

MELICA

ALCMAN

I. 60–3

ταὶ Πεληάδες γὰρ ἄμυν
ὀρθραὶ φάρος φερόισαις
νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίαν ἄτε Σήριον
ἄστρον ἀφηρομέναι μαχόνται.

The context shows that the intention of the lines was to bring out the surpassing beauty of a certain girl and its value to the chorus as a whole. When the Pleiades rise up the sky, they are followed by a star that far outshines them all: Sirius. In Alcman's image, then, the Pleiades should correspond to the chorus and Sirius to the girl. The point of *ὀρθραὶ φάρος φερόισαις* is that the comparison is not chosen at random, but suggested by something to be seen during the current ceremonies: the Pleiades rise up the sky *before dawn when we carry the plough*, with Sirius down below them, and they seem like a rival group.

There is no reference to Ortheia, and no rival chorus. We may translate: 'For the Pleiades range themselves against us, before dawn, as we bear the plough through the ambrosial night, bringing Sirius up with them as they do.' There would, however, be two advantages in changing *ἄτε* to *τότε*. The former is found nowhere else in the lyric poets, apart from Pindar; and the change would make *ἀφηρομέναι* intransitive, as it is elsewhere in connection with the heavenly bodies.¹

If the Pleiades are rising up the sky before dawn, and Sirius is also visible before the sun rises, it is late July or early August.² Threshing is over, the grain is stored away, the oxen are unyoked (Hes. *Op.* 608). As far as cereal crops are concerned, the agricultural year is at an end, and it is a very suitable season at which to carry a plough in procession and pray to the gods. There is a feast,³ and therefore a sacrifice. The obvious animal to sacrifice on such an occasion is the ox, whose work is finished and who will only be an expense to keep alive through the coming months. The Attic Buphonia took place now.

The plough-procession was before sunrise. That need not be the time of the song, and if I interpreted 40–3 rightly, it was not.⁴ But whether it was earlier or later does not appear from the text. When Alcman was composing the song, both alike were in the future, and their temporal relationship was not important to his comparison.

¹ To the examples I gave in *CQ* xv (1965), 197 n. 1 could be added Soph. *Ph.* 1331 (ἥλιος) ταύτη μὲν αἶρη, τῇδε δ' αὖ δύνῃ πάλιν, Orph. fr. 62. 3 ἥελιε χρυσέαισιν ἀειρόμενε περύγεσσιν.

² Calculations of ancient dates of rising and setting are now available in E. J. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World* (1966), 143; but the user must know that the definition there given ('Heliacal phenomena: near sunrise. Acronical [*sic*] and cosmical phenomena: near sunset') is quite

wrong. Heliacal rising and cosmical setting occur near sunrise; acronychal rising and heliacal setting occur near sunset.

³ 81 θωστήρια. See Page, *Alcman, The Partheneion*, 79.

⁴ Art. cit. 194 f. The other interpretation, which links *μαρτύρεται* with *φαίνην*, 'summons to shine', might be defended against my attack, on the ground that in the sun's case shining is inseparably connected with witnessing.

THE STESICHORI

Aelian tells a story about Daphnis, and says that this was the original subject of τὰ βουκολικά μέλη, and that Stesichorus of Himera τῆς τοιαύτης μελοποιίας ὑπάρξασθαι. Page rightly excludes this from the genuine work of the great Stesichorus (*Melici*, 279). But a poem on Daphnis might suit the fourth-century writer¹ who called himself 'Stesichorus of Himera the Second'. We assume that he wrote the *Cyclops* mentioned by Marsyas (*FGrHist* 135/6 F 17) ap. Did. in *Dem.* xii. 62 (*Mel.* 840), because it was performed in an aulodic competition in company with *Cyclopes* by Timotheus and Philoxenus.² We know that Philoxenus' *Cyclops* provided the background for Theocritus' sixth and eleventh idylls. It would not be surprising if the Sicilian Daphnis story, also a Theocritean theme,³ was introduced to poetic literature by a younger contemporary of Philoxenus. Of course, that is not what Aelian understood; the younger poet would have had to be distinguished explicitly.

The fact that Timotheus wrote a *Scylla* makes one wonder whether the *Scylla* attributed to Stesichorus was not another of the works of Stesichorus II.⁴ The agreement of Homeric and Apollonian scholia in *Mel.* 220 takes us back to Alexandrian philology; but we cannot assume that this excludes a citation from the younger poet, even if his work remained unconfused with that of the older. Nor can I find a decisive answer in a second piece of evidence, *Mel.* 275 (ii): 'octametrum catalecticum, quo usus est Stesichorus in Sicilia':

*audiat haec nostri mela carminis et tunc per tua rura uolabit.*⁵

'In Sicily' is neither a relevant nor a characteristic addition, and I conjecture in *Scilla*. Either Stesichorus might have written a dactylic octameter; and if their works became confused, either might be quoted by metricians. Finally, although *Scylla* and *Geryoneis* were certainly separate poems, there would be a possible ground for ascribing them to the same author if, as Vürtheim supposed, the story that Scylla was killed by Heracles on his way home with Geryon's oxen⁵ went back to the Stesichorean poem. But there is no compelling reason to assume that it does.

IBYCUS

282. 46-8

τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰέν'
καὶ σὺ Πουλύκρατες κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς
ὥς κατ' αἰοιδᾶν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.

There are four opinions about the identity of this Polycrates:

(i) For Hunt, who edited the papyrus, he was the famous tyrant of Samos. So Wilamowitz (*Pindaros*, 512), who, however, thought that the poem was written before he came to power.

¹ Maas, *RE* iiiA. 2460, suggests that the Suda's statement that Stesichorus' real name was Teisias should be referred to this fellow.

² With Foucart's correction Οἰνιάδην δὲ τὸν Τιμοθέου for Τιμόθεον δὲ τὸν Οἰνιάδου. Oiniades was a piper.

³ And Theocritus associates it with the river Himeras, 7. 75. Cf. Wilamowitz,

Textgesch. d. gr. Lyriker, 16 n. 3; *Sappho u. Simonides* (hereafter *SS*), 240.

⁴ Schmid-Stählin, *Gr. Lit.* I. i. 479, say without explanation: 'Die Skylla steht eher dem jüngeren Dithyrambiker Stesichoros an.'

⁵ Dionysius (ὁ κυκλογράφος, apparently, 15 F 12) ap. sch. *Od.* 12. 85; cf. *Lyc.* 44 ff. with sch.

- (ii) For Bowra he is a son of the tyrant, and he ruled Rhodes.¹
- (iii) For J. P. Barron (*CQ* n.s. xiv [1964], 223 ff.) he is a tyrant, but the father of the famous one.
- (iv) For Maas (ap. Wilamowitz, 511) he is just a boy who happens to have the same name as the tyrant.

The last possibility hardly suits the heroic content of the poem. We have some idea of the kind of piece that Ibycus or Anacreon wrote about ordinary *παῖδες καλοί*, and it was nothing like this. As for 'Polycrates of Rhodes', he has been exposed as a phantom.² It remains to consider Barron's hypothesis, part of an elaborate historical construction that has not as yet been subjected to criticism, so far as I know, apart from a brief dismissal by Berve.³ He tries to show that before Herodotus' Polycrates came to power (c. 533, in his view), his father, also called Polycrates, was tyrant for a period of about 32 years, c. 572-540. His arguments are as follows:

1. We hear of a tyrant Syloson, presumably earlier than Polycrates. One of Polycrates' brothers had the same name, so that the tyrant may have been an older member of the family, and Polycrates not a *novus homo*. So far, so good.
2. A Spartan called Archias told Herodotus that his grandfather had taken part in the expedition to Samos in support of the rising against Polycrates, and the Spartan account was that the aim had been to take revenge for crimes by Samian pirates committed before the fall of Croesus. (Hdt. 3. 47, 55.) It is suggested that this makes better sense if Polycrates 'had a dynastic predecessor in power in the forties'. Does it really? If you were 'agin the Samians' in 525, for whatever reason, you were necessarily for the overthrow of Polycrates.
3. Local tradition in Herodotus' time associated with Polycrates grandiose building projects which modern archaeology tells us were inaugurated up to a generation earlier. Polycrates cannot be updated. 'The alternative', according to Barron, is that there was an earlier tyrant of the same name, who became fused with his son in popular memory. *The alternative?*
4. An excerpt from Himerius, 29. 22 Colonna, tells a slightly incoherent story about a father who engaged Anacreon to teach his teen-age son music:

ἦν Πολυκράτης ἔφηβος· ὁ δὲ Πολυκράτης οὗτος οὐ βασιλεὺς Σάμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀπάσης θαλάσσης ἐφ' ἧς γαῖα (?) ὀρίζεται. ὁ δὲ ἡγῶν τῆς <ἄνω> Ῥόδου Πολυκράτης ἦρα μουσικῆς καὶ μελῶν, καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔπειθε συμπράξει αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν τῆς μουσικῆς ἔρωτα· ὁ δὲ Ἀνακρέοντα τὸν μελοποιὸν μεταπεμψάμενος δίδωσι τῷ παιδί τοῦτον τῆς ἐπιθυμίας διδάσκαλον ὅφ' ᾧ τὴν βασιλικὴν ἀρετὴν ὁ παῖς διὰ τῆς λύρας τῶν ὀνῶν τὴν Ὀμηρικὴν ἐμελλε πληρῶσειν εὐχὴν τῷ πατρί, πολυκράτης <καὶ> πάντων κρείστων ἐσόμενος.

As Barron recognizes, it is the son who is, or rather subsequently becomes, the 'king' of Samos and the thalassocrat. It is as a result of Anacreon's instruction that the boy develops true kingly quality and lays the foundations for a glorious future.⁴ It must be granted, however, that the excerptor has spoilt the beginning: it ought to have said not that 'this Polycrates' *was* king, but that he eventually became king.

¹ *Class. Journ.* xxix (1934), 375-80; *Greek Lyric Poetry*, ¹ 262, ² 251. Similarly Page, *Aegyptus* xxxi (1959), 170-2.

² J. Labarbe, *L'Ant. cl.* xxxi (1962), 185 f.

³ *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen* (1967), 582.

⁴ Barron is wrong in saying that the *object* of the tuition was to instil *βασιλικὴν ἀρετὴν*: that was its effect. There is no indication here that 'the father ruled Samos no less than did the son'.

At the end, after τῷ πατρί, one manuscript gives πολυκράτει and πάντα, the other πολυκράτης and πάντων. Barron rightly rejects Πολυκράτης on stylistic grounds, and concludes that we are being told the name of the father. I cannot believe that, if the father's name was to be given, it would be introduced so late, or that if it was the same as the son's, this would not have been expressed in some such way as ᾧ καὶ αὐτῷ Πολυκράτης ἦν ὄνομα. The dative is simply accounted for, as a scribal assimilation to τῷ πατρί. The nominative makes a good point if taken as an adjective, showing that Polycrates' name was appropriate to his life; I have added καί. The 'Homeric prayer' is assumed to be *Il.* 6. 476–81, which includes the wish that Zeus may make Scamandrius

ἀριπρεπέα Τρώεσσιν
ὦδε, βίην τ' ἀγαθόν, καὶ Ἰλίου ἱφί ἀνάσσειν.

5. The *Suda* (ii. 607. 16 Adler) says that Ibycus came to Samos ὅτε αὐτῆς ἦρχεν ὁ Πολυκράτης τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ. This is not Greek, whatever its relationship to history. In the interests of his theory, Barron reads ἦρχεν Πολυκράτης ὁ τοῦ τυράννου πατήρ.¹ This makes little sense; a Polycrates who is a tyrant cannot be identified as 'Polycrates the father of the tyrant'. Schmid's correction Πολυκράτους is by no means 'more violent', as Barron would have it, and to me it seems obviously right.

6. From a handful of aberrant notices Barron tries to argue that Apollodorus dated Polycrates' acme to 571, and that this represents a tradition of an earlier Polycrates. I need not discuss the matter in detail. The facts are sufficiently evaluated by Jacoby in *Apollodors Chronik*, a book of which Barron strangely fails to take account.

The arguments for the existence of an earlier Polycrates are empty. There was only one tyrant so named. If Ibycus' poem was addressed to a tyrant or a member of a tyrant's house, this was the man. It remains to be asked whether he was tyrant at the time. Ibycus' own evidence is indecisive. Polycrates may still have been young enough in the earlier part of his reign to be praised as he is in verses 46–8, in spite of the dreaming daughter of Hdt. 3. 124. It is probable that Ibycus and Anacreon only went to Samos because there was a ruler there who, like Hipparchus or Hiero or Archelaus or Ptolemy, wanted poets about him. But both, according to the independent testimony of Himerius and the *Suda*, went at the invitation, or during the rule, of Polycrates' father, whose name, as we know, was Aeaces. It is to be hoped that the information was based on evidence from the poems clearer than ours.

We may combine this with the report about the tyrant Syloson, and say that there is indeed some slight evidence that older members of Polycrates' family held the reins of power at times in the earlier part of the sixth century. The Eusebian list of thalassocracies implies that Polycrates came to power in 538. He and his brothers seized power in a coup (Hdt. 3. 39, 120), from which it has been inferred—too confidently—that he did not take over from another tyrant. Aeaces may have been deposed then, or earlier; but the hypothesis that Ibycus and Anacreon went to Samos during his rule seems open to no objec-

¹ He describes it as a transposition by Bentley. In fact Bentley, finding it in his *Suda*, commented: 'This is a Piece of History, that I know not what to say to. For the

father of Polycrates the Tyrant was called Aeaces' (*Diss. on the Epistles of Phalaris* [ed. Wagner, 1883], 122).

tion. The Polycrates poem may have been composed at that time, or in the mid-thirties.

285. 4-5 γεγαῶτας ἐν ὥέῳ ἀργυρέῳ.

The egg is a paradigm of whiteness: Sappho 167 ὥιῳ πόλῳ λευκοτέρα. Freak eggs with people inside do not appear to deviate from the standard colour. The one Helen was born from was white: Eur. *Hel.* 258; Eriphos fr. 7 (ii. 430 Kock). The one Phanes was born from was an ὤεον ἀργύφειον (Orph. fr. 70). I think the same should be postulated of the one the Molionidai came from.

ANACREON

358. 5-8
 ἦ δ', ἐστὶν γὰρ ἀπ' εὐκτίτου
 Λέσβου, τὴν μὲν ἐμὴν κόμην,
 λευκὴ γάρ, καταμέμφεται,
 πρὸς δ' ἄλλην τινὰ χάσκει.

It is now customary in this country to explain that the girl with the jazzy sandals is not interested in Anacreon because, coming from Lesbos, she does not incline towards men at all; and more or less conscientious efforts are then made to account for the poet's blaming his white hair.¹ Apart from this difficulty, the interpretation lays an impossible stress on the feminine ending of ἄλλην. Page paraphrases, 'goes gaping after another—girl'; but the Greek says 'is gaping at another-girl'.² 'Gawping' might be said of someone in love, but it need not mean more than 'foolishly preoccupied', giving one's whole attention to one thing when other more important issues are at hand.³ The girl is deep in trivial conversation with her friend, and only belatedly becomes aware that Anacreon is amusing the party with a song about her.⁴

What, then, is the point of ἐστὶν γὰρ ἀπ' εὐκτίτου Λέσβου? It is presented as a reason why she has no eyes for an elderly man. The implication is that Lesbian girls can afford to be choosy, they have young admirers enough to pick from. There is a trace of bitterness in εὐκτίτου, 'but she comes from Lesbos, ho yus!' But no more than a trace; Anacreon preserves the teasing good humour with which he elsewhere (417, 418) plays the old man blowing hopeful kisses at heedless (but not homosexual) young girls.

360
 ὦ παῖ παρθένιον βλέπων,
 δίζημαί σε, σὺ δ' οὐκ ἤαίεις,
 οὐκ εἰδὼς ὅτι τῆς ἐμῆς
 ψυχῆς ἡνιοχέυεις.

What is meant by 'I am searching for you'? There is no parallel to support

¹ B. Lavagnini, *Aglaia* (1937), 173; E. Romagnoli, *I poeti lirici*, iii. 166; Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 143; A. E. Harvey, *CQ* vii (1957), 213; Bowra, *GLP*² 285; D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 321. The interpretation is ignored by H. Fränkel, *Dichtung u. Philosophie*², 333.

² Not, of course, 'another head of hair' (Weir Smyth; Wilamowitz, *SS* 116; Gentili, *Anacreonte*, on fr. 13; Perrotta-Gentili, *Polinnia*², 249).

³ LSJ s.v. χάσκω I. 2; Theoc. 4. 53 εἰς

ταύταν ἐτύπην χασμέμενος ('I was gaping at the heifer when I trod on the thorn'). The obscene interpretation by M. Wigodsky, *CP* lvii (1962), 109, accepted by Perrotta-Gentili, betrays total misapprehension of Anacreon's art. The desire to find hitherto unsuspected sexual meanings in ancient literature frequently seems to blind American scholars to all considerations of relevance, style, and common sense.

⁴ Cf. Wilamowitz, loc. cit.

interpretation as 'I am trying to make contact with you' in some abstract, spiritual sense.¹ The search must be a literal one, and it needs a context.

Anacreon is on his way home from the party. The handsome boy who was guiding him has given him the slip, and he is blundering alone through the dark streets, fuddled by wine and hurt by desertion. *ήνιοχεύεις* is a sharp metaphor, as sharp in its way as *ήνίας δ' ἔχων στρέφοιμί σ' ἀμφὶ τέρματα δρόμου* 417. 4. The situation is illustrated by Heraclitus fr. 69 Marcovich (117 D.-K.) *ἀνήρ ὁκόταν μεθυσθῇ ἄγεται ὑπὸ παιδὸς ἀνήβου, σφαλλόμενος, οὐκ ἐπαίων ὁκη βαίνει, ὑγρὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ἔχων.*

395. 9-12

*Αἶδεω γάρ ἐστι δεινὸς
μυχός, ἀργαλῇ δ' ἐς αὐτὸν
κάτοδος· καὶ γὰρ ἐτοίμον
καταβάντι μὴ ἀναβῆναι.*

Campbell, 326 does well to comment on the unusual *καὶ γάρ*. Denniston, 108 f. (section 2) supplies nothing earlier than Sophocles and Euripides. I propose *κεῖ* (Archil. fr. 248 Tarditi).

SIMONIDES

53¹

*τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων
εὐκλεῆς μὲν ἂ τύχα κτλ.*

In *CR* xvii (1967), 133 I branded the words *τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων* as prose on stylistic grounds,² and overlooked another consideration which points no less to the same conclusion. In line 7 Leonidas, king of Sparta, is introduced, as supporting evidence for what has been said: *μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ Λεωνίδας, Σπάρτας βασιλεὺς κτλ.* Therefore lines 2-7 are general statements, not referring to particular men, or at any rate not to men connected with Leonidas.³ The beginning will have been, for example,

ἀνδρῶν δ' ὑπὲρ πάτρας θανόντων.

Someone misled by Diodorus' introduction glossed it with *τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις*.

The interpretation of 6-7 presents a further problem:

*ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅδε σηκὸς οἰκέταν εὐδοξίαν
Ἑλλάδος εἴλετο.*

Wilamowitz thought that *ὅδε σηκός* would not do, as this is not a tomb-inscription or a graveside chorus. He accordingly read *ὁ δέ*, and joined *ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν* with the sentence before. That makes an awkward extension to a sentence that comes to a natural close at *χρόνος*. But *ὅδε σηκός* need not refer to the physical tomb, any more than *ἐντάφιον τοιοῦτον* refers to the physical

¹ 'I pursue you' (Bowra, 295); 'Sehnsucht faßt mich nach dir' (H. Rüdiger, *Gr. Lyriker*² [1968], 123).

² I referred to Ibycus 298 as another example of prose printed as verse in Page's *Melici*. I have since struck more: Stes. 178 (partly verse, but **Ἦραν δέ* at least belongs to the indirect discourse); Anacr. 445 (*ὕβρισται καὶ ἀτάσθαλοι* is verse, but then it runs into

prose); adesp. 985.

³ Wilamowitz saw this, but did not draw the necessary conclusion about the first line: *Gr. Lesebuch*, ii. 104, SS 141 n. Fränkel, *Wege u. Formen*², 72, faces the difficulty, but the passages which he quotes to show that Simonides was using a typical archaic procedure are a mixed bag, and contain nothing to match our *μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ* . . .

shroud. It refers rather to the metaphorical heroon which is beyond the reach of time and decay, and at which praise and remembrance take the place of lamentation.¹ *ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅδε σηκός* would be overloaded as a noun phrase, and is best taken as a sentence; δ' can easily be added after *οἰκέταν*. 'This is the precinct of the brave; and for its servant² it has taken', etc. The glory and self-respect of Hellas is the sacristan appointed to tend the holy spot and keep it smart and fresh. Leonidas bears witness to this, that king of Sparta, who has left such a pride of valour and undying fame behind him.

PINDAR

Ol. 10. 24-5 *ἀγῶνα δ' ἐξαίρετον ἀείσαι θέμιτες ὦρσαν*
Διὸς δὲ ἀρχαίῳ σάματι παρ Πέλοπος
†βωμῷ ἐξάριθμον {Ἡρακλέης} ἐκτίσσαιτο.

βωμῷ is unmetrical and does not construe. The variant *βωμῶν* avoids the hiatus, and construes, but we need a short first syllable. As Hermann saw, *βωμῷ* is a gloss on *σάματι*. It is usually replaced by some innocuous but superfluous stopgap such as *πόνων* or *μολῶν*.

I read *πάις* (υ-), connecting *Διὸς* with this instead of with *θέμιτες*. The hypermetric *Ἡρακλέης* (after the verb in ζ, omitted in A) is another gloss; it does not of itself presuppose an expression such as *Διὸς πάις*, but we cannot wait till 30 for the subject, and much less understand it from 16.

Pyth. 1. 56 *οὕτω δ' †Ἰέρωνι θεὸς ὀρθωτήρ πέλοι*
τὸν προσέροντα χρόνον.

Ἰέρωνι is unmetrical; we need an anapaest such as *ἐπὶ τῷ*. The exegetic interpolation of a proper name is not exactly an unfamiliar occurrence; yet editors have acquiesced in the indefensible hypothesis that *θεός* is for once scanned as a single short.³ Erasmus Schmid's *τις* for *θεός* or *σωτήρ* for *ὀρθωτήρ* were better, but assumed improbable corruptions. *Ἰέρων* (Mingarelli) involves the further change *ἔρασαι*.

Pyth. 1. 87 *ἄψευδεὶ δὲ πρὸς ἄκμονι χάλκευε γλῶσσαν.*

The apparatuses do not mention that Galen π. διαφ. σφυγμῶν 3 (viii. 682 K.) quotes the verse thus: *καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον (οὐκ ἐπαινέται Πίνδαρος) ἐπειδὴν "ἄψευδῇ πρὸς ἄκμονι χαλκεύειν γλῶσσαν" ἢ τι τοιοῦτον ἕτερον εἴπῃ*. His *ἄψευδῇ* is surely better.

Pyth. 3. 17-19 *οὐδὲ παμφώνων ἱαχὰν ὕμεναίων, ἄλικες*
οἷα παρθένου φιλέουσιν ἐταῖραι
ἐσπερίαις ὑποκουρίζεσθ' αἰοδαῖς.

¹ Cf. Thuc. 2. 43. 2 *καὶ τὸν τάφον ἐπισημότατον, οὐκ ἐν ᾧ κεῖνται μᾶλλον ἀλλ' ἐν ᾧ ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν παρὰ τῷ ἐντυχόντι αἰεὶ καὶ λόγου καὶ ἔργου καιρῷ αἰείμνηστος καταλείπεται*.

² Not 'habitant' (Weir Smyth; Wilamowitz; Fränkel, *D. u. Ph.* 2 365; Campbell); the word does not mean that, and *σηκοί* are not camping sites. Bowra, 348 rightly rejects it, but his 'household spirit' does not commend itself either.

³ Of examples of two shorts scanned as one in Hephæstion, *Ench.* 2. 3, the only relevant one is Praxilla 748, *ἀλλὰ τεόν*

οὔποτε θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσιν ἔπειθον. We find the same scansion of *τεόν* in verse 9 of the Palaikastro hymn, also from a Doric-speaking area, and some special explanation seems called for. **τρόν* would be philologically correct, but unlikely to appear so late. Perhaps it developed into **τόν*, for which the more lucid *τεόν* was substituted in the written tradition. An alternative in Praxilla's case is that she wrote *τεο*, cf. *Od.* 23. 337 *ἀλλὰ τοῦ οὔποτε θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσιν ἔπειθεν* (τῷ a papyrus). This would still satisfy Hephæstion's description.

Read *ἑταίρα* (which is no change) or *ἑταίραις*. Better sense, and supported by the scholium *ὅποια μάλιστα αἱ ὁμήλικες παρὰ ταῖς ἑαυτῶν φίλαις φιληδοῦσι ταῖς ἑσπεριναῖς ὥδαῖς μετεωρίζεσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ παίζειν*.

Isth. 8. 23–24

ὁ καὶ
δαμόνεσσι δίκας †ἐπέραινε.

Triclinius patched up the metre with *ἐπείραινε*. But this, as a form of *περαίνω*, is only known to Aratus (24, 289, 365), and *δίκας περαίνειν* needs a parallel. Read *ἐπέκραινε*. Cf. Bacch. 13. 45 *δίκας θνατοῖσι κραίνων*, Eur. *Hcl.* 143 *αὐτοὶ καθ' αὐτῶν κυρίου κραίνειν δίκας*.

Fr. 106

ἀπὸ Ταῦγέτοιο μὲν Λάκαιναν
ἐπὶ θηροὶ κύνα τρέχειν πυκινώτατον ἔρπετόν·
Σκύριαι δ' ἐς ἄμελξιν γλάγεος αἶγες ἐξοχώταται·
ὄπλα δ' ἀπ' Ἀργεος, ἄρμα Θηβαῖον, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ
τᾶς ἀγλαοκάρπου
Σικελίας ὄχημα δαιδάλεον ματεύειν.

The first sentence does not construe. Remove the redundant words *Λάκαιναν κύνα*, and the construction is then as in 3. But it is just as likely that Pindar varied the construction, and we must account for the gloss's being in the accusative; so perhaps *δίξεο* or the like has been displaced.

Fr. 185

ἔστι δέ τοιχέκων ἀκύει καπνός	Guelph. 29–30
ἔστι δέ ταχέων κακίει καπνός	Paris. 2631

ταχέων is close to Boeckh's *τειχέων* (with Heyne's *ἔτι* for *ἔστι*). But *τοιχέκων* may be more revealing. If *εκ* is a correction of *ἔστι*, we get *ἐκ δέ τοίχων*. If we prefer *τειχέων*, it is a town that is burning; if *τοίχων*, I would guess a ship.

THE EPIDAUROIAN HYMN TO THE MOTHER OF THE GODS

When a poem inscribed on a stone is metrically faulty and does not altogether make sense, the reason may be that it was composed by an incompetent poet. In the case of the Epidaurian hymn to the Mother of the Gods,¹ however, such an explanation is inadequate. *κατωρημενα φρένας* in 8 is obviously a mistake caused by *κατ' ὥρεα καὶ νάπας* in 6. *τὰ τύμπαν' ἐλάμβανε* impossibly appears twice, 12 and 14, and it makes sense in neither place. At 19 we seem to jump from the middle of one speech into the middle of the reply. Clearly the original has suffered serious corruption, and textual criticism is called for.

Latte, in reviewing Maas's edition,² made two important observations: that the stonemason has made a perfectly good job of the hymn to Pan, so that the trouble here was with the hand-copy he was using; and that the duplications in 6/8 and 12/14 imply a copy in which two verses were written in each line. On this premiss, I restore the poem on these lines:

*Πιμπληϊάδε]ς θεαί,
δεῦρ' ἔλθετ' ἀπ' ὠρανῶ
καὶ μοι συναείσατε
τὴν Ματέρα τῶν θεῶν,*

¹ IG iv.² 131; Maas, *Epidaurische Hymnen*, 134 ff.; *Melici* 935.

² GGA cxvii (1934), 409 = *Kl. Schr.* 754.

- 5 ὥς ἦλθε πλανωμένα
κατ' ὥρεα καὶ νάπας,
σύρουσα ῥυτὰ[ν] κόμαν
φρένας <τ' ἀλύουσα>.
ὁ Ζεὺς δ' ἐσιδὼν ἀναξ
10 τὰν Ματέρα τῶν θεῶν
11 κεραυνὸν ἔβαλλε καὶ
13 πέτρας διέρρησσε·
13a καὶ <Κύπρις ἔπειθε, καὶ>
[12] 14 τὰ τύμπαν' ἐλάμβανε·
15 “Μάτηρ ἄπιθ' εἰς θεούς,
15a <πατήρ σε καλεῖ Ζεὺς>
καὶ μὴ κατ' ὄρη πλαν[ῶ].
μὴ σοὶ χαροποὶ λέον-
18 τες ἢ πολιοὶ λύκοι
18a <φίλοι γεγόνασιν;>”
ἦ δ' “οὐκ ἀπ<ελεύσομαι>,
20 ἂν μὴ τὰ μέρη λάβω,
τὸ μὲν ἥμισυ ὠρανῶ,
τὸ δ' ἥμισυ γαίης,
πόντω τε τρίτον μέρος·
χοῦτως ἀπελεύσομαι.”
25 χαῖρ' ὦ μεγάλα ἄνασ-
σα Μᾶτερ' Ὀλύμπω.

1. Πιμπληιάδε]s Peek; Wifstrand's ὦ Πιερίδε]s is too short, and ὦ Ὀλυμ-
πιάδε]s would involve an unlikely synecphonesis.

4. If θεῶν is scanned disyllabically as in 10 and 15, there is no catalexis. Maas accepted this, and said that the poem consisted 'aus 6 Vierzeilern, die teils durch Sinnespause, teils durch Katalexe (22), teils durch beides abgegrenzt werden' (p. 135). But there is nowhere where it is certain that there was not catalexis. The poet need not have scanned the word the same way each time, cf. κατ' ὥρεα 6 : κατ' ὄρη 16.

7. Editors have read συρουσαρπα[.]τα[.]κομαν, presumably ῥυτὰν {τὰν} κόμαν, though if it were my poem I would have preferred λυτάν.

8. If the stone cutter has followed his copy faithfully here, it had :

ΩΧΛΘΕΠΛΑΝΩΜΕΝΑ•ΚΑΤ'ΩΡΕΑΚΑΙΝΑΠΑΣ
ΚΥΡΟΥΣΑΡΥΤΑΝΤΑΝΚΟΜΑΝ•ΚΑΤ'ΩΡΗΜΕΝΑΦΡΕΝΑΣ

κατ' ὄρη is a false variant to the line above ; and μενα may have been a correction of (πλανω)μένη. If so, φρένας is left by itself to be filled out into a reizianus.

11 ff. As Maas saw, 13 follows on 11, completing the quatrain. As an anonymous pupil of his saw, the subject of τὰ τύμπαν' ἐλάμβανε was an emissary sent to liven up the Mother : the words are used in exactly the same situation in Eur. *Hel.* 1347,

τύ{μ}πανά τ' ἔλαβε βυρσοτενή
καλλίστα τότε πρῶτα μακά-
ρων Κύπρις,

and to give them any other sense here is sheer perversity. Hence my supplement in 13a. The manuscript, or an earlier copy, will have had:

ΚΕΡΔΥΝΟΝΕΒΔΑΛΛΕΚΑΙΤΑΤΥΜΠΑΝ'ΕΛΑΜΒΑΝΕ
ΠΕΤΡΔC Χ ΚΑΙΚΥΠΡΙCΕΠΕΙΘΕΚΑΙΤΑΤΥΜΠΑΝ'ΕΛΑΜΒΑΝΕ
ΔΙΕΡΗCCE

—the verse 14 being accidentally anticipated as 12, and the correction substituted for 13a instead of for 12.

The stone has *διερρησσε*.

15a. I have supplied this on the model of *H. Dem.* 460 (Rhea to Demeter in similar circumstances),

δεῦρο τέκος, καλέει σε βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
ἐλθέμεναι μετὰ φύλα θεῶν.

The similarity of *πατηρ* to *ματηρ* might have caused omission in a copy with only one verse to the line. That would mean that in the stonecutter's copy the lines ran 15/16, 17/18, and so on.

17. I write *σοί* for *σε*. (It might have been interpreted as *σε οἶ* and the article then omitted.) As Latte observed, the Mother ought to be quite at home with lions and wolves. The Homeric Hymn says of her (14. 3–5)

ἦ κροτάλων τυπάνων τ' ἰαχὴ σύν τε βρόμος αὐλῶν
εὐᾶδεν ἡδὲ λύκων κλαγγὴ χαροπῶν τε λεόντων
οὔρεά τ' ἡχίεντα.

Hence my supplement in 18a, making Aphrodite innocently hit on a significant fact.

19. The stone has *καὶ οὐκ ἄπειμι εἰς θεούς*. I emend to *ἡ δ'* (an easy graphic corruption), and *ἀπελεύσομαι* as in 24; *ἄπειμι εἰς θεούς* represents assimilation to 15.

21. The stone has *ουρανῶ*.

23. *τε* Latte, for *τό*. She does not want a third of the sea, but a half share of the sea thirdly.

26. The stone has *ολυμπου*.

Maas dated the hymn to the fifth century B.C. (ascribing it to Telesilla on the strength of its metre and its simplicity, which seemed to him a feminine characteristic); Latte to the second century A.D. The one dating seems to me exaggeratedly early and the other exaggeratedly late. The transfer to the Mother of the Gods of the myth of Demeter's withdrawal from heaven presupposes the syncretism of the two deities which first appears in the late fifth century.¹ The sketchy nature of the narrative implies a story well known. Details of language such as *μοι συναιέσατε, διέρρησσε, ἂν μή, χοῦτως*, bring the composition down to the Hellenistic age, see Latte, 410 f. (755 f.). The metrical structure has its nearest analogues in Aristonous (334 B.C.) and Corinna (for whom I argue on pp. 277 ff. below a third-century date). I can find no example of the use of

¹ Melanippides and Telestes, *Mel.* 764; *Antike u. Abendland*, xiv [1968], 93 ff.). The Eur. *Hel.* 1301 ff., cf. *Ph.* 685 f., *Ba.* 275; *Helen* passage is particularly relevant, as it *P. Derweni* xviii 7 (*Ἀρχαϊολ. Δελτίον* xix [1964], 17 ff.; from c. 400? Cf. W. Burkert, tells the same story.

glyconic or related verses, in stanzas or κατὰ στίχον, later than Limenius (128 B.C.).¹ The use of Doric ω (ὠρανῶ, etc.) is also against Latte's date. Mesomedes does not use it, though he still has α sporadically in words like Λατοῦς, εὐφαιμείτω. The digamma-hiatus μεγάλη ἄνασσα and the synapheias λέον/τες, ἄνασ/σα, would again be unthinkable in the Imperial period. The old, simple myth is presented in the simplest form, invocation—narrative—salutation, as in several of the Homeric Hymns (e.g. 4, 7, 26, 28). There is no trace of Stoic or other philosophical interpretation such as we see in Lucretius 2. 598 ff. or Orph. Hymn. 27. The third century B.C. would seem to satisfy the evidence best.

In the case of the hymn to Pan inscribed at the same time,² Latte's Hadrianic date may stand. To his arguments add that the cosmic hymn rising from earth and sea to Olympus (12 ff.) resembles Mesomedes 5. 1 ff. (Heitsch), cf. 2. 17 ff.

University College, Oxford

M. L. WEST

¹ Priapeans are still used by Herodorus of Seleucia, *SEG* vii. 14 (first century B.C., cf. Nilsson, *Arch. f. Rel.* xxx [1933], 164 n. 3). Heitsch, *Gr. Dicht. d. Kaiserzeit*, no. 5

may be Hellenistic. Latin poets are not relevant.

² *IG* iv². 130; Maas, 130 ff.; *Mel.* 936; Latte, 405 (750) ff.