

PYTHIAN 5.72-76, 9.90-92, AND THE VOICE OF PINDAR

GORDON M. KIRKWOOD

These two controversial passages both have a bearing on the manifold problem of the poetic first person in Pindar. Therefore, while my principal concern in this paper is with the interpretation of the passages themselves, it is appropriate to begin with some comments on the broader issue. Study of the passages themselves needs some general basis of understanding and perhaps, too, what is offered here toward the clarification of the individual passages may have some value for the larger question as well.

For a long time Pindaric criticism was dominated by a thoroughgoing biographical approach. If the poet announces, in an epinician ode, that he has accompanied Diagoras to Rhodes (*O.* 7.13) or has stood at the courtyard door of Chromios (*N.* 1.19), critics accepted this as a literal report of Pindar's activities and were ready to reconstruct from such information a kind of Mediterranean travel diary for the poet. Very likely some of these statements are literally true, but as specific evidence they are worthless; in *O.* 7 Pindar not only "comes down" with Diagoras, he also "sends" his poem to Rhodes (line 8), and if we are going to interpret these personal data literally we shall have to choose carefully and reject some. It is sobering to realize that even so widely accepted a "historical" event as Pindar's trip to Sicily rests on the insecure foundation of a few such passages, which may all be only metaphorical journeyings. But the historical interpretation of such incidental clues is at worst only a slight irrelevance. Where the procedure assumes interpretative significance is in its application to extensive passages which, in this biographical view, constitute statements about Pindar's

actions and feelings with no necessary relevance to the poem as a whole. The most famous of such passages is the final triad of *P. 2*. There is no need to quote at length from biographical interpretations of this admittedly strange and difficult passage, but an indication of what is essentially misguided about this procedure, so far as the criticism of Pindar's poetry is concerned, is apparent in a sentence in the discussion of the passage by Farnell, one of the latest in time and most assiduous of biographical critics: "We can only imagine that something happened to start Pindar off afresh, after he had brought his letter" - Farnell characterizes *P. 2* as a "lyrical letter" rather than a true epinician - "to a close."¹⁾ The weakness of this critical approach lies not in the quality of the historical reconstruction -- which may even be correct -- but in its irrelevance to the poem as a whole and its ready assumption that Pindar has willingly damaged the unity of the poem by the gratuitous introduction of his own personal concerns and views. In fairness it must be granted that Farnell was writing at a time when many critics despaired of finding unity in the individual odes.²⁾ It is significant that later critics, looking at the poem not for biographical information but for integrity of poetic meaning, have had no trouble in finding poetic unity in *P. 2*,³⁾ though I do not mean to suggest that all the interpretative problems of this passage are thereby solved.

For reasons which are not all either wrong or negligible, critics of ancient Greek poetry were slow to relinquish the biographical approach, though so far as Pindar is concerned Schadewaldt had, in 1928, in *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion*, begun to move toward the emphasis on text which was at that time becoming a leading tenet of Russian formalist criticism and the New Criticism,⁴⁾ and since Bundy's influential *Studia Pindarica* (1962) the biographical approach has largely been superseded. Critics are no longer likely to concentrate their attention on the creation of a life of Pindar of Thebes out of the first-person statements in the poems. But the problem of the poetic persona in ancient Greek lyric poetry and related genres is complicated by the fact that, so much being fragmentary, it is very difficult to know, even at the most literal

level, what voice we are hearing, -- the poet's, or a voice deliberately at odds with the poet, or a voice that is one of two or more engaged in dialogue.⁵⁾ In choral poetry, and especially in the epinician, the difficulty is compounded, both because the manner of its presentation inevitably creates some merging of the poet and the chorus and because the epinician is by the very nature of the genre anchored to a historical moment and to personal data. Not only are we given, in some of the poems, a good deal of information about the victor's previous athletic achievements and about the accomplishments and the status of his family, but there are passages too that can only be interpreted as providing personal information about the poet himself. Thus in the opening strophe of *I. 1*, the poet announces, in effect, that he has put the composition of the present poem, for a Theban compatriot, ahead of another "engagement" (ἀσχολία); he trusts that "rocky Delos will not be indignant," and hopes for a double success, with the help of the gods, both in the present ode and "celebrating in dance (χορεύων⁶⁾) long-haired Phoebus in sea-girt Keos, with sailing men." A paean, composed for a chorus from Keos to perform at Delos, is partially preserved (fr. 52d). The title is lost, but the contents of the first strophe provide reasonably certain identification, and beyond serious doubt this is the poem referred to as Pindar's other engagement. In *I. 8.5-11*, Pindar calls upon himself to lay aside his own sorrow because he is "called upon to summon the golden Muse," and a little later declares that "a god has removed the stone of Tantalus from overhead, a burden beyond endurance for Greece." It is a fair assumption that the poet's grief is for the Persian invasion and the inglorious part played in it by Thebes. In both cases Pindar is talking about the emotions and concerns of Pindar of Thebes. At the same time, there is in these personal references no breach of epinician unity or convention. They are simply extensive examples of the poet's relationship of *xenia* toward his patron, a relationship which has been carefully examined by Mary Lefkowitz.⁷⁾ The willingness of Pindar to lay aside his personal grief or his previous obligation for the advantage of his patron is an integral part of the encomiastic nature of the epinician. But the passages do introduce into his poem personal

matters that have a basis of existence outside the poem itself. They are neither intrusive biography (because they are relevant) nor merely "conventional masks and gestures," as Bundy designates such passages⁸⁾.

For the most part, of course, the "I" or "we" of the poet is a good deal less personal and individualized than in these two passages. Sometimes it is no more than the epinician poet as such, discharging his encomiastic function, as when, in *O.* 7.7 the poet sends "liquid nectar, gift of the Muses," and at *N.* 3.11 he "will blend" his song "to the voices" of the chorus "and to the lyre." Often the poet himself blends with the singers, as at *O.* 6.3, *πᾶξομεν*, or with his song, as in the proemium of *O.* 2: "Hymns, masters of the lyre, what god, what hero, what man shall we celebrate?" Often the poet speaks as the friend, adviser, or sharer, in the impersonal tone of the philosopher (*P.* 11.50): "May I love fair things that come with the will of the gods, and desire, in season, the attainable." The voice often takes a more individual and independent tone, and becomes the voice of the poet of the *ὀρθὸς λόγος* or the independent innovator, or the poet who rejects the graceful lies of Homer. When Pindar rejects the traditional story of Tantalus, in *O.* 1, the lies of Homer in *N.* 7, the rancor of Archilochus in *P.* 2, and when he asserts his originality, as at *O.* 9.48-49 ("Praise old wine but the flowers of new songs") he is again approaching the individuality and personal quality of the two extensive passages noticed above. The apparent excitement, or even distress or embarrassment, of some first-person references in passages of transition, as when the poet alleges that he has lost his course (*P.* 11.38-40) or is in danger of shipwreck (*N.* 3.26-27), does not, of course, mean that the poet is expressing a real embarrassment or fear, or that he has in fact strayed from what he meant to say; and the poet's reproach to his *θυμὸς* for lingering over a mention of Heracles, in *N.* 3, is a dramatic way of making transition from the praise of this greatest of epinician figures, who is always relevant in epinician poetry, to the more immediate matter of the present ode. There is no need to enlarge; this aspect of Pindar's style has been recognized and categorized⁹⁾. But we are wrong if we dismiss these dramatic transitions as purely conventional. Pin-

dar's assertions of his leadership in poetry (*P.* 4.247-48) and his devotion to the greatness of Heracles (along with the passage in *N.* 3, *N.* 1.33-34 is particularly striking) are personal, not just the views of "the poet" or even the epinician poet, but of the poet Pindar. Bacchylides too has his formulas of transition, and they are in a very different tone.

This, then, is the voice¹⁰⁾ of the poet in the Pindaric epinician. Its tone is manifold, its function both conventional and expressive of the strong presence of Pindar of Thebes. A recognition of its range and its style will help, I believe, in the interpretation of the two passages to which we now turn.

P. 5.72-76 is one of a very few passages in the epinicians of Pindar in which some critics, ancient and modern, have believed that they hear another voice, that of the performing chorus. The probability of the sporadic intrusion of an exclusively choral first person, in the midst of a vast majority of first-person references which clearly mean the poet, is at the outset, very slight. The case against it has been strongly and, in my opinion, successfully argued by Mary Lefkowitz, who distinguishes between the epinicians, in which there are no first-person references that exclude the poet, and other choral types, the partheneion and the paeon, in which there is, beyond doubt, a choral "I" or "we."¹¹⁾ The distinction by genre is not surprising. Partheneia and paeans, like dithyrambs, were composed for formal, communal occasions of religious celebration. For all these genres we know, from the poems themselves or from other sources, something about the constitution of the choral group. So it is also with the choruses of drama. The occasion for singing an epinician was, so far as we know, less formal, more personal, and the personal link was between poet and victor, and between poet and community.

In spite of some apparent evidence to the contrary, *P.* 5. 72-76 provides no exception to Pindar's epinician practice with regard to the first person. In the preceding sentence, from line 63, the poet is speaking of Apollo,

Who grants to men and women healing from heavy disease, who has bestowed the lyre and gives the Muse to whomever he will, bringing lawfulness without discord into men's hearts, who holds sway in his prophetic chamber; who has in Lacedaemon, in Argos, and in sacred Pylos caused the stalwart sons of Heracles to dwell.

Then follows the debated passage:

τὸ δ' ἔμὸν γαρύειν
ἀπὸ Σπάρτας ἐπήρατον κλέος,

ᾄθην γεγενναμένοι

75 ἵκοντο θήρανδε φῶτες Αἰγείδαι,

ἔμοι πατέρες, οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ, ἀλλὰ Μοῖρὰ τις ἄγεν·

First, the text of line 72 needs comment. Most modern editions read γαρύει, to replace the MSS vulgate γαρύειτ' (γαρύατ' and γαρύειντ' also occur), which is taken in the scholia as γαρύεται with elision but can be virtually ruled out on metrical grounds. With γαρύει the usual and most probably interpretation is to take Apollo as subject. But the assertion that Apollo "sings my lovely fame" (whether the poet's or the chorus's) rings false. Apollo grants the lyre and gives the Muse to whom he will, but he does not, in Pindar's poetry, celebrate the excellence of mortals¹²). That is the rôle of the poet, under divine inspiration. Hermann's γαρύειν is at least as probable palaeographically and restores both good sense, "It is my task to sing of a lovely fame from Sparta," and good idiom; *I.* 8.38-39 provides a striking parallel: τὸ μὲν ἔμὸν... ὀπάσσαι.

This reading does not ensure that "I" means the poet, though it makes the sentence correspond closely to the many passages in which Pindar speaks of his obligation, as epinician poet, to the victor and his community; it is one form of the convention which Hamilton classifies as "poet's task."¹³) Consideration of the phrase in relation to its context and to other epinician conventions strengthens the case for "I" as poet. First, the relevance of τὸ δ' ἔμὸν γαρύειν to what precedes is strengthened. Apollo is praised as the healer of diseases; we know from Herodotus (3.131) that Cyrene was famous for its physicians as well as for the export of the medicinal plant silphium. He is called the bestower of song; the relevance to Pindar's poem is obvious. He is god of prophecy; it was his prophecies, we know from *P.* 4.54-57 and from Herodotus (4.150-57), that led to the founding of Cyrene. He is the sponsor of Dorian states, from which Cyrene was founded. Then comes the first-person statement: it is my office, says Pindar, as the representative of Apolline

musical inspiration, to praise this state founded under Apollo's auspices, founded from Sparta (by way of Thera) by the Aigeidai, who are my ancestors. We know from Herodotus (4.149) and from *I.* 7.12-15 that Aigeidai from Thebes were in Lacedaemon. We need not press the point as to whether Pindar was in fact a member of that family or means simply that as a Theban, offspring, as were the Aigeidai, of $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}, \dots \Theta\acute{\eta}\beta\alpha$, as he invokes Thebes in the opening line of *I.* 1, Pindar can call any Thebans of old his "ancestors."

This is precisely the kind of close link between Pindar and Thebes and his patron that we see exemplified in other poems. *O.* 6 gives an extraordinarily close parallel. The ode is for a Syracusan whose family had come from Stymphalos, in Arcadia, the home of the water-nymph Metopa, who was by legend the mother of Thebe, eponymous nymph of Thebes. Hence, to Pindar, Metopa is $\mu\alpha\tau\rho\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}$, "my grandmother" (*O.* 6.84), and Pindar finds in this a close bond with his Syracusan patron. There is nothing here that is not entirely in accord with the epinician poetic ego. To fail to recognize it is to lose a part of the emotional power and intensity lent to the poetry by the poet's very personal presence in it¹⁴⁾.

P. 9.89a-92 exemplifies just the opposite interpretative danger. Here we must remove the person of the poet from a rôle in which he has been improperly made to appear. The context of these lines is riddled with problems, but clarification of the point at issue does not require that most of these be broached here. As general background to discussion, it will be enough to say that lines 76-104 of *P.* 9 consist, basically, of a listing of victories won by the addressee of the ode, Telesikrates of Cyrene, at various minor games. In itself, this is a recurrent feature of the epinician, but there are enough obscurities in the passage to have given rise to an enormous variety of interpretations. In my opinion the right line of interpretation was established by Schroeder¹⁵⁾ and worked out convincingly by Burton:¹⁶⁾ the ode was performed in Cyrene, and the passage has nothing to do with Pindar's relations with Thebes but only with Telesikrates' athletic prowess, Pindar's skill in honoring it, and mythological precedents for both.

Lines 89a-92, as they appear in the Snell-Maehler Teubner text, are as follows:

Χαρίτων κελαιδενναῖν
 μή με λίποι καθαρὸν φέγγος. Αἰγίνα τε γὰρ
 φάμι Νίσου τ' ἐν λόφῳ τρίς
 δὴ πόλιν τάνδ' εὐκλείξαι,
 σιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν ἔργῳ φυγῶν·

May the pure glow of the singing Graces not desert me. For I declare that on Aegina and on Nisus' hill I have thrice brought fame to this city, fleeing by my deed the helplessness of silence.

Again we are faced with a textual problem, slight in compass, with a convincing solution again provided by Hermann, and absolutely crucial to the understanding of the passage. The reading εὐκλείξαι is fraught with problems. An epinician poet "brings fame" to a city by composing epinician odes in honor of that city's successful competitors. With εὐκλείξαι, "this city" must be Thebes; there is not the remotest likelihood that Pindar has three times composed victory odes for competitors from Cyrene at Aegina and Megara ("on Nisus' hill").¹⁷⁾ The poet is, then, declaring that he has three times honored Thebes by poems composed for victories at Aegina and Megara; but why he speaks of glorifying Thebes by composing odes for such occasions is obscure indeed. Contests at Aegina and Megara are the minor leagues of ancient athletics, and, what is more compelling, we have no evidence that Pindar ever composed odes for victories at either place. But with Hermann's εὐκλείξας at 91 and φάμι taken as parenthetical, perfect intelligibility and conformity with the conventions of the Pindaric epinician are achieved: "At Aegina and on Nisus' hill, I declare, *you* have thrice brought glory to this city," i.e., Cyrene, the victor's state, "escaping by your deed the helplessness of silence." For this parenthetical φάμι P. 3.75-76 φάμι... ἐξικόμαν με provides an excellent parallel.

Responsible scholars are reluctant to accept an easy emendation as a cure for an interpretative difficulty, but here, though analysis quickly reveals the grave problems raised by MSS reading, at a superficial level εὐκλείξας is, in view of φάμι, the *lectio difficilior*, and some of Pindar's most percep-

tive and thoughtful editors, Alexander Turyn among them, have adopted this emendation. My aim is to call attention to three aspects of epinician style and form that argue in its favor.

First, the phrase Αἰγίνα τε... Νίσου τ' ἐν λόφῳ. I have called attention to the extreme improbability that Pindar is referring to other odes written by him. There is also a positive argument to the same effect. In two other listings of previous victories of the recipient of the ode, victories at Aegina and Megara are listed side by side. At *O.* 7.86-87, in the great victory list of Diagoras, occupying a position of relative insignificance at the end of the list, we read: Αἰγίνα τε νικῶνθ' ἐξάκις· ἐν Μεγάροισίν τ' οὐχ ἕτερον λιθίνα / Ψάφος ἔχει λόγον. And in the list of Xenophon's successes, in *O.* 13, sandwiched between victories at Argos, Arcadia, Pellene, and Sicyon and others at Eleusis and Marathon, are the same pair, 109: καὶ Μέγαρ' Αἰακιδᾶν τ' εὐερκέες ἄλλος... That here too in *P.* 9 this pair refer to the victor's exploits, not the poet's, is hard to doubt.

Second, there is the evidence of the words πόλιν τάνδ'. In epinician language this phrase can be expected to refer to the victor's state; it does so at *P.* 8.99, πόλιν τάνδε κόμιζε (Aegina), at *O.* 5.20-21,¹⁸⁾ πόλιν... τάνδε... δαιδάλλειν (Camarina, cf. τόνδε δᾶμον, line 14), and at *I.* 5.22, τάνδ' ἐς εὐνομον πόλιν (Aegina). In fact, of all the many occasions when Pindar uses the word ὄδε referring to this land, this city, this people, etc., there is not one comparable phrase that does not refer to the victor's homeland. There would probably never have been any question raised about the reference of πόλιν τάνδ' had it not been for the word δέξεται in line 73, which in older criticism was taken to indicate that the victor had not yet returned to Cyrene at the time of the poem's performance. Modern criticism of Pindar has firmly established one point -- if little else -- namely that such verbal tenses are not to be interpreted literally¹⁹⁾. Δέξεται, like κλαδήσω, *O.* 11.14, takes the stance of the composing poet toward the performance of the ode, and provides no evidence against the natural assumption that ὄδε πόλις is the victor's state.

A third point of epinician style and language may seem less decisive than these two, but I believe that it is equally so:

it is not the poet but the victor who escapes silence by his ἔργον. I need not elaborate on this point, since Burton²⁰) has presented the case convincingly and with parallel examples. In short, as Burton argues, ἔργον is quite the wrong word for the poet's activity, exactly right for the victor's achievement; and the silence is the oblivion of the man who has not achieved success and renown, not the poet's inability to find words -- a strange condition for Pindar to suggest as a possibility for himself.

To Burton's argument the following points can be added. Though Pindarists speak, correctly, of "Schuld" and of the poet's task,"²¹) it is conspicuous that this obligation is never (unless here) referred to as an ἔργον. On the contrary, the poet's task is a response to the victor's ἔργον, and the basic relationship of poem to victory is the relationship of χάρις, as Schadewaldt observes. Over and over again, song is reward, the fulfillment, the healing balm for the toil of the contest. *I.* 3.7 is a good example: "As a reward for deeds of fair fame (εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων ἄποινα) we must sing of a good man." Deeds bring escape from oblivion, provided they meet with their complement of song. This is simply one form of statement of the Pindaric belief that victory requires song for its fulfillment. *N.* 7.11-16 provides a clear parallel: "If a man succeeds in action, he gives sweet cause for the flow of the Muses' stream; great acts of prowess, lacking song, stay in deep darkness; we know but one way to provide a mirror for fair deeds, if by grace of Mnemosyne of the shining headband reward for toil is found in glorifying songs of praise."

In *P.* 5.72-76, to deny the presence of the poet's voice is to fail to reckon with the comprehensiveness and the personal intensity of the blend of poet and epinician occasion; in *P.* 9.90-92, to apply to the poet these descriptive phrases is to misunderstand the conventions of the epinician description of poetry and victory and the relationship between them. In both passages the poet has a prominent and significant place. While we cannot safely extrapolate from this presence biographical facts about Pindar of Thebes, we can see that it is more than a set of conventions determined by the genre. The conventions

are there and must be recognized for understanding of the poetry. They are important clues to the interpretation of the two dominant presences in a Pindaric epinician, the poet and the victor.

Cornell University

NOTES

- 1) L.R. Farnell, *Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar*, 2nd ed., Amsterdam, 1965, p.127.
- 2) See David C. Young's "Pindaric Criticism," reprinted in *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, ed. W.M. Calder, III, and Jacob Stern, Darmstadt, 1970, pp.38-58.
- 3) See especially Erich Thummer, *Rhein. Mus.* 115 (1972) 293-307.
- 4) For Russian formalist views see Boris Tomáševskij, "Literatura i biografija" (1923), reprinted in translation as "Literature and Biography," pp.47-55 of *Readings in Russian Poetics*, edited by Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska, Ann Arbor, 1978. On New Criticism, see, e.g., "The New Critics" (1947), by Robert W. Stallman, reprinted as pp.488-506 of *Critiques and Essays in Criticism*, edited by Stallman, New York, 1949. The concentration on the life and personality of the poet, against which the formalists and New Critics rebelled, was itself a movement of rebellion from eighteenth century criticism; see M.H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp* (Oxford, 1953), Ch.9.
- 5) The best discussion of the problem as it relates to ancient Greek poetry is in K.J. Dover's "The Poetry of Archilochus," *Archiloque* ("Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique," Tome X), Geneva, 1963, pp.181-212.
- 6) A good indication of the variety of usage of the first person in Greek choral poetry is given by the fact that this word, here clearly referring in the first person to the poet, is used, also in the first person singular, by a tragic chorus: τὸ δέῃ με χορεύειν; *Soph. O. T.* 896.
- 7) "ΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ: The First Person in Pindar," *H.S.C.P.* 67 (1963) 177-253; see especially 210-25.
- 8) *Studia Pindarica* II, 35.
- 9) See Wolfgang Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion* (1923) reprinted Darmstadt, 1966, pp.19-20, and Richard Hamilton, *Epinikion* (The Hague, 1974) 16-17.
- 10) My use of the word "voice" is borrowed from T.S. Eliot's 1953 essay "The Three Voices of Poetry." Eliot's threefold division consists of the voice of the poet talking to himself, the voice of the poet addressing an audience, and the multiple voice of dramatic poetry. Though in an earlier essay, "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (1919), Eliot carefully distinguished the personal emotions of the poet from his poetry ("The more perfect the artist, the more completely separate in him will be the man who suffers and the mind which creates; the more perfectly will the mind digest and transmute the passions..."), in the latter essay he shows no hesitation in regarding the two non-dramatic voices as the personal voice

the poet. It is clear that poets can have varying attitudes to the relationship between poet and poetry. In a letter dated October 27, 1818, Keats altogether (though perhaps not altogether seriously) denies existence to the "poetical character" ("it has no self -- It is everything and nothing -- It has no character -- it enjoys light and shade; it lives in gusto...") but limits this description to "that sort, of which, if I am anything, I am a member; that sort distinguished from the Wordsworthian, egotistical Sublime." We could, I think, substitute "Pindaric" for "Wordsworthian" without violating Keats's meaning.

- 11) Op. cit., note 7. Lyric genres in which there is a choral voice can also present the voice of the poet. *Paean* 6 and fr. 94a (usually classified as a partheneion) both do so.
- 12) Farnell, op. cit. (note 1), p.176 interprets as "the fair tale of renown gives voice from Sparta," and Lefkowitz follows this, op. cit. (note 7), p.177. This is extremely improbable, because it ascribes an intransitive sense to γαρούει which the active forms of this verb nowhere have. If this were the MSS reading there would at least be the evidence of *this* passage for such a meaning; but it is not.
- 13) Hamilton, op. cit. (note 9), p.16; cf. Schadewaldt, op. cit., pp.19-20.
- 14) Cf. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, 311.
- 15) *Pindars Pythien* (Leipzig, 1922), 85-87.
- 16) R.W.B. Burton, *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford, 1962), 48-53.
- 17) The reference cannot be only to the glory bestowed by *this* ode; γ... εὐκλείξει rules that out.
- 18) Even if O. 5 is not by Pindar, there is good reason to believe that it was composed under Pindar's influence. Cf. C.M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford, 1964) 414-20.
- 19) See Bundy on κελαδίῳ O. 11.14 (*Studia Pindarica* 1.20-22), Burton on δέξεται (*Pindar's Pythian Odes*, pp.53-54); Schroeder, op. cit. (note 85), and, for numerous examples, Erich Thummer, *Pindars Isthmische Dichtungen* (Heidelberg, 1968) 1.128.
- 20) Op. cit. (note 16) 52-53.
- 21) Cf. Schadewaldt, op. cit., 20; Hamilton, op. cit., 16-17.