SHORTER NOTES

TWO NOTES ON GREEK DITHYRAMBIC POETRY[1]

1. Melanippides, *PMG* 762

> κλυθί μοι, ὦ πάτερ, θαῦμα βροτῶν
> τᾶς ἀειζώου ψυχᾶς μεδέων.

The fragment is preserved in two sources, Clement of Alexandria's *Miscellanies*, *Strom.* 5.14.112 (ii.402 Stählin), which gives the order of words printed above, and Eusebius' *Praep. Evang.* 13.680c, in which the second line is given as τᾶς ἀειζώου μεδέων ψυχᾶς. The latter reading was preferred by Bergk,[2] but there seems at first little reason to prefer one order over the other. I shall return to this issue shortly.

The metre is uncertain, but apart from this there is no obvious textual corruption. However, in line 1 the phrase θαῦμα βροτῶν strikes a false note. The singular θαῦμα, and the plural θαύματα, are found in a number of different constructions: (1) followed by a dative, as at Hes. *Th.* 500 θαῦμα θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι, *Od.* 11.287 θαῦμα βροτοῖσι, *h. Hom.* 2.403 θαῦμα θνητοῖς τ' ἀνθρώποις, 4.219, E. *I.A.* 202 θαῦμα βροτοῖσιν (in lyric); (2) with an infinitive, as at *h. Hom.* 5.202 θαῦμα ἰδεῖν (E. *Ion* 1142 θαῦματ' ἀνθρώποις ὁρᾶν appears to be a conflation of these two constructions); (3) more rarely with a preposition, as at *h. Hom.* 4. 270 μέγα θαῦμα μετ' ἀθανάτοισι. However, there are no examples of a construction with the genitive with this sense: at E. *Ba.* 693, for instance, we find θαῦμ' ἰδεῖν εὐκοσμίας 'a strange sight for its ordered calm' (Dodds), where εὐκοσμίας is a genitive of the cause. In view of the parallels, and the probability of assimilation to the following genitive and the participle ending in -ων, we should here read βροτοῖς, despite the fact that βροτῶν is given by both sources.

Reading βροτοῖς, we can translate: 'Hear me, o father, marvel to mortals, ruler of the ever-living soul'. The precise sense is somewhat uncertain. Μεδέων is used only of Zeus in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 3.276, 16.234), but can be freely applied to other gods elsewhere; cf. *h. Hom.* 4.2 Κυλλήνης μεδέοντα (of Hermes), Pi. fr. 95 S.-M. ὦ Πάν, Ἀρκαδίας μεδέων (of Pan), *SIG* 1044.8 (of Apollo). Its use here thus gives no indication as to which god is being addressed. Πάτερ also makes us think of Zeus, but again there is no evidence that the epithet was restricted to him. At Ion *Eleg.* 26.13f. it is used of Dionysus: τῶι σὺ πάτερ Διόνυσε, φιλοστεφάνων ἀρέσκων ἀνδράσιν κτλ. Although there is a difference between πάτερ used on its own and used as an epithet with a name (as in Ion), the fact that Melanippides was primarily known for his dithyrambs might encourage us to expect a reference to Dionysus here.[3] In line 2, I suspect that we might see an allusion to Orphic–Dionysiac mysteries.

The metrical difficulties remain. If Clement's word-order is retained, the second line can be scanned as *e–D*, where *D* is – – – ⌣ ⌣ –[4]; this form of the *D*-colarion is more

---

[1] I am indebted to Dr M. L. West, who read an earlier version of this paper, and the anonymous referee, both of whom made a number of useful comments and suggestions.

[2] T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (Leipzig, 1914⁴).

[3] For Melanippides and the dithyramb, cf. Suda, s.v. μ 454, 455, Xen. *Mem.* 1.4.3 etc. He is also said to have composed hymns (Meleager 1.7 *GP* = *AP* 4.1.7), epigrams, elegies, and epic poems (Suda).

[4] This form appears in Euripides; see M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1992), p. 134.

likely than the form – ᴗ ᴗ – –, which must be read if Eusebius' text is preferred. The first line is less easily dealt with. We would expect correption of οι before ὧ, but it is unclear whether the stop + liquid combination βρ in βροτοῖς should be regarded as syllable-closing or -releasing; either would be possible, but if it is syllable-closing, we can compare Melan. *PMG* 760.2 τὸ πρίν, where τό is best scanned long (the whole line is *D²*–). Thus, we should perhaps analyse the line as *ar.* (– ᴗ ᴗ – – ᴗ – –) *cr.* (– ᴗ –); for the aeolic metron in dactylo-epitrite, compare Tim. *PMG* 781, to be analysed *gl.* | *D*–.

One final point deserves attention. O. Hansen has recently argued that the fragment should be attributed not to Melanippides, but to Euripides.[5] There are three arguments used to support his case: (1) the fragment shows marked metrical similarities to *PMG* adesp. 1018(a), the Prayer to the Fates, which he also regards as written by Euripides;[6] (2) the adjective ἀείζωος is restricted to tragedy; and (3) the only parallel to the expression θαῦμα βροτῶν is Euripides, *I.A.* 202, cited above. The other examples adduced above clearly show that argument (3) is fallacious. Nor are his other arguments convincing. ἀείζωος is attested at Heraclitus DK 22 B 30, which is a clear indication that it was not regarded as exclusively tragic. Even if his statement were true, it does not follow that Melanippides could not have been influenced by tragic diction. The metrical similarities are negligible; the Prayer to the Fates is predominantly dactylo-epitrite, but I can identify no aeolic cola which might make any initial similarities more noteworthy. Thus, even if we accept Hansen's attribution of the Prayer to Euripides, itself a subject of some doubt, we can nevertheless confidently reject Hansen's theory about *PMG* 762.

2. Timotheus, *PMG* 794

> τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν διθυράμβων (προοίμια) ὅμοια τοῖς ἐπιδεικτικοῖς·
> διὰ σὲ καὶ τεὰ δῶρα †ειτα σκύλλα†

> εἶτα A: εἴτε β (εἴ τι Vat. 23, s. xiii exeunt.)   σκύλλα A: σκῦλα β

The line is cited by Aristotle at *Rhet.* 3.14.1415a11 (p. 183 Kassel, from whom the apparatus is taken) as an example of how dithyrambs begin, and the ascription to Timotheus depends entirely on the reading of A, Σκύλλα. This connects the fragment with Timotheus' *Scylla*, a dithyrambic poem severely criticized by Aristotle (*Poet.* 15.1454a28, 26.1461b30) and the anonymous author of a treatise clearly based to a large extent on Aristotle's *Poetics*.[7] A is the earliest MS (cod. Paris. 1741), but is not necessarily to be trusted on that account. The rest of the codices (β) have σκῦλα 'spoils'; this must also be the reading behind the explanation in the anonymous Greek commentary on the *Rhetoric*: οἶον· ἦλθον εἰς σὲ διὰ σὲ καὶ τὰ τεὰ καὶ τὰ σὰ δῶρα καὶ εὐεργετήματα καὶ τὰ σκῦλα, ὦ θεὲ Διόνυσε (*comment. in Arist. graec.* 21.2: p. 230 Rabe). The sequence of developments is slightly unclear, but it seems highly probable that the commentator had no knowledge of the poem beyond the quotation in Aristotle, and that σκῦλα represents an attempt either by him or by some previous writer (scribe or scholar) to make sense of the corrupt line. That an original ΣΚΥΛΛΑ might be corrupted to ΣΚΥΛΑ by mere accident is also not unthinkable.

---

⁵ O. Hansen, *Živa Antika* 36 (1986), 32.
⁶ Also suggested by Hansen in *RhM* 133 (1990), 190–2.
⁷ For this treatise, see *Mittheil. Samm. Pap. Erz. Rainer* 1 (1887), 84ff. This, and the two passages in Aristotle, are printed by Page as *PMG* 793.

However, although we may accept σκῦλα as an obvious, and essentially meaningless, corruption, it is equally hard to defend Σκύλλα, since it is difficult to see what the 'gifts of Scylla' might be. Nor is it clear where they would belong in a poem which apparently repeated the story broadly as found in the *Odyssey*. We know that the poem was a dithyramb, and therefore a reference to Dionysus would not be out of place (as the Greek commentator obviously assumed). I suggest we read a vocative Σκυλλίτα; the name Σκυλλίτας is attested only at *SEG* 1025.58, 63, an inscription from Cos dating to the fourth or third century B.C., as a cult-title of Dionysus as the god of the σκυλλίς (given by Hesychius, s.v., as a variant for κληματίς 'vine-branch'). The vocative would in any case be expected in connection with a phrase such as διὰ σέ: we might compare Pi. *I.* 5.1–2 Μᾶτερ Ἀελίου πολυώνυμε Θεία, σέο ἕκατι κτλ.[8] The very rarity of the name would explain the corruption, and although the reference might seem overly obscure for a dithyrambic poet of the period, the context is unknown and the authorship uncertain. It might easily have been a dithyramb written for performance at a Coan festival. Εἶτα probably results from an attempt to correct the MS. If a text originally had ΣΚΥΛΛΑ, a scribe might have written ΕΙΤΑ (writing ΕΙ for Ι) above the line as a correction; this could subsequently have been introduced into the quotation by later copyists.

The 'gifts of Dionysus' can be understood as a reference to wine and its effects. We may compare especially δῶρα Διονύσου πολυγηθέος (of wine) at Hes. *Op.* 613, and the Latin phrases at Hor. *C.* 4.15.26 *iocosi munera Liberi* and Verg. *G.* 2.454 *Baccheia dona* (of the vine, and probably based on a Greek phrase; see Thomas on the line). The construction and thought are common in Greek: see West on Hes. *Th.* 102–3.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford   J. H. HORDERN

[8] See E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Stuttgart, 1956⁴), pp. 157–60, for further examples.

PHRYNICHUS FR. 27 K-A: A PUN

Punning on names was common in Old Comedy. Aristophanes punned on the name of Lamachus, who died at Syracuse (μαχῶν / καὶ Λαμάχων, *Acharnians* 269–70; cf. 1071). In the same play he made the famous joke, 'some went to Kamarina, others to Gela, and some to Katagela'—'an invention of the poet's from the fact that the men's officers laughed at them' (schol. Ar. Ach. 606).[1]

Aristophanes' flair for such jokes may have been rivalled by Phrynichus'.[2] Phrynichus fragment 27 (= schol. Ar. *Birds* 1297), which refers to the decree of Syrakosios of 415, has provoked much controversy:[3]

[1] καταγελᾶν, N. G. Wilson (ed.), *Scholia in Aristophanem: Acharnenses et Lysistratam* (Gröningen, 1975), p. 81. See also the omnipresent puns on the fictitious name Demus in *Knights* (pp. 211–17, 461, 650, 831–3, 953, 1111–20, *et passim*).

[2] The title of one of his plays, Ἐπιάλτης or Ἐφιάλτης, is uncertain precisely because of his parody of a sophistic etymology from two made-up words: ὄνομαδὲ ... φιάλτης .../... ἐπιάλας (Phrynichus fr. 1 K-A); neither φιάλτης nor ἐπιάλας is listed in LSJ. He called a certain Hierokleides 'Kolakophorokleides' (fr. 18). In general, wordplay and soundplay were important elements of his style: e.g. ἀμυχὰς καταμύξαντες (3.6), ἔπειτ' ἐπειδὰν (25), ὁ μὲν ἀπολύων οὗτος, ὁ δ' ἀπολλὺς ὁδί (33), τιμοῦντι κἀτιμοῦντι (63).

[3] M. Radin, 'Freedom of speech in ancient Athens', *AJP* 48 (1927), 215–30; A. Sommerstein, 'The decree of Syrakosios', *CQ* 36 (1987), 101–8; S. Halliwell, 'Comic satire and freedom of speech in classical Athens', *JHS* 111 (1991), 48–70.