Quadratus was to hand, with the added attraction of fashion. All of these points obtain in the case of Zosimus: he too *could* have consulted a source outside Olympiodorus.

But the traditional suspicions are probably well founded. A little after the Ravenna sequence, Zosimus offers (5. 29. 3) one of the very few testimonies to the third-century poet Pisander. In point of fact, it is one of the earliest.[8] The same material is exploited by Sozomen (*HE* 1. 6. 4), who drew on Olympiodorus for his ninth book in particular.

Olympiodorus would appear to be the common source here. The quick appearance of the Quadratus and Pisander references, one shortly after the other, in that part of Zosimus which is flagrantly derived from Olympiodorus, is suggestive, especially when we consider the rarity of named authorities in the *New History*. Apart from the ones under review, they boil down to: Homer, Herodotus, Polybius, the emperor Julian, and Syrianos the philosopher.[9] These are more widely dispersed: there is no agglomeration comparable to the one in question. The allusions to Quadratus and Pisander come in the first paragraphs after that point in Book 5 where Zosimus switches from Eunapius to Olympiodorus. The conclusion is obvious and tempting.

And there is one further reinforcement. At 1. 47, Zosimus commences his notorious dependence upon Eunapius. In this very paragraph, he vaguely adduces "certain historians" on the matter of Claudius' brother, Quintillus. In the opening sentence of the *New History*, where one or more elusive[10] sources are being exploited, there is a sloppy evocation of Polybius. A pattern is discernible. Wherever Zosimus begins to use a particular source, there is prompt adducing of authorities followed by long stretches without any such allusions. As a historiographical technique, it is a non-starter. But the assumption that Zosimus begins each major segment with a short-lived reproduction of his sources' sources, with equally swift abandonment thereof, is all too plausible, since it requires nothing more subtle than the plain evidence of his narrative as a whole. The odds against the outside chance lengthen: Olympiodorus remains a firm favorite as the source of Zosimus' knowledge of Asinius Quadratus.

BARRY BALDWIN
University of Calgary

8. See the *testimonia* assembled (with bibliography) in E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Göttingen, 1964), 2:44–46.

9. Consult the register in the introduction to F. Paschoud's Budé (Paris, 1971), p. xxxvi.

10. Ibid., pp. xxxiv–lxiii; Dexippus will surely have been a major (if not the sole) source, given his popularity in later times and the fact that Eunapius both admired and continued him.

PROPERTIUS 1. 1 AND CONSTANTINE THE SICILIAN

In the concluding section of an article that has cast much new light on Propertius 1. 1 (*CQ*, n.s. 24 [1974]: 94–110), Francis Cairns has recently compared that poem with a long anacreontic poem by a writer of the early tenth (rather than late ninth) century, Constantine the Sicilian. The first sixty lines describe how the

poet caught sight of and attempted to catch Eros, who finally turned and shot him; lines 77 ff. run as follows:

συνομηλίκων χορεία,
συναρήξατε προθύμως . . .
τί δὲ φάρμακόν ποθ' εὕρω,
κραδίην ἐμὴν δροσίζον.
φάρμακον ἐξ Ἑλένης εἴ τις ἐφεύροι
ἡμετέραις φιάλαις ἐγκαταμῖξαι.

"Here," writes Cairns (p. 109), "we have first an appeal to the speaker's contemporaries for help and advice. Then the speaker wishes for a φάρμακον. This word in itself can refer equally to magic or to orthodox medicine. But the phrase ἐξ Ἑλένης which qualifies φάρμακον favours a religious/magical interpretation." Cairns acknowledges a suggestion of A. J. Beattie "that Constantine's poem seems to refer to worship of Helen as a love-goddess," which he takes as a "further hint at the learned Hellenistic source from which this lyric may ultimately derive." On this assumption he infers that "in these lines we have appeals resembling those of Propertius to the witches and to his friends (1. 1. 19–30)," concluding (p. 110) that "it is impossible to dismiss the thematic correspondences between them as coincidence."

Alas, Constantine's source can be identified with certainty: none other than Homer. He is alluding to the opiate that Helen, no love goddess but the reinstated wife of Menelaus, mixed with Telemachus' wine to dissipate his grief at Sparta:

αὐτίκ' ἄρ' εἰς οἶνον βάλε φάρμακον, ἔνθεν ἔπινον
νηπενθές τ' ἄχολόν τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἁπάντων . . .

[*Od.* 4. 220–21]

There is also another text to be taken into account. Constantine's poem is transmitted in two MSS: in one (now apparently defective) together with some other early Byzantine anacreontics (see Bergk, *PLG*, 3⁴:339 f., 370), and in another (Paris. suppl. gr. 352) embedded in an anthology of classical epigrams, most but not all of which reappear in Palatinus gr. 23, the *Palatine Anthology* (Cramer, *Anecd. Par.*, 4:380–83). Despite the unfounded recent denial of R. Aubreton ("La Tradition des épigrammes de l'*Anthologie palatine*," *REA* 70 [1968]: 67), both anthologies may be presumed to derive from the now lost collection put together by Constantine Cephalas, a contemporary of Constantine the Sicilian, circa 900. One of the epigrams that does not feature in the *Palatine Anthology* is:

Τυνδαρέη κρητῆρα κερασσομένη παρὰ δεῖπνον
δάκρυα Τηλεμάχοιο κατέσβεσεν ἐς μίαν ὥρην.
εἰ δὲ βόδα προσέμιξε παρηγορέοντι κυπέλλῳ,
εἶχε μένειν ἄκλαυστος, ἕως νόστησεν Ὀδυσσεύς

[E. Cougny, *Appendix nova epigrammatum* (Paris, 1890), chap. 5, no. 52]

Here the poet is suggesting an improvement on Helen's drug (for the mixing of roses with wine, cf. *Anacreontea* 5. 2 f.). I shall elsewhere be presenting reasons for supposing that Constantine himself is the compiler of this little anthology (*Studies in the Greek Anthology*, forthcoming). Whether it was this epigram (presumably

late imperial) or its Homeric model that suggested the Helen motif to Constantine, the reference in his own poem to the mixing of the φάρμακον in a cup of wine puts it beyond doubt that it was a drug like Helen's he had in mind, something to make him forget his pain. No reference then to love potions or witches—and no lost Hellenistic poem.

The other parallels between Propertius and Constantine adduced by Cairns add up to no more than commonplaces: a warning for others to beware of love, and the benefits of travel as a cure for it. Cairns himself draws attention to "marked differences between the treatment of some of the themes in the two texts" (p. 110). With the disappearance of the most striking of the supposed coincidences, the idea of a common "learned tradition of erotic poetry" behind both Propertius and Constantine is probably best abandoned.

ALAN CAMERON
Columbia University

MOSCHOPOULOS AND THE SCHOLIA TO THE *BATRACHOMYOMACHIA*

There is contained in two manuscripts[1] of the *Batrachomyomachia*, U = Ambrosianus H 22 (saec. xv) and P° = Ottobonianus Gr. 150 (saec. xv/xvi), a set of scholia (to verses 1–208) which is attributed in P° (fol. 110r) to Moschopoulos: Ὁμήρου Βατραχομυομαχία μετ' ἐξηγήσεως ὠφελιμωτάτης τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου.[2] The attribution has not, to my knowledge, been questioned; but, in their text tradition and contents, these scholia present so many anomalies when compared with the texts and practices of Moschopoulos that their cumulative effect makes it almost certain that they were not composed by him.

THE TEXT

It is certain that the *Batrachomyomachia* was never part of the poetic *sylloge* of Moschopoulos (*Iliad* 1–2. 493, Hesiod *Opera et dies*, Pindar *Olympians* 1–8, the Byzantine triads of Sophocles [*Aj.*, *El.*, *OT*] and Euripides [*Hec.*, *Or.*, *Phoen.*], and Theocritus *Idylls* 1–8).[3] The text of the *Batrachomyomachia* is not found in any MS containing the whole, or the majority of the components, of the *sylloge*, although it is occasionally found in a MS which contains part of the *sylloge* (e.g., Baroccianus 46: Hesiod with scholia of Tzetzes and Moschopoulos; Ambrosianus L 73: Moschopoulos' commentary on the *Iliad;* Casanatensis G IV 16: Hesiod, Moschopoulos' commentary on Theocritus). No component of the *sylloge* and no other work of Moschopoulos is in U or P°.

1. The first three scholia are found without attribution in U[a] (Ambr. H 22, foll. 184 ff.). I use the sigla and edition (pp. 198–308) of A. Ludwich, *Die Homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres* (Leipzig, 1896), cited hereafter as Ludwich.

2. E. Miller, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de la bibliothèque de l'Escurial* (Paris, 1848), p. 330, no. 41, listed a MS containing *Batr.* with the scholia of Moschopoulos, scholia of Tzetzes to Hesiod, and Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca*. The MS came into the possession of Cardinal Ottoboni in Rome and was later incorporated in the Vatican's holdings by Benedict XIV (Miller, p. 305). It is tempting to identify the Escorial MS with P°; but, if Miller's description is correct, the identification is not possible (Ludwich, p. 119).

3. For bibliography see "Moschopoulos and Harpocration," *TAPA* 100 (1969): 204, n. 13, and "Moschopulea," *ByzZ* 64 (1971): 303, n. 1.