

by Hercules, in respect to a dinner the phrase 'What was that to you?' would not [apply]—especially to [a gourmet like] you." Not only would there be no need of emendation, but also the sentence would remain a statement,

as implied by the asseverative *hercule*, rather than an interrogative utterance.

ROBERT G. HOERBER

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE

### SOME OBSERVATIONS ON <ΒΙΩΝΟΣ> ΕΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ ΑΔΩΝΙΔΟΣ

There is still much which is obscure in the badly transmitted text of <Βίωνος> 'Επιτάφιος Ἀδώνιδος. This paper will discuss three passages only.

#### I.

Lines 23–27. As given by Gow in his Oxford *Bucolici Graeci*, they read:

δξὺ δὲ κωκύοισα δι' ἄγκεα μακρὰ φορεῖται  
'Ασσύριον βοόωσα πόσιν, καὶ παῖδα καλεῖσα.  
ἀμφὶ δὲ νιν μέλαν αἶμα παρ' ὀμφαλὸν ἄωρεῖτο, 25  
στήθεα δ' ἐκ μηρῶν φονίσσαστο, τοὶ δ' ὑπὸ μαζοῖ  
χιόνεοι τὸ πάροιθεν Ἀδώνιδι πορφύροντο.

If this whole passage is to make sense, I should like first to adopt Professor Hugh Lloyd-Jones' suggestion that in line 24 the comma be removed from where it stands and put after βοόωσα. The meaning would then be: "crying out in Assyrian fashion (i.e., in a wild Oriental manner; for Assyrian [=Syrian] exuberance, cf. Themistius 24. 301b and Heliodorus 4. 17), calling her husband and child." In line 18 of the same poem, Adonis is again called a παῖς, and in Theocritus 15. 129–32 he is also treated as a husband and as a youngster, so that the hendiadys πόσιν καὶ παῖδα should not bother us, as it seems to have bothered Hermann, Ahrens, and Legrand, who emended it into πολλά.

Line 25, as it stands, makes absolutely no sense. Blood cannot αἰωρεῖται round anybody's navel, not even a goddess', nor can νιν refer to Adonis, as Wilamowitz and Edmonds thought, for in that case we would expect τὸν and not νιν. We should certainly accept Ahrens' emendation of αἶμα into εἶμα, which is supported by the κυανόστολα of line 4 and by Theocritus 15. 134–35: λύσασαι δὲ κόμαν καὶ ἐπὶ σφυρὰ κόλπον ἀνέισαι / στήθεσι φαινομένοις λιγυρᾶς ἀρξέμεθ' αὐιδᾶς.

Finally in line 26 I should like to adopt an old suggestion by an unnamed scholar (reported by Valckenaer) who emended μηρῶν into μηρῶ, the Doric genitive singular (cf. τῶ in line 91); for the plural is both clumsy and inaccurate (cf. lines 7 and 16). It is the blood of Adonis' wound which stained the goddess' bared breast—bared because of her mourning (cf. Theocritus 15. 134–35)—when she clasped him in her arms and kissed him, as we know from lines 7–14 and 40–50. I do not think, therefore that Ahrens' unpoetic and strictly "logical" emendation of μηρῶν into χειρῶν is necessary.

So the whole passage, as emended, should read:

δξὺ δὲ κωκύοισα δι' ἄγκεα μακρὰ φορεῖται  
'Ασσύριον βοόωσα, πόσιν καὶ παῖδα καλεῖσα.  
ἀμφὶ δὲ νιν μέλαν εἶμα παρ' ὀμφαλὸν ἄωρεῖτο, 25  
στήθεα δ' ἐκ μηρῶ φονίσσαστο, τοὶ δ' ὑπὸ μαζοῖ  
χιόνεοι τὸ πάροιθεν Ἀδώνιδι πορφύροντο.

#### II.

Line 39. This, as given by Gow, who follows one of the two extant manuscripts, runs: Κύπριδος αἰνὸν ἔρωτα τίς οὐκ ἔκλαυσεν ἄν αἰαῖ; "Εκλαυσεν ἄν, however, is obviously wrong, especially after lines 32–38, in which we are told that everything—mountains and trees, rivers, fountains and flowers—has lamented the death of Adonis and Aphrodite's tragic love for him. Codex V felt this and omitted ἄν; and Ludwig emended ἄν αἰαῖ into ἐν αἰᾶ, which was not accepted by Gow.

I should like to suggest ἄν' αἶαν for the ἄν αἰαῖ of codex Tr. "Across the earth" (cf. *Odyssey* 19. 408, ἀνὰ χθόνα) makes good sense, and the manuscript error can be easily explained, if the last two strokes of N, which was the last letter in the line, faded away, and

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

### III.

Lines 91–95. In Gow, they read:

αἱ Χάριτες κλαίοντι τὸν νεία τῷ Κινύραο,  
 'ὦλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις' ἐν ἀλλάλαισι λέγοισαι,  
 'αἰαῖ' δ' ὅξυ λέγοντι πολὺ πλεόν ἢ Παιῶνα.  
 χαῖ Μοῖραι τὸν Ἄδωνιν ἀνακλείουσιν, Ἄδωνιν,  
 καὶ νιν ἐπαίδουσιν, ὃ δέ σφιν οὐκ ἐπακούει· 95

In line 93 Gow accepts Pierson's emendation of αὐταῖ into αἰαῖ as well as Ahrens' emendation of τὸν Διώννα into Παιῶνα, 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. αὐταῖ 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 πολὺ πλεόν ἢ τὸν Διώννα is supported by Theocritus 2. 79, πολὺ πλεόν ἢ τὸν Σελάννα, which Bion is clearly imitating here.

Finally, in line 94, Vulcanius' emendation of Μοῖραι into Μοῖσαι should be accepted—an obvious emendation accepted by numerous editors, Meineke, Ahrens, Legrand, and Galavotti among them—as should Wilamowitz' ἐν Ἄϊδα (which is preferable to Legrand's ἀφ' Ἄϊδα) instead of the second Ἄδωνιν. The stern and realistic Fates never ἀνακλείουσιν or ἐπαίδουσιν over a dead person, whereas the sensitive, artistic Muses do; and, as regards Wilamowitz' ἐν Ἄϊδα, it must be admitted that Ἄδωνιν twice in the same line rings strange.

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

αἱ Χάριτες κλαίοντι τὸν νεία τῷ Κινύραο,  
 'ὦλετο καλὸς Ἄδωνις' ἐν ἀλλάλαισι λέγοισαι,  
 αὐταῖ δ' ὅξυ λέγοντι πολὺ πλεόν ἢ τὸν Διώννα.  
 χαῖ Μοῖσαι τὸν Ἄδωνιν ἀνακλείουσιν ἐν Ἄϊδα  
 καὶ νιν ἐπαίδουσιν, ὃ δέ σφιν οὐκ ἐπακούει. 95

C. A. TRYPANIS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### MACHONICUM

Τὸν ὕδρὸπότην Μοσχίωνα λεγόμενον  
 ἰδόντα φασὶν ἐν Λυκείῳ μετὰ τινων  
 παράσιτον ὑπὸ γρᾶδς τρεφόμενον πλουσίας,  
 'Ὁ δεῖνα, παράδοξόν γε ποιεῖς πρᾶγμ' ὅτι  
 ἡ γραῦς ποιεῖ σ' ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνειν αἰεί. 50

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 ποιεῖν, ποιητής (seven instances in 477 lines: 12, 50, 65, 90, 93, 318, 343, aniceps in 405). ποιεῖς (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: τὸν <δ><sup>1</sup> ὑπὸ τῆς γρᾶδς τρεφόμενον παράσιτον Πανσίμαχος<sup>2</sup> ἔλεγεν τοῦναντίον

πάσχειν τῇ γραίᾳ συνόντα <αὐτῇ><sup>3</sup> αὐτὸν γὰρ ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνειν αἰεί.

(3) The phrasing πάσχειν πρᾶγμα can be paralleled by Aristoph. *Nub.* 816, τί χρήμα πάσχεις; and Dem. *Meid.* 21. 17, πρᾶγματ' αἰσχιστ' ἂν ἐπάθομεν. (4) The presence of ποιεῖς (49) in A and in the *Epitome* (II, p. 96 Peppinki) can be explained as a dittography of ποιεῖ σ' (50).

(5) Furthermore, the *Epitome* adds εἰπεῖν after πλουσίας (48), as it does elsewhere. That is why Kaibel conjectured φῆσαι (or ἐπειπεῖν) in place of ποιεῖς (49), and Gow (p. 71) suggested λέγειν τὸ for γε ποιεῖς (49), "though a violent change." Neither is paleographically likely. Nor is the presence of φῆσαι or λέγειν 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 ὃ δὲ αὐτὸς παράσιτον ἀκούσας ὑπὸ γραίας τρεφόμενον συγγινόμενον τε αὐτῇ ἐκάστης ἡμέρας . . .