The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes on Bacchylides

R. C. Jebb

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 03 / April 1898, pp 152 - 158
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00025713, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00025713

How to cite this article:

R. C. Jebb (1898). Notes on Bacchylides. The Classical Review, 12, pp 152-158
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00025713

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

was thought to be at the north' (*op. cit.* p. 39). The Opisthodomus, then, was to the south of the Erechtheum. Further, it is suggested on the strength of Hdt. 8, 55 that a Greek felt the Pandroseum to be part of the Erechtheum; and in the end the Opisthodomus is discovered to the south, not of the temple buildings, but of the precinct called the Pandroseum, on the site of the three western rooms and western portico of the old Hecatompædon. The theory is that these chambers which made up the Opisthodomus or 'back part' of the 'ante-Persian' temple of Athena, were rebuilt, after the devastation of the Acropolis by Xerxes' army, to serve as a treasury of the gods and of the state, that they retained their old name, although the rest of the building was not restored, and that they constitute 'the Opisthodomus' of literature and inscriptions. Now, if it had been convincingly demonstrated that the western portion of the 'ante-Persian' temple of Athena was rebuilt between the years 479 B.C. and 435-4 B.C., in order that Athens might not be without a treasury, it might be permissible to conclude that by the words

'behind the temple of Athena called Polias' the original author of the obscure definition reproduced in V must have meant 'to the south of the Pandroseum,' where *ex hypothesi* a structure stood that might perhaps have been called 'the Opisthodomus.' But it is precisely the existence of such a building that stands in need of proof. The restoration, partial or complete, of the old Hecatompædon destroyed by the Persians is merely a conjecture, not an unquestionable fact certified by ancient authorities and architectural remains. When the position of the Opisthodomus is discovered, it will be possible to interpret the statement of Harpocration, Photius, Suidas, and Schol. R on Aristoph. *Plut.* 1193 that it was 'behind the temple of Athena' and estimate the value of the unique note in the *Venetus*, on which Prof. White builds. But in this matter the lexica and scholia are worthless, since every critic can construe them in accordance with his own prepossessions. My bias, I will confess, inclines me towards the Parthenon.

W. WYSE.

NOTES ON BACCHYLIDES.

(Continued from p. 133.)

XVII. 95-99. I wish to amend one detail in my note on this passage (*C.R.* xii. p. 129). In 97 I proposed to read οὐρία νότου δ' ἐκόντες ἔξεναν (the last word being due to Mr. F. W. Thomas). But the Facsimile (col. 26) convinces me that what was read as EKON is ΕΚΟΛΙ, the last stroke being doubtless part of Π, so that Prof. Blass is right in giving ἐκόλπωσαν. To this, however, he subjoins σὺν αὐραῖς, where the metre indicates only ~ - (cp. 31, 64, 130, 196). Read οὐρία νότου δ' ἐκόλπωσαν πνοῇ | ιστίον κ.τ.λ.: cp. *Anth.* 9. 363 πνοῇ ἀπημάντω Ζεφύρου λῖνα κολπώσαντες.

XVII. 7. Π. ΛΕΜΑΙΓΙΔΟΣ ΑΘΑΝΑΣ. πολεμαίγιδος (Kenyon) is, I think, right: 'with warlike aegis.' For analogous compounds of πόλεμος cp. *Batrachom.* 475 Παλλάδα πέμψωμεν πολεμόκλονον: anon. ap. Dionys. *De comp.* 17 Βρόμει ..πολεμοκέλαδε: schol. *Od.* 1. 48 πολεμόφρων. Prof. Housman and Mr. W. Headlam propose οεεσμαίγιδος ('aegis-shaking'), an ingenious conjecture, which Mr. Headlam illustrates

by *Il.* 4. 167 (Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἐπισσεῖησιν ἐρεμνὴν αἰγίδα πάντων: where the 'dark aegis' that Zeus 'brandishes over' the Trojans directly suggests the storm-cloud. But the aegis worn by Athena as part of her panoply was regularly depicted as a short cape or mantle. She can, indeed, spread this to the wind as a sail (ῥοιβδοῦσα κόλπον αἰγίδος, Aesch. *Eum.* 404); but she could not well be described as 'shaking' it like a shield. As to the form πελεμαίγης, Mr. Headlam remarks that (despite such exceptions as *τερπικέρανος*) we might rather expect πελεμίζαίγης. No other compound with πελεμ- or πελεμιξ- occurs. Athena, it may be noted, is here the sender of Boreas; and it might be argued, in favour of πελεμαίγιδος, that here, as in the *Iliad* l.c., there is a reference to the storm-cloud. Even if (as seems probable) the poet wrote πολεμαίγιδος, that association with αἰγίς may, indeed, have been present to his mind. But that he should have conceived Athena (like the Homeric Zeus) as 'shaking' the storm-aegis is most unlikely, when we remember that her cape-aegis was already

a fixed convention of contemporary Greek art. Thus on that very cylix of Euphronius (circ. 490-450 B.C.) which illustrates one scene of this poem—the reception of Theseus by Amphitrite—Athena, the hero's guardian goddess, is wearing the cape-aegis (Baumeister, p. 1793).

XVII. 20. *εἶπεν* occurs again in 74. If sound, it may be explained by a wish to vary *εἶπεν*, which occurs in 47, 52, and 81. Prof. v. Wilamowitz assumes (as I did at first) that *εἶπεν* is merely a corruption of *εἴπεν*, due to a form of Pi (with the right-hand stroke shorter than the other) which went out of general use after the second century B.C. Hence he regards the (supposed) corruption as one of the documents for the antiquity of the source from which our MS. comes. But the change of such a Pi into P is not a very probable one. And it would be a most singular coincidence which had preserved *εἴπεν* in 47, 52 and 81, but corrupted it in 74 to *εἶπεν*,—just in the place where the poet might naturally have wished to break the monotony. For *εἶπεν*, indeed, he had no warrant (known to us) except the rare present *εἶρω* (*Od.* 11. 137 and 13. 7); but he may have thought that sufficient.

XVII. 36-38.

χρυσέον
τέ οἱ δόσαν ἰόπλοκοι
κάλυμμα Νηρηίδες.

A short syllable is wanting after *ἰόπλοκοι*. I agree with those who hold that *τοῖ* will not serve; and as to another possibility, *κά|λυμμ'* ~ *Νηρηίδες*, I can think of no tolerable word to fill the gap. Now, Theseus is here insisting with pride on his parentage;—‘Aethra became the bride of Poseidon,—aye, and the Nereids gave her a golden veil.’ *ἰόπλοκοί γε* seems, then, possible.

XVII. 74-76.

Θησεῦ, <σὺ> τάδε
μὲν βλέπεις σαφῆ Διὸς
δῶρα· σὺ δ' ὄρνυ' κ.τ.λ.

After Θησεῦ, the MS. has lost a short syllable (cp. 8, 31, 97): and σὺ might easily have dropped out after -σεῦ. Is σὺ δ' ὄρνυ' in 76 conclusive against this view? I think not; because σὺ δὲ with *imperative* was an idiom (especially Ionic) in which the stress on the verb was much stronger than that on the pronoun; see e.g. *Her.* 3. 68 εἰ μὴ αὐτῇ Σμέρδω . . γνώσκεις, σὺ δὲ παρὰ Ἀτόσσης πύθεν: *id.* 7. 159 εἰ δ' ἄρα μὴ δίκαιοις ἄρχεσθαι, σὺ δὲ μηδὲ βοήθες: cp. *Il.* 9. 300 ff., 6.

46, etc. Hence σὺ δ' ὄρνυ', with the chief emphasis on the imperative, is quite compatible with σὺ τάδε μὲν βλέπεις two lines before, where the emphasis on σὺ is normal.

Prof. Platt's τὰδ' ἐμὰ is a plausible conjecture (though he need not have altered Θησεῦ into Θησεῖ). But this papyrus never had any letters after ΤΑΔΕ in v. 74 (Facsimile, col. 34). We should have to assume, then, that the letters ΜΑ (required to complete τὰδ' ἐμὰ) either were accidentally omitted by the scribe, or were absent from the MS. which he copied.

XVII. 86.

τα . εν δὲ Διὸς υἱὸς ἔνδοθεν
κέαρ, κέλευσέ τε κατ' οὐ-
[ρ]ον ἴσχευ' εὐδαίδαλον
ναῦ· Μοῖρα δ' ἑτέραν ἐπόρσυν' δόον.

The first word is read by Mr. Kenyon as τᾶ(ξ)εν, and by Prof. Blass as τᾶ(κ)εν. I hold that it was γὰ(θ)εν. Mr. Kenyon would, indeed, have placed this in the text, had it not involved the alteration of a letter in the mutilated word: few changes, however, are slighter than that of T to Γ. What would τᾶξεν (or τᾶκεν) κέαρ mean? The disguised Odysseus says to Penelope, *μηκέτι νῦν χρόα καλὸν ἐναίρεο μηδ' ἔτι θυμὸν | τῆκε πόσιν γόσσουσα*, ‘nor waste thy heart with weeping for thy lord.’ So the sense here would be, ‘Minos wasted his heart within him,’—was consumed with *grief*,—which cannot be meant; or possibly (though this would strain the phrase), ‘felt his heart melt within him’ from *amazement* or *fear*. (So Kenyon: ‘Minos was taken aback and scared.’) But the whole context makes it clear that the sense required is, ‘Minos secretly rejoiced.’ It was with a malignant intent, as the poet hints, that he had challenged Theseus to ask a sign from Poseidon:—ὕφαινε . . ποταίναν μῆτιν (v. 51). Theseus sprang from the deck into the sea,—and no sign of the sea-god's favour was yet visible to the spectators. Minos was delighted. He thought that he had got rid of his foe. Instead of stopping the ship, he told his pilot to keep her on her way before the wind (κατ' οὐρον ἴσχευ): ‘but Fate,’ adds the poet, ‘was preparing a different course,’—viz., other than that in which Minos was prematurely rejoicing,—another confirmation of γὰθεν. Then the feeling of Minos is contrasted with the terror and grief of the ἡῤεοι (92 ff.). Lastly, when Theseus reappears from the depths, the poet exclaims (v. 119), φεῦ, οἶαισιν ἐν φροντίσι Κνώσσιον ἔσχασεν στραταγέταν,—‘in what thoughts did he check’ Minos,—by abruptly

dispelling his sense of triumph and security. In view of all this, it seems pretty certain that B. did *not* write τᾶ(ξ)εν or τᾶ(κ)εν: and, for my own part, I have little doubt that the word was γᾶθεν.

In *C.R.* xii. p. 139 Prof. Housman argues in favour of τᾶξεν (or τᾶκεν) as against γᾶθεν: I wish to examine his argument. Disregarding the accent on κατοῦρον in the MS. v. 87 f., he writes κάτουρον, and explains the passage as follows. When Theseus, accepting the challenge of Minos, jumped overboard, 'Minos was filled with remorse, as befitted a son of Zeus, to think that he had sent a fine young fellow to his death.' So he ordered the crew to *stop* the ship, which was running before the wind (κάτουρον ἴσχεν . . . νᾶα). 'But fate ordained a different course.' And what was this 'different course'? Simply, according to Mr. Housman, *that the ship should sail on*. But, if Minos told his men to stop the ship, why did they not do so? Did fate inspire a mutiny on board? Or, if the κυβερνήτης obeyed Minos, and put his helm hard up, did fate forbid the ship to answer it? In either case, the operation of fate was of so remarkable a kind that one might have expected the poet to say more about it. Then this sudden tenderness of Minos, though in itself an engaging trait, is surprisingly inconsistent with the rest of his conduct in this Minotaur business; if he really stopped to pick up Theseus, his true motive (one might suspect) was consideration for the hungry Minotaur. Lastly, as to the change of κατ' οὐρον into κάτουρον (a word which nowhere occurs, but for which Mr. Housman compares ἔπουρος): he assumes that ἴσχεν κάτουρον νᾶα means ἴσχειν τὴν κατουρίζουσαν ναῦν, 'to stop the ship which was (then) running before the wind'; but, according to the ordinary idiom of classical Greek, the sense should be rather, 'to keep the ship before the wind,' κάτουρον being still equivalent to κατ' οὐρον. In support of the MS. κατ' οὐρον ἴσχεν as = 'to keep before the wind,' it may be noted that the phrase ἔχειν ναῦν often occurs with reference to keeping a ship on a certain course: e.g. *Od.* 10. 91 ἐνθ' οἳ γ' εἴσω πάντες ἔχον νέας, ('thereinto they all steered their ships'); *Her.* 6. 95 οὐ παρὰ τὴν ἡπειρον εἶχον τὰς νέας κ.τ.λ.

XVII. 95. λειρίων . . . ὀμμάτων. What is the meaning of the epithet? Suidas has λειρόφθαλμος (which, by the way, is not in L. and S.), ὁ προσηγνῆϊς ἔχων τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. This ought probably to be λειρ(ι)όφθαλμος. The form λειρός is, indeed, given by Hesych.

(ὁ ἰσχνὸς καὶ ὠχρὸς), and occurs (see L. and S.) in *C. I.* 6270a, τέτιξ. . . λειρά χέων, a reminiscence of the cicada's ὅπα λειριόεσσαν in *Il.* 3. 152. But λειρός was presumably a rarer form than λείριος. The interpretation of λειριόφθαλμος as denoting προσηγνῆϊς ὀφθαλμούς seems to be derived from that of ὅπα λειριόεσσαν as τὴν προσηγὴ καὶ ἡδεῖαν (Hesych.), a 'soothing' or 'pleasing' voice. This explanation of λειριόεσσαν in that phrase is generalised in the gloss of Suidas, λειριόεντα ἀπαλά, προσηγὴ, τερπνὰ, ἡδέα. It is unfortunate that we know nothing as to the age or source of λειριόφθαλμος: we can only say that it has the stamp of a late word. But it is quite intelligible that the old epic ὅπα λειριόεσσαν (varied in later epos to ὅπα λείριον) should have been taken to mean, (1) a voice of delicate charm—the image being borrowed from the delicate beauty of the lily; cp. χρῶα λειριόεντα, 'delicate skin,' in *Il.* 13. 830: and then, by an easy transition, (2) 'a gentle or soothing voice,'—προσηγνῆ, which would well suit (e.g.) the ὅπα λείριον of the Sirens (*Ap. Rhod.* 4. 903). Next would come secondary phrases of a more artificial cast, such as λείρια ὀμματα in the sense of *blandi oculi*, 'gentle' eyes. Is such a phrase too artificial,—too Alexandrian,—for a poet living in the first half of the fifth century B.C.? My own instinct would be rather to answer that question in the affirmative. But it remains a possibility that Bacchylides may have intended such a sense. The only alternative that I can see is to understand, 'eyes of delicate beauty.' When Pindar calls the white coral λείριον ἄνθεμον ποντίας . . . ἑέρσας (*N.* 7. 79) that notion is present; there, however, the notion of colour also comes in.

XVII. 123-129.

λάμ-
πε δ' ἀμφὶ γνῖοις θεῶν δῶρ', ἀγλαό-
θρονοί τε κούραι σὺν εὐ-
θυμῖα νεοκτίτω
ὠλόλυξαν ἔκλαγεν δὲ
πόντος· ἦθροι δ' ἐγγύθεν
νέοι παῖανίζαν ἐρατὰ ὀπί.

Who are the κούραι in v. 125? ἀγλαόθρονος is an epithet of the Muses in Pind. *O.* 13. 96; and of the Danaïdes in *N.* 10. 1 (with reference to their representation in sculpture). So εὐθρονος is said by Pindar of Aphrodite, the Horae, the daughters of Cadmus, and Clio. The epithet ἀγλαόθρονοι strongly suggests, then, that the κούραι meant are divine (or semi-divine) persons; and these can here be only the Nereids. Cp.

Pind. *N.* 4, 65 ὑψιθρόνων μίαν Νηρηίδων. In Eur. *I.A.* 239 ff. golden statues of Nereids are at the sterns of the ships of Achilles. Theseus found the Nereids in the halls of Amphritite (v. 101 ff.). If the epithet be pressed, they must be imagined as still seated there; their cry of joy, mingled with the sound of the sea (ἐκλαγεν), is heard from the depths: they rejoice in the honours shown to the son of Poseidon. But ἀγλαόθρονοι might also be taken as merely an *epitheton ornans*; just as the palace of Poseidon beneath the waves is called that of πατρὸς ἱππίου (v. 99 f.). The phrase σὺν εὐθυμία νεοκίτῳ might naturally suggest that the κοῦραι are the seven Athenian maidens on board the ship: but ἀγλαόθρονοι must then refer merely to their seats on the ἱκρία at the stern (as in Eur. *Helen.* 1571 Helen sits ἐν μέσοις ἐδωλίοις): and considering their plight as victims destined for the Minotaur, the epithet would be strange indeed. Further, the term ἦθεοι in 128 would naturally denote both the maidens and the youths, as it does in v. 43 and 93, and as κούρους also does in v. 3. [Since writing this, I learn that M. Henri Weil also understands the Nereids to be meant.]

XVII. 131 φρένα ἰανθείς. The hiatus is irregular, since ἰαίνω had no *F*. My suggestion φρένας is accepted by Prof. v. Wilamowitz (*Gött. Anz.* p. 138). If φρένα be right, we can only compare v. 74 f., ἐξείλετο ἰόν (ἰός, ἄνθρω, not having *F*).

XVIII. 10. σέοντ' = σεύοντι. For the elision of *ε* in the Doric 3rd pl., cp. Pind. *P.* 4. 241 ἀγαπάζοντ'. αὐτίκα κ.τ.λ.

XVIII. 35. ἡ μόνον σὺν ὀπλοισιν MS. Verses 5, 20, and 50 show the metre $\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup\cup$. We need not change μόνον to μόνον here, nor κήρυκτον to κήρυκτον in 50. Kenyon gives ἡ μόνον τ' ἀνοπλόν τέ νιν. On this view the σὺν ὀπλοισιν of the MS. would be a dittographia from σὺν πολέμησις ὀπλοισιν in 33 f. Prof. Housman proposes ἡ μόνον συνοπαύων (cp. Soph. *O.C.* 1250 ἀνδρῶν γε μόνος); the corruption would then have started from a change of ΠΑ into ΠΛ, coupled perhaps with some mutilation or blurring of ΝΩ. An emendation which requires less change is ἡ μόνον συνόπλοιο νιν: if the last O had become C, the first N of νιν would have been deleted. This is due to A. Ludwich (Königsberg programm, 1898, p. 13), who compares *Al.* 511 σοῦ διοίσεταί μόνος. Against the distinct gain in palaeographical probability we have, however, to weigh the fact that, for a contrast with στρατιᾶν

ἄγοντα πολλάν in 34, a plural like συνοπαύων is slightly better than the singular συνόπλοιο.

XVIII. 50-54.

κήρυκτον κυνέαν Λάκαι-
ναν κρατὸς ὑπὲρ πυρσοχαιτου,
χιτῶνα πορφύρεον
στέρνοις τ' ἄμφι καὶ οὐλίον
Θεσσαλᾶν χλαμυδ' κ.τ.λ.

As to the last three of these verses, the obvious remedy has been proposed by Prof. v. Wilamowitz, and (independently) by Prof. Platt: we must write στέρνοις τε πορφύρεον | χιτῶν' ἄμφι. The problem of v. 51 remains, where the ~ ~ - given by (κρατ)ὸς ὑπὲρ ought to be ~ ~ ~, as is indicated by vv. 6, 21, 36. Prof. Crusius, indeed, holds (*Philol.* lvii. p. 175) that 'Ionics with anaclassis' form a characteristic element in the logaoedic style of this poem, and that anaclassis explains the metrical divergence between v. 51 and the triad of corresponding verses: but I cannot persuade myself of this. Mr. W. Headlam (*C.R.* xii. 67) says, 'Possibly κρατὸς κάτα,' comparing *Od.* 8. 84 f. φάρος . . | κακ κεφαλῆς εἵρυσσε ('drew his cloak *douven* over his head'): but this emendation would 'bonnet' Theseus. Prof. Housman (*ib.* p. 74) says: 'Write κρατὸς θ' ὑπο in 51 and delete τ' in 53.' But what sense results? 'He had a helmet . . , and beneath his head a purple tunic', etc. Surely the simplest remedy is here the most probable, viz., to write κρατὸς περὶ πυρσοχαίτου. Mr. Kenyon objects that we should expect the dative (as in 47 f. περὶ φαίδιμοις δ' ὦμοις | ξίφος ἔχειν): and it is quite true that the dative would be normal. But the genitive also occurs, though rarely, with περὶ in the local sense: see *Od.* 5. 68 ἡ δ' αὐτοῦ τετάνυστο περὶ σπείους γλαφυροῖο | ἡμερίς, 'about the hollow cave trailed a garden-vine.' Again, in *Od.* 5. 130 περὶ τρόπιος βεβαῶτα ('bestriding the keel') is exactly parallel with ἄμφ' ἐνὶ δούρατι βαῖνε *ib.* 371: but we know that ἄμφι κεφαλῇ (in a local sense) was good Greek (*Il.* 18. 205). Is there, then, any reason to doubt that, under even a light pressure of metrical convenience, a Greek poet could have used περὶ κρατὸς in a local sense?

XIX. 12-16.

πρέπει σε φερτάταν ἔμεν
ὁδὸν παρὰ Καλλιόπας λα-
χοῖσαν ἔξοχον γέρας·
ἵτην† Ἄργος ὅθ' ἵππιον λιπούσα
φεύγε χρυσέα βούς κ.τ.λ.

την in 15, i.e. τί ἦν, has found two dis-

tinguished defenders—Prof. v. Wilamowitz ('Was war . . . als Io . . .?'), and Prof. Crusius, who regards it as an old formula in beginning a story. (Both critics hold the iambus to be admissible.) But I agree with those who think *την* corrupt. Mr. Marindin proposes to read *τίεν* (Doric inf.), and to omit the point after *γέρας*, so that the construction is, *λαχούσαν ἐξοχον γέρας τίεν, quae rem eximiam celebrandam acceperis*: cp. Aesch. *Ag.* 705 f. τὸ νυμφότιμον | μέλος ἐκφάτως τίνοντας. The point after *γέρας* in the MS. is not conclusive against this attractively simple correction; for such a point would naturally have been added when TIEN came to be read as TIHN (τί ἦν). The connection, however, of Ἄργος ὅθ' ἱππιον κ.τ.λ. with the preceding context seems then not quite satisfactory. We have to take the sentence ὅτ' Ἄργος φεύγε βοῦς as defining either ὁδόν, the strain of song, or (which would be more natural) γέρας, the choice theme: '(namely the time) when Io was fleeing,' etc. This is not (I think) at all impossible; but it is somewhat strange. I am much disposed to accept a conjecture of Mr. W. Headlam (*C.R.* xii. p. 68), which allows us to keep the MS. stop after γέρας: viz. ἦεν, 'There was a time when,' etc. Mr. Headlam has cited several passages for the usage of ἦν ὅτε. He has omitted, however, to observe that this usage exhibits two distinct shades of meaning. (1) *Anthol.* 1. 92 begins with ἦν ὅτε Χριστὸς ἵαγεν κ.τ.λ. This is exactly apposite: for ἦν ὅτε is there merely a formula prefacing a narrative; 'There was a time when' (= 'Once upon a time'). (2) In all the other passages it will be found that ἦν ὅτε introduces a contrast between past and present; e.g., *Anth.* 8. 178 ἦν ὅτε ἦν ἀνίνακτος . . . νῦν δέ με θῆρ' ἐτίναξεν: 'there was a time when I was unshaken,'—but now it is otherwise. So also *Anth.* 12. 44; 14. 52; 9. 344 (ἦν ὁπότε): in Pind. fr. 83 (B⁴) we have only the words ἦν ὅτε σῶας τὸ Βοιωτίων ἔθνος ἔνεπον,—but that was manifestly an instance of the same kind. Presumably, then, this antithetic use of ἦν ὅτε was the normal one. But the single example (*Anth.* 1. 92) quoted above suffices to show that the purely prefatory use was idiomatic. As to the form ἦεν, it occurs *Il.* 12. 9, Hes. *Scut.* 15: an Ionic poet could certainly use it. Palaeographically, too, the correction is tenable. TIHN would come from HEN through H being read as TI (as Mr. Kenyon says, 'TI is very like H in the MS.'): and EN would then be read as HN.

XVIII. 29 εἶτ' οὖν...33 ἦ ῥα...35 ἦ Πιερίδες...37 ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν.

In 33 we must certainly (I think) read ἦ ῥα. In 29, where I accepted Mr. Kenyon's reading of ΕΙΤΟΥΝ as εἶτ' οὖν, I now prefer my earlier view, that it should be read as εἶτ' οὖν. The whole context from 29 to 37 is then as follows:—'Now whether fate decreed that Hermes should (unaided) slay Argus, or [ἦ in 33] whether the ceaseless cares of Argus finally exhausted him, or [ἦ in 35] the Muses lulled him to sleep,—for me at any rate [ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν in 37] it is safest (to relate only what is certain—or the final issue—viz., the arrival of Io in Egypt, and the birth of Epaphus).' The defective verse 38, ἀσφαλέστατον ἄπε, is thus completed by v. Wilamowitz, ἄπερ ἐκράνθη λέγειν (i.e., 'to tell how matters were finally ordained'). [Seeking to preserve the sequence ἄπ, without inserting the conjectural iota which ἄπερ requires, I suggested ἄπερ εἰλικρινῇ λέγειν: but it has been rightly objected that the adj. is a prose word. I took -ον ἄπερ to be ~ ~ ~ for ~ ~. ἄπερ ἐμφανῇ λέγειν would be possible.]

XVIII. 39–45.

ἐπεὶ παρ' ἀνθεμῷ[δεα
40 Νεῖλον ἀφίκετ']
Ἰὼ φέρουσα παῖδ'
Ἐπαφον, ἔνθα νύ
αἰνόςτολων πρυ[
ὑπερόχῳ βρύνοντ']
45 μεγίσταν τε θύ[

Much turns on the word in 43 which the *ed. princeps* gives as αἰνόςτολων. The first letter seems, however, to be Λ rather than Α (Facsimile col. 39), thus giving λινόςτολων, which is read by Prof. v. Wilamowitz and by Prof. Blass. The epithet would be specially suitable to Egyptian priests; but might also be said of the Egyptians generally (*Her.* 2. 37 εἴματα δὲ λίνεα φορέουσι αἰεὶ νεόπλυτα). In an Egyptian Isis-hymn of circ. 350 A.D. (Kaibel *Epigr. Gr.* 1028) Isis is addressed as Αἰγύπτου βασιλεῖα λινόςτολε.

But did νιν in 42 refer to Io or to Epaphus? If to Io, then βρύνοντ' in 44 must have been either βρύνοντος or βρύνοντων. For βρύνοντος (δλβφ, or the like), we should need a subst. in the sense of γένεος: but this is not easy to fit in along with λινόςτολων. If the word was βρύνοντων, then it must (for metrical reasons) have been the last of the verse (so that a subst. for ὑπερόχῳ would have to be found in 42 or 43): and it would be an epithet of the λινόςτολων (the Egyptian priests or people); whereas the lauda-

tory epithet should belong rather to Epaphus or his royal descendants. Therefore it seems probable that *νιν* in 42 referred, not to Io, but to Epaphus.

If *λινυστόλων* was an epithet of the priests, we might restore (*exempli gratia*) thus:—

41 Ἴω φέρουσα παῖδ' [ὑπερτάτου Διὸς]
Ἐπαφον· ἔνθα νιν [ν ἱερέων ἔθηκεν]
λινυστόλων πρὶ [τανιν]
ὑπερόχῳ βρύνοντ[α πλούτῳ],
45 μεγίσταν τε θν[ατῶν κτίσε σποράν].

For *ἱερέων* (---), cp. II. 2 *ἱεράν* (---). The subject to *ἔθηκεν* and *κτίσε* would be *Ζεύς*, supplied from *Διὸς* in 41. If *λινυστόλων* referred to the Egyptians at large, we might suggest in 42 (with a different but equally possible rhythm),

*Ἐπαφον· ἔνθα νιν ἔσσε δαμοτᾶν.

XVIII. 46-48.

ὄθεν καὶ ἀγανορε[
ἐν ἐπαπύλοι[σι Θήβαις]
Κάδμος Σεμέ[λαν φύτευσεν].

Led by *ἀγανορε* in the first transcript, I conjectured *ἀγανόρειος*. The Facsimile shows after *ΑΓΑΝΟΡ* a small vestige of the top of a letter which might be *l* quite as well as *E*. And since *l* is admissible, it is obvious that we should read *Ἀγανορίδας* (as Crusius, v. Wilamowitz, and Blass agree in doing). Agenor, father of Cadmus, was grandson of Epaphus.

XX. Idas and Lynceus were sons of Aphareus and Ἀρήνη (*ā*), a Messenian hero and heroine: hence the brothers are Ἀφαρηγίδαι (Pind. *N.* 10. 65). Idas and Apollo were rivals for the love of Marpessa, daughter of the Aetolian Εὔηνος. Evenus compelled suitors for his daughter's hand to engage in some contest with him, slew them when they were vanquished, and roofed a temple with their skulls. This was told by Bacchylides (as we learn from schol. Pind. *I.* 4. 92), probably in a lost part of this poem. Idas, having received a winged chariot (ὑπόπτερον ἄρμα. Apoll. 1. 7. § 8) from Poseidon, carried off Marpessa from her paternal home. Evenus pursued the couple; at the river Lycormas in Aetolia, finding that he could not overtake them, he slaughtered his horses, and drowned himself in the river, which thenceforth bore his name. Idas brought Marpessa to his home in Messene. Apollo came to take her from him. The undaunted hero bent his bow

against the archer-god; when Zeus intervened, and allowed Marpessa to take her choice. She chose Idas, fearing that her immortal lover might forsake her in her old age.

Here is the text of the fragment:—

Σπάρτα ποτ' ἐν[
ξανθαὶ Λακεδα[
τοιόνδε μέλος κ[
ὄτ' ἄγετο καλλιπα[
5 κόραν θρασυκαρ[
Μάρπησσαν ἰο[
φυγὼν θανάτου[
ἀναξίαλος Ποσι[
ἵππους τέ οἱ ἴσαν[
10 Πλευρῶν' ἐς εὐκτ[
χρυσάσπιδος νίο[

The restoration of the first five verses is easy, so far as their general sense is concerned (and that is all which we can hope to recover). They may have run somewhat as follows:—

Σπάρτα ποτ' ἐν [εὐρυχόρῳ v. Wilam.,
Headlam]
ξανθαὶ Λακεδαιμονίων
τοιόνδε μέλος κ[όραι ἄδον v. Wilam.]
ὄτ' ἄγετο καλλιπὰ[ρον Platt]
κόραν θρασυκάρδιος Ἰδας.

To restore verses 6-11 is more difficult. Three conditions of the problem must first be noted. (1) We must have a verb to which *Ποσειδᾶν* (*Ποσειδᾶν*) in v. 8 can be subject, and *ἵππους* in 9 object. (2) The place of *τε* shows that it cannot link this new sentence, in which Poseidon is subject, to the former sentence, in which Idas is subject and *ἄγετο* verb. *τε* must link *ἵππους* to another acc. (which may have either preceded or followed *ἵππους*); and this other acc. was probably that of a word denoting *chariot*. Cp. Pind. *O.* 1. 86 (in the parallel story of Pelops being aided by Poseidon to win Hippodameia from Oenomaus), τὸν μὲν ἀγάλλον θεὸς | ἔδωκεν δίφρον τε χρύσεον περὶοῖσιν τ' ἀκάμαντας ἵππους. (3) Whatever may have been the structure of the whole passage, *Πλευρῶν' ἐς εὐκτ[μέναν]* cannot go with *ἄγετο* in v. 4. It was to Peloponnesus, not to Pleuron, that Idas brought home Marpessa. Pleuron was near the river Evenus. Evenus figures in mythology as a king in Aetolia, great-grandson of Pleuron (Apoll. 1. 7. § 8). Pleuron is here manifestly the seat of Evenus, to which Idas went for the purpose of winning Marpessa. Simonides had, indeed, named Ὀρτυγίαν τὴν

ἐν Χαλκίδι (in Euboea) as the home from which Idas carried her off (schol. *Il.* 9. 556); but, in placing her home at Pleuron, B. was probably following the more generally current version. (4) Evenus was the son of Ares and Demonice (Apoll. *l.c.*). The last word in v. 11 was probably Ἀρῆος. We may now restore (*exempli gratia*) somewhat as follows:—

Μάρπησσαν ἰο[πλόκαμον],
φυγὼν θανάτου [τέλος, ὡς πόρε δίφρον]
ἀναξίαλος Ποσι[δᾶν]
ἵππους τέ οἱ ἰσαν[έμους· ὁ γὰρ ἐλθὼν]
Πλευρῶν' ἐς ἔκτ[υμέναν],
χρυσάσπιδος υἱὸ[ν Ἀρῆος]

The acc. υἱὸν (which euphony as well as the context makes more likely than υἱός) probably depended on a verb denoting some action of Idas of which Evenus was the object (*e.g.* ἤτησε κόραν). B.'s account of the manner in which Evenus had dealt with former suitors (schol. Pind. *I.* 4. 92) may have followed in connection with this passage.

The title of the poem in the MS. is ΙΔΑΣ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΙΣ. The corresponding ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙΣΙ in the title of XIX is shown by the internal evidence of that fragment to be right. Even though we assume that these titles can claim no older authority than that of an Alexandrian editor, we may well suppose that, if XX had come down entire, we should have found in it some internal evidence confirmatory of what the opening lines suggest,—that it was written for a Lacedaemonian festival, and presumably for a festival at Sparta. The Lacedaemonian maidens sang how Idas carried off Marpessa

from Pleuron—to what place? To Messenia, as the old legend of Μεσσήνιος Ἰδᾶς (Theocr. 22. 208) told? That is not likely. Pausanias (3. 13. 1) saw the tomb of Idas and Lynceus at Sparta. He remarks that one might have expected them to be buried in Messenia. [The tomb of their Messenian father Aphareus was the scene, in the old legend, of their death in conflict with the Dioscuri,—Lynceus perishing by the spear of Polydeuces, and Idas by the lightning of Zeus, Pind. *N.* 10. 66 ff.] But, adds Pausanias, the misfortunes of the Messenians, and their long exile from Peloponnesus, had dimmed their local traditions, and had made it possible 'for any people who were so disposed' to claim those traditions as their own. Ovid (*Fasti* V. 708) further illustrates this: he places the fatal encounter of the Apharetidae with the Dioscuri at *Aphidna*—not the Attic, but the Laconian: cp. Steph. Byz. Ἀφιδνα δῆμος Ἀττικῆς. ἔστι καὶ Λακωνικῆς, ὅθεν ἦσαν αἱ Λευκίππιδες (the maidens beloved by the Apharetidae). There can be little doubt, then, that in the ἐπιθαλάμιον of Idas and Marpessa, 'sung of yore at Sparta by the golden-haired maidens of Lacedaemon,' Lacedaemon was the home to which Idas brought home his bride. Simonides, if the schol. on *Il.* 9. 559 can be trusted, had made Idas a Lacedaemonian, but mentioned Arene in Messenia as the place to which Idas brought Marpessa. This fragment of Bacchylides has thus the mythological interest of affording the earliest testimony which we possess to the Spartan usurpation of the Messenian legend.

R. C. JEBB.

NOTES ON MACROBIUS.

FALLACY OF HOMONYMS.

ALL readers must concur in Eyssenhardt's eulogy on his predecessor: 'Ludovicus Ianius, cuius ingenti tot annorum diligentiae vix dici potest quantum debeant qui in Macrobio aut emendando aut enarrando versantur.'

It is only the more needful to warn students against occasional slips, even in so learned and vigilant a guide as L. Jan.

In book vii. c. 8, we read:

§ 9. Caecina subiecit: Dum de calore loquimur, admoneor rei quam semper quaesitu dignam putavi,

cur in Aegypto, quae regionum aliarum calidissima est, vinum non calida, sed, paene dixerim, frigida virtute nascatur? § 10. Ad hoc Diarius: Usu tibi, Albine, compertum est aquas quae vel de altis puteis vel de fontibus hauriuntur fumare hieme, aestate frigescere. . . . § 11. Quod ergo ubique alternatur varietate temporis, hoc in Aegypto semper est, cuius aer semper est in calore. Frigus enim ima petens vitium radicibus involvitur et talem dat qualitatem suco inde nascenti. Ideo regionis calidae vina calore caruerunt.

Here *vitium radicibus* is evidently 'vine-roots.' Yet Jan takes *vitium* as the nominative neuter of the second declension: