

A Grammatical Note on *Cypria*, Fr. 4 K.

By BRUCE KARL BRASWELL, Berlin

Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Seit Meineke (1846) wird in *Kypria*, Fr. 4 Kinkel von den maßgebenden Herausgebern des Athenaios und des epischen Kyklos unnötigerweise eine Lücke angenommen, da die verdächtige Stelle eine grammatisch korrekte, wenn auch ungewöhnliche Konstruktion *ad sensum* enthält.

Athenaeus 15, 682e–f has preserved two fragments of the *Cypria* (3–4 Kinkel, 4–5 Allen, Bethe) which were plausibly explained by F. G. Welcker¹⁾ as coming from the description of Aphrodite's preparations for the Judgment of Paris. Although the scene described in the second of the two fragments (Ath. 682f) is clear enough, the text and grammar have continued to present problems for editors and interpreters. In the edition of J. Schweighäuser, the first modern editor of Athenaeus²⁾, the fragment is printed as follows:

*Ἡ δὲ σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισι φιλομειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη
πλεξαμένη στεφάνους εὐώδους, ἄνθεα γαίης,
ἂν κεφαλαῖσιν ἔθεντο θεαὶ λιπαροκρήδεμνοι,
Νύμφαι καὶ Χάριτες, ἅμα δὲ χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ,
καλὸν αἰεδόνσαι κατ' ὄρος πολυπιδάκου Ἰδης³⁾.*

This is essentially the text which was adopted with little or no comment by W. Dindorf, the next editor of Athenaeus⁴⁾, and by early nineteenth-century collectors of the fragments of the cyclic poets⁵⁾. In 1846, however, A. Meineke wrote of the fragment:

¹⁾ *Der epische Cyclus oder die Homerischen Dichter*², 2 (Bonn 1882), 88–89; cf. further T. C. W. Stinton, *Euripides and the Judgement of Paris* (London 1965), 33, 61 with n. 3.

²⁾ On the manuscripts and editions of Athenaeus v. A. S. F. Gow, *Machon: The Fragments*, ed. with an Introd. and Comm. (Cambridge 1965), 25–32.

³⁾ *ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΥ ΝΑΥΚΡΑΤΙΤΟΥ ΔΕΙΠΝΟΣΟΦΙΣΤΑΙ* . . . , 5 (Strasbourg 1805), 489–90. Schweighäuser, it should be added, records no variants in the text of the fragment nor does he discuss it in the corresponding part of his *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, 8 (Strasbourg 1805), 134–37.

⁴⁾ *Athenaeus ex recensione* . . . , 3 (Leipzig 1827), 1520 (continuous pagination).

⁵⁾ Cf., e.g., C. G. Müller, *De cyclo Graecorum epico et poetis cyclicis* (Leipzig 1829), 96 (fr. 16), Anonymus, *ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΠΟΙΗΜΑΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΚΛΟΥ ΔΕΙΨΑΝΑ* . . . A. Firmin-Didot (Paris 1837, corrected repr. 1877),

“Mirum est in his nihil vitii suspicatos esse criticos, qui si ad sententiae vim attendissent, non dubito quin duo fragmenta coniuncta esse vidissent:

*Ἡ δὲ σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισι φ. Ἀ.
πλεξάμενη στεφάνους εὐώδεας ἄνθεα γαίης . .
καὶ πάλιν·
Πλεξάμεναι στεφάνους εὐώδεας ἄνθεα γαίης
ἂν κεφαλῇσιν ἔθεντο θεαὶ λιπαροκρήδεμνοι —*

Apertum enim est etiam post secundum versum ad sententiae absolutionem aliquid desiderari⁶⁾.” Later Meineke in his text of Athenaeus duly indicated a lacuna after v. 2 of the fragment⁷⁾. In turn, Meineke’s text was adopted with lacuna by G. Kinkel in his influential collection of the epic fragments⁸⁾.

A decade later the text of Athenaeus was firmly set on a new basis by G. Kaibel who undertook a fresh collation of MS A (Codex Venetus Marcianus 447), which is the archetype of all the other manuscripts except perhaps the Epitome⁹⁾. Kaibel printed the fragment as follows:

*ἡ δὲ σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισι φιλομειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη
πλεξάμεναι στεφάνους εὐώδεας ἄνθεα γαίης
ἂν κεφαλαῖσιν ἔθεντο θεαὶ λιπαροκρήδεμνοι,
Νύμφαι καὶ Χάριτες, ἅμα δὲ χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ,
καλὸν αἰείδουσαι κατ’ ὄρος πολυπιδάκον Ἰδης¹⁰⁾.*

Unfortunately Kaibel’s critical apparatus fails to mention *πλεξάμενη*, the reading adopted by earlier editors in v. 2, and misleadingly

594, a–b (fr. 14.8–12; the fragments of the cyclic poets were edited by F. Dübner; cf. A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*, 4 [Liège 1963], 35), and H. Düntzer, *Die Fragmente der epischen Poesie der Griechen bis zur Zeit Alexander’s des Grossen* (Köln 1840), 13 (fr. 3). For an account of editions containing cyclic and related texts v. Severyns, *op.cit.*, 4, 15–57.

⁶⁾ *Philologicarum exercitationum in Athenaei Deipnosophistas specimen secundum* (Berlin 1846), 39. The remark is substantially repeated in his *Analecta critica ad Athenaei Deipnosophistas* (Leipzig 1867), 332, which appeared as the fourth volume of his edition of Athenaeus.

⁷⁾ *Athenaei Deipnosophistae* . . . , 3 (Leipzig 1859), 232, 28.

⁸⁾ *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, 1 (Leipzig 1877), 23 (fr. 4). Cf. also Welcker, *op.cit.*, 2, 510–13.

⁹⁾ See Gow, *op.cit.*, 27.

¹⁰⁾ *Athenaei Naucratis Dipnosophistarum libri XV*, 3 (Leipzig 1890), 510, 12–16. On Kaibel’s edition v. Gow, *op.cit.*, 26 and 30.

implies that Meineke assumed a lacuna after v. 1 rather than after v. 2. In short, we might suspect that Kaibel's text is a muddled version of Meineke's note. This, however, would be an unfair accusation since the reading of MS A in v. 2 is in fact *πλεξάμεναι*¹¹). Kaibel's text has subsequently been adopted with the same lacuna by the latest editor of Athenaeus, C. B. Gulick¹²), and in the collection of the cyclic fragments of T. W. Allen¹³) and E. Bethe¹⁴) as well as in the recent separate edition of the *Cypria* fragments by C. C. Xydias¹⁵). It has also been adopted without the lacuna by H. G. Evelyn-White¹⁶) and A. Bernabé Pajares¹⁷), neither of whom provides any further comment.

Although Meineke in contrast to the apparently uncritical attitude of earlier editors was certainly right to call attention to the seemingly incongruous construction involving the use of a singular subject *Ἀφροδίτη* in v. 1 and a plural predicate *ἔθεντο* in v. 3, he unnecessarily assumed that two originally separate fragments had been joined ungrammatically¹⁸). In fact, the sentence . . . *σὺν ἀμφι-*

¹¹) See fol. 360^r a 19–20. Through the courtesy of the authorities of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana I have been able to verify the reading of the Venetian MS in microfilm.

¹²) Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists* with an Engl. transl., 7 (London and Cambridge, Mass. 1941, repr. 1961), 156.

¹³) *Homeri opera*, 5 (Oxford 1912, corrected repr. 1946), 119–20 (fr. 5). It may be noted in passing that F. Jouan, *Euripide et les légendes des Chants cypriens* (Paris 1966), who apparently bases his discussion of the fragments of the *Cypria* primarily on the text of Allen (cf. p. 21, n. 2, and p. 484), prints the reading *πλεξαμένη* in his single citation of fr. 5.2 (p. 102, n. 1), without, however, indicating his reason for doing so.

¹⁴) *Homer. Dichtung und Sage*, 2, 2 (Leipzig and Berlin 1929), 157 (fr. 5).

¹⁵) *Τὰ Κύπρια ἔπη. προλεγόμενα, κείμενα, ἐρμηνευτικὸν ὑπόμνημα* (Athens 1979), 72–73 (fr. 5).

¹⁶) *Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and Homerica* with an Engl. transl., new ed. (London and Cambridge, Mass. 1936, repr. 1964), 498 (fr. 6.8–12).

¹⁷) *Fragmentos de épica griega arcaica*. Introducción, traducción y notas (Madrid 1979), 129 (fr. 5). Bernabé, who offers no text of his own, remarks (p. 126) that he takes Allen's text as the basis for his translation of the *Cypria* fragments, but in the case of fr. 5 "sin laguna".

¹⁸) That Kaibel, who accepted Meineke's assumption, should indicate the lacuna after v. 1 instead of after v. 2 was of course logical once the correct reading *πλεξάμεναι* in v. 2 had been recovered. The source of *πλεξαμένη*, the reading adopted before Kaibel, is not indicated by any modern editor, but it may well have been one of the copies of MS A; v. Gow, *op. cit.*, 28. More precisely we may observe that since I. Casaubon does not discuss the reading in his *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas* (Lyon 1600; repr. 1612) but prints *πλεξαμένη* in the text of his Athenaeus edition (Heidelberg 1597;

πόλοισι . . . Ἀφροδίτῃ πλεξάμεναι . . . ἔθεντο . . . αἰδούνσαι . . . is an example of a grammatically correct, *ad sensum* construction which, though uncommon, can be paralleled elsewhere in Greek. We may compare, e.g.:

- (1) Th. 3.109.2 κρύφα δὲ Δημοσθένης μετὰ τῶν ξυστρατήγων Ἀρκανάων σπένδονται Μαντινεῦσι καὶ Μενεδαῖω καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἄρχουσι τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ ὅσοι αὐτῶν ἦσαν ἀξιολογώτατοι ἀποχωρεῖν κατὰ τάχος, βουλόμενος¹⁹) ψιλῶσαι τοὺς Ἀμπρακιώτας τε καὶ τὸν μισθοφόρον ὄχλον,
- (2) X. HG 1.1.10 ἡμέραις δὲ τριάκοντα ὕστερον Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐκ Σάρδεων μετὰ Μαντιθέου τοῦ ἀλόντος ἐν Καρία Ἰππων εὐπορήσαντες νυκτὸς ἀπέδρασαν²⁰) εἰς Κλαζομενάς, and, to take a poetic example,
- (3) Diph. fr. 43.38–40 (2,554 Kock)
 . . . οὗ δὲ νῦν σ' ἄγω,
 πορνείον ἐστι, πολυτελῶς Ἀδώνια
 ἄγουσ' ἑταῖρα μεθ' ἐτέρων πορνῶν . . .

In this construction the prepositional phrase introduced by *σύν* or *μετά*²¹) is clearly felt to make the subject of the predicate plural²²).

repr. Lyon 1621), p. 682, whence it entered the vulgate tradition (the whole section is missing from the two earliest editions of Athenaeus, the Aldina of Marcus Marsurus [1514] and the Basiliensis of Jacobus Bedrotus [1535]), this is presumably the reading of the MS or MSS which he consulted. The reading itself is clearly no more than an early misguided attempt to ease the supposed difficulties of the grammar.

¹⁹) The return to the singular in the participle does not make “the conjecture σπένδεται probable” as E. C. Marchant, *Thucydides: Book III* (London 1909), 212 (ad loc.), maintains (cf. also J. Classen-J. Steup, *Thukydides erklärt*, 3³ [Berlin 1892], 218 [ad loc.]), but rather with it “the personality of Demosthenes once more asserts itself” as A. W. Spratt, *Thucydides: Book III*² (Cambridge 1905), 297 (ad loc.), aptly observes; Spratt also rightly explains the *ad sensum* construction of σπένδονται. Less helpful is A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, 2 (Oxford 1956), 422 (ad loc.), who merely notes that σπένδονται “is a remarkable plural”.

²⁰) G. E. Underhill, *A Commentary with Introd. and Appendix on the Hellenica of Xenophon* (Oxford 1900), 4 (ad 1.1.10) correctly remarks that εὐπορήσαντες and ἀπέδρασαν are “plural κατὰ σύνεσιν”.

²¹) The fact that we have *σύν* c. *dat.* in the *Cypria* fragment but *μετά* c. *gen.* in the parallel examples merely reflects the tendency of the second construction to replace the first in later Greek, especially in Attic; cf. E. Schwyzler-A. Debrunner, *Griech. Gram.*, 2 (München 1949), 481–85, 487–90, and J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*², 2 (Basel 1928), 154, 242–43, and v. in particular Tycho Mommsen, *Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griech. Präpositionen* (Berlin 1895), esp. 1–24, 179–80.

We may therefore be certain that Athenaeus (682f), so far as we can determine, quoted fr. 4 K. of the *Cypria* correctly and without omission²³).

Homeric Hymn to Demeter 108: *κουρήϊον ἄνθος*

By H. J. BLUMENTHAL, Liverpool

In a thorough examination of the use of *ἄνθος* in Homer, and of its possible derivations, J. M. Aitchison has shown convincingly that, whatever the origin of the word, its basic sense is 'growth' or 'plant'¹), though a few passages show the later sense of 'flower'²). She concludes her article by saying that the word lost its original sense early, and cites in evidence Hymn to Demeter 108 where, she writes 'obviously the original meaning of *ἄνθος* has been well and truly forgotten'³). That conclusion may well be mistaken, notwithstanding both its acceptance in what is likely to remain the definitive edition of the Hymn, and also the entry in the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*⁴).

²²) Although this uncommon construction *ad sensum* in Greek is duly recognized by grammarians, cf. R. Kühner-B. Gerth, *Ausführl. Gram. der griech. Spr.*³, 1 (Hannover-Leipzig 1898), 58, Anm. 5, and E. Schwyzler-A. Debrunner, *op. cit.*, 2, 608–9, it is far better known in Latin; cf., e.g., Liv. 21.60.7 *ipse dux cum aliquot principibus capiuntur*, and v. further R. Kühner-C. Stegmann, *Ausführl. Gram. der latein. Spr.*², 1 (Hannover 1912), 27–29, and M. Leumann-J. B. Hofmann-A. Szantyr, *Latein. Gram.*, 2 (München 1965), 433–34.

²³) A. Severyns, *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (Liège 1928), 132–37, 264, has argued with some plausibility that Athenaeus owes his knowledge of the fragment to a commentary of Aristarchus.

¹) 'Homeric *ἄνθος*', this journal 41, 1963, 271–8.

²) Cf. *ibid.* 272. Od. 6.231 (and its repeat at 23.158) may, however, not belong to this group, see below.

³) 278.

⁴) N. J. Richardson ed., *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford 1974, ad loc.; LfrgE I (1979) 876.64f. gives this line, as an example of the sense 'jugendliche Schönheit', together with Hes. Th. 988, *τέρεν ἄνθος . . . ἥβης*, which is also questionable: as the parallels cited by M. L. West in his edition, Oxford 1966, ad loc., show, the latter expression seems to correspond to *ἄνθος ἥβης* of which Aitchison, 278, sees *κουρήϊον ἄνθος* as a variant. F. Cassola, *Inni Omerici*, Milan 1975, says nothing in his notes but continues to translate *ἄνθος* as 'flower'; similarly A. N. Athanassakis, *The Homeric Hymns. Transl. Introd. and Notes*, Baltimore 1976, translates it as 'bloom', and offers no comment.