

K. J. Dover, however, in a stimulating article published in 1967,<sup>1</sup> offered a new interpretation of the passage. He emphasizes the technical difficulties of making readily identifiable masks in a society which must have been, by modern standards, homogeneous in appearance, and suggests that there was nothing unusual about Cleon's face; that 'when the requirements of the apertures for eyes and mouth had been met, it was impossible to make a mask such that anyone in the audience could say οὗτος ἐκεῖνος.' Noting the horrendous descriptions of Cleon's physical appearance at *Wasps* 1031–5 and *Peace* 753–8, Dover suggests that Aristophanes may have put on the Paphlagonian an exceptionally hideous mask 'which expressed visually what he felt about Cleon', and turned it to good comic effect by pretending that it fell far short of the real man, because a realistic mask would have been too frightening for even the mask-maker to look at.

Dover's general observations about the difficulty of making realistic portrait masks are clearly timely. The hypothesis which he puts forward is highly ingenious, and if it is correct it changes the point of *Knights* 230–3. It seems to rest, however, upon the assumption that Cleon's features were completely regular, and Cratinus in his *Seriphians* apparently mocked the appearance of Cleon, emphasizing particularly the ugliness of his eyebrows; schol. Lucian, *Tim.* 30.<sup>2</sup> [π. Κλέωνος] τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν ἦν ἀργαλέος καὶ μάλιστα τὰς ὀφρύς, ὡς Κρατῖνος Σεριφίους. It is not easy to see how a man's eyebrows can be repulsive,<sup>3</sup> but Aristophanes' mask-makers would apparently have had something to work with, if they had been so inclined.

Ottawa

D. WELSH

<sup>1</sup> *KOMOIDOTRAGEMATA*, *Studia Aristophanea*, W. J. W. Kostr, in honorem, 1967, pp.16 ff. Dover repeated his arguments in *Aristophanic Comedy*, Berkeley and Los

Angeles, 1972, pp.28–9.

<sup>2</sup> Fr. 217A, Edmonds.

<sup>3</sup> For ἀργαλέος in this sense, cf. Aesch. 1.61.

## ΒΩΣΕΣΘΕ REVISITED

The form βώσεσθε (Ap. Rhod. 1.685) has lately caused controversy. It is traditionally interpreted as poetic for βιώσεσθε, but O. Skutsch<sup>1</sup> has denied that iota could be lost in this way, pointing out that instead it could be a correctly formed future of βόσκειμαι,<sup>2</sup> cf. δόσκον: δώσω, with a root ending in the laryngeal \*a<sub>3</sub> (my addition). M. Campbell rejects this,<sup>3</sup> and rightly claims that Apollonius borrowed the line from the *Homeric Hymn to Pythian Apollo* 528:

πῶς καὶ νῦν βιδόμεσθα; τό σε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγμεν,

cf. Ap. Rhod. 1.685a πῶς τῆμος βώσεσθε, and 693 τάδε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα. Campbell reinforces his point by citing other parallels between the *Hymn* and this part of the *Argonautica*, which are hard to gainsay. But this does not

<sup>1</sup> *CQ* N.S. 23 (1973), pp.60, 378.

<sup>2</sup> cf. H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. βόσκω.

<sup>3</sup> *CQ* N.S. 27 (1977), p.467, cf. id. 22 (1972), pp.111 f.

obviate the phonological problem: we should at least read βιώσεσθε if the verb is from βιώω, and a synizesis that scribes could not handle is possible,<sup>1</sup> but a better solution exists, that the anomalous βιώμεσθα of the *Hymn* is corrupt for βώμεσθα, which was altered by the copyists into something they could understand.

βιώμεσθα is explicable: Zumbach<sup>2</sup> remarks that we expect βεόμεσθα, but that the analogy of ἐβίων and βίως has affected the vowel. The form βίονται is attested in a late oracle in Phlegon *Mir.* 2,<sup>3</sup> where Emperius emended to βέονται. But it is on grounds of sense that βιώμεσθα is to be rejected: the meaning of βιώω is 'pass one's life', as opposed to ζάω 'exist':<sup>4</sup> the latter is used correctly at 530. There is certainly a reference to food in 529, and thus a part of βόσκω seems more appropriate: so too in Apollonius. But there is a stronger argument yet from the parallel passage in the *Hymn to Delian Apollo* 54–60. Having enumerated Delos' agricultural failings (with 54 f. cf. 529) Leto goes on to detail the advantages of having Apollo's temple (with 58 cf. 539) and continues (59 f.):

... βοσκήσεις θ' οἷ κέ σ' ἔχῃσι  
χειρὸς ἀπ' ἀλλοτρίης, ἐπεὶ οὐ τοι πᾶρ ὑπ' οὐδας.

βοσκήσεις is a conjecture, but the manuscripts are unanimous in giving a part of βόσκω. Whichever poet was imitating the other, this is a strong argument for βώμεσθα at 528, where it was read and imitated by Apollonius. It is interesting to find another archaism alongside ἄνωγμεν.<sup>5</sup>

University of St. Andrews

R. JANKO

<sup>1</sup> Cf. P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*<sup>2</sup>, i. p.170 for similar cases in Homer.

<sup>2</sup> O. Zumbach, *Neuerungen in der Sprache der homerischen Hymnen* (Winterthur 1955), pp.30–1. A. Hoekstra, *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Oral Tradition*, p.15, compares ἀεργή perhaps for -εῖη, but this is inappropriate in view of the

difference in length.

<sup>3</sup> p.66 in Keller's edition.

<sup>4</sup> LSJ s.v. βιώω.

<sup>5</sup> On balance I agree with M. L. West's decision in favour of the priority of the *Pythian Hymn* (CQ N.S. 25 (1975), 161 ff.). I am grateful to Dr. R. D. Dawe for helpful criticisms.

## Εἰκονώδης: A PROBLEM OF ORIGIN

In the latest edition of Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* appears the entry, 'εἰκονώδης —, fantastic, Gloss.' No more information is given. *Gloss.* refers to the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* edited by G. Loewe, G. Goetz, and F. Schoell. (Leipzig, 1888–1923). If one consults that work, however, one finds that εἰκονώδης does not appear in it. Nor does it appear in Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* before the new, revised edition of 1925. The source for this new word was not H. van Herwerden's *Lexicon Graecum supplementum et dialecticum*, (Leiden, 1910), but the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* of Stephanus whose second edition, edited and augmented by A. J. Valpy (1821–2) contains εἰκονώδης, translated as *imuginosus* and derived from 'Gloss.'

The *Gloss.* in this case refers, not to Stephanus's *Glossaria Duo*, published in 1573, but to the *Glossaria* of A. C. Labbé, first published in Paris in 1679, some