

TEXTUAL AND INTERPRETATIVE PROBLEMS IN GREEK POETRY

In this paper I shall examine sixty-two passages which have been discussed by Professor M. L. West in an article entitled «*Conjectures on 46 Greek Poets*» (*Philologus* 1966, Band 110, p. 147 ff.).

1. *Odyssey* 16. 281-5:

ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν·
ὄππότε κεν πολὺβουλος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θῆσιν Ἴαθήνη,
νεύσω μὲν τοι ἐγὼ κεφαλῇ, σὺ δ' ἔπειτα νοήσας,
ὅσά τοι ἐν μεγάροισιν ἀρήγια τεύχεα κείται,
ἔς μυχὸν ὑψηλοῦ θαλάμου καταθεῖναι ἀείρας.

Translation by E. V. Rieu (*The Odyssey*, Penguin Classics, 1970, reprint, p. 252):

«And here is another part of my plan that I must impress on your mind. When the great strategist, Athene, tells me that the time has come, I shall give you a nod. Directly you see the signal gather up the warlike weapons that are lying about in the hall and stow them away in a corner of the strong-room».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 147) was puzzled by the repetition ἐνὶ φρεσὶ in lines 281-2, and suggested that «line 282 should read ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆσιν Ἴαθήνη».

The alteration proposed by West is, however, totally unwarranted. West has failed to understand that the repetition of words and phrases is a common feature of epic poetry from Homer onward: cf. H. Düntzer, *De Zenodoti Studiis Homericis*, Göttingen 1848, p. 112 and 146 and my own commentary on Theocritus' *Idyll XXIV* (Amsterdam 1979) p. 106. For the phrase ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θῆσιν Ἀθήνη cf. *Odyssey* 11, 146:

δηϊδίον τοι ἔπος ἐρέω καὶ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θήσω (ἐνὶ codd. aliquot).

Cf. also *Odyssey* 15, 233-4:

εἶνεκα Νηληϊος κούρης ἄτης τε βαρείης,
τήν οἱ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ δασπλήτις Ἑρινύς
(τήν οἱ ἐνὶ AP: cf. J. La Roche, *Homeri Odyssea*, Leipzig 1868, vol. II, p. 56).

and *Iliad* 1, 54-5:

τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ἀγορήνδε καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς.
τῷ γὰρ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη.
(ἐνὶ Hesych., ἐν Eust.).

2. *Hymn. Dem.* 24-5:

εἰ μὴ Περσαίου θυγάτηρ ἀταλά φρονέουσα
ἄϊεν ἔξ ἄντρου Ἑκάτη λιπαροκρήδεμνος.

Translation by H. G. Evelyn-White (*Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns and Homeric*, London 1954, reprint, p. 291):

«only tender-hearted Hecate, bright-coiffed, the daughter of Persaeus, heard the girl from her cave».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 149) commented as follows on this passage: «Hecate's father is elsewhere called Perses (Hes. *Th.* 409, 'Musaeus' B 16, Apollod. 1.2.4). So perhaps Περσαίη θυγάτηρ like Γαιήσιος υἱός, etc.» Once again, though, West's suggested textual alteration is not warranted. West has not noticed that whereas Hecate's father is called Perses

by Hesiod, he is given the name Perseus at Lycophron 1175: cf. W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig 1902-1909, s.v. Perseis. In other words, three forms are attested for the name of Hecate's father, i.e. Perses, Persaeus and Perseus. Similarly we find the variant forms Φόρκος and Πόρκος for the name Φόρκυς: cf. M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony*, Oxford 1966, p. 235, note on line 237: «Φόρκυν: another name for the ἄλιος γέρων... Another form of his name is Φόρκος... The Πόρκος of Alcman (1.19) is doubtless the same person».

3. *Hymn. Dem. 326-8*:

ἀμοιβηδὶς δὲ κιώντες/κίκλησκον καὶ πολλὰ δίδον περικαλλέα
δῶρα,/τιμὰς θ'ἄς κ'ἔθέλοιτο μετ'ἄθανάτοισιν ἐλέσθαι.

Translation by Evelyn-White (*op. cit.*, p. 313):

«and they came, one after the other, and kept calling her and offering many very beautiful gifts and whatever rights she might be pleased to choose among the deathless gods».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 149) proposed that we should delete θ', in line 328, and compared Hesiod, *Th.* 412-3 πόρην δέ οἱ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα, / μοῖραν ἔχειν γαίης τε καὶ ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης. This textual alteration is, however, not justified since the employment of τε in this passage is perfectly normal: cf. LSJ s.v. τε A, 4: «a single τε (*and*) joins a word, phrase, or (esp. later) clause or sentence to what precedes».

Cf. moreover Hesiod, *Theogony* 187:

Νύμφας θ'ἄς Μελίας καλέουσ' ἐπ'ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.

4. *Hymn. Herm. 422-3*:

καὶ μιν γλυκὺς ἕμερος ἤρει/θυμῶ ἀκουάζοντα.

According to West (*art. cit.*, p. 149) the mss reading θυμῶ should be altered to θυμὸν. For the double accusative he compared *Iliad* 3.35 ὄχρος τέ μιν εἶλε παρειάς, 16.805 τὸν δ'ἄτη φρένας εἶλε and *Odyssey* 19.471 τὴν δ'ἄμα χάσμα καὶ ἄλγος ἔλε φρένα. There is, though, no need to alter the transmitted text. The dative θυμῶ means here «in

his heart»: cf. C. Capelle, *Vollständiges Wörterbuch über die Gedichte des Homeros und der Homeriden*, reprint Darmstadt 1968, s.v. θυμός (4). We should therefore translate the passage under discussion as follows: «and a sweet longing took hold of him in his heart (θυμῶ) as he listened».

Cf. also H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, Hildesheim 1963, reprint, s.v. θυμός (2), quoting e.g. *Hymn. Dem.* 458:

ἀσπασίως δ' ἴδον ἀλλήλας, κεχάρηντο δὲ θυμῶ.

5. *Hymn. Herm.* 423 ff.:

λύρη δ' ἔρατὸν κιθαρίζων / στῆ ῥ' ὄ γε θαρσήσας ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ
Μαϊάδος υἱὸς / Φοίβου Ἀπόλλωνος· τάχα δὲ λιγέως κιθα-
ρίζων / γηρύετ' ἀμβολάδην, ἔρατῆ δέ οἱ ἔσπετο φωνή /
κραινῶν ἀθανάτους τε θεοῦς καὶ γαῖαν ἐρεμνήν / ὡς τὰ
πρῶτα γένοντο καὶ ὡς λάχε μοῖραν ἕκαστος.

Translation by Evelyn-White (*op. cit.*, p. 395): «Then the son of Maia, harping sweetly upon his lyre, took courage and stood at the left hand of Phoebus Apollo; and soon, while he played shrilly on his lyre, he lifted up his voice and sang, and lovely was the sound of his voice that followed. He sang the story of the deathless gods and of the dark earth, how at the first they came to be, and how each one received his portion».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 149) stated that ἔσπετο in line 425 «does not make sense» and he therefore suggested that we should «read ἔπλετο» instead. It is, however, perfectly possible to make sense of the transmitted text. The phrase ἔρατῆ δέ οἱ ἔσπετο φωνή means «for his lovely voice accompanied him» and serves to point out that Hermes' lyre playing was accompanied by his singing. It will be noted that δέ has here an explanatory force: cf. Capelle, *op. cit.*, s.v. δέ, 2 (b), quoting e. g. *Iliad* 1,259:

ἀλλὰ πίθεσθ', ἄμφω δὲ νεωτέρω ἔστων ἐμεῖο. cf. also J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1970, reprint, p. 169. For the parenthesis cf. *Iliad* 3,410:
καῖσε δ' ἔγῶν οὐκ εἴμι —νεμεσσητὸν δέ κεν εἶη — and *Hymn to Apollo* 267-8. For the verb ἔσπετο cf. *Iliad* 18,571—
μολπή... ἔποντο.

6. *Hymn. Herm. 471-3:*

καὶ τιμὰς σέ γέ φασι δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὀμφῆς / μαντείας
 [θ'] Ἐκάεργε Διὸς πάρα θέσφατα πάντα.
 τῶν νῦν αὐτὸς ἔγωγε † παῖδ' ἀφνειὸν † δεδάηκα.

Translation by Evelyn-White (*op. cit.*, p. 397):

And they say that from the utterance of Zeus you have learned both the honours due to the gods, O Far-worker, and oracles from Zeus, even all his ordinances. Of all these I myself have already learned that you have great wealth».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 150) placed the mss reading θ', in line 472, between square brackets. There is, though, no need for us to alter the transmitted text since, as Radermacher¹ has already explained, lines 471-2 make perfect sense if punctuated as follows:

καὶ τιμὰς σέ γέ φασι δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὀμφῆς / μαντείας θ'
 Ἐκάεργε. Διὸς πάρα θέσφατα πάντα.
 «They say that you have learnt your privileges and prophetic power from the utterance of Zeus. All oracles come from Zeus».

For τιμὰς cf. Hesiod, *Theogony* 73f. εὖ δὲ ἕκαστα / ἀθανάτοις διέτα-
 ξεν ὁμῶς καὶ ἐπέφραδε τιμὰς.

Translation by Evelyn-White (*op. cit.*, p. 83):

«and he (i.e. Zeus) distributed fairly to the immortals their portions and declared their privileges».

7. *Homeric Hymn to Hestia 7-12:*

καὶ σύ μοι Ἄργειφόντα Διὸς καὶ Μαϊάδος υἱέ,
 8 ἄγγελε τῶν μακάρων χρυσοῦραπι δῶτορ ἑάων,
 10 ἴλαος ὦν ἐπάρηγε σὺν αἰδοίῃ τε φίλῃ τε
 11 Ἐστίη· ἀμφότεροι γὰρ ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
 9 ναίετε δώματα καλά, φίλα φρεσὶν ἀλλήλοισιν
 12 εἰδότες† ἔργματα καλά νόω θ' ἔσπεσθε καὶ ἥβῃ.†

¹ Cf. L. Radermacher, *Der homerische Hermeshymnus*, Vienna and Leipzig 1931, p. 48.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 150) commented on these lines as follows: «Martin's transposition of line 9 removes all difficulty except in 12. φίλα φρεσὶν ἀλλήλοισιν εἰδότες is one phrase, as Od. 3.277 Ἄτρεΐδης καὶ ἐγώ, φίλα εἰδότες ἀλλήλοισιν.

ἔργματα καλά cannot be construed either with εἰδότες or with ἔσπεσθε. I would write ἔργματα καλά, nominative; if a man can be called ἔργμα πόλης (Il. 16.549, al.), then Hermes and Hestia can be called supports of the household». It can, however, be shown that both Martin's proposed transposition of line 9 and West's suggested textual alteration are unnecessary. Lines 7-12 make perfect sense if printed and translated as follows:

καὶ σύ μοι Ἄργειφόντα Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱέ,
 ἄγγελε τῶν μακάρων χρυσόρραπι δῶτορ ἑάων.
 ναίετε δώματα καλά, φίλα φρεσὶν ἀλλήλοισιν.
 ἴλαος ὦν ἐπάρηγε σὺν αἰδοίῃ τε φίλῃ τε
 Ἔστίη· ἀμφοτέρω γὰρ ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
 εἰδότες ἔργματα καλὰ νόω θ' ἔσπεσθε καὶ ἦβῃ.

«And also you, Slayer of Argus, Son of Zeus and Maia, messenger of the blessed gods, bearer of the golden rod, giver of good. You (i.e. Hermes and Hestia) dwell in a beautiful house which is dear in your hearts to each of you (φίλα φρεσὶν ἀλλήλοισιν). Be favourable and help us together with Hestia, the worshipful and dear. For both of you, knowing well the noble actions of men, attend with intelligence and vigour».

This is the earliest example known to me of the pronoun ἀλλήλους not being reciprocal and simply meaning «both».

Hestia and Hermes are said in line 9 to inhabit the same house which is dear to both of them. It will be noted that the two adjectives καλά and φίλα both describe δώματα: for similar examples of *Adjektivhäufung* cf. my commentary on Theocritus' *Idyll XXIV*, p. 37. Cf. also *Hymn. Dem.* 107 φίλα ... δώματα. For the phrase εἰδότες ἔργματα καλά cf. *Iliad* 11,719: ἴδμεν πολεμήϊα ἔργα.

For the *Subjektswechsel* (ναίετε ... ἐπάρηγε) cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. I, p. 306.

8. *Phoronis fr. 2, 1-2* (=Kinkel, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1877, vol. I, p. 211):

ἔνθα γόητες /
 Ἴδαῖοι Φρούγες ἄνδρες ὀρέστεροι οἰκί' ἔναιον.

According to West (*art. cit.*, p. 150) ὀρέστεροι should perhaps be altered to ὀρέστερα. The alteration proposed by West is not warranted because it destroys the *Adjektivhäufung* which occurs in this passage. For *Adjektivhäufung*, which is a well-known feature of epic poetry from Homer to Nonnus, cf. W. Bühler, *Die Europa Des Moschos*, Wiesbaden 1960, p. 212 ff. and my note on 7.

9. [*Hes.*] *Scut. 211-2*:

δοῖω δ' ἀναφυσιόωντες /
 ἄργύρεοι δελφίνες † ἐφοίνεον ἔλλοπας ἰχθῦς.
 ε]φοίνεον P. Berol. 9774: ἐφοίβων Paris. 2773, ἐφοίβων
 agn. Schol. Mutin.: ἐφοίτων codd. cett., Et. gen. s.v. ἔλλοψ.

In his discussion of the variant readings which are presented by the mss in line 212, West (*art. cit.*, p. 151) stated that the verb φοινάω «is non-existent» and that «φοιτάω and φοιβάω make no sense in the context.» Consequently he proposed the alteration ἐφοίμεον or ἐφοίμων which would mean «swoop upon». West's proposed textual alteration is nevertheless not necessary since the mss reading ἐφοίτων provides perfectly good sense. The poet has employed the verb φοιτάω in a causative sense here, the meaning being that the dolphins «caused the fishes to roam wildly about»: cf. LSJ s.v. φοιτάω (2) and G. Giangrande, *Facitive and Causative Verbs*, *Mus. Phil. Lond.*, vol. 8, p. 75 ff. Cf. moreover *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. 4, p. 435 f.

10. *Sappho fr. 96, 15-17* (Lobel-Page):

πόλλα δὲ ζαφοίταισ' ἀγάνας ἐπι- / μνάσθεισ' Ἄτθιδος ἰ-
 μέρω λέπταν ποι φρένα κ[·]ρ... βόρηται.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 151) proposed that we should alter the dative ἰμέρω into the genitive ἰμέρω. This alteration is not warranted. As

Page² has already correctly understood, the passage under discussion makes sense without any textual alteration and should be translated as follows:

«*To and fro wandering, / She remembers gentle / Atthis with yearning (ἰμέρω)*».

11. *Solon fr. 1. 13-15 (Diehl)*:

ταχέως δ' ἀναμίσγεται ἄτη·
 ἀρχὴ δ' ἔξ ὀλίγου γίνεται ὥστε πυρός,
 φλαύρη μὲν τὸ πρῶτον, ἀνηρῆ δὲ τελευτᾶ.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 152) commented on this passage as follows: «ἄτη must be the subject in 15, not ἀρχή. Read ἀρχῆς δ' ἔξ ὀλίγης. Cf. line 59, πολλάκι δ' ἔξ ὀλίγης ὀδύνης μέγα γίνεται ἄλγος. The same phrase ἔξ ἀρχῆς ὀλίγης occurs in [Hes.] fr. 43 (a) 61 M.-W.» This textual alteration is unnecessary. West has failed to understand that we are faced here with an example of *Subjektwechsel*. The subject of lines 13 and 15 is ἄτη, whereas the subject of line 14 is ἀρχή. For similar cases of *Subjektwechsel* cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. I, p. 306. Accordingly a full stop should be placed at the end of line 14. For ἄτη ἀνηρῆ cf. Quintus Smyrnaeus 5,323. Cf. moreover Aeschylus, *Pers.* 109-111: φιλόφρων — παρασαίνουσα τὸ πρῶτον — Ἄτα.

12. *Theognis 639-40*:

πολλάκι παρ δόξαν τε καὶ ἐλπίδα γίνεται εὖ ῥεῖν
 ἔργ' ἀνδρῶν, βουλαῖς δ' οὐκ ἐπέγεντο τέλος.

Translation by J. M. Edmonds (*Elegy and Iambus*, London 1961, reprint, vol. I, p. 307):

«Often it cometh about that men's works flow fair and full,
 contrary to belief and expectation, whereas their devices
 come not to accomplishment».

² Cf. D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, Oxford 1970, reprint, p. 88.

In this discussion of line 640, West (*art. cit.*, p. 152) noted that Stobaeus 4.47.15 preserves the variant οὐκ ἔπεσεν τὸ τέλος. He then suggested that we should perhaps print here οὐκ ἐπέθεντο τέλος and compared *Iliad* 19,107 οὐδ' αὐτε τέλος μύθῳ ἐπιθήσεις. There is, however, no reason for us to accept West's proposed alteration. West has not understood that the reading οὐκ ἐπέγεντο τέλος is preferable in so far as it is modelled on *Odyssey* 17,496 εἰ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρῆσιν τέλος ἡμετέροισι γένοιτο. For the fact that Theognis, like the other elegiac poets, constantly «reflects the words and phrases of the Homeric poems» cf. T. Hudson-Williams, *The Elegies of Theognis*, London 1910, p. 35.

13. *Stesichorus fr. 46 (Page)*:

οὔνεκα Τυνδάρεος / ῥέζων ποτὲ πᾶσι θεοῖς μόνας λάθεται
ἠπιοδώρου / Κύπριδος· κείνα δὲ Τυνδαρέου κόραις / χολω-
σαμένα διγάμους τε καὶ τριγάμους τίθησι / καὶ λιπεσάνορας.

Translation by J. M. Edmonds (*Lyra Graeca*, London 1979, reprint, vol. II, p. 41):

«How Tyndareüs one day in making sacrifice to all the Gods forgot the joy-giving Cypris; and in anger she caused the maidens of Tyndareüs to be twice-wed and thrice, and forsaker of husbands».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 152) stated that the historic present «is completely absent from Greek epic» and «avoided in choral lyric narrative». He added that it is not found in Pindar and that it is therefore not likely to have been employed here by Stesichorus. Consequently West argued that τίθησι, in line 4, should be altered to ἐτίθει. West's statements about the historic present are misleading. First of all, it should be pointed out that examples of the historic present are to be found in Epic: cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. I, p. 13. Moreover it is not certain whether or not the historic present occurs in Pindar³:

³ Cf. B. L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, The Olympian And Pythian Odes*, New York 1885, Index of Subjects, s.v. Historical present.

cf. H. W. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets*, London 1900, p. 405: «In Pindar the historical present is rare, if indeed it occurs at all». Thirdly, it should be noted that the historic present is found in Bacchylides: cf. D. E. Gerber, *Euterpe*, Amsterdam 1970, p. 351, note 48. Thus it follows that there is no reason why we should object to the existence of the historic present in Stesichorus.

14. *Ibycus fr. 1.23-6 (Page)*:

καὶ τὰ μὲ[ν ἄν] Μοῖσαι σεσοφ[ισμ]ένοι / εὖ Ἑλικωνίδ[ες]
ἐμβάειν λόγ[ω] / θνατὸς δ' οὐκ [ἄ]ν ἀνήρ / διερο[ς] τὰ ἕκαστα
εἶποι.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 152) stated that «λόγ[ω] is unavoidable in 24» and that «since the last syllable must be short, θνατὸς must be replaced by a word beginning with a vowel». Moreover West argued that θνατὸς is unsatisfactory in sense. Accordingly, West proposed that we should alter θνατὸς to αὐτὸς. The objections made by West to the transmitted text are, however, once again unwarranted. As Professor B. Gentili has already pointed out, the metre of line 24 can be defended on the basis of several parallels: cf. *Quaderni Urbinati* 4 (1967) pages 177-81; cf. also Gerber, *Euterpe*, p. 211f. Furthermore, as Gentili has already explained, the phrase θνατὸς δ' οὐκ [ἄ]ν ἀνήρ/διερο[ς] is modelled on *Odyssey* 6,201 - οὐκ ἔσθ' οὗτος ἀνήρ διεροῦς βροτῶς.

15. *Ibycus fr. 5*:

ἦρι μὲν αἶ τε Κυδώνιαι / μηλίδες ἀρδόμεναι ῥοᾶν / ἐκ πο-
ταμῶν, ἵνα Παρθένων / κήπος ἀκήρατος, αἶ τ' οἴνανθίδες /
αὐξόμεναι σκιεροῖσιν ὑφ' ἔρνεσιν / οἴναρέοις θαλέθοισιν· ἐ-
μοι δ' ἔρος / οὐδεμίαν κατάκοιτος ὥραν. / †τε† ὑπὸ στεροπᾶς
φλέγων / Θρηίκιος Βορέας / αἴσσων παρὰ Κύπριδος ἀζαλέ-
/ αἰς μανίαισιν ἐρεμνὸς ἀθαμβῆς / ἐγκρατέως πεδόθεν † φυ-
λάσσει † / ἡμετέρας φρένας.

line 12 πεδόθεν Naeke, παιδόθεν Athen.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 153) accepted Naeke's alteration πεδόθεν, in line 12, and then suggested that we should also alter φυλάσσει into λαφύσσει. It is, though, possible to make sense of this fragment by

accepting only one alteration rather than two. As G. Giangrande has already explained, if we alter the ms reading παιδόθεν to πάντοθεν then the phrase πάντοθεν φυλάσσει will refer to Eros who is said to «keep watch from all sides»: cf. *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. 4, p. 404 ff., quoting Bacchylides 19,19:

Ἄργον ὄμμασι βλέποντα / πάντοθεν ἀκαμάτοις.

Cf. also *Mus. Phil. Lond.*, vol. VI, p. 37 ff.

16. *Anacreon fr. 38*:

οἴνοχόει δ' ἀμφίπολος μελιχρὸν / οἶνον τρικύαθον κελέβην
ἔχουσα.

According to West (*art. cit.*, p. 154) this fragment makes no sense since the words οἴνοχόει κελέβην ἔχουσα «would mean that the κελέβη is what the servant uses for pouring wine, i.e. what she pours out of». He therefore suggested that we should alter the fragment as follows:

οἴνοχόει δ' ἀμφίπολος μελιχρὸν / ἔς κελέβην τρικύαθον χέουσα.

The alterations proposed by West are not warranted. As Weber⁴ has already explained, the word κελέβη means in this passage not «cup» but «vessel», «jar». For this meaning of κελέβη cf. Athenaeus XI, 475 f. where it is noted that according to Nicander the κελέβη was a «vessel»: Νίκανδρος δ' ὁ Κολοφώνιος ἐν ταῖς Γλώσσαις ποιμενικὸν ἀγγεῖον μελιτηρὸν τὴν κελέβην εἶναι.

17. *Anacreon fr. 60*:

Schol. Hes. Th. 767 ἐνθα θεοῦ· ἐν τοῖς οἰκῆμασι Νυκτός· τὸ δὲ «χθόνιου» ἢ τοῦ στυγεροῦ, ὡς Ἀνακρέων· χθόνιον δ' ἔμαυτὸν † ἦρεν, <ἦ...>.

⁴ Cf. L. Weber, *Anacreontea*, Diss. Göttingen 1895, p. 84: «κελέβη. Anacreonti ingens vas est. fr. 32: οἴνοχόει δ' ἀμφίπολος μελιχρὸν οἶνον, τρικύαθον κελέβην ἔχουσα, ubi *urceum* significat, ex quo vinum in poculum infunditur».

In his discussion of this passage, West (*art. cit.*, p. 154) noted that the above scholium appears as follows in the manuscript Paris. Suppl. gr. 679, f.23 recto:

χθονίου· εν τοις οικίμασι της νυκτὸς. χθόνιον δὲ καὶ τὸν
 στυγνὸν ὡς ἀνακρέων· χθόνιον δ' ἑμαυτὸν ἤγων.

West then added that «στυγνός, not στυγερός, appears to be the right word, for it is found elsewhere as an explanation of χθόνιος». The argument used by West is not valid. West has overlooked the fact that the adjectives στυγνός and στυγερός are synonyms: cf. *Thes. Gr. Ling.* s.v. στυγνός: «i.q. στυγερός». There is thus no reason why we should prefer the adjective στυγνός to the adjective στυγερός in the passage under discussion.

18. *Aesch. Suppl. 514*:

ἀεὶ δ' ἰσχυρὰν ἀνάκτων ἐστὶ δειμ' ἑξαίσιον..

West (*art. cit.*, p. 155) suggested that the mss reading ἀνάκτων should perhaps be altered to ἐπακτῶν. No textual alteration is needed here. The Chorus, who are being pursued by the sons of Aegyptus, state in line 513 that they are afraid. King Pelasgus replies to them that «fear of kings is always immense». Pelasgus means that he can understand why the Chorus are so afraid of the sons of Aegyptus. Cf. line 886f.: πολλοὺς ἀνακτας, παῖδας Αἰγύπτου, τάχα / ὄψεσθε. In other words: the particle δέ, at line 514, is used in order to confirm what has been stated in line 513 (cf. e.g. Rumpel, *Lex. Theocr.*, s.v. δέ, 2: «confirmantis... superiora»).

19. *Aesch. Prom. 54-6*:

HΦ. καὶ δὴ πρόχειρα ψάλια δέρεσθαι πάρα.
 ΚΡ. βαλὼν νιν ἀμφὶ χερσὶν ἐγκρατεῖ σθένει
 ὀαιστήρι θεῖνε, πασσάλευε πρὸς πέτραις.

The following statement was made by West (*art. cit.*, p. 155) concerning this passage: «βαλὼν Stanley, λαβὼν codd.) 55 seems very abrupt; in place of νιν I would prefer to see νυν, which is regularly

used with imperatives». Again textual alteration is unwarranted. The phrase λαβών νιν ἀμφὶ χερσὶν means «having clasped him (i.e. Prometheus) in your hands». For similar examples of tmesis inversa cf. Kühner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache*, vol. I, p. 534. For the *asyndeton* cf. Kühner-Gerth, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 340, 3.

20. *Eur. Hipp. 776-9*:

- TP. βοηδρομεῖτε πάντες οἱ πέλας δόμων·
 ἐν ἀγχοναῖς δέσποινα Θησέως δάμαρ.
 XO. φεῦ φεῦ, πέπρακται· βασιλις οὐκέτ' ἐστὶ δὴ
 [γυνή, κρεμαστοῖς ἐν βρόχοις ἠρτημένη].

West (*art. cit.*, p. 155) commented as follows on this passage: «I have bracketed 779. κρεμαστοῖς ἐν βρόχοις after 770 κρεμαστόν... βρόχον, 802 βρόχον κρεμαστόν. Cf. Hecuba 683 οὐκέτ' εἰμὶ δὴ». There is no reason why we should accept West's objection to line 779. West is, it seems, unaware of the fact that repetition is a feature of Euripides' style: cf. W. S. Barrett, *Euripides, Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964, General Index, s.v. repetition; cf. also P. T. Stevens, *Andromache*, Oxford 1971, p. 223, note on line 1092: «διαστείχει: such repetition with no special point sounds to us careless but is not rare in Euripides».

21. '*Linus*' *ap. Stob. 1.10.5, lines 1-2*:

- ὦς κατ' ἔριν συνάπαντα κυβερνᾶται διὰ παντός,
 ἐκ παντὸς δὲ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐκ πάντων † τὸ πᾶν ἐστί.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 156) objected to the mss reading τὸ πᾶν because, according to him, it does not scan. Accordingly he proposed that we should alter it to ὄλον. There is, though, no need for us to accept West's alteration. The scansion πᾶν is obviously based on the fact that πᾶν is scanned short in compounds: cf. Passow, *Handwörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache* s.v. πᾶς, p. 764: «Das α der Stammsylbe ist durchgängig lang, wird aber im Neutr. in den durch Zusammensetzung verlängerten Formen kurz, wie ἅπᾶν, πάμπᾶν, σύμπᾶν... Erst spätere Versmacher, wie Gre. Naz. in Anth. 8, 93. 109. haben auch in πάσης u. πάσιν (für πᾶσιν) das α kurz gebraucht».

22. *Antimachus fr. 89*:

κοίας ἐκ χειρῶν σκόπελον μέτα ῥιπτάζουσιν.

According to the sources that quote this fragment (*Et. magn.* 770.7, *Epimer. Hom.* in *Anecd. Ox.* I. 401.1. and II. 329, 9 Cramer) κοία means here «ball», σφαῖρα. West (*art. cit.*, p. 156) was, however, puzzled by the fact that Hesychius has the following entry for κοίας: σφαίρας, ἢ λίθους. He accordingly suggested that in the fragment under discussion κοίας means not «balls» but «pebbles». It should be pointed out, though, that the fact that Hesychius gives two different meanings for κοίας is not at all surprising. From Homer onwards we find words employed in two or more different meanings: cf. e.g. the Homeric adjective μορόεις and my *Studies in the Poetry of Nicander*, Amsterdam 1986, p. 88. Moreover, as Wyss⁵ has already explained, Antimachus' fragment imitates *Odyssey* 6, 115:

σφαῖραν ἔπειτ' ἔρριψε μετ' ἀμφίπολον βασιλεια.

It will be noted that Antimachus has replaced the Homeric σφαῖραν by the plural κοίας. Thus West's proposal that we should translate κοίας here as «pebbles» not only disregards the ancient sources which quote our fragment, but also destroys Antimachus' allusion to Homer. For Antimachus' tendency to imitate Homeric diction cf. Wyss, *op. cit.*, p. LVII.

23. *Anon. ap. 'Longin'. περὶ ὕψους 23.2*:

καὶ αὐτίκα λαὸς ἀπείρων
† θύννων ἐπ' ἠμόνεσσι διστάμενοι κελάδησαν.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 157) noted that «this is usually read θύννων ἐπ' and taken to mean 'straightway the innumerable multitude cried «Tunny» as they divided on the beach'». This interpretation of our passage did not, however, satisfy West., who argued that we should eliminate the word «tunny» by reading θινῶν ἠμόνεσσι. The alteration proposed

⁵ Cf. B. Wyss, *Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae*, Berlin 1936, p. 46.

by West is contextually inapposite. West has failed to understand that the context requires θύννον to be preserved. Longinus is discussing in this passage words which are singular in form but plural in meaning. To illustrate his point he quotes this passage where the word θύννον is singular in form but plural in meaning. The fact that θύννον is plural in meaning has already been correctly understood by Prickard⁶ who explained that the passage refers to tunny-fishing: «fishermen place a look-out or sentinel on some elevated spot, who makes the signal that the shoal of tunnies is approaching, and points out the direction in which it will come». For the fact that tunnies travel in shoals cf. also Oppian, *Hal.* 3, 629ff. For the collective singular cf. Gow-Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge 1965, vol. II, Index s.v. Number and Kühner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, vol. I, p. 13. For λαὸς ...κελάδησαν cf. *Iliad* 23, 156 λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν/ πείσσονται.

24. *Menander, Comoedia Florentina (=Aspis) 50:*

καλῶς ἐπόησεν· πρόφασιν εἴληφ' ἄσμενως.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 157) commented on this line as follows: «Read ἄσμενος, as *Dysc.* 135 πρόφασιν οὗτος ἄσμενος / εἴληφεν. Menander elsewhere has the adjective rather than the adverb: *Samia* 119-20 ἀπολελόγηται τὸν φανέντ' αὐτῷ γάμον / ἄσμενος ἀκούσας, fr. 88.2 ὡς οὐκ ἂν ἐκδοίη θυγατέρας ἄσμενος».

Again textual alteration is not warranted. West has not understood that we are faced here with an example of *Selbstvariation*. Menander employed the adjective ἄσμενος at *Dysc.* 135 but preferred the adverb ἄσμενως at *Aspis* 50. For ἄσμενως cf. Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 728 (same metrical *sedes*). For *Selbstvariation* in Greek poetry cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. 4, Select Index s.v.

25. *Callim. Hymn. 4.75-8:*

φεῦγε καὶ Ἀονίη τὸν ἕνα δρόμον, αἱ δ' ἐρέποντο
 Δίρκη τε Στροφίη τε μελαμψήφιδος ἔχουσαι
 Ἴσμηνοῦ χεῖρα πατρός, ὃ δ' εἶπετο πολλὸν ὀπισθεν
 Ἀσωπὸς βαρύγουνος, ἐπεὶ πεπάλακτο κεραινοῦ.

⁶ Cf. A. O. Prickard, *Longinus On The Sublime*, Oxford 1961, reprint, p. 47.

Translation by G. R. Mair (*Callimachus, Hymns And Epigrams*, Loeb edition, London 1955, reprint, p. 91):

«Fled, too, Aonia on the same course, and Dirce and Strophia, holding the hands of their sire, dark-pebbled Ismenus; far behind followed Asopus, heavy-kneed, for he was marred by a thunderbolt».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 158) objected to the fact that ἐφέποντο, in line 75, is followed by εἶπετο in line 77. According to West, «we would expect Callimachus to vary his verbs». Consequently West proposed that we should alter ἐφέποντο into ἐφέβοντο. West has, however, failed to notice that repetition is a common feature of Callimachus' poetic style: cf. Lapp, *De Callimachi Cyrenaei Tropis et Figuris*, Diss. Bonn, 1965, p. 68, C, quoting e. g. *Hymn V*, 72-4:

μεσαμβρινὰ δ'εἶχ' ὄρος άσυχία /.../ πολλὰ δ' άσυχία τῆν
κατεῖχεν ὄρος.

For the phrase αἱ δ'ἐφέποντο cf. Apollonius Rhodius, *Arg.* 3, 315 οἱδ' ἐφέπονται (same metrical *sedes*) and Quintus Smyrnaeus 4, 522 οἱ δ' ἐφέποντο (same metrical *sedes*).

26. *Callim. Hymn. 4. 163-4:*

οὐτ' οὖν ἐπιμέφομαι οὐδὲ μεγάρω / νῆσον, ἐπεὶ λιπαρή τε
καὶ εὐβοτος, εἴ νύ τις ἄλλη.

Translation by Mair (*op. cit.*, p. 99):

«I blame not the island nor have any grudge, since a bright isle it is and rich in pasture as any other».

The following statement was made by West (*art. cit.*, p. 158) concerning this passage: «Callimachus tends to avoid τε καί, which is felt as facile; γε καί would here be ideal». West's statement concerning Callimachus' employment of τε καί is not correct. Callimachus used τε καί to join two adjectives at *Hymn 2*, 111 —καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος, 3, 129— εὐμειδής τε καὶ ἴλαος, 3,177— γυιαί τε καὶ αὐχένα κερμηῦαι and 6,66 χαλεπόν τε καὶ ἄγριον: cf. E. Fernández-Galiano,

Léxico De Los Himnos De Calímaco, vol. IV, Madrid 1980, s.v. τε, 3, ε: «τε καί uniendo ...dos adjetivos». There is therefore no reason why we should eliminate τε καί from the passage under discussion.

27. *Callim. Hymn. 5.53-4*:

ὅς κεν ἴδῃ γυμνὰν τὰν Παλλάδα τὰν πολιοῦχον,
τῶργος ἔσοψεῖται τοῦτο πανυστάτιον.

Translation by Mair (*op. cit.*, p. 117):

«Whoso shall behold Pallas, Keeper of Cities, naked, shall look on Argos for this the last time»

West (*art. cit.*, p. 158) stated that «the article with Ἔργος is out of place in this style» and argued that τῶργος should be altered to τῶργον.

West has, however, overlooked the fact that the reading τῶργος in line 54 is supported by τῶργος at line 138 of the same Hymn:

ἔρχετ' Ἀθηναία νῦν ἀτρεκές. ἀλλὰ δέχεσθε
τὰν θεόν, ᾧ κῶραι, τῶργος ὄσαις μέλεται.

Translation by J. A. Ernesti (*Callimachi Hymni, Epigrammata et Fragmenta*, Leyden 1761, vol. I, p. 231):

«Venit Minerva nunc haud dubie. At vos excipite
Deam, puellae, quibus Argos cordi est».

For the employment of the article in Callimachus' Hymns cf. A. Svensson, *Der Gebrauch Des Bestimmten Artikels In Der Nachklassischen Griechischen Epik*, Lund 1937, p. 60ff.

28. *Leonidas epigr. 52 Gow-Page (A.P.6.4), 1*:

Ἰεῦκαμπῆς ἄγκιστρον καὶ δούνακα δουλιχόεντα.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 158) noted that Hermann had proposed altering εὔκαμπῆς to γαμφόν τ' or γναμπτόν τ' and that Meineke had suggested altering it to καμπύλον or στρεπτόν τ'. He then added that he

would suggest ἀγκύλον as a possible alteration. Nevertheless textual alteration is not necessary. As G. Giangrande⁷ has already explained, the scansion εὐκάμπες can be defended on the basis of the variant reading τῦμπάνων at *Homeric Hymn* 14, 3. For εὐκάμπες ἄγκιστρον cf. Oppian, *Hal.* 3, 128. In other words, Leonidas has imitated in this passage a Homeric metrical rarity whereby —μπ— does not make position.

29. *Leonidas epigr.* 53 (A.P. 6.221), 7-8:

χεῖμα δὲ θῆρ μείνας † θῆρ νύκτιος οὔτε τιν' ἀνδρῶν / οὔτε
βοτῶν βλάψας ὄχετ' ἀπαυλόσυνος.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 158) first noted that Gow-Page adopted Brunck's alteration διανύκτιος and then proposed the alteration ὄλονύκτιος instead. No alteration is necessary. As I have already explained⁸, the words θῆρ νύκτιος refer to the fact that lions hunt cattle by night. For the repetition of θῆρ cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. II, p. 313. Our passage should therefore be translated as follows:

«But the beast, the beast of the night, waiting until the storm was over, went away from the fold without having hurt either man or beast».

30. *Asclepiades epigr.* 36 (A.P. 5.209: Ποσειδίππου ἢ Ἀσκληπιάδου), 1-4:

† ἐν Παφίῃ Κυθέρεια παρ' ἠόνι εἶδε Κλέανδρος
Νικοῦς ἐν χαροποῖς κύμασι νηχομένης·
καιόμενος δ' ὑπ' ἔρωτος ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἀνθρακας ὦνηρ
ξηροῦς ἐκ νοτερῆς παιδὸς ἐπεσπάσατο.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 159) proposed that lines 1-2 should be printed and translated as follows:

ἐν Πάφ<ω>ι ἢ Κυθέρεια· παρ' ἠιόν' εἶδε Κλέανδρον
Νικοῦς ἐν χαροποῖς κύμασι νηχομένης·

⁷ Cf. *Hermes* 1968, p. 175.

⁸ Cf. my *New Essays in Hellenistic Poetry*, Amsterdam 1985, p. 119ff.

«Aphrodite is in Paphos (not on Cythera, Eryx, or any of her other haunts): she has turned her eye on Kleandros on the beach, as Niko was swimming in the water».

West's proposed alterations are both palaeographically too rough and contextually inapposite. The whole point of the epigram is that Cleander saw Nico while she was swimming and immediately fell in love with her. It is therefore pointless to alter the text so that it states that Aphrodite saw Cleander while Nico was swimming. As I have already explained, the transmitted text makes perfect sense if we translate it as follows: «Cleander, O Paphian Cytherea, observed (ἐν ...εἶδε) by the shore while Nico was swimming in the grey waves, and burning with love he took to his heart dry coals from the wet girl». For the extended *imesis* ἐν ...εἶδε cf. G. Chryssafis, *A Textual And Stylistic Commentary On Theocritus' Idyll XXV*, Amsterdam 1981, p. 134.

31. *Alcaeus of Messene epigr. 21 (A.P.6.218), 5-6*:

δείσας δ' ὠμηστέω θηρὸς μόρον † ὥς αὐδάξει
τύμπανον ἐξ ἱερῶς ἐπλατάγησεν ἄλης.

West (*art. cit.* p. 159) commented on line 5 as follows: «ὥς αὐδάξει P: ὥς αὐδάξε Plan.: ὥς ἄν δόξα Suda. ὥς ὑπαλύξαι? (ὥς ἄν ἀλύξη Jacobs)». Once more textual alteration is unwarranted since the correct text has been preserved for us by Planudes¹⁰. The words ὥς αὐδάξει mean «how (i.e. how loudly) he cried out»¹¹. For ὥς meaning «how» cf. LSJ s.v. D,I,2 and Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 15,347- παρθένος ὥς ἐλέαιρε, τὸν ἔκτανε («how the maiden pitied him whom she killed»). I therefore propose that a full stop should be placed after αὐδάξει and that we should translate the passage as follows:

«And fearing death caused¹² by a savage beast how he cried out. He beat his tambour from the holy grove». For the *asyndeton* cf. G. Gian-

⁹ Cf. my *New Essays in Hellenistic Poetry*, p. 127ff.

¹⁰ For other cases where the correct text has been preserved by Planudes cf. my *New Essays in Hellenistic Poetry*, p. 29.

¹¹ Cf. F. Jacobs, *Animadversiones in Epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae*, Leipzig 1798, Tom. VII, p. 350, who translated ὥς αὐδάξει as «*quantopere exclamavit*».

¹² For the genitive of origin cf. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, Paris 1963, vol. II, p. 61, quoting e.g. *Iliad* 2,723 ἔλκει ... ὕδρου «la blessure faite par une hydre».

grande, *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. I, p. 267. For the fact that the Gallus cried out when he was confronted by the lion cf. *A.P.* VI, 219,17.

32. *Lycophron 67-8:*

πόθῳ δὲ τοῦ θανόντος ἠγκιστρωμένη
ψυχὴν περισπαίροντι φουσήσει νεκρῶ.

Translation by A. W. Mair (*Lycophron*, Loeb edition, London 1955, reprint, p. 327):

«and pierced by sorrow for the dead shall breathe forth her soul on the quivering body».

This passage tells how Oenone will commit suicide when she learns of the fate of Paris. West (*art. cit.*, p. 160) was puzzled by the fact that Paris' corpse is described as quivering. Consequently he argued that we should alter the mss reading *περισπαίροντι* to *περισπαίρουσα* and understand it to mean that Oenone will quiver. West's proposal is not warranted. The participle *περισπαίροντι* refers to the fact that Paris is not dead but dying. This fact is explained for us by the scholia on this passage: cf. *Lycophronis Alexandra*, ed. E. Scheer, Berlin 1958, vol. I, p. 7: φιλία δὲ καὶ στοργῇ τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ἐλκομένη (68) τὴν ψυχὴν σακρίζοντι καὶ ἀποπνέοντι ἐκπνεύσει τῷ νεκρῶ.

It will be noted that Lycophron has used the compound *περισπαίρω* rather than the Homeric *ἀσπαίρω* to describe the dying man. For *νεκρός* employed of a dying person cf. LSJ s.v. 2.

33. *Lycophron 331:*

πρέσβυν Δολόγκων δημόλευστον ὠλένη.

Translation by Mair (*op. cit.*, p. 349): «stoned by the public arm of the Dolonicians».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 161) commented as follows: «The reference is to Hecuba. Scheer wrote *πρέσβαν*, and indeed *πρέσβυς* feminine is remarkable. It can however be avoided with a smaller change: *πρέσβην* or *πρέσβιν*». West's objection to the fact that *πρέσβυς* is employed

here as feminine is unjustified. As Konze¹³ has already explained, Lycophron's employment of πρόσβυς as feminine should be compared with ἡ τοκεύς at Aeschylus, *Eum.* 659, ἡ βραβεύς at Euripides, *Helen* 703 and ἡ γραμματεύς at Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 430.

34. *Hermonax (or Hermon) ap. Schol. B. Il. 10.274 (Powell, Coll. Alex. p. 251, 4-6:*

ἔσθλός καὶ πεζοῖσι καὶ ἱππήεσσιν ἄριστος
 ἐν πεδίῳ θεμένοισι μάχην, ἐν ὄρει δέ γε χείρων
 φαινόμενος· μάλα γὰρ πέλεται νικηφόρος ὄρνις.

According to West (*art. cit.*, p. 161) «δέ γε is not used in hexameter poetry». He therefore proposed that we should «read δέ τε, which is common enough in an adversative sense». This alteration is not necessary since, contrary to West's belief, δέ γε is in fact attested in hexameter poetry: cf. Manetho 6,389 and 670 εἰ δέ γε; cf. also Manetho 5,38 καὶ σὺ δέ γ'.

35. *Crinagoras A.P.6.100.4:*

θῆκεν ὄμωνυμῆ παῖς πατρὸς Ἀντιφάνης.

The following statements were made by West (*art. cit.*, p. 161) concerning this line: «θῆκ' ἐν ὄμωνυμῆ Boissonade, ὄμωνυμῆς Salmasius, ὄμωνύμιος Jacobs, ὄμωνυμίου Hecker. None of these is attractive. ὄμωνυμῆ is probably best taken as nominative: Antiphanes is the ὄμωνυμῆ of his father. ὄμηλική is used in a similar way in Homer: *Od.* 3.49 ἀλλὰ νεώτερός ἐστιν, ὄμηλική δ' ἔμοι αὐτῷ 6.23, 22.209, al». It is though not necessary for us to alter the dative ὄμωνυμῆ. As Gow-Page¹⁴ have already pointed out, the «text is protected by Peek 1931.6 (A.D.II) Πρατεόνικος / οὔνομα μοι, τοῦμοῦ πατρὸς ὄμωνυμῆι». They explained that «here παῖς Ἀντιφάνης πατρὸς ὄμωνυμῆι = 'son called Antiphanes by homonymity with his father'». Cf. also A.P. 7,628,2 ἐς δ' ἀνδρῶν ἦλθον ὄμωνυμῆιν.

¹³ Cf. J. Konze, *De Dictione Lycophronis*, Münster 1870, Part I, p. 45f.

¹⁴ Cf. *The Garland Of Philip*, Cambridge 1968, vol. II, p. 219.

36. *Crinagoras A.P.6.345.1-2*:

εἶαρος ἦνθει μὲν τὸ πρὶν ῥόδα, νῦν δ' ἐνὶ μέσσω
 χεῖματι πορφυρέας ἐσχάσαμεν κάλυκας.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 161) commented on this couplet as follows: «1 ἦνθέομεν. (ἦνθοῦμεν already Brunck). The roses speak». The alteration proposed by West is unwarranted. As has already been explained by Gow-Page¹⁵, «there is no difficulty in the text which means 'roses (in general) used to bloom in spring, but now we (these particular roses) have opened in winter'».

37. *Philippus A.P.6.101.2*:

πυριτρόφους τε ῥιπίδας † πυρηνέμους.

West (*art. cit.* p. 161) noted that Hecker proposed that πυρηνέμους should be altered to φουσηνέμους. He then suggested συρηνέμους as another possible alteration. There is, however, no reason why we should object to the mss reading πυρηνέμους which means «fanning fire»: cf. *Thes. Gr. Ling.* s.v. The noun ῥιπίς has been employed here by the poet together with two synonymous adjectives. For other examples of the employment of a noun together with two synonymous adjectives cf. Lapp, *De Callimachi Cyrenaei Tropis Et Figuris*, p. 73, quoting e.g. Hymn 2, 111 — καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει (sc. λιβάς) and 3,129 — οἷς δέ κεν εὐμειδῆς τε καὶ ἴλαος αὐγάσσηται.

For the repetition of πυρ- cf. A.P.7,214,8 πολυψάμμους ... ψαμάθους and A.P. 9,19,4 πτανοῖς ὠκυπέταις. Cf. moreover A.P. 6,5,5 καὶ τὸν ἐγεροσιφαῆ πυρὸς ἔγκυον ἔμφλογα πέτρων. In other words, the *Hinterglied* -ηνεμους is not nominal, but verbal and active (cf. ἀνεμῶ): cf. also G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alexandrina*, vol. 4, pp. 291-294.

38. *Ps.-Simonides A.P.6.216 (Simon. 161 Diehl)*:

Σῶσος καὶ Σωσῶ † σωτήρι τόνδ' ἀνέθηκαν,
 Σῶσος μὲν σωθεῖς, Σωσῶ δ' ὅτι Σῶσος ἐσώθη.

¹⁵ Cf. *The Garland Of Philip*, vol. II, p. 216.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 162) commented as follows on line 1: «σωτείρη. Brunck, σῶτερ σοὶ Salmasius. Perhaps σωτήρι<ε>». There is though no need to alter the mss reading. As Jacobs¹⁶ has already pointed out, there are in the *Anthology* many similar examples of the lengthening of a short syllable. Cf. A. Rzach, *Neue Beiträge Zur Technik Des Nachhomerischen Hexameters*, Vienna 1882, p. 27ff. The word σωτήρι refers to Zeus. For Zeus σωτήρ cf. C.F.H. Bruchmann, *Epitheta Deorum*, Leipzig 1893, s.v. Ζεύς.

39. *Andromachus 115*:

αἴνυσο καὶ δινήεντας ἀνάπλασσε τροχίσκους.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 162) was puzzled by the fact that the rhythm of this line (i.e. dssdd) is unparalleled in *Andromachus*. He therefore proposed that we should alter the text as follows: αἴνυσο καὶ δινήεν-
τας <ἴσους> ἀνάπλασσε τροχίσκους.

West has however failed to understand that the poet is imitating here a Homeric rhythm: cf. C. Kunst, *De Theocriti Versu Heroico*, Diss. Vienna, 1887, p. 16.

40. *Andromachus 129-30*:

τοῖς δ' ἔπι καὶ κινάμωμον ἰσάζεο, μηδέ σε λήθη
ἀγαρικὸν τοῦτοις ἰσοβαρὲς θέμεναι.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 162) argued that we should alter λήθη, in line 129, into λήθῃ and he compared Hesiod, *Op.* 491-2: μηδέ σε λήθῃ / μήτ' ἔαρ γινόμενον πολιὸν μήθ' ὄριος ὄμβρος. West failed to notice, however, that at Hesiod, *Op.* 491 we find the variant reading λήθη: cf. F. A. Paley, *The Epics Of Hesiod*, London 1883, p. 70, apparatus on line 491: «λήθη H (as Herm. had conjectured)». This Hesiodic variant reading has been reproduced both by *Andromachus*, in the passage under discussion, and by Nicander at *Alex.* 397 μηδέ σέ γ' ἔχ-
θομένη λήθη πόσις.

¹⁶ Cf. *Animadversiones in Epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae*, vol. VI, p. 254: «Metro timentes Viri docti σωτήρια et σῶτερ σοὶ emendarunt; sed frustra. Brevis syllabae extra caesuram productae exempla in Anthologiae carminibus multa sunt obvia».

41. *Andromachus 143*:

αὐτίκα καὶ πολίου πίουρας βαρυέσας ὀλκάς.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 163) commented as follows: «Two manuscripts have βαρυέας. All editors assume an otherwise unknown equivalent of βαρύς, and transpose it to follow ὀλκάς, which leaves the last syllable of πίουρας as a brevis in longo. And since βαρύεις is linguistically impossible, this approach involves the further change to βαροέσας (Lobeck, Schneider; Heitsch keeps βαρυέσας)». West concluded with the statement that «Andromachus wrote βαρουάας (or -ος) ὀλκάς» and compared Nicander, *Ther.* 64 ἢ πόλιον βαρύοδμον, ὃ δὴ ῥίγιστον ὄδωδεν.

For the adjective βαρουαῆς «strong-smelling» cf. Nicander, *Ther.* 43. It should be pointed out here that the same sense can be obtained by us if we accept the smaller alteration βαροέσας. For βαρύς¹⁷ used of smell cf. LSJ s.v. III,2: «of smell, *strong, offensive*, Hdt. 6.119».

The reader will note, moreover, the adjectival *enallage*. It was, of course, the hulwort itself which was «offensive». For other cases of adjectival *enallage* cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. 4, s.v. *enallage adjectivi* and my *Studies In The Poetry Of Nicander*, Amsterdam 1986, Select Index s.v.

42. *Andromachus 169-71*:

ἰλήκοις ὃς τήνδε μάκαρ τεκτήναιο Παιών,
εἴτε σε Τρικκαῖοι δαῖμον ἔχουσι λόφοι
ἢ ῥόδος ἢ Βούρινα καὶ ἀγγιάλῃ Ἐπίδαυρος.

In his note on this passage, West (*art. cit.*, p. 163) stated that «καὶ is presumably the familiar corruption of ἢ». It should however be noted that καὶ can be employed instead of ἢ to link alternatives: cf. J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1970, reprint, p. 292, (8); cf. also Dionysius Periegetes 1122.

¹⁷ The adjective βαρόεις is attested in the Suda: cf. *Thes. Gr. Ling.* s.v.

43. *Marc. Sid. 73:*

είναλίου δ' ἵπποιο χολῆ ἀτάλαντος ὑαίνης.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 163) commented on this line as follows: «Surely ὑαίνη, 'equal to (that of) a ὑαίνα'». The alteration of the genitive ὑαίνης is, however, not warranted. West has not understood that we are faced here with an example of the *comparatio compendiaria*: cf. Kühner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, vol. II, p. 310, quoting e.g. *Iliad* 21, 191 κρείσσων αὐτε Διὸς γενεῆ ποταμοῖο τέτυκται and Theocritus' *Idyll* 20, 25 ὄμματά μοι γλανκᾶς χαροπώτερα πολλὸν Ἀθήνας; cf. also Nicander, *Ther.* 642 βλάστη δ' ὡς ἔχιος («its shoot resembles that of the ἔχις»).

44. *De viribus herbarum 48:*

ψώραν τ' † ἔξανίατον βροτοφθόρον ἐκ κακότητος.
ἔξακέσαιο A

West (*art. cit.*, p. 163) noted first that «the meaning is given by schol., ψώραν ἐκ [λ] μοκτονίας, 'scurvy produced by a (prescribed) starvation diet'». He then suggested that we should print this line as follows: ψώραν τ' ἔξανιόντι βροτοφθόρου ἐκ κακότητος.

West's proposed textual alterations are nevertheless not necessary since, as Lehrs¹⁸ has already understood, the correct reading has been preserved for us by A. For the phrase ψώραν τ' ἔξακέσαιο cf. *Iliad* 4,36 τότε κεν χόλον ἔξακέσαιο; cf. also line 90 φλεγμαίνοντα πάθη καταπλάσμασι τοῖσδ' ἀκέσαιο.

45. *De viribus herbarum 89-90:*

καί κεν τοῖς κρυφίμοισιν ἀναγκαιοῖς τε τόποισι
φλεγμαίνοντα πάθη καταπλάσμασι τοῖσδ' ἀκέσαιο.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 163) made the following comments concerning this passage: «So A; GENTOIS C. Sillig wrote τὰν τοῖς, and Heitsch

¹⁸ Cf. F. S. and K. Lehrs, *Poetae Bucolici et Didactici*, (Didot) Paris 1851, II, p. 171.

follows him. ἐν is certainly wanted, but τά is unnecessary and κε unobjectionable. So κ'ἐν».

Once again, though, the correct reading has been preserved for us by A. The preposition ἐν is not needed because we are faced here with an example of the locatival dative. The locatival dative is, of course, attested in epic poetry from Homer onwards: cf. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, vol. II, p. 78. Cf. also Nicander, frag. 74,57ff.

46. *De viribus herbarum* 135-7:

τῆς βοτάνης τὴν ῥίζαν, ὅταν ἀλγῆ τις ὀδόντα, / λαμβανέτω,
 μούνην δὲ μασησάμενος παραχρημα / εὐθὺς ἀποπτυσάτω,
 καὶ ἐλεύσεται ἔκτοθι ῥεῦμα.

According to West (*art. cit.*, p. 164) μούνην should be altered to μούνον. He compared lines 71-3:

φοικάζη δ'ὀπτόταν τις ἀνήρ, βοτάνης ἀπὸ ταύτης / κλώνας
 ἑλῶν κάμνοντος ἐναντίος ἴστασο μούνον, / κεϋθὺς ἀπαλλά-
 ξεις τὸν δαίμονα μηκέτ'ἐπελθεῖν.

Once more the text should not be changed. As Lehrs¹⁹ has already understood, the adjective μούνην refers to ῥίζαν and means that the root «alone» should be chewed by somebody who has toothache. For μόνος meaning «alone» cf. LSJ s.v. I.

47. *De viribus herbarum* 192-3:

αὐτὰρ ἀλδὸς κόλποισιν ἀεξομένην ἱερὴν δρυῖν / κύμασιν ἐν
 νοτεροῖσι τετιμένον ἔρνος ἄφυλλον.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 164) commented on this passage in the following manner: «As I wrote in *Class. Rev.* 1965.225, the main manuscript C appears to have ΛΥΜΑΣΙΝ, not κύμασιν. A possible reading is φύμασιν. The sense will be 'honoured among sea plants'; for φύματα νοτερά cf. Rufinus A.P.5.74.2 νοτερῆ τ'ἀνεμώνη». West has, howe-

¹⁹ Cf. *Poetae Bucolici et Didactici*, II, p. 176.

ver, failed to understand that the correct reading has been preserved for us by A: cf. my notes on lines 48 and 89 above. Our passage should therefore be translated as follows: «But the holy oak which grows in the bosom of the sea, a leafless shoot honoured in the wet waves».

48. *Dion. Per. 77-8:*

ἐνθ' Ἰταλῶν υἷης ἐπ' ἠπειροιο νέμονται,
ἐκ Διὸς Αὔσονιῆς αἰεὶ μέγα κοιρανέοντες.

According to West (*art. cit.*, p. 165) «after Ἰταλῶν υἷης a second expression for 'Italians' is not wanted». Consequently he argued that «Dionysius wrote ἐκ Διὸς Αὔσονιῆς». West's objections to the transmitted text are not warranted. West has failed to understand that we are faced here with a typical example of apposition²⁰. A similar case of apposition occurs at Dionysius Periegetes line 558ff.:

Ἦτοι μὲν ναίουσι, βοοτρόφον ἄμφ' Ἐρύθειαν,
Ἄτλαντος περὶ χεῦμα, θεουδέες Αἰθιοπῆς,
Μακροβίων υἷης ἀμύμονες. For opposition in Homer cf. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, vol. II. p. 12 ff.

49. *Maximus Astrologus 75-81:*

τεύξει γὰρ φαέθουσα Σεληναίη κλυτόπωλος
τῆμος καὶ φιλίην μινυανθέα καὶ ταχύβουλον
ἄστασίην, λήσει δ' ἔρατῆς καὶ ἀκηράτου εὐνῆς,
κουριδιόν τε λέχος προλιπεῖν πόσιός τε λαθέσθαι
τεύξει ὁμοφροσύνην· τῷ σε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα,
ὄππότεν ἐνὶ Κριοῖο παλιστρέπτοιο κελεύθῳ
αἴγλη ἐρευθομένην ἐσίδης χρυσάμπυκα Μήνην.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 165) was puzzled by this passage and decided to mark a lacuna at the end of line 78. There is, though, no need for us to posit the existence of a lacuna in this text. As Koechly²¹ has already

²⁰ The that the words Ἰταλῶν υἷης are in apposition to Αὔσονιῆς has already been understood by G. Bernhardt: cf. *Dionysius Periegetes*, Hildesheim. New York, reprint, 1974, p. 12.

²¹ Cf. *Poetae Bucolici et Didactici*, vol. III, p. 104.

explained, lines 77ff. should be translated as follows: «and with forgetfulness of the beloved, pure marriage-bed, she (i.e. the moon) will cause (τεύξει) Concord (‘Ομοφροσύνην) to leave her bridal couch and to forget her husband». It will be noted that ὁμοφροσύνη is here personified: cf. *A.P.* 7,551, 8- βωμὸς ‘Ομοφροσύνης. For τεύξει followed by the infinitive cf. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, vol. II, p. 312, quoting e.g. *Od.* 23,258 σε θεοὶ ποίησαν ἰκέσθαι / οἶκον; cf. also Manetho 6,628 ἄλγεα τεύχει / ἔξειν.

50. *Maximus Astrologus* 145:

εἰ μὲν γ' εἰαρινοῖσιν ἐν ἀστράσιν Ἄρνειοῖο.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 165) suggested that we should alter μὲν γ' into μὲν τ'. This alteration is not justified. West has failed to note that the combination μὲν γε is attested already in Homer: cf. *Iliad* 15,211 and Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, s.v. γέ (9), quoting *Od.* 5,206 εἴ γε μὲν. Cf. moreover Passow, *Handwörterbuch*, s.v. μὲν, p. 179 (2), quoting e.g. Aristophanes, *Nub.* 1386- εἰ μὲν γε βροῦν εἶποις.

51. *Maximus Astrologus* 160:

εἰ δὲ φάος μὲν ἔχοι Κριῶ ἔπι δεύτερον ἦδη.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 166) commented as follows: «μὲν makes no sense. Ludwich, realizing this, reads κεν. I would prefer μιν». West has, however, failed to notice that the combination εἰ δὲ ...μὲν is paralleled at Manetho 6,69:

εἰ δὲ καθ' ὠρονόμου μὲν ἔοι βεβαυῖα Σελήνη.

52. *Maximus Astrologus* 347:

εἰ μὲν ἐπὶ πρώτῃ ἡοῖ δρόμον ἐντύνειν.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 166) suggested that we should alter ἐπὶ πρώτῃ to ἐνὶ πρώτῃ and compared 124-5 ἐν πρώτῃ ...ἡοῖ. Cf. also 171, 173, 179, 183, 210, 230, 245, 344, 349 and 386. It should be pointed out, however, that ἐπὶ with the dative was employed in epic poetry from

Homer onwards to denote a particular point in time: cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπί B, II, quoting e.g. *Iliad* 13,234 ἐπ' ἡματι τῷδε «on this very day»; cf. also M. Oswald, *The Use Of The Prepositions In Apollonius Rhodius*, Diss. Indiana 1904, p. 179.

53. *Maximus Astrologus* 415-6:

οὐδ'εἴ τοι περὺγεσσιν ἐπήρεα νῶτα γένοιτο,
οἶά γ' ἐνὶ μελέεσσι Βορήιοι υἴες ἔχεσκον.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 166) proposed that οἶά γ' should be altered to οἶά τ'. This alteration is not warranted since οἶα γέ is paralleled at *Anth. Pal. App.* III,107, 6. Cf. also *Thes. Gr. Ling.* s.v. οἶος, p. 1831.

54. *Maximus Astrologus* 524:

εὖ μὲν ἄροτρα καὶ αὐλάκα πορσύνειας.
(«tend well the plough and the furrow»).

West (*art. cit.*, p. 166) stated that the words καὶ αὐλάκα should be altered to κατ'αὐλάκα. It should, *however*, be pointed out that West's proposed alteration is totally unnecessary since the transmitted text makes perfect sense. As is clear from line 525, the ploughman must first tend the plough, and then pay due attention to the furrows, which are to be suitably planted.

West has, moreover, failed to notice that the poet is imitating the Homeric phrase λέχος πόρσυνε καὶ εὐνήν (*Od.* 3,403).

55. *Maximus Astrologus* 534:

πολλήν τ'εὐεστῶ φερέμεν καὶ θέσφατον ὄλβον.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 166) proposed that καὶ θέσφατον should be altered to καὶ ἀθέσφατον. Again no textual alteration is necessary. As Koehly²² has already understood, the adjective θέσφατος means

²² Cf. *Poetae Bucolici et Didactici*, vol. III, p. 113, where Koehly translated θέσφατον ὄλβον as «ingentes divitias».

here «wonderful», «mighty»: cf. LSJ s.v. Π, quoting *Od.* 7, 143 θέσφατος ἀήρ (same metrical *sedes*).

56. *Maximus Astrologus* 600-2:

θαμέως δέ κεν ἀμφὶ κλοπείου / εἰσαίοις, τὰ δὲ πολλὰ πέ-
λοντ' ἀνεμώλιοι αὐτως / μῦθοι ἐπαγγελίησι κεναις θέλγοντες
ἀκούσας.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 166) commented as follows: «ταδε (so L): read τά τε». There is, however, no reason why we should accept this alteration. West has failed to notice that the repetition of δέ is common in Epic from Homer onwards: cf. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum* s.v. δέ, p. 276: «In anaphora ponitur δέ A 436-439 etc.». Cf. furthermore Fernandez-Galiano, *Léxico De Los Himnos De Calímaco*, s.v. δέ, E and Peek, *Lexikon zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos*, s.v. δέ II.

57. *Musaeus* 312-3:

δὴ τότε Λεϊάνδρος ἐθήμονος ἐλπίδι νύμφης
δυσκελάδων πεφόρητο θαλασσαίων ἐπὶ νώτων.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 167) noted that a syllable is missing in line 312. He then added that Koechly wrote καὶ τότε δὴ and that he was followed by both Ludwich and Malcavoti. As an alternative alteration West suggested δὴ τότε δὴ «a combination found at [Opp.] *Cyn.* 2.271, Q.S. 10.244, Orph. Arg. 1270, Nonn. D. 22.299». Textual alteration is, though, not necessary. As G. Giangrande²³ has already explained, the correct reading here is δὴ τότε καὶ²⁴ which has been preserved for us by V. The phrase δὴ τότε καὶ is an epic rarity (cf. Callim. *Hymn.* 4.307 and *Orac. Sib.* 2.15) meaning «just then». Musaeus has employed this rarity in the same metrical *sedes* and with the same meaning as Callimachus and the author of the *Oracula Sibyllina*.

58. *Christodorus* A.P.2.5-6:

ἴστατο δὲ προβιβῶντι πανεῖκελος. εὖ δ' ἐπὶ κόσμῳ / δόχμιος
ἦν.

²³ Cf. *Classical Review*, vol. XXIII (1973), p. 138.

²⁴ Cf. T. Gelzer, *Musaeus, Hero And Leander*, Loeb edition, London 1974, p. 384.

West (*art. cit.*, p. 167) was puzzled by the phrase εὖ δ' ἐπὶ κόσμῳ and proposed that it should be altered to εὖ δ' ἐπὶ βασιμῶ. Again textual alteration is not warranted. The words ἐπὶ κόσμῳ mean here «duly», «in order»: cf. LSJ s.v. κόσμος: «freq. in dat., κόσμῳ καθί- ζειν to sit *in order*, Od. 13,77... σὺν κόσμῳ Hdt. 8.86, Arist. Mu. 398b 23; ἐν κόσμῳ Hp. Mul. I. 3, Pl. Smp. 223b». For ἐπί with the dative «of the condition or attendant circumstance» cf. Oswald, *op. cit.*, p. 180, quoting e.g. Apollonius Rhodius, *Arg.* I, 252 ἐπ' ἀγλαΐῃ βιότοιο «with the joy of life». Cf. also LSJ s.v. ἐπί III, 1: «in adverbial phrases [δικάσαι] ἐπ' ἄρωγῃ with favour, Il. 23.574; δολίῃ ἐ. τέχνῃ Hes. Th. 540».

59. *Christodorus A.P.2.44-9*:

οὐδὲ σὺ μολπῆς / εὐνασας ἄβρον ἔρωτα, Σιμωνίδη, ἀλλ' ἔτι
 χορδῆς / ἰμείρεις, ἱερὴν δὲ λύρην οὐ χερσὶν ἀράσσεις· /
 ὦφελεν ὁ πλάσσας σε, Σιμωνίδη, ὦφελε χαλκῶ / συγκεράσαι
 μέλος ἦδύ· σὲ δ' ἂν καὶ χαλκὸς ἀναυδῆς / αἰδόμενος ἑυθμοῖ-
 σι λύρης ἀντήχεε μολπῆν.

Translation by W. R. Paton (*The Greek Anthology*, Loeb edition, London 1969, reprint, vol. I, p. 63):

«Nor hadst thou, Simonides, laid to rest thy tender love, but still dost yearn for the strings; yet hast thou no sacred lyre to touch. He who made thee, Simonides, should have mixed sweet music with the bonze, and the dumb bronze had revered thee, and responded to the strains of thy lyre».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 167) proposed that we should alter the words οὐ χερσὶν, in line 46, to εὖ χερσὶν. This alteration is contextually inapposite. The point that the poet is trying to make is that the statue of Simonides longs to play the lyre, as Simonides did when he was alive, but is not able to.

Similarly we are told that the statues of Hesiod and Polyidus long to speak but are, of course, unable to: cf. lines 38ff.

Ἡσίοδος δ' Ἄσκραϊος ὀρειάσιν εἶδετο Μούσαις / φθεγγόμε-
 νος, χαλκὸν δὲ βιάζετο θυιάδι λύσση, / ἔνθεον ἰμείρων ἀνά-

γειν μέλος. ἐγγύθι δ' αὐτοῦ / μαντιπόλος πάλιν ἄλλος ἔην φοιβηίδι
 δάφνη / κοσμηθεὶς Πολύειδος· ἀπὸ στομάτων δὲ τινάξει / ἤθελε μὲν
 κελάδημα θεοπρόπον· ἀλλά ἔ τέχνη / δεσμῶ ἀφωνήτῳ κατερήτυεν.

Translation by Paton (*op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 61ff):

«Hesiod of Ascra seemd to be calling to the mountain Muses, and in his divine fury he did violence to the bronze by his longing to utter his inspired verse. And near him stood another prophet, Polyidus, crowned with the laurel of Phoebus, eager to break into prophetic song, but restrained by the gagging fetter of the artist».

60. *A.P.* 1.10.12-15:

πάντα γὰρ ὅσα τέλεσεν ὑπέρετρα τεῦξε τοκῶν, / ὄρθην
 πίστιν ἔχουσα φιλοχρίστοιο μενοινῆς· / τίς γὰρ Ἰουλιανὴν
 οὐκ ἔκλυεν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοῦς / εὐκαμάτοις ἔργοισιν ἑοὺς φαί-
 δρυνε τοκῆας;

West (*art. cit.*, p. 167) suggested that we should alter the phrase ὅτι καὶ αὐτοῦς into ὅτι καὶ αὐτῆ, and compared Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 1.458, 504, 2.113,5. 465, etc. Once more textual alteration is not warranted. The words ὅτι καὶ αὐτοῦς / ... ἑοὺς φαίδρυνε τοκῆας mean «because she glorified her parents themselves (αὐτούς)». Cf. Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 32, 57-8:

οἶσθα γάρ, ὡς Ζυγίη κικλήσκομαι, ὅτι καὶ αὐτῆς
 χεῖρες ἔμαϊ κρατέουσι τελεσσιγόνου τοκετοῖο.

Cf. also *Dionysiaca* 32, 94-5:

οὐδὲ καὶ αὐτῆς
 ἔδρακεν ἄφθιτα λέκτρα βοώπιδος ὄμμα Σελήνης.

In the passage under discussion, the emphasis is not on Juliana, but on her parents, the sense being that she has glorified not only herself, but even her parents (αὐτούς), who were of royal blood of the third generation (as is stressed in lines 7 f.) and who as such did not need any further glorification at the hands of their daughter.

61. *A.P.1.10.56-7*:

κίονες ἀρρήκτοις ἐπὶ κίοσιν ἑστηῶτες
 χρυσορόφου ἀκτίνας ἀεργάζουσι καλύπτρης.

Translation by Paton (*op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 11):

«columns standing on firm columns support the rays of the golden dome».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 167) proposed that we should alter χρυσορόφου into χρυσορόφους. Textual alteration is, however, unwarranted. West has not understood that we are faced here with an example of the stylistic device whereby the hexameter is encased by an adjective and a noun in agreement: cf. G. R. McLennan, *Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus*, Rome 1977, p. 97 and A. Wifstrand, *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos*, Lund 1933, p. 133.

62. *A.P.1.32*:

ὦδε τάλαιπαθέων χραισμήια θέσκελα κείται
 ἢ δέμας ἢ κραδίην τειρομένων μερόπων·
 καὶ γὰρ ἀνιάζουσα πόνων φύσις αὐτίκα φεύγει
 οὔνομα σόν, Μιχαήλ, ἢ τύπον ἢ θαλάμους.

Translation by Paton (*op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 21):

«Here is kept the divine help for wretched men, afflicted in mind or body. For vexing trouble at once is put to flight, Michael, by thy name, thy image, or thy house».

West (*art. cit.*, p. 168) was troubled by the repetition of ἦ in this epigram and consequently proposed that we should alter ἦ θαλάμους into ἐν θαλάμοις. Once again West's proposed alteration is not justified. West has failed to note that repetition is a common feature of Greek epigrammatic poetry: cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alex.*, vol. II, p. 313.