THE TEXT OF THE HOMERIC HYMNS.[1]

PART II.

In the first part of this dissertation an account was given of the MSS. which contain the Homeric Hymns, their families ascertained and an approximation made towards the character and ages of their archetypes. Our next step is to compare these four archetypes, *m x y* and *p*, among themselves, with the view of discovering if, and how, they are related to each other, and what is the intrinsic value of their respective traditions. To do this I examine the readings of each archetype in detail, judging each variant in its turn and comparing it with such examples as I can produce that illustrate its particular case. I endeavour to assign each variant to the category of correct original, independent variation, pure corruption, half-intentional correction, and intentional interpolation. Upon the totals of these different classes given by each archetype depends its character and value. It will be seen that I am a disbeliever in the *a priori* method of dealing with MS. tradition, the method which selects, whether on good or bad grounds, one family as the source of pure tradition and rejects the rest as doctored and vicious, calls their good readings corrections, and their additions interpolations. I see rather in the divergence of families the working of accident, incalculable and not to be formalized. I start from the scribe in his function as a copyist, bent on the production of a marketable article and with no Mephistophelian predisposition to pervert tradition, and I call in the first place, to explain variants, on the natural conditions that attend such a function, unconscious errors of eye and hand, semi-unconscious tricks of memory and association, conscious correction within slight limits and approximative to the clerical; these causes I endeavour to support by analogy, and only in the last resort and in the light of clear proof bring in the *kritische Thätigkeit* of the patient copyist. I believe therefore that families differ only in degree, that Providence has scattered survivals of the original over all of them, in unequal proportions, and that in short, regard being naturally had to the general character of a family, every particular case must be judged on its merits.

---

[1] As I send these sheets to press I receive, through the kindness of the writer, Dr. Hollander's tract *Ueber die neu bekannt gewordenen Handschriften der homerischen Hymnen*, Osnabrück 1895. I see on a first reading that the same view in essentials of the single MSS. and their relations is taken that I have expressed in Part I.

To illustrate the variations of these MSS. I have drawn largely on the MSS. of the Iliad and Odyssey, analogous documents whose history is on a larger scale that of the Hymns.   For the Odyssey I quote from Ludwich; on the Iliad I use, besides La Roche's material, my own unpublished collations of the Italian MSS.   I give below a list of the symbols by which I refer to them.[1a]

[1a] Laur.   1 = Laurenziana 31, 5.
Laur.   2 =   id.   32, 1.
Laur.   3 =   id.   32, 4.
Laur.   4 =   id.   32, 5.
Laur.   5 =   id.   32, 6.
Laur.   6 =   id.   32, 8.
Laur.   7 =   id.   32, 10.
Laur.   8 =   id.   32, 11.
Laur.   9 =   id.   32, 18.
Laur. 10 =   id.   32, 22.
Laur. 11 =   id.   32, 25.
Laur. 12 =   id.   32, 27.
Laur. 13 =   id.   32, 28.
Laur. 14 =   id.   32, 31.
Laur. 15 =   id.   32, 38.
Laur. 16 =   id.   32, 47.
Laur. 17 =   id.   91 sup. 1.
Laur. 18 =   id.   91 sup. 2.
Laur. 19 =   id.   Conv. soppr. 48.
Laur. 20 =   id.   Conv. soppr. 139.
M   1 = Milan (Ambrosiana) A 181 sup.
M   2 =   id.   B 39 sup.
M   3 =   id.   B 150.
M   4 =   id.   E 35 sup.
M   5 =   id.   F 101 sup.
M   6 =   id.   H 77 sup.
M   7 =   id.   I 4 sup.
M   8 =   id.   I 58 sup.
M   9 =   id.   I 98 inf.
M 10 =   id.   L 73 sup.
M 11 =   id.   L 117 sup.
M 12 =   id.   M 86 sup.
M 13 =   id.   E 56 inf.
Vat.   1 = Vaticani greci 26.
Vat.   2 =   id.   27.
Vat.   3 =   id.   28.
Vat.   4 =   id.   29.
Vat.   5 =   id.   30.
Vat.   6 =   id.   31.
Vat.   7 =   id.   50.

Vat.   8 =   id.   97.
Vat.   9 =   id.   902
Vat. 10 =   id.   903.
Vat. 11 =   id.   915.
Vat. 12 =   id.   1315.
Vat. 13 =   id.   1316.
Vat. 14 =   id.   1317.
Vat. 15 =   id.   1318.
Vat. 16 =   id.   1319.
Vat. 17 =   id.   1404.
Vat. 18 =   id.   1626.
Vat. 19 =   Palat.   6.
Vat. 20 =   id.   12.
Vat. 21 =   id.   150.
Vat. 22 =   id.   180.
Vat. 23 =   id.   310.
Vat. 24 =   Urbin.   136.
Vat. 25 =   id.   137.
Vat. 26 =   id.   138.
Vat. 27 =   Ottob.   58.
Vat. 28 =   id.   303.
Vat. 29 =   id.   342.
Vat. 30 =   Reg.   92.
Vat. 31 =   Pio II.   38.
Ven.   1 = Marc. 431.
Ven.   2 =   id.   455.
Ven.   3 =   id.   456.
Ven.   4 =   id.   458.
Ven.   5 =   id.   459a.
Ven.   6 =   id.   459b.
Ven.   7 =   id.   514.
Ven.   8 =   id.   612.
Ven.   9 =   id.   cl. ix. cod. 2.
Ven. 10 =   id.   cl. ix. cod. 16.
Ven. 11 =   id.   cl. ix. cod. 21.
Ven. 12 =   id.   cl. ix. cod. 25.
Ven. 13 =   id.   cl. ix. cod. 33.
Other signs are explained where they first occur.

The four archetypes differ in the following passages; insignificant errors are omitted.

		m	x	y	p
Ap.	19	πάντοσσ'	πάντοτος	—	πάντον
	21	πορτιτρόφον	id.	—	παντοτρόφον
	24	def. M	λιμένες	—	λίμνας
	46	def. M	σοι	—	om.
	ib.	def. M	γαιέων	—	γαιάων
	54	def. M	εὔβον	—	εὔβουν
	55	def. M	οἰσείς	πολλήν	οἰσείς
	57	def. M	full line	—	half line
	65	def. M	γ' ἐροίμην	—	γενοίμην
	71	def. M	ἴδης	—	ἴδη
	72	def. M	ἀτιμήσω	—	ἀτιμήσας
	78	ἀκηδέα χήτει λάων	id.	—	ἕκαστά τε φῦλα νεπού-δων
	82	ἔσται	ἐστίν	—	id.
	99	φραδμοσύνησ	φραδμοσύνη	—	id.
	110	ἀπὸ	ἀπἐκ	—	id.
	114	ἴθμαθ	ἴσμαθ'	(ἴδμαθ' or ἴθμαθ')	ἴσθμαθ'
	129	δεσμάτ'	id.	—	δεσμάσ'
	136, 7, 8	om.	om.	hab.	om.
	151	ἀθάνατος	ἀθανάτους	—	id.
	ib.	αἰεί	ἀνήρ	---	αἰεί
	152	οἱ τότ' ἐπαντία	id.	αἰεί	οἳ δὴ πότ' ἐπαντία
	162	κρεμβαλιαστὺν (ἢν M)	id.	βαμβαλιαστὺν	κρεμβαλιαστὺν (-σὺν Par.)
	176	δή	δη	—	δήν

	m	x	y	p
Ap. 192	ἀφραδέεσ	ἀμφαδέες	—	id.
198	ἀγανή	ἀγανή	—	id.
200	ἐν δ'	ἔνθʼ	—	id.
209	ὁππόταν ἱέμενος	ὅππος' ἀναοόμενος	—	id.
211	ἅμ' ἐρεχθεῖ	ἅμ' ἐρευθεῖ	ἀμαρύνθω	om.
216	πιερίην (? πετρίην M)	πιερίης		πιερίη
217	ἀγνήνας	μαργηίδας	μαργηίηας	μαργηίδιας
224	τέμμισον	τευμησσὸν		τελμησσὸν
227	ποτε	id.		τότε
233	οὐδὲ	id.		οἴδε
249	πολλοὶ	ἐνθάδ'		id.
272	προσάγοιεν	προάγοιεν		προσάγοιεν
284	ἐπικρέμαται	ὑποκρέμαται		ἐπικρέμαται
293	νηῶ	id.		βωμῷ
295	καλὰ	μακρὰ		id.
ib.	διηρεκές	διαμπερές		id.
306	τυφλόν (cum τε M)	id.		τυφάονα
308	ἤνεκ' ἄρα	εὖτ' ἄρα δὴ		id.
322	μητίσεαι	μήσεαι		ἔτι μήσεαι
325a (φράζεο νῦν)	om.	om.	hab.	om.
326	νῦν μέντοι ἔγωγʼ	μὲν τοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ	—	νῦν τουγὰρ ἐγὼ
339	ἐστιν. ὅσον	ἦ πόσσον	—	ἦ παρόσον
341	δὲ ἰδοῦσα	δ' ἐσιδοῦσα	—	id.
349	μῆνες	νύκτες	—	id.
350	ἐπιτελλομένου	περιτελλομένου	—	id.
352	θεοῖσι	βροτοῖσι	—	id.

	m	x	y	p
Ap. 366	ἀγνήσουσι	id.	—	ἀδυνήσουσι
402	οὔτις	ὅστις	—	id.
ib.	ἐπεφράσατο	ἐπιφράσατο	—	ἐπιφράσσατο
407	πρώτιστα	πρῶτα	—	id.
423	εὔκτιτον	εὐκτιμένον	—	id.
447	ἔμβαλ' ἑκάστω	εἷλεν ἕκαστον	—	id.
459	ἐπὶ	ποτὶ	—	id.
501	εἰς ὅτε	εἰς ὅκε	—	id.
515	ἐρατὸν	.. ατον	—	χρυσὴν (χαρίεν Athenaeus)
516	ῥήσσοντες	φρίσσοντες	ἄδυτον ζάθεον	id.
523	αὐτοῦ δάπεδον	id.	—	αὐτοῦ δάπεδον
Herm. 45	ἢ ὅτε	αἲ ὅτε	—	ἃς ὅτε
ib.	δυνηθῶσιν	id.	—	δυνηθῶσιν
ib.	ἀμαρυγαί	id.	ἀμάλδυναι	ἀμαρυγαί
59	ὀνομακλυτὸν	ὄνομα κλυτὸν	—	ὀνομακλυτὴν
ib.	ἐξονομάζον	ὀνομάζον	—	id.
65	ἆλτο	ὦτο	—	ὦρτο
82	νεοθηλέαν ἀγκαλαρήν	νεοθηλέος ἄγκαλον ὕλης	—	id.
86	αὐτοτροπήσας	αὐτοτρεπὴς ὣς	αὐτοτροπήσας	αὐτοτροπήσας
87	δέμων ἀνθοῦσαν	δόμον αἴθουσαν	—	id.
90	ἐπικάμπυλα ξύλα	ἐπικάμπυλος ὄμους	—	id.
91	πολὺ οἰνήσεις	πολυνοιμήσεις	—	id.
109	ἔναλλε	ἐπέλεψε	—	id.
110	ἄμπνυτο δὲ	ἀνὰ δ' ἄμπνυτο	—	id.
ib.	θυμὸς ἀυτμή	θερμὸς ἀυτμή	—	id.

	m	x	y	p
Herm. 119	ἐκκρίνας	ἐγκλίνων	—	id.
ib.	αἰῶνας	id.	—	αἰῶνος
120	πίονα	πίονι	—	id.
127	χαρμοφέρων	id.	—	χάρμα φέρων
132	ἐπεπείθετο	οἱ ἐπείθετο	—	id.
148	ἰθύσας	ἰθύνας	—	id.
152	περιγνύσι	id. (ὑγ.)	—	παρ᾽ ὑγνύσι
159	φέροντα	λαβόντα	—	id.
164	πολλὰ—ἄρμενα	παῦρα—αἴσυλα	—	id.
168	ἄπαστοι	id.	ἄλιστοι	ἄπαστοι (λ)
212	μῦθον ἀκούσας	φοῖβος ἀπόλλων	μῦθον ἀκούσας	φοῖβος ἀπόλλων
224	ἔλπομαι εἶναι	ἔστιν ὁμοῖα	ἔλπομαι εἶναι	ἔστιν ὁμοῖα
241	ἥδυμον	id.	id.	νήδυμον
ib.	δή ῥα νεόλλουτος προκα- λεύμενος ἥδυμον ὕπνον,	id.	θῆ ῥα νέον λοχάαον προ- καλεύμενος ἡδύ	δή ῥα νεόλλουτος κ.τ.λ.
248	ἐμπλείους	ἐκπλείους	id.	id.
254	λίκνω	κλίνη	λίκνω	id.
259	μετ᾽	ἐν		id.
280	ὡς	id.	τὸν	ὡς τὸν
288	ἀντήσεις ἀγέλῃσι βοῶν καὶ πώεσι μήλων	id.	ἄντην βουκολίοισι καὶ εἰροπόκοις ὄιεσσι	ἀντήσεις κ.τ.λ.
303	οἰωνοῖσι σὺ	οἰωνοῖσιν εὖ	—	οἰωνοῖσι σὺ
306	ἐελμένος	ἐλυμένος	—	id.
312	δέξο	id.	—	δέξαι
313	ἐρέευνεν	id.	—	ἐρέευνον
322	δὲ τέρθρον ἵκοντο	id.	δ᾽ ἵκοντο κάρηνα	id.

	m	x	y	p
Herm. 326	ποτὶ πτύχας οὐλύμποιο	id.	μετὰ χρυσόθρονον ἠῶ	ποτὶ πτύχας οὐλύμποιο
342	εὐθύπυλουδ'	εὐθυπόρουδ'	—	id.
352	πολὺν	μέγαν	—	id.
356	κατέρεξε	id.	—	κατέρξε
357	παλάμησεν	μάλ' ἄμησεν	—	id.
361	ἀλεγίζον	ἀλεγύνον	—	ἀλεείνον
366	ἑρμῆς δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρωθεν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπος ηὖδα	id.	ἑρμῆς δ' ἄλλον μῦθον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἔειπεν	ἑρμ. δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρωθεν ἀμ. ἐπ. ἦν.
368	ἀγορεύσω	καταλέξω	—	id.
371	νέον	id.	—	νέον γ'
385	φωρὴν	φωνὴν	—	id.
397	σπεύδοντε	σπεύδοντο	—	σπεύδοντε
401	ἐς	παρὰ	—	id.
402	ἐξήλαυνε	ἤλαυνε	—	id.
403	ἀπάνευθεν	ἀπάτερθεν	—	id.
422	hab.	om.	—	om.
431	ἅπαντες	ἕκαστος	—	id.
440	γενετῆς	γενεῆς	—	id.
451	ὕμνος	οἶμος	ὕμνος	οἶμος
457, 8	hab.	om.	—	om.
471	δέ	γε	τῶν	id.
473	καὶ	καὶ	—	καὶ
481	φιλοκυδέα	id.	—	φιλομειδέα
ib.	κῶμον	id.	—	χῶρον
486	φεύγουσα	φθέγγουσα	—	id.
501	νέρθεν	καλὸν	—	id.
502	σμερδαλόεν	ἱμερόεν	—	id.

	m	x	y	p
Herm. 503	καὶ ῥα	ἔνθα	—	id.
ib.	βόας	βόες	—	id.
ib.	κατὰ	ποτὶ	—	id.
507	τὰ μὲν	τὸ μὲν	—	id.
515	ἀνακλέψῃς	ἅμα κλέψῃς	—	id.
518	κατὰ μέγαν	μέγαν	—	id.
544	φωνή τ' ἠδε πότησι (M)	φωνὴ καὶ πτερύγεσσι	—	id.
552	σεμναὶ	μοῖραι	—	id.
557	ἀλέγυνεν	id.	—	ἀλέγευνεν
560	θυίοσι	θυίωσι	—	θύωσι
563	πειρῶνται δ'ἔπειτα παρὲξ ὁδὸν ἡγεμονεύειν	id.	ψεύδονται δ' ἤπ. δι' ἀλλήλων δενέουσαι	πειρῶνται κ.τ.λ.
Aphr. 8	γλαυκῶπιν	γλαυκῶπιδ'	—	id.
16	χρυσηλάκατον	χρυσήλατον	—	χρυσηλάκατον
18	πουλύχρυσα	καὶ γὰρ τῇ ἅδε	—	id.
20	πόλεις	πόλις	—	πόνος
66	κῆπον	κύπρον	—	id.
67	ῥίμφα	θοῶς	—	id.
71	παρδάλιες	id.	—	πορδάλιες
82	καὶ	id.	—	τε καὶ
84	θαύμαινεν	id.	—	θάμβαινεν
99	βήσεα	πείσεα	βήσεα	βήσεα
114	τρωὸς	τρωὸς	—	id.
118	χρυσηλακάτου	χρυσηλάτου	—	id.
132	μὲν	om.	—	om.
136 / 136a	hab.	hab.	—	{ οὔ σφιν ἀεικελίη γυνὴ / ἔσσομαι ἠὲ καὶ οὐκί }

	m	x	y	p
Aphr. 144	ἔρος	id.	—	ἔρως
146	ἀγορεύεις	id.	—	ἀγοράξεις
175	ἰοστεφάνου	εὐστεφάνου	—	id.
203	ἐνὸν	id.	—	ἐὸν
205	τετιμένον	τετιμένον	—	τετιμένος
214	ἴσα θεοῖσι	ἤματα πάντα	ἴσα θεοῖσι	ἤματα πάντα
244	τάχα	τάχα	κατὰ	τάχα
247	ἐν	μετ᾽	—	id.
279	γηθήσεις	id.	—	γηθήσαις
280	ἄξεις	id.	—	ἄξαις
ib.	νῦν	νῦν	—	id.
Aphr. vi. 9	ἄνθεμ᾽	id.	—	ἔνθεμ᾽
12	κοσμήσθην	κοσμίσθην	—	κοσμείσθην
18	ἰοστεφάνου	id.	—	ἐυστεφάνου
Dion. vii. 8	ἤγαγε	id.	—	ἧγε
37	φόβος	τάφος	φόβος	τάφος
Ares viii. 9	εὐθαρσέος	id.	εὐθαλέος	id.
Art. ix. 3	μέλητος	μελήτης	—	μιλήτης
Aphr. x. 3	θέει	φέρει	—	id.
4	μάκαιρα κυθήρης	θεὰ σαλαμῖνος	—	id.

	m	x	y	p
Dem. xiii. 2	περσεφόνειαν	φερσεφόνειαν	—	id.
Mat. de. xiv. 3	κροτάλων	id.	—	κροτάλη
ib.	τυμπάνων	id.	—	τυπάνον
ib.	βρόμος	τρόμος	—	βρόμος
6	θ'	δ'	—	id.
Heracl. xv. 4	ῥὰ ἠμὲν	πρὶν μὲν	—	id.
5	πημαίνετ', ἀεθλεύων κραταιός	πομπῇσιν· ὑπ' εὐρυσθῆος ἄνακτος	—	id.
6	ἔξοχα ἔργα	πολλὰ δ' ἀνέτλη	—	id.
Asclep. xvi. 3	δοτίω	id.	—	δοτίνω
Pan xix. 7	—	κάρηνα	κέλευθα	id.
24	—	λυγκὸς	—	λυγγός
26	—	θαλέων	—	θαλέθον
48	—	λίσομαι	ἵαμαι	λίσομαι
Poseid. xxii. 1	—	θεὸν	—	θεὸν
Hest. xxix. 3	—	ἔλαχε	—	ἔλαχες
Ge xxx. 8	—	πέρ ἐστι	—	πάρεστι
14	—	περσεανθέσιν	—	παρ' εὐανθέσιν
Sel. xxxii. 6	—	ἀκτῖρες	—	ἀκτῖνες
Diosc. xxxiii. 14	—	ἀέλλας	—	ἀέλλαι

Upon casting up this table it appears that x and p agree against m in 85 cases, m and x against p in 41, and m and p against x in 7. Without relying too strongly on these figures we may conclude that x and p agree in about twice as many cases as those in which they differ, and that therefore they are about twice as near each other as m is to the nearer of them (x). This result of counting agrees with what one would have expected from the palpable fact that xp omit the Demeter Hymn while m has it.

y, seeing that we have it quoted only where it differs from x, agreed presumably in the main with x. Otherwise of the 30 recorded divergences from x, 15 are peculiar to y, 5 are common to both m and p, 5 to m only, and 5 to p only. As regards m and p therefore, y is half-way between them.

The general relationship of the archetypes is therefore settled. We proceed to investigate their intrinsic value. I begin with the family reputed least good, p.

Ap. 19. πάντων p, πάντως x, πάντοσσ' M. Πάντως is fixed by 207, besides being a good Homeric word. The reason for the existence of πάντων is hard to find. Cf. however Solon iv. 29 Bergk πάντως, -ων, -ας, Theognis 26 πάντεσσ', -ως, -ας. The coincidence with the disturbance in M is curious.

21. παντοτρόφον p, πορτιτρόφον mx. We cannot suppose that the scribe of p shared Gemoll's opinion as to the inappropriateness of πορτι-τρόφον. His reading is a graphical corruption, beginning with the vowel (so πόρδαλις, πάρδαλις N 103, P 20, Φ 573, δ 457), followed by the usual change of ν for ρ (see p. 174). As to the reading to be adopted, there can be no doubt that Gemoll is over-nice. The fact that in an enumeration of the properties of Ithaca that island is called βούβοτος is nothing against the propriety of πορτιτρόφος as an *epithetum ornans* of continent opposed to islands. Even in Odysseus' case all his oxen and part of his sheep and goats are ἐν ἠπείρῳ (ξ 100), and the only beef the suitors get is carried over by πορθμῆες with Philoetius (υ 186).

24. λίμνας τε θαλάσσης p, λιμένες x (def. M). Λίμνη is found in the sense of sea in Homer, see Lexx., but not with a genitive of θάλασσα. It may be a graphical corruption from λιμένες, ε and ες abbreviated. Hardly a pure conjecture.

32. ἀγχίαλος Πεπάρηθος p, ἀγχιάλη x (def. M). p is very probably right; B 640 χαλκίδα τ' ἀγχίαλον, 697 ἀγχίαλόν τ' ἀντρῶνα (ἀγχιάλην Zenod.), Theocr. xxv. 65 Ἑλίκης ἐξ ἀγχιάλοιο, Ap. Rhod. iv. 425 δίῃ ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ.

The laws as to the number of terminations of adjectives in verse are loose, cf. Lobeck *Paralip.* p. 474 *sq.*, Kühner-Blass § 147 esp. p. 538. As the MSS. in the Hymns vary considerably, I give in a table nine places where the question arises:

Ap. 32 ἀγχιάλη Πεπάρηθος x ἀγχίαλος p (def. M).
ib. 181 Δήλοιο περικλύστου m περικλύστης xp.
ib. 251 ἀμφιρύτους κατὰ νήσους m ἀμφιρύτας xp.

T 2

Herm. 124 καταστυφέλη ἐνὶ πέτρη m καταστυφέλω *xp.*

ib.   209 βουσὶν ἐυκραίρησιν mx ἐυκραίροισιν *p.*

ib.   272 βουσὶ μετ' ἀγραύλησι m ἀγραύλοισι *xp.*

ib.   412 ἀγραύλησι βόεσσιν mx ἀγραύλοισι *p.*

Aphr. 39, 50 καταθνητῇσι γυναιξί mx καταθνητοῖσι *p.*[2]

The MSS. give the masculine termination as against the feminine in this proportion; M in 2 cases (out of 8), *x* in two (out of 9), *p* in 6 (out of 9). Metre, to which Lobeck *l.c.* is willing to allow a large influence, does not, it will be noticed, enter into any of these instances. Itacism on the other hand probably does, at least into genders turning upon η and οι, and the inconstancy of *x* at *Herm.* 272, 412 is noticeable in this connection. The several lines will be best noticed as they occur.

42. πόλεις *p*, πόλις *x* (def. M). Possibly mere itacism, possibly an expression of a view with regard to μερόπων. If μερόπων is a simple adjective then both Cos and Miletus may stand in apposition to πόλις, if Μερόπων is a proper name then only Cos. Cf. Peppmüller, *Philol.* 1884 p. 196.

54. εὔβουν *p*, εὔβων *x* (def. M). The same variant H 238 βῶν Aristarchus, codd. plerique; βοῦν Aristophanes, ' L '[3] L₁₁, ₁₄ B₁,[4] Mc,[5] Pa,[6] Pe.[7]

59. δηρὸν ἄναξ εἰ βόσκοις *p*, full line *x*,[8] (def. M). The scribe of *p*, both careless and ignorant, simply omitted what he was unable to read. The Stoll-Cobet restoration βοσκήσεις θ' οἵ κε σ' ἔχωσι is supported by the parallel case of the Delphians (536, 7). Both oracles, naturally barren spots, are to be maintained χειρὸς ἀπ' ἀλλοτρίης, by the *forestiere*.

65. γενοίμην *p*, γ' ἐροίμην *x* (def. M). Γενοίμην is obviously right, and preserves the tradition; γ' ἐροίμην, as we have seen (Part I. p. 174), is a common minuscule error.

71. ἴδη *p*, ἴδης *x* (def. M). 72 ἀτιμήσας *p*, ἀτιμήσω *x* (def. M). The fixed point in this passage is given by 71, where ἴδη must be right and ἴδης wrong. 'Ατιμήσω seems to have been altered to suit ἴδης, see p. 269; ἀτιμήσῃ is a fifteenth century conjecture. In the absence of M therefore the original seems to be *p*'s ἀτιμήσας, and this though ungraceful should be read. The second participle καταστρέψας goes closely with ὥσῃ and almost = καταστρέψῃ καὶ ὥσῃ. M 113 *sq.* is somewhat parallel.

78. ἕκαστά τε φῦλα νεπούδων *p*, ἀκηδέα χήτει λαῶν mx. The accepted view is probably right, that *p* composed this hemistich to fill the place of ἀκηδέα χήτει λαῶν, though it is difficult to understand what confusion or lacuna can have justified *p* in doing so. At v. 59 *p* omitted a hemistich, apparently on similar grounds; here he fills the gap. Errors of ου for ο in compounds of πούς are frequent (*e.g.* in ἀρτίπος I 505, θ 310, cf. νηλίπους and νηλίπος), but in this case ου is fixed by the metre and must have been

---

[2] H 32, ὑμῖν ἀθανάτῃσι, the MSS. are about equally divided between ῃσι and οισι. Zenodotus read the fem.

[3] MSS. taken from editions are distinguished by inverted commas.

[4] *i.e.* Barberini i. 161.

[5] Monte Cassino S 94.

[6] Parma H H ii. 27.

[7] Perugia E 48.

[8] See Part I. p. 165.

original. Possibly πουλύποδες in 77 suggested the form. It would be interesting if our knowledge of Byzantine phonetics permitted a guess at the century when such a conjecture was possible.

129. δεσμάσ' *p*, δεσμάτ' *mx*, δεσματ' *J*, δέσματ' *KS*. The plural of δεσμός in the Hymns is δεσμά, as shown by *Herm.* 157, 409, *Dion.* vii. 12, 13 where there are no variants. (On the other hand *a* 204 δέσματ' ἔχῃσι.) Δεσμά σ' therefore is probably right here, and should be read; the accent which remains on δεσμάτ' in *mx* points to an incomplete correction; the later MSS. KS carried the alteration a step farther.

152. οἳ δὴ πότ' ἐπαντία *p*, οἳ τότ' *mx*. The reading of *p* seems to be due to the incorporation of a variant οἳ δὴ, of which ποτ' possibly represents τότ' the reading of *mx*, corrupted. For the process cf. 215 ἀπόλλωνος for ἀπολλων.

159. αὖθις *p*, αὖτις *mx*. A common variant, generally considered less correct, so Α 27, Γ 36, 440, Ε 697, Λ 567, etc.

171. See *infra* p. 275.

176. ἐπιδὴν *p*, δὴ *mx*. Δὴν and δὴ are variants κ 160, where Zenodotus and the second hand of 'U' (Monac. 519 B s. xiv.) read δήν. The difference however may be purely graphical.

178. ὑμνῶν *p*, ὑμνέων *mx*. Coalescence of resolved syllables is one of the most usual signs of a careless scribe; cf. ἀφ' ὑμῶν 171, σφας 460, χρυσοῦ *Sel.* xxxii. 6; in M cf. *Ap.* 263, *Herm.* 542.

211. *p* omits the verse, from *homoeoarchon.*[9] Its archetype naturally had it.

215. ἀπόλλωνος *p*, ἄπολλον *mx*. 'Απόλλωνος of course is unmetrical, and arises, I imagine, from an original error ἀπόλλων, corrected into the vocative thus, ἀπόλλων; this *o* was then taken as a termination, = ος.

216. πιερίη *p*, πιερίης *x*, πετρίην *M*. On the accusative in this construction see La Roche, *Hom. Studien* p. 118; it is recommended by the corruption (graphical, see p. 144) in the earlier part of the word in M. The dative and genitive are corrections with a grammatical object.

224. τελμησσὸν *p*, τευμησσὸν *x*, τέμμισον *m*. The form τευμησσὸν is established by Strabo 409, Steph. Byz. *s.v.* and the passage there quoted from Antimachus, who derives the name from τευμήσσατο. *m* and *p* are attempts to help the metre after υ had fallen out, *m* perhaps with a reminiscence of τεμέσην *a* 184.

227. πω τότε *p*, πώποτε *mx*. ποτε is a common error, cf. 152.

233. οἱ δὲ *p*, οὐδὲ *mx*. οὐδὲ is a corruption, possibly intended in *m* to go with its reading κρατέουσιν (cf. p. 277). The same variation *Aphr.* 139 is confined to AQ.

272. προάγοιεν, *xm*, προσάγοιεν *p*. A corruption from misreading πρ, that arose independently in *x* and *m*. Not a correction.

---

⁹ I may perhaps be permitted to coin this word, the natural correlative of homoeoteleuton.

293. βωμῶ *p*, νηῶ *mx*. I am unable to account for this singular corruption; ζ 162 where βωμῷ is the original Ludwich quotes ναῷ from Plut. *de sollert. anim.* 283 E, η 100 for βωμῶν we find the variants πύργων and βουνῶν.

306. τυφάονα *p*, τυφλόν *mx* (τε add. *m*). Corruption in *mx* from which *p* happens to be free; cf. 352 where the readings are τυφάονα *xp*, τυφῶνα *m*. One sees how accidental variants are, and also that when *x* and *p* diverge it is upon a point of uncial confusion.

322. ἔτι μήσεαι *p*, μήσεαι *x*, μητίσεαι *m*. Ἔτι no doubt is a correction based upon λ 474 and does credit to the scribe of *p*. The common archetype of *xp* had μήσεαι, a simple uncial corruption from MHTICΔI, TI coalescing to give H. Cf. p. 279.

339. ἢ παρόσον *p*, ἢ πόσσον *x*, ἐστιν. ὅσον, M. On this passage see p. 279. The original reading of *xp* seems to have been HOCON, which produced πόσον to avoid the hiatus, and afterwards παρόσον and πόσσον alike to save the metre.

356. αἴσιον *p*, αἴσιμον *mx*. A simple confusion with the more common word αἴσιος. Cf. *Herm.* 516, p. 294.

366. ἀδινήσουσι *p*, ἀγινήσουσι *mx*. A graphical corruption, and not a common one; cf. Ap. Rhod. ii. 240 ἀγινὸν 'L' for ἀδινόν.

403. παντόσ' *p*, πάντοθ' *mx*. Παντόσ[ε] seems better than πάντοθ[ε] of which there is no clear example in Homer. *V.* Lexx.

515. χρυσῆν *p*, ἐρατὸν *m*,...ατὸν *x*, χαρίεν Athenaeus 22 C. I am unable to see that χρυσῆν is necessarily a correction : *m* and *x* (originally) indeed both read ἐρατόν, but χαρίεν which goes back to the second century A.D. is enough to show that other readings were then in existence, and χρυσῆν may be a survivor of one of these. The lacuna in *x* is an accident confined to that family. An example of a *real* correction of...ατὸν is at once to hand in ἀγατὸν the conjecture of At D, accepted by Demetrius Chalcondyles.

Herm. 45. ἃς ὅτε *p*, αἲ ὅτε *x*, ἢ ὅτε *m*. The original of this passage is as hard to recover as that of *Ap.* 339, see below p. 279. The readings of *p* and *x* are certainly both corruptions, and that of *p* is the deeper. What can ἃς have meant to the scribe? hardly an accusative; did he intend it for ὡς?

59. ὀνομακλυτὴν ὀνομάζων *p*, ὀνομακλυτὸν ὀνομάζων *x*, ὀνομακλυτὸν ἐξονομάζων *m*. An attempt of *p* to make ὀνομακλυτόν, the υ in which was to him long, metrical. Cf. E 55, 491, 578 *al.*

67. φηληταί. I collect the MS. variants on this word as it appears in the Hymn to Hermes.

67.	φηληταὶ *xp*	φιληταὶ *m*.
175.		φιλητέον *m*, φιλητεύων *xp*.
214.	φηλωτὴν *p*	φιλήτην *mx* (φιλοτὴν E).
292.	φηλιτέων *p*	φιλητέων *mx*.
446.	φηλητὰ *p*	φιλητὰ *mx*.

It will be seen that p has at least its full share of the correct φη- spellings. It would be easy to ascribe the variants to itacism, but that the φιλ- spelling prevailed in antiquity ; so Herodian and Trypho *ap.* Choerobosc. *An. Ox.* ii. p. 2712 derive it from ὑφειλέτης, κατὰ ἀφαίρεσιν τοῦ ῦ καὶ τοῦ ε̄ καὶ ἐκτάσει τοῦ ε̄ εἰς η̄. Hes. Opp. 375 the MSS. are divided as here. Aesch. *Choeph.* 999 the Laur. has φιλήτης and Eur. *Rhesus* 217 the Venetus and the other MSS., but in Photius the words φηλοῦν· ἀπατᾶν, φιλώματα[*sic*]· ἐξαπάτας follow in the series φη-. Archilochus (*fr.* 46) is quoted by Eustathius (*Od.* 1889, 1 *sq.*) as using the word (spelled by Eust. naturally φιλήτᾳ), Seneca (*Ep.* v. 11, 13) makes the curious statement about its origin 'latronum more quos φιλήτας *Aegyptii vocant.*' Brunck's φηλήτης ὁ ἔρως καλοῖτ' ἂν ὄντως *Anth. Pal.* v. 308 is very probable for ψιλλησστὴς of the MSS. On the derivation see Vaniček, p. 1192.

119. δι' αἰῶνος τε τορήσας p, δι' αἰῶνας mx. Gemoll's objection to τε is well founded : the original was probably δι αἰῶν' ἀ ν τ ι τ ο ρ ή σ α ς, *i.e.* διαιωνᾱτιτορησας, which divided wrongly gave διαιῶνα τιτορήσας and the successive corrections δι' αἰῶνας and δι' αἰῶνος τε τορήσας. p again is furthest off. For ἀντιτορεῖν cf. 178, 283, E 337, K 267; for the misdivision cf. ἀτιτάλλετο *Herm.* 400, p. 291.

127. χάρμα φέρων p, χαρμοφέρων mx. Again p is a step further off the original, which no doubt is Barnes' χαρμόφρων.

152. παρ' ἰγνύσι p, περιγνύσι m, περ' ἰγνύσι x. Παρ' is probably an alteration of p's, cf. *Ge* xxx. 7, 14, I 336 παριαύων, περ ἰαύων 'G Mor.' L$_{18}$, Ven.$_6$, Vat.$_{12, 13, 15, 18, 23}$. *ib.* 198. περ ἀχαιῶν, παρ' ἀχαιῶν 'L' Vat.$_{9, 23}$, M$_4$. The phrase περ' ἰγνύσι, which has been attacked, is well defended by Theocr. xxv. 242 περ' ἰγνύῃσιν ἔλιξε | κέρκον, where similar variants occur (see Ziegler).

209. εὐκραίροισιν p, εὐκραίρησι mx. For εὔκραιρος with two terminations cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 304 εὐκραίρῳ βοί. The reading of p therefore is not necessarily itacistic or a correction. See *ante*, p. 261.

241. νήδυμον p, ἥδυμον mx. id. 449. In neither place is νήδυμον possible, and we must admit it to be a correction. The two words are occasionally interchanged; no variants on νήδυμος are reported in the Iliad, nor on *Ap.* 171, *Pan* xix. 16; in the Odyssey however ἥδυμον is read δ 793 by 'P²,' μ 311 by 'PG²,' the form being in both cases metrically possible.

312. δέξαι πὰρ p, δέξο παρὰ mx. A mistake on the part of p, but how far conscious it is hard to say. Variations between -αι and -ο in verbs are frequent, cf. *Ap.* 146 under m, p. 275.

313. ἐρέεινον p, ἐρέεινεν mx. The plural is obviously right, and there is no reason why we should call it a correction. The singular of mx is an easy error, arising from the 'nearer subject.'

342. δῖα p, δοιά mx. Which of these two forms is an itacistic corruption from the other will depend on the view taken of the passage in general. I do not admit the necessity of Barnes' τοῖα ; and in this case δῖα will seem more original than δοιά which, though Ilgen printed it, is plainly impossible. Read therefore δῖα, πέλωρα.

356. κατέερξε p, κατέρεξε mx. The reading of p is right, and similar confusions between the tenses of ἔργειν, ἔρδειν occur E 650, I 535.

361. ἀλεείνων p, ἀλεγύνων x, ἀλεγίζων m. 557. ἀλέγεινεν p, ἀλέγυνεν mx. Ἀλεγύνων seems established by ἀγλαίας ἀλέγυνε 476 where there is no variant. The two variants of p are cases of itacism, with in one of them (ἀλεείνων) a slight conjecture to make a possible word.

371. νέον γ᾽ ἐπιτελλομένοιο p, νέον mx. The addition of γ᾽ is a metrical conjecture, which occurred independently to the scribe of D. See in general p. 275, Ap. 157.

386. κραταιῶ p, κρατερῷ mx. Gloss, or perhaps corruption (ρ dropping out); the reverse process Λ 119, and m on 265.

402. ἤλαυνε p, ἐξήλαυνε mx. Accidental omission, cf. 59 ὀνομάζων px. ἐξονομάζων m.

412. ἀγραύλοισι p, ἀγραύλῃσι mx. Ἀγραύλοισι is probably right, cl. 492 where there is no variant, and 272 where only m has -ῃσι. Apollonius iv. 1341 ἄγραυλοι without variant; more exx. in the Lexx. See in general ante, p. 261.

478. ἑταῖρον p, ἑταίρην mx. Due probably to assonance with λιγύφωνον.

481. φιλομειδέα χῶρον p, φιλοκυδέα κῶμον mx. The adjectives are about on a level. Φιλομειδής is not found without a double μ earlier than Paul. Silentiarius Anth. Pal. vi. 66, 10 ἐνθάδε Καλλιμένης φιλομειδέσιν ἄνθετο Μούσαις cf. ix. 524. 22, though it would be rash to tie the writer of this hymn down to such a rule. Φιλοκυδής appears to occur elsewhere only in 375, φιλοκυδέος ἥβης, and is a less good epithet of κῶμος. Either word may have been derived from the other, by itacistic change of ει and υ, then graphical change of κ and μ. I cannot account for χῶρον.

530. ἀκήραον p, ἀκήριον mx (ἀκήραον L). No variants are quoted on ἀκήριος in the Odyssey, but the reading of L shows that ἀκήραος was a natural error, perhaps caused by reminiscences of ἀκήρατος, ἀκηράσιος.

540. πιφάσκειν p, πιφαύσκειν mx. A very common phonetic error, cf. p. 289.

560. θύσωσι p, θυίσωσι x, θυίωσι m. The commonest of phonetic errors, cf. merely γύων for γυίων 20, Apollonius iii. 685 θῦεν ' L. Guelf.' ; contra v. 85 θυῖε ' M ' for θῦε, cl. χ 309, Λ 180.

ib. ἐδωδυῖαι p, ἐδηδυῖαι mx. Apparently a graphical confusion of ω for η ; cf. φηλωτήν, φηλητήν 214, Κ 252 παρώχωκεν, παρώχηκεν.

Aphr. 16. χρυσηλάκατον mp, χρυσήλατον x. 118 χρυσηλάτου xp, χρυσηλακάτου m, Art. xxvii. 1 χρυσηλάκατον omnes. Here we have two passages where p goes wrong against one where it is right. Probably therefore χρυσηλάκατον in this line is not a correction but the original reading, and in χρυσήλατον χρυσηλάτου a syllable has accidentally fallen out. No variants are recorded in the Iliad and Odyssey.

20. πόνος p, πόλις x, πόλεις m. Πόλις, as Gemoll observes, is surprising in the sing., and feeling the difficulty m made πόλεις. Πόνος is a graphical

corruption; Π 726 in the phrase ἀμ πόνον ἀνδρῶν, πόλιν is read by L₁₈ Vat.₄, ₂₇.

39. κατὰ θνητοῖσι *p*, κατὰ θνητῆσι *mx*, id. 50. The feminine καταθνητή does not occur in Homer; the masc. form is therefore probably a correction conscious or unconscious of *p*. On his tendency to this formation see p. 261.

71. πορδάλιες *p*, παρδάλιες (def. M). A usual and ancient variation in the spelling of this word. Aristarchus preferred παρδ-; N 103, P 20 the MSS. are about equally divided, πορδ- is in the text of the Ven. A.

82. τε καὶ *p*, καὶ (def. M). A correction to save the quantity of καὶ before εἶδος; Ruhnken accepted it, and *Art.* xxvii. 22 ὑμέων καὶ ἄλλης, Wolf's τε is usually inserted. For the reverse cf. Λ 528 ἵππους τε καὶ ἄρμ', where τε is omitted by ' L ' Vat.₂₃, M₁, ₁₀.

84. θάμβαινεν *p*, θαύμαινεν *x* (def. M). Θαμβαίνειν does not occur, and is probably a phonetic corruption.

136, 136a. οὔ σφιν ἀεικελίη γυνὴ ἔσσομαι ἠὲ καὶ οὐκί *p*, οὔ σφιν ἀεικελίη νυὸς ἔσσομαι ἀλλ' εἰκυῖα | εἴ τοι ἀεικελίη γυνὴ ἔσσομαι ἠὲ καὶ οὐκί *mx*. A typical instance of mechanical contamination; both lines stood in the archetype of *p*, the scribe's eye wandered from one ἀεικελίη to the other. This the commentators have recognized.

146. ἀγοράζεις *p*, ἀγορεύεις *mx*. A sheer misguided correction in *p*, ἀγοράζειν does not occur in Homer. Cf. ἀλεγίζων in *m Herm.* 361 for ἀλεγύνων.

174. ηὗρε *p* {βῦρε *a* / ηῦρε *b*} κῦρε *m*. This typical uncorrected graphical corruption in *p* and *x* shows how little deliberate purpose works among MSS.

203. ἥρπασ' ἐὸν *p*, ἥρπασ' ἐνὸν *x*, αἰνὸν *m*. The mere omission of ν ἐφελκυστικὸν has produced this variant in *p*. It is curious that in the other families the same letter has been incorporated with the next word, and in M an itacism has supervened to give an additional disguise. Hermann no doubt was right in establishing ὃν.

218. χρυσόθρονον *p*, χρυσόθρονος *mx*. Semi-conscious correction in *p*, influenced by the neighbourhood of Τίθωνον and ἐπιείκελον.

245. τ' *p*, γ' *mx*. Homeric usage shows τ' to be right; γ' is naturally a common graphical mistake.

279. γηθήσαις *p*, γηθήσεις *mx*, 280 ἄξαις *p*, ἄξεις *mx*. Possibly simple itacism, otherwise a correction of optative for future is of extremely common occurrence, *e.g.* H 129, I 251.

Aphr. vi. 9. ἔνθεμ' *p*, ἄνθεμ' *mx*. Ἄνθεμον is established by the adjective ἀνθεμόεις and Pindar's ἄνθεμα χρυσοῦ besides by later use; ἔνθεμ' must be an alteration based upon ignorance of the rare word.

18. εὐστεφάνου Κυθερείης *p*, ἰοστεφάνου *mx*, *Aphr.* 175 ἐυστεφάνου *xp*, ἰοστεφάνου *m*. *Aphr.* 6 ἐυστεφάνου, 288 ἐυστεφάνῳ without variant. It may well be, and has been by all commentators, doubted whether ἐυστέφανος or ἰοστέφανος be the more fitting epithet of Aphrodite; I incline to side with Hollander (p. 13 n.) and Gemoll in favour of ἐυστ., but without joining with Baum. in condemning the 'levitas' of *m*, which is at least consistent in

reading ἰοστ.; rather does *x* exhibit light conduct in wavering between the two words. Ἐυστέφανος is the Homeric epithet, ἰοστέφανος we have as early as Solon *fr.* 19, 4, Theognis 250, 1304, 1332, 1383; in Simonides *fr.* 52 the two words again are variants (ἰοστεφάνου 'B,' ὀϊστεφάνου 'PQ,' εὐστεφάνου 'VL ').

Dion. vii. 8. ἦγε *p*, ἤγαγε *mx*. In *mx* a syllable has been doubled.

Mater deor. xiv. 3. κροτάλη *x*, κροτάλων *mx*. Κροτάλων has been assimilated to ἰαχή in *p*; the scribe no doubt considered κροτάλη a nominative.

ib. τυπάνων *p*, τυμπάνων *mx*. Τυπάνων is right and not a correction; in *mx* a confusion occurred with the more familiar word, as Apollonius i. 1139 both 'L' and 'Guelf.' have τυμπάνων where it is unmetrical, and in *Anth. Pal.* vi. 165, 5 (a passage modelled on this) βαρὺν τυπάνου βρόμον, Suidas quotes τυμπάνων.

Asclep. xvi. 3. δωτίνω *p*, δωτίω *mx*. Semi-conscious alteration in *p*, with reminiscence of δωτίνη. Δωτίῳ is fixed by Hesiod *ap.* Strabo 442, 647, and Simonides *fr.* 30.

Pan xix. 26. θαλέθων *p*, θαλέων *x* (def. M). The theta has dropped out in *x* from the greater familiarity of θαλέων; the same process may be seen at ψ 91, Apollonius ii. 843 ('Guelf.').

Ath. xxviii. 10. ὀβρίμης *p*, ὀμβρίμης *x* (def. M). Here for once *p* has the more correct spelling. The variation is perpetual in the Iliad and Odyssey.

Hest. xxix. 3. ἔλαχες *p*, ἔλαχε *x* (def. M). The second person is surely right, and the third a correction; φέρβει xxx. 2 is not parallel, for there Γαῖα is addressed in the third person while here we have Ἑστίη in the vocative and σοῦ v. 4. Cf. the invocations Ἄρτεμις ἢ θαλάμους τοὺς ὀρέων ἔλαχες Anth. Pal. vi. 240, 2, ἤ τε Σάμου μεδέουσα καὶ ἢ λάχες Ἴμβρασον Ἥρη id. 243, 1.

Ge xxx. 8. πάρεστι *p*, περ ἐστι *x* (def. M). Πάρεστι though no doubt coinciding with the original seems a real correction; otherwise it is hard to explain περ ἐστι. Cf. v. 14, *Herm.* 152, *ante*.

ib. 14. παρ' εὐανθέσιν *p*, περεσανθέσιν *x* (def. M). This also is a case of correction in *p*; cf. below p. 271.

Selene xxxii. 6. ἀκτῖνες *p*, ἀκτῆρες *x* (def. M). *x*'s error seems inexplicable, but there is no reason to suppose it was originally common to *p*.

Diosc. xxxiii. 14. ἄελλαι *p*, ἀέλλας *x* (def. M). Apparently the scribe of *p* took κατέπαυσαν as intrans. = κατεπαύσαντο (as παύσειεν *Dem.* 351), and altered ἀέλλας to suit his view.

On counting up these passages it will be found that among some seventy variants peculiar to *p*, eleven are conjectures (*Ap.* 59, 78, 322, 339, *Herm.* 127, 241, *Aphr.* 146, *Aphr.* vi. 9, *Ge* xxx. 8, 14, *Diosc.* xxxiii. 14), seventeen are half-conscious conjectures (*Ap.* 19, 152, 216, 224, 356, *Herm.* 45, 59, 119, 312, 361, 386, 402, 530, *Aphr.* 39, 82, *Mat. de.* xiv. 3, *Asclep.* xvi. 3), one is an independent reading (*Ap.* 515), twenty-one are original (*Ap.* 32, 65, 71,

129, 227, 233, 272, 306, 403, *Herm.* 67, 209, 214, 292, 313, 412, 446, *Aphr.*
245, *Dionys.* vii. 8, *Mat. de.* xiv. 3, *Pan* xix. 26, *Ath.* xxviii. 10, *Hest.* xxix. 3,
Selen. xxxii. 6); the remaining twenty-three are phonetic and graphical
blunders, but to these have to be added the long list already given
Pt. I. p. 174.

I proceed to examine *x*.

Ap. 71. ἴδης *x* (def. M), ἴδη *p*. Ἴδης 2 pers. is obviously wrong; the
two forms ἴδη, ἴδης are exchanged, but in circumstances where either of them
is possible, A 203, Γ 163, Δ 205; we must suppose that the scribe of *x*,
under the influence of some similar association, wrote ἴδης for ἴδη, and then
altered ἀτιμήσας into ἀτιμήσω (72, which he meant for aor. med.) to suit it.
I think this more likely than that, with Hollander p̈. 10, ἀτιμήσω is a
survival of ἀτιμήσων.

151. ἀνὴρ *x*, αἰεὶ *mx*. Ἀνήρ does not stand in any graphical relation
to αἰεί, and we must suppose it to be a correction of *x*, introduced, after ὅς
in 152 had become οἰ, to provide a subject for φαίη.

174. ἡμέτερον *x*, ὑμέτερον *mp*. Gemoll is plainly wrong in preferring
ἡμέτερον; the maidens are to establish the poet's fame, by talking of him to
tourists, in return he will carry *their* fame wherever he goes [as he actually
does in the Hymn]. There is the same notion of a bargain, but reversed, at
θ 496, 7. Ἡμέτερον is far from being the 'bessere Ueberlieferung'; it is an
itacismus purus putus.

211. ἄμ' ἐρευθεῖ *x*, ἄμ' ἐρεχθεῖ *m*, ἀμαρύνθω *y* (def. *p*). The original,
and the relative value of these three readings is quite uncertain. See
p. 276, n. 12.

216. πιερίης *x*, πιερίην *m*, πιερίη *p*. A correction in *x*, as in *p*:
cf. p. 263.

224. τευμησσὸν *x*, τέμμισον *m*, τελμησσὸν *p*; *x* alone is right, the
other ll. are corrections : cf. p. 263.

284. ὑποκρέμαται *x*, ἐπικρέμαται *mp*. Ὑποκρέμαται is not found,
and its origin in *x* is hard to explain, unless it was suggested by ὕπερθεν and
ὑποδέδρομε. I may observe in passing that little use can be made in criticism
of confusions between abbreviations; those for ἐπὶ and ὑπὸ are absolutely
unlike.

322. μήσεαι *x*, μητίσεαι *m*, ἔτι μήσεαι *p*. *x* presents its original
unaltered, while *p* has emended it, cf. p. 264, and v. 515.

339. ἢ πόσσον *x*, ἐστιν. ὅσον *m*, ἢ παρόσον *p*. Apparently a correc-
tion in *x*, but nearer to the common original than *p*'s reading. Cf. p. 264.

515. .. ατὸν *x*, ἐρατὸν *m*, χρυσῆν *p*, χαρίεν Athen. 22 C. Whatever
view be taken of the readings of *p* and Athenaeus, it is plain with what
fidelity *x* has transmitted its original.

Herm. 45. αἰ ὅτε *x*, ἢ ὅτε *m*, ὰς ὅτε *p*. Αἰ ὅτε though wrong seems less
far than the reading of *p* from the original, cf. p. 264.

65. ὦτο *x*, ἆλτο *m*, ὦρτο *p*. A clerical error in *x* from which *p* is free.
For the falling out of a ρ cf. N 125 ὦσεν 'Mor.' for ὦρσεν, Ξ 522 ὦρσεν, ὦσεν,

L $_{17, 18}$, Vat. $_{22}$. O 694 ὦσεν Aristarchus, ὦρσεν the majority of our MSS. It is noticeable how x here also refrains from correcting its original.

Herm. 86. αὐτοπρεπὴς ὡς x, αὐτοτροπήσας *mp*. These words as they stand give no sense. Whatever the original may have been they are a long way from it. Mr. Tyrrell's conjecture of αὐτοπορήσας will be admitted to be the best yet made, and seems to satisfy the sense admirably. I should however prefer αὐτοπόρος ὥς (without which it is difficult to explain the reading of x), or may we assume an original pair of readings, αὐτοπορήσας and αὐτοπόρος ὥς?

Making this supposition, the actual variants must be explained as the result of repeated emendation and conflation; thus αὐτοπόρος ὥς = αὐτο- $\overset{\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\varsigma}{}$ πορησως; then by an inversion αὐτορεπης ως, and by correction, to give the semblance of a known word, αὐτο(π)ρεπησως. On the other side αὐτοπορησας, we may imagine, by the same process became αὐτοροπησας and αὐτο(τ)ροπη- σας. The ground for the emendation of αὐτοπόρος ὥς will naturally have been the (apparent) metrical difficulty.

232. ταναύποδα x, τανύποδα *mp*. The form τανύποδα exists, *c.g.* *Ajax* 837, but the metre here settles the question in favour of ταναύποδα. x is free from the corruption, which is phonetic, and occurs ι 464 and in the lemma of Apollonius' lexicon *s.v.* Cf. πιφάσκειν = πιφαύσκειν, p. 266.

254. κλίνη x, λίκνω cett. Κλίνη is usually taken as a gloss on λίκνω, but glosses do not seem to have largely invaded x, and it may well be a correction from a corruption, λίκνω κλίνω κλίνη.

303. οἰωνοῖσιν εὖ x, οἰωνοῖσι· σὺ *mp*. An uncial corruption, ΕΥ for CΥ, as noticed p. 174. Here we may observe the fidelity with which x transmits it. τυφλόν *Ap.* 306 is another case.

361. ἀλεγύνων x, ἀλεγίζων *m*, ἀλεείνων *p*. See p. 266; x has escaped the itacism of *p*.

397. σπεύδοντο x, σπεύδοντε *mp*. A correction in x, due apparently to the distance of ἷξον, which may have been taken for an adjective. The same failure to understand a construction led to ἀτιμήσω for ἀτιμήσας *Ap.* 72. Here the corrector of Γ was seized with the same idea.

Aphr. 16. χρυσήλατον x, χρυσηλάκατον *mp*; 118 χρυσηλάτου *xp* χρυσηλακάτου *m*. See p. 266; the syllable ακ seems to have fallen out accidentally before ατ.

99. πείσεα x, βήσεα *myp*. Πείσεα (or rather πίσεα, as Ruhnken corrected) of course is right; the variation is itacistic with a reminiscence of βῆσσα. *Pan* xix 2 the word is spelled πίσση. Τ 9 we have πήσεα as a variant, ζ 124 πίσεα πείσεα πήσεα, Ap. Rh. iii. 1218 πείσεα. Cf. Ruhnken's note.

144. ἔρος x, ἔρως *mp*. A natural error in *mp*; Ξ 294 where the metre does not decide, Eust. and Vat. $_{16}$ have ἔρος, Ξ 315 where the metre makes ἔρος necessary, the MSS. are about equally divided; *Herm.* 434, *Aphr.* 91 there is no variant.

244. κατὰ x, τάχα *myp*. Κατὰ seems impossible with ἀμφικαλύψει; one must suppose it a corruption from τάχα through χατα.

Mat. deor. xiv. 3. τρόμος *x*, βρόμος *mp*. βρόμος αὐλῶν occurs *Herm.* 452, *Dion.* xxvi. 10 τυπάνου βρόμον *Anth. Pal.* vi. 165, 5, id. vi. 217. 5 κυβέλης ἱερὸν βρόμον; τρόμος is evidently the worse reading and, as there is no graphical relation between β and τ, must be either a gloss or a conjecture.

Pan. xix. 7. κάρηνα *x*, κέλευθα *py* (def. M). Here M is wanting κέλευθα of *yp* gives the better sense as against *x*'s κάρηνα, which is identical with κορυφὰς and may very probably have come from v. 4. (Ludwich, *Rh. Mus.* 1887, p. 548 prefers κάρηνα.)

26. θαλέων *x*, θαλέθων *p* (def. M). See p. 268. *x* has fallen into a clerical error.

Hest. xxix. 3. ἔλαχε *x*, ἔλαχες *p* (def. M). Ἔλαχε seems the inferior construction, and the scribe was probably tempted to it by the distance from ἦ. Cf. Ruhnken's note on *Dem.* 269, and *ante* p. 268.

Ge xxx. 3. περ ἐστι *x*, πάρεστι *p* (def. M). Περ ἐστι is unexplained, and on that account, besides its persistence in DEΠ and some members of *p* (BL₂NP), is to be considered original. *x* therefore again has accurately transmitted its original. *p* would seem to have corrected it.

14. περεσανθέσιν *x*, παρ' εὐανθέσιν *p* (def. M). The original of *x* again seems to have persisted, while *p* has endeavoured to correct it. With π(φ)ερσεφονεία (p. 299) before us, and comparing φερέσβιος v. 9, *Dem.* 451, 452, 475, φερεσσακέος *Her. Scut.* 13 we may perhaps accept Ernesti's φερεσανθέσιν. M, it must be remembered, is wanting.

Selene xxxii. 6. ἀκτῆρες *x*, ἀκτίνες *p* (def. M). The word ἀκτήρ does not exist, and how *x* inserted it can only be guessed.

When these passages are counted, it appears that among some twenty-eight variants peculiar to *x*, there are two downright conjectures (*Ap.* 151, *Mat. de.* xiv. 3), nine semi-conscious conjectures (*Ap.* 71, 216, 284, 339, *Herm.* 86, 397, *Aphr.* 244, *Pan* xix. 7, *Hest.* xxix. 3), no independent readings, four survivals of the original (*Ap.* 224, *Herm.* 232, 361, *Aphr.* 144) and some thirteen graphical or phonetic errors, *plus* those given Pt. I. p. 161 *sq.*

I pass to a more difficult and more important subject, the valuation of the tradition of M. Our experiences with *x* and *p* have prepared us for a large proportion of novelties in M; we shall see to what conclusion as to their origin a detailed examination of them takes us. I may notice how important it is in such an examination to deal with archetypes of families and not with single MSS. As against AtDELΠT or ABC......V, the single M might seem to have little authority; when we deal with *m x* and *p*, *m* at the lowest reckoning has the weight of one to two.

Ap. 14. μάκαιρα λητοῖ M, μάκαιρ' ὦ λητοῖ cet. When ὦ fell out, μάκαιρ' was expanded to give another syllable. So 17 κύνιον for κύνθιον, θ has fallen out.

19. παντόσσ' *m*. πάντως *x*, πάντων *p*. Πάντως is fixed by v. 207 (see p. 261). Of παντόσσ' with the second syllable lengthened there is no example; either therefore παντως became παντος and the ς was doubled to make metre, or οσ is a graphical confusion for the minuscule omega (∞).

82. ἔσται *m*, ἐστὶν cet. ἔσται evidently is right, and occurred as a conjecture to J. The vulgate ἐστὶν is a corruption; cf. Θ 286 (ἔσται) ἐστι 'Η post ras.,' Ven. ₁₃, I 310 (ἔσται) ἐστι 'D' N₄B₁ Vat. ₉, K 41 (ἔσται, εἴη) ἐστι Ixion. γρ. Ven. A, hitherto no other MSS., 223 (ἔσται) ἐστι 'L Barocc. Mor.' Laur. ₆, ₈, ₉, Ven. ₁, Vat. ₁, ₃, ₄, ₆, ₁₁, ₂₃, M ₁, ₇, ₁₀, ₁₃, and τ 404, 547.

94. τε *m*, καὶ cet. A mechanical slip, due to the three τε's before.

96. om. M*a*, hab. *bp*. The coincidence between M and *a* is accidental, and arises of course from homoeoarchon with 98. The line stood in *m* and *x*. Baumeister and Gemoll therefore are signally mistaken in seeing an 'interpolation' in it.

To show what a part mechanical circumstances play in these omissions. I give a table of omitted lines in the Hymns.

Ap. 35 σκύρος καὶ φώκαια καὶ αὐτοκάνης ὅρος αἰπύ
    40 καὶ κλάρος αἰγλήεσσα καὶ αἰσαγέης ὅρος αἰπύ.
       41 follows 35 in AtDHJK.   *Homoeoteleuton.*
Ap. 23—73 om. M without apparent reason.
    144 πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαί τε φίλαι καὶ πρώονες ἄκροι
    145 ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ποταμοί θ' ἅλαδε προρέοντες.
       πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαί τε φίλαι καὶ προρέοντες L.   *Homoeoteleuton.*
       189 om. *p* without apparent cause.
    211 ἢ ἅμα φόρβαντι τριόπω γένος ἢ ἀμαρύνθω
    212 ἢ ἅμα λευκίππω καὶ λευκίπποιο δάμαρτι.
       212 om. *p. Homoearchon.*
    231 ἔνθα νεοδμὴς πῶλος ἀναπνέει ἀχθόμενός περ
    232 ἕλκων ἅρματα καλὰ χαμαὶ δ' ἐλατὴρ ἀγαθός περ.
       232 om. MBO.   *Homoeoteleuton.*
    260 ἐνθάδ' ἀγινήσουσι τεληέσσας ἑκατόμβας.
    289 the same words.
       261—289 om. ET.
    293—320 om. B apparently without cause.
    325 *a* omit all but *y* apparently without cause.
    344 οὔτε ποτ' εἰς εὐνὴν διὸς ἤλυθε μητιόεντος
    345 οὔτε ποτ' ἐς θῶκον πολυδαίδαλον ὡς τὸ πάρος περ.
       344 om. E *p. Homoeoarchon.*
    371 τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ κατέπυσ' ἱερὸν μένος ἠελίοιο
    372 ἐξ οὗ νῦν πυθὼ κικλήσκεται· οἱ δὲ ἄνακτα
    373 πύθιον καλέουσιν ἐπώνυμον οὕνεκα κεῖθι
    374 αὐτοῦ πῦσε πέλωρ μένος ὀξέος ἠελίοιο.
       372—4 om. D.   *Homoeoteleuton.*
    375 καὶ τότ' ἄρ' ἔγνω ᾗσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
    376 οὕνεκά μιν κρήνη καλλίρροος ἐξαπάφησε·
    377 βῆ δ' ἐπὶ Τελφούσῃ κεχολωμένος αἶψα δ' ἵκανε
    378 στῆ δὲ μάλ' ἄγχ' αὐτῆς καί μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε
       . . . .
    382 ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ ῥόον ὦσε ἄναξ ἑκάεργος ἀπόλλων.

Ap.   376—8 repetit post 382 M.   *Homoeoteleuton.*

505 ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ βαῖνον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης

506 ἐκ δ' ἁλὸς ἠπειρόνδε θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆ' ἐρύσαντο

507 ὑψοῦ ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις παρὰ δ' ἔρματα μακρὰ τάνυσσαν

508 καὶ βῶμον ποίησαν ἐπὶ ψαμάθοισι θαλάσσης.

     506—8 om. ET.   *Homoeoteleuton.*

537 ὅσσα ἐμοί κ' ἀγάγωσι περικλυτὰ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων

538 νηὸν δὲ προφύλαχθε δέδεχθε δὲ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων.

     538 om. M*p.*   *Homoeoteleuton.*

     539 om. T apparently without cause (so Bethe's collation).

Herm. 135 δημὸν καὶ κρέα πολλὰ μετήορα δ' αἶψ' ἀνάειρε

136 σῆμα νέης φωρῆς ἐπὶ δὲ ξύλα κάγκαν' ἀείρας.

     136 om. M.   *Homoeoteleuton.*

215 ἐσσυμένως δ' ἤιξεν ἄναξ διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων

216 ἐς Πύλον ἠγαθέην διζήμενος εἰλίποδας βοῦς.

     215 om. L, perhaps from *Homoeoarchon.*

218 ἴχνιά τ' εἰσενόησεν ἑκηβόλος εἶπέ τε μῦθον·

219 ὢ πόποι ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶμαι.

220 ἴχνια μὲν τάδε γ' ἐστὶ βοῶν ὀρθοκραιράων.

     218, 219 om. M.   *Homoeoarchon.*

     422 om. *xp* without apparent cause.

456 νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ὀλίγος περ ἐὼν κλυτὰ μήδεα οἶδας

457 ἷζε πέπον καὶ θυμὸν ἐπαίνει πρεσβυτέροισιν

458 νῦν γάρ τοι κλέος ἔσται ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.

     457, 458 om. *ap.*   *Homoeoarchon.*

498 βουκολίας τ' ἐπέτελλεν· ἔδεκτο δε Μαιάδος υἱὸς

499 γηθήσας· κίθαριν δὲ λαβὼν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ χειρός.

     499 om. M apparently from *Homoeoteleuton.*

509 σήματ' ἐπεὶ κίθαριν μὲν ἑκηβόλῳ ἐγγυάλιξεν

510 ἱμερτὴν δεδαώς· ὁ δ' ὑπωλένιον κιθάριζεν.

     510 om. M apparently from *Homoeoteleuton* (ξεν and ζεν).

532 τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅσα φημὶ δαήμεναι ἐκ διὸς ὀμφῆς

533 μαντείην δὲ φέριστε διοτρεφὲς ἣν ἐρεείνεις

534 οὔτε σε θέσφατόν ἐστι δαήμεναι οὔτε τιν' ἄλλον.

     τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅσα φημὶ οὔτε τιν' ἄλλον *p* from the influence of

       δαήμεναι in 532 and 534.

     535 om. E without apparent cause.

Aphr. 10 ἀλλ' ἄρα οἱ πόλεμοί τε ἄδον καὶ ἔργον ἄρηος

11 ὑσμῖναί τε μάχαι τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ ἔργ' ἀλεγύνειν.

     ἀλλ' ἄρα οἱ πόλεμοί τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ ἔργ' ἀλεγύνειν E, from the

       influence of ἔργον in 10 and ἔργ' in 11.

96 πᾶσιν ἑταιρίζουσι καὶ ἀθάνατοι καλέονται

97 ἤ τις νυμφάων αἵτ' ἄλσεα καλὰ νέμονται.

     97 om. E.   *Homoeoteleuton.*

136 οὔ σφιν ἀεικελίη νυὸς ἔσσομαι ἀλλ' εἰκυῖα

Aphr. 136 a εἴ τοι ἀεικελίη γυνὴ ἔσσομαι ἠὲ καὶ οὐκί.

οὔ σφιν ἀεικελίη γυνὴ ἔσσομαι ἠὲ καὶ οὐκί *p*, from the influence of ἀεικελίη—ἔσσομαι in both lines.

Out of twenty-seven cases therefore in which omissions are testified to by our MSS. (and no others can enter into the question), twenty-one are the result of similarities of words at the beginning or at the end of a line, acting on the eye of the scribe. The remainder are probably due to mechanical circumstances of a similar sort, but which escape our observation. The conclusion therefore with regard to the value of a particular omission is overwhelmingly in favour of its being accidental. Moreover (and this is a consequence which finds its application in part III.), it follows that if we seek to improve the text by insertions of our own, these must, by their wording, explain their omission.

99. φραδμοσύνης M (-ησ *m*), φραδμοσύνη cet. M is right (cf. *Herm.* 172 τιμῆς without variant). Similar errors arising out of the 'Ionic dative' are B 227 (κλισίης) κλισίη(η) Laur. ₈ R₁ Ven. ₁₀ 'Cant.' Vat. ₁ M ₁₁, 456 (κορυφῆς) κορυφῆ(ῆ) L ₉, ₁₇ Ven. ₂, and no doubt the variant ἐκ κορυφῆς Ven. ₅ Vat. ₆ M ₉, ₁₀ 'Vrat. a' is due to the same cause, E 75 (κονίης) κονίη(η) codd. plerique, I 627 a (ἀτρείδης) ἀτρείδη(η) 'G' Laur. ₈ (cl. H 373 ἀτρείδης without variant). The simple confusion ἄλλης ἄλλαις occurs *passim*. In the opposite sense of Z 456 (ἄλλης gen.) ἄλλης, -οις, -αις codd. ἄλλη Vat. ₅, K 542 (δεξιῇ) 'S Cant. Vrat. b. A. Mosc. 3' L ₂, ₃, ₁₆ R₁ Ven. ₁₁ etc.

110. ἀπὸ μεγάροιο *m*, ἀπὲκ cet. The fact that ἀπὲκ does not occur in Homer is nothing against it here, seeing that v. 428 we have ὑπὲκ νεφέων without variant, but a comparison of similar variants makes it probable that ἀπὲκ here is a scribe's contrivance to make metre and ἀπὸ original. Cf. H 131 ἀπὸ μελέων, ἀπὲκ L ₁₉ Ven. ₆ in ras., ἀπὸ μμελέων Ven. ₉ ἀπαὶ al., ψ 43 ἀπὸ μεγάροιο, ἀπ᾽ ἐκ 'J,' υ 343 ἀπὸ μεγάροιο without variant, I 248 ὑπὸ τρώων, ὑπ᾽ ἐκ᾽ 'Vrat. 6, 2 man.' Vat. ₁₂, ₁₃.[10]

114. ἴθμαθ᾽ *m*, ἴσμαθ᾽ *x*, ἴσθμαθ᾽ S*p*, ἴδμαθ᾽ DTK. An error of spelling partly occasioned by the influence of ἰσθμός; *m* alone preserves the correct form. The identical errors occur E 778 and in addition the forms ἴθμ᾽ L ₁₀, ἰφθιμαθ᾽ Ven. ₅, οἴμαθ᾽ M ₁₂.

116. μενήνυσεν *m*, μενοίνησεν cet. Itacism, and so 142 ἰλάσκαζες, 143 τοι (prob.), 146 σοὶ, 162 κρεμβαλιαστὴν, 218 περρεβοῦς, ἰολκόν, 223 εἶξας, 224 μυκάλισσον, 117 φοίνικε for φοίνικι, 120 ἴηε for ἤιε must be called accidental.

125. ἐπώρξατο *m*, ἐπήρξατο cet. Ἐπώρξατο is possibly a conjecture, intended in the sense of ἐπωρέξατο (as Ilgen thought), or ω may simply have come out of η by ordinary permutation (cf. p. 266). Ἐπήρξατο is used unhomerically, but Gemoll's discussion upon its meaning is somewhat beside the mark; to the writer of this hymn no doubt it was simply an old word for 'to serve, pour.'

---

[10] La Roche, *Hom. Untersuchungen* i. p. 53, 54.

126. κρατερὸν *m*, καρτερὸν cet., sim. 358. A constant change, due to absence of feeling for quantitative metre, *passim* in the Iliad MSS.

127. ἄβροτον *m*, ἄμβροτον cet. (cf. 411 τερψιβρότου *m*, τερψιμβρότου cet.). *Herm.* 71 ἄμβροτοι, 339 λησίμβροτοι without variation supports the μβρ here, but the forms, especially in ὄβριμος, etc., vary indefinitely in the MSS. Cf. La Roche, *Hom. Untersuch.* i. p. 6, 7.

129. σπείρατα *m*, πείρατα cet. Σπείρατα is perhaps a phonetic variation, as σβῆσσαν for βῆσσαν Β 532 'C Eton.' L 19, Ven. 2, Vat. 9, 15, 20 Mc, helped by the reminiscence of σπεῖρον.

145. ὑψηλῶν τ' ὀρέων ποταμοὶ ἅλαδε *m*, ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ποταμοί θ' cet. An accidental transposition ; at 24 there is no variant.

146. ἐπιτέρπεο *m*, ἐπιτέρπεαι cet. The present is right, Thucydides' ἐτέρφθης being governed by ἀλλ' ὅτε in his version. *m*'s variant is no doubt accidental, cf. 428 πέφανται for πέφαντο, Α 424 ἔποντο codd., ἔπονται Aristarch., Β 448 ἠερέθονται, ἠερέθοντο Zenod., MSS. about equally divided, Δ 184 δειδίσσεο, δειδίσσεαι Mc, 264 εὔχεαι, εὔχεο MSS. divided, *al.*

151. ἀθάνατος *m*, ἀθανάτους cet. Quite accidental, for the nom. can hardly be given sense. Cf. Ε 901 καταθνητός, κατὰ θνητὸν, 'Vrat. a' Pe, Ω 499 αὐτούς, αὐτός 'L Lips.' Vat. 1, 23.

157. δηλιάδες *m*, δηλιάδες δ' *xp*. *m* is obviously right, δ' is added to make metre. I have no instances of δ' itself used for this purpose, but the following are examples of the insertion of other quantity-making letters or words. Θ 21 ἂν ἐρύσαιτ', ἄν μ' ἐρύσαιτ' 'S. Mosc. 1' and many MSS. Λ 457 ἔξω τε χροός, τ' ἐκ χροός 'BC' L 9, 12 (cf. ἀπὸ ἀπἐκ, v. 110, p. 274) ; Λ 459 δὲ μεγάθυμοι, δ' αὖ 'L Harl. Vrat. b, Mosc. 3' L 3, 4, 16, Ven. 3, A.[11] Vat. 6, 15, 19, 23, 25, M 1, 12 ; *Ap.* 491 ἐπικαίοντές γ' ἐπὶ *m* ΓΟ, ἐπικαίοντες ἐπὶ cet., Γ 430 πρίν γ' εὔχε', γ' om. 'CD' Vat. 10, 22, ib. 442 ὧδέ γ' ἔρως Ven. A. and L 3, γ' om. cet., Ε 821 τήν γ' οὐτάμεν, γ' om. 'L' L 3, 6, 12, 21 M 1, 12. Θ 131 ἠΰτε ἄρνες, ἠΰτε γ' 'S Cant.' L 16, R 1 M 5, 11 ἠΰπερ M 10, *h. Herm.* 371 νέον ἐπιτελλομένοιο, νέον γ' D *p* (exc. AQ).

162. κρεμβαλιαστὴν Μ, κρεμβαλιασ(τ)ὺν *xp*. Itacism ; *m* no doubt had κρεμβαλιαστὺν. Cf. the similar variations πουλὺν, πουλὴν, πολλὺν, πολλὴν Θ 50, Κ 27.

171. ὑποκρίνεσθ' *m*, ὑποκρίνασθ' cet. A very common exchange. It may suffice to quote from the Hymns alone *Ap.* 321, 430, 543, *Herm.* 343, 408, *Ares* viii. 12. Here the aorist seems fixed by μνήσασθ' 167 where there is no variant.

181. γὰρ *m*, δ' αὖ cet. Δ' αὖ is here the better reading. Such particles are constantly interchanged ; I give for instances Η 328 πολλοὶ γὰρ τεθνᾶσι, μὲν many codd., δὴ Ven. 5, Ν 4, Vat.1, δὲ Ν 2, Pa, Pe, Θ 238 δή ποτέ φημι, γάρ 'H' Ven. 13.

ib. Δήλοιο περικλύστου *m*, περικλύστης *xp*. On περίκλυστος see Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 474 ; the word varies in one play of Aeschylus, *Pers.* 599 περίκλυστα νᾶσος, 882 νᾶσοι—περίκλυστοι, so that περικλύστου here need

---

[11] A = Angelica C i. 2.

not be called a 'conjecture.' A real conjecture is to hand in the second reading of Γ, περικλύστοιο, which would involve the omission of μέγ'. Cf. p. 261.

192. ἀφραδέες *m*, ἀμφαδέες cet. One of the most signal instances of the excellence of M. The corruption ἀμφαδέες arose from ρ dropping out of ἀφραδέες, leaving ἀφαδέες, to strengthen which μ was added more or less on the analogy of ὄβριμος, ὄμβριμος. Γ's corrector saw the truth.

198. εἶδος ἀγανή *m*, ἀγητή cet. No defence of ἀγανή can be offered; it is a conjecture, possibly motived by some corruption in ἀγητή.

200. ἐν δ' *m*, ἔνθ' cet. 'Εν δ' is naturally right; τῆσιν needs a preposition. Δ' and θ' are exchanged almost *passim* as particles, it is rarer to find them confused as parts of words; cf. however ξ 78 ἐν δ', ἔνθ' 'FO,' A 93 οὔθ', οὐδ', MSS. divided.

204. μέγα *m*, μέγαν cet. Μέγα is very likely an accident, due to the abbreviation μέγᾱ. Μέγας and μέγα (adverb) are exchanged in the Iliad, B 111, I 18, but not before a vowel.

209. ὁππόταν ἱέμενος *m*, ὅππος' ἀνωόμενος cet. (ὁππότ' S). ἀνωόμενος appears really to conceal Martin's brilliant conjecture μνωόμενος; the consonants μν occurring together seem to have had a tendency to part, *e.g.* A 113 κλυταιμνήστρης, κλυταιμνήστρης Ven. A, λ 439 κλυταιμήστρα schol. Soph. *O.C.* 71 (cod. Laur. 32, 9), Ω 347 αἰσυμνητῆρι, αἰσυμητηρ' 'Pap. 2 man.', νώνυμνος, νώνυμος frequently; in these instances ν has fallen out while μ remains, but Θ 304 αἰσύμνηθεν codd., αἰσύμνηθεν Aristarch., αἰσύνηθεν (ut vid.) Aristophanes and Zenodotus. Μνωόμενος then became νωόμενος, and ὅππως ὅππος somewhat as in M at *Ap.* 19; α was then added to give a sort of word. 'Ιέμενος in M wears a strong look of a conjecture, while conversely from ιεμενος one could hardly suppose ωομενος conjectured.

I may notice further that the principal verb, ἔκιες, is not necessarily sound, cf. ο 157 κιχὼν 'GUZ,' κιὼν 'FPHXDJLW Eust.' [12]

220. τῷ τ' οὐχάδε *m*, τό τοι οὐχάδε cet. Τοι first disappeared, under the influence of hiatus, then το was lengthened to make metre.

223. ἀπ' *m*, ἐπ' cet. The context makes ἀπ' right; the interchange of these prepositions need not be illustrated. Demetrius conjectured ἀπ'.

---

[12] The passage that follows, 209—213, is no touchstone to decide the excellence of MSS. Where many proper names come together and a corruption takes place the particular form that they will assume is almost pure chance; the authority lies in the facts of the story, not in one or another family. Find once a consistent story for Apollo's amours, and the names will be decided independently of diplomatic evidence. The actual ll. given by the MSS. are much on a level; 209 ἀτλαντίδα *m* is not necessarily a conjecture more than ἀζαντίδα of cett., nor 211 is ἀμαρύνθω *y* necessarily superior to ἅμ' ἐρεχθεῖ *m* or ἅμ' ἐρευθεῖ *x*. 213 ἐλέλιψεν *m* is enigmatical, possibly a corruption for

ἐνέλειψεν intended as the 1 aor. of ἐλλείπω, but in face of the total absence of direction from the context one cannot call it a conjecture (Schneidewin's notion that ἐνέλιπεν of *xp* represented a marginal note ἐλλείπει has met with no one's acceptance but Baumeister's. Λείπει, not ἐλλείπει, is the word found in this connection.) Τρίοπος 213 is *genitive*; the form Τρίοψ is warranted by Apollodor. i. 7, 4, 2 Κανάκη δὲ ἐγέννησεν Τρίοπα, 3 'Ιφιμέδειαν τὴν Τρίοπος. Translate 'he came not short of Triops (his ancestor),' cp. Δ 399, 400, though of whom this is said, as the passage stands, is doubtful.

224. τέμμισον m, τευμησσὸν x, τελμησσὸν p.   Another correction to make metre, see *ante*, p. 263.

231. ἀναπνέει m, ἀναπνείει cet.   Right; contra, *Herm.* 413 m is wrong with ἑρμείω against ἑρμέω of cet.

232. om. MBO; hab. cet.   Homoeoteleuton, acting (naturally) independently on M and these two members of *p*.   See *ante*, p. 272.

233. ἐκ δὲ δίφροιο m, ἐκ δίφροιο.   Accidental reduplication.

234. κρατέουσι m, κροτέουσι cet.   A mistake in spelling; or can the scribe of *m* have intended κρατέουσι to go with οὐδὲ of *m* (and *x*)?   It is needless to say that κροτέουσι is established by O 453.

247. τελφοῦσ' m, δελφοῦσ' cet., and 256, 276.   At 244 m has with the rest δελφούσῃ; at 377, 379, 386, 387 all have the correct τελφ.   At 244 Γ, at 276 L, have been corrected to τελφ.   A striking case of the arbitrariness of both corruptions and corrections.

249. πολλοὶ m, ἐνθάδ' cet.   Πολλοὶ has a fair claim to be called an independent reading; at least it is hard to see how ἐνθάδ' here if it were original should have lost its place.   In 249 it is justified as an antecedent to ὅσοι in 250, 251, which are not repeated in the corresponding passage below: there (260) it may either therefore not have stood at all, or may have been ejected by the influence of ἐνθάδ' in 258.

251. ἀμφιρύτους κατὰ νήσους m, ἀμφιρύτας cet.   See *ante*, p. 261. V. 291 in the same phrase ἀμφιρύτους omnes.   The -ους of *m* is therefore original, and -ας of *xp* probably a grammatical correction.   In this hymn v. 27 we have Δήλῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ without variant, and the fem. termination is the rule in the Odyssey (but α 50 νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ 'Ma'), cf. also Apollonius i. 1305 Τήνῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ.   Later the word has two terminations, *e.g.* Hes. *Theog.* 983.   The usage then is about equally balanced, and the conclusion must be to follow the majority of MSS. in each particular case.

263. πηγῶν m, πηγέων cet.   A mere corruption, cf. p. 263.

269. παρνησοῖο m, παρνασ(σ)οῖο cet.   Vv. 282, 396, 521, *Herm.* 555 παρνησοῖο without variation.   The prose form is a variation in several places in τ, φ, and ω, and therefore we need not call παρνησοῖο here a correction.

ib. κρίση m, κρίσση cet., and so 282, 431, 438, 445.   The single σ is right, see Ebeling *Lex. Hom. s.* κρῖσα.   Whether *m* preserved the right spelling and *xp* corrupted it, or *m* corrected a common error, is an open question.

272. ἀλλά τοι ὧς m, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὧς xp.   Τοι might possibly be supposed repeated from τοι 270, but the sense of the passage seems to give it the preference over καὶ.   'Αλλὰ καὶ would represent the absence of chariots and horses as a disadvantage *in spite of* which the oracle might still prosper. Telphusa's argument is 'there will be no chariots indeed, but so, you see' (τοι), *i.e.* therefore, the place will do for an oracle.   Τοι is persuasive and argumentative.   Baumeister felt the objection to ὧς, though his conjecture is nonsense: τοι is not, as Gemoll says, Ruhnken's conjecture.   For the permutation cf. τ 224 αὐτάρ τοι 'GPHJULW,' ἀλλὰ καὶ ὧς 'XD γρ. U².'

279. ναιετάεσκον *m*, ναιετάασκον *xp*. A mistake in spelling: cf. *Pan* xix. 32 ψαφερότριχα *x* for ψαφαρότριχα, *Ap.* 346 φραζάσκετο *x* for -έσκετο.

284. πέτρος *m*, πέτρη *xp*. Πέτρος appears to mean always a small stone; perhaps here it is a correction motived by hiatus, cf. 341. The same variant is noted by Eustathius on Π 411 but without MS. support hitherto.

292. ἄρ' *m*, ἄν *xp*. Ἄρ' evidently gives much the livelier sense, and ἄν might have crept in grammatically, apart from its graphical closeness; cf. *Herm.* 246 ἀνά, ἄρα, E 686 ἄρ', ἄν, L ₉, ₁₄, ₁₇, Ven. ₁₁, κ 130 ἅμα Aristarch. ' Ω,' ἄρα some critics and ' P ' ἄλα Rhianus and Callistratus, 257 ἅμα ' Ω,' ἄρα ' P,' ω 8 ἀνά ' Ω ' ἅμα ' FMZ,' Ap. Rhod. iii. 198 ἀνὰ ' Laur. Guelf. Laur. 16 ' ἄρα codd. dett. In the parallel passage v. 252 the MS. reading is τοῖσιν δέ τ' ἐγώ, and Ilgen's κ' for τ' is by no means necessary.

293. θεμιστεύοιμι *m*, θεμιστεύσοιμι *xp*. The parallel v. 253, where the variant only extends to ΒΓ of the Parisienses, makes the present certain. The insertion of σ between vowels in verb-forms is a common error in MSS. So ἐκέλευε -ευσε B 28, 50, 65, Γ 119, I 660, Λ 641, etc., βουλεύωσ' -εύσωσ' B 347, τίωσ' τίσωσ' I 258, etc. Cf. also v. 403, *Herm.* 560, *Aphr.* 125.

295. καλά, διηνεκὲς *m*; μακρὰ, διαμπερές *xp*. V. 255 all MSS. have μακρὰ, διηνεκές, from which it may be supposed that here where the line is repeated *m* failed in memory over one word, and *xp* over the other. καλὰ might be a reduplication of μάλα; for the exchange cf. μ 436 where Apoll. *Lex.* reads καλοὶ for μακροί. Διηνεκὲς as an adv. does not appear elsewhere.

308. ἤνεκ' ἄρα M (ἠνίκ' *m* ?), εὖτ' ἄρα δὴ *xp*. The dots affixed in M call attention to the error of spelling in ἤνεκ', which is not for οὕνεκ' or εἵνεκ', as Ruhnken and Hollander suggest, but a mere blunder for ἡνίκ', which occurs without variant χ 198, Theognis 1275. It is an independent reading, and, of the two, preferable to εὖτ' ἄρα δὴ of *xp*.

318. ἔμβαλον *m*, ἔμβαλεν *xp*. The 3 pers. of *xp* is evidently due to a misunderstanding of the person referred to in ἐλοῦσα. The right correction occurred to Demetrius Chalcondyles and the reviser of Γ. The connexion of 317, 318 is still unsettled, and the alterations of τέκον, from Ruhnken's to Gemoll's, are futile. Chalcondyles' λείπει hits the mark; the words ὃν τέκον αὐτὴ are emphatic and cannot be dispensed with. Hephaestus is 'her son whom she bore herself' in contrast to the unnatural methods of Zeus, who must needs assume the part of mother: 324 οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ τεκόμην; On the other hand a construction is required between 317 and 318; to read δὲ for ἀνά, with Abel and the second hand of Γ, is equivalent to giving up the situation. A lacuna, containing such a line as αἶσχος ἐμοὶ καὶ ὄνειδος ἐν οὐρανῷ· ὅν τε καὶ αὐτή or the like must be supposed. The similar ending caused the omission; if the assonance offends, cf. 230, 231, and 537, 538.[12a]

321. χαρίσασθαι M, χαρίζεσθαι *xp*. The aorist, as Hollander p. 22 says, is more suitable to the context which deals with a past event; see the

---

[12a] This passage is discussed by Peppmüller, *Philologus*, 1894 f. 261 *sq.* I regret that I cannot agree either with his alteration of αὐτῷ (317), nor his bracketing of 318-321.

passages collected in Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.* We should therefore read χαρίσ(σ)ασθαι, though I have not found another example of the doubling of σ in this word. Gemoll's 'vielleicht richtige Konjektur' begs the question; why, if M's reading is right, should it be a conjecture? The single σ of χαρίσασθαι is so far in favour of its genuineness, cf. 430, *Herm.* 343, 408.

Presents and aorists infin. are often exchanged ; cf. E 255 ἐπιβαινέμεν, ἐπιβήμεναι 'EM' Ven. ₃, Vat. ₂₅, γρ. Vat. ₅, M 50 διαβαινέμεν, διαβήμεναι 'Townl.' Z 105 μαχέσασθαι, μαχέεσθαι 'E' L ₁₅, ₂₀, Vat. ₃, ₆, ₁₆, ₂₄, M ₁, ₆, Λ 213 id. μαχέεσθαι L ₂, Vat. ₂₅, M ₈, ₁₃ Pa, Θ 449 ὀλλῦσαι, ὀλλῦναι, L₅, Vat. ₂.

322. σχέτλια *m*, σχέτλιε *xp*. An accident; assimilation to ποικιλομῆτα.

ib. μητίσεαι *m*, μήσεαι *x*, ἔτι μήσεαι *p*. See p. 264. Μητίομαι is amply guaranteed in Homer, cf. merely 325a, *Dem.* 345, Γ 416. The passage λ 474 σχέτλιε τίπτ' ἔτι μεῖζον ἐπὶ φρεσὶ μήσεαι ἔργον (where ἔτι goes closely with μεῖζον) is not enough to turn the balance in favour of *p*; [12b] rather it supplied the correction ἔτι, after the original μητίσεαι had, as explained above, contracted into ΜΗ(ΤΙ)ϹΕΑΙ.

326. καὶ νῦν μέντοι *m*, καὶ νῦν μὲν τοὶ γὰρ *x*, καὶ νῦν τοι γὰρ *p*. *m*'s combination is perhaps the best. It may be doubted whether the other reading was καὶ νῦν τοὶ γὰρ or καὶ νῦν μὲν γὰρ; *x* at any rate presents a conflation of both.

339. ἐστιν. ὅσον *m*, ἢ πόσσον *x*, ἢ παρόσον *p*. I have suggested above, p. 264, that the π in the reading of *xp* was due to the scribe's desire to avoid the hiatus ΗΟϹΟΝ; Demetrius Chalcondyles less sensitive restored ἢ ὅσσον. The point in M's reading may be an indication of the same feeling, and ἐστιν a correction for the same purpose. The ἢ of *xp* would suit with an original εἴη (Hermann's conjecture), the first syllable of which was treated as a dittography of the second and consequently omitted; cf. Λ 366 where for εἴη Vat. ₂, ₂₅ read ἢ. M's ἐστιν on the other hand suggests ἔ σ τ ω (which I would put in the text), and ἔστω ὅσον, εἴη ὅσον may have been a pair of independent readings. Parts of the verb 'to be' are often interchanged, *e.g.* K 41 ἔσται, ἐστι, εἴη, 239 ἐστιν, εἴη, Λ 366 ἐστι, εἴη, ἢ and even ἔλθοι: *Ap.* 82 ἔσται, ἐστι. Anth. Pal. vi. 243, 4 εἴη. ὅσοι 'P.' ἴσμεν ὅσοι 'Pl.' is a curious resemblance.

341. ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα *m*, ἡ δ' ἐσιδοῦσα *xp*. The reading of *xp* is palpably a metrical expedient; in v. 255 it has invaded *m* also. This desire, semi-conscious, of scribes and readers, both mediaeval and ancient, to avoid what they considered hiatus, leads to different combinations: cf.

ρ 9. με ἴδηται, μ' ἐσίδηται 'FGXDUZ'; so perhaps τε ἴδη is rightly restored Hes. *Op.* 610 for τ' ἐσίδη of codd.

Z 365. δ' ἐσελεύσομαι, δὲ ἐλεύσομαι, MSS. equally divided; ρ 52 δ' ἐσελεύσομαι Aristarchus and most MSS., δὲ ἐλεύσομαι Aristophanes, δ' ἐλεύσομαι 'F'.

Γ 349. ἀσπίδ' ἐνὶ L ₅, ₁₁, ₁₆, R₁, Ven. ₁, ₅, ₁₀, Vat. ₁₁, Mo,[13] Pa, Pe, M ₁₁,

---

[12b] As lately Peppmüller, *l.c.* n. 8, has maintained.

[13] Mo = Modena iii. D 4.

for ἀσπίδι ἐν. Sim. P 45. The commonest reading is a mixture, ἀσπίδι ἐνί.

Δ 542. ἐλοῦσ' ἀτάρ, ἐλοῦσ' αὐτάρ vulg. for the proper ἐλοῦσα ἀτάρ which seems found unambiguously only in L ₁₄, Vat. ₁₂, B₁.

Cf. also Θ 376 ὄφρ' ἂν ἴδωμαι for ὄφρα ἴδωμαι, Η 198 οὐδέ τ' ἀιδρείη for οὐδέ τι ἰδρείη, Η 452 ὅτ' ἐγώ, τότ' ἐγώ for τὸ ἐγώ, Ι 564 κλαῖ' ὅτε μιν for κλαῖε ὅ μιν, Λ 417 ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἀίσσονται, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ἀίσσονται and even ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖτ' ἀίσσονται for ἀμφί τε ἀίσσονται, Ε 4 δαῖε δέ οἱ, δαῖε δ' οἱ for δαῖέ οἱ.

342. ᾤετο Μ, οἴετο xp. Ignorant misspelling.

349. μῆνες m, νύκτες xp. Μῆνες, the reading without variant of the parallel places, λ 294, ξ 293, is undoubtedly the real tradition ; νύκτες is inappropriate in the context and owes its position to the automatic suggestion of ἡμέραι. Gemoll's 'Besserung,' applied to μῆνες, begs the question ; if m is right and xp are wrong, why must m be a ' Besserung ' of xp ?

350. ἐπιτελλομένου m, περιτελλομένου cet. Περιτελλομένου is read in the two Odyssey places just quoted, but in both cases with the variant ἐπι- ; λ 295 'sch. Yv 65,' ξ 294, ἐπι suprascr. 'H₂X.' It is improper therefore to talk of m's 'coniectandi libido' with Baumeister. The ἐπι- probably came from ἐπήλυθον which follows (so ξ 204, ἐπήλυθον itself is suprascr. παρή in 'X'), helped by a reminiscence of the word ἐπιτέλλεσθαι itself.

352. τυφῶν m, τυφαόνα cet. Natural variation of spelling, like ἀγήρων, ἀγήρω τ', ἀγήραον Β 447, ἐείσω ἐείσαο Ι 645 etc.

ib. πῆμα θεοῖσι m, πῆμα βροτοῖσι cet. Ruhnken accepted θεοῖσι, and after him Ilgen. βροτοῖσι, however, seems fixed by 306 and μ 125 ; the homoeoteleuton of 351, 352 may have produced the opposite of its usual effect, and have made the scribe of m imagine that the second βροτοῖσι had driven out the original word. We have the same change β 216, βροτῶν 'Ω' θεῶν 'PY' ; contrariwise Hes. Theog. 329 πῆμ' ἀνθρώποις.

356. τώγ' m, τῆγ' cet. I do not know if τώγ' is a real correction, based on a misunderstanding (i.e. = τῷγ'), or a graphical confusion, to be added to the instances p. 266.

367. τυφωνεὺς m, τυφωεὺς cet. Ruhnken is inclined to defend τυφωνεὺς, comparing the article in Hesychius, τυφωνεῖ· ἐνὶ τῶν γιγάντων. The form in Hesych. is generally emended into τυφωεῖ, but even so it is evidently the same corruption as in our passage ; it is a half-conscious rewriting, due to a mental mixture of τυφῶν and τυφωεύς. In MSS. at large also there is a tendency to insert a ν between adjacent vowels.

374. πέλας m, πέλωρ cet. A corruption that I cannot explain. There is no similarity between the symbol for ας and ωρ ; still we have the same change exactly ι 428. ' An pro τέρας ? ' says Ruhnken.

375. βοῖβος m, φοῖβος cet. Phonetic.

379. ἐξαπαφοῦσα m, ἐπαπάφουσα cet. Right accentuation preserved in m.

394. ἀγγέλλουσι m, ἀγέλλουσι x, ἀγγελέουσι p. m preserves the present ; in ῥέξουσι however it wavers with the rest. I agree with Gemoll that the

present is to be retained in both cases, and that οἵ ῥα—Παρνησοῖο is parenthetical.[13a] The arrangement is harsh, but excusable as an amplification of Κρῆτες ἀπὸ Κνωσοῦ Μινωίου. The whole hymn gives the history of existing institutions, and this parenthesis calls attention to the point now to be explained : ' he saw a ship in which were men, Cretans, the Cretans who etc.' Müller, *Dorians* i. p. 233, says ' it is known from many traditions and historical traces that the connexion established by the Cretans continued for a long time.' Cf. 518 οἷοί τε Κρητῶν παιήονες, *Herm.* 125, 6. Peppmüller *l.c.* p. 266 *sq.* defends the transpositions.

402. οὔτις *m*, ὅστις *xp.* ἐπεφράσατο *m*, ἐπιφράσσατο *x*, ἐπιφράσσαιτο *p*. Nothing seems certain here except that νοῆσαι is corrupt and that the commonly adopted ἠδ' ἐνόησεν (after θ 94) is an inert supplement. Query ν ω μ ῆ σ α ι? on the meaning of the word see under *Dem.* 373, in part III.; cf. E 777 νέμεσθαι, νέεσθαι, Theognis 705 νόοιο ' AO,' νόημα cet. Νωμῆσαι would have the advantage of preserving ἐπεφράσατο, which seems genuine, while ἐπιφράσσατο and -αιτο are evidently metrical corrections. Translate ' not one had the wit to lay hands on him,' on the supposed dolphin. Οὔτις therefore seems the better reading, ὅστις may have been a conjecture to avoid the apparent asyndeton of 403. (Peppmüller *l.c.* accepts οὐδ' ἐνόησε.)

403. ἀνασσείασκε *m* (and T), ἀνασσείσασκε cet. The imperfect is more in accordance with τίνασσε. See v. 293 for the tendency of σ to insert itself.

ib. νήϊα δουρός *m*, δοῦρα cet. An ignorant correction.

407. τὰ πρώτιστα *m*, πρῶτα cet. Τὰ πρώτισθ' occurs v. 237, πρώτιστα *Herm.* 25, 111 and confirm the form. Πρῶτα is presumably a gloss. Similar variants are Δ 297 ἱππῆας μὲν πρῶτα (πρώτιστα ' Vrat. b.c.' R ₄, Vat. ₂₉, ₃₁ A Mc, πρῶτον Ven. ₃ Vat. ₆, ₂₅), Ξ 295 οἷον ὅτε πρῶτόν περ Aristarchus ' ACL' Ven. ₃, Vat ₂, ₂₃, ₂₅, Pa, Pe (πρώτιστον alii and most MSS. πρῶτον om. περ L ₆, ₈ Vat. ₁₃ Mc). These variations are unintentional, a specimen of a real conjecture is that of Demetrius, οἳ τὰ πρῶτα.

420. ἧι' *m*, ἦεν *x*, ᾖεν *p*. It is generally recognized that *m* has kept the right form. Ἧεν arises first from contraction (as ᾖε M 371), then ν is added to avoid the hiatus. Similar variants occur σ 150 ; A 609 H 307 ἧι' preserves itself intact.

423. εὔκτιτον αἶπυ *m*, εὐκτί(σ)μενον αἰπύ *xp.* The same unmetrical corruption appears B 592, where εὔκτιστον, εὐκτίμενον and the impossible εὐκτίμεν' are common variants; Quintus, xii. 91 the MSS. have εὐκτίμενον ἐξαλαπάξειν for the necessary εὔκτιτον.

431. ἐπὶ *m*, ἐπεὶ *xp.* Ἐπὶ Κρίσης ' over against Crisa '; Crisa, being the principal place to which the gulf at that time led, is used as a general direction, equivalent to a point of the compass. ' When it had gone past all the Peloponnesus, and over against Crisa began to show the great gulf that

---

[13a] Another parenthesis which interrupts the logical order, but in past time, is Theocr. xiii. 22-24.

severs off the fertile Peloponnesus,' *i.e.* to the East. For the sense cf. Herod. vii. 115 κόλπον τὸν ἐπὶ Ποσιδηίου, and other exx. in the Lexx. Ἐπεὶ of *xp* is intolerable after ὅτε : Schneidewin's very bad alteration τάχ' ἐφαίνετο, though accepted by Gemoll, is sufficiently refuted by Ap. Rhod. iv. 1231 Πέλοπος δὲ νέον κατεφαίνετο γαῖα, Theocr. vii. 10 κοὔπω τὰν μεσάταν ὁδὸν ἄνυμες, οὐδὲ τὸ σᾶμα | ἀμὶν τὸ Βρασίλα κατεφαίνετο.[13b]

436. ἄψορρον *m*, ἄψορροι *xp*. Cf. *Herm.* 141 παννύχιον *m*, παννύχιος *xp*. The adverb is not impossible, at any rate the variation has precedents ; Ω 330 οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἄψορροι προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέοντο, ἄψορρον ' Ambr. L,' Ven. ₁₀ : ἀντίον, ἀντίος, ἐναντίον, ἐναντίος, πλησίον, πλησίος, interchange *passim*, in the Iliad.

447. μέγα γὰρ δέος ἔμβαλ' ἑκάστω *m*, εἷλεν ἕκαστον *xp*. It is hard to see in what way the reading of *m* is inferior to that of *xp*. The turn is Homeric, Λ 11 μέγα σθένος ἔμβαλ' ἑκάστῳ. *A priori* both readings may be independent. Somewhat similar changes of subject are δ 508 τὸ δὲ τρύφος ἔμπεσε πόντῳ, ἔμβαλε ' G,' ξ 31 ἔκπεσε, ἔκβαλε ' GXD.'

459. ἐπὶ *m*, ποτὶ *xp*. These prepositions are constantly interchanged ; cf. Η 83, Κ 336, 347, Μ 115, etc. There is a natural presumption that ἐπὶ is a gloss, and here the metre confirms it.

496. δελφίνιος *m*, δέλφειος *xp* (δελφίος DAOPQ). A word containing the elements δελφιν- seems necessary after δελφῖνι 494, δελφινίῳ 495, but δελφίνιος is obviously out of the question. May the right form be found in δελφίνης ? Ap. Rhod. ii. 706 the name of the python is given in the line δελφύνην τόξοισι πελώριον ἐξενάριξεν, where the scholiast of L doubts as to the gender ; τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ δράκοντος οἱ μὲν ἀρρενικῶς οἱ δὲ θηλυκῶς εἶπον, ὃ καὶ βέλτιον. However this be in the verse of Apollonius, the existence of the masc. form δελφύνης seems assured by the next sentence of the scholiast, who continues ἄλλως. ὅτι δελφύνης ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ φυλάσσων τὸ ἐν δελφοῖς χρηστήριον Μαιάνδριος καὶ Καλλίμαχος εἶπον. If then the temple-keeper was called δελφύνης, the same word may have been an epithet of the altar ; the spelling, on which in any case no weight can be laid (the MS. Guelf. in Apollonius has δελφίνην), may have varied according to the derivation imagined ; here naturally one must read δελφίνης. The somewhat unusual masc. termination and the familiar title (Rhianus, *Anth. Pal.* vi. 278. 3 Φοῖβε σὺ δ' ἵλαος δελφίνιε) amply accounts for M's -ιος, and δελφίνιος easily passed into δελφίος. Cf. the variants for ἐλατιονίδη v. 210.

501. εἰς ὅτε *m*, εἰσόκε *xp*. The use of εἰσότε in Homer is mostly confined to places where it is followed by κε, *e.g.* β 99 εἰς ὅτε κεν, τ 144, ω 134 ; later, *e.g.* Athena xxviii. 14 Ap. Rhod. iv. 800, 1212, the word is found alone. In the Odyssey places there are several variants, β 99 εἰς ὅκε τέ ' Η,' ω 134 εἰσόκε ' FZ,' and to a similar corruption I suppose that εἰς ὅτε is due here.

502. ἔφαθ' *m*, ἔφατ' *xp*. The inferior family neglect the aspirate.

505. βῆσαν *m*, βαῖνον *xp*. Βαῖνον is fixed by Α 437, and the 1 aor.

---

seems only transitive. Βῆσαν may be a late gloss. The same variant however occurs O 384 Σ 68.

507. ἔργματα *m*, ἕρματα *xp*. The spelling of *m* is wrong, as at A 486 in 'H 2 man.,' Ven. ₁₃. The γ is more frequent in ἐερμέναι; H 89 all codd., σ 295 'JH 2,' Apoll. 104.

516. ῥήσσοντες *m* Γ, φρίσσοντες *xp*. Only Baumeister has been found to suggest that *m* conjectured ῥήσσοντες—a feat that moderns as well as Byzantines might have been proud of. Φρίσσοντες is a curious example of double corruption, itacism (ρίσσοντες, so ρύσσοντες Vat. ₁₅ Σ 571), and correction into an actual word ((φρίσσοντες). Σ 571, the other passage where ῥήσσειν appears in Homer, ' Harl. Vat.' L ₁₂, Ven. ₃, Vat. ₅, ₂₂, ₂₅, ₂₆, turn it merely into πρήσσοντες. Cf. Ar. *Eq.* 4 εἰσήρρησεν codd., εἰσέφρησεν *v. l.* in schol.

537. αἰὲν *m*, ὅσσα *xp*. Αἰὲν perhaps, as Hollander p. 19 says, comes from αἰεὶ in 536.

543. ὄμματα *m*, ἤματα *xp*. Apparently a sheer, uncorrected error.

Herm. 11.[13c] μῆς *m*, μεὶς *cet.* (εἰς) T 117 the Chian read μής, but no MS. evidence is known for it. Is μῆς here merely itacistic ? Hes. *Op.* 557 μείς without variant.

12. ἄγαγ' ἀρίσημα *m*, ἄγαγεν *cet.* In *m* first ν was omitted, then the ε, to avoid hiatus, suppressed.

15. πολύδοκον *m*, πυληδόκον *cet.* Itacism, cf. 50 πήχεις, 151 ἠλυμένος, 289 πήματον.

42. Marg. γρ. ὡς δοκεῖ μοι ἀγῶν' ἐξετό *m*; cf. 88 γρ. ον, ην; *Ap.* 391 ἴσως λείπει στίχος εἷς; *Heracl.* xv. 5 πημαίνετ (η),' these acknowledged corrections show the sort of intentional conjecture that the scribes of *m* effected. It is needless to say that none of them are the work of the actual writer of M; he copied them from his archetype with the rest of the book. I imagine them to be due to the tenth century propagator of *m*; at that period we find conjecture active on the margins of MSS. If ἀγῶν' on this line be thought too poor a suggestion to be true, then the original note can be put back into the uncial period, and time given for ΔΙѠΝ to corrupt into ΑΓѠΝ; but it seems to me a true scribe's conjecture, aiming merely at the nearest intelligible word, like a printer's correction of an author's MS. The identical correction, reversed, occurs in Laur. 32, 9 *Agamemnon* 1146, where for ἀγῶνα of the text the reviser writes in the margin γρ. αιωνα.

45. ἢ ὅτε *m*, αἲ ὅτε *x*, ἃς ὅτε *p*. This passage has been misinterpreted by every commentator, so far as I am aware, but Baumeister.[14] Accepting his αἱ δέ τε the translation goes: 'as when a swift thought passes through the heart of him whom thick cares disturb, and they, the sparks, dart from

---

his eyes, so at one time, word and deed, did brave Hermes devise.' That is to say Hermes' ἔργον followed upon his ἔπος with the rapidity with which, when a man is puzzled, as soon as ever an idea comes to him, his eyes light up.   All four members (νόημα—ἀμαρυγαί, ἔπος—ἔργον) are necessary to the comparison; and therefore, if for no other reason, the theory of Hermann (praef. p. xlviii.) and others, that we have two alternatives run together in the text, falls to the ground; so does any interpretation based on ἢ ὅτε of *m*. Gemoll's inability to understand what cares and glances have to do with each other is a wonderful admission, even for a commentator.   The psychology is minutely accurate; as long as the man is tossed by constant anxieties (ἐπιστρωφῶσι μέριμναι) which seem to admit no solution, so long his eyes are dull; but *no sooner* does the happy thought cross his breast (διὰ στέρνοιο περήσῃ) than his eyes light up and glances dart from them (δινηθῶσιν) like light from a pool.   He is in fact 'stung with the splendour of a sudden thought,' his case is

> as when a great thought strikes along the brain
> and flushes all the cheek.[15]

The Homeric δέ τε to introduce an additional touch in the simile needs no illustration.

The palaeographical account on the other hand of the origin of the actual MS. readings is by no means as satisfactory.   From ΔΙΔΕΤΕ one may perhaps get ΔΙΟΤΕ of *x* and ἃς ὅτε, as suggested p. 264, may be a further correction, but ἢ ὅτε of *m* is very far away and may point to an independent though inferior reading ἠύτε cl. v. 55.   Somewhat similarly in Ap. Rhod. iv. 1453 Stephanus emended ἢ ὅτε for ἠύτε.

59.   ὀνομακλυτὸν ἐξονομάζων *m*, ὀνομάζων *x*, ὀνομακλυτὴν ὀνομάζων *p*. *m* only preserves the original; in *xp* the ἐξ has fallen out, as of ἐξήλαυνε in v. 402, though there in *p* only.   *x* leaves the line imperfect, *p* makes the impossible emendation ὀνομακλτήν; cf. p. 264.   For ἐξονομάζειν cf. δ 278.

65.   ἆλτο *m*, ὦτο *x*, ὦρτο *p*.   Independent variants; Τ 62 δείσας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἆλτο, marg. Ven. Α ἐν ἄλλῳ ἐκ θρόνου ὦρτο οὕτω καὶ ἡ μασσα-λιωτική, no MSS. seem to have the variant.

74.   ἀγέλας *m*, ἀγέλης *xp*.   A matter of spelling; cf. 154 ἔλαθε, 356 ἡσυχία, Aphr. ἕκατι, Herm. xii. ἤραν.

78.   πρώτας *m* πρόσθεν *xp*.   Perhaps a gloss; cf. Δ 129 πρόσθε, πρῶτον L 18, M 40 πρόσθεν, πρῶτον L 5, 9, 12, 15, Ven. 9, 'C,' A, Mo, Vat. 20, 24, 29, M6.

82.   νεοθηλέαν ἀγκαλωρήν M, νεοθηλέος ἄγκαλον ὕλης *xp*.   The passage is somewhat uncertain, from the non-occurrence elsewhere of ἄγκαλον.   The word presented by M is particularly mysterious.   Hermann (praef. p. lvi.) conjectured ὤρης for the last word, and with this assumption

---

[15] Prof. Tyrrell has anticipated this Tenny-sonian reminiscence.   Another is suggested by *Aphr.* 219 *sq.* ; who does not think of 'And thee returning on thy silver wheels'?

νεοθηλεαναγκαλωρην can be derived without much difficulty from νεοθηλε-ᵒ

αγκαλōωρησ, if one compares the similar processes νεογνοίων 406 = νεογνεῶν,

ὀλοσποδὸς 238 = ῦ̔λσποδος. The cadence resembles Hes. *Theog.* 576 νεοθηλέας ἄνθεσι ποίης, Athen. 682 F στεφάνους εὐώδεας ἄνθεα γαίης. Cf. also Mimnernus *fr.* 2, 1 πολυανθέος ὥρῃ | ἔαρος.

87. δέμων ἀνθοῦσαν *m*, δόμων αἴθουσαν *xp*. A striking instance of the depravation of *xp*. Δέμειν in Homer is not used except of actual building, τείχη, πύργους, etc., but it is no great stretch to apply it to building up, terracing, tending, a vineyard, in the sense of the expressions ἐυκτιμένη ἐν ἀλωῇ, ἐυκτιμένην κατ᾽ ἀλωήν.[16] What the old man was actually doing is defined by v. 90 ὦ γέρον ὅστε φυτὰ σκάπτεις, and his own words v. 207 ἔσκαπτον περὶ γουνὸν ἀλωῆς οἰνοπέδοιο; in v. 188 he had moved on to another job. When therefore Hermes found him he was 'building up' his vineyard by digging about and tending the roots of his vines, *i.e.* digging out the furrows and loosening the earth about the roots, a usual springtime occupation in Mediterranean countries where corn and fodder are raised between the vines before the grape ripens (ἀνθοῦσαν). Gemoll's note lacks actuality. Δόμων αἴθουσαν seems partly corruption, partly conjecture.

88. ὀγχήστων λεχεποίων M originally; ὄγχηστον λεχεποίην *xp*. The plural is inexplicable, unless it is another case of ω = η, cf. p. 266.

90. ἐπικάμπυλα ξύλα *m*, ἐπικάμπυλος ὤμους *xp*. It is hard to believe that so satisfactory and stable a reading as ἐπικάμπυλος ὤμους can ever have been corrupted into ἐπικάμπυλα ξύλα. Ξύλα may well mean the lower woody stalk of the vines about which the gardener is actually digging; this dry wood (τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου, Eur. *Cycl.* 572 κάγκανα δ᾽ ἀσπαλάθου ξύλα Theocr. xxiv. 89) is eminently 'twisted,' ἐπικάμπυλος, in contrast to the straight shoot which springs new each year. For the adjective cf. Hes. *Op.* 427 ἐπικάμπυλα κᾶλα; and generally Apollonius i. 1117 στύπος ἀμπέλου ἔντροφον ὕλῃ.

91. οἰνήσεις *m*, οἰμήσεις *xp*. οἰνήσεις of course is right. The words εὖτ᾽ ἂν τάδε πάντα φέρῃσι illustrate ἀνθοῦσαν (the vine still in flower).

98. ἐγένετο *m*, ἐγίγνετο *xp*. A corruption, through ἐγίνετο.

108. πυρὸς δ᾽ ἐπεμαίετο τύνη *m*, τέχνην *xp*. Τύνη is a considerable corruption from τέχνην, but θυμός v. 110 is analogous; Ruhnken conjectured αὐτμήν. The sense of the v. is difficult; ἐπιμαίεσθαι with an accusative elsewhere means 'to touch,' as ι 441 ὄ̔ιων ἐπεμαίετο νῶτα, and this does not suit τέχνην. Ilgen, and after him Hermann, wished to give ἐπεμαίετο the sense of 'desire' and make it govern πυρός directly, as indeed is more natural, cl. K 401 δώρων ἐπεμαίετο θυμός. Still the writer may have used the word as equivalent to ἐκμάσσατο, 511.

109. ἐνίαλλε σιδήρῳ *m*, ἐπέλεψε σιδήρῳ *xp*. On primitive fire-making see the passages and authorities quoted in Baumeister's and Gemoll's notes.

---

[16] Herodotus uses it in two places of a road; see Ilgen, or the Lexx.

'Επέλεψε seems sound, of pruning and pointing the stick to make it a proper borer; so in exactly the same sense Λ 236 περὶ γάρ ῥά ἑ χαλκὸς ἔλεψε | φύλλα τε καὶ φλοιόν, of the sceptre, and Φ 455 ἀπολεψέμεν οὔατα χαλκῷ, with variants ἀποκόψειν, ἀποκοψέμεν. 'Ενίαλλε has hitherto been inexplicable; according to ἴαλλε and προίαλλε it can only mean 'thrust on, dashed on,' which, as Gemoll has seen, would make σιδήρῳ = στορεῖ, naturally an impossible combination. Dr. Postgate suggests that ἐνίαλλε may be a contortion of λείαινε 'smoothed' (Quintus xii. 136 οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἀπ' ὄζους | λείαινον). In any case the actual process of friction is omitted (as the act of lighting is v. 113), for σιδήρῳ can mean nothing but 'knife.' If Hermes had a γλύφανον with which he scooped out the tortoise and apparently killed two cows, there is nothing to prevent another tool appearing on the scene.

110. ἄμπνυτο m, ἀνὰ δ' ἄμπνυτο xp. m is right, seeing that ἄμ(εμ)πνυτο has the υ long in Homer. Similar variations depending on misapprehended metre are Β 828 οἱ δ' ἀδρήστειαν, οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἀδρήστειαν 'Η,' L $_{10}$ Ven. $_{1, 13}$, Vat. $_{1, 13, 14, 23}$, M $_{1, 12}$, Pa, Pe, B$_1$, Ε 363 τῇ δ' ἄρ' Ἄρης, τῇ δ' ἄρης, MSS. equally

divided. Η 186 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τὸν ἵκανε vulg., δή ῥ' ἵκανε Ven. A, Ven. $_1$,

Vat. $_{16}$, δὴ ῥ' ἵκοντο Aristarch., no codd., Λ 528 ἄρμ' ἰθύνομεν, ἄρματ' ἰθύνομεν MSS. equally divided, M 218 ὄρνις ἦλθε Aristarch. but no MSS., ὄρνις ἐπῆλθε MSS.

ib. θυμὸς αὐτμῆ m, θερμὸς αὐτμή xp. 'Αναπνέειν seems always used of mental or bodily processes in Homer; still the phrase θερμὸς αὐτμὴ is so strongly supported (see the comm.) that θυμὸς must be supposed a correction of θεμός, ρ having fallen out.

119. ἐκκρίνας m, ἐγκλίνων xp. The place is admittedly difficult.[16a] 'Εγκλίνων can hardly be distinguished in meaning from ἐκύλινδε. 'Εκκρίνας does not occur in Homer, but may mean 'taking them apart,' i.e. first one then the other. I am unable to judge between the readings. I may observe however that ἐκύλινδε, which neither Baum. nor Gemoll can understand, is necessary to the story. Hermes had thrown two cows down; they fell upon their backs (ἐπὶ νῶτα); he then, in order to get at their backbones (αἰῶνες), *rolled them over* and pierced their spines with his γλύφανον.

One understands that when cattle are poleaxed at the present day the essential part of the process consists in the penetration of the brain by a spike, by which death is immediately produced. Hermes' action in 'boring' through the cows' αἰῶνες is virtually the same. The throat-cutting was a second stage, passed over by the writer here; in v. 405 Apollo mentions the second act only, δειροτομῆσαι. The two parts of the operation are clearly given in the account γ 442 sq., Ap. Rhod. i. 425 sq., and where Eumaeus kills a pig ξ 425. Quintus i. 264 gives only the former part; the second only is mentioned Α 457 sq., Β 420 sq., Γ 292, Η 313. The instruments are given in a line of Anth. P. vi. 306, 4 σὺν πελέκει καὶ τὰν λαιμοτόμον σφαγίδα.

[16a] Ludwich, *N. J. f. Ph.* 1888, p. 734 *sq.*

Gemoll's difficulties are therefore unnecessary.   On ἀντιτορήσας, which I would read, see p. 265.

120. πίονα δημῶ *m*, πίονι δημῶ *xp*.   The inferior MSS. attract πίονα into the case of δημῷ ; so in the same phrase Ψ 750 we have πίονι in 'L' (and the reverse mistake πίονα δημόν in L ₄), ι 464 πίονι 'GPHJTKW,' ρ 241 in the phrase πίονι δημῷ we find πίονα in ' G.'

132. ἐπεπείθετο *m*, οἱ ἐπείθετο *xp*.   The dative ἱμείροντι 133 makes οἱ necessary.   'Επεπείθετο (v. 395) no doubt was invented by one of the scribes of *m* after οἱ had fallen out, to make metre.   Somewhat similar is H 195 where for γε πύθωνται we find πεπύθωνται in ' F Vrat. c. Mosc. 3,' L ₉, Ven. ₉, Vat. ₉, ₂₂, while γε is omitted without substitute in M ₅, ₇, ₁₁.   M 162 ὣ πεπλήγετο, ἐπεπλήγετο 'L' Vat. ₁₉, ₂₃, *ib.* 229 οἱ πειθοίατο, πεπιθοίατο 'Ambros.,' O 162 ἐπέεσσ' ἐπιπείσεται, ἐπέεσσι πεπείσεται L ₁₉, Vat. ₂, M ₉, A Mo, πιπείσεται Ven. ₉.

138. ἐπειδὴ *m*, ἐπεὶ *xp*, ἐπεί τοι A ed. pr.   Here on the contrary *m* has preserved the necessary δή, the place of which after it had fallen out in *xp* was supplied by the conjecture τοι in A and ed. pr.   Cf. φ 25 ἐπειδὴ Διὸς υἱόν, δὴ om. ' U,' 205 αὐτὰρ ἐπειδή, δὴ om. 'DWY.'   So Hollander, p. 22. These two instances, following one upon the other, may show the arbitrariness of correction.

141. παννύχιον *m*, παννύχιος *xp*.   Παννύχιον might stand as an adverb cf. ἄψορρον *Ap.* 436, p. 282.

ib. κατέλαμπε *m*, ἐπέλαμπε *xp*.   'Επέλαμψε occurs P 650, and the parts of ἀπολάμπω frequently ; καταλάμπω though found in later Greek is not Homeric.   Does this however affect its position here ?

148. ἰθύσας *m*, ἰθύνας *xp*.   'Ιθύσας is the right form and is generally accepted, cf. ἐπιθύει 475.   For a similar confusion between like forms cf. H 195 where for δύω Aristarchus read δύνω and the form is preserved in Vat. ₁₂.

ib. ἄντρον *m*, ἄντρου *xp*.   The accusative seems a conjecture resting on a misapprehension.   "Αντρου (of the construction of which Baum. doubts) is of course directly dependent on ἰθύσας ; cf. O 693 ἴθυσε νεός, α 119 βῆ δ' ἰθὺς προθύροιο, γ 17 ἰθὺς κίε Νέστορος 'straight for.'

159. φέροντα *m*, λαβόντα *xp*.   Here, as in other passages where the sense is lost, the merits of the MSS. cannot be estimated from their readings. *Prima facie* φέροντα and λαβόντα are on a level, and as they do not improve the sense there is no reason to call one a correction of the other.   The sense appears to me to require a lacuna which might be filled thus ;

159   ὅς σε λαβὼν ῥίψει κατὰ τάρταρον ἠερόεντα (cf. 256)
159a   ἢ σε λαθόντα μεταξὺ κατ' ἄγκεα φηλητεύσειν.

' either Apollo will bind you and throw you down to Tartarus, or if you escape (λαθόντα) you will be an outlaw in the *macchia*.'   This utilizes the reading of *xp*; the resemblance of σε λαβών to σε λαθόντα accounts for the omission of 159a and the contamination λαβόντα.

164. ὃς μάλα πολλὰ μετὰ φρεσὶν ἄρμενα οἶδε *m*, παῦρα—αἴσυλα *xp*

Ἄἴσυλα seems too cynical a term to suit Hermes' supposed character (νήπιον, ταρβαλέον κ.τ.λ.), and with this feeling Ruhnken conjectured αἴσιμα. The passage Υ 201 quoted by editors since Pierson is not in point; there Aeneas retorts to Achilles that he also understands ἠμὲν κερτομίας ἠδ' αἴσυλα μυθήσασθαι, i.e. to utter scoff and evil speech. Could a precocious infant make the same reply to his mother? Hermes' answer is rather that he is not an ordinary child, senseless and without counsel, timorous and afraid; for (166) his action is deliberate and intended for their common benefit. This difficulty is by no means removed by the reading of M, πολλά—ἄρμενα. On the other hand I cannot imagine that this is a correction or corruption from that of xp; the difficulties in παῦρα—αἴσυλα were not likely to occur to a Byzantine scribe or reader. Ἄρμενα in Homer always and Hesiod mostly is used of concrete objects: Scut. 84 however οἵ ῥά μιν ἠσπάζοντο καὶ ἄρμενα πάντα παρεῖχον, 116 μάλα γάρ νύ οἱ ἄρμενα εἶπεν are metaphorical instances, and cf. Theognis 275, 695, Theocr. xxix. 9, Plato Anth. vii. 35, 1. On the whole, to make the best of what the MSS. give us, I suggest that the actual readings are the result of the dislocation of two original ones, πολλά—αἴσυλα, i.e. 'a very naughty boy (justly) afraid and dreading his mother's rebuke,' and παῦρα—ἄρμενα 'a boy with few sensible, fitting ideas,' etc. For the dislocation cf. Ap. 295, p. 278.

169. ἀεξόμεθ' m, ἀνεξόμεθ' xp. A graphical mistake, cf. B 560 ἀσίνην, ἀσίην Et. Mag. Vat. ₁ (post ras.), 656 ἀργινόεντα, ἀργιόεντα 'S,' L ₁₁, R ₁, A.

183. πότνια μήτηρ m, μαῖα xp. I confess myself unable to decide if (with all the editors) μήτηρ is half gloss half reminiscence, or (with Hollander, p. 23) μαῖα is a gloss upon μήτηρ.

200. κέλευθα m, κέλευθον xp. For the plural cf. v. 348, Dem. 381, Ap. 452, 472, Pan xix. 7; it is a variant Ψ 501 ('Vrat. a'), but unfortunately I have not marked this line for collation. Under these circumstances the plural has at least as much claim to consideration as the singular.

202. ἴδοιμι m, ἴδοιτο xp. Hard as the omission of τις with ἴδοιτο is it seems impossible to resist the analogy of N 287 οὐδέ κεν ἔνθα τεόν γε μένος καὶ χεῖρας ὄνοιτο, Hes. Theog. 740 οὐδέ κε πάντα τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν | οὖδας ἵκοιτ', εἰ πρῶτα πυλέων ἔντοσθε γένοιτο: Op. 12 τὴν μέν κεν ἐπαινέσσειε νοήσας is softened by the participle. Cf. Jelf-Kühner § 373, 6. It does not however follow that m's ἴδοιμι is a correction; Ruhnken and Ilgen preferred it. In any case Ernesti's ἴδοιο (a parallel might indeed be found P 681) is surely very bad, though Gemoll and Ludwich print it. Cf. A 216 om. τινα.

208. νοήσας m, νοῆσαι xp. Νοήσας is put out of court by the fact that δοκέω according to the Lexx. is followed by an infinitive in Homer; whether it is a conjecture or a corruption I leave unsettled. On the general construction I follow Franke quoted by Baumeister (whose parallels are not all relevant). V. 277 μήτε τιν' ἄλλον ὄπωπα βοῶν κλόπον ὑμετεράων | αἵτινες αἱ βόες εἰσι, and Dem. 57 φωνῆς γὰρ ἤκουσ' ἀτὰρ οὐκ ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν | ὅστις ἔην, ib. 119 establish the sense here as 'I thought I saw, but I know not for sure, I thought I saw a boy—whoever the boy was that went with the oxen.'

For examples in later Greek see Blaydes on *Nub.* 883 τὸν κρείττον' ὅστις ἐστὶ καὶ τὸν ἥττονα. In both the passages of this hymn the supplement is malicious; here the speaker contrives in the parenthesis to give the information which he denies he possesses.

230. κρονίωνα *m*, κρονίωνος *xp*. Accidental assimilation to παῖδα, cf. p. 279.

238. ὁλοσποδὸς *m*, ὕλης σποδὸς. Ὁλοσποδός must be a corruption, perhaps through υλ'σποδοσ; cf. ἀγκαλωρήν, etc., p. 143. The verse is sound as it stands and requires no alteration. The charred logs (πρέμνων ἀνθρακιήν) are kept alive by a covering of wood-ash (σποδὸς ὕλης), in the same way as the δαλός in ε 487 and Metaneira's boy *Dem.* 239 and cf. Theocr. xi. 51, xxiv. 88; while v. 140 Hermes puts *out* his own fire with ordinary dust (μέλαινα κόνις).

241. προκαλούμενος *m*, προκαλεύμενος *xp*. A common variation in spelling; B 684 καλεῦντο, καλοῦντο L ₂, M ₁₃ 'Eust. G'; on the other hand M 283 Aristarchus read λωτοῦντα while all the MSS. have -εῦντα.

246. παπτήνας δ' ἀνὰ πάντα μυχὸν *m*, ἄρα *xp*. For confusions between ἀνά and ἄρα see p. 278, *Ap.* 292. Here the decision turns on the construction of παπταίνειν, for which see Ebeling *Lex. Hom.* 'Ἀνὰ occurs Ap. Rhod. iii. 1284 παπτήνας δ' ἀνὰ νειὸν ἴδε ζύγα, M 333 with the addition of the clause εἴ τιν' ἴδοιτο; the direct acc. Δ 220; in other passages the verb is absolute or with other prepositions. The balance of sense seems in favour of ἀνά; at least it is gratuitous, with Baumeister, to call it a conjecture.

248. ἐμπλείους *m*, ἐκπλείους *xp*. Ἔκπλειος is not Homeric, and κ is an easy corruption from μ.

255. θᾶττον· ἐπεὶ om. *m*. Accidental, cf. *Aphr.* 156.

259. μέτ' *m*, ἐν *xp*. There is no ex. of ἡγεμονεύειν in Homer with a preposition except v. 461, which obviously is not comparable. Μετ' and ἐν therefore stand on about a level; elsewhere they are interchanged, cf. *Aphr.* 247 where μετ' is impossible. Λ 470 ἐνὶ, μετὰ codd. equally divided, γρ. μετα Ven. A, both readings Eust.

265. κρατερῷ *m*, κραταιῷ *xp*. Gloss or emendation from κρατεῶ = κραταιῶ. The reverse, κραταιῶ for κρατερῶ, stands in *p* v. 386. Λ 119 for κραταιοῦ, which the metre necessitates, we have κρατεροῦ, καρτεροῦ, κρατερροῦ (L ₅). Cf. also *Ap.* 126, 358.

287. μήλων *m*, κρειῶν *xp*. Μήλων is either a gloss or the result of μηλοβοτήρας 286.

292. αὖχος *m*, ἀρχός *xp*. The corruption in *m* is phonetic; ρ fell out, and α was strengthened in accordance with a common tendency; cf. *Ap.* 540 p. 266, πιφαύσκειν, B 867 νάστης, ναύστης Eust., Λ 578 φαυσιάδην, φασιάδην 'G Barocc. Townl,' Ven ₂, Vat. ₁₁ m. 2, M ₄, ₁₃. Π 338 καυλόν, καλόν 'A(B)CDHL Cant.' and most MSS. Mr. Goodwin's correction παυομένη for παομένη *Dem.* 393 rests on the same law.

294. κρατὸς *m*, κρατοὺς L, κρατὺς *xp*. The mistake in *m* seems accidental, especially as the accent is preserved. L's κρατοὺς looks like a correction of the same error conflated with the text.

303. αὐτοῖς *m*, τούτοις *xp*. A correction in *m* from ταύτοις, which is actually the reading of E. The exchange of ου and αυ hardly needs illustration, cf. however E 253, Z 55, H 285.

306. ἐέλμενος *m*, ἐλιγμένος *xp*. Cf. 151 σπάργανον ἀμφ' ὤμοις εἰλυμένος, *Ap.* 450 χαίτης εἰλυμένος εὐρέας ὤμους, and *Herm.* 245 δολίης εἰλυμένον ἐντροπίῃσι; for other exx. in Homer see Gehring's index. The survival of the *nominative* both in *m* and in *xp*, when the acc. would have been so much easier a construction, is a considerable proof of its genuineness. Translate ' he pushed his wrap down past his ears, with his shoulders covered in it,' *i.e.* although his shoulders were covered in it; he uncovered his head but no more; ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν κ.τ.λ. is parenthetical. As to the divergence between *m* and *xp*, I incline (with Windisch) to regard both forms as corruptions from an original εἰλυμένος; the υ fell out, and εἰλμένος was corrected conjecturally by *m* to ἐ[ε]λμένος, by *xp* to ἐλ[ιγ]μένος. Commentators have universally taken παρὰ to mean ' up,' but Hermes was till this moment a bundle of σπάργανα (240); now, beginning to walk seriously (σπουδῇ ἰών), he undoes his head to talk with more dignity to Apollo.

339. γαῖαν *m*, γαίη *xp*. Γαῖαν has been neglected by all editors, even Ruhnken, but I see no reason why it may not be the better reading. Of the parallels given by Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.* p. 448*b*, the following are in point:

δ 417.   πάντα δὲ γινόμενος πειρήσεται ὅσσ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν
ἑρπετὰ γίνονται καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ θεσπιδαὲς πῦρ.

η 332.   τοῦ μέν κεν ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν
ἄσβεστον κλέος εἴη, ἐγὼ δέ κε πατρίδ' ἱκοίμην.

ρ 386.   οὗτοι γὰρ κλητοί γε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν·
πτωχὸν δ' οὐκ ἄν τις καλέοι.

ψ 371.   ἤδη μὲν φάος ἦεν ἐπὶ χθόνα.

I have omitted cases in which there is a verb other than the verb ' to be.' In the remaining instances the ' pregnant accusative ' is doubtless to be explained by some notion of motion or extension inherent in the subject; and it will hardly be disputed that ἀνδρῶν, ὁπόσοι λησίμβροτοι εἰσ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν fulfils this condition as well as any of the exx. from the Odyssey. The corruption from γαῖαν to γαίη is easy, the reverse seems impossible.

342. εὐθύπυλον *m*, εὐθύπορον *xp*. The reading of *m* is of course right, and is supported by 342, 355; πόρον may be an emendation for πολον, helped by the occurrence of the word in 398; at any rate it is unnecessary with Gemoll to call πύλον a ' Besserung.'

349. βαίνων *m*, βαίνοι *xp*. I cannot explain βαίνων, which is impossible in this construction.

352. πολὺν στίβον *m*, μέγαν *xp*. I have no instance of an exchange between πολὺς and μέγας. It is impossible to say *a priori* that one reading is more original than the other.

361. ἀλεγίζων *m*, ἀλεγύνων *x*, ἀλεείνων *p*. Apparently a real conjecture

in *m*, arising from a corruption of ἀλεγύνων similar to *p*'s ἀλέγεινεν 557. Cf. *ante*, p. 266.

368. ἀγορεύσω *m*, καταλέξω *xp*.   These synonyms are perpetually exchanged, *e.g.* Κ 384 κατάλεξον vulg., ἀγόρευσον 'γρ. L,' Vat. ₃, ₆, ₁₀, ₁₉, ₂₃, Μ ₁; 413 καταλέξω Aristarchus vulg., ἀγορεύσω alii 'D Townl.,' Ven. ₉, Ν ₄, Vat. ₁₆, ₂₂, Μ ₈; 427 καταλέξω vulg. ἀγορεύσω 'D' L ₄, Ν ₄, Ven. ₉, ₁₁. Gf B, Vat. ₁₂, ₁₄, ₂₂, ₂₇, ἀγορεύω Vat. ₁.

383. ἐπιδεύομαι *m*, ἐπιδαίομαι *xp* (ἐπιδέομαι II).   The common original seems ἐπιδέομαι, out of which *m* has made ἐπιδε(ύ)ομαι, *xp* ἐπιδαίομαι in order to lengthen the syllable.   Both inventions are of course *voces nihili*. 'Quidam' in Stephanus suggest ἐπομόσσομαι, Barnes' ἐπιδώσομαι however at present holds the field.   This has all the marks of a bad conjecture; the sense it gives is but mediocre (Χ 254 δεῦρο θεοὺς ἐπιδώμεθα is not really parallel), and it is inconceivable that a familiar and, so to speak, stable form like ἐπιδώσομαι should have crumbled into ἐπιδέομαι.   To heal a corruption, one must first discover the circumstance that started it.   Among the more common accidents that may set corruption in motion is the case where a word is omitted in its proper place, and added at the end of the line.   I collect here some instances of this process and its results:

Α 239. μέγας ἔσσεται ὅρκος, μέγας ὅρκος ἐσεῖται 'G Barocc.,' L ₆, ₁₉, Ven. ₆. *ib.* 287 περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι, πάντων περιέμμεναι Eust. (Neumann, p. 200).   Β 731 ἀσκληπιοῦ δύο παῖδε, ἀσκληπιοῦ υἷε δύω (*i.e.* to the scribe υἷε δυῶ)L ₅, Mo.   Γ 442 ὧδέ γ' ἔρως φρένας, ὧδε φρένας ἔρως (*i.e.* φρένᾶς ἔρῶς Eust. who therefore proposes to read ἔρος).   Ζ 211 αἵματος εὔχομαι εἶναι, εὔχομαι αἵματος εἶναι 'Lips. Mosc. 3.'   *ib.* 261 μένος μέγα οἶνος ἀέξει, οἶνος μένος μέγα 'O,' L ₁₉, Ven. ₆ οἶνος μέγα μένος Ven. ₉, Vat. ₁₈ οἶνος μάλα μένος 'L' Vat. ₁₉, ₂₃ μέγα σθένος οἶνος Boissonade *An.* i. 114, *ib.* 335 τρώων τόσσον χόλῳ, τόσσον τρώων χόλω L ₅, Vat. ₂, ₁₉, ₂₁, ₂₃ Mo.   Η 130 φίλας ἀνὰ χεῖρας ἀεῖραι, χεῖρας ἀναεῖραι φίλας 'D,' φίλας χεῖρας ἀναεῖραι Vat. ₁₆. Θ 79 οὔτε δύ' αἴαντες, οὔτ' αἴαντε δύω 'C.'   *ib.* 305 δέμας εἰκυῖα θεοῖσι, θεοῖς δέμας ἐοικυῖα Ath. 632 F.   Ι 204 ἐμῷ ὑπέασι μελάθρῳ, ἐμῷ μελάθρῳ (*i.e.* μελάθρῳ) ὑπέασσιν L ₅, Vat. ₂, Μ ₉, Mo.   Λ 76 σφοῖσιν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι καθείατο, ἐν σφοῖσιν μεγάροις ἐκάθηντο Eust.

Here therefore I suppose that the original was the ordinary formula μέγαν δ' ἐπὶ ὅρκον ὀμοῦμαι and that ὅρκον was omitted and added at the end, producing the line δ' ἐπὶ ὀμοῦμαι ὅρκον, and that in course of centuries of copying the unmetrical collection of syllables δεπιομουμαι was weakened down to δεπιδεομαι or δαιομαι.

385. φωρήν *m*, φωνήν *xp*.   The most signal proof of the excellence of *m* ; the rarity of the word, and the easy permutation of ρ and ν (see Part I. p. 174) amply explain the corruption in *xp*, and give the lie to Baumeister's designation of φωρήν as 'conjectura.'[16b]

400. ὅχου δὲ τὰ χρήματα τιτάλλετο *m*, ἦχ' (ἦχ)' οὐ δὴ τὰ χρήματ'

[16b] Ludwich, *N. Jahrb. f. Phil.* 1889, p. 415 and ed. alone of recent writers doubts this   palmary instance of *m*'s superiority—surely without ground.

ἀτιτάλλετο *xp.* Does M's ὄχου imply a former ὄκκου, or is it entirely unintelligible, like ὀλοσποδός v. 238 ? Ἀτιτάλλετο, though an existing form, is metrically impossible, and Demetrius' ἀτάλλετο seems certain; ἀτιτάλλετο arose from misdivision, χρηματαταλλετο χρημα | ταταλλετο, τιταλλετο, finally χρηματατιταλλετο, which Valla made ἀντιβάλλετο and Lascaris ἀντιτάλλετο (cf. λ 250 κομέειν ἀτιταλλέμεναί τε, ἀντιτελλέμεναί ' F '). The conjectures for ἦχ' οὐ δή are unconvincing. I hazard the suggestion ἦχ' ο ὔ- δ ε ι, *i.e.* ' on the ground ' of the cave, where the cows were, in contradistinction to the roast meat which (135) μετήορα δ' αἶψ' ἀνάειρε.

401. ἐς *m,* παρά *xp.* Ἐς is perhaps a gloss on παρά, in which there is certainly more force ; so Franke *ap.* Baumeister.

403. ἀπάνευθεν *m,* ἀπάτερθεν *xp.* These two words are exchanged E 445, where ἀπάνευθεν is read by ' S Cant.' R ₁, Vat. ₁, M ₁₁, ₁₃ and the mixture ἀπάνερθεν in L ₁₁. Ἀπάνευθε is far the more frequent word in Homer, an ex. of it in a somewhat similar sense to this is P 198 τὸν δ' ὡς οὖν ἀπάνευθεν ἴδεν.

404. γαίη κατ' M, πέτρη ἐπ' *xp.* I can offer no suggestion as to the origin of γαίη κατ'.

411. ἀμβολάδην *m* cum punctis, ἐμβολάδην *xp.* ἐμβολάδην is an ἅπαξ εἰρημένον, but the meaning which must be ' closely, clinging,' is amply guaranteed by the forms ἐμβάλλειν, ἔμβλημα, ἐμβολάς, ἐμβολεύς, ἔμβολος, ' graft.' ἀμβολάδην exists but in the senses of either (1) boiling, throwing up, or (2) preluding, as 426. The change of *a* and *ε* before consonants is so frequent (ἀγείρειν, ἐγείρειν, ἀν', ἐν, ἀμβαίνοντες, ἐμβαίνοντες, ἄμπνυτο, ἔμπνυτο, ἀνῆκας, ἐνῆκας, ἀγκλίνας, ἐγκλίνας) that we need not call ἀμ- βολάδην a ' conjecture.'

418. λύρην *m,* χειρός *xp.* The quantity of the ῠ naturally puts λύρην out of the question. I explain it as a scribe's conjecture to avoid the homoeoteleuton of 418, 419. Cf. *Ap.* 352 πῆμα θεοῖσιν, p. 280.

422. vers. hab. *m,* om. *xp.* ' Eximius ille codex Moscov. hunc locum pulcerrimo versu auget,' Ruhnken. The two thetas account for its loss in *xp.* Gemoll, whose suspicions are too easily roused, objects to this v. and to 457, 8, which also *m* alone preserves ; why not to the Hymn to Demeter itself ?

429. ἀοιδὸν *m,* ἀοιδῇ *xp.* ἀοιδὸν seems the result of assimilation to υἱόν v. 430. Cf. A 171 ἄφενον καὶ πλοῦτον ' Barocc. Mor. Mosc. 1 ex corr.' for ἄφενος καὶ πλοῦτος.

431. ἅπαντες *m,* ἕκαστος *xp.* Ilgen after Wolf accepted ἅπαντες, under the idea that ἕκαστος came from v. 428; it seems more probably a gloss. Ἕκαστος with a plural is well established in Homer ; variants of ἕκαστος ἕκαστοι occur in several passages, and τ 463 ' Vind. 5 ' reads ἅπαντα for ἕκαστα.

440. γενετῆς *m,* γενεῆς *xp.* *m* is obviously right, but why call it with Gemoll a ' Besserung ' ? σ 6 the MSS. read γενετῆς, γενεῆς ' διχῶς Didymus,' and *contra* Z 142 γενεήν, γενετήν ' Plut. *Cons. ad Apoll.* 6.' In the other places there seem to be no variants.

451. χορὸς M, χοροί xp. Did the scribe of M mistake χορ for χορ ?

453. ἄλλο μέλησεν m, ὧδε μέλησεν xp. The double ὧδε in xp is singular. Possibly ὧδε and ἄλλο were originally inverted in the arch. of xp and ὧδε written over ἄλλο as a correction; the next scribe then gave ὧδε in the first place, but without correcting ὧδε in the second. 'Mosc. ex coniectura puto' says Baum., but who by the light of nature would have thought of ἄλλο ?

456. οἶσθα m, οἶδας xp. οἶδας occurs v. 467 without variant, and a 337 where Zenodotus read ᾔδεις; in other places in Homer the form is οἶσθα without variant (e.g. v. 382), except A 85, where Zenodotus read οἶσθας. Here therefore we may call οἶσθα a grammatical gloss.

457, 458. hab. m, om. xp. 'Sind nur in M überliefert und jedenfalls Interpolation,' Gemoll. Possibly, but their omission in xp is no evidence, for there was never a clearer case of homoeoarchon. This even Baum. admits. Cf. ante, p. 272.

468. θοάσσεις m, θαάσσεις xp. Θοάσσεις is not, as might be supposed, a mere error in spelling. The ancients considered the word θοάζειν to have the meaning of θαάσσειν; schol. Aesch. Suppl. 603 gives καθήμενος as an equivalent of θοάζων, schol. Soph. O.R. 2 gives θάσσεται and θοῶς προκά-θησθε as explanations of θοάζετε, Hesych. s.v. θοάζει among other interpretations has κάθηται. There is no variant to θαασσέμεν 172, nor in the places where the word occurs in the Iliad and Odyssey; Apollonius ii. 1026 we have θοάσσων in 'Guelf.' On the whole therefore we may call θοάσσεις a half-conscious variant.

471. δέ m, γε xp. These particles are exchanged passim in the Homeric MSS.; the sense gives the preference to δέ.

482. ὅστις ἂν καὶ αὐτήν m, ὅστις ἂν αὐτήν xp. The extra syllable in m may be the result of contamination, e.g. of ὅσ τις ἂν or ὅς κε μεν, cl. 486.

486. φεύγουσα m, φθέγγουσα xp. Φεύγουσα coincides with Martin's conjecture, and is generally accepted; it must be supposed that in the case of xp the υ first fell out of φεύγουσα, then φέγουσα was written φέγγουσα to make metre, and φθέγγουσα to look like a real word. Cf. μ 351 στρεύ-γεσθαι, στρέγγεσθαι 'NK,' Dionysius Chalcus (Bergk vol. ii. p. 262, fr. 2, 1), πευσόμενοι 'L,' πεσσόμενοι 'BPV.'

487. ἰὼν m, ἐὼν xp. 'Εὼν is made necessary by νῆις, but the words are hardly distinguishable graphically, so great is the resemblance of form, and often of meaning; e.g. Δ 277 ἐόντι Aristarch. vulg., ἰόντι Zenod. 'MS' L ₁₀, Ven. ₁, ₃, Vat. ₁, ₁₀, ₁₃, ₁₄, ₂₅, 426, ἐὸν codd., ἰὸν Aristarchus, Vat. ₁, Λ 230, ἐὼν, ἰὼν Aristarchus διχῶς; ἐών vulg. ἰών L ₈, ₁₆, ₁₈, Ven. ₂, ₁₃, Vat. ₄, M ₄, ₁₀, M 264, ἰόντας vulg. ἐόντας L ₆, ₁₇ R₁, A, Vat. ₁₄, ₂₂, M ₅, ₁₁.

487. ἐρεείνῃ m, ἐρέεινε xp. The error of xp is accidental, and was avoided v. 483.

499. om m, hab. xp. The omission, no doubt accidental, may be due either to homoeoteleuton, or to the recurrence of υἱός in 500.

501. ὑπὸ νέρθεν *m*, ὑπὸ καλὸν *xp*.

502 ὑπὸ καλὸν *m*, ὑπὸ μέλος *xp*.

The reading of *m* in both places is consistent and intelligible, that of *xp* is in neither case possible, and admits of explanation on graphical grounds. So in 501 καλὸν is impossible with ἱμερόεν (or σμερδαλέον) following in 502; it crept in from ὑπὸ καλὸν underneath. In 502 μέλος is impossible metrically; it may be accounted for either by supposing that μέλος in 501 (after itself supplanting μέρος, which v. 53 makes certain) was copied mechanically into 502, or, more elaborately, one may suppose that when ὑπὸ καλὸν had taken the place of ὑπὸ νερθε in 501, the scribe was offended by the second καλόν, and substituted a new word for it. For this complex process cf. 352, 418. The reading of *m* therefore seems original in both places; translate 'the lyre rang beneath (his touch) and the god sang sweetly to it' (ὑπό, cf. φ 411). I have written ὑπένερθε as more Homeric, cf. *Ap.* 118.

502. σμερδαλέον *m*, ἱμερόεν *xp*. It is hard to understand the objection to σμερδαλέον; it occurs in the same sense 54, 420 without variant, and these passages are thought sufficient to replace χειρὸς 501, where no MS. reads it, while here where *m* reads σμερδαλέον it is called a 'reminiscence.' Suspicion should more naturally fall upon ἱμερόεν, as a palpably easier word, helped also by the analogy of Σ 570. Ilgen's correction of ἄεισεν to ἄειδεν in obedience to the earlier passages is superfluous; the scribe had no inducement to make such an alteration, cf. φ 411 for the form.

503. καί ῥα *m*, ἔνθα *xp*. ἔνθα makes more of a paragraph, καί ῥα carries the action on with less break. Which sense is the more appropriate may be a matter of opinion. I see no reason why the two readings may not be independent.

ib. βόας *m*, βόες *xp*. βόας, since Clarke conjectured it, has prevailed; βόες was an obvious error.

ib. κατὰ *m*, ποτὶ *xp*. κατὰ may be a gloss; προτὶ and ποτὶ are constantly glossed in the Iliad MSS., cf. *e.g.* K 336. Similarly *Ap.* 459 ἐπί.

507. τὰ μὲν *m*, τὸ μὲν *xp*. Either reading may stand; the plural of the article seems commoner in later Greek, the singular in Homer, *e.g.* β 46. The conjectures ῥ' ὁ μὲν, ὁ μὲν are singularly misplaced; the apodosis to μὲν is δ' in 511, and the opposition is not between *persons*, which ὁ would imply, but between the different occupations of Hermes. τὰ μὲν 'in one respect,' *i.e.* as regarded Apollo, αὐτὸς δ' αὖθ' 'for himself on the other hand.'

510. om. *m*, but, singularly, Baum. and Gemoll are asleep to the 'interpolation' in *xp*.

515. ἄμα κλέψῃς *m*, ἀνακλέψῃς *xp*. Ἀνακλέπτειν does not exist, and the sense of ἄμα is admitted to be good. The change of ἄμα and ἀνά and generally of μ and ν is sufficiently motived by graphical laws, cf. *ante*, p. 278. Baum.'s 'correctio' is therefore unnecessary.

516. ἐπ' ἀμοίβημα M, ἐπαμοίβια *xp*. Neither [ἐπ]αμοίβιος nor [ἐπ] αμοίβιμος (for which ἐπ' ἀμοίβημα must be meant) occur; Wolf and Ludwich are no doubt right in reading the latter form, the comparative

rarity of the termination (Kühner-Blass § 33 2, 5, 335, 15, Lobeck *Pathol·* p. 171, who gives a list of adjectives of both formations) accounting for the omission of -μ-. Cf. Δ 381 παραίσια, παραίσιμα 'Ν,' Ζ 62 αἴσιμα, αἴσια, 'Bekker *An.* 831, 16.'

518. κ μέγ M, μέγαν *xp*. The reading of M points to a variant κατά. Κατόμνυμι is unhomeric; cf. Eur. *Hel.* 835 ἀλλ' ἀγνὸν ὅρκον σὸν κάρα κατώμοσα.

524. ἀριθμῷ *m*, ἀρθμῷ *xp*. The same phonetic variant occurs Η 302 ἀρθμήσαντε, ἀριθμήσαντε L ₃, ₄, ₈, ₁₆, ₂₀, R₁, N₂, A, Pa, Vat. ₃, ₆, ₁₀, ₁₉, ₂₃, M ₁, ₄, ₅, ₇, ₈, ₁₁, π 427 ἄρθμιοι, ἀρίθμιοι 'DHULWZ.'

533. διαμπερές *m*, διοτρεφές *xp*. A second epithet of Hermes, after φέριστε, seems unnecessary; on the other hand the inversion διαμπερὲς ἦν ἐρεείνεις is strange, and διαμπερές itself is not very significant, since in the text as we have it there is no mention of this request.

534. ἄλλων *m*, ἄλλον *xp*. This might be thought a casual variant, but in the similar phrase μήτε τιν' ἄλλων | ἀθανάτων Ε 827 ἄλλων is read by several MSS., some of a distinct family, *e.g.* 'Cant. Vrat. a,' L ₂, ₁₁, ₁₂, ₁₆, ₁₈, Ven. ₁₀, R₁, Mc, Pa, Pe, Vat. ₃, ₆, ₁₁, M ₁, ₅, ₇, ₁₁, ₁₂.

537. ἐμοῖο *m*, ἐμεῖο *xp*. A phonetic variant, occurring *passim* in the Iliad (Α 259, 301, 341, Δ 343, Ε 214, Ζ 362, Θ 149 *al.*); cf. *Dem.* 72, *Ap.* 166, 314.

542. περιτραπῶν, *m*, περιτροπέων *xp*. Correction in *m*, supervening on a corruption (περιτροπῶν, περιτραπῶν). For the contraction cf. p. 263.

543. οὐδ' ἀπατήσω *m*, ὅστις ἂν ἔλθῃ *xp*. *m* obviously has taken the ending of 545, induced by the recurrence of ἐμῆς ὀμφῆς ἀπονήσεται.

544. φωνή τ' ἠδὲ πότῃσι M, φωνῇ καὶ πτερύγεσσι *xp*. The strength of the view which regards *m*'s reading as independent is the solidity of the reading of *xp*. The citations brought by the commentators to justify πτερύγεσσιν only make it the more inconceivable that so regular an expression should have been glossed by a rare word like πότῃσι. There is a complete absence of *motive*, failing which we are bound to admit the independence of πότῃσι, a word imitated, as by Aratus *Phaen.* 278, from ε 337 αἰθυίῃ δ' εἰκυῖα ποτῇ (*v.l.* -ήν). Ποτή (Hesych. ποτήν· ἰδέαν. οἱ δὲ πτῆσιν. E.M. ποτή· ἡ πτῆσις. ὡς ἔχω ὀχή, οὕτω πέτω ποτή) is a concrete noun meaning 'course, flight,' and of several birds seen at once and taking different directions may well be used in the plural (Quintus xii. 5 πτήσιας οἰωνῶν). For the form cf. *Heracl.* xv. 5 πομπῆσιν ὑπ' Εὐρυσθῆος, O 633 βοὸς ἀμφὶ φονῇσιν, Ε 887 χαλκοῖο τυπῇσιν, etc. Since Ruhnken and Ilgen every editor has preferred the *xp* reading, but their rejection of ποτῇσι rests on mistaken ideas of ancient and mediaeval text-alteration. A rare word is not used to gloss a familiar one, and Byzantine scribes had neither wish nor capacity to invent a 'gesuchte Wendung' of this sort. The two readings are independent.

550. υἱός *m*, υἱέ *xp*. Ὑίός is perhaps an accident, the result of the neighbourhood of ἐρικυδέος; cf. 429.

552. σεμναὶ *m*, μοῖραι *xp*. Of the two words μοῖραι is the more

likely to have been a gloss. Hermann's Θρίαι, however brilliant, is not conclusive; Mr. A. B. Cook, *J.H.S.* xv. p. 7 prefers μοῖραι, Ludwich σεμναί.

556. δικασκαλίαν ἐπὶ *m*, διδάσκαλοι ἦν ἐπὶ *xp*.　See Part I. p. 143; διδασκαλίαν ἐπὶ is an example of real Byzantine correction.

560. θυίωσιν *m*, θυίσωσι *x*, θύσωσι *p*.　The reading of *m* is accepted by every one since Ruhnken; σ inserted between vowels, to form futures and aorists, is a very common error (see p. 278). The correct spelling υι is shared by *m* with *x* (cf. p. 266).

565. ἄνδρ' ἀδαῆ *m*, ἄνδρα δαείης *xp*.　Cf. p. 145; this unconcealed

corruption in *m* may come from ἀνδραδαει̇ (with ης superscribed), abbreviated or not, the super-scribed syllable being understood as a correction of ει. So reversely ἀπόλλωνος for ἀπόλλων p. 263, in *p*.

νομίζων *m*, ὁμιλεῖ *xp*.　Νομίζων similarly seems to be a correction from an ancient corruption arising from a mis-division; ἀθανατοισι | νομιλει.

Aphr. 8. γλαυκῶπιν *m*, γλαυκώπιδ' *xp*.　α 156, Hes. *Theog.* 13, 888, *Ap.* 314 γλαυκῶπιν 'Αθήνην, Ath. xxviii. 2 γλαυκῶπιν before a consonant without variant; on the other hand *Ap.* 323 γλαυκώπιδ' 'Αθήνην, Θ 373 γλαυκώπιδα εἴπῃ also without variant. Here accordingly the authority is about equal.

10. ἄδον *m*, ἄδεν *xp*.　"Αδεν no doubt is from εὔαδεν v. 9. In the same word *Ap.* 22 all the MSS. have the plural.

18. πουλύχρυσα δὲ *m*, καὶ γὰρ τῇ ἄδε *xp*.　'Mira lectio in M partim errore nata partim hariolatione' Baum. I cannot regard πουλύχρυσα δὲ otherwise than as original; there would be a complete absence of induce-ment to misunderstand or to improve upon καὶ γὰρ τῇ ἄδε. The passage must have run at first

　　18　καὶ γὰρ τῇ ἄδε [παρθενίη μέν τ' ἀγαμίη τε]
　　18a　πουλύχρυσα δὲ τόξα καὶ οὔρεσι θῆρας ἐναίρειν
　　19　φόρμιγγές τε χοροί τε κ.τ.λ.

The letters αδε repeated in exactly the same position in consecutive lines produced the double omission; so in 10 and 11 ἔργον and ἔργ' had a like effect in E. Artemis' bow is called παγχρύσεα *Art.* xxvii. 5.

25. στερρῶς *m*, στερεῶς *xp*.　Correction in *m*, to make metre of στερῶς after the second ε had fallen out.

38. ἐθέλῃ *m*, θέλοι *xp*.　Itacism in *m*; so πόλεις 20, κῆπον 66, νηός 138, ἑρμαίω 148, νῦν 280.

66. τροίης *m*, τροίην *xp*.　For the gen. after ἐπὶ in the sense of motion, see Ebeling *Lex. Hom.* p. 451*a*. Here the meaning 'towards Troy' (the place of arrival being more closely indicated by "Ιδην δ' ἵκανε 68) seems not inappropriate.

67. νέφεσι ῥίμφα *m*, νεφέεσσι θοῶς *xp*.　I do not see why *m*'s reading is necessarily the less genuine. Gemoll attributes ῥίμφα to the 'Belesenheit' of the author of the 'recension'; sooner than make such a demand upon the

learning of any scribe or reader of *m* I would consider θοῶς a gloss upon the rarer ῥίμφα (and thereby settle Baumeister's doubts). For ῥίμφα in Homer see the Lexx.

114. τρωὰς *m*, τρωὸς *xp*. The rarity of the fem. τρωάς as an *adjective* explains the corruption τρωός; several critics conjectured *m*'s reading, which no doubt is original.

118. χρυσηλακάτου *m*, χρυσηλάτου *xp*. At v. 16 this corruption was confined to *x*; here it has invaded *p* also. See p. 266.

125. ψαύσειν *m*, ψαύειν *xp*. On the insertion and omission of σ cf. p. 278. Here the tense decides the interpretation. All commentators but Ruhnken and Matthiae prefer the present, which must mean ' I thought my feet did not even touch the ground,' of some one who moves so fast he thinks he swims in air. But are we to suppose Aphrodite representing this maiden as *walking* from Phrygia to Troy, 'across fields of men, and much unparted and untilled land where hungry beasts roam ' ? Surely Hermes carried her; Baum.'s citation Ξ 228 οὐδὲ χθόνα μάρπτε ποδοῖιν of Hera is against him; Hera flew, as is explicitly said of Hermes (ε 49 πέτετο), and therefore literally ' did not touch the earth'; and similarly Persephone and Hermes *Dem.* 384 βαθὺν ἠέρα τέμνον ἰόντες, and the bearers of Memnon, Quintus ii. 569, τυτθὸν ὑπὲρ γαίης. We must therefore read the future and translate ' I thought I should never touch the ground again,' *i.e.* the journey was so long she thought it would never end. The antithesis with 126 is good : ' I thought we were going on for ever, *but* he assured me I was being taken to you,' *i.e.* that the journey had a definite end.

132. μέν *m*, om. *xp*. ' Coniectura additum' the relentless Baum. does not fail to say.

135. δοιώ τε κασιγνήτω *m*, σοῖς τε κασιγνήτοις *xp*. *m*'s reading may be recommended to the consideration of those who believe in the 'Belesenheit des Urhebers der Recension.' It is a corruption superficially corrected, possibly arising from σοις τε κασιγνητοις, σοιω being made into δοιω to give the semblance of a word.

139. κε—τε *m*, τε—κεν *xp*. These confusions are the result of the number of particles in the line. One (supplied by Matthiae as τοι) has disappeared entirely. In the second place *m*'s τε is obviously right, in the first κε is not impossible. See the Lexx. on κε with the future.

147. ἀθανάτου δ' ἕκατι *m*, ἀθανάτοιο δ' ἕκητι *xp*. Ἕκατι is an error of spelling in which *m* is accompanied by N, cf. p. 284, but ἀθανάτου δὲ ἕκητι is a possible reading, cl. ο 319 ἑρμαίαο ἕκητι, π 86 ἀπόλλωνός γε ἕκητι, υ 42 σέθεν τε ἕκητι and was printed by Hermann, followed by Abel.

157. λέχον *m*, λέχος *xp*. The ending in *m* may be due to assonance with εὔστρωτον, cf. p. 289. Scribes are sometimes thought to have mistaken the abbreviation ° (= ος) for ον, see Vitelli *Museo italiano* i. pp. 13, 170.

174. κῦρε *m*, βυρε *a*, ηυρε *bp*. Κῦρε is right, cf. *Dem.* 189 and see *ante*, p. 267. Does not the correct κῦρε by the side of monsters such as δοιῶτε κασιγνήτω and γαῖαν κατ' suggest that all are equally accidental survivors ?

175. Cf. *ante*, p. 267.

189. βιοφθάλμιος *m*, βιοθάλμιος *xp*. A case of semi-conscious assimilation to a familiar word, in which *m* is joined by NP; cf. exactly ἀριθμῶ for ἀρθμῶ Herm. 524.

204. ἐπιοινοχοεύειν—205. τετιμένον—206. ἀφύσσειν *m*.
        ἐπιοινοχοεύοι —   τετιμένος—   ἀφύσσων *xp*.
Ruhnken wished to insert the *m* reading throughout, but besides the harshness of the change from optative to infinitive, a copula (*e.g.* χρυσέου τ'), as Baumeister observes, is necessary. On the other hand, once the *m* reading in existence, it is hard to see any reason for altering it, while three infinitives might conceivably have been corrected into optatives by a scribe who wished to assimilate them to μετείη. The *m* reading now receives this amount of independent support that τετιμένονος of *x* points, as I have said above,
                                                                                       os
p. 172, to τετιμένον, *i.e.* an original acc. with a nom. as variant or correction. The passage Τ 234 does not support one reading more than the other.

229. εὐηγενέος *m*, εὐγενέος *xp*. Εὐηγενέος is right, but not as Baum. says ' ex emendatione '; the η fell out of the unfamiliar form in the carelessly spelled *xp* as at Λ 427 εὐηγενέος Σώκοιο it has fallen out in Ven. ₁₃, Μ ₁₂, ₁₃, and at Ψ 81 in Ven. ₁₀, Β ₁, Vat. ₆, Μ ₇.

241. τοῖος *m*, τοιοῦτος *xp*. Τοῖος may have come from 239, but more probably is due to the falling away of ουτ, so Η 242 τοιοῦτον ἐόντα we have τοῖον in L ₃, ₄, ₁₂, ₁₅, Vat. ₂₃, Μ ₁₀ and τοῖον περ, evidently by a correction, in 'L.'

247. ὄνειδος ἐν *m*, μετ' *xp*. 'Εν is necessary here, as Demetrius saw. For the exchange of the prepositions cf. Herm. 259 p. 289.

255. ζώνην *m*, ζώνη *xp*. There is no variant v. 282; the acc. is perhaps due to the influence of ἐθέμην.

280. νῦν *m*, νιν *xp*. Itacism in *m*, but is Hermann's correction μιν really necessary? In 267 we have an at least equal portent, ἑ as a plural, and there fortunately it is beyond the reach of emendation. Νιν 3rd pers. sing. is used as early as Theognis 364 and Theognis writes virtually the same conventional epic dialect as that of this hymn.

Aphr. vi. 4. ἤνυκε *m*, ἤνεικε *xp*. Itacism, and so 12 κοσμήσθην, *Dion.* vii. 13 ληδοί, *Ath.* xi. 3 αὐτοί.

15. ἰδέσθαι *m*, ἰδόντες *xp*. 'Ιδέσθαι is certainly unintentional; perhaps ἄγεσθαι 17 produced it.

Dion. vii. 29 δὲ καστέρω Μ, ἢ ἐκαστέρω *xp*. The mysterious δὲ seems to represent an original ὅγε in *m*; for such a variant cf. Κ 506 where for ἢ ἔτι in the third member ' C ' has ὅγε (repeated from 504), for the omission of γ cf. Ψ 332 where the Aristarchean reading according to schol. V was ἠὲ, according to Eust. (Neumann, p. 328) ἢ τόγε. For the sense, apart from the difficulty of taking ἐκαστέρω as epexegetic of Ὑπερβορέους (which ὅγε would necessitate), there seems no instance of a repetition of γε in alternatives; see Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.* p. 248*a*. The ordinary reading here corresponds exactly to β 326 ἢ—ἢ ὅγε—ἠὲ, Ap. Rhod. i. 308 ἠὲ—ἢ ὅγε—ἢ iii. 1241 ἢ—ἢ

ὅγε—ἠὲ. Ὅγε therefore in *m* was a mechanical repetition of ὅγε in 28; the fact that it remains in the unintelligible form ὀὲ uncorrected, in M, is a proof how little the MS. underwent a thoroughgoing editing.

Artem. ix. 3. μέλητος *m*, μελήτης *x*, μιλήτης *p*. The proper name is preserved, as usual, in the best MS.

Aphr. x. 3. θέει *m*, φέρει *xp*. So far as sense goes θέει seems to me the better reading (*sc.* αὐτῇ). That there are difficulties in the way of φέρει ἄνθος may be seen by Gemoll's note, where the rash conjecture ἔσθος is hazarded. With θέει the translation of ἄνθος will be 'bloom, beauty' (as *Dem.* 108 *al.*), not 'flower' literally. Ἐπιθέω itself does not seem to be used in this sense, but ἐπιτρέχω is and abundantly, v. Lexx. The change of subject should not be a hindrance.

To φέρει I have no objection as an independent reading, but it is easy to account for it: θ and φ are close, cf. p. 301, and the change of subject would be sufficient motive for a scribe to alter θέει by inserting ρ. The actual variant occurs Ο 88 θέουσα, φέρουσα 'Lips. Harl. frgm. Mosc.' Ven. ₃, Vat. ₂₅.

4. μάκαιρα κυθήρης *m*, θεὰ σαλαμῖνος *xp*. The objections raised against κυθήρης on the score of sense are sufficiently met by Hollander's observation (p. 32) that κυθήρης corresponds to κυθέρειαν of v. 1. It has not been noticed that χαῖρε μάκαιρα κυθήρης εὐκτιμένης μεδέουσα gives a line with a diaeresis after the third foot—a grave objection against a Homeric verse, but perhaps less weighty in a composition of the uncertain date of this hymn.

5. εἰναλίης τε κύπρου *m*, καὶ πάσης Κύπρου *xp*. (M. de Vries has had the kindness to assure me, Jan. 23, 1894, that this is the reading of M. I regret that it was overlooked in the edition.) Κύπρος, κύπρις in Homer have the υ long by position; Κύπρις is found as early as Ibycus *fr.* v. 2 καλλικόμων μελέδημα σὲ μὲν Κύπρις, and often later. Both quantities meet Theocr. xviii. 51. Hermann regarded the variants of vv. 4, 5 as two different versions of the same passage. Cf. *Aphr.* vi. 2, 3.

Demetr. xiii. 1. θεὰν *m*, θεὸν *xp*. The unmetrical θεὰν may be a gloss.

2. περσεφόνειαν *m*, φερσεφόνειαν *xp*. The variant is common, the π-form appears to be right; cf. Ι 457 περσεφόνεια (with φ above) Ven. A, 569 περσεφόνειαν (with φ above) Ven. A, φερσ. Vat. ₁₁, Μ ₁₃, κ 494 φερσ. 'Matro fr. vi. 6,' 509 φερσ. 'Η,' 534 φερσ. 'Η,' λ 217 φερσ. 'GD,' 226 'GHD,' 635 φερσ. 'GD γρ. U²,' μ 70 φασιμέλουσα, a reading handed down for πασιμέλουσα but without MS. authority.

Heracl. xv. 4. ὃς ῥὰ ἠμὲν *m*, ὃς πρὶν μὲν *xp*.

5. πημαίνετ' ἀεθλεύων κραταιῶς *m*, πομπῆσιν ὕπ' εὐρυσθῆος ἄνακτος.

6. ἔξοχα ἔργα *m*, πολλὰ δ' ἀνέτλη *xp*.

There may be some doubt as to the restitution of *m*'s reading (Ilgen inserted δὲ between ἀεθλεύων and κραταιῶς, I would suggest καρταιῶς, on the analogy of the perpetual interchange of κράτος, κάρτος, κρατερός, καρτερός, and make a stop at v. 5), but no one will, I imagine, with

Baumeister and Gemoll consider a Byzantine scribe to be the author of the whole. At least one may with equal right ask why the reading of *xp* is not an invention. Hermann again saw two versions of the same passage. The unmetrical state of M as it stands, and the correction πημαίνετ̓ (with η above), might have suggested that the line was not of quite recent origin. Cf. Hollander, p. 33.

This condition of vv. 4, 5 in M and the corruption *Dion.* xvii. 5 make it likely that *m* or the archetype of *m*, which we know to have been mutilated and which ended abruptly at xviii. 4 (Part I. p. 142), had suffered some damage on its last page or two.

The result of this investigation shows that out of some 150 variations peculiar to *m* not more than six are deliberate conjectures (*Ap.* 198, 209, *Herm.* 306, 349, 361, 418), thirty-four are semi-conscious conjectures (*Ap.* 125, 181, 284, 295, 350, 352, 367, 459, 496, 501, 505, *Herm.* 78, 82, 132, 141, 148, 208, 265, 287, 303, 383, 400, 401, 411, 431, 456, 468, 503, 524, 542, *Aphr.* 25, 135, 189, *Dionys.* vii. 29); substantive variants there are seventy-nine, of which thirty-three are independent (*Ap.* 181, 308, 321, 326, 339, 436, 447, *Herm.* 45, 65, 90, 119, 159, 164, 200, 202, 259, 368, 403, 502, 503, 518, 552, *Aphr.* 8, 18, 66, 67, 204, *Aphr.* x. 3, 4, 5, *Heracl.* xv. 4, 5, 6), and forty-six original (*Ap.* 82, 99, 110, 114, 157, 192, 200, 272, 292, 293, 318, 322, 341, 349, 402, 407, 420, 423, 431, 516, *Herm.* 59, 87, 91, 110, 138, 148, 246, 248, 339, 342, 385, 440, 453, 486, 501, 503, 515, 516, 544, 560, *Aphr.* 114, 118, 125, 174, 229, *Art.* ix. 3). The remaining twenty-six are graphical or phonetic corruptions, and their number is to be augmented by those collected Pt. I. p. 143 *sq.*

The peculiar readings of *y* have next to be considered.

Ap. 55. πολλὴν *y*, οἴσεις *xp* (def. M). The readings are as nearly on a level in point of sense as any pair can be; they seem to me independent. Gemoll puts πολλὴν in the text; Hollander, p. 30, is more guarded. We miss the evidence of M.

136-8. βεβρίθει καθορῶσα Διὸς Λητοῦς τε γενέθλην
γηθοσύνῃ ὅτι μιν θεὸς εἵλετο οἰκία θέσθαι
νήσων ἠπείρου τε φίλησε δὲ κηρόθι μᾶλλον hab. *y*, om. *mxp*.

Whether *y* had 139 also we cannot definitely conclude. The verses 136-8 and 139 are incompatible with each other; on the other hand either alone gives a fully adequate sense. To emend or transpose the whole passage therefore so as to include all four lines seems mistaken; we have evidently two versions of the same passage, one preserved by *mxp* the other by *y*, independent one of the other. This is the view of Hermann, praef. pp. xx. xxi. As illustrations of similar alternatives I give H 234, 234*a*, Θ 415, 415*a*, *Aphr.* 136, 136*a*, Dion. i. 4-6, 7.

162. βαμβαλιαστὺν *y*, κρεμβαλιαστὺν *mxp*. The vulgate is well established, see comm. Still βαμβαλιαστύς is not necessarily a graphical corruption, as Hollander, p. 30, assumes; it is a verbal noun from βαμβαλιάζω,

a form which may well exist by the side of βαμβαίνων K 375 βαμβαίνει Anth. Pal. v. 272, 4, βαμβαλύζων schol. Ven. *ib.*, βαμβαλύζειν Lex. Sequ. *ap.* Bekker *An.* i. p. 30 (copied by Eust. 812, 45), βαμβακύζω Hipponax *fr.* 17, 2, βομβυλιάζουσιν οἱ δεινῶς δεδιότες Ar. *Probl.* 27, 11 (949a 13). In these passages it means 'chatter' or 'rattle' (ἀσαφῆ φωνὴν προιέμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ φόβου schol. Ven. *l.c.*) of the teeth, and from teeth it is but a step to 'bones.' I take βαμβαλιαστὺν therefore to be an independent reading.

211. ἀμαρύνθω *y*, ἄμ' ἐρεχθεῖ *m*, ἄμ' ἐρενθεῖ *x*. On this place I have expressed a general opinion above, p. 276 n. 12. 'Αμάρυνθος is known to us as a town Strabo 448 ταύτης [τῆς 'Ερετρίας] δ' ἐστι κώμη ἡ 'Αμάρυνθος ἀφ' ἑπτὰ σταδίων τοῦ τείχους, and the evidence for the word as the name of a person is very slight (Steph. Byz. 'Αμάρυνθος· νῆσος τῆς Εὐβοίας, ἀπό τινος κυνηγοῦ τῆς 'Αρτέμιδος, a mere eponym; Probus Verg. *Ecl.* ii. 48 Narcissus flos ut Arcesilaus refert a Narcisso Amaranthi qui fuit Erectheis ex insula Euboea. C. Müller, *F. H. G.* i. p. 102, corrected 'Erectheis' into 'Eretriensis'; it would be as simple to change 'amaranthi' into 'amaranthio'). In any case it is a long step to call Amarynthus an 'amasium' of Apollo, and I wonder at the facility with which editors have followed Schneidewin in printing 'Αμαρύνθῳ.

325a. hab. *y*, om. *mxp*. The similarity between νῦν μή τοι and νῦν μέντοι caused *mxp* to omit it. Editors, kinder to *y* than to *m*, have not called it an interpolation.

523. ἄδυτον ζάθεον *y*, αὐτοῦ δάπεδον *mxp*. I do not share in the certainty of editors in regard to the reading of *y*; the graphical likeness between α(δ)υτονζαθεον and αυτουδαπε(δ)ον is of course considerable, but it may be doubted which way it tells.

Herm. 45. ἀμαλδύναι *y*, ἀμαρυγαί *mxp*. I cannot suggest any explanation of ἀμαλδύναι.

241. θῆ ῥα νέον λοχάων *y*, δή ῥα νεόλλουτος *mxp*. Νέον λοχάων still resists all attempts at explanation; and the conjectures based upon it do not deserve mention. The alternative νεόλλουτος may fairly mean 'new-born,' of an infant who has received the attentions that the goddesses give Apollo, *Ap.* 120; the periphrase suits the semi-serious style of this Hymn; cf. Aristoph. *Ach.* 17 ἀλλ' οὐδεπώποτ' ἐξ ὅτου 'γὼ ῥύπτομαι where the scholiast says τουτέστι ζῶ, μεταφορικῶς. τῷ γὰρ ζῶντι ἔπεται τὸ ῥύπτεσθαι. A sense has been got for the passage by patching νεόλλουτος with Hermann's conjecture φή for δή. This is strikingly confirmed by *y*'s θῆ, since φ and θ are exchanged not unfrequently, more on phonetic than on graphical grounds; so A 268 for φηρσὶν θηρσὶν is read in 'L Lips. Vrat. b,' L ₃, ₄, ₁₄, Ven. ₁, R ₁, A Vat. ₂₃, ₂₉, M ₁, ₁₁, ₁₃, and as a correction in several other MSS., M 302 for αὐτόφι, αὐτόθι is in L ₆, ₁₇, Ven. ₂, Vat. ₁₂, ₁₄, ₂₂, ₂₃, M ₄, ₇, ₉ Mo. The particle φή was read by Zenod. at B 144, but is found in no MS., at Ξ 499 it is given as δὲ φή or δ' ἔφη (and in the latter sense Aristarchus interpreted it). Cf. also Hipponax *fr.* 14, 2. We are next to suppose that θῆ became in the majority of MSS. δή, for which change cf. I 394 θήν, δή 'E S Cant.' L ₁₆, R₁, M₅, ₁₁, cl. Θ 448, K 104.

288. ἄντην βουκολίοισι καὶ εἰροπόκοις ὀίεσσιν y, ἀντήσῃς (εἰς) ἀγέλῃσι βοῶν καὶ πώεσι μήλων mxp. Hollander's examination (p. 27) of these lines is unexceptionable. The two readings are independent.[17]

326. μετὰ χρυσόθρονον ἠῶ y, ποτὶ πτύχας οὐλύμποιο mxp. Again I refer to Hollander l.c.

366. ἄλλον μῦθον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἔειπεν y, δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρωθεν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπος ηὔδα mxp. Hollander, p. 26. This case falls under the head of 'formula of speaking,' of variations in which there are countless instances in the Iliad and Odyssey; e.g. A 73 ὅ σφιν ἐϋφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν, Aristarchus and all MSS.; ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ὡς εἰποῦσ' Ven. ₁, Vat. ₁₈, ib. 560 τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος vulg., τὴν δὲ μέγ' ὀχθήσας γρ. Ven. A, Δ 92 ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα vulg., προσέφη γλαυκῶπις ἀθήνη 'NS Cant. Lips. Mos.' L ₁₁, ₁₆, ₁₈, Ven. ₅, R ₁, P, Pa, M ₁₁; E 764 τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς vulg., τὴν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἔπειτα πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε some ancients (ἔνιοι Schol. Ven. A) 'LS Cant. Vrat. b Mosc. 1,' L. ₅, ₁₄, R ₁, Vat. ₂, ₃, ₆, ₁₂, ₂₃, M ₁, ₉, ₁₁, ₁₂, ₁₃ etc. For single words exchanged cf. Herm. 368 ἀγορεύσω, καταλέξω, p. 291. Similar variations occur in phrases denoting 'going away.'

473. τῶν y, καὶ mxp. In the uncertainty as to what word is hidden by παῖδ' ἀφνειὸν it is impossible to decide absolutely between these two variants. Profs. Ludwich and Tyrrell have broken the monopoly of Hermann's πανομφαῖον, which however brilliant does not satisfy the graphical conditions; Tyrrell's πεδ' ἀφνειῶν is more than ingenious, but are we really to introduce πεδά = μετά into Homer? Another mysterious phrase, bearing some likeness to this, is φησὶ δ' ἀνὴρ φρένας ἀφνειός Hes. Op. 455. The older conjectures are collected in Ilgen.

563. ψεύδονται δ' ἔπειτα δι' ἀλλήλων δενέουσαι y, πειρῶνται δ' ἔπειτα παρὲξ ὁδὸν ἡγεμονεύειν mxp. Δονέουσαι Baum., but this conjecture has for the first time been clearly explained by Mr. A. B. Cook, J.H.S. xv. p. 7. As long as δονέουσαι referred to women, no clear picture or intelligible motive was given; but the applicability of the term to bees or bee-women is at once evident. Δονεῖν is divided in meaning between motion and sound; in the latter sense we have δονήσεται Ap. 270 of chariots, and in the neuter Theocr. xx. 29 κῆν αὐλῷ δονέω. I take δονέουσαι therefore of the angry buzz of bees that will not settle, 'buzzing about among each other.' Similarly, metaphorically, Anth. P. v. 121 μὴ σύγε—ἀμφιδονοίης τὸν καλόν. I see however no reason to suppose that δενέουσαι is anything but a graphical corruption, to which marginalia are peculiarly liable, not necessarily going back many years; and the other reading, which it must be remembered belongs to m also, was certainly not invented (as Gemoll supposes, Einleitung, p. 10) to supersede it. Schneidewin's, Hollander's (p. 28) and Ludwich's attempts to read both vv. at once are not happy. We find everywhere in the Hymns that real variants are original alternatives, not a sequence interrupted. I take the two lines therefore to be independent, as 288, 326, 366.

---

[17] Ἄντην is not certain ; Hollander emends it ἀντᾷς, Gemoll after Schneidewin ἀντῇς.

Pan xix. 48. ἵλαμαι *y*, λίσομαι *xp* (*Asclep.* xvi. 5 λίτομαι omnes, *Apoll.* xxi. 5 ἵλαμαι omnes). Gemoll here bestows his 'Besserung' upon *y*; again I take ἵλαμαι and λίσομαι to be independent alternatives, and the latter is not necessarily a corruption of λίτομαι or λίσσομαι, but a regularly formed *future*, implied in λίσαι A 394, λίσῃ κ 526 and cf. the variants Anth. Pal. v. 164. See Veitch, *Greek Verbs s.v.*

Counting up these fourteen solitary readings of *y*, we find that nearly all of them are independent variants; of none of them however can we say that it is right to the exclusion of the corresponding reading. The variants are of great value and interest, but we are to remember that *y* (as far as we can judge of it from the way in which it is cited) is a close relation of *x* and a member of the general *xp* family. Also, from *Herm.* 45 (ἀμαλδῦναι), 241 (λοχάων), 288 (ἄντην), 563 (δενέουσαι), it is plain that *y* is as severely corrupted as the other families.

We may next look at such variants as have two families to support them. It may be expected *prima facie* that a reading found in two such distant families as *m* and *y* will have a strong claim to acceptance.

Ap. 217 ἠδ' ἀγυιήνας *m*   ἢ μαγνηίδας *xp*.
ἢ μαγνιήνας *y*.

The readings of *my* evidently go back to a common source, which may be Matthiae's ἠδ' 'Ενιῆνας; *m* of the two is nearer the original, and has not made the step of taking on μ-. A bridge may be made from ἐνιῆνας to ἀγυιηνας if we imagine the former written itacistically αινιηνας, and I confused with Γ. The corruption must be very old, and we are therefore correct in positing an uncial exchange. (So Hollander, p. 24.) The *xp* reading is a further correction of μαγνιηνας.

                                     ἄλιστοι *y*.
Herm. 168. ἄπαστοι *mx*,   λι   The amount of authority for
                           ἄπαστοι *p*.

ἄλιστοι is uncertain for it is very possible that the superscription in *p* may be drawn from a *y* source. In point of sense however ἄπαστοι does not seem appropriate; Hermes and his mother would hardly starve even if they were not recognized by the other Olympians. Ἄπαστοι also may be explained as a correction of ΑΛ(Ι)CΤΟΙ from ΑΛΙCΤΟΙ; the corruption again is uncial.

212. μῦθον ἀκούσας *my*, φοῖβος ἀπόλλων *xp*. The variants are equally balanced in authority and sense, and seem independent.

224. ἔλπομαι εἶναι *my*, ἔστιν ὁμοῖα. Either reading gives a good construction, and no such expedients as reading κένταυρον λασιαύχενα (Schneidewin) or omitting 225 (Hollander) are wanted. Construe in the one case οὔτε κενταύρου βήματα ἔλπομαι εἶναι τὰ βήματα ἐκείνου ὅστις κ.τ.λ., in the other οὔτε κενταύρου βήμασιν ἔστιν ὁμοῖα τὰ βήματα ἐκείνου ὅστις κ.τ.λ. Of the two variants ἔλπομαι εἶναι is the livelier, but if it were original I cannot see a reason for altering it to ἔστιν ὁμοῖα, for the difficulty such as it is is on the side of the latter.

280. ὡς *mx*, τὸν *y*, ὡς τὸν *p*. Ὡς is probably an interpretation which the difficulty of the construction has forced into the text.

322. δὲ τέρθρον ἵκοντο *mx*, δ᾽ ἵκοντο κάρηνα *yp*. On τέρθρον see the Lexx. In Attic (*e.g.* Aristophanes) the word denotes part of a ship, and the nautical connotation is predominant in it. However it is used of other material things (στέγη οἰκίας Hesych., ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τέρθρον θυράων Apollodorus Bergk, *P.L.G.* iii. p. 378) and there seems nothing in the etymology to give it a more definite meaning than ʻpoint, peak.ʼ Accordingly with Ruhnken and Ludwich I keep it here; the more technical the meaning of τέρθρον, the harder it is to imagine a learned reader wishing to insert it at the price of disturbing an inoffensive reading like ἵκοντο κάρηνα. It has also the joint authority of *m* and *x*.

451. ὕμνος *my*, οἶμος *xp*. I confess myself unable to fix the relation between these words. The eagerness of editors to accept in this case, where it might obviously be a gloss, the reading of *m* is singular. θ 429 ἀοιδῆς ὕμνον is undecisive and cuts both ways. On the whole I should prefer οἶμος, as the less common word. Ludwich, *Homerica* i. p. 6 note, holds the interesting view that the corruption of ὕμνος to οἶμος is phonetic.

Aphr. 214. ἶσα θεοῖσι *my*, ἤματα πάντα *xp*. Here again, as *Herm.* 224, the sense given by one reading, ἶσα θεοῖσι, is the livelier, but there is no positive reason to reject the other. The arguments brought by editors in favour of ἶσα θεοῖσι may all be turned against them.

Dion. vii. 37. φόβος *my*, τάφος *xp*. Here again, as *Herm.* 451, the reading of *my* wears the look of a gloss.

Ares viii. 9. εὐθαρσέος *mx*, εὐθαλέος *yp*. Εὐθαλέος is naturally appropriate to ἥβης, and the α, which is used by Pind., Eur., Aristoph. (*Birds* 1062), need be no stumbling-block in a document of the very uncertain age of this hymn. It is equally unlikely to have suggested a correction to a scribe, and I am not inclined, with Hollander (p. 29) and Gemoll, to consider εὐθαρσέος unoriginal.

Of the nine readings then which are shared equally between the four families there appear to be five cases of independent variants and four where the one variant has proceeded from the other, viz. *Ap.* 217 and *Herm.* 168 as the result of corruption, *Herm.* 451 and *Dion.* vii. 37 as part of a process of interpretation. The way in which the families are distributed—now on the right side, now on the wrong—is a proof of the arbitrariness of tradition and the merely relative difference between MSS.

We have thus discussed the variants offered by the four families in detail; our next step is to collect our results :—

Of conscious conjectures, there are in *m* 6, in *x* 2, in *p* 11 ;

of semi-conscious conjectures, in *m* 34, in *x* 9, in *p* 17 ;

of independent readings, in *m* 33, in *x* 0, in *p* 1 ;

of exclusively right readings, in *m* 46, in *x* 4, in *p* 21 ;

of graphical and phonetic blunders, in *m* about 90, in *x* about 20, in *p* about 50.

These figures, which are necessarily only loosely approximate, give a fairly correct idea of the value of the various archetypes after an unprejudiced survey of their variants.

m is in every way the most strongly characterized branch. It has a very large number of graphical and phonetic blunders, of which some 34 are roughly and only half-intentionally corrected while the greater number remain untouched. It has also nearly 80 peculiar readings which have always belonged to it; 33 of these have an equal claim to acceptance with the alternatives in the other families, 46 are sole survivors of the original. m therefore appears in the excellent character of an uncorrected codex, whose errors are due to natural causes, and which represents a distinct line of tradition.

x, p, and y form in comparison a uniform vulgate, valuable as preserving the alternatives to m's independent readings, and the correct originals of m's innumerable blunders. Among themselves they differ as follows. x is principally valuable for the fidelity of its copying and the almost entire absence of conjecture, to which its singular corruptions offered much occasion, p has the general defect of having passed through the hands of particularly ignorant scribes, whose errors and whose half-intentional corrections of them detract from its value; a larger proportion however of genuine survivals remains in p than in x. y offers a small number of 'variants, whose chief value is that they consist for the most part of entire lines.

No one family therefore represents the original fully, and no family can be dispensed with; all in part, none entirely, possess the inheritance. They possess it in different degrees, and this proportion is their value. Paradosis is a fickle goddess, and dispenses her favour with a deplorable lack of system. When all our weighing and balancing is done, it remains for the editor of these Hymns to take his good where he finds it.

I next endeavour, with the knowledge that we have gathered up to this point, to reconstruct the history of the text. The fifteenth century copies fall into two classes. The former contains the MSS. ELΠTDAtHJKS; of these HJK seem to be descended from DAt, DAt from an ancestor which had a close connection with LΠ; S also seems derived from LΠ. LΠ, the parents of DAtHJKS, go back to a common ancestor b. ET similarly spring from one parent a, and the origins of a and b lead to a common family-archetype x.

The other fifteenth and sixteenth century copies, ABCΓGL$_2$L$_3$NOP QR$_1$R$_2$VMm, point through several but less well defined stages to a common origin p.

Both of these archetypes were minuscule, and in all probability passed, as single MSS., through several minuscule stages. While they were apart, readings were added to the margin of x from another stock y, about which from the circumstances in which it is given us we can say little but that its readings stand equidistant between m and p, and therefore the natural presumption may be correct, that it belonged in the main to x.

Next, x and p, and therefore y, all issued from one common stock z, a

MS. written well in the uncial period and probably pretty far back in that. When x and p differ, it is accordingly generally on points of uncial variation. z contained the hymns minus that to Demeter and the fragment to Dionysus, combined in one collection with various other quasi-epic writings.

Parallel to z and its progeny, there had descended another family, represented by the single fourteenth century MS. M. This had for at least two generations minuscule ancestors, and may be traced back without admixture to an uncial progenitor μ. This copy, as well as all its offspring save M, possessed at least two more Hymns than the z family, and presented them in company with the Iliad and possibly other Homeric poems.

This μ coincided in the main with z, though in a very considerable number of lines it offered different readings. Whether μ and z ever had a common ancestor, that is, a universal archetype of the Hymns, must be a doubtful question. It is perhaps too generally assumed that the tradition of any author necessitates a single archetype. Where the writer is an historical person, as Persius or Martial, such an expression may have meaning; but when we deal with a corpus of writings of uncertain authorship and different ages, the expression original archetype becomes as theoretical as original family of languages. In the absence of any documentary evidence bearing on the Homeric Hymns earlier than the fourteenth century, no conclusion of the sort can be drawn; nor, considering the endless possible relations between manuscripts and scribes in the whole course of antiquity, can any explanation be offered of the connexions and combinations that may have existed between m at any of its stages and the different members of z.

The stemma therefore which I subjoin does not end in a single point, but in two open threads.

Whether however or no there was ever a common archetype of the Hymns, there are a certain number of errors common to all the MSS. alike. These I will next enumerate. To arrive at errors common to an entire tradition is from the circumstances of the case difficult; there is *ex hypothesi* no other MS. authority with which to compare them. On the other hand objective certainty is equally imperative, and to include readings which have been displaced by brilliant conjectures is but a begging the question. A modified objectivity may be had in cases (1) where the passage is quoted by some other writer, (2) where the traditional reading is unmetrical or palpably corrupt, (3) where analogy of sources or other similar literature is very strong. With these criteria we may collect the following series (the interpretation of the passages will be considered in Part III.):

Ap. 165. ἀλλά γε λητώ; ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ἱλήκοι Thuc., 171 ἀφ' ἡμέων, ἀφήμως Thuc., 184 τεθυωδέα a vox nihili, 255 ἡ δ' ἐσιδοῦσα; ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα v. 341 seems proof that this is wrong (see p. 279), 371 ἵμερον μένος; ἵμερον is a vox nihili, and the Homeric analogy seems to necessitate ἱερόν, which Barnes first restored; 392 ἠμαθόην, for νῆα θοήν as corrected in M; 446 κρισσαγῶν without meaning; Lascaris in T corrected κρισσαίων, an uncial error; *Herm.* 133 περῆν; 325 εὔμι(υ)λίη, 346 ὅδ' ἐκτός, all three at least unexplained, if not corrupt; 419 and 501 κατὰ μέλος, where κατὰ μέρος

seems established by v. 53: 473 παῖδ' ἀφνειόν, unmetrical: *Aphr.* 252 στοναχήσεται a vox nihili, 254 σχέτλιον οὐκ ὀνότατον, unmetrical (no doubt originally ὀνοταστόν) and the Homeric ὀνομαστόν seems imperiously necessary.

These very restricted instances throw a clear light upon the character of the tradition of the Hymns, at the furthest point to which the MSS. take it. That such forms as ἵμερον, ἠμαθόην, κρισσαγῶν, εὐμιλίη, παῖδ' ἀφνειόν, ὀνότατον should have come into existence, and having come into existence have persisted uncorrected till the fifteenth century in a language and style so familiar as the Homeric, is surely a very remarkable phenomenon. It points, in my judgment, to the great neglect of these poems; they will have been copied from time to time, but seldom read; and as it is the reader and not the scribe who notices errors and to whom corrections in MSS. are due, these corruptions once in being continued undisturbed down to the Renaissance. The overwhelming number of corruptions in M (see Part I. p. 143 *sq.*) suggests that this family met with even fewer readers than the others; an opinion confirmed by the survival of the Demeter hymn alone in M. If free commerce had existed between the various families and exchanges of variants had been frequent, surely the two first hymns could not have failed to be added to the truncated corpus.

The next question which presents itself is this: Given a number of variants that, so far back as our MSS. reach, are not deducible from each other, what is their origin? Are they due to early interpolation, to a recension made in classical times, or how?

To answer this question I will compare the phenomena of a text which bears an obvious resemblance to this, namely the Iliad. I invite consideration of the following variants :—

(1) Γ 126 πορφυρέην, μαρμαρέην.
(2) *ib.* 211 ἑζομένω, ἑζομένων.
(3) Δ 260 κρητῆρι, κρητῆρσι.
(4) *ib.* 456 πόνος, φόβος.
(5) *ib.* 527 ἀπεσσύμενον, ἐπεσσύμενον.
(6) Ε 31 τειχεσιπλῆτα, τειχεσιβλῆτα.
(7) *ib.* 60 πάντα, πολλά.
(8) *ib.* 293 ἐξελύθη, ἐξεσύθη.
(9) *ib.* 394 καί, κεν.
(10) *ib.* 549 ὀρσίλοχον, ὀρτίλοχον.
(11) *ib.* 744 πολίων, πόλεων.
(12) *ib.* 791 δὲ ἑκὰς, δ' ἔκαθεν.
(13) *ib.* 797 τείρετο, τρίβετο.
(14) Ζ 226 ἔγχεα, ἔγχεσι.
(15) *ib.* 288 ἡ δ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα παρίστατο φωριαμοῖσι, αὐτὴ δ' ἐς θάλαμον κατεβήσετο κηώεντα.
(16) Η 12 λῦντο, λῦσε.
(17) *ib.* 193 δύνω, δύω.

(18) *ib.* 197 ἑλών, ἑκών.
(19) *ib.* 420 ὀτρύνοντο νέκυς, ὤτρυνον νέκυας.
(20) *ib.* 481 πιέμεναι πρὶν λεῖψαι, πρὶν πιέειν πρὶν λεῖψαι.
(21) Θ 191 ὄφρα, αἴκε.
(22) *ib.* 378 προφανέντε, προφανεῖσα, προφανείσας.
(23) *ib.* 408 κεν εἴπω, νοήσω.
(24) *ib.* 526 εὔχομαι ἑλπόμενος, ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος.
(25) Ι 612 ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἀχεύων, ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων (κινυρίζων).
(26) Κ 413 καταλέξω, ἀγορεύσω.
(27) *ib.* 538 μετὰ φρεσί, κατὰ φρένα.
(28) Λ 86 δεῖπνον, δόρπον.
(29) *ib.* 144 οὖδας ἔρεισεν, οὖδει ἐρείσθη.
(30) *ib.* 466 ἵκετ' αὐτή, ἵκετο φωνή.
(31) *ib.* 688 ὄφειλον, ὄφελλον.

I draw short the list, which is not meant to be exhaustive, with the former half of the Iliad. All these are MS. variants. Now suppose that our knowledge of the Iliad text depended entirely upon fourteenth and fifteenth century MSS., and that scholia and other external sources were not existent; what account would be given of these readings? I imagine that criticism would make short work of them, and assign them on one ground or another to the 'kritische Thätigkeit' of unrestful Byzantines. Nos. 1, 4, 13, 28, 30 are excellent examples of the gloss supplanting the original; 15, 23, 25, 26 point to the common phenomenon of 'unconscious cerebration' *i.e.* recollection, on the part of the scribe; 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, etc. might be thought due to intentional correction of supposed grammatical and orthographical errors—and so with the remainder. Yet what do we find? Of the 'glosses' πορφυρέην (1) is ascribed to Zenodotus, Aristophanes and Aristarchus, μαρμαρέην was the contemporary vulgate which the majority of the MSS. have preserved; πόνος (4) was Aristarchus' reading, which he preferred to the already existent φόβος; τείρετο (13) was Aristarchus' preference, τρίβετο was read by ἄλλοι; the most striking instance (28) shows that δόρπον is not an effort of misplaced antiquarianism, nor δεῖπνον an explanatory gloss; δόρπον has Zenodotus for godfather; αὐτή (30), be it better than φωνή, is due to no Tzetzes, but to Aristarchus. Analysis of the other cases shows that these variants, which in appearance seem so explicable by the ordinary accidents of tradition, are without exception of the respectable antiquity of 2,000 years, and were reviewed, approved or rejected by the librarians of Ptolemaic Alexandria.

These variants, thus seen to be ancient, are of the same sort as the variants which we have been discussing throughout the Hymns; some of them are literally identical. Our history of the transmission of the Hymns begins with the fourteenth century. What reason have we to suppose that, if it were continued farther back, these variants would not be found in existence at any given period? That all of them are ancient does not necessarily follow, for in the Iliad there are hundreds of variants beside those

which I have quoted on whose history we have no light. But considering the Hymn-variants as a mass, it appears reasonable to conclude, after they have been subjected to detailed examination, and *in default of external evidence to the contrary*, that they have always subsisted in the Hymn-corpus, and that they go back to times approximating to the original collection.

The test of this theory can only be a papyrus of the Homeric Hymns from a tomb in Egypt or the gallabîyeh of an Arab; but, *in tanto*, we may content ourselves with the one piece of substantive evidence that does exist—the quotation made by the fifth-century Athenian Thucydides. Thuc. iii. 104, in a familiar context, quotes the *Hymn to Apollo* 146-150, 165-171, and exhibits the following variations from our tradition :—

MSS.	Thuc.
146 ἀλλά σύ	ἀλλ' ὅτε.[18]
ib. μάλιστ' ἐπιτέρπεαι ἦτορ	μάλιστά γε θυμὸν ἐτέρφθης.
148 αὐτοῖς σὺν παίδεσσι καὶ αἰδοίης ἀλόχοισι	σὺν σφοῖσιν τεκέεσσι γυναιξί τε σὴν ἐς ἀγυιάν.
149 οἱ δέ σε	ἔνθα σε.
ib.	τε post πυγμαχίη add. Thuc.
ib. ὀρχηθμῷ [18a]	ὀρχηστυῖ.
150 στήσωνται	καθέσωσι.
165 ἀλλάγε δὴ λητὼ μὲν	ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ἱλήκοι μὲν.
168 ξεῖνος ταλαπείριος ἐλθών	ταλαπείριος ἄλλος ἐπελθών.
171 ἀφ' ἡμέων, ημῶν, ὑμῶν	ἀφήμως, εὐφήμως.

Very different views have been held at different times upon the relation of these two versions. Many of the opinions are collected by Gemoll *ad loc.* The most natural perhaps was to give the preference to apparent age, and suppose the Thucydidean the original; then to assume both corrupted, and to arrange a composition from elements of either of them. The only sound view however is that most justly expressed by Gemoll, 'im ganzen und grossen stehen beide Texte fest, und der Herausgeber hat sich für den einen oder den andern zu entscheiden.' If a positive analogy is wanted, I need only point to the prae-Alexandrian variants upon the Iliad and Odyssey, for instance in Plato; these no one that I am aware of would seek to introduce into the text of Homer at the expense of the vulgate.

---

[18] It may be noticed that the ἀλλ' ὅτε of Thucydides is far from 'sinnlos,' as Gemoll carelessly asserts. The sense is perspicuous : ' You, Apollo, at one time walk about on rocky Delos, at another you wander through the islands and mankind, for you have many temples and groves, and all heights and peaks and streams are dear to you ; *but when* you take your pleasure in Delos in especial, *then* (apodotic) the Ionians gather.' The MS. tradition is more emphatic in favour of Delos : ' *but* it is in Delos that you take your pleasure ; there (relative) the Ionians gather.'

Incidentally it may be worth suggesting that a proposition such as 'Thucydides quotes from memory' is intrinsically absurd. What do we know of the circumstances under which a Greek of the fifth century wrote a book ? All we are entitled to say, as judges of evidence, is ' Thucydides quotes.'

[18a] ὀρχηθμῷ καὶ ἀοιδῇ is supported by the identical phrase in Theognis 791.

There are however two places in which a doubt may be felt as to the genuineness of one or both traditions. The former is

ἀλλάγε λητὼ μὲν καὶ ἀπόλλων *m*   ἀλλ᾽ ἄγεθ᾽ ἰλήκοι μὲν ἀπόλλων Thuc.
ἀλλάγε δὴ λητὼ μὲν ἀπόλλων *xp*   (ἄγε δὴ λητῶ *b*, ἄγε δὴ λήκοι *c*).

Editors until Ernesti allowed the MS. reading to stand in the text, although Normann (1687), in an edition of a speech of Aristides, had advised the substitution of the Thucydidean. The arguments against the vulgate are (1) that there is no example of ἄγε being given so much substantive force as to balance χαίρετε (ἄγε μέν, χαίρετε δέ), (2) the μὲν after λητὼ calls imperatively for a verb before it. Δὴ λητὼ is therefore corrupt, and M's reading is an attempt at a correction, to unite λητὼ and ἀπόλλων; and as an original is wanted, no doubt it is ἰλήκοι μὲν. The transition will be facilitated if we suppose the vocative λητοῖ (vv. 14, 62) the intervening stage; δὴ is then a corruption of θι taken for θη (θην).

This account is remarkably confirmed when we find that in the late MSS. of Thucydides the same phenomenon has taken place. Bekker's apparatus, which, to the shame of the learned world, is still the only one available for the third book, shows that while the elder MSS. have ἰλήκοι, one of the later (*b*) has the reading of the Hymns λητώ, while another (*c*) has the intermediate stage λήκοι. It is not necessary to suppose that these late Byzantine scribes were aware of a rare book like the Hymns; the corruption in both places alike was graphical. Gemoll therefore is so far right when he says that the two traditions are identical. The other case is

Ap. 171 ἀφ᾽ ἡμέων *mx*.   ἀφήμως Thuc.
       ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν *p*.   εὐφήμως I. P. Q. c. d. e. f. i.

In the first place ὑμῶν of *p* is doubtless an itacism, cl. *Ap.* 174, p. 10; similarly εὐφήμως of the later MSS. of Thucydides must be a metrical correction from ἀφήμως, since α and ευ can only exchange through minuscule forms, and the testimony of *mx* takes αφ back to the uncial period (this naturally disposes of the attempt of Ruhnken and his followers to put εὐφήμως in the text). Taking then the reading of the best MSS. of both traditions, αφημως on the whole offers more of sense than ἀφ᾽ ἡμέων, and may accordingly be considered a correction from it. The difficulties seem concentrated in ἀφημεων, and this we may therefore suppose the original of the passage. From this form emendation must start. A singular coincidence of corruption occurs in Ap. Rh. iv. 1373 ἢ γὰρ κατὰ νηδύος ἄμμε φέρουσα | ἡμέας ἀργαλέοισιν ὀιζύει καμάτοισιν.

Twice therefore where the Thucydidean and the manuscript versions differ, corruption has had its way: in the former it is confined to the MS. tradition, in the latter it has invaded both sources. The other passages appear to be genuine variants, and confirm the view that we have taken of the differences within the manuscripts themselves, namely, that they are from their origin independent.[19]

---

[19] Compare also the variants given by Pausanias in *Dem.* 482, and by Antig. Carystius in *Herm.* 51.

The question immediately follows. If these variants are taken back as existing parallel to such an early age, what view is implied of their ultimate origin? and here it is inevitable that the well-deserving word 'Rhapsode' should make itself heard. The view that the variations in Homer generally are the work of Rhapsodes has filled a great space in the literature of the Question, and with respect to the Hymns is maintained with most persistence by Hermann (in his Preface) and Hollander. But the Lower or Textual criticism can have nothing to do with Rhapsodes or other figures of early literature; it has no tests by which to detect or define their work, it must content itself with tracing the variants on the Hymns as far back as its method will take them, and declaring that at this point they are independent. A further step belongs to a different province,[19a] and is outside an inquiry which clings to MSS. and the inferences that may be drawn from them.

I conclude therefore this section with a list of these independent variants, the authorities on which each depends being affixed:

Dion. I.	4—6	ἢ καὶ κυανέῃσιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε κρονίων M.
	7	ὡς εἰπὼν ἐκέλευσε καρήατι μητιέτα Ζεύς M.[20]
Dem.	482	χρησμοσύνην M.
		δρησμοσύνην Pausanias.
ib.		καλά M.
		πᾶσιν Paus.
Ap.	136—8	βεβρίθει καθορῶσα διὸς λητούς τε γενέθλην
		γηθοσύνῃ ὅτι μιν θεὸς εἵλετο οἰκία θέσθαι
		νήσων ἠπείρου τε, φίλησε δὲ κηρόθι μᾶλλον y.
	139	ὡς ὅτε τε ῥίον οὔρεος ἄνθεσιν ὕλης. mxp.
ib.	146	ἀλλά συ codd.
		ἀλλ' ὅτε Thucydides.
ib.		μάλιστ' ἐπιτέρπεαι ἦτορ codd.
		μάλιστά γε θυμὸν ἐτέρφθης Thuc.
ib.	148	αὐτοῖς καὶ παίδεσσι καὶ αἰδοίης ἀλόχοισι codd.
		σὺν σφοῖσιν τεκέεσσι γυναιξί τε σὴν ἐς ἀγυιάν Thuc.
ib.	149	οἱ δέ σε codd.
		ἔνθα σε Thuc.
ib.		ὀρχηθμῷ codd.
		ὀρχηστυῖ Thuc.
ib.	150	στήσωνται codd.
		καθέσωσι Thuc.
		δὴ
ib.	152	τότ' mx ποτ' p.
ib.	162	κρεμβαλιαστύν mxp βαμβαλιαστύν y.

Ap.	168	ξεῖνος ταλαπείριος ἐλθών codd.
		ταλαπείριος ἄλλος ἐπελθών Thuc.
ib.	211	[? ἄμ' ἐρεχθεῖ *m* ἄμ' ἐρευθεῖ *x* ἀμαρύνθω *y*].
ib.	249	πολλοὶ *m* ἐνθάδ' *xp*.
ib.	308	ἡνίκ' ἄρα *m* εὖτ' ἄρα δὴ *xp*.
ib.	423	ἐρατὸν *mx* χρυσῆν *p* χαρίεν Athenaeus.
ib.	523	αὐτοῦ δάπεδον *mxp* ἄδυτου ζάθεον *y*.
Herm.	45	[? ἦ ὅτε *m* αἱ ὅτε *x* ᾶς ὅτε *p*].
ib.		[? ἀμαρυγαί *mxp* ἀμάλδυναι *y*].
	51	συμφώνους codd. θηλυτέρων Antigonus Carystius.
	63	ἆλτο *m* ὦρτο *xp*.
	86	[? αὐτοτροπήσας *myp* αὐτοπρεπὴς ὡς *x*].
	90	ἐπικάμπυλα ξύλα *m* ἐπικάμπυλος ὤμους *xp*.
	109	ἐνίαλλε M (= λείαινε ?) ἐπέλεψε *xp*.
	159	φέροντα *m* λαβόντα *xp*.
	164	[? πολλὰ—ἄρμενα *m* παῦρα—αἴσυλα *xp*].
	212	μῦθον ἀκούσας *my* φοῖβος ἀπόλλων *xp*.
	224	ἔλπομαι εἶναι *my* ἔστιν ὁμοῖα *xp*.
	241	[? δὴ ῥα νεόλλουτος *mxp* θῆ ῥα νέον λοχάων *y*].
	288	ἀντήσεις ἀγέλῃσι βοῶν καὶ πώεσι μήλων *mxp*.
		ἄντην βουκολίοισι καὶ εἰροπόκοις ὄιεσσι *y*.
	322	τέρθρον ἵκοντο *mx* ἵκοντο κάρηνα *yp*.
	326	ποτὶ πτύχας οὐλύμποιο *mxp* μετὰ χρυσόθρονον ἠῶ *y*.
	352	πολὺν *m* μέγαν *xp*.
	366	δ' αὖθ' ἑτέρωθεν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπος ηὔδα *mxp*.
		δ' ἄλλον μῦθον ἐν ἀθανάτοισι ἔειπεν *y*.
	368	ἀγορεύσω *m* καταλέξω *xp*.
	403	ἀπάνευθε *m* ἀπάτερθε *xp*.
	431	ἅπαντες *m* ἔκαστος *xp*.
	451	[? ὕμνος *my* οἶμος *xp*].
	473	καὶ *mxp* τῶν *y*.
	502	σμερδαλέον *m* ἱμερόεν *xp*.
	503	καὶ ῥα *m* ἔνθα *xp*.
	518	κατὰ *m* μέγαν *mxp*.
	544	τ' ἠδὲ ποτῇσι *m* καὶ πτερύγεσσι *xp*.
	552	σεμναὶ *m* μοῖραι *xp*.
	563	πειρῶνται δ' ἔπειτα παρὲξ ὁδὸν ἡγεμονεύειν *mxp*.
		ψεύδονται δ' ἔπειτα δι' ἀλλήλων δενέουσαι *y*.
Aphr.	18	πουλύχρυσα *m* καὶ γὰρ τῇ ἄδε *xp*.
	67	ῥίμφα *m* θοῶς *xp*.
	136	οὔ σφιν ἀεικελίη νυὸς ἔσσομαι ἀλλ' εἰκυῖα ⎱ *mxp*.
	136*a*	εἴ τοι ἀεικελίη γυνὴ ἔσσομαι ἠὲ καὶ οὐκί ⎰
	175	ἰοστεφάνου *m* εὐστεφάνου *xp*.
	204	ἐπιοινοχοεύειν *m* ἐπιοινοχοεύοι *xp*.
	205	τετιμένον *mx* τετιμένος *xp*.
	206	ἀφύσσειν *m* ἀφύσσων *xp*.

Aphr. 214   ἶσα θεοῖσι *my*   ἤματα πάντα *xp.*[21]
Aphr. VI. 18 ἰοστεφάνου *mx*   ἐυστεφάνου *p.*
Dion. VII. 37 φόβος *my*   τάφος *xp.*
Ares VIII. 9 εὐθαρσέος *mp*   εὐθαλέος *y.*
Aphr. X.   3 θέει *m*   φέρει *xp.*
             4 μάκαιρα κυθήρης *m*   θεὰ σαλαμῖνος *xp.*
Heracl. XV. 5 πημαίνετ' ἀεθλεί'ων κραταιῶς M   πομπῇσιν ὑπ' εὐρυσθ-
             ῆος ἄνακτος *xp.*
             6 ἔξοχα ἔργα *m*   πολλὰ δ' ἀνέτλη *xp.*
Pan XIX. 7 κάρηνα *x*   κέλευθα *yp.*
            48 λίσομαι *xp*   ἵλαμαι *y.*

<div align="right">THOMAS W. ALLEN.</div>

---

[21] 274, 5 and 276, 7 are probably alternatives.