

PROBLEMS IN THE ANACREONTEA

The task of making a new Teubner edition of the Anacreontea has led me to realize how much still remains to be done for the text of these once celebrated but now little-read poems, for which we depend on the same tenth-century manuscript as for the Palatine Anthology. In what follows I attempt to justify the new emendations adopted in the edition, and one or two old ones which have generally been dismissed.

1. 1–3 Ἀνακρέων ἰδὼν με
ὁ Τήϊος μελωιδός
ὄναρ λέγων προσεῖπεν.
προεῖπεν P (-ον a.c.): corr. Stephanus

I read with Baxter (1695) ὄναρ λέγω, as a parenthesis. The objection to the participle is not just that ἰδὼν με . . . λέγων προσεῖπεν involves redundancy and an awkward oscillation between aorist and present, but also that, while ὄναρ can be used adverbially, ἰδὼν με . . . ὄναρ would naturally mean ‘seeing me in *his* dream’, not ‘in *my* dream’. With Baxter’s reading, the parenthesis comes in just where it is needed, after line 2 has confirmed that the Anacreon in question really is the old poet, whom this poet could obviously never have met in real life. For ὄναρ λέγω of recounting a dream, cf. the saying τὸ ἕμὸν ἐμοὶ λέγεις ὄναρ (Pl. R. 563d, *al.*).

2. 3–5 φέρε μοι κύπελλα θεσμών,
φέρε μοι νόμους κεράσσω,
μεθύων ὅπως χορεύσω.

The poet has called for Homer’s lyre minus the string (or note, as we would say) of bloodshed. θεσμοί and νόμοι stand for the peace and order which he wants to govern his revelry. For κύπελλα θεσμών cf. 5. 2 ἕαρος κύπελλον, and 58. 27 (λύρη) πόθων κύπελλα κίρναϊ. But they are not just metaphorical cups, they are real ones. He wants to get drunk, to dance and sing. If he says φέρε μοι νόμους κεράσσω, however, he is no longer calling for cups but for a crater. This is quite irregular. The crater is not brought to the drinker. It stands in the background, and the servants mix the wine in it before serving. We must read κεράσσας; the ending has been affected by χορεύσω below. For confirmation cf. 20. 4 συγκεράσας τις ἐγχέοι, 38. 11 f. τὸ μὲν οὖν πῶμα κερασθέν ἀπαλοὶ φέρουσι παῖδες, and especially 47. 8–10 ἐμοὶ κύπελλον ὦ παῖ μελιχρὸν οἶνον ἡδὺν ἐγκεράσας φόρησον.

- 3 Ἄγε, ζωγράφων ἄριστε,
λυρικῆς ἄκουε Μούσης·
φιλοπαίγμονες δὲ Βάκχαι
έτεροπνόους ἐναύλους.
γράφε τὰς πόλεις τὸ πρῶτον
ἱλαράς τε καὶ γελώσας·
ὁ δὲ κηρὸς ἂν δύναιτο,
γράφε καὶ νόμους φιλοῦντων.

5

Everyone admits that something is badly wrong here. An encaustic painter is being given specifications for a picture, as in poems 16 and 17; the first line is the same as in 16, and 7 is virtually the same as 16. 8. But we are not told the subject of the picture as a whole. Joyful communities are only the first item to be delineated. Where are the rest? The instructions seem to end almost as soon as they have begun. Further, lines

3–4 have no construction. And surely, when they did, the Bacchants dancing to auloi were part of the painting, not ‘music while you work’ for the painter. (Line 2 only means ‘accept instructions from a lyric poem’.) If so they ought not to precede 5. Many editors have followed Scaliger in transposing 3–4 to follow 6, with some further alteration such as *φιλοπαίγμονάς τε Βάκχας ἑτεροπνόους σὺν αὐλοῖς* (Barnes), or *φιλοπαίγμονός τε Βάκχου* (Baxter, cf. 42. 1–2 *Διονύσου φιλοπαίγμονος*). Bergk in his fourth edition of the lyric poets leaves the order of lines unchanged but assumes lacunae after 2 (as first proposed by Anne le Fèvre) and 4.

I believe that 3–4 are out of place, and there may be a hint of external support for this in the fact that the couplet is preceded and followed in P by the sign \diagup , which the scribe uses to mark words in the text to which he has found a variant or perhaps would like to find a variant. However, the lines should not be put after 6, for 5–8 are paralleled by, probably modelled on, 16. 6–9:

γράφει μοι τρίχας τὸ πρῶτον
ἀπαλὰς τε καὶ μελαίνας·
ὁ δὲ κηρὸς ἂν δύνηται,
γράφει καὶ μύρου πνεούσας.

5–8 therefore make an indivisible block, and 3–4 must go after 8. There is no reason to alter the wording, provided that we assume the loss of further verses following. *ἑτεροπνόους* can only refer to a pair of auloi. *ἐναύλους* may stand as an adjective meaning ‘of the aulos’. Hiller’s supplement *ἀναμιξ βοᾶς ἰέντων* (imperative), though unlikely to be verbally correct, aims in the right direction.

We still need, before 5, a statement of the subject of the painting as a whole, just as 16. 6 is preceded by *γράφει τὴν ἐμὴν ἑταίρην*. I conjecture that the subject was the grape-harvest, e.g.

γράφει μοι καλὴν ὁπώραν
Διονυσίαις ἐν ὥραις.

Cf. 53. 9–10 *Διονυσίης . . . ὁπώρης*, 55. 18 *Διονυσίαις τ’ ἐορταῖς*. First of all the painter is to portray public festivity. If possible he is also to show *νόμους φιλοῦντων*. This might mean ‘(cities) of men loving law’, that is, peaceful and orderly, but more probably it means ‘the ordinances of lovers’; cf. the account of the vintage in poem 59, and for the diction Thallus *A.P.* 9. 220 1 (*Garland of Philip* 3434 G.-P.), *ἀ χλοερὰ πλατάνιστος ἰδ’ ὥς ἔκρυψε φιλοῦντων ὄργια*. Then we move on to dancing Bacchants. There may have been much more. The model, poem 16, has 34 lines.

Poem 4 has a related theme. Hephaestus is charged to make, not arms as he did for Achilles, but a silver cup, as capacious as possible, embellished with scenes of grapes being harvested by Maenads and trodden by Satyrs, Erotes, Aphrodite, and Dionysus. Poem 5 appears as a foil to this:

Καλλιτέχνα, τόρευσον
ἕαρος κύπελλον ἥδη.

We have had our autumn cup: *now* make a spring cup. The metre and prosody of this latter poem are degenerate, and it has been much emended to accord with different views of the principles to be assumed. In my view its prosody is of a type seen also in poems 40, 41, 45 and 49, in which the vowels *a i u* are liable to be given false quantities, and in addition other short vowels may be treated as long if they are accented, unaccented long vowels may be treated as short, and endings such as *-ος -ον* may also be treated as long. The metre is basically hemiambic, but admits of several types of anacalasis.

— — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —
 — — — — —

as well as anacreontics and acatalectic dimeters,

x — — — — —
 — x — — — — —

Most of these licences can be paralleled in other poems. On these assumptions there is no necessity to emend the text for the metre's sake. But difficulties of language and interpretation remain. In lines 3–4,

τὰ πρῶτ' ἡμῖν τὰ τερπνά
 ῥόδα φέρουσιν ὦρην,

ὦρην appears to be in apposition with ἔαρος κύπελλον. (Portray) 'the season that is producing for us the first delightful roses'. The next two lines,

ἀργύρεον δ' ἀπλώσας
 ποτὸν ποίει μοι τερπνόν,

mean 'and beating (spreading) it out in silver, make me a cup that is joyful'. The emphatic *τερπνόν* leads on to the succeeding instructions, which become clearer as soon as it is realized that the poet has in mind a particular kind of artwork that he does *not* want, just as the author of poem 4 rejected the Achillean panoply. He is thinking of scenes representing mystery rites and horrid bloody sacrifices.¹ Instead of these he wants rites of a cheerful nature.

τῶν τελετῶν, παραινῶ,
 μὴ ξένον μοι τορεύσεις,
 μὴ φευκτὸν ἱστόρημα·
 μάλλον ποίει Διὸς γόνον,
 Βάκχον Εὐνιον ἡμῖν.
 μύστις νάματος ἢ Κύπρις
 ὑμεναίους κροτοῦσα.

10

The place of the female initiate will be taken by Aphrodite, who will be shown bringing couples together in amorous union. Ellipse of ἔστω is abnormal, and I follow the translator De la Fosse (in Anne Dacier's second edition of the *Anacreontea*, Amsterdam 1716) and Pauw in preferring *ἦ* to *ἢ*. For *ἦ* in the sense of ἔστω compare Gregory of Nazianzus, εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν (carm. 2. 1. 88) 105,

τὸ δ' ἔσθ' ἡ καμῆλων
 τρίχες, νόμῳ δικαίων.

When our poet continues

χάρασσ' Ἐρωτας ἀνόπλους,

there is again an implied contrast with representations of mysteries in which armed figures appeared. There are to be smiling Charites under a leafy, cluster-laden vine (15–17); the idiot poet has already forgotten the season. To complete the picture,

σύνναπτε κούρους εὐπρεπεῖς,
 †άν μη† Φοῖβος ἀθύρηι.

¹ For two cups from Arezzo with such scenes in relief see M. P. Nilsson, *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age* (1957), pp. 93–5.

These comely lads are, I take it, to be coupled with the Charites under the vine; for this as a discreet place to make love cf. 41. 5 ff. *ἂν μὴ Φοῖβος ἀθύρῃ*, at a severe pinch, might be understood as ‘unless Phoibos is (already) sporting (with them)’. Certainly *ἀθύρω* is likely to have this meaning, cf. 37. 6 *μετὰ παρθένων ἀθύρων*, 42. 7, 43. 10. But Phoibos is in the artist’s power and the artist in the poet’s: it does not make sense for the poet to tell the artist to do something ‘unless Phoibos’ is doing something else. Conjectures include *ἄμα δὴ* (van Medenbach Wakker), ‘let Ph. sport there also’; *ἄλλῃ* (Crusius), ‘let Ph. sport with another of them’; *οἷς ἂν* (Edmonds), ‘lads such as Ph. would sport with’. P has *ἀθύρει* with *η* suprascript over *ει*; Brunck conjectured *ἀθύροι*. If the construction with dative of person is acceptable – a parallel would be welcome – I should prefer *αἷς μὴ Φ. ἀθύρῃ*. ‘Join good-looking lads to the ones Ph. himself is not dallying with.’

14. 18–19 *τί φηίς ἄει κηρωθεῖς†*
οὔπω Σύρους ἔλεξα κτλ.

The poet has engaged an accountant to take stock of his love affairs. In Greece alone the tally exceeds two thousand. At this point the lines in question appear. 18 is unmetrical unless we admit *κηρωθείς*; that would be imprudent, seeing that the only other offence against classical prosody in the 27-line poem is at 25 *καὶ τοὺς Γαδείρων ἑκτός*, which even if not corrupt or interpolated² is not a complete parallel, as there are some half a dozen poems in which short scansion of ‘long’ vowels is confined to unaccented *final* syllables.³ A more unanswerable objection to line 18 is that it makes no sense. The scribe himself marked it as requiring correction by placing before and after it the sign *✕* (cf. above on 3. 3–4).

There can surely be no doubt that the words *τί φηίς* are spoken by the same person as the rest of the poem. The accountant is imagined to have made some protest, but these are not his words, for 19 cannot be the answer to ‘What’s that you say?’, whatever *ἀει κηρωθεῖς* conceals. It is rather the answer to an accountant who cries out for relief, who is overwhelmed, who cannot carry on.

καρωθείς (Stephanus) restores the metre with the minimum of force. It is a word used elsewhere in the Anacreontea: 52A. 3 *τὴν ψυχὴν μου κάρωσον*, fr. 2. 2 (Hipp. Ref. 5. 8. 6) *μέθυσόν με καὶ κάρωσον*. Its meaning, ‘benumbed’, is appropriate enough; it is what the accountant may well feel. But what are we to do with *ἀει*? ‘Always’ is incongruous with the aorist participle and with the general sense. A finite verb is required, for *τί φηίς καρωθείς*; cannot go together as a single phrase. I doubt if we can do better than to write *ἄγει*: ‘What’s that you say? You’re being carried away by torpor? I haven’t mentioned the Syrian ones yet’, etc.

At 24 the transmitted text is

τί σοι θέλεις ἀριθμεῖν
καὶ τοὺς Γαδείρων ἑκτός κτλ.

Almost all editors adopt Scaliger’s *ἀριθμῶ*, which was suggested by 10. 1 *τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω*; But ‘what do you want me to count out to you?’ or ‘why do you want me to count out to you?’ is not satisfactory. The overworked accountant obviously does

² *τοὺς ἑκτὸς αὖ Γ.* Stephanus, *καὶ τοὺς πέρα Γ.* Bergk. It is a possibility that lines 24–7, which also contain an inelegant crasis of *καὶ* with *ι-* (*κινδῶν*), are a later addition to the poem. The parallel tradition available for poems 4 and 8 (Gell. 19. 9. 6; *A.P.* 11. 47–8, *A. Plan.* 11a. 47. 17–18, etc.) shows that 4 at least, perhaps 8 too, has suffered expansion at the end.

³ 38. 9. 47. 9?, 50. 6, 16, 24, 52A. 3, 54. 2, 58. 2, 5, 8, 18.

not want any more counting at all. The other cannot suppose, after 18, that he is hankering after more or different details. What is wanted is

τί δ' οὐ θέλεις ἀριθμεῖν.

Corruption to σοὶ was due to reminiscence of 10. 1.

15. 7–10 Ἀνακρέων μ' ἔπεμψε
πρὸς παῖδα, πρὸς Βάθυλλον
τὸν ἄρτι τῶν ἀπάντων
κρατοῦντα καὶ τύραννον.

Eros himself is *τύραννος θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων* (Eur. fr. 136. 1), but I do not know a parallel for *τύραννος* used of someone to whose charms everyone is enslaved. It is, to be sure, not much of an advance on *κρατοῦντα*. But we can obtain a livelier sense by making the small change to *τυράννων*. Apuleius, *Flor.* 15, describes a statue of Bathyllus *à Polycrate tyrannò dicata*. No doubt Bathyllus is secondary to Smerdies (*PMG* 414) in the role of the youth admired both by Anacreon and by Polycrates, but I feel little hesitation in recognizing the motif here. My emendation was in a sense anticipated by J. C. Zeune (*Animadversiones in Anacreontem, Platonem et Xenophontem*, 1775), but he proposed *τυράννου*.

18. 5–7 δότε δ' ἀνθέων ἐκείνου,
στεφάνους δότ' οἷς πυκάζω
τὰ μέτωπά μου, ἵκκαίει.

I take *δότ' οἷς* from Bergk (1843, *δόθ'*) for *δ' οἷου* of P. The other problem is *ἐκείνου*, whose only possible antecedent is *Βρομίου* in 2 (*δότ' ὦ γυναῖκες Βρομίου πεινᾶμυστί*). Why, three lines later, should flowers for a garland be *his* flowers? I conjecture

δότε δ' ἀνθέων, ἐλίνου,

'give me flowers, a vine-runner'. The *ἔλινος* will serve to bind the flowers upon. The word has a short iota in Nicander, Dionysius Periegetes, and pseudo-Oppian, but a long one in Nonnus (*D.* 12. 299, 16. 278, 17. 333), who will have had earlier authority for it.

After finding shade from the boiling sun, the poet seeks escape from the burning of love in the 'shade' of Bathyllus, who is pictured as a tree (11 ff.):

καλὸν τὸ δένδρον,
ἀπαλὰς δ' ἔσεισε χαίτας
μαλακωτάτῳ κλαδίσκῳ.

There is an erotic *double entendre* here, for while one appreciates the waving *χαῖται* of a shady tree, its 'soft little branch' does not attract notice. This is Bathyllus' penis, mentioned with similar enthusiasm in 17. 34–7 *ἀπαλὼν δ' ὑπερθε μνηρῶν . . . ἀφελῇ ποιήσον αἰδῶ, Παφίην θέλουσαν ἤδη*. The *ἀπαλαὶ χαῖται*, then, must be his pubic hair. Here the lover seeks his shade.

παρὰ δ' αὐτὸν ἐρεθίζει
πηγὴ ῥέουσα Πειθοῦς.

15

All the best trees have a spring at their base. This spring which runs with Persuasion, or we might prefer to say Temptation, is again a metaphor for physical charms.⁴ The

⁴ cf. Philodemus *A.P.* 5. 13. 5f. (*Garland of Philip* 3170f.) καὶ χρώς ἀρρυτίδωτος ἔτ' ἀμβροσίην, ἔτι πειθῶ πάσαν, ἔτι στάζει μυριάδας Χαρίτων.

verb ἐρεθίζει is intelligible in that connection ('arouses'), but one expects something more appropriate to a spring, and the verse is metrically unsatisfactory. Brunck conjectured μ' ἐρεθίζει, Bergk (αὐτὸ) ψιθυρίζει, Edmonds ἡρεμίζει. I propose παρὰ δ' αὐτὸ νέρθε ροιζει.

31. 9-11 ὁ δ' Ἔρως †μέτωπα σείων†
ἀπαλοῖς πτεροῖσιν εἶπεν
"σὺ γὰρ οὐ δύνῃ φιλῆσαι,"

Eros has been relentlessly whipping the poet along over torrents and gorges, almost driving him to death. But now (apparently) he lets up; the series of imperfects gives way to an aorist, marking the culminating event. What does Eros do 'with his gentle wings'? Most likely he uses them in a soothing way, as when one of the Erotes uses his wings to fan Adonis in Bion, *Adonis* 85, or when Amor uses his to dry the moist eyes of the love-tormented Stella in Statius, *Silvae* 1. 2. 92 f. If σείων could mean 'fanning', there would be little difficulty, but I have found no evidence that it can. Nor can I find another verb with that meaning which would scan in this place; σαίνων (Brunck) will hardly do, nor σαίρων, nor σύρων, nor λειών. Perhaps, then, it is not fanning but something a little less amiable – nothing very painful, presumably, in view of ἀπαλοῖς πτεροῖσιν, but a petulant cuff or something of that sort. Edmonds conjectured παίων. The forehead, however, does not seem a natural target. It may be that μέτωπα conceals the pronoun με. We could then think of μ' ἐς ὦπα or μ' ἐπ' ὦτα παίων. Eros loses patience with the man and abandons him. Admittedly it is a little hard to see the ground for the complaint σὺ γὰρ οὐ δύνῃ φιλῆσαι, since the forced running, the sweating, the bounding heart, the near-death, are signs that he has loved indeed. I have wondered whether Eros in fact said σὺ γὰρ εἰ δύνῃ φιλῆσαι, and gave him relief because he was pleased with his performance. But in that case we must go back to looking for a merciful gesture in μέτωπα σείων.

34. 8-9 σὺ δὲ †φιλία γεωργῶν
ἀπὸ μηδενός τι βλάπτων.

To the cicada. *φιλία* is neither metrical nor a possible way of saying in Greek 'you are a friend of the farmers'. Those critics who have admitted this have generally wanted to substitute some form of φίλος: σὺ γὰρ εἶ φίλος Barnes, σὺ δὲ φίλτατος Rose (earlier considered by A. F. Lindau, *Zeitschr. f. Alt.* 8, 1841, 873 ff.), etc. Some of them realized that the dative would then be preferable to the genitive: γεωργοῖς Barnes, γεωργῶι H. Richards (*J. Phil.* 25, 1897, 94 ff.). The corruption to *φιλία*, however, is inexplicable. What the poet wrote was surely *φείδαι*. He has likened the cicada in the preceding lines to a king, and said that it owns the whole countryside. As a potentate it may well 'spare' the farmers. The ending -*εαι* does not occur elsewhere in the collection, but it is not out of keeping with such Ionicisms or Homericisms as *Γύγω* 8. 1, *τοκῆς* 29A. 7, *κέαται* 33. 5, *κεισόμεσθα* 32. 9, *δαφνηφόροιο* 12. 6, etc.

36. 1-5 'Ο Πλούτος εἴ γε χρυσοῦ
τὸ ζῆν παρείχε θνητοῖς,
ἐκαρτέρουν φυλάττων,
ἔν' †ασθενεῖν ἐπέλη†
λάβῃ τι καὶ παρέλθῃ.

'If Wealth granted men life in exchange for gold, I would persevere in hoarding it, so that... might accept a payment and pass me by.' Who would he like to pass him by? Not Wealth, obviously, but Death or some similar figure. Sitzler⁵ suggested

⁵ In his revision of E. Buchholz's *Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen*⁵ (Leipzig, 1909).

introducing him in the first line by writing *Πλουτεύς*. This is, however, metrically very dubious, and it is not natural to speak of Hades–Pluto granting men life. So it is in line 4 that we must look for the subject of the verbs in 5. Most editors have adopted Stephanus' reading ἴν' ἄν θανεῖν ἐπέλθῃ. It must be agreed that an 'if' or 'when' clause within the ἵνα clause is scarcely avoidable, and that its verb can scarcely be other than ἐπέλθῃ.⁶ But θανεῖν cannot be considered as a person who could accept a payment and pass by. Θάνατος (van Medenbach Wakker) would be possible, except that resolution is only once attested in the hemiambic poems of the collection (49. 1), and corruption of ἄν Θάνατος to ἀσθενεῖν is hard to understand. If the *ductus litterarum* is not completely misleading, it may possibly conceal ἄν Σθενώ μ'. Stheno or Sthenno is one of the Gorgons.⁷ To see a Gorgon is of course fatal. Odysseus retreated from the vicinity of the House of Hades

μή μοι Γοργείην κεφαλὴν δεινοῖο πελώρου
ἐξ Αἰδὸς πέμψειεν ἀγανὴ Περσεφόνηα

(Od. 11. 634 f.), which seems to suggest a superstition that the apparition of a Gorgon visits the man about to die. I do not know of other evidence for it, nor of Stheno in particular being picked out for this role, and I cannot claim that the conjecture is more than a possibility. But until some more convincing solution is found it seems worth bearing in mind.

The poem continues

εἰ δ' οὖν μὴ τὸ πρίασθαι
τὸ ζῆν ἐνεστι θνητοῖς,
τί καὶ μάτην στενάζω;
τί καὶ γόους προπέμπω;
θανεῖν γὰρ εἰ πέπρωται,
τί χρυσὸς ὠφελεῖ με;

10

Lines 8–9 do not accord with the argument. 'If money could stave off death, I would hoard it. But as it cannot, why do I...to no purpose? What use is saving gold if I am bound to die?' The sense requires 'why do I *hoard it* to no purpose?' not 'why do I *lament*?' The poet wrote στενάζω, and 9 was added by someone who already had the corrupt στενάζω before him. Mehlhorn deleted the line long ago on quite another ground: without it the poem divides neatly into three self-contained strophes of five lines each. Strophic construction is found in over a dozen poems in the collection; five-line stanzas in 29 A, 30, 44 (deleting 44. 8), 47 (as restored below), and 49.

40. 5–6 μέτετέ με φροντίδες·
μηδέν μοι καὶ ὑμῖν ἔστω.

This is one of the poems with the most degenerate prosody; on its principles see above on poem 5. The metrical scheme is

∞ — — — —

with — — — — — in 8 and perhaps — — — — — in 4. Line 5 is too short however we scan it, and various corrections have been proposed. In 6 we must give ὑμῖν the enclitic accentuation ὕμιν (on which see W. S. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos*, p. 425), for -ιν

⁶ Preisendanz gives the manuscript reading as ἐπέλ η. The truth is that the letters ἐλ η are rather widely spaced out, as happens here and there in this manuscript. The spacing does not in itself point to the omission of a letter after λ.

⁷ Σθενώ in Hes. *Th.* 276 (but σθενώ in nearly all MSS. *contra metrum*) and Nonnus, Σθενώ in Apollod. 2. 4. 2. 7, Palaeph. 32. 7, 13, ps.-Plut. *Fluv.* 18. 6, etc.

accented would not be scanned short. ὕμιν was already printed by Pauw, and ὕμιν before him by Davisius. μηδέν μοι καὶ ὕμιν ἔστω will scan like 8 παίξω γελάσω χορεύσω. But a more normal rhythm can be obtained by writing χῦμιν. Cf. *A.P.* 9. 49 Ἐλπίς καὶ σὺ Τύχη μέγα χαίρετε. . . οὐδὲν ἔμοι χῦμιν (καὶ ὕμιν *Sylloge Euphemia*). There is another case of false *scriptio plena* in the Anacreontea at 20. 8 καὶ αὐτὸς, and a case of καί in crasis with ὕ- at 41. 6 χῦπό.

41. 1-8 Τὶ καλὸν ἔστι βαδίζειν
ὅπου λειμῶνες κομῶσιν,
ὅπου λεπτήν ἡδυτάτην
ἀναπνεῖ Ζέφυρος αὔρην,
κλήμά τε Βάκχιον ἰδεῖν
χῦπό τὰ πέταλα δῦναι
ἀπαλὴν παῖδα κατέχων
Κύπριν ὄλην πνέουσιν.

5

Every line except the last has eight syllables, and the underlying metrical scheme appears to be the anacreontic, with anacalasis yielding an ionic dimeter (2, 4, 7) or - - - - - (5? εἶδεν P, εἶδειν Mehlhorn; 6). This latter anacalasis has parallels in the so-called *κουκούλια* of Sophronius and later Byzantine writers of anacreontics, where the trimeter - - - | - - - | - - - becomes - - - - - | - - - - -. ⁸ I believe that line 1 also has this pattern, τὶ being an uncial corruption of ῥ̣. Initial τὶ may be conceivable in later Greek, but I do not know of any parallel in even the basest verse; ῥ̣ on the other hand is supported by Satyrus, *A.P.* 10. 19. 1 (*Further Greek Epigrams* 341 Page), ῥ̣ καλὸν αἰ δάφναι, and especially by Marianus, *A.P.* 9. 668. 1ff.,

ῥ̣ καλὸν ἄλσος Ἐρωτος, ὅπου καλὰ δένδρεα ταῦτα
πρηῦς ἐπιπνεῖων ἀμφιδονεῖ Ζέφυρος,
ῥ̣ καὶ ἐρσῆεις ἀμαρύσσεται ἄνθει λειμῶν.

Line 3 could be scanned - - - - - , but I prefer to follow Barnes in reading λεπτός (- - - - -), giving Ζέφυρος its own epithet. Cf. Marianus' πρηῦς.

46. 10-14 †καρποῖσι γαῖα προκύπτει,†
†καρπὸς ἐλαίας† προκύπτει.
†Βρομίου στέφεται† νᾶμα
κατὰ φύλλον †κατακλόνον
καθελων† ἤνθισε καρπός.

In the rest of the poem the metre is the regular anacreontic (with the licence - - - ' - - - in 1) and the prosody normal. The duplication of προκύπτει cannot be original; either 10 and 11 are doublets (Faber rejected 10, Degen 11), or the verb has displaced another in one of the verses. Its sense, 'peeps out', is better suited to καρπὸς ἐλαίας (unmetrical though those words are) than to γαῖα, and after καρποῖσι γαῖα the metre calls for a spondaic word. Zeune followed this line of reasoning, reading καρποῖσι γαῖα βρίθει. As the season being described is spring, βρίθει is perhaps premature, and in any case it is a verb applicable to trees and plants rather than to earth. I suggest e.g. χαίρει.

καρπὸς ἐλαίας does not scan – nor will any form of ἐλαία or ἐλάα in this part of the verse – and καρπός is itself awkward after καρποῖσι in 10. The phrase has every appearance of being a gloss. The ideal word for the context is θαλλός (Hesych., *Suda* θαλλός· κλάδος ἐλαίας, κτλ.), and e.g. θαλλὸς νέον (adv.) προκύπτει would make a perfect verse.

12 is problematic. Βρομίου . . . νᾶμα is very plausible, cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 14 Βακχίου τε

⁸ cf. my *Greek Metre* (1982), p. 169.

νάματος. Only the wine is not flowing yet, the grapes are still young. σφριγαῖ τὸ νᾶμα may be a possibility, or, if we admit degenerate prosody in this poem, τρέφεταῖ. But Bromios may be in the wrong case. We might also consider Βρόμιος τρέφει τὸ νᾶμα. Of older conjectures the best is perhaps one of Boeckh's, cited by his pupil C. B. Stark:⁹ Βρομίου στέγων τὸ νᾶμα, the participle subordinate to ἤνθισε καρπός in 14.

It is highly likely that κατακλόνον conceals κατὰ κλώνα (Stephanus). The best emendation proposed for the meaningless καθελων is θαλέθων, published by Hermann but anticipated by D'Orville in a manuscript annotation in one of his copies of Pauw's edition (Bodleian MS. D'Orville 403). An alternative solution that occurs to me is that κατακλονονκαθελων is a jumbled version of καθ' ἔλινον κατὰ κλών'. Eager for the vintage, the poet marks the fruit appearing 'on leaf, on tendril, on twig'. For ἔλινος cf. above on 18. 5.

- 47 Ἐγὼ γέρων μὲν εἰμι,
 νέων πλέον δὲ πίνω,
 κἂν δεήσῃ με χορεύειν
 σκῆπτρον ἔχω[ν] τὸν ἀσκόν·
 ὁ νάρθηξ δ' οὐδὲν ἔστιν. 5
 ὁ μὲν θέλων μάχεσθαι,
 πάρεστι γάρ, μαχέσθω·
 ἐμοὶ κύπελλον ὦ παῖ
 μελιχρὸν οἶνον ἥδύν
 ἐγκεράσας φόρησον. 10
 ἐγὼ γέρων μὲν εἰμι.
 Σιληγὸν ἐν μέσοισι
 μιμούμενος χορεύσω.

I give the order of lines as transmitted. There are two things apparently wrong with it. First, as Lachmann pointed out in 1819, 3 should be followed by 12–13, not by 4; 'the wineskin is all I need to support me' does not refer to dancing, since the ordinary dancer does not use a σκῆπτρον anyway. Secondly 11 (= 1) is insupportably isolated as it stands; we should either delete it as a mistaken repetition (Lachmann) or repeat νέων πλέον δὲ πίνω after it (Bergk). Lachmann gives us two six-line stanzas: 1–3, 12–13, 4 ~ 5–10. Bergk and others adopt the same order but with a repeat of 1–2 at the end and no stanza-division. F. Hanssen in his edition of 1884 adopted a radically different solution, placing 6–10 at the beginning of the poem and continuing 11 = 1, 2–5, 12–13; he read ἔχων in 4 (as in ^{Pac}) and took 5 as parenthetic. But as I have said, 4 ought not to follow 3.

I propose a new arrangement which yields three stanzas of five lines each and which makes the confusion in the manuscript easier to account for than the hypotheses above. The first stanza consists of 1–5 except that 3 is transferred elsewhere, a lacuna remaining in its place. The second stanza consists of 6–10, and is modelled on genuine verses of Anacreon.¹⁰ The third goes

- ἐγὼ γέρων μὲν εἰμι, 11
 <νέων πλέον δὲ πίνω> 11 a
 κἂν δεήσῃ με χορεύειν, 3
 Σιληγὸν ἐν μέσοισι 12
 μιμούμενος χορεύσω. 13

⁹ *Quaestionum Anacreonticarum libri duo* (Leipzig, 1846), p. 76.

¹⁰ *PMG* 429 + *SEG* 26. 1213 (*SLG* p. 157 Page) ὁ μὲν θέλων μάχεσθαι, πάρεστι γάρ, μαχέσθω· ἐμοὶ δὲ δὸς] προ[πίνειν με]λιχρ[ὸν οἶνον] ὦ [παῖ. The same idea, 'other people can fight if they want to; I'd rather drink', recurs in 48. 7–10.

As the scribe copies 1–2 his eye falls on the identical couplet 11–11 a, and this leads him to copy 3 next. His exemplar may have been laid out, as P is, in two columns to be read across the page. If the preceding poem ended in the left-hand column, 47. 1 would be on the right; 2 and its original successor would share the next line, and 11 a + 3 the fifth after that. He copies this line (11 a + 3) instead of the earlier one, but then resumes at the line under the first νέων πλέον δὲ πίνω, that is, at 4. When he comes to the line containing 11 a + 3 he rejects it, having copied it previously, and passes straight from 11 to 12–13.

50. 1–4 "Οτ' ἐγὼ πίνω τὸν οἶνον,
 τότε μὲν (ἐμὸν Bergk) ἦτορ ἰανθέν
 †λιγαίνειν ἄρχεται μούσας†.

The poem is composed in quatrains, the first line being the same every time. There is therefore no possible doubt that the words obelized represent two verses. *λιγαίνειν* must stand at the end of one of them: that is the only place in an anacreontic for a word of that shape. Much the likeliest place for one of the shape of ἄρχεται is ∪∪'–∪∪'–∪∪--'. The collocation ∪∪ ἄρχεται *λιγαίνειν* (Mehlhorn) is supported by the parallel of Sophronius 17. 24 πόθεν ἄρξομαι *λιγαίνειν*; For the beginning of the line μέλος seems ideal; cf. John of Gaza 4. 14 (Bergk, *PLG*⁴ iii. 345) μέλος ὄρνειον *λιγαίνειν*, 1. 34 σὺν ἐμοὶ μέλος *λιγαίνειν*, Const. Sic. 1. 54 (Bergk 349) λιγυρὸν μέλος *λιγαίνω*, Georg. Gramm. 7. 14 (Bergk 374) γάμιον μέλος *λιγαίνειν*, Sophronius 1. 21 ἱερὸν μέλος *λιγαίνειν*, 2. 105 μέλος ἀγγέλων *λιγαίνω*.

For the other line I propose <ἀναβάλλεται δὲ> Μούσας. Cf. Georg. Gramm. 8. 1 ἀναβάλλομαι χορεύειν, [Sophron.] 23. 15 ἀναβάλλομαι *λιγαίνειν*.

51. 3–5 μηδ', ὅτι σοὶ πάρεστιν
 ἄνθος ἀκμαῖον †τὰς ἐμας
 δῶρα τὰ φίλτρα διώξεις†.

The old man beseeches the girl not to reject him on account of his white hair. διώξης is to be read; Hermann altered the verb to διώση, thinking that διώκω would mean 'run after', but it can equally well mean 'chase away, spurn', as in Nonnus, *D.* 15. 277 παρθένε, μή με διώκε.

For τὰς ἐμας δῶρα τὰ φίλτρα many conjectures have been made. I list the more sensible:

- ῶρας, | τὰμὰ φίλτρα Stephanus
ῶρας | ἐμὰς δῶρα Hermann
τὰμὰ | δῶρα, φίλα, Bergk 1843
ῆβας, | δῶρα τὰμὰ Bergk 1882 (ῆβης iam Barnes)
τὰμὰ | φίλτρα, φίλα, Crusius
τὰμὰ | φίλτρα, κόρα, Sitzler.¹¹

φίλτρα is unlikely to be the product of corruption or glossing, and it gives good sense: 'do not spurn (my) charms'. Before it, in place of δῶρα τὰ, we need a disyllable scanning –∪ or ∪– or ––. In 4 we have τὰς ἐμάς or τὰς ἐμὰς with no noun to refer to. The metre of this line is defensible as it stands, for acatalectic dimeters occur sporadically in the hemiambic poems. The most economical solution to the crux, then, will be to replace δῶρα τὰ by a feminine noun in the genitive, depending on φίλτρα. Surely τὰς ἐμὰς | ῶρας. 'And do not, because *you* still have the flower of your prime, spurn the charms of *my* season. See, in garlands too, white lilies look good among the roses.'

¹¹ Because the poem bears the title εἰς κόρην.

53. 1–2 Ὅτ' ἐγὼ †σ[ἐ] νέοις ὁμίλουν
 ἐσορων† πάρεστιν ἦβα.

The scribe presumably thought (if he thought at all) that the sense was 'when I conversed with the young men, looking at (them, or you)'. But a past tense will not do. Nor is there any place for a σέ, as the poem has no addressee, and the scribe partly cancelled it by putting a dot above the ἐ and drawing a vertical line through it. Preisendanz's reading νέοις σ' ὁμιλοῦντ' ἐσορῶ (noluit Mehlhorn) is impossible for another reason: synapheia between verses is nowhere apparent in the Anacreontea, and elision at line-end is excluded. Certainly Stephanus was right to restore ἐσορῶ as the verb governed by ὅτε, and since we cannot find or understand any neuter noun with which a participle ὁμιλοῦν may agree, he was presumably also right to emend to νέων ὁμιλον. One can imagine a two-stage corruption, ὁμιλον first becoming ὁμιλουν (through ὁμιλοῦ?), and νέων then being changed to the dative to suit the apparent verb form.

I have a further refinement to contribute to Stephanus' solution. It is to account for the unwanted σ[ἐ] as a misunderstanding of 's, that is ἐς with prodelision. Prodelision of ἐπι is found in the collection at 18. 7 μου 'πικαίει and 25. 5 ἥ 'πὶ Μέμφιν. Prodelision of ἐς has caused confusion in at least two other passages of Greek poetry: at Archilochus 89. 29, where τωισοδον in the Mnesiepes inscription has been read by different editors as τῶ(ι) 'ς ὁδόν and (less plausibly) as τῶ(ι) σ' ὁδόν, and at Sappho 16. 9, where ἔβα 'ς Τροῖαν (εἰβα' τροῖαν pap.) was not correctly diagnosed for many years.

The poem continues:

τότε δῆ, τότ' ἐς χορείην
 ὁ γέρων ἐγὼ πετροῦμαι,
 †περὶ μείνός μ'ε κυβήβα†.

5

περίμεινόν μ'ε is surely incredible; there is no such ancient idiom corresponding to 'Cybele, here I come!'. Salmasius saw that the series of suprascript vowels give παραμεινωμε = παραμαίνομαι. The vocative Κυβήβα, however, remains unacceptable. The old man describes his youthful spirits to his companions, not to a goddess. A dative would be a little easier. But I have no doubt that what the poet wrote was κυβηβῶ, completing a trio of verbs.

55. 11–15 γλυκὺ καὶ ποιοῦντα πείραν
 ἐν ἄκανθίναῖς ἀταρποῖς,
 γλυκὺ δ' αὖ λαβόντα θάλγειν
 μαλακαῖσι χερσὶ κούφαις
 προσάγοντ' Ἔρωτος ἄνθος.

In praise of the rose. 11–12 do not construe, unless with Baxter we interpret P's ποιοῦντ' as ποιοῦντι, nor are they intelligible. Commentators take them as referring to attempted seduction, but even if 'the rose is sweet for a seducer on thorny paths' were a convincing proposition, Greek idiom would seem to require, at the nearest, ποιουμένωι, not ποιοῦντι. Rather we should look for an infinitive, parallel to the one in 13. It could only be concealed in πείραν. If πείραν conceals an infinitive, ποιοῦντα must also be corrupt, as without an object it is incomprehensible. I propose ποιοῦντ' ἀγείρειν. Gathering roses makes a good match for the gentle pleasure described in 13–15.¹²

This second pleasure consists in warming the rose between the hands. What for?

¹² As remoter possibilities for the infinitive I have considered ἀμέργειν and ἀνείρειν.

Of course to bring out its fragrance, the fragrance of Love itself. To disclose this sense we must make the trifling change from *προσάγοντ'* (P actually has *προσάγωντ'*) to *προάγοντ'*. A further improvement is effected by altering *κούφαις* to *κούφον*. Baxter read *κούφως*, and Mehlhorn *κούφα*.

A worse crux follows.

16-19 $\tau\bar{\omega}\sigma\sigma\phi\omega\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta'\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\uparrow\ \tau\epsilon\rho\pi\nu\acute{o}\nu$
 θαλίαις τε καὶ τραπέζαις
 Διονυσίαις τ' ἑορταῖς
 τί δέ' δίχα τοῦ ῥόδου γένοιτ' ἄν.

The words *τί δέ* were added at the beginning of 19 after the line had been copied. They make it unmetrical, and evidently represent the scribe's own attempt to find a subject for *γένοιτ' ἄν*. They should not be taken as the starting-point for another conjecture, as they were by Stephanus (*τί δ' ἄνευ ῥόδου*). The missing subject must lurk in 16, and it must have been something like 'what' or 'nothing'.¹³ We shall not therefore find satisfaction in the family of conjectures which assume *τόδ' αὐτὸ* (Stephanus) preceded by a dative noun (*στεφάνωι* Stephanus, *κορυφῇ* or *κροτάφωι* or *κροτάφοις* D'Orville, *ἁσόφωι* Bothe), but rather by following the lead of those who alter *τὸ δ' αὐτῷ* so as to find *τί* in it: *τί δ' αὖ*, *τί* Bergk (1867), *τί δ' ἂν* *τὸ* Bergk (1882, preceded by *τί δέ φῶς*); *τί δ' αὖτε* Michelangeli, *τί δ' αὖ* *τὸ* Friedländer. But what is concealed in *ῶσσοφῶ*? The *ο* is a correction from something else; above it is the sign \diagup , and in the margin $\zeta(\acute{\eta}\tau\epsilon\iota)$ \diagup . The first *ω* is not dissimilar to an *α*. As π in early minuscule commonly has the form ϖ , which could easily be confused with σ , I venture to read

ἀπορῶ τόδ' αὖ, τί τερπνόν κτλ.

It is true that the poet has not professed *ἀπορία* before, but *αὖ* is justified because a new item is being added to the catalogue of the rose's merits: 'And then again, I don't know what pleasure there would be in feasting... without the rose'. Georgios Grammatikos 3. 112ff. (Bergk, *PLG*⁴ iii. 370) makes Ares say to Aphrodite when she has pricked herself on a rose-thorn

*τί καλὴ πέφυκε τέρψις;
τὸ ῥόδον δέ ποῖον εἶπω
ἀπορῶ μὰ τήν 'Αθήνην.*

57. 23-6 $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega\iota\uparrow\ \delta'\ \acute{\omicron}\chi\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\tau\alpha\iota$
 ἐπὶ δελφίσι χορευταῖς
 δολερὸν νόον ἔμερόπων
 "Eros Ἰμερος γελῶντες.

23 *ορχοῦντ(αι)* P, corr. Stephanus

Aphrodite is accompanied at her birth by Eros and Himeros, as in Hesiod (*Th.* 201). The silver in 23 probably refers to metal used in the work of art being described (a disc), whether it is all of silver or inlaid. But the syntax is obscure. *ὑπέρ* cannot take the dative (except in Arcadian in the sense 'for the sake of'). Rose conjectured *ἀργυροῖ*, supposing Eros and Himeros to be figured in silver, and taking *ὑπέρ* with *ῥοχοῦνται* by tmesis. This is artificial, especially when the placing of *δέ* marks *ὑπέρ ἀργύρωι* as a unit. Edmonds wrote *ὑπέρ ἀργύρου*. But it is surprising if Eros and Himeros ride on dolphins 'above the silver', and equally so if they are picked out as being silver themselves. If anything is silver, it should be the dolphins. Cf. [Hes.] *Sc.* 212f.,

¹³ It is uneconomical to introduce it in 17 (*τί κὰν* Rose, Preisendanz), which there is no reason to think corrupt.

ἀργύρεοι δελφίνες ἐφοίμεον ἔλλοπας ἰχθύς,
τῶν δ' ὕπο χάλκειοι τρέον ἰχθύες,

and Quintus of Smyrna 5. 95f. (dolphins on a shield),

κατ' ἡρόεν δ' ἄλός οἶδμα
νηχομένοις εἶδοντο καὶ ἀργύρεοί περ ἔοντες,

and Virgil, *Aen.* 8. 673 f. (Aeneas' shield),

et circum argentó clári delphínes in orbem
aequora uerrébant caudís aestumque secábant.

Hence Michelangeli hesitantly suggested ἀργυροῖς. But the problem of ὑπέρ remains. I suggest that a compound ὑπεραργύροις is to be recognized, formed like περιάργυρος, ὑπάργυρος. περιαργύροις would also be possible.

Nothing plausible has been offered as a cure for μερόπων in 25: μετώπων Voss, μετ' ὠπῶν Preisendanz; δολεροὶ νέον μέτωπον Barnes, δολερὸν Πόθος μετώπων Bergk. I read

δολερὸν νόον μετοίσων
"Ερος, Ἰμερος γελῶν τε.

The two gods are differentiated in aspect: Eros is fickle, you can see that he is going to change his mind, but Himeros has an open smile. τε as third word is paralleled in the very next line, χορὸς ἰχθύων τε κυρτός, and in 56. 13.

58. 19–22 ἄπιστ' ἄπιστε Χρυσέ,
μάταν δόλοισ με θέλγεις·
πλέον †χρυησου νεῦρα
πόθους †κεκλῷ ἀδεις†.

The νεῦρα are those of the lyre, whose merits the poet contrasts favourably with those of riches. 21 has been variously emended, usually on the assumption that χρυησου stands for χρυσοῦ: πλέον <τὰ> νεῦρα χρυσοῦ Barnes, χρυσοῦ πλέον <τὰ> νεῦρα Bergk, πλέον <τι> χρυσοῦ νεῦρα Mehlhorn. Only Rose rejected this assumption, writing πλέον τί σου τὰ νεῦρα. A solution which avoids both a change of word order and the insertion of τά or τι to restore the metre is

πλέον λύρης σου νεῦρα.

The unaccented σου can be treated as short; cf. 2 φεύγῃ, 5 διώκῃ, etc.

κεκλῷ has always been interpreted as κέκλυθι, and I daresay that is what the copyist intended. ἀδεις has been interpreted as ἀδεῖς (= ἡδεῖς acc. pl.), or altered to ἄδει (Rose). The first is just what is wanted, for the poet goes on to contrast the ἔρως δόλων and φθόνων which gold inspires with the πόθοι παστάδων φιλαμάτων τε κεδνῶν aroused by the lyre. ἄδει is unintelligible. So is κέκλυθι. We need a main verb which tells us that the strings of the lyre, more than gold, foster gentle desires. It seems to me that the only verb which will give a suitable sense and which could be supposed to have been corrupted into κεκλῷ is κέκευθεν, 'contain, have within them'.

59. 1–8 Τὸν μελανόχρωτα βότρυ
ταλάροις φέροντες ἄνδρες
μετὰ παρθένων ἐπ' ὤμων
κατὰ ληνὸν δὲ βαλόντες
μόνον ἄρσενες πατοῦσιν
σταφυλῆς λύοντες οἶνον,
μέγα τὸν θεὸν κροτοῦντες
ἐπιληνίοισιν ὕμνοις.

The scene in 1–3 is influenced by *Il.* 18. 562–8, μέλανες δ' ἀνὰ βότρυνες ἦσαν. . . παρ-
θενικαὶ δὲ καὶ ῥήθιοι. . . ἐν ταλάροισι φέρον μελιηδέα καρπὸν. Contrasted with it
in 4–8 is a subsequent stage of the vintage at which only the men are involved. Clearly
there is a main verb missing in 1–3. Stephanus recognized the problem, which is more
than some editors have done, and he made the facile emendation φέρουσιν for
φέροντες. It is more probable that a verse has fallen out after 3, on the lines of e.g.
λιγυρὰν χέουσιν ὀμφάν. In the Homeric passage the young men and women are
attended by a boy singing the Linos song to the phorminx,

τοὶ δὲ ῥήσσοντες ἄμαρτη
μολπήτ' ἰνυγμῷ τε ποσὶ σκαίροντες ἔποντο (571–2).

The meaning in 4 is 'when they have cast the clusters down into the vat'. The
genitive ληνοῦ seems called for.

At two later points in the poem Bergk recognized that there are lacunae. In 14–16
I supplement e.g.

ὁ δὲ παρθένον λοχῆσας
ἐρατὸς νέος <πιέζει
περιβάλλεται τ'> ἔλυσθείς.

For πιέζει in this context cf. Georg. Gramm. 4. 16 ἀπαλὴν κόρην πιέζειν. In 20–1
I supplement

ὁ δ' Ἔρως ἄωρα θέλων
<παράγει κόρην προδῆλων>
προδότην γάμων γενέσθαι.

It is presumably an unmarried girl who is being seduced. The marriage which she
betrays is therefore in the future. But she can owe it no loyalty unless it has already
been arranged, or is being negotiated. γάμων must accordingly be qualified by a word
such as προδῆλων – and is there another such that would fit the metre?

60. 1–4 Ἄνὰ βάρβιτον δονήσω –
ἄεθλος μὲν οὐ πρόκειται,
μελέτη δ' ἔπεστι πάντη
σοφίης λαχὼν ἄωτον.

Editors follow Stephanus in writing παντί in 3 and λαχόντ(ι) in 4. But the elision of
dative -ι is of a harshness unparalleled in the collection or indeed anywhere in
post-Hellenistic verse.¹⁴ And πάντη is protected by Pindar, *Ol.* 1. 117 πρόφαντον
σοφίαι καθ' Ἑλλαντας ἔοντα πανταῖ, particularly as σοφίης ἄωτον is also Pindaric
(*Isth.* 7. 18), and there are other striking echoes of Pindar in the poem.¹⁵ Retain the
manuscript reading, connecting πάντη. . . λαχὼν with δονήσω and taking ἄεθλος –
ἔπεστι as a parenthesis.

The passage beginning at 11 poses serious problems.

σὺ δὲ Μοῦσα συγχόρευε.
ἱερὸν γάρ ἐστι Φοίβου
κισάρη δάφνη τρίπους τε
†λαλέων ἔρωτα Φοίβου, λαλέω δ' St.
ἀνεμῶλιον τὸν οἶστρον
σαόφρων γάρ †ἐστ' ἀκούσας† mg. εὖτ' ἀκούσης
τὸν μὲν ἐκπέφευγα κέντρα -γε St.
φύσεως δ' ἄμειψα μορφὴν -ψε St.
φυτὸν εὐθαλὲς δ' ἐπηχεῖ. ἐπήχθη Bergk

15

¹⁴ See my *Greek Metre*, pp. 10, 164.

¹⁵ 1 ~ *Pyth.* 10. 39; 24–7 ~ *Ol.* 2. 89; 32–4 ~ *Ol.* 7. 1–8.

The first problem is the *non sequitur* of 12. The poet is to sing of Phoibos' attempted rape of Daphne and her transformation into the δάφνη, though he has not given any hint of his theme before 11. As it stands, Daphne is not named at all. I think she must have been named in a verse after 11 such as

〈ἐρέω Δάφνης τὸν οἶτον〉

We can then attach some sense to 12–13: Daphne is a suitable theme for me, the citharode, because the cithara and the bay-tree, together with the tripod, are the things most sacred to Phoibos. And when we come to 14–15 we will know which love affair of Phoibos is in question.

By 18 we have already reached Daphne's metamorphosis. Stephanus' correction to ἄμειψε is certain, as is Bergk's emendation ἐπήχθη in 19.¹⁶ Stephanus also changed the first person to the third in 17, and all have followed him, supposing the line to refer to Daphne's deliverance from the god's κέντρα and variously emending τόν (τοῦ Rose, τὰ Hiller, τὸ (and κέντρον) Stephanus). This interpretation is impossible because of the perfect tense, which is inadmissible in poetic narrative at all periods. The tense cannot be altered by any moderate emendation. It follows that the line is out of place in the myth. If it is misplaced, the first-person ending becomes a clue to its proper context.¹⁷

It will go well before 14, relieving us of the necessity to emend the participle λαλέων to λαλέω δ'. 'I have escaped from . . . κέντρα by telling of the fruitless love of Phoibos.' The κέντρα are those of Eros, which may be assuaged by song.¹⁸ I postulate that something about the power of Eros has been lost after 13. One could almost insert here the anacreontic fragment preserved by Clement, *Strom.* 6. 2. 14. 7 (*PMG* 505(d), my fr. 1 in the Teubner),

〈τὸν〉 Ἔρωτα γὰρ τὸν ἄβρόν
μέλομαι βρύοντα μίτραϊς
πολυανθέμοις αἰείδειν.
ὄδε καὶ θεῶν δυναστής,
ὄδε καὶ βροτοὺς δαμάζει.
— τοῦ μὲν ἐκπέφευγα κέντρα κτλ.

But it may have been something shorter on the same lines.

There remains the crux in 16. The marginal variant εἶτ' ἀκούσης makes no more sense than what is in the text, and appears to be taken from a cognate manuscript which had the same corruption in a slightly different form, the difference perhaps resulting from a desperate attempt at emendation. Stephanus' σαόφρων γὰρ ἐστι κούρα is hardly less desperate. A present tense is as out of place as the perfect in speaking of the mythical Daphne, and corruption of the simple words ἐστι κούρα to ἐστ' ἀκούσας inexplicable. Besides, however briefly the story is told, it is hardly sufficient to say 'Phoibos' love was fruitless. She was a moral girl, and changed her form' – as if any well-brought-up young woman would have done the same.

¹⁶ From πήγνυμι, of course (Preisendanz stupidly indexes it under ἐπάγω). In 10, where the true text is ἡχηί, P has ἡχθη with suprascript ηχη. This ἡχθη is presumably a correction of 18 which got into 10 by mistake and then had to be corrected itself.

¹⁷ If the first-person endings are corrupt in both 17 and 18, it is hard to see how they arose. But if the one in 17 is genuine, it is easy to explain the one in 18 from its influence.

¹⁸ οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο. . . ἡ ταὶ Πιερίδες (Theoc. 11. 1–3). The idea perhaps recurs in 32ff., φιάλην πρόπινε παισίν, φιάλην λόγων ἔρανῃν· ἀπὸ νέκταρος ποτοῖο (metaphor for song, cf. Pind. *Ol.* 7. 7, from which passage φιάλην πρόπινε also comes) παραμύθιον λαβόντες φλογερὸν φυγόντες ἄστρον (οἶστρον Rose, cf. Georg. Gramm. 1. 107 φλογερὸς πέφυκεν οἶστρος, 6. 6 φλογερῆς . . . οἶστρον ἀνάγκης).

Bergk rightly scented another lacuna. He suggested

σαόφρων γάρ, εὔτε <Γαῖα
ὅπα τῆς κόρης> ἄκουσεν
φύσεως τ' ἄμειψε μορφήν,
τὸ μὲν ἐκπέφευγε κτλ. 18
17

The subject of the active ἄμειψε is indeed likely to be a divinity, and ἀκούσας does indeed suggest this divinity hearing Daphne's cry for help. According to Parthenius 15 (after Diodorus of Elaia [Supp. Hell. 380] and Phylarchus [81 F 32]), it was Zeus: ὡς δὲ συνεδιώκετο, παρὰ Διὸς αἰτεῖται ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπαλλαγῆναι· καὶ αὐτὴν φασὶ γενέσθαι τὸ δένδρον τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἀπ' ἐκείνης δάφνην.¹⁹ I supplement accordingly

σαόφρων γὰρ ἐστ' ἐναξεν
θεὸν οὐ θέλουσα κούρη
γαμέττην ἔχειν· ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς
ἐλέησ' ἀπωθ' ἀκούσας,
φύσεως δ' ἄμειψε μορφήν.

For ἐλέησε . . . ἀκούσας cf. 33. 14 ἐλέησα ταῦτ' ἀκούσας, and for the whole sequence Eustathius Macrembolites 8. 18. 2 ἡ παρθένος φρίττει τὴν ξυμπλοκὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνανεύει τὸν ἔρωτα· τὴν Γῆν δυσωπεῖ, ἥ δ' ἐλεεῖ τὴν κόρην καὶ φεύγουσαν κρύπτει καὶ παρθένον τηρεῖ καὶ φυτὸν ὁμῶνυμον ἀντιδίδωσιν.

Bedford College, London

M. L. WEST

¹⁹ In Ovid, *Met.* 1. 545, it is the river Peneus (there represented as her father) that she prays to, or according to a variant, Tellus; Earth also in Hyg. *Fab.* 203, Tzetz. in Lyc. 6, Eust. Macremb. 8. 18. 2, 11. 22. 1.