

Rather, as Heubeck has himself pointed out, \**Μένμων* is nothing but an apocopation of the name-set epitomized by *Μενέλαος*; it is therefore the formulaic equivalent, so to speak. \**Αγα-μένμων* is then 'great, Ober-\**Μένμων*'. He is the principal *wanakt*s of the coalition, whatever such a contemporary office exactly was.

## II

In connexion with the above developments we see then that the Attic inscriptional variant *μεσομνη* to *μεσόδημη* provides us with an extremely valuable form. It is apparent that the undisturbed non-paradigmatic development of *δημη* was Attic *μν*. We must suppose that *δημη* assimilated to Attic \**νμη*, and that this then submitted to rule (B) above, which however already existed in the grammar. At the same time we confirm that Attic dental + *σ* + *μ* was not a purely phonetic development; it was clearly paradigmatic, and we thus understand forms such as *ἴσμεν* more thoroughly. That is, the insertion of *σ* was essentially a sequence-preserving mechanism.

We thus see again that in Attic \**Αγα-μεν-σ-μων* clearly had a value placing it in paradigmatic relation with *Μενε-* etc.

We also get an interesting insight into the productive relation of *θεσμός* to *θεῖναι*; on this set of related notions see my remarks elsewhere on Eng. *doom* and *do*, etc.

### 'Ρηγμῖνος at Iliad XX. 229

By R. M. FRAZER, New Orleans

- 226      *αἶ δ' ὅτε μὲν σκιρτῶεν ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν,  
ἄκρον ἐπ' ἀνθερίκων καρπὸν θεόν οὐδὲ κατέκλων·  
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ σκιρτῶεν ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης,*
- 229      *ἄκρον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνος ἀλὸς πολιοῖο θέεσκον.*

The above verses describe how the immortal fillies which Boreas has fathered run over the tops of the wheat and over the tops of the waves. In the last verse (229) there appears the word *ῥηγμῖνος* which presents us with two problems I should like to discuss. First, there is a textual problem: Should we emend *ῥηγμῖνος*, which is the reading

of the manuscripts, to ῥηγμῖνα? Secondly, there is a question of meaning: Does the word ῥηγμῖν (or -μῖς) refer here, as it usually does in Homer, to the water breaking along the shore, or does it refer to the waves of the wide-open sea?

H. L. Ahrens was the first to propose the emendation ῥηγμῖνα<sup>1</sup>). This would allow the construction of verse 229 to parallel that of verse 227, since ἄκρον could be taken as an adjective in both places. If ῥηγμῖνος is read, ἄκρον must be taken as an adverb or, if we change the accent of ἐπί to ἔπι, as a noun<sup>2</sup>). Ahrens felt that the original ῥηγμῖνα was altered to ῥηγμῖνος in order to avoid hiatus before ἀλός. E. Risch, in support of Ahren's emendation, has recently pointed to Archilochus F 79a (Diehl): ἄκρον παρὰ ῥηγμῖνα<sup>3</sup>). Archilochus is here cursing a personal enemy: he hopes that he will be enslaved after his ship is wrecked and he is caught lying *along the edge of the surf*. The words in italics give what I consider to be a correct translation<sup>4</sup>). The important thing to notice is that ἄκρον has a different meaning here from that in our *Iliad* verse. It means *the edge of* and not *the top of* the water. If this difference is kept in mind, it seems to me that the Archilochus fragment does not support Ahren's emendation but rather the reading of the manuscripts. The word ῥηγμῖν usually describes the breaking water along the shore and connotes in itself the edge of the sea<sup>5</sup>). Thus the adjective ἄκρον would be most easily interpreted as strengthening this meaning and ἄκρον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνα would be understood to mean *on the water at the very edge of the surf*. The poet of our *Iliad* passage, however, wished to express the idea of fillies skimming in the air over the surface of the wheat and over the surface of the water. He wished in verse 229 to use ἄκρον to describe the top of the water as he used it in verse 227 to describe the top of the wheat. Accordingly, he may have chosen ἄκρον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνος as better able to express the unusual idea of fillies running over the top of the water than ἄκρον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνα, where the adjective ἄκρον meant to him the edge of the water, as it does to us in the similar expression of the Archilochus fragment.

<sup>1</sup>) H. L. Ahrens, *De Hiatus Homerici Legitimis Quibusdam Generibus* (Hannover 1851), p. 21.

<sup>2</sup>) E. Risch, *LfgrE* 441.77f., takes it as a noun.

<sup>3</sup>) *LfgrE* 441.75ff.

<sup>4</sup>) This is the interpretation of all the translations and commentaries I have examined. The same interpretation must be given to the ἄκραις of Euripides, *I. T.* 253: ἄκραις ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖσιν.

<sup>5</sup>) For the most recent discussions of the meaning of ῥηγμῖν see the articles by Heitsch and Erbse referred to in notes 6 and 7 below.

The expression ἄκρον παρὰ ῥηγμίνα, as we have seen, reinforces the usual meaning of ῥηγμῖν which is descriptive of the water breaking along the shore. We have suggested that this would have probably been the effect of ἄκρον ἐπὶ ῥηγμίνα in the mind of the poet of our *Iliad* verse and that he preferred to use ἄκρον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνος, as he wished to give a different sense to ἄκρον, a sense which does not reinforce the usual meaning of ῥηγμῖν. Thus we are brought to our second question: Did the poet of our *Iliad* verse wish to alter the usual meaning of ῥηγμῖν? Or, in other words, do the fillies which Boreas has fathered run over the waves of the wide-open sea or only over the water along the shore? This question has recently been discussed by H. Erbse and E. Heitsch.

Erbse believes that ῥηγμῖν always refers to the water along the shore and that there is no reason to suppose that verse 229 uses it differently<sup>6</sup>). Heitsch, in refutation of Erbse's view, has pointed out that the expression εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης, which appears in verse 228, always describes the wide-open sea<sup>7</sup>).

I think that Heitsch's view is right, and it seems to me to be supported by the nature of the fillies in our passage. These fillies are immortal horses, and such horses were commonly described as running over the wide-open sea. Poseidon's horses run over the water from Aegae to Troy (*Iliad* XIII. 23ff.); the sea is no obstacle to the horses of Hades (*Hymn to Demeter* 380ff.); and the horses of Castor and Pollux go over land and sea (Alcaeus 34a [Lobel-Page]). Furthermore, as W. D. Geddes once remarked, the imagery describing the flight of the fillies in our passage seems to be naturally drawn from the action of their father the north wind Boreas<sup>8</sup>). One is reminded of how Zetes and Calais, who are the sons of Boreas and thus the half-brothers of our fillies, chase the Harpies out over the sea. In *Iliad* II. 144–9, a simile, there is a description of the winds which closely resembles that of the fillies in our passage:

κινήθη δ' ἀγορῇ φῆ κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης  
πόντου Ἰκαρίοιο, τὰ μὲν τ' Εὐρός τε Νότος τε

<sup>6</sup>) H. Erbse, „Über die sogenannte Aeneis im 20. Buch der *Ilias*“, *Rh. Mus.*, CX (1967), 14–15, a criticism of E. Heitsch, „Aphroditehymnos, Aeneas und Homer“, *Hypomnemata*, XV (Göttingen 1965), pp. 83–84.

<sup>7</sup>) E. Heitsch, *Epische Kunstsprache und Homerische Chronologie* (Heidelberg 1968), pp. 54ff., esp. p. 56f., n. 31; H. Maehler, *Lfgre* 580.30ff., presumably because of εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης, takes the ἄλος in our verse to mean *offenes Meer, hohe See*.

<sup>8</sup>) W. D. Geddes, *The Problem of the Homeric Poems* (London 1878), p. 206.

ὄρορ' ἐπαΐξας πατρὸς Διὸς ἐκ νεφελῶων.  
 ὡς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺν λήϊον ἔλθων  
 λάβρος ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπὶ τ' ἡμῶν ἀσταχέσσιν,  
 ὡς τῶν πᾶσ' ἀγορὴ κινήθη.

And Virgil, in *Georgics* III. 201, comparing a swiftly running horse with Aquilo (Boreas), describes Aquilo as follows: *Ille volat simul arva fuga, simul aequora verrens*. I think this wind-nature of our fillies a strong reason for taking ὄρηγμίν to refer to the wide-open sea, for the action of the winds on the waves of the wide-open sea makes a very nice parallel with their blowing over a wheat field, which can not be said of the winds on the breakers along the shore.

## Noch einmal zum Opferbetrug des Prometheus

Von JOACHIM LATACZ, Würzburg

Die in dieser Zeitschrift 48, 1970, 31–36 von W. Kohl vorgeschlagene Interpretation der Stelle Hes. Theog. 538–41 scheint mir zwar sachlich richtig, die Begründung ist jedoch sprachlich kaum zu halten und überdies überflüssig<sup>1)</sup>.

Hesiod geht von der Tatsache aus, daß beim Opfer die Götter den schlechteren, die Menschen den besseren Teil erhalten (556/7). Wie kam es dazu? Freiwillig haben die Götter sich sicher nicht selbst benachteiligt, gezwungen werden konnten sie natürlich auch nicht. Bleibt nur die List. Nicht weniger als 7mal kennzeichnet Hesiod in den Versen 535–62 Prometheus' Vorgehen mit dem Worte δόλος oder mit Ableitungen davon. Da muß es sich schon — bei aller Berücksichtigung der bei Hesiod extrem stark ausgeprägten epischen Wiederholungstechnik — um eine ganz besonders raffinierte List handeln. Daß Hesiod diese List nicht selbst erfand, wird man Heitsch ohne weiteres zugeben. Nur daß Zeus nicht auf sie hereinfliegen darf, das hat sicher Hesiods Zeusbild bewirkt.

Vollkommen klar ist, daß diese List von vornherein in der Abwälzung der Verantwortung auf den Gefoppten selbst bestanden haben muß. Nur wenn dieser, um den Effekt der List zu verhindern,

<sup>1)</sup> Kohls Ausführungen einschließlich der von ihm angegebenen Literatur werden im folgenden vorausgesetzt.