only the first vertical stroke remained visible. Moreover, the many $\alpha i \alpha i$ in this poem—two of which are at the end of lines 31 and 89—would account for the acceptance of one more $\alpha i \alpha i$ in line 39 by later scribes.

III.

Lines 91-95. In Gow, they read:

αί Χάριτες κλαίοντι τὸν υίέα τῶ Κινύραο, 'ὤλετο καλὸς "Αδωνις' ἐν ἀλλάλαισι λέγοισαι, 'αἰαὶ' δ' ὀξὺ λέγοντι πολὺ πλέον ἢ Παιῶνα. χαὶ Μοῖραι τὸν "Αδωνιν ἀνακλείουσιν, "Αδωνιν, καί νιν ἐπαείδουσιν, ὅ δέ σφιν οὐκ ἐπακούει'

In line 93 Gow accepts Pierson's emendation of $\alpha \dot{v}\tau \alpha \dot{l}$ into $\alpha \dot{l}\alpha \hat{i}$ as well as Ahrens' emendation of $\tau \dot{v}$ $\Delta \iota \dot{\omega} v \alpha$ into $\Pi \alpha \iota \dot{\omega} v \alpha$, both of which were also accepted by Wilamowitz in his Oxford edition of the *Bucolici Graeci*. But the transmitted text makes excellent sense and need not be altered. $\alpha \dot{v}\tau \alpha \dot{l}$ refers to the Graces, and Dione ("the daughter of Dione") is a name also given to Aphrodite (cf. Theocritus 7. 116). Moreover, the exuberant tone of the whole poem admits of the Graces crying out more sharply even than Aphrodite (cf. line 23) at the death of "graceful" Adonis. At the

same time, and this is I feel decisive, the reading $\pi o \lambda \dot{v} \pi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} o \nu \ddot{\eta} \tau \dot{v} \Delta \iota \dot{\omega} \nu \alpha$ is supported by Theocritus 2. 79, $\pi o \lambda \dot{v} \pi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} o \nu \ddot{\eta} \tau \dot{v} \Sigma \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha$, which Bion is clearly imitating here.

Finally, in line 94, Vulcanius' emendation of $Mo\hat{\imath}\rho\alpha\iota$ into $Mo\hat{\imath}\sigma\alpha\iota$ should be accepted—an obvious emendation accepted by numerous editors, Meineke, Ahrens, Legrand, and Galavotti among them—as should Wilamowitz' $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ " $A\iota\delta\alpha$ (which is preferable to Legrand's $\dot{\alpha}\phi$ ' " $A\iota\delta\alpha$) instead of the second " $A\delta\omega\nu\iota\nu$. The stern and realistic Fates never $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota o\nu\sigma\iota\nu$ or $\dot{\epsilon}m\alpha\epsilon\iota\delta o\nu\sigma\iota\nu$ over a dead person, whereas the sensitive, artistic Muses do; and, as regards Wilamowitz' $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ " $A\iota\delta\alpha$, it must be admitted that " $A\delta\omega\nu\iota\nu$ twice in the same line rings strange.

So lines 91-95, as emended, should read:

αί Χάριτες κλαίοντι τὸν υίέα τῶ Κινύραο,
'ὧλετο καλὸς Άδωνις' ἐν ἀλλάλαισι λέγοισαι,
αὐταὶ δ' ὀξὺ λέγοντι πολὺ πλέον ἢ τὺ Διώνα.
χαὶ Μοῖσαι τὸν Ἅδωνιν ἀνακλείουσιν ἐν Ἅιδα
καί νιν ἐπαείδουσιν, ὃ δέ σφιν οὐκ ἐπακούει.

95

C. A. TRYPANIS

University of Chicago

MACHONICUM

50

95

Τον ύδροπώτην Μοσχίωνα λεγόμενον ἰδόντα φασὶν ἐν Λυκείωι μετά τινων παράσιτον ὑπὸ γραὸς τρεφόμενον πλουσίας, 'Ο δεῖνα, παράδοξόν γε ποιεῖς πρᾶγμ' ὅτι ἡ γραῦς ποιεῖ σ' ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνειν ἀεί.

The text of the joke is as printed by Gow (Machon [Cambridge, 1965], p. 37) from Athen. 6. 246B. (1) Machon consequently shortens the first syllable of $\pi οιε ιν$, $\pi οιητής$ (seven instances in 477 lines: 12, 50, 65, 90, 93, 318, 343, anceps in 405). $\pi οιε ιε$ (49) would be the only exception, if sound. But I do not think it is. (2) Fortunately, this can be proved by comparing Machon's versified version of the joke with the one told by Athenaeus in prose: $τον (δ)^1 υπο της γραος τρεφομενον παράσιτον Παυσίμαχος ελεγεν τουναντίον$

- πάσχειν τῆι γραίαι συνόντα $\langle \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \eta \dot{\nu} \rangle^3$ αὐτὸν γὰρ ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνειν ἀεί.
- (3) The phrasing πάσχεις πρᾶγμα can be paralleled by Aristoph. Nub. 816, τί χρῆμα πάσχεις; and Dem. Meid. 21. 17, πράγματ αἴσχιστ αν ἐπάθομεν. (4) The presence of ποιείς (49) in A and in the Epitome (II, p. 96 Peppinki) can be explained as a dittography of ποιεί σ (50).
- (5) Furthermore, the *Epitome* adds $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ after $\pi \lambda o \nu \sigma i \alpha s$ (48), as it does elsewhere. That is why Kaibel conjectured $\phi \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ (or $\hat{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \iota \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$) in place of $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\imath} s$ (49), and Gow (p. 71) suggested $\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \nu$ for $\gamma \epsilon \pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\imath} s$ (49), "though a violent change." Neither is paleographically likely. Nor is the presence of $\phi \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ or $\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ absolutely necessary. For a verb of

^{1.} add. Epit .: om. A.

^{2.} A: Πανσίμαχον Epit. teste A. Barigazzi, who adopts the latter, RFIC, XCV (1967), 341.

^{3.} addidi conl. Athen. 246C ό δὲ αὐτὸς παράσιτον ἀκούσας ὑπὸ γραίας τρεφόμενον συγγινόμενόν τε αὐτῆι ἐκάστης ἡμέρας...

speaking is omitted by Machon also in $\kappa \delta \iota \theta$ δ Στρατόνικος, Πρὸς $\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$, μῆτερ, φράσον (151) and αὐτὴν ἐπικροῦσαι βουλόμενος, Πρὸς τῶν $\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ (240).

(6) In conclusion, lines 48–49 should read: $\pi \lambda o \nu \sigma i \alpha s$: 'Ο $\delta \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \alpha$, $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta o \xi \delta \nu$ $\gamma \epsilon$ $\pi \alpha \delta \alpha \chi \epsilon \iota s$ $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \gamma \mu$ ', $\delta \tau \iota$... The joke about the inverted roles becomes now quite clear: the parasite is δ $\pi \alpha \delta \chi \omega \nu$, the old woman is $\hat{\eta}$ $\pi o \iota o \hat{\nu} \sigma \alpha$, both

MIROSLAV MARCOVICH

University of Illinois