

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THEOCRITUS¹

THE first three passages I propose to examine are all cases in which I believe that the codex of Theocritus which was found at Antinoopolis during the winter of 1913–14, and dates from around 500,² can contribute still more to the restoration of the words Theocritus actually wrote than has yet been recognized. Its impact on the constitution of the twentieth-century vulgate since its publication in 1930³ has been great: to consider two poems alone, in *Id.* 14 it provided MS. authority for four new readings or previous conjectures (lines 13, 23, 41, 60) and in *Id.* 15 at least 12 (2, 17, 25, 30, 67, 72, 86, 90, 98, 99, 143, 145). In this paper, however, I am not concerned with the text explicitly offered by the papyrus, but with three marginal notes which seem to me to reflect different readings from those presented in the text: readings which, I shall argue, we can reconstruct, and which are correct. That some of the scholia in the Antinoe codex, in spite of their frequent superficiality and downright illiteracy, embody ancient and valuable information has already been realized; I think particularly of the note on fol. 6 recto, opposite 15. 60, where the (deleted) words *ποιητριαν Τελεσιλλαν* ‘presumably imply’, as Hunt puts it, ‘that there was a poem by Telesilla describing the marriage of Zeus and Hera’. Latte⁴ was a good deal more positive in his assessment of this point; and the note has been adopted by Page as fr. 10 of Telesilla (*PMG* 726 [iii]). In view of cases like this⁵ the scholia ought to have been treated with more respect than was accorded them by Hunt; in the three examples that follow their author was either ignored or else abused for the (alleged) ignorance and irrelevance of his remarks, and this judgment seems to have imposed itself on subsequent editors and commentators.

(a) *Idyll* 14. 26

τούτω τὸν κλύμενον κατεφρύγετο τῆνον ἔρωτα
κατεφρύγετο Pohlenz: καταφρύγετο P3: κατετάκετο codd.

Aeschinas has just given Thyonichus an angry account of his discovery at a country-house party that his girl Cynisca is carrying on with Lycus, the boy

¹ This paper was written in appropriately idyllic surroundings at the Fondation Hardt, outside Geneva, during April 1971; I am grateful to the Council of the Fondation for their invitation and for the hospitality so generously afforded. Thanks are also due to Professor Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Dr. Michael Coffey, from whose critical attention these notes have greatly benefited.

² P₃ Gow, Pa Gallavotti; a note on the physical make-up of the MS. appears on pp. xlix f. of Gow's introduction to his *Theocritus*. A further fragment of the papyrus—the missing top corner of fol. 7—has been identified by E. G. Turner and published in vol. 3 of the *Antinoopolis Papyri* (no. 207).

³ *Two Theocritus Papyri*, edd. A. S. Hunt

and J. Johnson, Egypt Exploration Society, London, 1930. A first transcript was made by Johnson; this was completed and revised by Hunt, who was also responsible for the commentary. The first editor able to make use of the papyrus was Legrand, who added an appendix discussing its readings to the second edition of his Budé *Bucoliques grecs*.

⁴ ‘Zur Textkritik Theokrits’, *Nachr. d. Ak. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen* 1949, Phil.-hist. Kl., 231 f. (= *Kl. Schr.* 533 f.).

⁵ See too 15. 16, where the paraphrase in the margin supports Wilamowitz's *ἀγοράσδειν* (imperative) against the text of the papyrus itself, and 26. 27 where, whatever the text once offered, a marginal note gives the correct sense.

next door; in 27 ff. he goes on to say that some rumour of the affair had in fact reached him already, but he foolishly paid no attention to it. Translators and commentators are united in their interpretation of line 26: *ironice dicit nobilem illum et praeclarum amorem* Meineke;¹ *acerbe hoc dicitur* Fritzsche; *ce bel amour* Legrand. Gow translates 'It was for him, the precious passion that had Cynisca on the grill', and adds by way of comment 'apparently ironical'.²

Two objections to this accepted text and interpretation. First, the particular sort of bitter irony that critics have agreed in detecting in Aeschinas' expression would be properly in point only if this sneering remark had been preceded by some description of Lycus' physical ugliness or moral depravity; if *κλύμενος* (as usually understood, in the sense *praeclarus*) is to be used thus 'ironically', it must be that Lycus is someone totally unworthy to be the object of Cynisca's affections. What do we find instead? He is described, grudgingly, as *εὐμάκης, ἀπαλός, πολλοῖς δοκέων καλὸς ἦμεν* (25), a tall, delicate, and eminently desirable boy.³ So the required contrast between the snide '*praeclarus*' and a disappointing reality does not exist. Nor can *κλύμενος* here have its root-meaning 'much heard-of, talked about' (Jacobs *ap. Fritzsche-Hiller*): 26 is a summing-up of what has gone before, and Aeschinas' mention of the circulating rumours does not make its appearance till the following line.

Secondly, a basic philological objection: the Greek language has no adjective *κλύμενος*;⁴ Gow can cite only Antim. fr. 85 W *κισσοῦ τε κλυμένοιο καὶ ἀμπελίνης*, but as we shall see below *this* phrase has a quite special reference.

On two counts, then, the line is unsatisfactory. And we may note in passing that the Antinoe codex differs from the medieval MSS. in reading *καταφρύγετο* for *κατετάκετο*. How can we resolve these difficulties? The Antinoe codex can help us further; it contains a marginal scholium on the passage giving a brief biography of the mythological character Clymenus—a scholium branded by Hunt (p. 64) as 'a strange idea' and 'an inept note'. It has not been mentioned since; but I believe it conceals the truth.

Our main source for the story of Clymenus is Parthenius, *Erot. Path.* 13, who tells us he has taken his account from Euphorion⁵ and a mysterious Dektadas; Hyginus, *fab.* 206 has little to add. The main lines of the story are as follows: Clymenus married Epicaste, and had by her two sons and a daughter. Clymenus became infatuated with the daughter, and gradually abandoned himself to this passion until, by using the girl's nurse as a go-between, he was able to reach her bed. His lust stayed within controllable bounds, however; and when she reached marriageable age and her betrothed, the Neleid Alastor, arrived to claim his bride, he arranged a huge banquet and dispatched the couple on their honeymoon. It was at this point that Clymenus' self-control snapped: suddenly

¹ *Theocritus Bion Moschus*³ (1856), 294.

² Similarly F. P. Fritz, in his recent *Tusculum-Ausgabe*, and Rumpel, *Lexicon Theocriteum* s.v. *κλύμενος*.

³ Hermann's explanation of Aeschinas' bitterness, 'quod pulchellum et mollem adulescentulum sibi praefert Cynisca' sounds reasonable; but this distinction between 'manly' and 'tender boyish' beauty was less sharply felt by the Greeks. Aeschinas has grounds for angry jealousy, but not contempt.

⁴ The word is exiled to a footnote in

Legrand's discussion of Theocritus' vocabulary (*Étude sur Théocrite*, 262 n. 3): 'κλύμενος, qu'Homère n'a pas employé, a cependant une allure épique'. Antimachus does seem to have used *ἀγακλύμενος* as an adjective (fr. 66. 2 W), but there it is associated with a proper name.

⁵ A fragment of the end of Euphorion's account of the story (Pack², 371) was published by Vitelli and Norsa in *Ann. Pisa* ser. 2, vol. 4 (1935), and re-edited by Bartoletti as *PSI* xiv (1957), no. 1390, fr. C.

his anguish at the loss of his beloved daughter overcame him, he charged after the pair, seized the girl, took her back home and throwing all restraint to the winds began to sleep with her openly. This is the final act of the tragedy, and the end is predictable: the daughter, enraged by the simultaneous loss of her husband and her reputation, carves up Clymenus' son (either her younger brother or a child she had herself borne), and serves him up for dinner; this discovered, Clymenus hangs himself, and the daughter is metamorphosed into a *chalkis* bird.

The final stages of this edifying tale are, as remarked, familiar and predictable; what marks it out is the earlier part of the narrative, where during the period before he loses his reason it is plain that Clymenus' main character-trait as brought out by the story was that of *resistance* to the temptation of incest and concealment of his lust; this is stated explicitly by Parthenius (χρόνον μὲν τινα ἐκαρτέρει καὶ περιῆν τοῦ παθήματος) and clearly shown—with obvious psychological accuracy—by his final despairing attempt to break free of the whole business by marrying the girl off and sending her out of harm's way.¹ That this was indeed the main feature of the first part of Euphorion's story was well grasped by Crusius, the author of the Roscher article on the myth,² and can be confirmed by further evidence.

Pliny the Elder knows of an ivy-like plant called *clymenus*: *NH* 25. 70 *clymenus a rege herba appellata est, hederæ foliis, ramosa, caule inani articulis præincto, odore gravi et semine hederæ, silvestribus et montibus nascens*. Why should such a plant be named after the king? Another note explains: *sedat . . . suspiria clymenus* (26. 41); and at 26. 111 it is mentioned as a cure for sleeplessness. It seems plain that at some point during his tortured obsession Clymenus, wandering through the woods and hills in distraction, had absently chewed a piece of this soon-to-be-eponymous ivy, and discovered its tranquillizing properties. We are now in a position to deal with Antimachus fr. 85: *κισσοῦ κλυμένοιο* must be, not simply 'glorious ivy', but 'Clymenus' ivy', in a specific sense. Perhaps Antimachus had told the story of the king before Euphorion, in the *Lyde*, which told of the lovesickness of the heroes in an attempt to console him for the loss of his own beloved.³

All in all, then, Clymenus seems to have been the very archetype of the mortal cherishing, and struggling over a long period to resist and conceal, a forbidden passion; and (to return to Theocritus) the grotesque and bathetic parallelism between this gripping melodrama from the realms of mythology and the petty liaison which Cynisca had tried to keep secret from her established lover will do very nicely to supply real point to the sneering irony that all readers have correctly felt present in this line. Aeschinas must somehow be referring to Cynisca as 'some latter-day Clymenus'; but how can we square this with the transmitted text? The Antinoe papyrus is at first sight of little help, for the text differs only slightly from the medieval tradition.

If there is to be a reference to Clymenus, it will most probably have been

¹ For the resistance-motif elsewhere in Parthenius, compare stories no. 5 (incest), 16, 17 (incest), and 29.

² *Myth. Lex.* 1. 837 f., s.v. Harpalyke: 'Der Verlauf der Liebesleidenschaften, des νόσημα, muss durch verschiedene Stadien hindurch ausführlich und mit raffinierter Kunst entwickelt sein.'

³ Hermesianax fr. 7. 41–6 P. Wyss ad loc. attributes fr. 85 to the ecphrasis of Teumessos from Book 1 of the *Thebaid*; certainly it is unlikely to come from the Antimachean version of the Clymenus story that I tentatively hypothesize: it already assumes the existence and connotation of the plant.

couched in a proverbial form.¹ Now one way in which proverbs relating to the archetypal experiences of heroes are formed in Greek is by attaching an adjective in *-eios* to the abstract noun which the great man's suffering (or other activity) typified: *Καδμεία νίκη*, the commonest, occurs in Herodotus (1. 166) and Plato (*Laws* 641 c), with a slight variation in Meleager (*AP* 5. 179. 7 = *HE* 4034: *Καδμείον κράτος*). Aristophanes (*Eccl.* 1029) and Plato (*Rep.* 493 d) supply us with *Διομηδεΐα ἀνάγκη*. In the Hellenistic period the formation becomes increasingly popular: Nic. *Alex.* 273 *Προμηθεΐα φωρά*, Philodemus, *AP* 11. 30. 4 = *GP* 3331 τὸ *Τερμέριον* (cf. Plut. *Thes.* 11 τὸ *Τερμέρειον κακόν*), Crinagoras, *AP* 6. 100. 2 = *GP* 1810 *Προμηθεΐα πυρικλοπία*, Leon. *Alex.* *AP* 9. 351. 2 *Ἀστυανακτεΐα δυσμορία*. Many other examples are recorded in the medical writers, ancient dictionaries, and the paroemiographers.²

I suggest accordingly that Theocritus wrote

τούτω τὸν Κλυμένειον ἐφρύγετο τήνον ἔρωτα

'he's the one that roasting, Clymenus-like passion was for'. Aeschinas' irony is now focused firmly where it belongs—on Cynisca; *Κλυμένειον*, an unfamiliar form and a recondite allusion,³ was corrupted into *κλύμενον*, a more acceptable-looking adjective;⁴ and to make up the missing syllable *κατετάκετο* was imported from 11. 14 and/or 7. 76 to replace *ἐφρύγετο*;⁵ *καταφρύγετο* in the Antioch papyrus shows a confused stage in this process, while its scholium still dimly reflects the original text.

Why did Theocritus choose to include this fairly out-of-the-way reference in his poem? I have so far suppressed the name of Clymenus' daughter: it was Harpalyce, 'Wolf-snatcher'. The analogy with Cynisca and her lover Lycus was too good to miss.

(b) *Idyll* 15. 8 ff.

ἐπ' ἔσχατα γὰς ἔλαβ' ἐνθὼν
ἱλεόν, οὐκ οἴκησιν, ὅπως μὴ γείτονες ὤμεις
ἀλλάλαις, ποτ' ἔρην, φθονερὸν κακόν, αἰὲν ὁμοῖος.

Praxinoa alleges that her husband has bought this house in the depths of suburbia in an attempt to keep her away from the company of Gorgo (and if so, who could blame him?). Again, modern commentators are agreed on the meaning of line 10: 'pour contrarier, la méchante bête, toujours le même', Legrand; 'out of spite, the mean brute; he's always the same', Gow. *φθονερὸν*

¹ For the concentration in this poem especially of Theocritus' naturally gnomic and proverbial style, see E. Heimgartner, *Die Eigenart Theokrits in seinem Sprichwort*, Diss. Freiburg (1940), 189 f.

² e.g. *Παλαμήδειον βούλευμα* (λόγος); *Τηλέφειον ἔλκος*; *Κυκλωπεΐα δωρεά*; *Αἰάντειος γέλως*; *Ἐπιμηνίδειος ὕπνος*; *Ἀσκληπιάδειον πόλμα*; *Ἡρακλεία νόσος* (ψωρά); *Σειρήνειον μέλος* (φωνή); *Χειρώνειον ἔλκος*; *Στεντορεΐα φωνή*. It is a pity that Wackernagel, in his otherwise exhaustive article 'Genitiv und Adjektiv' (*Kl. Schr.* ii. 1346–73), chose deliberately to omit discussion of 'die Fälle, wo das Adjektiv qualitativ "nach Art des Betreffenden" bedeutet' (p. 1362)—precisely the case I am concerned with here. 'Es wäre erwünscht', he remarks, 'einmal eine volle,

alles umfassende Zusammenstellung zu erhalten', but such a work has not yet to my knowledge appeared.

³ Anyone hesitant to attribute to Theocritus an otherwise unrecorded proverbial expression should bear in mind that the *-eios*+noun phrase is particularly suited to *ad hoc* 'one-off' coinages; and that (for example) the adage about 'washing bricks' at 16. 62 occurs elsewhere in Greek only in the paroemiographers (who no doubt have it from T.).

⁴ Cf. Legrand, loc. cit., on its 'allure épique'.

⁵ Just as 2. 61 was partly manufactured from 3. 33, and *διαχρέμπεται* at 15. 99 was glossed from 6. 15 with *διαθρύπτεται*.

κακόν is perfectly in order, αἰὲν ὁμοῖος is good colloquial Greek (to Gow's citations add Plato, *Charm.* 170 a), but what does ποτ' ἔριν mean? 'The phrase is equivalent to ἐριστικῶς, as, e.g., πρὸς βίαν to βιαίως', writes Gow; but those of a sceptical nature may be inclined to doubt this in the absence of other examples, and a suspicion that all is not well with the text here could be reinforced (though on more subjective grounds) by the unpleasingly incoherent structure of the end of Praxinoa's speech, which breaks down into three totally discrete exclamations without its being plain that her anger is sufficient to justify such uncoordinated ejaculation.¹

Again the Antinoe codex can provide us with some indirect assistance. In the text stands the usual reading; but a marginal note shows that the *hypomnema* or other source on which the copyist is drawing for his notes linked the first of the three phrases with the last: ὁ αἰὲν ὁμοῖος ἐπὶ τὴν φιλονείκην. This won't do,² but it does show the direction in which the solution lies—the conjecture made by Meineke (*Philol.* xviii [1862], 535) and printed by Fritzsche (2nd edn. 1870): ποτ' ἔριν . . . αἰὲν ἔτοιμος 'always looking for a chance to pick a quarrel', with φθονερὸν κακόν added as an interpolated oath, as often,³ and much more effectively.

Meineke's emendation no doubt fell from favour (Hiller expelled it when revising the third edition of Fritzsche) because ἔτοιμος πρὸς+acc. seemed scarcely better attested than the expression it replaced; the Stephanus/Dindorf *TGL* and *LSJ* can only scrape up one example between them. In fact this construction (often, as here, with αἰὲν) became standard in Hellenistic Greek, as is amply demonstrated by over 20 cases indexed in A. Mauersberger's *Polybios-Lexicon*;⁴ and more can be added from Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint* and Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*.⁵

(c) *Idyll* 24. 14

κυανέαις φρίσσοντας ὑπὸ σπείραισι δράκοντας

ὑπό is uncomfortably redundant,⁶ but a more serious difficulty is that snakes do not bristle with *coils*. Both Gow and Legrand are reduced to paraphrase: 'snakes with rippling steel-blue coils'; 'dragons qui se hérissaient en formant des spirales noirâtres'. The following examples show the conventional phraseology:

Nic. *Ther.* 157 (the asp) φράζεο δ' αὐαλέησιν ἐπιφρίκτην φολίδεσσιν

Ibid. 221 (the viper) ἀργαλέαις φρίσσουσιν ἐπηετανὸν φολίδεσσιν

Dion. *Per.* 443 (the Delphic Python) ὀλκὸς ἀπειρεσίησιν ὑποφρίσσων φολίδεσσιν

Pausanias 9. 21. 1 (the eels in Lake Tanais) τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν σῶμα φολίδι λεπτήν πέφρικέ σφισι.

¹ Line 50 in the same poem, where the native Egyptians are crisply summed up by Praxinoa in three parallel barbed phrases, is quite different.

² Xen. *Cyn.* 5. 29 τοῦτω ὁμοῖόν ἐστι πρὸς δρόμον 'like it at running' provides a precarious parallel to the scholiast's interpretation; but the overwhelming popularity of the expression ἔτοιμος πρὸς (see below) seems to me decisive.

³ e.g. Luc. *As.* 39 ἡ γυνή (κακὸν ἐξαΐσιον ἐμὸν) εἶπεν . . .

⁴ Cols. 1007 f., s.v. ἔτοιμος. Frequently

ἔτοιμος πρὸς μάχην or πρὸς πόλεμον, a context significantly similar to this Theocritus passage.

⁵ Corruption, easy enough given the familiarity of the expression αἰὲν ὁμοῖος, may have been helped by the superficial similarity of ἀλλάλοις ὁμάλος in line 50 to ἀλλάλαις . . . ἔτοιμος here.

⁶ More so than in the cases which Gow cites in justification; Opp. *H.* 4. 605 f. περὶ γὰρ φρίσσουσι κελαινὰ | πρόκροσαι πυκνήσιν ὑπὸ σταλίκεσσιν ἄκανθαι would make a better defence.

Not surprisingly, then, the expected word is *φολίδεσσι*;¹ but this will not scan here. The other item with which Greek animals regularly bristle is *hair*:² e.g. Opp. C. 3. 395 *τρηχέαις λασίαισι πέριξ πέφρικεν ἐθείραις* and Nonnus D. 35. 55 *Σειληνοὺς πολυῆσιν ὑποφρίσσοντας ἐθείραις*. This may not be as out of place here as one might imagine. *Δράκων* in a semi-technical sense is a particular brand of snake,³ unusually large and ferocious, and its characteristics fit the Theocritus passage well: it is *κύνεος* (e.g. at Nic. *Ther.* 438) as in line 14 here, and it is a constrictor (*RE* s.v. col. 532) as in lines 30–3. Most important, it is bearded,⁴ or was believed to be so.⁵

So there may be a place in the text for bristling hair here. The Antinoe codex, though almost none of the text is legible at this point, has the marginal note *ταῖς πλοκαῖς*, and though this may be nothing more than an unintelligent gloss on *σπείρα* in its Attic sense ‘hair-do’ (LSJ, I. 4), the temptation to interpret in this way must have been slight in the extreme: *σπείρα* is much more familiar in a snake-context (it occurs again in line 30) than as a hair-dressing term. Altogether this seems strong corroboration for the idea that a word for ‘hair’ once actually stood in the text here, and needed comment from an ancient *hypomnema*.

What word could Theocritus have used to refer to the dragon-snake’s beard? Pollux (2. 31) has the gloss *ὑπόσπειρα*, which he interprets—certainly on the analogy of *σπείρα* = hair-do—to mean *εἶδος τριχὸς πλεγμάτων*.⁶ I suggest that it was in fact the word written here by Theocritus (from what gloss source we cannot tell)⁷ to signify ‘the hair underneath: the beard’; his line will have meant ‘dragon-snakes, with bristling deep-blue⁸ beards’. We thus have no need to emend at all, merely to reinterpret our MSS.; we have disposed of the redundant *ὑπό*, and we have restored a stylish four-word line, as used so often in these descriptive participial phrases.⁹

(d) *Idyll* 13. 32ff.

ἔκβάντες δ’ ἐπὶ θίνα κατὰ ζυγὰ δαῖτα πένοντο
 διελινοί, πολλοὶ δὲ μίαν στορέσαντο χαμεύναν.
 λειμῶν γάρ σφιν ἔκειτο μέγα στιβάδεσσιν ὄνειρα,
 ἔθθεν βούτομον ὄξυ βαθύν τ’ ἐτάμοντο κύπειρον. 34

¹ *φρίσσειν* used absolutely (as at Nic. *Ther.* 167, 293) behaves differently, meaning ‘rear up’; but wherever a dative is used with the verb, that dative is *φολιδι/-δεσσι*.

² Cf. *Et. Mag.* s.v. *φρίσσειν*: *κυρίως τὸ ἐξορθοῦν τὰς τρίχας*.

³ *RE* 2. Reihe, vol. 2. i, cols. 531 ff., s.v. Schlange.

⁴ Nic. *Ther.* loc. cit., Philumenus 30. As Giangrande notes (*Eranos* lxviii [1970], 89), ‘every respectable *draco* is bearded’.

⁵ Gossen-Stier (*RE* loc. cit.) is pained to find that ‘selbst ein so sachlich schreibender Mann’ as Philumenus held this view.

⁶ Pollux’s *Onomasticon* was of course chiefly intended to list Atticisms; but he could not resist including a great many lexicographical oddities from the pan-Hellenic poetic tradition, from authors as un-Attic as Homer,

Hesiod, the Lesbians, Antimachus (fr. 108 W), Aratus, Callimachus (fr. 80. 5, 191. 2, 177. 33), and Nicander; indeed it seems to have been for just this reason that he was attacked by his rival, the purist Phrynichus (Bethe, *RE* 10. i, cols. 778 f.). So we should not be surprised to find *ὑπόσπειρα* lurking in this quarter.

⁷ For other glosses in Theocritus (*ἀκιδά, ἄμφην, χαός, σκνιφαῖος*, etc.) see Legrand, *Étude*, 255 ff.

⁸ At Nic. *Ther.* 444 the *drakon*’s beard is yellow; but where we are in any case dealing with a mythological appendage, we may allow poets to choose its colour for themselves.

⁹ Cf., e.g., Nonn. D. 35. 55, Dion. Per. 443, Nic. *Ther.* 221 (all quoted above), Theoc. 7. 9, Ap. Rhod. 3. 928, Moschus, *Europha*, 57.

The sense of line 34 is obvious: 'une prairie était à leur disposition', Legrand; all editors print this text, and assume this meaning. But Gow is worried about the Greek: 'κείμεναι is common enough of tracts or places, but usually of their geographical position, which is not here in point. The verb seems rather to be selected to indicate a store or deposit . . .'—but the *vox propria* for 'to be at someone's disposal as a store' is *παράκειμαι*, and *P. Oxy.* 694 in fact reads *λειμών σφιν παρέκειτο* here. We should restore *λειμών πάρ σφιν ἔκειτο*, which accounts for both readings.

For *παράκειμαι* in tmesis (very frequently) cf. *Il.* 10. 75, 77, *Od.* 13. 424, and especially Theoc. 15. 112 ff. *παρ μέν οἱ ὄρια κείται κτλ.* (of the image of the dead Adonis, with goodies placed by his side) and Ap. Rhod. 1. 455 ff. *παρὰ δέ σφισι μυρὶ ἔκειτο | εἷδατα κτλ.* ('one of the two parallel bivouac scenes', Gow on 13. 33: in view of this, the similarities of language may not be coincidental). And (to counter the obvious objection) for the asyndeton in brisk narratives of this sort, compare *Od.* 9. 425–7 and *Il.* 23. 173 f.; in all three examples the asyndetically introduced item looks forward: *ἄρσενες οἷες ἦσαν . . . τοὺς; ἐννέα τῷ γε ἄνακτι τραπέζῃς κύνες ἦσαν | καὶ μὲν τῶν . . . δύο; λειμών πάρ σφιν ἔκειτο . . . ἔνθεν.*¹

(e) *Idyll* 24. 10

ὥς φασμένα δίνησε σάκος μέγα· τοὺς δ' ἔλεν ὕπνος

δίνασε codd., corr. Wilamowitz

Everyone is agreed on what Alcmena did to the shield-cum-cradle: she rocked it. But in spite of Gow's attempted defence of *δίνησε* which 'does not necessarily imply circular motion',² the immediate and irresistible image conjured up by the line is that of the wretched babes being spun round in a circular shield revolving like a top on its central boss,³ an experience more likely to induce nausea than drowsiness. No, the word required here is *κίνησε*: *κινέω* is the technical term (if one may use the expression) for rocking a cradle, as emerges from the pleasant story recounted by Aelian (11. 14) and Athenaeus (13. 607a), as well as Plato's strange passage at *Laws* 789–91;⁴ and anyone who still doubts the appropriateness of the verb *κινέω* to denote a back-and-forth motion should consider *κινέω* = *βινέω*.

University College, London

ALAN GRIFFITHS

¹ The sub-type *νήσος τις ἐστὶ* (e.g. Antim. fr. 2 W) is the best-known example of this sort of asyndetic scene-setting; see Austin on *Aen.* 2. 21, Norden on *Aen.* 6. 42 ff.

² Gow's note on 15. 82 (to which he refers us) can cite only 'wandering' as a meaning of words in *διν-* which does not have a clearly circular implication; and in that case the idea is presumably of *aimless* wandering, where the vagrant is likely to trace broad

arcs or even to cross his own tracks.

³ Theocritus may have had a mental picture of Ajax's *σάκος ἥτε πύργον*; if he correctly envisaged it as semi-cylindrical, it would not only take two babies in tandem very comfortably, but would rock from side to side in the desired manner perfectly.

⁴ Plato also uses *σεισμός* to describe the motion.