reverence’ towards the gods, through fear of that response or that retribution. If we discount I. 5.58 itself (and likewise the focus of the present article, O. 2.6), all the pre-Hellenistic attestations can be straightforwardly listed under these headings: (a) II. 16.388 θεόν ὀπίς ὀλέγοντες, Od. 14.88 ὀπίδος κρατερὸν δέος, Hes. Theog. 221–2 θεόν…| …ἀπ’ τὸ δῶσι κακήν ὀπίς, Pind. P. 8.71–2 θεόν ὀπίς | ἀφθονόν αἰτέα, sim. Od. 20.215, 21.28, Hes. Op. 187, 251, 706, along with, seemingly, a fragmentary fifth-century Thessalian verse inscription, CEG 1.120.1 Hansen; (b) Hdt. 9.76.2 θεόν ὀπίς ἔχοντας, 8.143.2. In addition, one other instance can be interpreted as either (a) or (b), or in effect both: Od. 14.82 (of the suitors) ὀπίδα φρονέοντες…|…ὁδ’ ἐλεητῶν.² In all cases, though, ‘gods’ are specified, usually as a dependent genitive with ὀπίς, or else separately but in the near context.³ Hellenistic and later occurrences of the word are few, and (as I argued in 1998) hints there of a secular reading can actually be taken to reflect misunderstandings based on, precisely, the early corruption in I. 5.⁴

¹ ‘Pindar’s poetry and the obligatory crux: Isthmian 5.56–63, text and interpretation’, TAPhA 128 (1998), 25–88.
² Pace LSJ s.v. (‘in bad sense, as always in Hom.’) and comm.—who all assume sense (a) here, without proper discussion. In any Homeric passage, the word ὀπίδα in itself inevitably invites appeal to (a), the normal usage in Homer, but at 14.82 the parallel structure with ἐλεητῶν, as it emerges, points, at least momentarily, to (b): ‘giving no thought to reverence <for gods> or pity <for men>’. This, notwithstanding the fact that, one line later, retributive gods are invoked, and that, a few lines after that (14.88), the word is clearly to be taken in sense (a), both now and with retrospective implications for 14.82 itself.
³ As at Hes. Theog. 221–2, Hom. Od. 14.82–8 (cf. n. 2 above), Hdt. 8.143.2.
⁴ Silk (1998), 37–8. Hesychius, representatively, has the gloss, ὀπίς ἔπιστροφήν—interpreting the problem word as ‘care’, ‘regard’: a (mis)interpretation which, I have suggested, derives directly from the corrupt ὀπίς in the early text of I. 5.58 (Silk, ibid.). In post-classical usage, the word shows signs of becoming an icronym: Silk (2019), 325–6 with n. 133. Icronym: page 502 below.
In reviewing the evidence, I noted that the closest thing to an apparent parallel for the supposed secular sense of ὀπίς is another corrupt Pindaric sequence, this one in O. 2, in praise of Thero of Acragas. After quoting the text as printed by Snell–Maehler (O. 2.5–7), I offered some comments on the passage:

Θήρωνα δὲ τετραχώρις ἕνεκα νικαφόρου
gεγονητέον, ὀπί [sic] δίκαιον ἔξον, ἔρεισι' Ἀκράγαντος,
eὐωνύμων τε πετέρων ὅσων ὀρθόπολιν.

ὀπί δίκαιον ἔξον, ‘strict in his reverence towards strangers’ (LSJ): this is indeed the nearest thing to any sort of parallel for secular ὀπίς in classical Greek. . . .[But] this is only [Hermann’s] conjectural text, rightly described by [one] recent editor [Willcock (1995), ad loc.] as quite ‘uncertain’. All manuscripts (supported by P.Oxy. 1614) point us to ΟΠΙ δίκαιον ἔξον [which last word Hermann reinterpreted as the now universally accepted ἔξον], and in the Byzantine era, at least, ΟΠΙ was in fact interpreted as ὀπί, ‘voice’, and associated with the preceding word γεγονητέον (witness the scholiastic glosses ἐμμελεστάτω ἀσματι / ἐν λόγοις / φωνή [I. p. 110 Abel]). On metrical grounds this ὀπί (ὦ ὀπι) can hardly be right, since ὀ – is required; but then again, the ‘uncertain’ form ὀπί, which is accepted by most modern editors for its supposed metrical value ὀ – , is nowhere attested with [or, on inspection, without] this value; and a glance at the range of alternative conjectures [Gerber (1976), 32] is enough to dispel any cosy belief that ὀπί, or any part of ὀπίς, has even commended itself to all modern authorities on Pindar’s text.6

By way of clarification, I would now add that ὀπίς itself is not a common word, and is used only in restricted grammatical cases (chiefly the accusative),7 which makes the unattested ὀπι/ὀπι still more problematic, while the genitival relationship assumed by

---

5 On the papyrus, see page 505 below; on Hermann’s ἔξον, pages 501 and 509 below.

6 Silk (1998), 36–7. Turyn’s apparatus criticus indicates that all manuscripts have ὀπί, but G and H have ὀπί ante correctionem. This ὀπί was singled out and interpreted as ὀπί by Hermann in 1817. Snell–Maehler elide the facts.

7 Outside the accusative, the noun ὀπίς (always singular) seems only to have a marginal existence. The word is reliably attested thirteen times in pre-Hellenistic Greek (page 499 above), and sporadically later; of the thirteen attestations, ten are in the accusative form ὀπίς; two others are in the epic variant, ὀπίδα (Od. 14.82 and 20.215—so, later, Mosch. 4.117); one other in the genitive, ὀπίδος (Od. 14.88). The word is only attested in the nominative, ὀπίς, if one accepts Bergk’s conjecture at Tyrtaeus 10.12 West (as I more or less did in Silk [1998], 35: I am more sceptical now) or Meineke’s at Timo Phl. 802.2 Suppl. Hell. (not accepted by Lloyd-Jones–Parsons ad loc.), or the same scholar’s proposed emendation in ‘Perictione’ apud Stob. 4.25.50 Wachsmuth–Hense, or if one counts the citations in the grammatical and lexicographical traditions (like the Suda’s ὀπίς: Silk [1998], 37), along with their congeners in the Pindaric scholia (Silk, ibid.). The ‘Perictione’ passage deserves a separate discussion, if only because the conjecture might seem to assume a secular usage; see Appendix A (page 515) below. There is also one apparent—but only apparent—citation of ὀπί in the scholarly literature of later antiquity. In the latest text of Apollonius Sophista, Lex. Hom. (first/second century A.D.)—but this ‘latest text’ is Bekker’s text of 1833!—the entry for τρόφι (as in τρόφι κύμα κυκλίσσεται, II. 11.307) includes the comment: . . . ὥς ὀπί [sic] . . . ὧπο εὐθείας τῆς τρόφι: τρόφι . . . like ὀπί . . . from a nominative τρόφι. In itself, this clearly points to a reference to ὀπί, not ὀπί from ὀπι, like (supposedly) τρόφι from τρόφι. Concealed within the ellipses above, however, is a problematic sequence, the substantive part of which actually begins: προενεκτέον δὲ ὧς τρόφι . . . ([‘τρόφις’ is to be pronounced like τρόφι . . . ‘?!”]). The text for the entry evidently harbours some corruption, but it is hard to escape the conclusion that Apollonius Sophista, or his source, in essaying a derivation of τρόφι from a nominative *τρόφος (in preference to the established nominative τρόφος), has no good reason to invoke ὀπίς at all. Whatever the precise truth here, the entry hardly provides any consequential support for the assumption of a dative ὀπί, from ὀπίς—and none at all for the hypothetical ὀπί, because τρόφι is not ὀ – but (like ὀπί) ὀ ὀ. (My thanks to Eleanor Dickey for advice on this passage.)
Hermann’s ὃπι... ξένον⁸ only serves to highlight the anomalouness of a ‘reverence’ felt not for mighty gods (θεὸν ὅπιν ἐχοντας, Hdt. 9.76.2) but for vulnerable humans. Traditional Greek respect for strangers/guests indeed reflects, or is correlative to, the ultimate commitment to Zeus xenios (πρὸς... Δίος εἰσιν... | ξένοι, Od. 6.207–8), but feeling, or expressing, ὅπις for xenoi is as unlikely in this era as worshipping xenoi as gods themselves.⁹

Meanwhile, in an aside in my earlier discussion, I added:

To the crux in O. 2.6 I have no solution, but note that, besides importing the ad hoc and otherwise unattested form ὅπι, the ‘uncertain’ text (cont. Hermann) offers a sequence, δίκαιον... ἔρεισι... ἐνοφίημον τε πατέρων ἄνωτον, which is in effect a triadic structure, ABC τέ. Such a structure is not common in any period (‘rarely, τέ couples the last two units of an otherwise asyndetic sequence’: Denniston [1959], 501), and does not seem to occur in Pindar (see Slater [1969], 488–9).¹⁰

For this corrupt passage in O. 2, I now propose a solution: not, as it turns out, a new solution. That is: this article will champion and elucidate one of the numerous existing proposals for the passage.¹¹ I start by first assuming the prima facie plausibility of Hermann’s ξένον, not, indeed, because of its proposed connection with the hypothetical ὃπι¹² but on metrical grounds. In the sequence ξένον ἔρεισι’, the final syllable of ξένον must be heavy, (cor)responding to the final syllables of Ἀλφεοῦ (13), φιλεῖ (26), τελευτάσσομεν ἰ (33), πρέπει (46), δεδαιδαλμένος φ- (53), εὐρωκίας (66), δενδρέων (73), φιλά (86), πόλιν φ- (93). ξένον, before ἔρεισι’, would be ὅ φ, whereas ξένον gives the requisite φ.¹³ This ξένον, however, is not to be regarded as a textual emendation. It is a recognition that here, as elsewhere in Pindar, we have surviving traces of his use of the pre-ionic alphabet,¹⁴ in which O is indifferently o or ω. And, as will soon be apparent,¹⁵ Hermann’s ξένον is clearly right, as against the substantial implausibility of his ὃπι—a problematic form of a word¹⁶ in a problematic sense—which the discussion that follows will show to be yet more implausible.¹⁷

---

⁸ Not a problem in itself: cf. (e.g.) τοκέω... αίδο (P. 4.218).
⁹ In retrospect, one might well think that, as prospective support for the improbable secular ὅπιν vulgarly ascribed to I. 5.58, this improbable ὃπι is actually not secular enough.
¹⁰ Silk (1998), 37 n. 43.
¹¹ Gerber (1976), 32 lists fifteen.
¹² Nor indeed because, in a sequence Θήρων... ξένον, there would in fact be anything amiss in acclaiming Thero as a ‘just host’ through the phrase δίκαιον ξένον—a usage that evidently worried at least one ancient commentator (ξενοδοχικόν. ὃντι τοῦ δίκαιου καὶ εἰς τούς ξένους· οὐ γάρ αὐτός ἂν ξένος, Σ11b, I page 61 Drachmann). The noun ξένος, though commonly signifying ‘stranger’ or ‘guest’, is of course also used by classical authors in the sense ‘host’ (LSJ s.v. A.I.2), as by Pindar himself (e.g. of Hiero, O. 1.103).
¹³ The only alternative would be to take ξένον as brevis in longo, which is not unparalleled in Pindar (see e.g. Braswell on P. 4.184d), but not something to be assumed, and certainly not in (‘iambic’) mid period, as the relevant syllable would be.
¹⁴ See e.g. Braswell on P. 4.14d; Silk (1998), 48.
¹⁵ See pages 504 and 509–10 below.
¹⁶ The form would be paralleled in other comparably shaped words: i.e. as an epicism, like Homeric μήτη, alongside μητίδι, and Θετί, alongside gen. Θετιδος (there is no attested **όπιδι, but cf. the -δ- forms of ὃπις cited in n. 7 above: ὁπίδο and ὁπίδος), with μήτην and Θετίνν corresponding to ὃπιν. But with a word so obviously restricted in form (see n. 7), such parallels have little force.
¹⁷ See page 504 with n. 30 below. Hardly more plausible are proposals involving a conjectural ὃπιν. Hartung, for instance, proposed ὃπιν δίκαιον ξένον, which avoids the hypothetical ὃπι at the cost of a less idiomatic construction, while still retaining the problematic ὃπις itself.
Putting ὅπι aside, now, we can more profitably focus on the issue of the triadic structure, ABC ὅπι. Such a sequence, though it would be rash to call it impossible, is certainly suspect. On closer inspection, though, the sequence is seen to be not ABC ὅπι at all but something even more suspect. The point is that, on reflection, the C (the sequence ἀωτόν ὁρθόπολιν with which the sentence ends) cannot be regarded as a single phraseological unit, as the attested usage of ἀωτός/-ov makes clear. I have reviewed the usage of this curious word on two previous occasions: in 1974, by way of explaining how limited is its supposed association with ‘flowers’;\(^\text{18}\) and in 1983, in a discussion of its iconymic status, as a verse word ‘obsolete in the speech-community’, a word that has ‘lost its denotations’ and has no straightforward reference, but only ‘a few faint scattered connotations’.\(^\text{19}\) Let us now reconsider the usage of the word, from yet another perspective.

The word ἀωτός/-ov occurs twenty-eight (or very possibly twenty-nine) times in pre-Hellenistic Greek. In Homer the word is attested five times, with reference to wool or linen cloth: \textit{Il.} 9.661, 13.599, 13.716, \textit{Od.} 1.443, 9.434. The seeming coherence of that usage implies that in ἀωτός/-ov we have a rare example of a subsequent iconym whose original (pre-iconymic) meaning we seem to know\(^\text{20}\)—even if it is not at all obvious that our understanding of the post-Homeric outcomes is thereby enhanced. Those other twenty-three (or twenty-four) occurrences are all fifth-century, twenty of them in Pindar, and in all cases the word is used as if it meant\(^\text{21}\) something elusively complimentary in the range of ‘the best’, ‘the paragon’, ‘the consummation’, ‘the glory’, ‘the glorious product’, ‘the glorious reward’. In all cases, too, the word belongs to a phrase with a dependent genitive noun, as if ‘the paragon of . . .’, ‘the glorious product of . . .’, ‘the glorious reward for . . .’.\(^\text{22}\)

The occurrences fall into two groups. In the larger group \((a)\), the dependent genitive noun signifies a non-personal abstraction, or more concrete entity, indifferently singular or plural, with the genitival relation itself variable: in ‘Antigenes’, 1.3 Page \textit{FGE} (= Simon. 148 Bergk\(^\text{4}\)), ῥόδων ἀωτίς; and in Pindar, μοστικάς ἐν ἀωτῷ \textit{O.} 1.15, ἵππων ἀωτόν \textit{O.} 3.4, στεφάνων ἀωτόν γλυκύν (Pindar?) \textit{O.} 5.1, χειρῶν ἀωτόν . . . ἐπίνικον \textit{O.} 8.75, στεφάνων ἀωτόν \textit{O.} 9.19, ἱερὸν ἐυξίσσις ἀωτόν \textit{P.} 4.131, ἀωτός ὤνον \textit{P.} 10.53, ἵσθιμαιδών . . . κάλλιστον ἀωτὸν \textit{N.} 2.9, δίκως ἀωτός \textit{N.} 3.29, γλώσσας ἀωτὸν \textit{I.} 1.51, ζωᾶς ἀωτόν . . . τὸν ἄπλινστον \textit{I.} 5.12, ἀωτόν . . . στεφάνων \textit{I.} 6.4, σοφίας ἀωτὸν ἀκρόν \textit{I.} 7.18, Χάριτων ἀωτὸν \textit{I.} 8.16a, μέλιτος ἀωτόν γλυκύν \textit{fr.} 52f.59 \textit{S–M} (= \textit{Pae.} 6). In this group, however, the genitive, though variable, is never partitive. Thus, in \textit{O.} 3.4, for instance, the ἀωτόν ‘of the horses’ is not (e.g.) ‘the best of the horses’ but (something like) ‘the glorious tribute to the achievement of the horses’, namely Pindar’s poetic ‘tribute’, while in \textit{P.} 10.53 the ἀωτός ‘of songs’ is (something like) ‘the glorification arising from, or consisting in, this ode’; the ‘Antigenes’ is comparable (‘roses that glorify’).

In the second, smaller, group \((b)\), the whole phrase refers to a person or persons; the genitive is always partitive; and the genitive noun itself is always in the plural (or else the noun or the plurality are implicit): in Pindar, ναοτάν ἀωτοί \textit{P.} 4.188, ἥρων ἀωτοί

\(^{18}\) Silk (1974), 239–40.

\(^{19}\) Silk (1983), 311–12 (the quoted phrases) and 316–17 (ἀωτός/-ov); on iconyms, see also Silk (2019), 318–26.

\(^{20}\) Contrast such iconyms as ὁμοταμίας: Silk (1983), 328–9.

\(^{21}\) With iconyms, one should avoid speaking of the, or even α, ‘meaning’ without qualification.

\(^{22}\) In Aesch. \textit{Supp.} 666 the genitive is implied (n. 24 below).
N. 8.9, γεννησίων ἃτωτος fr. 6b(f) S–M, ἃτωτος ἱρών fr. 111a.7 S–M;\(^{23}\) in Bacchylides, Ἀθηνών <ἐὐ–>ανδρόν ἱεράν ἄτωτον 23.1 S–M (where ‘Athens’ is in effect metonymic for ‘Athenians’, and the supplement is Lobel’s); and in Aeschylus, ἄτωτον (sc. Ἀργείων) Supp. 666.\(^{24}\) Here, clearly, belongs the instance at O. 2.7, πατέρων ἄτωτον, while (the probable twenty-ninth attestation of the word) Page plausibly conjectured another instance at Aesch. Pers. 978, Περσῶν τὸν ἄτωτον.\(^{25}\)

The anomalousness of the supposed unitary phrase in O. 2, πατέρων ἄτωτον ὀρθόπολιν, comes into view when we scrutinize the structures of the phrasing in the post-Homeric passages. In most of the occurrences we find simple two-term phrases, ἄ. + genitive noun, as in δίκας ἃτωτος (group [a]: N. 3.29) or ναιστάν ἄτωτος (group [b]: P. 4.188). In four instances from the first group, ἄ. is additionally qualified by a simple intensifying adjective, hardly descriptive of the purported object (vel sim.): ἱερὸν εὐζώιας ἄτωτον (P. 4.131), Ἰσθμιάδων . . . κάλλιστον ἄτωτον (N. 2.9), ζωϊκὸς ἃτωτον . . . τὸν ἠλπινστόν (I. 5.12), σοφίας ἄτωτον ἄτρον (I. 7.18). In (Pindar’s?) O. 5.1, the qualifying adjective, in effect intensifying, is marginally more descriptive—στεφάνοιν ἄτωτον γλυκύν—while the same adjective occurs at fr. 52f.59 S–M: μέλλος ἄτωτον γλυκύν. In that last instance, one might still see the qualifier as intensifying, though it would make more sense to read it as metonymic (transferred epithet), semantically attachable to the genitive noun: the μέλλι is literally γλυκῦ. In the fragmentary sequence at Bacchyl. 23.1, from the second group, there is another metonymic transference—Ἀθηνῶν <ἐὐ–>ανδρόν ἱερὰν ἄτωτον—where it is Athens itself that is full of ‘good men’ and the Athenians themselves (implied in the name of the city) who actually are those ‘good men’. Then, in one Pindaric passage from group (a), O. 8.75, an adjectival metonymy is operative on a more elaborate basis: χειρῶν ἄτωτον Βλεψιάδαις ἐπινικον—where a ceremonial crown is ‘victorious reward for hands . . . , that is, (in full) ‘glorious reward for hands that produced victory <in the wrestling competition> for a new honorand from> the Blepsiad clan’.

The seeming collocation in O. 2.7, πατέρων ἄτωτον ὀρθόπολιν, is different in kind from any of these instances. The adjective is neither intensifying nor metonymic: it makes a new point, and its referent lies wholly outside the genitive phrase. It is not the ‘fathers’ who make, or keep, ‘the city upright’ but Thero, the honorand and focus of the praise: he is ὀρθόπολις. As such, though grammatically and positionally attachable to the ἄτωτον phrase, the adjective is logically and semantically separate, and is thus, and would surely be felt as, a separate and self-contained item of praise. In effect, then, the weighty compound adjective ὀρθόπολιν would constitute a fourth, final member of the list: δίκασιον . . . , ἐρείσια . . . , . . . ἄτωτον, ὀρθόπολιν. Compare, for instance, the similarly weighty compound adjective that constitutes the final member of a shorter list at O. 13.4–5: τῶν ὀλίβων Κόρινθον, Ἰσθμιοῦ | πρόθυρον Ποτειδάδονος, ἀγλαϊκώροφον. But if ὀρθόπολιν is a separate member, the list as it supposedly stands is now wholly anomalous: ABC τε D—a sequence much more improbable than ABC τε

\(^{23}\) In these last two cases, sufficient context is lacking to make it entirely certain that the genitives are partitive, but they give every sign of being so.

\(^{24}\) Ἀργείων, implied by ἰῆς (663), ἀνδρῶν (659), Ἀργείως (625).

\(^{25}\) The relative coherence of this group, and especially of the genitival usage in it, raises the possibility that here, as often with iconyms (Silk [1983], 314), some re-etymological association is operative, albeit here one of an unusual kind. Specifically: is ἄτωτος in group (b) felt as a quasi-superlative form, on the analogy of the similar-sounding próς in uses like πρός ἄνθρωπον πλοῦτος (Hdt. 7.27.2)? Cf. the discussion of πατέρων ἄτωτον, page 511 below.
itself. Is such a counter-intuitive sequence ever attested in classical Greek? There is certainly nothing like it in Pindar, and no sign of anything like it elsewhere.26

The obvious implication is that Pindar’s ὅ cannot connect two members (supposedly the last two members) of the list but two items within a single member. That is: the accepted division of phrases is wrong, and the accepted punctuation misleading.27 Pindar’s list ends not Ἀκράγαντος | εὐνούμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον ὅρθόπολιν but, rather, Ἀκράγαντος | εὐνούμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον, ὅρθοπολιν.28 From which it follows that the division assumed for the previous member is wrong as well: so, not . . . ἔξενον, ἔρεισι ’Ἀκράγαντος | εὐνούμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον (where ἔξενον goes with the as yet undetermined word[s] preceding), but ἔξενον ἔρεισι’, Ἀκράγαντος | εὐνούμων τε πατέρων ἄωτον.

All of which leaves us with a shorter problem-sequence to come to terms with: not (let us now confine ourselves to Pindaric capitals)29 ὈΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝΞΕΝΟΝ (that is, following Hermann, . . . ἔξενον) but a seemingly self-contained phrase, or equivalent, ὈΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ, which (to restate) must be metrically ὅ – ὅ – . Here ὅπι (ὁ ὃ, not ὁ – ) is out of the question, while the hypothetical ὅπι, now without an explanatory genitive, is even less plausible than it was with one.30 The solution is to posit a simple scribal slip, ὈΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ > ὈΠΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ— which, it will become apparent, must have occurred in antiquity itself31—and restore the text with a self-contained elliptical clause, ὅπα δίκαιον.

This solution, as I have indicated, has been anticipated in earlier scholarship. Bergk’s apparatus criticus, in the second edition of his Poetae Lyrici Graeci (1853), notes that MS G contains the gloss (‘supra’) ὅπως, καθός, on which he comments: ‘unde elicias γεγονητέον, ὅπα [sic] δίκαιον, ἔξενον vel ἔξενον ἔρεισι’, Ἀκράγαντος εὐνούμων τε πατέρων κτλ.’32 Then in Bowra’s OCT (1935/47), the apparatus criticus records: ὅπως Mair coll. gl. G ὅπως, καθός’.33 Although ὅπως (sic) is demonstrably right,34

26 Denniston (1959), 501 notes that ‘alternation of copulation and asyndeton’ is attested—with lists of names—in Aeschylus’ Persæ (exotic [dis]connections for exotic names?), but I see nothing at all comparable anywhere in the play.
27 It is of course most unlikely that there would have been any punctuation in Pindar’s original text: all punctuation is doubtless the product of scribal, or editorial, division in later ages.
28 On the interpretation of this restored sequence, as of the rest of the passage, see the commentary, pages 509–11 below.
29 See page 505 below.
30 ὅπι δίκαιον on its own would have to mean ‘observant in reverential fear (vel sim.) of the gods’—not impossible but highly improbable on two grounds: (i) although the elite can of course be commended for honouring the gods in suitable rituals (N. 11.5–7, I. 2.39), reverential fear is not something usually ascribed to a great honorand (contrast Od. 6.121, with Hainsworth ad loc.); (ii) if it were, it would in any case call for θεῶν or equivalent in the near context (cf. page 499 with n. 3 above).
31 See page 505 below.
32 In Bergk’s fourth edition (1878) the apparatus criticus has ‘Γ ὅπως καθός interpretatur, quasi ὅπα scriptum fuerit’, and the apparatus criticus in Schroeder’s 1900 revision of Bergk’s, more expansively, ‘mire Germanus αὐτί τοῦ ὅπως καὶ καθό, gl. G ὅπως, καθός, quasi fuerit ὅπη (ὅπα)’. In full, Σ in the ‘Germanus’ codex (Vindobonensis suppl. gr. 64: thirteenth century) has τοῦ ὅπως (sic) αὐτί τοῦ ὅπως καὶ καθό, ἡ τῶν ἐμελεστάτων ρημάτων (l. page 110 Abel), with the relevant part of the gloss presumably derived from G itself or a common source. Unlike G (see page 507 below), ‘Germanus’ is a strictly secondary witness: Irigoin (1952), 217–19.
33 Evidently among the unpublished notes left by (A.W.) Mair after his death: cf. Bowra’s 1935 preface, page x.
34 In Pindar’s text elsewhere, and in various dialect occurrences outside Pindar, recent editors and others often print ὅπα as ὅπα. In this article, I assume ὅπα (like Attic ὅπη) throughout: cf. Lomiento (2007).
neither Bowra nor Bergk thought well enough of it to print it in the text, but Bergk—
however unconvinced himself—correctly divined the knock-on effect for the division of
the two phrases that follow (albeit not the separate issue about the division of the items
at the end of the sentence). The gloss under discussion must itself be ‘ancien’, reflecting an earlier text with ΟΠΑΙ//octet: it is surely inconceivable that any medieval scholar would have independently offered a new gloss, δπος, καθος, on a text with ΟΠΙ (whether read as ὦςι or as ὦσι)—whereas one notes that elsewhere in Pindar a straightforwardly attested (if grammatically rather different) ὦσι attracts the scholiastic gloss ὦς δικαίον likewise. In the relevant (first) volume of his Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina (1903), Drachmann makes no mention of G’s gloss, though citing G for the lines immediately following. In his preface (I, page ix), he explains: ‘codicem [sc. G] non totum contuli (quod nunc paenitet)’. Drachmann’s relative inattention to G has no doubt contributed to the subsequent inattention to the crucial gloss; it remains regrettable (‘quod nunc paenitet’).

And now the important evidence of P.Oxy. 1614 (= Π in Snell–Maehler: fifth or sixth century A.D.). In the transcription by the editors, Grenfell and Hunt, the relevant portion of this papyrus reads:

ΓΕΓΩΝΗΤΕΟΝ ΟΠΙ
ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ ΞΕΝΟΝ
ΕΡΕΙΣΜ’ ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΟΣ
ΕΥΩΝΥΜΩΝ ΔΕ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ
ΑΩΤΟΝ ΟΡΘΟΠΟΛΙΝ

Like the medieval manuscripts of O. 2, then, the papyrus has ΟΠΙ (and ΞΕΝΟΝ), from which it follows that our corruption is early and belongs to the era of undivided capitals. No less noteworthy: from ΕΡΕΙΣΜ’ to ΟΡΘΟΠΟΛΙΝ, the word-groupings on the papyrus correspond to those assumed in modern scholarship. That is: the essentially colometric layout of words on the papyrus (presumably Alexandrian in origin) no doubt facilitated erroneous presumptions about sense division—in line with modern (mis)understandings (ἐρεισμ’ with ἀκράγαντος; ορθόπολιν with ἀωτόν).

References:

35 Van Leeuwen (1964) mentions the gloss in G, only to dismiss it as inconsequential (page 411: ‘We laten de glosse van G: ὦς καθος, die wijst op een lezing ὦσι of ὦςι, als onbelangrijk buiten beschouwing’); this, in the course of an uneventful defence of Hermann’s ὦςι. Most editors, including Turyn, Snell–Maehler and Gentili et al. (in the 2013 Mondadori edition of Le Olympiche), simply ignore it altogether.

36 See n. 43 below.

37 As in his apparatus criticus on the scholia to 15d (= O. 2.8) καμίντες κτλ.: I, page 63 Drachmann.

38 But in capitals: Grenfell–Hunt transcribe in unaccented minuscules.

39 The papyrus also has δ in (for MSS τε). On the evidence provided by Denniston (1959), 164–5, ABC δ is even rarer than ABC τ (except where the ABC involves anaphora), and ABC δ E quite anomalous. Xen. Cyr. 8.2.6, cited by Denniston ([1959], 165) as a solitary example of δ linking ‘two . . . units in the middle of an otherwise asyndetic series’, is quite different: in effect, marking a separate contrast within a longer ‘series’. The δ on the papyrus can safely be ignored as a trivial corruption.

40 Ancient scholarship already assumes the association: Σ12a, I, page 61 Drachmann: ἐρεισμ’. 
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What are the palaeographical implications of our restoration? In scribal activity, almost anything can be miswritten as almost anything else, but across the centuries, both in antiquity and later in the Middle Ages, some errors are much more common than others. And Al > I is not especially common, and certainly less common than (for instance) Al > A. Very relevantly, though, given the evident antiquity of the corruption, Al > I is reasonably well attested in ancient capitals (see [i] below). The slip is hardly so complicated as to call for special explanations, but in O. 2 more than one such explanation is readily available in the event. The misreading of ΟΠΑΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ as ΟΠΙΑΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ would seem to involve a kind of anticipatory haplography from the syllables immediately following (-ΠΙΑΙ-ΔΙ-ΚΑΙ- > -ΠΙΙ-ΙΔ-ΚΑΙ-), while, after γεγονητέον, a sequence ΟΠΙ (as if ὅπι, ‘voice’) could of course feel speciously natural;41 then again, ὅπα δίκαιον, though perfectly Greek and eminently Pindaric in spirit, is not familiar as a specifiable Pindaric phrase (see [ii] below).

[i] Al > I. Examples from antiquity, both from papyri and, earlier, from inscriptions, include a range of types and contexts. In Eur. Bacch. 1096, for instance, P.Oxy. 2223 (first century A.D.) has ΚΡΑΤΙΒΟΛΟΥΣ for ΚΡΑΤΑΙ- (see Diggle, OCT). Compare three non-literary examples from papyri cited by Mayser–Schmoll 1.12 (1970), 86: ΕΓΜΕΤΡΗΣΙ (for -ΣΑΙ), P.Cair.Zen. 59317.2 (a letter of the third century B.C.); ΕΑΙΟΥ (for -ΑΙΟΥ), UPZ 35.11 (a letter of the second century B.C.); ΑΠΙΣΤΑΣΙ (for -ΑΙΣ), P.Teb. 888 (a wine account of the second century B.C.). Compare two examples from inscriptions: XAMI (for XAMAI), SEG 26.1115.1 (Megarian inscription from Selinus, early fifth century B.C.), and ΦΙΑΙΩΥ (for ΦΑΙΔ), SEG 28.155.8 (Attic inscription, c.300 B.C.). Likewise, for the record, one might note some random minuscule miscopyings (but copyings from uncials?) elsewhere in Pindar: O. 9.96, ΛΥΚ<Λ>ΑΙΩΥ, cod. H (see Tury’s apparatus criticus, on his O. 9.103); P. 3.78, ΜΕΛΙΟΝΤ<Λ>Ι, coø. CV; P. 11.57, ΓΛΥΚΥΤΑΤ<Α>Ι (that is, γλυκνότατα), cod. V.

[ii] Pindar’s ὅπα δίκαιον is an elliptical parenthetic clause, approximately equivalent to the δίκα phrase at P. 9.95–6, αἰνεῖν... | παντὶ θυμῷ σὸν τε δίκα, or the semantically comparable one-word adverb at O. 3.7–9, χρεός... | πρεπόντως... | με γεγονεῖν: ‘in a way worthy of [the laudandus]’, as Verdenius (ad loc.) renders πρεπόντως there. Pindaric praise is required to be, and is often specified as, ‘worthy’.42 ὅπα itself is attested as a conjunction elsewhere in Pindar (O. 10.56, Ν. 3.25), albeit not in a precisely equivalent construction.43 Pindar has no aversion to the given kind of elliptical clause: compare εἰ δυνατόν at N. 9.28. Then, in fifth- and fourth-century Greek in general, the neuter adjective δίκαιον, with ellipse of the copula, is a well-attested usage:44 Democ. 265 καὶ γὰρ δίκαιων οὕτως, Eur. Cyc. 150 δίκαιον (as a one-word sentence), Hippoc. Prorrh. 2.12 Potter καὶ γὰρ δίκαιον οὕτως, Lys. 20.30 ἀλλ’ οὐ δίκαιον, Pl. Grg. 463c

Ἀκράγαντος ἔδρασιμα ὅντα καὶ τείχισμα τῆς Ἀκράγαντος, καὶ Ὄμηρος ἔρκος Ἀχαϊων. Cf. Σ Hom. Il. 16.549 Erbse (on Sarpedon as ἔρμα πόλις): ὅθεν καὶ Πινάκαρος ἔρεσις Ἀκράγαντος εἶπε τὸν Ὀθρόνα. By contrast, apart from G’s gloss, no early scholastic comment on, or reference to, ΟΠΙΑΙΟΠΙ is recorded.

41 With the implication that in antiquity (at least, later antiquity) the corrupt ΟΠΙ was already interpreted as it would come to be in the medieval era (i.e. as ὅπι), although there is no direct evidence for this (n. 40 above)—unless one takes the layout in P.Oxy. 1614 as itself evidence.

42 See further page 508 below.

43 There is also an ‘exclamatory’ ὅπα at O. 10.10–11—which, one notes, is glossed ὅπος: I, page 313 Drachmann (on 14b and 15c) (cf. page 505 above).

44 Cf. Kühner–Gerth 1.40–2; Schwzyer (1939–71), 2.623–4.
II COMMENTARY

5 Θήρωνα δὲ τετραορίας ἐνεκα νικαφόρου

6 γεγονητέον, ὅπη δίκασιν, ἔναι νέρσα’, Ἀκράγαντος

7 εὐνυμιόν τε πατέρων ἀσωτον, ὀρθοπόλιν.

But Thero, by virtue of his victorious chariot,
Is to be acclaimed, justly, as mainstay of strangers/guests, as paragon
Of Acragas and its/his famous ancestors, as upholder of the city.

The overall logic of the sentence is characteristically Pindaric: in the light of his victory, Thero is to be acclaimed as... something else as well: great host, fine representative of Acragas and its/his family, supreme statesman. ‘Pindar sometimes acclaims an athletically successful subject, both as such and also, simultaneously, on other grounds’ (Silk [2012], 356–7)—as e.g. at I. 1.32–8 (ibid.), O. 7.15–17, O. 13.1–3, I. 2.12–17, I. 4.2–3. The ἐνεκα phrase in 5 virtually amounts to ‘in the context of’, like e.g. the ἐνεκα at N. 10.3: cf. LSJ s.v. ἐνεκα 1.2, Gerber on ἐνεκα at O. 1.99 and Slater (1969), 176 on the same passage, s.v. ἐνεκα.

τετραορίας... νικαφόρου: ‘victorious chariot’ as metonymic inversion for ‘chariot victory’—privileging the more concrete (chariot) over the less (victory).

45 In a conformation superficially Pindaric: Μούσα... | κλέος ἄν’ Ἐλλάνας τίθει, | ὁς κτλ.—but only superficially, because the κλέος here is the (desired) fame of Timocereon’s latest critique of Themistocles (Plut. Them. 21).

46 Pace Benveniste (1966), 161–5, such elliptical constructions (he calls them ‘phrases nominales’) are not restricted to ‘discourses direct’ and generalized (‘sentences’) reference. The first claim is refuted by (e.g.) Hippoc. Proorrh. 2.12 (above), and the second by (e.g.) Pindar’s εἰ δυνάτων at N. 9.28 (on which cf. Braswell ad loc.), and the present passage too.

47 Transl. Hobbes (1629), Cf. SGDI 2501.3 Collitz (Delphian inscription, 380 b.c.): δικαζόμενα τᾶς δίκαιας ἀν δικαιουσάτα γνώμων τά μέγε γεγραμμένα κατὰ τοῦ νόμου. Cf. also simpler inscriptive formulas like ὡς δικαιοστάτα καὶ ἐρευνεῖται (as in Dittenberger, Syll. 2.24.10: Eleusis, 352–351 b.c.); κἀ(t) τὸ δίκασιν (as IG 9.1² 609, 5–6: Naupactus, sixth/seventh century b.c.); ὡς ἂν δύναται δικαιουσάτα (as IG 12.9.189, 24: Eretria, mid fourth century b.c.); καθάσπερ δικαιοὶ ἔστιν (as SEG 55 [2005], 1816.67: Egypt, third century b.c.).

48 Below, pages 508–9.
Cf., more elaborately, *N. 1.7 ἄρμα δ’ ὄρτυνει Χρομίου... ἐργάσιςν νικαφόρος ἐγκώμιον ξεύζοι μέλος* (‘Chromios’ chariot prompts me to yoke a song of celebration for victorious deeds’) and, more generally, Pindar’s instinct for concrete metonymy: *P. 1.66 κλέος ἀνθὴσεν αἰχμᾶς* (with ‘spear’ for ‘fighting spirit’; Slater [1969], 22, s.v. αἰχμά, c); *P. 9.12 γλυκεροῖς εὐνάξ* (‘beds’ for ‘acts of love’) (on these two passages, cf. Matzner [2016], 67–8, 60–1). Contrast the ‘abstract for concrete’ manoeuvres at e.g. *O. 1.95* (with Gerber ad loc.), *O. 10.72* (with Verdenius ad loc.).

**γεγονητέον**: the earliest datable attestation (476 b.c.) of any verbal form in -τέον/τέον. Such forms are predominantly Attic and only come into view ‘in der attischen Blütezeit’: Kühner–Gerth 2.1.447 (see 2.1.447–8; cf. Schwzyzer [1939–71], 1.810–11; Moorhouse [1982], 171–2). In Attic the earliest datable uses (467 B.C.) are in Aesch. Sept. (499 φυλακτέον, 600 κοιμαστέος), and in Attic tragedy most of the occurrences (like those two) are in dialogue. Outside Attic, uses are rare in verse: Thgn. 689 πιμαντέον (earlier than our passage?), Orph. 21.7 DK τλητέα. Non-Attic prose-uses include (e.g.) Hdt. 1.120.6 προστέον, Hippoc. *Flat. 1 ιησέον*, Hippoc. *Vic. 1.27 διακτέον*, Hippoc. *Acut. 18 (= 6 Littré) τμορριτέον*. ‘Distinctly prosaic’, suggest Buck–Peterson (1944), 530, but the instances in Aeschylus (above) and the common occurrence of -τέον in Sophocles (e.g. *Aj. 1140 θατέον, OT 628 όρκτέον*) and Euripides (e.g. *Hipp. 491 διστέον, Or. 769 οίστέον*: the latter in recitative) indicate that this is a very questionable characterization.

The three accusatives (ἐρειπείρι, ἀστων, ὀρθόπολιν) are governed by γεγονητέον in the double-accusative construction common with verbs of praise in Pindar’s odes: we acclaim x as y. Likewise, γεγονέω at *P. 9.3–4 Τελεσικράτη... γεγονείν | ἀλβον ἄνδρον, διαξείππου στερφάνωμα Κυράνος*, and similarly (e.g.) οίνεω at *O. 4.14–16, ἐπαινέω at *O. 13.1–3, κελαδέω at *I. 1.52–4*. Commentators and others are reluctant to acknowledge the construction (LSJ is silent in all such cases), seemingly taking the y as appositional to the x (or to the sentence: cf. e.g. Carey on *P. 9.3–4*, above).49 Slater (1969), 105 correctly has ‘c. acc. dupl.’ for *P. 9.3 (s.v. γεγονέω)* and (page 275) for *I. 1.54 (s.v. κελαδέω)*, but not for the other instances cited above, including our *O. 2* passage.

**ὅπα δίκαιον**: as our earlier findings indicate (pages 504 and 506–7 above), the restored phrase, vouched for by the gloss in MS G, is an isolated expression in Pindar, but comparable with (e.g.) the simpler σὺν... δίκα at *P. 9.96 (οινεν... | παντι θωμω σὺν τε δίκα καλὰ ῥέξοντι)*. The sentiment that this particular acclamation is ‘worthy’ and ‘appropriate’ is echoed at *O. 3.9*, in the parallel ode for the same victory: πρεπόντας... γεγονείν.50 In Pindar, ‘appropriate’ praise for the *laudandus* is frequently signalled as such, as it is again later in *O. 2* itself: πρέπει τὸν Ἀινσθαδίμου | ἐγκομίον τε μελέον λυράν τε τυγχανέμεν (46–7). The principle is asserted in general terms in one of his encomia: πρέπει δ’ ἐσλοίην ὑμνεῖσθαι (fr. 121 S–M).

49 Carey resists the relationship of ἄνδρον and στεφάνωμα there, partly for lack of a parallel to σταφ. words as honorific metaphors for a man: ‘Pindar nowhere terms an athlete “crown of the city”’. This is true, and would be highly relevant if one were introducing such a usage in an emendation; but much less relevant in a sound text, the run of which invites the interpretation. For the ‘honorific metaphor’ itself, cf. Lycurg. *Leocr. 50 εἰπόν στεφάνων τῆς πατρίδος εἶναι τὰς ἐκείνους νησιάς*, and cf. Eur. *Heracl. 839*, where τὸν καλλιτάκια στέφανον is a phrase applied to Heracles’ children. Pindar elsewhere does use στεφάνωμα (as opposed to στέφανος) metaphorically in other ways (as at *P. 1.50*: cf. Slater [1969], 472 s.v.).

50 See page 513 below.
With the compressed clause, compare εἰ δύνατόν at N. 9.28 (with Braswell ad loc.) —another isolated expression in Pindar, like ὅπα δίκασον here—and the parallel compressions like Xenophon’s ὅπα δύνατόν (An. 2.1.19) and Timoecron’s ὡς εὐτυχός καὶ δίκασον (2 PMG) cited above (page 507). The seeming allusion to legal formulas (ὅπα καὶ δικαίωτα . . . : ibid.) invests Pindar’s praise of Thero with a distinctive authority: the praise is not just ‘appropriate’ but also, somehow, has the force of law. In Pindar, δίκα is often associated with praise: cf. again P. 9.95–6 οἰκεῖον . . . σὺν . . . δίκα (likewise Bactyl. 13.201–2 οἰκεῖον σωφρὸν ἄνδρα | σὺν δίκα), along with (e.g.) O. 6.12 οἰνος . . . ἐν δίκᾳ, N. 3.29 ἐπέτατα . . . ὁ λόγος δίκας ἄσως, ἐσάλον οἰκεῖον. Yet, here it is as if he is insisting on the wider connotations of δίκα/δίκαιος and specifically on a reciprocally implication that Thero’s own actions and achievements are themselves ‘lawful’ and ‘just’ (note the corollary at N. 5.14, οἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδύνεμένῳ).

The tone of the sequence γεγονητέον, ὅπα δίκασον is not easy to assess. The -τέον is clearly a modernism,51 and ὅπα δίκασον too, from judge from the distribution of comparable examples (pages 506–7 above); as a lexical item, γεγονέω is standard usage, verse and prose, from Homer onwards (LSJ s.v.). Epicsisms abound in Pindar, but one notes the absence of any specifiable epicism here (such as the imagined ὅπα would yield: see n. 16 above). Some of the various ellipses in which ὅπα is seen to participate elsewhere look colloquial (καρυξ Δικαιόπολιν ὅπα, Ar. Ach. 748), but there is nothing to suggest that here, and the apparent legal associations of ὅπα δίκασον certainly pull in a different direction. The predominant tone would seem to be one of contemporaneity. Thero, if not exactly, like W.S. Gilbert’s Stanley, a ‘modern Major-General’,52 is pre-eminently a great figure of ‘our’ time—but then, this is contemporaneity at once allied to ancestral achievement (ἐυνόμυμον . . . πατέρων).

Beside its role in the immediate context, δίκασον, at the start of the ode, introduces a theme that plays an important part in the impact of the ode as a whole. In O. 2, δίκα and its cognates recur in a way that links Thero’s beneficence and achievement (celebrated here) with righteous behaviour in this world and the next (ἐν δίκᾳ τε καὶ παρὰ δίκαν, 16; μείναντες ἄπο πάμπαν ἄδικων, 69), with judgement in the next (κατὰ γάς δικάζει τις, 59) and, at the end of the ode, with the importance of poetic propriety in celebration itself (οἰνον ἐπέβα Κόρος | οὐ δίκα συναντόμενον, 95–6). This is the unity of ‘associative co-presence’ so characteristic of Pindar: Silk (2012), 356–64.

ζένον ἐρείσμα: on the reinterpretation of ΖΕΝΟΝ as ζένον, see above (page 501). In Pindar’s epinicians, the proper response to xenoi (which would often include the poet himself, as beneficiary of ἄνδρός φιλοξείνου: N. 1.19–24) is a constant theme: cf. Pavese (1966), 109 n. 16; Carey (1995), 94–5. Just as, later in the poem, Thero is φίλος . . . ἐὑρέσθαι (93–4: cf. pages 511–12 below), so here he is a ‘prop’ or ‘support’ or ‘mainstay’ for xenoi. This usage of ἐρείσμα belongs to a series of semi-conventional honorific metaphors, favoured especially by Pindar, but whose original models are πῦργος, ἔρκος and ἔρμα in their Hомерic uses: Ἀργείσσοι | . . . πῦργος, of Ajax (Od. 11.555–6); ἔρκος Ἀχιλλός, again of Ajax (II. 3.229); ἔρμα πόλης, of Sarpedon (II. 16.549) and the Ithacans (Od. 23.121). The ‘supportive’ source is sometimes a city (vel sim.), sometimes a man (ditto), and in Pindar—distinctively—

51 And largely Attic—which probably amounts to the same thing.
52 Gilbert and Sullivan, The Pirates of Penzance (1879), Act I.
the beneficiary may be, precisely, xenoi.\textsuperscript{53} Thus "Εκτορά... Τροίας... κίονα (O. 2.81–2) but also τάνδ' ἀλλικεύει χώραν [sc. Aegina]... ξένοις... κίονα (O. 8.25–7).\textsuperscript{54} Likewise, Thgn. 233–4 πύργος... δήμῳ... ἐσθλὸς ἄνηρ and Alceaus 112.10 L–P ἄνδρες... πόλιος πύργος, whereas in Pindar the enduring ὀλβος of Battos, more elaborately, is hailed as πύργος ἄστες ὑμία τε φαεννότατον | ξένουσι (P. 5.55–7). In the metaphorical uses of ἔρεισμα, the actual recipients of the 'support' may themselves be cities or countries, as in fr. 76.2 S–M, Ἐλλάδος ἔρεισμα (Hellas 'supported' by Athens), or else groups of people, as in Eur. IA 952, ἔρεισμα βαρβάρων (barbaroi 'supported' by Mt Sipylus), or as with the ξένον here.\textsuperscript{55} Elsewhere in Pindar, simpler tropes are used to characterize the relation between honorand and xenoi: at P. 3.7.1 Hiero is ξένοις... πατήρ and at O. 13.2–3 the οἶκον of Xenophon of Corinth is ξένουσι... θεράποντα. Much more flamboyant is Empedocles, fr. 112.3 DK, where—as so often in Pindar—the proper response to xenoi is articulated in metaphor, and specifically the Acragantines are called ξείνων αἰδοίοι λιμένες. In context, the phrase looks remarkably like a response to Pindar’s (Appendix B, pages 516–17 below), and, as such, represents confirmation of our restored text. Further confirmation, it might well be thought, is provided by the fact that, whereas ξένον ἔρεισμα makes a distinctive point in the sequence of commendations, the supposed collocation ἔρεισμα ἔρεισμα Άκραγάντως would effectively be duplicated by ὀρθόπολιν at the end of the sentence.

In retrospect, it becomes apparent that the parenthetic ὅπως δίκαιον applies, not just to the propriety of praise (γέγονετέον) but, apo koinou,\textsuperscript{56} to the terms of praise now specified, especially the first one, ξένον ἔρεισμι'. The connotations of δίκαιον, that is, remain active, because (as Pindar repeatedly reminds us) 'supporting' xenoi is itself a matter of δίκαιο. O. 13.2–7 οἶκον... | ξένουσι... θεράποντα... [in Corinth, where]. E. Εὐνόμια ναεὶ κασυγήτα τε... | Δίκαιον N. 4.12 δίκαιον εννεαρχεί; I. 9.5–6 οὐ θεμέν οὐδὲ δίκαιον | ξένων υπερβικίοιντες. Pindar has not, indeed, invented the association: cf. Od. 6.120–1 δίκαιον ~ φιλόξενου, Hes. Op. 225–6 δίκαιος ξένουσι... διδουσι | θείες καὶ μὴ τι παρεκβαίνουσι δικαίον, Aesch. fr. 196.1–2 Ραδτ ἐνδικτότατον... | καὶ φιλοξείνουσιντος, Bacchyl. 14.23. φιλοξείνου τε καὶ ὀρθόδικου, Eur. Alc. 1147–8 δίκαιος ὅν |... ἐσώβετε περὶ ξένουσιν.

Άκραγάντως | εὖνόμιον τε πατέρων: a typically Pindaric kind of double specification, almost a hendiadys; cf. N. 5.8 Αἰακίδας ἐγέγαρεν ματρόπολιν τε, N. 9.14 πατρίοιν οἶκον ἀπό τ’ Ἀργεος, O. 3.38–9 Ἐμμενίδας | Θήρων τ’ (Thero is an Emmenid).\textsuperscript{57} In all the examples cited, the particle τε isolates, therefore foregrounds, a proper name, as here Άκραγάντως: Thero (we are to agree) is the supreme representative of his city, Acragas, as well as of the Emmenids, his clan.

\textsuperscript{53} Similarly, without metaphor, Pindar presents a city (Aegina) as φίλον ξένον ἄρουραν (N. 5.8), while a man (the Aeginetan Lampon) inspires warm feelings for his ξένον εὐφρενίας (I. 6.70).

\textsuperscript{54} The alteration between κίονα + gen. and κίονα + dat. here is of little consequence: cf. e.g. the alteration between grammatical cases in ξείνα... δίκαιον υπερβικίοιντες at ll. 11.779 and διδουσι | θείες καὶ μὴ τι παρεκβαίνουσι δικαίον, Aesch. fr. 196.1–2 Ραδτ ἐνδικτότατον... | καὶ φιλοξείνουσιντος, Bacchyl. 14.23. φιλοξείνου τε καὶ ὀρθόδικου, Eur. Alc. 1147–8 δίκαιος ὅν |... ἐσώβετε περὶ ξένουσιν.

\textsuperscript{55} For bolder examples of apo koinou types, see Des Places (1962).
πατέρων ἄωτον: hyperbolic, in so far as, when used of people partitively (above, pages 502–3), ἄ. + genitive plural implies that the subject is one of the plurality: compare the hyperbolic superlatives in Soph. Ant. 100–2 (with Jebb ad loc.) or Milton’s ‘fairest of her daughters, Eve’ (Paradise Lost, 4.324). The hyperbole is lessened by Ἀκράγαντος—as if ‘the finest representative of Acragas, including his own ancestors’. With Ἀκράγαντος, ἄωτον functions like its counterpart in Αθανά . . . ἄωτον at Bacchyl. 23.1; with πατέρων, like ναυτάν ἄωτος at P. 4.188. On the iconym ἄωτος-’on, its occurrences and its usage, see pages 502–3 above.

ὁρθόπολιν: the adjective goes not (aberrantly) with ἄωτον but (straightforwardly) with the underlying subject Ἱῆρωνα, as the last item in an unconnected (asyndetic) list (pages 503–4 above); similarly O. 13.4–5 τῶν ὀλβίων Κόρινθον, Ἰσθμίου | πρόθυρον Ποτειδάνος, ἀγγαλόκουρον, where ἀγγαλόκουρον goes with Κόρινθον, not with πρόθυρον. The adjective ὁρθόπολις is rare in the extreme: in antiquity only attested otherwise in a Pisidian verse inscription of the Roman era (BCH 23 [1899], 302), as a proper name (as in Strabo 7 fr. 16.11 Radt and Pausanias 2.5.8) and with explicit allusion to Pindar in Himerius (Orat. 38.75 Colonna) and Libanius (Epist. 288.1). Libanius’ reference (τὸν ὁρθόπολιν, εἰτεν ἄν Πινδάρος) conveniently suggests that the compound was Pindar’s coinage or, at least, effectively his property, with no independent life outside O. 2 itself. The first element, ὁρθ-, is verbal in force (Σικελίαν . . . ὀρθώσειν N. 1.15, πόλις . . . ὀρθοθείσα I. 5.48), like the first elements in ἀγγέλπολις (of the nymph Κυράνα: P. 9.54), φερέπολις (of personified Τύχας: fr. 39 S–M), ἐρωσιτολλός (of Athena: Il. 6.305). The parallels are indicative of the high pitch of Pindar’s praise of Thero in this passage.

What follows after ὁρθόπολιν is a celebration of the πατέρων: καμόντες οἱ πολλὰ θημῶ | ἱερὸν ἔσχον οἴκημα ποταμοῦ . . . (8–9). With ὁρθόπολιν a distinct item in the list, that sequence is seen to involve a very Pindaric dislocation of the relative pronoun from its antecedent. With πατέρων ἄωτον, ὁρθόπολιν | καμόντες οἱ . . . compare, later in the ode (79–81), Ἀχιλλέα τ’ ἑνεκ’, ἐπεὶ Ζηνὸς ἦτορ | λιταὶ ἐπεισε, μάτηρ’ | ὃς . . . In all such cases, the effect is to highlight the new topic, even at the cost of an abrasive touch (as, strikingly, in the later passage).

III ECHOES

Towards the end of O. 2, at lines 93–5, Pindar picks up the topic of Thero’s beneficence to xenoí: in a hundred years, no city has produced φίλοις ἄνδρα μᾶλλον | εὐεργέταιν προσπισίν ἄρθονέπετρον τε χέρα | Θήρωνα. In passing, one notes the concrete force of Thero’s ‘hand’. 58 Less noteworthy in itself: the momentary concreteness precisely matches the implicit physicality of ἔξωνν ἔρεισι’ in line 6. ‘Hands’ are hardly what ‘support’ the xenoí there, but ἔρεισι’ and χεῖρ are readily associative in Greek usage (ἔρεισι’ itself is not common enough to show up the association): Il. 5.309 ἔρεισατο χειρί; 11.235 ἐπὶ δ’ αὐτὸς ἔρεισε, βαφρεὶς χεῖρι πιθήσας; Od. 11.426 χερσὶ . . . σοῦ . . . στόμῳ ἔρεισα; Ηρμ. Art. 58 τῇ χειρί . . . ἐρείσατο, 11 τῇ χειρὶ ἐπερείσειν, 52 τῇ χειρὶ πρός τὴν γῆν ὑπερεισδύονεν. Meanwhile, the φίλοι to whom Thero has shown himself a εὐεργέτας in lines 93–5 doubtless are, or subsume, xenoí: cf. I. 6.70 ἔξωνν εὐεργασίας ἀγαπάτατα. The association of ἔξωνν and φίλοι is

58 Cf. pages 507–8 above.
familiar in Greek usage more generally, from epic-era verse (Il. 6.224 ξείνος φίλος; Od. 1.313 φίλοι ξείνοι; CEG 1.453 Hansen ξένος τε φίλος: Ithacan inscription, c.700 B.C.) to classical prose (Xen. An. 2.1.5 φίλος καὶ ξένος; sim. Lys. 19.19, Dem. 21.110, Aeschin. 3.224) and Pindar himself (N. 5.8, 7.61–3). The echo is hardly perceptible—which tells us what? That, for Pindar, unobtrusive self-echoing is, or may be, a significant mode of composition.

A more consequential example, for present purposes, is provided by the echoes of our passage in the parallel ode, O. 3, a second celebration of the victory that is the occasion for O. 2. As with at least one other group of related poems in Pindar’s epinician collection, private compositional imperatives lead the poet to recall phraseology or verbal sequences from one ode to another, far beyond any question of Lieblingswörter or, indeed, random repetition. The case in point is the three pankration odes for the brothers Pytheas and Phylacidas, N. 5, I. 5 and I. 6, where the phenomenon is surely beyond dispute.59 In particular, I. 5, the latest of the three, shows such striking correspondences as these, with the earlier I. 6:

Λαξατοι παιδων — συμμάχων, — πόλιν Τρόων — σύν — πέριν — χαλκοάραν (I. 5.35–41)
χαλκοχάρμα — σύμμαχον ἐς Τρόιν — πέριν δὲ σύν — Λαξατοι (I. 6.27–35),

‘where the χαλκο- compounds and the noun σύμμαχος (not otherwise attested in Pindar) are distinctive’.61 With O. 2 and O. 3, it is impossible to know which ode was composed first, but that hardly matters. The point is that the two commemorations of Thero’s Olympic victory contain comparable echoes (‘allusions’ would be an inappropriate characterization)62 and that, as will become apparent, the echoes serve to strengthen the case for the textual restoration proposed for O. 2.63

There are, of course, substantive elements in common between O. 2 and O. 3. Not only do the poems celebrate the same victor and the same victory; they share at least one noteworthy mythological connection. Heracles figures in both odes, while, specifically, both the opening of O. 2 and the closure of O. 3 associate Thero and Heracles as great achievers: Ὀλυμπιαδὰ δ’ ἐστασαν Ἡρακλέης | ἄκροθινα πολέμου· Ἱθρώνα δὲ . . . γεγονυτέν (O. 2.3–6); νῦν δὲ πρὸς ἐσχατίαν Ἰθρών αὐτούπς | οἰκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλάν (O. 3.43–4). Much less striking, no doubt, but much more to the point, is the set of correspondences in the following two passages (the second of which subsumes that same closure), where any overt substantive connection is lacking. The first passage belongs to Pindar’s remarkable depiction of the afterlife; the second, to the sequence that begins with Heracles’ foundation of the Olympic games and ends with the poet’s affirmation of limits:

κενείν — νέμοντα αἰώνα — ψυχάν, ἐτελέν — μακάρων — περιπένεισιν — χρυσοῦ —
δενδρέων, ὕδωρ — ὀρθείσι (O. 2.65–75)

59 Silk (1998), 81–5. On the more overt intertexts between these odes, see Morrison (2011), 238–50.
60 σύν μάχας codd., corr. Bury: Silk (1998), 82 n. 146.
61 Silk (1998), 81–2.
62 Because, as with the echoes in the three pankration odes, these hardly operate on a public-perceptible level: cf. Silk (1998), 81–2.
63 As also with I. 5: Silk (1998), 83–5.
64 Printed as κενείν by most editors.
In the I. 5/1. 6 example, the correspondences largely involve repeated words or word-elements (πένθον/πέφινεν), but also sound-echoes (χαλκοαράν/χαλκοχάρμαν). So too here we have κενεάν/κενεός but also νέμονται αἰώνα/ἀγώνα νέμεν.66

In this light, two other—much shorter—sequences have a special relevance. First, we have the correspondence, both in word and sound, between O. 2.6–7 Ακράγαντος | εὐφονύμων τε πατέρων ἀωτόν, ὀρθόπολιν and O. 3.3–4 (likewise early in its ode) ὑμον ὀρθώσαις, ἀκαμαντοπόδων | ἔπουν ἀωτόν, or specifically:

’Ακράγαντος — ‘ὑμον — ‘ων ἀωτόν, ὀρθό- (O. 2.6–7)

ὑμον ὀρθώ — ἀκαμαντο — ‘ων ἀωτόν (O. 3.3–4).

Here, it is arguably no coincidence that in the O. 3 sequence the ἀκαμαντο- element (like the echoic Ακράγαντο- in O. 2)67 goes closely with the ἀωτόν that follows. In Pindar’s authorial-compositional mind, the shape of the phrasing is determinative.

Finally, the early part of O. 3, again, has a revealing correspondence, part verbal, part semantic, with the restored phrase that is at the centre of our argument. With γεγονητέον, ὡς δικαιον at O. 2.6, compare πρεπόντως . . . γεγονείν at O. 3.9.68

The latter phrasing emerges from a much more intricate sequence, indeed (O. 3.6–9):

. . . στέφανοι
 πρόσσοντι με τοῦτο θεόδικαν χρέος,
 φόρμιτα τε ποικιλόγαρν καὶ βοϊν εὐλόου ἐπέων τε θέσιν
 Λίνησιδάμου παιδ ἵλη συμμεζία πρεπόνα, ὃ τε Πίσα με γεγονείν.

The kinship, however, is apparent. Here, as with the ἀκαμαντοπόδων sequence, Pindar’s perhaps unexpected compositional habits have given us a correspondence that tends to confirm the plausibility of a corrected text.69
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APPENDIX A: ‘PERICTIONE’ (see n. 7 above)

Meineke’s ὅπις in ‘Perictione’ apud Stob. 4.25.50 Wachsmuth–Hense: this is a flowery neo-Pythagorean paragraph on the right treatment of parents by (especially) daughters, written in quasi-Ionic Greek, probably in the second century A.D.70 The passage as transmitted is seriously corrupt. Meineke provided various improvements and at least one—this one—more questionable adjustment. The relevant sentence, as printed by Wachsmuth–Hense, runs: θεὶς γὰρ καὶ καλὴ ὅψις γονέων, καὶ ἡ τοιεύον ὅπις καὶ θεραπείη, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ἥλιον οὐδὲ πάντων ὠστρόν, τὰ οὐρανός ἐναγμένου ἀμφιχορεύει, καὶ εἰ τι ἄλλο δοκέει τις χρήμα μέξον εἶναι ἐόντων κατὰ θεωρίην. This, seemingly, is to mean: ‘The appearance of one’s parents is divine and beautiful, and <likewise> our regard and care for them, beyond even <the appearance of> the sun and all the stars that heaven sets alight in its circular dance, or anything else one could imagine as a greater spectacle.’ This ὅπις is Meineke’s conjecture. Of the manuscripts, as the Wachsmuth–Hense apparatus criticus indicates, A (Parisinus: fourteenth century) has (that is, repeats) ὅψις; S (Vindobonensis: eleventh century) and M (Escurialensis: twelfth century) have ὅψις (‘sine acc.’); while Tr. (the sixteenth-century editio Trincaveliana) has ὅψις (whether by simple correction of SM or through reference to some additional witness is not clear). By any reckoning, the Greek is intricate, and, among much else, the non-visual-related sequence καὶ ἦ...θεραπείη is a noteworthy parenthesis, in that it interrupts a flamboyant visual-centred comparison of ὅψις γονέων and ἥλιου κτλ. The sentence (as indeed the passage more generally) is characterized by wordplay: not only εἶναι ἐόντων but θεὶς first word, θεωρίην last. This might seem to support a sequence ὅψις...ὁπὶς: and, if so, we would have an instance of the nominative ὅπις, prospectively in the secular sense (ἐπιστροφῆ) posited by the likes of Hesychius (see n. 4 above). However, Malcolm Schofield (who has kindly commented on my discussion) advises me that arguably ὅπις here would suggest religious ‘reverence’, in line with θεὶς, and likewise θεραπείη religious ‘service’ (as to gods); and he finds the conjectural ὅπις ‘very likely right’ on this basis. He notes: ‘For the divinity of parents in this kind of context, and the requirement to accord them worship, see Stob. 4.25.53, from Hierocles, thought also to be second century A.D.: especially pages 641.3–642.5 Wachsmuth–Hense, where children are to think themselves ξακόρους τινὰς καὶ ἱέρεας for the household, as if in a temple.’ As such, the passage would provide no support for secular ὅπις, though indeed it would exemplify the nominative form. That said, one should still note that the conjecture would offer a unique attestation of the nominative in a continuous text (even in later texts); and that there is at least a case for retaining Tr.’s version of SM’s text, ὅψις...ὁψις: ‘The appearance of one’s parents is divine and beautiful, and likewise touching and tending them...’. Not surprisingly, ὅψις/ὁψις is an attested collocation in philosophical Greek (Arist. Hist. an. 535a12–13; cf. Posidonius Phil., fr. 394 Theiler), while here, in an extra bit of wordplay, ὅψις would then be picked up (however inconsequentially) by ἐν-αψι-ἀμενος. Non liquet?

70 See Giani (1993), 8–12; cf. Swain (2013), 284–5, 315. The text is unconvincingly taken to be early Hellenistic by Thesleff (1961), 113.
APPENDIX B: EMPEDOCLES’ KATHARMOI (see page 510 above)

In the opening verses of his Katharmoi, fr. 112.3 DK, Empedocles calls the citizens of Acragas ξέινων αἰδοίοι λιμένες. The phrase impinges as a response to Pindar, to Pindar’s characteristic use of metaphor to present the exemplary treatment of xenoi, but more specifically to the phrase ξέινων ἑρείσιμα in O. 2.6. As printed by Wright (1995), 134,71 the opening six lines of Empedocles’ poem run:

οδ φίλοι, οἱ μέγα ἅπτῳ κάτα ξενθοῦ Λικράγαντος
ναίετ’ ἐν’ ἄκρα πόλεος, ἀγαθόν μελεδήμονες ἔργον,
(ξείνων αἰδοίοι λιμένες κοκότης ἀπειρολ,)
χαῖρετ’ ἐγώ δ’ ἤμιν θεός ἀμβρότος, οὐκέτι θνητός,
πολεύματε μετὰ πάσι τετμένος, ὡσπερ ἔοικεν,
ταῦτας τε περίστεπτος στέφεσιν τε θαλείοις.

The ancient sources for this passage do not indicate that verse 3 belongs to it. The sequence ξέινων . . . ἀπειροι is recorded separately by Diodorus (13.83.2), who ascribes it, as a description of the Acraganites, to Empedocles, and it was inserted in the opening lines by modern editors—hence Wright’s brackets. It remains a disputed presence here, although there is no question of misattribution, and the line makes good sense as verse 3.72 Assuming that the line is correctly inserted here, we have a striking sequence of seeming echoes or allusions (phraseological and auditory) to Pindar’s epinician odes, and specifically to the opening of O. 2. [i] With Empedocles’ (1–3) ἀκρόγαντος — ἄκρα πόλεος — ξέινων — λιμένες, compare Pindar’s ἀκρόθινα πολέμου — ξένων ἑρείσιμα’, Ἀκράγαντος (O. 2.4–6).73 [ii] Empedocles’ θεός ἀμβρότος, οὐκέτι θνητός (4) reads like a grandiose riposte to Pindar’s τίνα θεόν, τίν’ ἥρωα, τίνα δ’ ἀνόρα (O. 2.2). [iii] With Empedocles’ ὡσπερ ἔοικεν (5), compare the restored phrase ὡσπα δίκαιον (O. 2.6) itself. [iv] Then, without specific reference to the opening of O. 2, Empedocles’ τετμένος . . . στέφεσιν (5–6) is strongly evocative of the τιμαὶ καὶ στέφανοι of Pindaric epinician celebrations (the phrase itself comes from fr. 221.2 S–M). Empedocles, then, presents himself as a revered figure (like Pindar’s [ὑραξέ], Μ. 5.29), graced with garlands like an epinician victor. Very relevantly, Empedocles was a native of Acras; his grandfather was himself an Olympic victor;74 and there are notable eschatological affinities between his Katharmoi and O. 2.75

The Acraganite Empedocles, we may infer, has not only had Pindar in mind, but has also felt it natural to make the opening of his momentous poem, with its momentous opening claims, evoke—and even trump—the majestic opening of Pindar’s great tribute to Acragas and the Acraganite Thero. And the sequence of evocations would seem itself to support the placing of ξέινων . . . ἀπειροι as verse 3 of Empedocles’ proem,

71 But with added commas in verse 4; in Wright the fragment is numbered 102.
72 Wright (1995), 265–6.
73 For what it may be worth, an anecdote in Diog. Laert. 8.65 (Emped. P19 in Laks–Most [2016], 344–7) credits Empedocles with an epigram devoted to multiple wordplay with ἄκρα—(ἄκραν . . . ἀκρον’ Ἀκραγαντίνον . . . Ἀκρών | . . . ἄκρος . . . ἀκροτάτης). The epigram is printed as ‘Empedocles’ II by Page (1981), 153–4, who calls it ‘plainly spurious’ ([1981], 153).
74 Emped. P3 in Laks–Most (2016), 328–31: Diog. Laert. 8.51–2.
75 See e.g. Demand (1975), 355 n. 38.
just as, reciprocally, that proem supports the textual-critical case for the phrase ξένων ἔρεισμα in Pindar’s ode. I observe in passing that in Empedocles’ ξένων αἰδοίοι λημένες, the epithet αἰδοίοι recalls nothing in Pindar, but rather Od. 9.268–71, where Odysseus asks the Cyclops for δώτιν, ἢ τε ξένων θέμις ἑστιν, referring to Ζεῦς. . . ξείνιος, ὡς ξεινοσιον ὡς αἰδοίοισιν ὁπαί: it is the ξένων who are αἰδοίοι, strictly, not the λημένες. And that LSJ s.v. λιμήν unhelpfully cites the Emped. usage under II.2 ‘gathering-place’, rather than (as it surely should be) under II.1 ‘haven’.

APPENDIX C: EURIPIDES’ HIPPOLYTUS (see n. 69 above)

At Eur. Hipp. 585–7, the chorus hear shouting and—apparently—look to Phaedra, who is closer to the commotion, for enlightenment. The manuscripts at this point offer the hardly credible sequence: σωφρείς δ’ οὐκ ἔχω | γεγονενίν ὡς [or ὡς or ὡς] διὰ πύλας ἐμολεν | ἐμολελ’ σοι βού. Diggle (OCT) reads: . . . γεγόνει δ’ οἰα . . . , accepting a conjecture by Lloyd-Jones (γεγόνει δ’) and another by ‘nescoquis ap. Valckenau’ (οίο). Barrett had γεγονει δ’ ὡς (printed as ὡςα), where γεγονει δ’ was Murray’s suggestion. Whatever else is uncertain here, it can be agreed that the resemblance of γεγονειν ὡς δι- to the corrected version of Pindar’s sequence, γεγονητέον ὡς δι-, is curious. Might there be another reminiscence of Pindar’s text here? We know that O. 2, to judge from Empedocles’ reminiscence, was already established as a classic text (it remained a celebrated and much-cited poem for centuries: cf. the citations listed in Turyn’s edition). And Pindar’s ode and Euripides’ tragedy have just about enough in common to make it possible to imagine that the playwright might have had O. 2 in mind while composing the play: specifically, O. 2 is a poem celebrating a four-horse chariot victory (τετραορίας, O. 2.5), while Hippolytus is a tragedy whose climax has its hero destroyed by, precisely, such a chariot (τετράορον, Hipp. 1229). If ὡς at Hipp. 586 were sound, one would be tempted to hypothesize an unconscious authorial echo of Pindar by Euripides,76 prompted, then, by musings on four-horse chariots. But ὡς is anything but secure in Euripides’ text, and (for the record) no other significant correspondences to Pindar’s ode present themselves in the play.77

Alternatively, if ὡς has to be regarded as corrupt, but if one could be sure that this is an ancient corruption, one might posit a random scribal reminiscence by an ancient copyist familiar with ὡςα δικαῖον in a copy of O. 2—which would of course also provide corroborative evidence that a correct text of Pindar was still current at the time. But one can hardly be sure about the date of the corruption (most inconveniently, a second-century A.D. papyrus version of the passage—P.Oxy. 2224—breaks off after γεγο-), and, under the circumstances, random coincidence would seem at least as likely.78

76 As with Pindar’s own reminiscences, there is (whatever else) obviously no allusion here.
77 One notes, symptomatically, the gulf between the very specific description of the afterlife in O. 2.56–80 and the nurse’s blunt assertion that no one knows anything about any ‘other life’ beyond this world (Hipp. 195–7).
78 My warm thanks to Eleanor Dickey and Malcolm Schofield for helpfully responding to particular questions (see, specifically, n. 7 and Appendix A above). I am indebted also to CQ’s referee for several suggested improvements, to Patrick Finglass, as editor of CQ, for his tolerance of an awkwardly styled text, and to Nick Lowe for help with Unicode Greek fonts.