

## THE TEXT OF THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

## PART IV.

## APOLLO.

RECENT literature on this Hymn is almost limited to the notes of R. Peppmüller, *Philologus*, 1884, p. 196 *sq.*, 1894, p. 253 *sq.*, and H. Pomtow, *Neue Jahrb. f. Phil.*, 1886, p. 176, and the articles of A. Kirchhoff, *Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akad.* xlii. 1893, and A. W. Verrall in this Journal vol. xiv. pp. 1 *sqq.* (1894). For Apollo we have the account by Roscher in his Lexicon; Mr. Farnell (*Cults of Greek States*) has not yet treated him.

Want of illustration and of positive information upon the topics with which the Hymn deals, is the chief stumbling block to its interpretation. We are practically entirely ignorant, so far as other sources are concerned, at these places: the geographical names *Εἰρεσίαι* 32, *Ἀὐτοκάνη* 35, *Αἰσαγέη* 40, *Λέκτος* 217, *Ἀρήνη Ἀργυφέη Αἴπυ* 422, 423; the nature of Eilithyia's necklace 103; the recitations at the Delian festival 156 *sq.*, Apollo's 'brides' 208 *sq.*, the observances connected with chariots at Onchestus 230 *sq.*, the epithets of Apollo *πύθιος* 373, *δέλφειος* 496; the part taken by Cretans in the Delphic worship 393 *sq.* It is the more disappointing that the newly found Delphic inscriptions, so far as they have been published, contribute nothing to the elucidation of these points. The fragments of Hymns to Apollo, whatever perturbation they may have caused in the theory of Greek music, are singularly barren as literary documents.

This condition of ignorance has brought the usual result, that the Higher Criticism has marked the document for its own. Even the usually judicious Ruhnken divided the Hymn into two. I venture to think that consideration tends to show that even where the full import of the context is unrealisable, the grammatical sense presented by the tradition is clear, and that therefore the text may vindicate its soundness. When the darkness that surrounds the subject-matter of documents is deep, a prudent editor will, pending the arrival of better lights, at least guard the wording and the order of the texts for which he is responsible.

In three places in the poem the text has literally disintegrated, at 59, 152, 211; the first two of these singular corruptions have been fairly satisfactorily healed. Several lacunas, but of small extent, appear necessary.

18. *ὑπ' Ἴνωποιο ρέεθροις*. Reiz and A. Matthiae substituted *ἐπ'*, the necessity of which with Ilgen I doubt. As Ilgen remarks, the Inopus is con-

ceived as a mountain torrent (vv. 17, 26), and Leto might be said to be 'under' its waters as it fell steeply. Or ὑπό may have the more general sense of 'near, about,' as in Apollonius ii. 794 ὄφρ' ἐβάλοντο | ὄδρα βαθυρρείοντος ὑφ' εἰαμεναῖς Ὑπίοιο. Φ 87 ἐπὶ Σατυρόντι; ἐπὶ Strabo, ὑπὸ all MSS.

20. νόμος βεβλήσεται ὠδήs. Barnes removed the singular, which was kept by Maittaire (*Miscellanea Graecorum aliquot Scriptorum Carmina*, 172 p. 166): cf. Aratus 817 καὶ μάλλον μελαεύσα, καὶ εἰ ῥηγνύατο μάλλον, where Maass quotes γ 438 θεὰ κεχαροῖατ' ἰδοῦσα, as several MSS. have it for κεχάρωτο ἰδοῦσα; Δ 660 one MS. has βεβλήσεται for βέβληται μὲν ὁ Τυδείδης. To keep the singular νόμος here would imply a strong view upon the unfamiliarity of the author with the epic dialect, but the principle of the preservation of linguistic anomalies presented by MSS. is one to which I incline. Cf. κατενήνοθεν with plural, *Dem.* 279, εἰ in the plural *Aphr.* 267. Whether νόμος should be kept, or altered with Barnes into νομός, may be doubted. Βάλλειν νόμον is in any case an unusual phrase; βάλλειν must be taken, I suppose, in the sense of 'lay, found,' and in this sense may suit better with νόμος 'custom' or 'strain' than with νομός 'range' or 'course.' Also some weight perhaps should be given to the unvarying accentuation of the MSS. Hes. *Theog.* 66 μέλλοντας πάντων τε νόμους, one MS. has νομούς. The conjectures πεπλήσεται (Matthiae), μεμέληται ἀοιδῆs (Hermann), νόμοι μεμβλήσεται ἀοιδῆs (Nitzsch) do not assist.

26. πρὸς κύνθος ὄρος. On the united authority of the MSS. and of Steph. Byz. (*s.v. παρ' Ἀντιμάχῳ ἐν πρώτῃ Θηβαΐδος. ὁ οἰκῆτωρ κύνθιος· καὶ θηλυκῶs καὶ οὐδετέρως*) who can hardly refer to any passage but ours, I retain the neuter, notwithstanding the gen. Κύνθου v. 141. Barnes is the last editor, D'Arnaud, quoted by Ilgen, the last critic, who has not departed from the MSS.

29 sq. With Hermann and Baumeister it must be felt that the connection of the enumeration of places, vv. 30-44, is uncertain. If, as is usually the case, we print a comma at the end of 29, the places are introduced as those over which Apollo rules; but when we get to the end of the list we find they are regions over which Leto wandered. Unless we are to suppose that Apollo's dominion coincided with the spots through which his mother when big with him wandered, either a sign of interrogation, as Gemoll, or a full stop, as in the Oxford text, must be put after 29; the slight abruptness finds many parallels in the Hymns.

32. αἰγαί τ' εἰρεσίαι τε. Πειρεσίαι Ruhnken. It is admitted that no connection is known between Piresiae and Apollo, and as we have Iresiae standing in the texts of Livy xxxii. 13 it seems safe to leave Εἰρεσίαι here. It is true that the Livian Iresiae and Piresiae must have been in the same neighbourhood, and Leake (*Northern Greece*, iv. 493) wished to simplify the matter by abolishing Iresiae. But is it even certain that our Iresiae is the

same as the Livian? For the name cf. the deme *Εἰρασίδαι*. Two other unknown names preserved in this catalogue are *Αἰσαγέη* and *Αὐτοκάνη*. It is a pity that Strabo did not extend his studies on B to this document.

35. *αὐτοκάνης ὄρος αἰπύ*. *Αὐτοκάνη* is not found; it does not follow however that we need the conjectures *ἀντικάνη*, *ἀκροκάνη*, *αἰγοκάνη*, which are equally non-existent. *Κάνη* or *Κάναι* is the name of a considerable mass of mountain opposite the south point of Lesbos, mentioned often by Strabo in his account of Asia Minor and described p. 615. The name applied to a town also, and (according to Stephanus s. v.) to a lake; the district in general was called ἡ *Καναία*. Hence (at Ilgen's suggestion) I take it that *αὐτοκάνη* may mean the centre of the geographical name *κάνη*, 'Heart of *Κάνη*,' i.e. the original peak of which Strabo says *αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ ἰκανῶς συνέσταλται, προσνεύει δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ Αἰγαῖον πέλαγος*, although no parallel use of *αὐτο-* seems to be preserved. *Αἰσαγέη* v. 40 is still unidentified.

46. *εἴ τίς σοι γαιέων νιεῖ θέλοι οἰκία θέσθαι*. *Οἱ* which is generally read, is now found to be the emendation of H, and is made probable by *ἐκηβόλον* in 45. At the same time Apollo is addressed immediately before this parenthesis begins, v. 25, as *σε*, and afterwards v. 120, and therefore *σοι* may not be impossible here.

53. *ἄλλος δ' οὔτις σεῖό ποθ' ἄψεται οὐδέ σε λίσσει*. Mr. T. L. Agar (*Classical Review*, Nov. 1896,) has removed the scales from our eyes, and with the help of the unknown writer of S, seen *οὐδέ σε λήσει* in the end of the line. Thus Ernesti's *τίσει*, Kirchhoff's *ἐσελάσσει* and my *ἐσδύσει* retire into their proper limbo. *Τίσει* had no graphical possibility, and it is singular that it should have occupied the field for a century; Kirchhoff's contribution is curiously inappropriate to an island like Ithaca *οὐχ ἰππήλατος* (or *Zacynthus*, of which Simonides fr. 15 *ἰπποτροφία γὰρ οὐ Ζακύνθω*): my own effort rested on the graphical support given by ρ 276 *δύσει δὲ μνηστήρας, λίσσειο* 'J marg.' E 811 *δέδυκεν, λέλυκεν* 'L.' For the effects produced by the simplest case of itacism cf. Hes. *Opp.* 2, *δεῦτε δὴ ἐννέπετε, δεῦτε δὲ ἐννέπετε*.

79. *ἀλλ' εἴ μοι τλαίης γε θεὰ μέγαν ὄρκον ὀμόσσαι  
ἐνθάδε μιν πρῶτον τεύξειν περικαλλέα νηόν  
ἔμμεναι ἀνθρώπων χρηστήριον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα  
πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἐπειὴ πολύνυμος ἔσται.*

How Gemoll can say 'der Sinn lässt nichts zu wünschen übrig' passes comprehension. Leto was not to include in her oath (nor does she actually 84 sq.) that Apollo should proceed to other men after building a temple at Delos, she was to engage that he should build such a temple at Delos; after which says Delos with a sigh, let him continue his favours, *ἐπειὴ πολύνυμος ἔσται*. No possible compression can get this into the passage: supply rather, with Hermann, such a verse as *τεύξασθω νηούς τε καὶ ἄλσεια δειδρήντα*, which fell out from its identity with 76. Cf. 35-40, 371-4, 505-8, where similar endings have had this effect at four lines distance. The phrase

is repeated, vv. 143, 221, 245, so that one more instance need not give offence. Pomtow's objections (*N. Jahrb. f. Phil.*, 1887, p. 176, sq.) to Hermann's notion of the contents of the lacuna seem unfounded, and his suggestion that 81 is not genuine gratuitous; the same epithet applies to Peppmüller's bracketing of 81, 82 (*l. c.* p. 198).

103. μέγαν ὄρμον | χρυσείοισι λίνοισιν ἐεργμένον, ἐννεάπηχυν. Whether any work of art resembling this necklace ever existed in *rerum natura* at any period of Greek art is for archaeologists to settle: the commentator need have no difficulty in translating the words as they stand: 'a great necklace, nine cubits long, set with golden threads.' The Greek will bear the interpretation either of gold wire, or of tassels of thread or string gilded or strung with gold thread; the latter seems the more likely, if we consider some of the objects to which χρύσεος is applied in Homer: thus Θ 42 horses' manes, Θ 44, N 26 a whip, E 727 reins, T 382, X 383 plumes of Achilles' helmet. In all these cases *material* cannot be implied, but decoration. We get closer to the context in the *Scutum Herculis* 224, ἀμφὶ δὲ μιν κίβισσις θέε θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι | ἀργυρέῃ θύσανοι δὲ κατηρωρῶντο φαεινοὶ | χρυσείοι, of the golden tufts or tassels round Perseus' bag. Further to anyone who objected that no such objects are known from excavations (if indeed tassels and such like can survive) I would answer that this necklace and most of the other objects I have quoted are the work of Gods, and may therefore possess unusual refinements of art. When we find in some Mycenae a necklace nine yards long, we may expect to find one 'set with golden threads, a wonder to behold.' The alterations besides being uncalled for, are all more or less improbable. Barnes' χρύσειον ἠλέκτροισιν ἐεργμένον is graphically impossible (and Gemoll's palaeographical observations merely illusory); λίθοισιν (Matthiae and Peppmüller) is commonplace and can never have been corrupted into the rarer word λίνοισιν; γλήνεσσιν like most of Bergk's conjectures is brilliant but scatterbrained.

Ἐεργμένον (Barnes) for ἐεργγμένον is a very proper correction on the analogy of E 89 σ 296.

Matthiae, in his *Animadversions* and edition, Franke, and Burckhardt in a dissertation quoted by Gemoll, keep the reading λίνοισιν.

116. τὴν τότε δὴ τόκος εἶλε should be restored from Ilgen's most needless alteration δὴ τότε τὴν. The amount of emphasis conveyed by the position of τὴν is quite in place.

133. ὧς εἰπὼν ἐβίβασκεν ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυδοείης. Ἐπὶ Matthiae, which of course gives an easy sense. I am inclined to think however that ἀπὸ may without violence be given a pregnant sense, 'he began to walk [getting up] from the ground,' where up to this time he had been lying. E 13 τῶ μὲν ἀφ' ἵπποιον, ὁ δ' ἀπὸ χθονὸς ὤρνωτο πεζός is somewhat parallel, in so far as it shows how ἀπὸ may be used out of its strictly literal sense. So Hermes as soon as he was born, οὐκέτι δηρὸν ἔκειτο—ἀλλ' ὄγ' ἀναΐξας κ.τ.λ. (*Herm.* 21, 22).

142. ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ νήσους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἠλάσκαζες. Ilgen, Peppmüller and Tyrrell seem right in denying that ἠλασκάζειν can take a simple accusative; αὖ therefore must be altered to ἄν; cf. B 198 ὄν δ' αὖ δῆμον, ὄν δ' ἄν Eust. Here the ν fell out before νήσους, and ν was added to make metre. It is unnecessary to alter ἀνέρας, as has been proposed: νήσους τε καὶ ἀνέρας is a Hendiadys for the 'inhabited islands,' in contrast to Delos. For a similar omission of ἄν cf. Dem. 7.

152. οἷ τὸτ' ἐπάντια σείο τ' ἰάονες ἀθροοὶ εἶεν etc. codd. Martin's brilliant δς for οἷ is made necessary by ἴδοιτο and τέρψαιτο of 153. Οἷ no doubt came in after ἐπαντιάσει' had decomposed, in order to give an apparent subject to εἶεν, the only verb then left. 356 δς τῆγ' ἀντιάσειε. The corruption has the marks of being very early. Conversely Herod. i. 124 ἀντήσαι for ἀντία σεῦ.

160. The apodosis starts here, as Gemoll rightly says. The πάντων ἀνθρώπων φωναὶ are of course the various dialects, which in strongly decentralized countries assume to their speakers the dignity of languages. The case of Gorgo and Praxinoa is in point. In modern Italy recitations in different dialects may now and then be heard. Κρεμβαλιαστὺς or βαμβαλιαστὺς is, as Gemoll sensibly decides, the accompaniment. The forestieri at this great pilgrim centre hear their own speech and their own music. Peppmüller's alteration of αὐτῆ ἐκάστη in 163 misses the point sadly. Matthiae in his Animadversions appears to realise the scene, but in his edition, with the inexplicable violence to which the subjective critic is chronically liable, cuts out all three lines, the most graphic and racy in the Hymn. A study of the arrangements at Rome or Einsiedeln would convince commentators that there is nothing 'inept' in making the pious feel at home.

166 sq. ἐμεῖο δὲ καὶ μετόπισθε  
 μνήσασθ' ὅπποτε κέν τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων  
 ἐνθάδ' ἀνείρηται ξείνος ταλαπείριος ἑλθών  
 ὦ κοῦραι, τίς δ' ὕμνιν ἀνὴρ ἤδιστος ἀοιδῶν κ.τ.λ.

I quote here, since I do not find it in any commentary, the remarkable fragment of Hesiod. No. 227:—

ἐν Δήλῳ τότε πρῶτον ἐγὼ καὶ Ὀμηρος ἀοιδοὶ  
 μέλομεν, ἐν νεαροῖς ὕμνοις ῥάφραντες ἀοιδῆν,  
 Φοῖβον Ἀπόλλωνα, χρυσάορον, ὃν τέκε Δητώ.

The coincidence of subject and place is so marked that one can hardly imagine that the fragment and the Hymn are without connection with one another.

171. ὑμεῖς δ' εὖ μάλα πᾶσαι ὑποκρίνασθε ἀφήμωσ. ἀφήμωσ Thucydides codd. antiquiores, εὐφήμωσ deteriores. ἀφ' ἡμέων Mx: ἡμῶν Aristides ii. p. 539: ὑμέων, ὑμῶν p. I should like to withdraw my note on this line, vol. xv. p. 310. I think now that ἀφήμωσ, the reading of the older

MSS. of Thucydides is literally correct, and that we do not even require the rough breathing of Bergk's ἀφήμως, *Griech. Literaturgeschichte* i. p. 750 n. 'einstimmig (ὑποκρίνασθαι ἀφήμως oder besser ἀφήμως).' Compound words consisting of a primitive + ἀ in the sense of the primitive are not unfrequent, see Kühner-Blass § 339 δ, e.g. ἄπεδος 'flat' from πέδον, Herod. i. 110, ἄβρομοι ἀνίαχοι 'noisy' from βρόμος, *ιαχή* N 41, and especially I 404 οὐδ' ὄσα λάνος οὐδὸς ἀφήτορος ἐντὸς ἐέργει, where the usual derivation was from ἀφήμι, but Aristarchus glossed the word by ὁμοφήτορος, and this derivation is approved of by Prellwitz. There is, I think, no need to refer to ἄμα either in origin or in sense, and if ἀφήτωρ means 'the speaker,' ἀφήμους will mean 'clearly' or 'loudly,' not 'unanimously,' as the scholiasts on Thucydides render, acknowledging the word but misinterpreting it, ἡσύχα, ἀθρόως. I read therefore with Bergk ὑποκρίνασθαι ἀφήμως, recommending myself to the mercy of the etymologists.

Assuming ἀφήμως, the reading of the oldest MSS., to be the original, the corruptions are easily accounted for: on the one hand, ἀφήμως retained as a single word fell into εὐφήμως by the most usual process of graphical corruption; on the other, ἀφήμως, the preposition separating, naturally gave rise to the conjectures ἀφ' ἡμέων or ἡμῶν. In the editions, ἀφ' ἡμέων starting as the *x* reading from Demetrius Chalcondyles, lasted down to Ruhnken, and was translated by Barnes 'responderitis a nobis.' Ruhnken took from the younger MSS. of Thucydides the reading εὐφήμως, palpably the worst of any. *a* may explain *ev*, but not *ev a*. Normann, in his edition of two speeches of Aristides, Upsala, 1687, and after him Bergk, defended ἀφήμως.

173. Keep the present ἀριστεύουσιν; 'whose songs *have* the greatest fame after,' *i.e.* after ἠε̄ has sung them once. He has fame within his lifetime, his songs are more demanded than those of others (*e.g.* the Hesiod of the fragment). Μετόπισθε 166 is used of time during the poet's life, and πωλεῖται, τέρπεσθε, οἰκεῖ are all present. Ἀριστεύουσιν (Barnes) would invest the Delian maidens with prophesy in addition to their other accomplishments.

The criticisms of Ruhnken, Ilgen, and Matthiae upon the excellent word ἀριστεύουσιν are typical of that age ('Deinde quale istud est, ἀριστεύουσιν ἀοιδαί. Tua te lingua prodit, o bone. Digna haec sunt Nonni aetate, non Homeri.'). Hermann vindicated the word. The lines which, even as late as Bergk, have been thought unworthy of the poet, are surely original and most characteristic of the professional bard.

185. ἄμβροτα εἶματ' ἔχων τεθνωδέα. There would be no objection to θνώδεα, on which Pierson's εὐώδεα is no improvement (in its favour may be brought ε 264 θνώδεα, εὐώδεα Plut. de vitando an. al. 831 D, Ap. Rhod. iv. 1155 ἐανούς εὐώδεας), but that it involves the awkwardness of τε fourth in the sentence. Barnes' usually accepted τεθνωμένα may therefore stand,  
M
and we must suppose that the participle, written as usual τεθνω with an

indeterminate scrawl to indicate omission, was at an early period misdeciphered

Δ  
τεθυω, i.e. τε θυωδέα.

204-6. Peppmüller's (*Philologus*, 1894, p. 256) discussion of these lines, which lands him in either the alteration of *θυμόν* into *νίδν* (!) or the transposition of 206 before 205, is a striking instance of the results of overfamiliarity with a document in a foreign language.

207 *sq.* This passage seems as far off as ever from salvation. The only opinion I can express is that as all the lines with the exception of 211 make a bare sense as they stand the text should be left untampered with. The various suggestions that have been made can be refuted one by one, even where they do not mutually destroy each other. I will merely notice the frivolity of Gemoll's *ἀναμνήσω* or *ἐπιμνήσω* for *ἐνὶ μνηστῆσιν*; no one will believe that the omission of *γένος* (211) in *γ* is a proof that it was interpolated into the other MSS. Schneidewin's *ἦ ὡς φόρβαντα* for *ἦ ἅμα φόρβαντι* is now given up, and my own assertion (vol. xv. p. 276) that *τρίοπος* 213 is genitive is as uncertain. The passage waits, and may do so to eternity, for an interpreter.

218. *λέκτον τ' ἤμαθόεντα*. Baumeister's *Λάκμον* and the earlier conjecture *Λεύκον* are unconvincing and therefore to be rejected. There may have been a *Λέκτος* in Europe as there was in Asia, and the name lost, cp. *Αἰσαγέη* and the other names p. 2. The only geographical corrections that seem indispensable are *Ἐνιήνας* in this line and *Ἴλος τ' ἔφαλον* v. 410, both due to Matthiae.

227. οὐδ' ἄρα πω τότε γ' ἦσαν ἀταρπιτοὶ οὐδὲ κέλευθοι  
Θήβης ἀμ πεδίου πυρηφόρον ἄλλ' ἔχεν ὕλην.

*Υλη* for *ὕλην* is Barnes' best conjecture. The accusative comes from the tendency of scribes to be influenced by the nearest apparent construction; similar cases are N 104 οὐδ' ἐπι χάρμη, where the suggestion of the preposition has been irresistible to 'H' Ven.<sub>11</sub>,<sub>13</sub> M<sub>10</sub> which give *χαρμήν* and to L<sub>2</sub> M<sub>6</sub> Vat.<sub>16</sub> Ven.A B C, which give *χάρμη*; φ 177 τρίς δε μεθήκε βίη; many MSS. βίη and Bekker needlessly βίης. Δ 174 σέο δ' ὄστέα πύσει ἄρουρα; ἄρουρα B. M. Pap. 136.

230 *sq.* The custom at Onchestus. My rendering of this passage is as follows: 'there the new-tamed horse breathes again, tired though he be with dragging a fair car, and the driver good though he be leaps to ground from the chariot and walks the road; meanwhile the horses rattle empty cars and have lost their lords. Now if the chariot be broke in the planted grove, they groom their horses, but the chariot they lean up [against a wall or the temple] and leave there, for so is it the custom from the beginning; they make their prayer to the king, but the chariot is the god's portion to keep.' I think that this is intelligible in itself, and it involves only Cobet's alteration of *ἀγησιν* into *ἀγῆσιν*. The current interpretation of the passage down to

Baumeister followed an account given to A. Matthiae by Böttiger. Gemoll exhibited disbelief in this account, and Peppmüller in an interesting note has reviewed the whole situation (*Philologus*, 1894, pp. 257–260). He rightly remarks that the interpretations of Böttiger and of Preller are incorrect in several vital points, and that the passages quoted from Pausanias do not refer to the local custom in question. They are however none the less extremely interesting and pertinent, as illustrating the terrifying effect upon horses attributed to Poseidon in particular places. So in the hippodrome at Olympia (p. 504) there was on one side, in a sort of cutting, *κατὰ τὴν διέξοδον τὴν διὰ τοῦ χόματος*, ‘the fear of horses’ *ὁ ταραξιππος*. At this point *τοὺς ἵππους φόβος τε αὐτίκα ἰσχυρὸς ἀπ’ οὐδεμιᾶς προφάσεως φανερᾶς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου λαμβάνει ταραχή*; the chariots as a rule are broken, and the drivers hurt. There were other *ταραξιπποὶ* in Greece, at the Isthmus and at Nemea; and a certain suspicion attached to the hippodrome of Apollo at Delphi (p. 893). Pausanias believes the divinity at the bottom of these various manifestations to be *Ποσειδῶν Ἴππιος*: a celebrated case of his action is that of Hippolytus.

In our passage Peppmüller objects to the slight alteration *ἀγῆσιν*, although it has the undeniable analogy of Pausanias’ *τά τε δὴ ἄρματα καταγύουσι ὡς ἐπίπαν*, and reads *ἄρμ’ ἀγάγωσιν*. This is open to more than one objection; the translation must be ‘if they bring the chariot into the grove’; but *ἐν ἄλσει δενδρήεντι* cannot be used to express motion after *ἀγειν*—seeing which Peppmüller would connect *ἐν ἄλσει δενδρήεντι* with the next line; this however is forbidden by *μέν*, which plainly marks the beginning of the apodosis. Secondly, the sense of *ἀγάγωσι* is very flat. The young horse is left to himself, and the question is how he will behave; will he get safe past the temple, or will the influence of *ταραξιππος* be too strong and will he bolt and smash the chariot among the sacred trees? ‘Bring the chariot to the grove’ could only have a meaning if we suppose the horse liable to turn tail. Also the horse and his driver were already *ἐν ἄλσει*; the road doubtless ran past the temple, and the driver will have got down where the precinct began. There is therefore no question of the horse ‘finding his way to the goal,’ and becoming *ἄφετος*. Far from that it is implied that his master in any case kept him.

I conceive the statement not to refer to any special festival or *ἀγών*, but to have been the ordinary rule of the road in these parts. The God of Horses was offended at wheeled traffic that passed his home; but he gave travellers so much grace that their cattle were allowed a chance, without guidance. If the horse withstood his influence, well; if he bolted and wrecked the chariot, the traveller compounded by leaving the broken carriage—of which it is to be presumed the priests undertook the repair and eventual sale at second-hand. This very interesting use died out with the decay of Onchestus, of which in Pausanias’ time (p. 76) there were left the ruins of the town, the temple and the grove: Strabo (p. 411) saw the temple, but thought the poets had invented the grove. Lastly no particular stress is to be laid upon *νεοδμής*, as if only young horses underwent the ordeal. Rather it was only in the case of



a νεοδμῆς πῶλος that his owner felt the anxiety; old hacks' nerves were beyond the reach even of an Earthshaker. Leake, *Northern Greece*, II. p. 213 describes the site of Onchestus, on a low ridge.

250. ἤμὲν ὅσοι Πελοπόννησον πείρασαν ἔχουσιν,  
ἢ δ' ὅσοι Εὐρώπην τε καὶ ἀμφιρύτους κατὰ νήσους.

That the name Εὐρώπη, like Ἀσία and Ἑλλάς, extended its original connotation, is suggested by the ancient authorities (Steph. Byz. and the *Etym. Magnum*, who point to Macedonia) and by modern geographers (e.g. Bunbury, *History of Ancient Geography*, i. p. 89). To gut the document, and substitute the impossible ἤπειρον written by Reiz on the margin of his edition, is unworthy of a responsible editor.

299. κτιστοῖσιν λάεσσι. It seems impossible to apply κτίζειν to the materials out of which the temple is made—'fabricatis lapidibus' as Barnes translates. Ernesti's ξεστοῖσιν is too far from the letters of κτιστοῖσι, and the other epic epithet ῥυτοῖσι is farther still. Perhaps τυκτοῖσι 'wrought,' comparing δ 627, ρ 169 206, ν 306 v.l., τυκτὰν μάρμαρον Theocr. xxii. 210. The stages of the corruption are ΤΥΚΤΟΙΣΙΝ, ΤΙΚΤΟΙΣΙΝ by itacism, ΤΙΙΚΤΟΙΣΙΝ (Κ = ΙC), (Κ)ΤΙΚΤΟΙΣΙΝ to make a word.

331. ὧς εἶποῦσ' ἀπόνοσφι θεῶν κίε χωομένη περ.

Barnes' κῆρ for περ has been accepted from his time till Gemoll's, but the non-adversative force of περ, though rare, can hardly be denied in these places:—

- a 315. μή μ' ἔτι νῦν κατέρυκε λιλαιόμενον περ ὁδοῖο·  
ρ 12. ἐμὲ δ' οὐπὼς ἔστιν ἅπαντας  
ἀνθρώπους ἀνέχεσθαι ἔχοντά περ ἄλγεα θυμῶ·  
ιδ. 47. μῆτερ ἐμὴ μή μοι γόνον ὄρνυθι μηδέ μοι ἦτορ  
ἐν στήθεσσιν ὄρινε φυγόντι περ αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον·

and it may well be absent from Γ 200

οὗτος δ' αὖ Λαερτιάδης, πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς  
ὅς τράφη ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης κραναῆς περ εἰούσης.

The amount of emphasis in περ in these instances very fairly suits our line: 'she left the god, angry as she was.'

340. ὧς ἄρα φωνήσασ' ἵμασε χθόνα χειρὶ παχείῃ.

Mr. Platt in a recent number of the *Journal of Philology* prefers ἔλασε, on the precedent of 333, to ἵμασε. Certainly graphically the words are not far off as in minuscule μ produces, not unfrequently, λλ: N 372 ἰλλάσιν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα six or seven MSS. give ἵμασιν or ἵμασιν for ἰλλάσιν. However ἵμασε is forcible, of Hera's rage, and is supported by I 568 πολλὰ δὲ καὶ γαίαν πολυφόρβην χερσὶν ἀλοία, an exact parallel: and of Zeus scourging the earth

or his enemies B 782 ὅτε τ' ἀμφὶ τυφωεὶ γαῖαν ἰμάσση, Hes. *Theog.* 857 πληγῆσιν ἰμάσσας.

361.

λείπε δὲ θυμὸν

φοινὸν ἀποπνεύουσ'.

The incredibly bad substitutions for this fine phrase repay study. Gemoll, who collects them, justly decides that the text is sound. The unusual λείπε δὲ θυμὸν is defended by the passage Pind. *Pyth.* iii. 180 first brought by Matthiae, and by the usual tendency to regard these human physical phenomena (death, etc.) from two alternate points of view, as the man becomes object or subject.

380. προρέειν καλλιέρροον ὕδωρ. Φ 366 προρέειν and προχέειν are variants, and we have προχέειν alone Φ 219 and here 241, but the cognate accusative after προρέειν seems made out, and is certainly the more difficult construction.

382. ἦ καὶ ἐπὶ ῥίον ὄσεν ἀναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων  
πετραίης προχυτῆσιν, ἀπέκρυσεν δὲ ῥέεθρα.

This fall of rocks has buried more than one critic; Ruhnken altered 383 to πετραίης προχοῆσιν, the latter word not a very violent change (Ion of Chios fr. ii. 3 προχύταισιν ἐν ἀργυρέοις, as quoted by Ath. 463 B προχοαῖσιν) but hopeless as to sense; a Dutchman may be excused unfamiliarity with mountain phenomena, but Gemoll is no better, who thinks that the change of ῥίον into ῥόον makes all straight.

The dative, cause of all this mischief, is not governed by ἐπὶ—ὄσεν, but is of circumstance: 'he pushed a rock over, with a shower of stones,' profusis lapidibus. Another ignored dat. of circumstance is at Hes. *Scut.* 288 οἷ γε μὲν ἤμων | αἰχμῆς ὄξειησι κορυνιόωντα πέτηλα: commentators, ancient and modern have had doubts about reaping grain with spears, and Paley brings in ἄρπης to do duty: the ears, however, 'bristle with sharp spears,' i.e. their stalks, as Burns has it.

Apollo's *Bergsturz* followed the usual laws of such things; first the heavy crag detached itself, then a shower of stones and earth followed, and effectually filled the river. Travellers (see Bursian, *Geog. von Griechenland*, i. p. 234) have identified the spring and the mountain behind it, wooded below but ending in sharp rocks, but they do not say if any appearance suggests a catastrophe—another local legend lost except for this Hymn. Other descriptions of falling stones and the damage done by them may be read in *Scut.* 374 sq. and 437 sq.

408. κραιπνὸς δὲ Νότος κατόπισθεν ἔγειρε | νῆα θοήν. Ruhnken's ἔπειγε is usually accepted for ἔγειρε, but passages like the following suggest that the text may stand: Herod. vii. 49 ἐγειρομένου χειμῶνος, Ap. Rhod. i. 1159 ἐγρομένοιο σάλου ζαχρηέσιν αὔραις, iii. 295 of flame, *Anth. Pal.* vi. 21 πρασιῆν διψεύσαν ἐγείρειν. Quintus ix. 271 of a wave, ὃ τ' ἐξ ἀνέμοιο

*διεγρομένον φορέηται.* The ship had been running under canvas; now the wind strengthened and 'woke' it into a quicker course.

417. *εἰς οἶδμ' ἄλιον πολυέχθουον ἀμφὶς ὀρούσει.*

Pierson's *αὔθις* is not as violent a conjecture as might appear at first sight (*αμφίς, αφίς, αυφίς, αυθίς*) but I keep *ἀμφίς* in the sense of 'apart, away' or more shortly 'out.' Examples with a genitive are given in the *Lex. Hom.*, p. 108*b*; it is but a step to the absolute use, for which the nearest parallels in this sense are *ω* 218 *ἢ κεν ἀγνοίησι πολὺν χρόνον ἀμφὶς ἔοντα*, *γ* 486 *ο* 184 *σειὸν ζυγὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχοντες*, *Ap. Rhod.* iii. 1069 *μνάεο—οὔνομα Μηδείης· ὡς δ' αὐτ' ἐγὼ ἀμφὶς ἔόντος | μνήσομαι*, oracle *ap. Herod.* i. 85 *τὸ δέ σοι πολὺ λώιον ἀμφὶς | ἔμμεναι.*

422. In handling this geographical passage, Gemoll, with much judgment, decides that in default of further knowledge the text is to be left unaltered. The passage partly coincides with *B* 591 *sq.* and *ο* 294 *sq.* Strabo 348 *sq.* pointedly ignores the Hymn, though he quotes *v.* 425 (but with *καλλιρέεθρον* and *p.* 447 *πετρήεσσαν* instead of *καὶ παρὰ Δύμην*) as from the *Odyssey*. In view of the abundant extra lines that papyrus is adding to the Homeric poems, it is perfectly probable that Strabo found this verse in his copies.

488. *νῆα δ' ἔπειτα θοὴν ἐπὶ (ἐπ' M) ἠπείρου ἐρύσασθε.*

Mr. Agar's *θοὴν ἀν' ἐπ' ἠπείρου* to save the hiatus is neat and corresponding to the wording of 506.

491. Ilgen's *δ'* after *πῦρ* is unnecessary if we make a comma at *θαλάσσης* and take the two participles with 490; the conclusion then comes with natural weight at *εὔχεσθαι δὴ ἔπειτα.*

521. Pierson altered *ἔμελλεν* and *τετιμένος* into the plural—most needlessly, for while both temple (479, 483) and priests (485) are to enjoy honour, the MSS. may be allowed to turn the scale here in favour of the former.

529. *οὔτε τρυγηφόρος ἦδε γ' ἐπήρατος οὔτ' εὐλείμων* is certainly harsh, but the construction ('this land is not desirable as corn-producing nor as fair-pastured') of adjectives qualifying adjectives is amply covered by *v.* 246 *αἰγίβοτος δ' ἀγαθὴ καὶ βούβοτος*, where no other translation is possible but 'it is good as goat-feeding and as ox-feeding.' The conjectures, most of them incredible, are collected by Gemoll: Peppmüller (*l.c.* p. 275) in an evil hour added *αἰά γ'* for *ἦδε γ'*!

538. *νηὸν δὲ προφύλαχθε, δέδεχθε δὲ φύλ' ἀνθρώπων,  
ἐνθάδ' ἀγειρομένων καὶ ἐμὴν ἰθύν τε μάλιστα.  
ἢ τι τηύσιον ἔπος ἔσσεται, ἢ τι ἔργον.*

Various attempts have been made to complete the construction of 539. *Ἰθύν* seems too good a word to be given up: it is used tropically in Homer, *Z* 79, *δ* 434 *πάσαν ἐπ' ἰθύν* and *π* 304 *σύ τ' ἐγὼ τε γυναικῶν γνώμεν ἰθύν*,

the 'inclination, bent' of the women. Here it is peculiarly appropriate to the will or guidance of the God, the straight path made plain through the oracles of Loxias. The expressions *ἰθείησι δίκησι, δίκην ἰθύντατα εἶποι, δίκη δ' ἴθυνε θέμιστας* are analogous. The word should therefore be kept, and here I find myself in agreement with Peppmüller. I cannot, however, accept his parenthesis (*δέδεχθε δὲ φύλα ἀνθρώπων, ἐνθάδ' ἀγειρομένων*): rather a lacuna must be made, to contain a verb to govern *ἰθύν*, a transition to the threat of 540, the construction of which as it stands is abrupt, and a singular to antecede *σὺ—φύλαξαι* of 544. I can think of nothing better than *δείκνυσθε θνητοῖσι, σὺ δὲ φρεσὶ δέξο θέμιστα*. Homocoteleuton of some sort naturally is wanted.

#### HERMES.

Critical work on the Hymn to Hermes during the last ten years consists for the most part of the labours of one man, Arthur Ludwich. Articles by him are to be found in the *Rheinisches Museum* for 1888, '89, and '90, and the *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, 1886, '87, '88, and '89, and their results are collected in the extremely useful edition of the hymn, Regimontii, 1890. Homer owes more to Professor Ludwich than perhaps to anyone else of his generation, and it is well that this debt should be put on record at a moment when he has lately been the victim of a gratuitous impertinence, not, we may be glad to think, on the part of an Englishman.<sup>1</sup>

I have also to refer to notes by R. Peppmüller, *Neue Jahrb.*, 1887, pp. 201, 805; Herwerden, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1888, p. 73 *sq.* The myth is well treated by Gemoll, and in Roscher's exhaustive article in his *Lexicon*.

The Hymn is admittedly the most difficult of the collection: and this not so much on account of its subject, for the story was often treated in literature, *e.g.* by Alcaeus, and accounts corroborative in the main, though divergent in detail, remain in Apollodorus, Antoninus Liberalis, Ovid, and Pausanias, as from its language and style. The view that the hymn is late is generally abandoned: we have rather a specimen of early, half simple, half ironic, epos: the style, though admirable narrative on the whole, is in places apparently intentionally riddling and dark; absence of cognate literature for comparison has produced unusual corruption; the continuity of sense is broken in several places, and a large number of voces nihili remain to baffle the reader. The attempts of the learned upon them have been more than usually unsuccessful. They belong, or seem to belong to the desperate category of difficulty, where either there is no corruption and it is our knowledge that is at fault, or the corruption is but a step removed from the tradition—a step which is beyond our skill to make. I hope closer study of these documents may make it plain that violent conjectures do not win acceptance, and that the right method is, either that of new interpretation of

<sup>1</sup> I refer to P. C. Molhuysen, *De tribus Homeri* 1896. Mr. Mulvany, *Classical Review*, June 1897, has overrated this performance.

the existing word-forms, or of corrections that approach the type of Mr. Agar's palmary *οὐδέ σε λήσει* for *οὐδέ σε λίσσει*, *Apoll.* 53.

Lacunae seem necessary at 91, 409, 415, 526, 568, and these expressions are either corrupted or still uncertain: *ἀναπηλήσας* 41, *αὐτοτροπήσας* 86, *τὸ σὸν αὐτοῦ* 93, *περῆν* 133, *ἢ σε λαβόντα μεταξὺ* 159, *τιτύσκειαι* 163, *βουλεύων* 167, the whole line 188, *ἄγρης· εἰνετέον τε* 242, *ὄφρυσι ριπτάζειν* 279, 282 *sq.*, *εὐμυλίη* 325, *ὄδ' ἐκτός* 346, *κραίνων* 427 and elsewhere, *μέμηλας* 437, *θυμὸν ἐπαίνει* 457, *ἡγεμονεύσω* 461, *σῆματ' ἐπεὶ* 509.

With the higher criticism of the Hymn I have not to do. There is however, one peculiarity of the story which must strike every attentive reader, the variations in the different accounts of Hermes' journey with the oxen from Pieria to Pylos and Apollo's search after him. The difficulty is real, but I entirely agree with Franke, Gemoll (p. 187 and note on 211), and Ludwich 'Angeblliche Widersprüche im hom. Hermeshymnus' *Neue Jahrb.*, 1887, p. 321 *sq.* that the inconsistency is original and native to the poem. It is satisfactory to find literary criticism at length becoming historical and taking account of conditions and standards other than those of its own time. Tyrrell, *l.c.* p. 42 *sq.* has fallen into a misapprehension with regard to Hermes' descent from Pieria which it is unnecessary to examine in detail. There was, of course, only one journey.

The integrity of the document apart, the geographical outlook of the writer is curious; he is very vague as to continental Greece, and evidently thought Pieria was connected with Onchestus by a sandy road along the sea. This vagueness contrasts with the accuracy of the author of the *Hymn to Apollo*, who gets Apollo's journey from Euboea to Delphi marked out with great correctness. It would be an easy guess that the writer of the Hymn to Hermes was a Peloponnesian; the reference to the skin surviving outside the cave at Pylos (v. 125) implies connection with the Alpheus country. Bergk (*Griech. Lit.*, i. p. 766 n.), upon the same evidence thinks the author was an Ionian; so differently do things present themselves to different people.

6. *ἄντρον ἔσω ναίουσα παλίσκιον*. With Ludwich I restore this, the MS. reading. *Ἄντρον* or *ἄντρον* is needless; xviii. 6 *ἄντρον ναιετάουσα παλίσκιον* has no binding force, and *ἔσω* is absolute and parenthetic; 'inhabiting the cave, within'; cf. 49 *ἀψ εἴσω κίε δῶμα*, H 13 *δῶναι δῶμον αἶδος εἴσω*, Θ 549 *κνίσσην δ' ἐκ πεδίου ἄνεμοι φέρον οὐρανὸν εἴσω*, and other passages; ψ 23 *νέεσθαι | αὐτίς ἔσω μέγαρον*, where the variant *μεγάρων* arises from the same misapprehension, Theocr. *Epigr.*, 3: 5, *ἄντρον ἔσω στείχοντες*. The use being parenthetic can accommodate itself as well to rest as to motion: Ilgen brings some exx. of the former sense.

15. *πυλαδόκον*. Certainly not 'porter,' as Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.*, and the older commentaries, since Hermes never appears in so sedentary a function; but = 'thief,' as Matthiae suggests and Baumeister decides; cf. *ὀδοιδόκος* and (in a different sense) *πολεμαδόκος*.

32. *πόθεν τόδε καλὸν ἄθυρμα | αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἔσσι χέλυς ὄρει ζώουσα.* Tyrrell's brilliant and humorous ἔσσο must command universal acceptance. When *τόδε καλὸν ἄθυρμα, αἰόλον ὄστρακον* become accusatives, the difficulties of construction and punctuation, which had endlessly embarrassed the commentators, vanish.

41. *ἔνθ' ἀναπηλήσας γλυφάνῳ πολιοῖο σιδήρου  
αἰῶν' ἐξετόρησεν ὄρεσκόιο χελώνης*

*Αἰῶν'* literally 'marrow' is by a natural semi-comic metaphor 'flesh,' which is to the tortoise's shell what marrow is to the spine: in the sense of 'life' *αἰῶν'* could not in this sort of poetry be joined with a concrete word like *ἐξετόρησεν*. If then v. 42 expresses the process of clearing the flesh out of the shell, we should expect v. 41 to contain the act of killing; *ἀναπηλήσας* however has resisted all the interpretation and conjectures of the learned. The latter, many of them evidently impossible, may be seen ap. Ludwich: Barnes' *ἀναπηδήσας* is not bad, if the action be unnecessarily violent: Hermann's *ἀναπιλήσας* is the best and perhaps may satisfy. *Ἀναπιλεῖν* must mean to squeeze, and denotes I suppose choking, a possible method no doubt of executing the job, though now-a-days we hear more of cutting off the heads of tortoises. *Πιλεῖν* occurs in epos Ap. Rhod. iv. 678 *πιληθείσα*.

44. *ἀνέρος ὄντε θαμῖναι ἐπιστροφῶσι μέριμναι.* Ruhnken kept *θαμῖναι*, quoting *μεσημβρινός, ὀπωρινός, ὀρθινός* as instances of ambiguous quantity, Blass-Kühner, *Ausführl. Gramm.* § 75, 9, Lobeck *Pathol.* p. 200 sq. Choeroboscus in Cramer *An. Ox.* ii. p. 180 quoted by Lobeck *l. c.* p. 188 recognises a form *θαμεινός*, and I can bring the derivative of *ἰδατ-* which in Hipp. *Αἴθ.* c. 15, 19 is written *ἰδατειναί*, and has *ι* necessarily long in Matro 79. This evidence would incline me, rather than accept Barnes' *θαμειαί* (the loss of which I cannot account for), to leave *θαμῖναι*.

48. *πειρήνας διὰ νῶτα διὰ ῥινοῖο χελώνης.* Whether we can have *πειραίνω* in the sense of *πείρω* is a question I would not decide; in any case Matthiae's *τετρήνας* may be justified by Herod. ii. 11 *συντετραίνοντας* v. l. *συμπεραίνοντας*. Of the words that follow, *διὰ ῥινοῖο* are unanimously considered corrupt: *κραταιρίνοιο, λιθορίνοιο, ταλαρίνοιο* are proposed, but *pace* Mr. Sikes (*Classical Review*, 1894, April) and Mr. Tyrrell, they do not convince. Why should these elegant adjectives have broken up into *διὰ ῥινοῖο*? To my mind the second *διὰ* has driven out another preposition that originally occupied the place of the first; this phenomenon,—where two prepositions occur in the same line and one expels the other—may be seen K 54 *ῥίμφα θεῶν παρὰ νῆας· ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ Νέστορα δῖον*: for *παρὰ* 'ACHS' read *ἐπὶ*; 141 *τίφθ' οὕτω κατὰ νῆας ἀνὰ στρατὸν οἶοι ἀλάσθε, κατὰ νῆα κατὰ στρατὸν* 'L'; 298 *ἀμφόνον, ἀν νέκρας διὰ τ' ἔντεα καὶ μέλαν αἷμα, ἀνὰ τ' ἔντεα* Eust. *Κατὰ* and *διὰ* are exchanged simply N 383, σ 341, and for the sequence *κατὰ—διὰ* cf. η 40 *ἐρχόμενον κατὰ ἄστρῳ διὰ σφέας*, Ap. Rhod. iv. 1002, *κατὰ στόμα καὶ διὰ πέτρας*. Here, of the two, *διὰ* with *ῥινοῖο* is clearly the more appropriate

(Hes. *Opp.* 515 *καὶ τε διὰ ῥινοῦ βοῶς ἔρχεται*): I would therefore write *πειρήνας κατὰ νῶτα διὰ ῥινοῖο χελώνης* 'at, or on, the back, through the shell.'

58. *ὄν πάρος ὠρίζεσκον ἑταιρείῃ φιλότῃτι*. 'ὄν πάρος is untranslatable, nor do I see how to explain its corruption from *ὡς πάρος* the correction of Γ, nor Clarke's *οὐ πάρος*, the sense of which also is poor. A bolder critic than I might think of *ὄππός' ἄρ'*.

79. *σάνδαλα δ' αὐτίκ' ἔριψεν ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις ἀλήσιω  
ἄφραστ' ἠδ' ἀνόητα διέπλεκε θαύματα ἔργα  
συμμίσεων κ.τ.λ.*

Vv. 79 and 80 have evidently to be brought into grammatical connection, and this is most neatly done by Dr. Postgate's *ἀίψιν*. I had thought of making *ἄφρ' ἄστ'* (i.e. *ἀϊστά*) out of *ἄφραστ'*, but this word is evidently sound and not to be disturbed. 'Ἐραψεν which Gemoll and others liked, never helped.

83 sq. 'Αβλαβέως must mean securely, so as not to come undone and trip (*βλάπτειν*) him. Metaphorically *Theognis* 1153 *εἴη μοι πλουτεῦντι κακῶν ἀπάτερθε μεριμνέων | ζῶειν ἀβλαβέως, μηδὲν ἔχοντι κακόν*, 'without a check.' 'Αλεείνων 85 may stand if it can mean avoiding (the toil of) way-faring, i.e. helping him to walk through the sand, but the variants on 361 lend probability to Windisch's *ἀλεγύνων*, 'preparing.' *Οἶά τ' ἐπειγόμενος* 86 agrees with this, 'being, as he was, in haste' utpote qui festinaret. Tyrrell's *αὐτοπορήσας* for *αὐτοτροπήσας* or *αὐτοπρεπής* ὡς though not certain is better than the monsters collected in Ludwich's note, (vol. xv. p. 270).

88. The other accounts of the myth do not mention Onchestus: Antoninus Liberalis gives as the scene the rocks called *βάττου σκοπιαί* on Mt. Maenalus in Arcadia. Bergk's notion that Onchestus was chosen because it was half-way between Pieria and Pylos is too 'modern:' it would be more to the point to notice that Onchestus was on a rising ground. Really, we have as in the hymn to Apollo another lost local legend, and it is curious that in both hymns the story attaches itself to the same village.

90. *ὦ γέρον, ὅς τε φυτὰ σκάπτεις ἐπικαμπύλος ὤμους,  
ἢ πολυοινήσεις εὐτ' ἂν τάδε πάντα φέρῃσι.  
καὶ τε ἰδὼν μὴ ἰδὼν εἶναι καὶ κωφὸς ἀκούσας,  
καὶ σιγᾶν, ὅτε μή τι καταβλάπτῃ τὸ σὸν αὐτοῦ.*

A most enigmatical passage, perhaps intentionally so. The absence of construction in 92 makes the lacuna between 91 and 92, started by Groddeck, indispensable; and the absence of this line or lines in its turn makes the meaning of 93 doubtful. The purport seems to be twofold: (1) an impertinence: 'you will have plenty to drink when these vines bear.' (2) A hint to be blind, deaf, and dumb, as to Hermes and the oxen. Gemoll is perfectly right in seeing no threat nor entreaty in Hermes' language; the whole is

ironic. The lacuna might be supplied by a line to this effect, ἦ (or ὡς) μέλλεις μάλα παῦρα νοῆσαι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ σῆσι, (which I offer as a mere stop gap): homoeoteleuton is thus set up, and a construction supplied for 92.

What are we to make of 93? The context will run: 'you will some day be full of wine, and are like seeing not to see, and hearing to be deaf, and to hold your peace except when ——.' Καταβλάπτῃ may be either active or passive; τὸ σὸν αὐτοῦ may be either nom. or acc. It has often been taken to mean 'your own interests,' and there is no difficulty in the combination of possessive pronoun and genitive, cf. Z 446 ἐμοὶ αὐτοῦ, 490 τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα, and the neuter easily stands for 'interest, concern': cf. θ 211 ἔο δ' αὐτοῦ πάντα κολουέει, Θ 430 τὰ ἃ φρονέων Dion. Chalcius fr. i. 5 τὸ σὸν εὖ θέμενος Eur. Her. Fur. 507 τὸ δ' αὐτοῦ σπουδάσας. Still the phrase is harsh, as Gemoll says, and also no question of the old man's good or ill enters into the Homeric story; in the later account he was punished, but in the hymn all parties go scot free.

After several years reflection, the passage seems to me to turn entirely upon the vineyard and the taunt Hermes gets out of it: 'when these vines bear, won't you be full of wine! you won't see what you see, you won't hear what you hear: you'll hold your tongue except ——.' Except when the wine has some similar effect on his speech, *i.e.* except when his tongue is loosened and he blabs. How is this to be got out of καταβλάπτῃ τὸ σὸν αὐτοῦ? I offer τόσον αὖ τοῦ for consideration: lit. 'except when you are hindered as much in that too,' sc. τοῦ σιγᾶν. Exx. of βλάπτειν c. gen. are supplied by the Lexx. Cf. generally Aesch. P. V. 196 δίδαξον ἡμᾶς, εἴ τι μὴ βλάπτῃ λόγῳ, and for the language of 92, *ib.* 463 οἱ πρῶτα μὲν βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην, | κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον.

94. φᾶς ~~αυέευνε~~ for φασὶν ἔσειε is the simple and convincing correction of Demetrius Chalcondyles, and needs no tinkering. Now that he was on hard ground, he drove his herd head-forward and 'together,' not straggling as before.

103. ἀδμήτες δ' ἴκανον ἐς αὐλιον ὑφιμέλαθρον.

Ἄκμητες Ilgen, but we have no reason to suppose that cows driven first backwards through wet sand, and then forwards across hills and ravines and plains all one night would be 'unwearied.' In a weak moment I conjectured ἄκμηνοι, since Hermes promptly feeds them (105), but I must not fall into the habits I denounce. Ἄδμητες seems to correspond to ἄζυγες in Ant. Lib. 23, 3 εἶτα δ' ἀπελαύνει πόρτιας δώδεκα καὶ ἑκατὸν βοῦς ἄζυγας καὶ ταῦρον. 'All unyoked they came': the epithet gives an idea of the value of the theft. Certainly the adjective in this place is rather harsh, but cf. ἄφθιτοι ἠγερέθοντο 326.

109. δάφνης ἀγλαὸν ὄζον ἐλῶν ἐπέλεψε σιδήρῳ  
ἄρμενον ἐν παλάμῃ, ἄμπνυτο δὲ θερμὸς αὐτῆ.

Cf. vol. xv. p. 285, 6. On again considering the passage, I think a lacuna between 109 and 110 absolutely necessary. Besides that it is hardly



conceivable that in an aetiological account of the origin of fire the essential act of friction should be omitted, the word ἄρμενον can only apply to the 'recipient': it is not necessary in order to prune a branch to hold it 'firmly fixed' in one's palm: such an action on the contrary is peculiarly appropriate to the στορεύς. Ἐπέλεψε over which difficulties have been made, is to trim, prune, point: the Lexx. recognise the force of ἐπι—'to a point, cut down,' in ἐπικόπτειν, ἐπιτέμνειν. Ἀπέλεψε as Herwerden and possibly others prefer, would mean 'cut off' the tree; but this is already given in ἐλών.

116. τόφρα δ' ὑποβρυχίας ἔλικας βοῦς εἶλκε θύραζε.

Ἵποβρυχίας is still uncertain; but as the Lexx. give two verbs, ὑποβρυχάομαι and ὑποβρύχω meaning 'to roar or bellow a little,' there seems no reason to deny the existence of an adjective in the same sense. Or, having regard to the humorous style of the hymn, it might be thought that the cows in the dark cavern were called 'drowned,' i.e. 'hidden away.' In any case an alteration like ἐριβρύχους is not to be thought of.

124. ῥινοὺς δ' ἐξετάνυσσε καταστυφέλω ἐνὶ πέτρῃ  
ὡς ἔτι νῦν τὰ μέτασσα πολυχρόνιοι πεφύασι  
δηρὸν δὴ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἄκριτον.

The only cognate form to μέτασσα is the feminine, ι 221 χωρὶς μὲν πρόγοναι χωρὶς δὲ μέτασσαι. I see no reason why μέτασσα may not be the neut. pl. used adverbially—'in the intervening time'; a record of such a use is preserved in Cramer, *An. Ox.*, i. p. 280, quoted by Lobeck, *Pathol.*, p. 143, ὡσπερ παρὰ τὴν ἐπὶ γίνεται ἐπισσα—οὕτω καὶ παρὰ τὴν μετὰ μέτασσα [not μέτασσαι]. Baumeister inserted μέταζε, but the fact that μέταζε has given place to μεταξύ (a gloss) Hes. *Opp.* 394 is no argument for its corruption into μέτασσα, a word that must have seemed and did seem nonsense to the scribes. Ἄκριτον about which Gemoll doubts, naturally means 'boundless, endless' and here is adverbial: so 577 ἄκριτον ἠπεροπεύει, *Ran* xix. 26 καταμίσγεται ἄκριτα, and very similarly θ 505 τοὶ δ' ἄκριτα πόλλ' ἀγόρευον. The expression denotes simple belief: 'a long, an endless time after these things.'

As to the facts, the view first expressed by J. P. D'Orville (*Journal of Philology*, xxv. p. 254) and then by O. Müller (*Hyperbor-Röm. Studien*, p. 310, quoted by Baumeister) seems nearly certain, that the writer of the Hymn saw what professed to be these skins, preserved or shewn by priests; the commentators speak of caves, at Pylos or in Arcadia, where the natural conformation of the rock in some way resembled skins. This miracle I must confess seems harder of belief than the conservation of the actual hides: but relics in general were abundant in the ancient world; D'Orville quotes Ovid *Met.* viii. 29, and I have noticed the skin of Marsyas Herod. vii. 26, the Alban sow preserved in brine Varro r. r. ii. 4. 18, and Eur. *Her. Fur.*, 415 τὰ κλεινὰ δ' Ἑλλάς ἔλαβε βαρβάρου κόρας | Δάφυρα καὶ σώζεται Μυκλήναις, and many more instances no doubt can be produced.

132. ἄλλ' οὐδ' ὥς οἱ ἐπέθετο θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ  
καὶ τε μάλ' ἰμείρουτι περὴν ἱερῆς κατὰ δειρῆς.

To me as to Gemoll περὴν is incomprehensible; certainly περάω cannot mean 'send down,' and περαίνω seems out of the question: possibly ἰμείρουτί περ εἰν ἱερῆς κατὰ δειρῆς. Καθήμι is quite in place, Ω 642 λαυκανίης καθέηκα, cf. for the expression T 209 πρὶν δ' οὐ πως ἂν ἐμοί γε φίλον κατὰ λαιμὸν ἰεῖη | οὐ πόσις οὐδὲ βρώσις. I am aware that καὶ τε μάλ' ἰμείρουτί περ εἰν ἱερῆς involves diaeresis after the third foot and elision of αι; if the former objection be fatal perhaps παρεῖν might stand, 'admit,' though it is almost burlesque; cf. below 152, and Ge xxx. 8 περ ἔστι x πάρεστι p. But I prefer my first suggestion. Ludwich's πιεῖν is not very suitable to an ὄσιη κρεάων.

136. ἐπὶ δὲ ξύλα κάγκαν' αἰέρας; Ilgen needlessly altered αἰέρας into ἀγείρας. Hermes we may suppose threw the hands and feet upon the embers of his old fire in the κατοῦδαιος βόθρος; he then piled more wood upon the top, and consumed everything in the heart of the fire. v. 113 ἐπέθηκεν, and for the general use of αἰέρω I 214 Σ 615 α 141 σ 120. The writers neither of this nor of the other hymns object to the assonance ἀνάειρε αἰέρας.

147. Αὔρη ὄπωρινῇ ἐναλίγκιος, ἥγ' ὀμίχλη, 'like a draught in autumn' is a comparison that comes home to anyone living in a cave or a châlet, but there is surely no justification for a mythologist (like Roscher) to see in it a proof of Hermes' original function as God of Wind; cf. ζ 20 of a dream ἢ δ' ἀνέμου ὡς προῖη ἐπέσσυτο δέμνια κούρης: δ 802 a spirit makes an entry very like Hermes—ἐς θάλαμον δ' εἰσῆλθε παρὰ κληῖδος ἵμαντα. Quintus iv. 111 αὔρη ὑπηώη ἐναλίγκιος.

152. λαῖφος ἀθύρων 'playing with the clothes' may seem a singular phrase, but it is undoubtedly defended by the passive ἀθυρομένη 'being played' v. 485, and other accusatives from Pindar and the Anthology may be seen in the Lexx.

159. ἢ σὲ λαβόντα (φέροντα M) μεταξὺ κ.τ.λ. In the Oxford text Matthiae's λαθόντα was adopted as a stop-gap, but it belongs to the class of unmotivated corruptions, and the right remedy for the line seems quite uncertain. Neither Ludwich's λάοντα μάλ' ὀξὺ nor the lacuna proposed vol. xv. p. 287 are convincing; and φέροντα also must be accounted for in any conjecture that is to hold water.

160. Ruhnken's τάλαν is only ingenious; πάλιν 'get you back the way you came' is perfectly in point.

163. τί με ταῦτα τιτύσκειαι. In meaning τιτύσκειαι might well stand: to aim is a metaphor easily transferable to words; ταῦτα also as a cognate acc. is possible, but the accusative με is a stumbling block. Before accepting Pierson's δεδίσκειαι one would wish to see instances of the exchange of δ and τ.

167. *Βουλεύων ἐμὲ καὶ σέ. Βουκολέων* (Ludwich) or *Βουκολέειν* (Gemoll) is exceedingly ingenious and graphically not too far off.

187.

*ἔνθα γέροντα*

*κνώδαλον εὔρε νέμοντα παρέξ ὁδοῦ ἔρκος ἀλωῆς.*

*Κνώδαλον* is usually held to be corrupt, but the conjectures (*τρόχμαλον*, *νώδαλον*,<sup>8</sup> *κώδαλον*, etc.) are unsatisfactory, and the passage falls into such hopeless confusion without this object to *νέμοντα*, that perhaps we may allow the well-known lines Aesch. *Prom.* 462 to save the word. Prometheus says:—

*κάξευξα πρῶτος ἐν ζυγοῖσι κνώδαλα  
ζεύγλαισι δουλεύοντα σώμασιν θ' ὄπως  
θνητοῖς μεγίστων διάδοχοι μοχθημάτων  
γένουινθ', ὑφ' ἄρμα τ' ἤγαγον φιληνίους  
ἵππους.*

Horses then being excluded, *κνώδαλα* in Prometheus' mouth must imply oxen and mules, and given the humorous style of the Hymn, one may without much violence take *κνώδαλον*, literally 'beast,' to mean here 'ox.' "*Ἐρκος ἀλωῆς* is metaphorical, not literal—'prop of the vineyard'—of the ox who ploughs between the vines, and draws the grapes and the fodder. Translate 'there he found an old man grazing his ox, the stay of his vineyard, on the edge of the road.' Gemoll's grammar and agriculture are equally strange.

226. *αἰνὰ μὲν ἔνθεν ὁδοῖο τὰ δ' αἰνότερ' ἔνθεν ὁδοῖο.*

With Franke and Ludwich, *Neue Jahrb.*, 1887, p. 327, n. 15, I quite agree that Hermes' footprints only are intended. The cows Apollo has noticed, v. 220, and recognised them: the other spoor baffles him, and he expresses a naïf astonishment 'wonderful here, and more wonderful there'; Hermes 'waddled,' *ἐπιστροφάδην δ' ἐβάδιζεν* 210, partly because the cows straggled, partly because his peculiar foot-coverings made him flounder. Cf. 357.

231. Gemoll suggests that the 'delightful smell' came from Maia's fire, as that in *ε* from Calypso's. This, however, is too 'literary'; the ancients had noses for natural smells, and the fragrance of the Alp is intended here. Martial, iii. 65, 4, *gramina quod redolent quae modo carpsit ovis.*

239. The transposition *ἀνεείλε'* for *ἀλέεινεν* is simple and probable; *ἀνεείλε'*, as Dr. Postgate pointed out to me, is more correct than *ἀνεείλει* (Lohsee); it also represents more exactly the letters of *ἀλέεινεν*, and this is of importance when a metathesis is in question.

242. *ἀγρης· εἰνετέον τε χέλυν ὑπὸ μασχάλη εἶχεν.*

Martin's *ἐγρήσσαν* for *αγρης ειν* is probable; P 660 for *ἐγρήσσουντες* L<sub>9</sub>, M<sub>8</sub>, Vat.<sub>18</sub> have *ἀγ-*, Λ 551 there seems no variant, υ 53 *ἀγρήσσοντα* 'P.

'Ἐτεός also is a word that has a tendency to dissolve, cf. the variants T 255. Read therefore with Martin and Hermann

*ἐγρήσσω ἐτεὸν δὲ χέλυν κ.τ.λ.*

which is a little simpler than ἐτεὸν γε· χέλυν δ'. Hipponax 89 ἐρμῆ μάκαρ καθ' ὕπνου οἶδας ἐγρήσσειν is in point and seems to have escaped the commentators. In the line before, it is Barnes, not Hermann, that deserves the credit of the excellent conjecture φή, half-confirmed afterwards by γ's θή. Ludwich's objection, *N. J.*, 1887, p. 325, n. 10, that in a hundred similar cases ὡς, not φή, is used would have weight if the MSS. θή and δή did not point strongly to the rarer word, another instance of which may now be drawn from the new fragments of Callimachus' *Hecale* (see Ellis, *Journal of Philology*, xxiv. p. 153): in the same fragments φηλητής (spelled φιλητής) occurs.

258.

ὑπὸ γαίῃ

ἐρρήσεισιν ὀλίγοισι μετ' ἀνδράσιν ἡγεμονεύων.

Hermes' subjects have been called by different critics λυγροῖσιν, ἀλιτροῖσιν, δολίοισιν, ὀλοοῖσιν, φθιμένοισιν (!) 'ψυδνοῖσιν vel potius ψυδροῖσιν (olim φήλοισιν vel λιροῖσιν)' (!). I quote Ludwich's note, omitting the names of the authors of these pearls of learning.

Mr. Tyrrell, and Boissonade quoted by Franke, defend ὀλίγοισιν, which has much point. Hermes will go to Tartarus and be king among men of his own size, *i.e.* other bad babies. It is to be presumed that ancient ideas of the next world kept a place for children among the 'matres atque viri,' heroes and girls.

272. βουσι μετ' ἀγρούλοισι. It is certainly a small step from -σι μετ' to -σιν ἐπ', yet I think that the MS. reading gives as good a sense as Schneidewin's conjecture. To have passed through the door *with* oxen is even a greater feat for an infant than to have gone out *after* them, and it is the former that Apollo accuses Hermes of when he examines Maia's household stores.

279. ὀφρύσι ριπτάζεσκειν. There is no quotation to support ριπτάζειν in any connection with the eyes, but it occurs absolutely, in the middle or active in Hippocrates of tossing in bed, of patients unable to sleep (*e.g.* *Acut.* ii. 18), and a substantive ριπτασμός exists in the same sense. Therefore, since the MSS. give ὀφρύσι, it seems as well to preserve the intransitive use here also. Hermann preferred the acc. ὀφρῶς; the alterations of the excellent word ριπτάζεσκειν do not need enumerating.

280. ἄλιον τὸν μῦθον ἀκούων. On ὡς which M x give instead of τὸν and p gives together with τὸν, see vol. xv. p. 304. Tyrrell defends the tradition, but ἄλιον predicative is certainly hard, 'for naught.' The occurrence of ὡς in so many MSS. suggests that it may after all not be a gloss, and that emendation should take account of it. 'Ἀκούων is sound, the attempts upon it are unsuccessful: Stadtmüller, who decidedly has not *la main heureuse*, thought of ὑλακτῶν.

282. ὦ πέπον, ἠπεροπευτά, δολοφραδέες, ἦ σε μάλ' οἶω  
πολλάκις ἀντιτοροῦντα δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας  
ἔννευχον οὐχ ἓνα μόνον ἐπ' οὔδει φῶτα καθίσσαι.

It is to be wished that a better parallel than Theocr. i. 51 ἀκράτιστον ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι καθίζειν (especially as in modern texts the conjecture ἀκρατισμῶν or ἀκρατισμῶ is generally printed) could be brought to ἐπ' οὔδει καθίσσαι. To 'seat a man upon the floor' is an odd expression for to rob; besides that σε as the words run may be either subject or object to the verb. A somewhat similar odd phrase is ἐπ' ἀκινήτοισι καθίζειν Hes. *Opp.* 750. The *Paroemiographi* do not help.

315. ὁ μὲν νημερτέα φωνήν  
οὐκ ἀδίκως ἐπὶ βουσὶν ἐλάζυτο κῦδιμον Ἑρμῆν.

The alterations of φωνήν into φωνῆ, φωνεῖν, φωνῶν are unacceptable; they belong to the class of petty, unmotivated, and therefore unconvincing changes. If φωνῶν or φωνεῖν had originally stood, there is no probability of it being altered by any reader into -ήν. After Hermann's brilliant correction of φωνῆς into φωρῆς 136, based upon the variation φωνήν, φωρήν 385, the same emendation is obvious here (and Windisch already had attempted φῶρα). The sense will then be 'he was attempting to convict Hermes of clear theft in the matter of oxen,' a good Attic construction (ἐλεῖν τινα τι) which Matthiae seems to have contemplated here. If it be thought too forensic my only other suggestion is to return to φωνήν with a lacuna containing *ίεις* or an equivalent word. *Οὐκ ἀδίκως*, if prosy is sound, 'not without justice,' as opposed to Hermes' 'arts and crafty words.'

325. ~~εὐμυλλίη~~ (εὐμυλλίη M) δ' ἔχ' Ὀλυμπον ἀγάνυφον. The older conjectures endeavoured to produce a word somewhat resembling εὐμυλλίη; so Heyne's *αιμυλλίη* accepted by Ilgen but rejected by Matthiae, Hermann's *εὐμελίη* or *ἐμμελίη*, Franke's *εὐελίη*. The later attempts desert the letters of the MSS. and may well be left unquoted. I will have the courage to interpret. Hes. *Opp.* 529 of animals in a storm, καὶ τότε δὴ κεραοὶ καὶ νήκεροι ὑληκοῖται | λυγρὸν μυλιόωντες ἀνάδρια βησσήεντα | φεύγουσιν. *Μυλιόωντες* was a rare word and variously interpreted, and Crates indeed read *μαλκίοωντες*. However, the second of the explanations of Proclus seems correct, τὰ χεῖλη κινούντες ὑπὸ τῆς ψυχρότητος, chattering from cold; cf. *μοιμύλλω* and *μύλλω* which Prellwitz connects with the simple form *μύω*. When we consider the close connection between the vocabulary of the four greater Hymns and Hesiod (brought out by Fietkau, *De carminum Hesiodaeorum atque hymnorum quatuor magnorum vocabulis non homericeis*, Reg., 1866), perhaps *εὐμυλλίη* may express the action exactly opposite to *λυγρῶς μυλιόων*, 'a pleasant buzz or hum.' The sense (much the same as D'Orville's *στωμυλλίη*, *Journ. Phil.* xxv. p. 255) would suit the easy style of this Hymn, 'a pleasant hum possessed Olympus'; the gods were exchanging morning salutations, μετὰ χρυσόθρονον ἦῶ. Right or wrong, I think this attempt at interpretation better than inventing another

word of the measure  $\_ \cup \cup \_$  and with much timidity I submit it to the etymologists.

326. \**Ἀφθιτοί* is difficult as a predicate, but finds a parallel in *ἀδμήτες δ' ἴκανον* v. 103. Groddeck's *ἀθρόοι* certainly is quite inadmissible; the later conjectures *ᾠθετοί*, *ἄψ θεοί*, and Tyrrell's *ἄφθονοί* do not, I am afraid, help matters. Probably, as Gemoll suggests, *ἀθάνατοι* is used as a complete substantive, qualified by *ἄφθιτοί*: 'the Immortals gathered, deathless.'

344. *τῆσιν μὲν γὰρ βουσὶν ἐς ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα  
ἀντία βήματ' ἔχουσα κόνις ἀνέφαινε μέλαινα.*

I see no difficulty in the dative *βουσὶν*: 'in the case of the oxen the sand, which held them, showed the foot-prints facing the meadow.' '*Ἀντίος* with *ἐς* is unexampled; ρ 333 *τὸν κατέθηκε φέρων πρὸς τηλεμάχοιο τράπεζαν | ἀντίον* is obviously different. One may, I suppose, translate 'facing towards.' '*ἔχουσα* must mean 'took and kept.' The sentence is as the commentators say, awkward; but the antithesis to *αὐτὸς δ' οὗτος* was the cause of its contortion.

346. *αὐτὸς δ' οὗτος ὄδ' ἐκτός ἀμήχανος.*

'*Ὀδ' ἐκτός* is completely dark. Barnes thought *ἐκτός* might mean 'supra modum' and Ruhnken gave effect to this interpretation by writing *ἔξοχ'*. The modern conjectures *ὀπηδός*, *ὄλεθρος*, *ὄδαϊος*, etc. are evident stop-gaps. Formally Hermann's *ἄϊκτος* is still the best, as it makes a good parallel to *ἀμήχανος*, but the sense is poor. '*Ὀ δεκτός* and *ὄδ' ἐκτός* do not promise. Can *ὄ ἐκτός* mean the 'outsider,' stranger, one who is not yet admitted into Olympus, according to a sense given by the Lexx. not earlier than Plato? *Αὐτὸς δ' οὗτος* is certainly sound; Apollo's rage rises in stages: 'the cows have their footsteps the wrong way about, but this, this very *ἐκτός* here —.'

349. *ὡς εἴ τις ἀραιῆσι δρυσὶ βαίνοι.* *Δρυσὶ* is simple instrumental dative, like *ποσσὶν* and *χερσὶν* in 346 and 347, 'as if one walked with trees, instead of feet. Solon xi. 5 *ἀλώπεκος ἴχνεσι βαίνει*, M 207 *πέτετο πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο*. The conjectures *σὺν* (Gemoll) *ἐν* (Herwerden) are needless.

357. *διαπυρπαλάμησεν* and 361 *ὠμόργαζε* are two of Ilgen's best contributions, the former a joining together of *διὰ πῦρ παλάμησεν* given by M (as I should have noticed in Part II.), the latter for the vox nihili *ὠμάρταζε*. Ludwich, indeed, alone of editors keeps the latter, but his *χέρσφ* explain who can.

409 sq. It is impossible not to feel that a certain quantity of matter has perished in this context; verbal alteration does not suffice to restore (1) the construction and (2) the sense. Under the former head the fem. plur. *ταὶ* 410 cannot possibly follow *δεσμὰ ἄγνου*, even *κατὰ σύνεσιν: ἐγκρύψαι* 416 wants an object, and no word can be supplied out of the preceding lines. (2) The motive of 'twisting the chains' 409 is entirely unexplained, and also 'chains' are not made of agnus castus. Something intervened between 409

and 410; the chains were perhaps changed into shoots of willow. Again in 415 Hermes 'flashes fire,' but in the same sentence 416 he is 'soothing' Apollo. In short the scene is not stated; we have six lines left from a much longer passage. We may think we see what the action may have been, but no literature could have left it originally in such obscurity. I therefore leave the language as it stands (and every word seems sound), and suppose with Baum. two lacunae of unknown size after 409 and 415.

I conjecture, from the surviving fragments, the course of events to have been this. Apollo, irritated at seeing the skins, and inferring that two cows were lost from his herd, began to 'twist strong chains' in his hands (for Hermes, naturally, not for the unoffending cows). They by magic, *ἐρμέω βουλῆσι κλειψίφρονος*, fell off Hermes, or fell to the ground before they could be put on him, and turned into shoots of willow, took root in the ground, and in a moment (*αἶψα*) grew up and made a bower or pergola over all the cows, at which Apollo, with reason, *θαύμασεν ἀθρήσας*. Hermes' next action, to 'look askance at the ground, his eyes glancing fire' is certainly inexplicable: his desire 'to hide' can only refer either to the skins or to the fat and flesh which was stored inside the cave. Lastly, one or the other gap must have contained a mention of the lyre, which is referred to without definite introduction in 417. Πῦρ in 415 is rightly restored by Lohsee and Ludwich for Martin's *πίκν'*: cf. Hes. *Theog.*, 827 (quoted by Clarke) and Quintus, viii. 28. 'Ρεῖά τε καὶ πάσῃσιν 412 is well defended by Gemoll with Hes. *Theog.*, 87.

426. γηρύετ' ἀμβολάδην, ἐρατὴ δέ οἱ ἔσπετο φωνή,  
κράινων ἀθανάτους τε θεοὺς καὶ γαίαν ἐρεμνήν.

Hesych. *κράινειν* τιμᾶν may perhaps establish the meaning 'celebrate,' 'tell' which is definitely maintained by Maurophrydes (Kuhn's *Zeitschr.*, vii. 346 sq., quoted in the *Lex. Hom.*) here, 531 and 559. Let etymologists pronounce. The conjectures (*e.g.* *κλείων*) are unconvincing and Stadtmüller's *οὐρανόν* (adopted by Ludwich) one of the worst that has disfigured a text. 'Ερατὴ—φωνή is generally recognised to be parenthetical; parentheses are frequent, *e.g.*:

Δ 429. οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ἀκὴν ἴσαν, οὐδέ κε φαίης  
τόσσον λαὸν ἔπεσθαι ἔχοντ' ἐν στήθεσιν αὐδῆν,  
σιγῆ δειδιότες σημάντορας.

*Herm.* 175.

436. Μηχανιώτα is analogous to *σπαργανιώτα* 310, *χαριδώτα* *Herm.* xviii. 12, *εἰραφιώτα* *Dion.* i. 2, 17, 20 Πᾶν σκοπιήτα, *Anth. Pal.*, vi. 34, 5, 109, 7, *λοφιήτα* 79, 1, *ύλειώτα* 106, 1. I see no objection to *πονεύμενε* 'labourer, industrious.' Apollo as throughout is ironical, and congratulates Hermes on the variety of his accomplishments: 'butcher, trickster, workman, minstrel.'

*Δαιτὸς ἐταίρη* (Ludwich) is ingenious, but the God may be said to be present where his invention is used or at what he inspires; *πονεύμενε δαιτὸς ἐταίρη*

in combination is intolerably prosaic. Cf. Hipponax i. ἔβωσε Μαίης παῖδα Κυλλήνης πάλμυν | Ἐρμῆ κυνάγχα, Μηροιστί Κανδαῦλα | φωρῶν ἑταῖρε.

437. πεντήκοντα βοῶν ἀντάξια ταῦτα μέμηλας. I can do nothing with μέμηλας; there is no ex. of μέλομαι c. acc. nor in fact of the 2 perf. except in the third person. Μεμηλῶς (Ludwich) does not ease the construction, μέμηλε (Eberhard) lacks sense, and this verb is really not wanted at all; μεμελέτηκας or μέμολπας is the sense; Lohsee's μέλη σά is too desperately ingenious. Gemoll has added to the enormity of Stadtmüller's ἀνέφηνας by putting it in his text. Are there, or are there not, principles of emendation?

447. τίς τέχνη, τίς μούσα ἀμηχανέων μελεδῶνων;

The 'muse of hopeless cares' passed muster till Schneidewin, who made the prosy and inaccurate alteration ἀμήχανε σῶν μελεδῶνων. Hermes' cares were material, and confined to admission among the Olympians. For the construction I may quote Franke who shows often excellent judgment: 'est penitivus ut dicitur objecti: *cantus contra sollicitudines et curas*. Ἀμηχανέων is not from the unheard of ἀμηχανής, but is gen. fem. from ἀμήχανος; I may refer to a list of compound adjectives of three terminations, vol. xv. p. 261. The word itself is greatly in point, cf. 434 ἔρος ἀμήχανος, Theocr. xiv. 52 ἀμηχανέουτος ἔρωτος: μελεδῶνας occurs Apoll. 532. Herwerden's and Gemoll's conjectures, which would destroy the general predication of Hermes' art, will not bear repeating. The sentiment is that of Hes. *Theog.* 55 (the Muses) λησμοσύνην τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμά τε μερμηράων., and the well-known lines, *Cypria* fr. 10 οἶνόν τοι Μενέλαε θεοὶ ποίησαν ἄριστον | θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισιν ἀποσκεδάσαι μελεδῶνας.

453. ἀλλ' οὔπω τί μοι ὦδε μετὰ φρεσὶν ἄλλο μέλησεν  
οἶα νέων θαλίης ἐνδέξια ἔργα πέλονται.

Θεῶν (Herwerden, Gemoll) is excessively weak for νέων; the comparison is the same as in 55 ἤυτε κοῦροι | ἤβηται θαλίησι παραιβόλα κερτομέουσι. Nor is τοῖα (Ludwich) necessary: construe οὔπω μοι ἄλλο τι ὦδε μέλησεν ἐκείνων οἶα θαλίης νέων, ἐνδέξια ἔργα, πέλονται (as Matthiae).

456, 7. νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ὀλίγος περ ἐὼν κλυτὰ μῆδεα οἶδας  
ἴζε πέπον καὶ θυμὸν ἐπαίνει πρῆσβυτέροισι.

That M alone preserves these two lines is nothing against their genuineness, as indeed has been recognised since Ruhnken's time: but M's character for uncorrected corruption would admit mistakes in tradition and allow of bolder remedies. That some corruption has happened is obvious.

To take the words in order. ἴζε is usually accepted, though as Gemoll notices, there is no motive for Apollo ordering Hermes to sit down and as a matter of fact he does not do so. The first word of a verse is peculiarly exposed to corruption, and for instances of loss or addition of initial, cf. Z 185 δύμεναι, ἔμμεναι 'L,' 203 Ἴσανδρον, Πείσανδρον Strabo, Hes. *Theog.* 970, Ἴασίφ, Ἀσίω and Ἀσσίω, *Theognis*, 477 δείξω, ἤξω and ἤκω, Hippocr. *Vet.*



Med. 22 *πίη, εἴη, ἴη*. Schneidewin tried *εἴκε*, but this evades the problem; three years ago in the *Academy*, Sept., 1894, I proposed *δίζε πέπον καὶ θυμόν ἐγείραι προσβυτέροισιν*, i.e. 'think twice before'; *ἐγείραι* is a fair uncial permutation for *ἐπαίνει*, but the construction of *δίζω* is always with *ἦ*, and *καὶ* also is difficult. The accepted method is Ruhnken's *μῦθον* for *θυμόν*, but (1) metatheses should be avoided except under the clearest proof; the only place in the Hymns where a metathesis seems necessary is v. 256, Ilgen's *λαβών* for *βαλών*. (2) *μῦθον ἐπαινεῖν*, approve or agree to a speech, is an odd phrase for general humility; and again, how does sitting come in? (3) the dative in such a construction is unintelligible. Other attempts, to be seen in Ludwich's note, hardly need mention. After much reflection I incline to think the sentence springs out of Hermes' musical accomplishments; 'since at your young age you are so clever, use your gifts for the general good'; *ἴζε* will then be of the bard, at the table in Olympia. 'Sit and ~~the spirit in your elders.~~' The missing word must be an equivalent of 'comfort' and what but *ἰαίνειν*? And this I now see was Schneidewin's view. He read *ἴαυε*, but the synzesis *ἐπίαυε* does not seem impossible (Monro, *Hom. Grammar*, § 378 and for the elision of -ι cf. *περ' ἰγνύος Herm.* 152, *περεβάλλοντο Aesch. Ag.* 1144, *περεσκήωσεν Eumen.* 637 and schol.), and the rarity of the word together with the metrical license will have given *ἐπαίνει*.

460. *τόδε κρανάϊον ἀκόντιον*. That some adjective from *κράνον* or *κράνεια* is intended I do not doubt; the usual form is *κρανεῖόν*, which Ilgen restored. Cf. *δορυκράνον λόγχης ἰσχύς Aesch. Persae.* 151. For omission or insertion of *ν* cf. the forms of *ἐλατιονίδη Apoll.* 210; for the quantity *κρανεῖόν* one may perhaps compare *θαμναῖ* v. 44.

460. ἦ μὲν ἐγὼ σε  
*κυδρὸν ἐν ἀθανάτοισι καὶ ὄλβιον ἡγεμονεύσω*  
*δώσω τ' ἀγλαὰ δῶρα καὶ ἐς τέλος οὐκ ἀπατήσω.*

For *ἡγεμονεύσω* which is enigmatical Mr. Tyrrell suggests *ἡγεμόν' εἴσω*, Mr. Agar *ἡγεμόν' ἔσσω*. This close coincidence cannot but have weight. No advantage results from transposing *ἡγεμονεύσω* and *οὐκ ἀπατήσω*, as Ludwich after Waardenburg prints.

471. *καὶ τιμὰς σέ γέ φασι δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὀμφῆς*  
*μαντείας θ' ἐκάεργε Διὸς παρὰ θέσφατα πάντα.*

This is the punctuation and reading of the MSS., which at Gemoll's suggestion (in his note, for in his text he goes with the majority) I have restored. Usually, following Matthiae a colon is put after *τιμὰς*, *γε* is changed into *δὲ*, and *θ'* after *μαντείας* is suppressed. The documentary reading, however, gives *τιμαί* and *μάντειαι* as two gifts of Zeus to Apollo, and this corresponds to the division 531 sq. The accent on *παρὰ* is best retracted.

473. *τῶν [γ, καὶ Μαρ] νῦν αὐτὸς ἔγωγε παιδ' ἀφνειὸν δεδάηκα.*

A line unmetrical and most mysterious. The older critics omitted *γε* to help the metre and took *ἀφνειὸν* often of money; others tried to turn it into

something resembling *αἰφνίδιος*. Hermann's *πανομφαλον* (too good), for a long time won acceptance. I think most scholars will now admit that *τῶν—ἀφνειόν* 'rich in which' is sound; but how to deal with *παῖδ'*? I still admire the amazing ingenuity of Tyrrell's *πεδ' ἀφνειῶν*, but after much consideration, I think the simplest expedient is to write *ἐγὼ σε παῖ ἀφνειόν*. The *δ* was inserted to avoid the apparent hiatus. This is a phenomenon of wide occurrence and that shews itself under very different forms: one or two cases are collected vol. xv. p. 275, here I may add E 4 *δαίε οἱ, δαίε δ' οἱ* T 194 *δῶρα ἐμῆς, δῶρα δ' ἐμῆς*. *Παῖς* might be thought precocious in Hermes' mouth, but he calls Apollo *κοῦρε* 490, and he may have thought like Aristophanes *παῖδα γὰρ κὰν ἦ γέρων | καλεῖν δίκαιον ὅστις ἂν πληγὰς λάβῃ* (*Wasps*, 1297).

479. Gemoll's *ἐπιστάμενος* for *ἐπισταμένως* is very neat, and gives a good sense. *Ἐπισταμένην* (Barnes) is very bad, and ought not to have been adopted so generally. The accusative would never have corrupted into the adverb. I agree with Gemoll that the passage 478–480 is sound: Ludwich's transposition of *εὐμόλπει* and *εὐκηλος* does not assist.

485. *ρέια σννηθειῆσιν ἀθυρομένη μαλακῆσιν*. An affected way of describing a musical instrument, but the sense is plain: 'easily played by gentle practice,' the harp will respond to the executant who takes the trouble to 'learn its ways,' to 'painful labour' *ἐργασίη δυήπαθος* it refuses itself. Franke is right with his interpretation *consuetudines molles pro consuetudine molliter tangendi fides*. *Ἄθυρομένη* is nothing but passive.

497. *Ἐρμῆ δ' ἐγγυάλιξεν ἔχων μάστιγα φαεινήν*. *Ἐχων* naturally offends, but Matthiae's generally accepted *ἔχειν* belongs to the category of unmotivated corruptions, like *φωνῶν* for *φωνήν* v. 315. If *ἔχειν* had been original, who consciously or unconsciously would have changed it to *ἔχων*? Martin's *ἐκῶν* is better, but I venture to write *ἐλῶν*, permutation between which and *ἔχων* is graphical, and frequent in Homeric MSS. *E.g.* E 136 H 197 (*ἐκῶν*) Λ 488 Ψ 219 Ω 735 α 95 ι 387.

509. I can make nothing of *σήματ' ἐπεῖ*. The sense is so complete without it that no clue is given to its possible meaning. If it were joined with *ὡς ἔτι καὶ νῦν* a verb would be wanted, but *ὡς ἔτι καὶ νῦν* (v. 125 *ὡς ἔτι νῦν*) 'as still now' requires *φιλεῖ* and seems a simple expression like *δηρὸν δὴ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἄκριτον* v. 126. If *σήματ'* belongs to 509 and means 'as a token' it must at least be dative, and its position makes such a sense very doubtful.

526 sq. The transition to direct oration is quite intolerable, *ἔκ* requires a verb, *τέλειον* is senseless with *σύμβολον*, lastly the pronoun *σε* is required. So many conditions can only be fulfilled by a lacuna, which might have contained such a line as *αἰετὸν ἦκε πατήρ· ὁ δ' ἐπώμοσεν ἢ σε μάλ' οἶον*. Zeus to approve of the compact let fly the *τελειότατος πετεηνῶν*, at sight of which Apollo made oath.

558. Schneidewin's correction ἄλλοτε ἄλλη for ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλη is justified by Hes. *Opp.*, 713, where for ἄλλοτε ἄλλον various MSS. give ἄλλοτε τ' ἄλλον, ἄλλοτ' ἐς ἄλλον. Desire to avoid hiatus produced alike ἐπ', τ' and ἐς. Some other examples are given in Rzach's note *ad loc.*

568. The construction here is absolutely broken; one or two lines are wanted to pave the way to the *orat. obliqua* and provide a principal verb for ἀνάσσειν. They may, as Gemoll says, have contained a reference to Zeus and have run thus:

ὡς ἔφατ' · οὐρανόθεν δὲ πατὴρ Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἔπεσσειν  
θῆκε τέλος · πᾶσιν δ' ὁ μὲν οἰωνοῖσι κέλευσε.

T. W. ALLEN.