

Lösung einer Abkürzung, eine Erscheinung, die in dieser HS auch sonst nicht selten vorkommt<sup>6)</sup> (das hätte man schon aufgrund des *ω* statt *ο* vermuten können).

Sowohl der Passus *περὶ διχούων* 293, 18–23, von dem wir aus gegangen sind, als auch die Epimerismen-Stelle, nötigt also zu der Folgerung, daß Herodian *ἴφθιμος* als *σύνθετον* aufgefaßt hat<sup>7)</sup>.

## Scriptiunculae criticae

By N. C. CONOMIS, Thessaloniki

1. Ael. Dion. attic. e 60: *ἐπιτήθη*: *ἡ τῆς τήθης μήτηρ ὥστε εἰναι τὴν μὲν τήθην μητρὸς *ἡ πατρὸς μητέρα*, τὴν δὲ ἐπιτήθην τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς μητέρα καὶ τῆς μητρὸς μητέρα. οὕτω Ἰσαῖος κλπ.*

It seems that *τήθην* should be read twice instead of *μητέρα* as *ἐπιτήθη* is the mother of one's grandfather or grandmother, the *προμάμμη* of Ammonius, Diff. no. 481 Nickau. The mistake is also present in other lexicographical references and this suggests that the misunderstanding was already in their source. The mistake was perhaps understood by Eustathios who tacitly corrected his source p. 971, 23 *ἐπιτήθη* δὲ *ἡ ώντερ αὐτὴν* (= *τὴν τήθην*), *καθ' δμοιότητα τοῦ πάππουν* (= *δ ἐπάνω τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦ πάππουν ἐπίπαππος*) probably borrowing from Aristoph. Byz. π. *συγγενικῶν ὀνομ.* fr. 9 Nauck (p. 138).

2. Bachm. Anecd. 184. 30: *Γέρρα: μικρὰ σκοντά.*

Read *σκοντά(ρια)*. The word is not in LSJ. but it occurs in later Greek, cf. Schol. Luc. 256, 17 Rabe *πελτίδια: μικρὰ σκοντάρια ΓΜΩ* etc.

3. Bachm. Anecd. 185. 17 *Γλαῦξ: νυκτοβαῦς, πετεινὸν νυκτερινὸν*

Hesych. *γλαῦξ: νυκτοβάῦς. πετεινὸν νυκτερινὸν*

*νυκτοβαῖς* H: *νυκτοβοῶν* g: vSΣ, *bubo* a *βαῦζειν*, non a *βαυειν* appellatus

*Βαῦζειν*, however, is never used of birds. Rather *νυκτοβύας*, . . . as *βύας* is in Greek the name for *bubo* and the correspondent verb is

<sup>6)</sup> Andere Beispiele, a.a.O., S. 15.

<sup>7)</sup> Möglicherweise wird die Ableitung von *ἴφη* und *θυμός* ihm zuzuschreiben sein (vgl. a.O., S. 56, Z. 6–9 [= *An. Par.* III. 303, 18–21 und *An. Ox.* I. 206, 4–7]; E. Gud. 285, 31ff. Sturz; Eust. 16, 15). — Ich danke sehr herzlich meinem verehrten Kollegen Prof. Dr. W.-D. Lebek, der diesen kleinen Beitrag in HS gelesen und mir wertvolle Kritik am Ausdruck und Gedanken-gang mitgeteilt hat.

*βύζω*, see LSJ. *ad loc.* Later on the bird *βύας* was called *βοῦφος* (Cyranid. 86), hence Mod. Gr. *μποῦφος*<sup>1</sup>). It is noteworthy that Zonaras' Lexic. 397 records the ancient proverb *Βοῦθος περιφοιτᾶ* which was used ἐπὶ τῶν εὐήθων καὶ παχυφρόνων, ἀπό τινος Πυθιονίκου *Βούθον μετενεχθεῖσα* Zen. II 66 (Paroem. Gr. 1, 50) as *Βοῦφος περιφοιτᾶ* owing to the fact that the bird *βοῦφος* came in the meantime to denote an *εὐήθης* person, like the person *Βοῦθος*.

4. Schol. Demosth. XVIII 260 (Dindorf 313,28): 313,28. *κιστοφόρος*: ὁ φέρων τὰς κοίτας.

Read *τὰς κίστας*, though strictly speaking *κιστοφόρος* should be the person carrying the *κίστη*. But probably the explanation is taken from Harpocratio s.v. *κιττοφόρος* where *κίστας* is mentioned. The same mistake is corrected by Ziegler in Plut. Phoc. 28.5.

5. Hesych. *κορνάγχη*: ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιμελείας ὕδατος.

Writing some years ago in *Acta Classica* 4, 1960, p. 48 I expressed the view that *κορνάγχη* must be corrupt but I was not sure whether *κορνῶν ἀρχὴ*, *κορνοφυλάκη* or something else' should be written. I now regard these terms as improbable and the same holds for Latte's suggestion *κορναρχίη* (*κορνάρχη* Soping). Neither Pollux's (8.113) *κορνοφυλάκιον* nor IG II<sup>2</sup> 338, 11 αἰρεθεὶς ἐπὶ τὰς κοίτας which are quoted corroborate the reading *κορναρχίη*. However, taking into account the phrase ὁ τὰς κοίτας ἄγων which occurs in a fragment of Phrynicus' *Μονότροπος* (fr. 21 Kock) and applies to Meton of the deme of Leuconoe \**κορναργαγή* is tentatively suggested as a likely candidate. This noun is not attested but its formation does not present any difficulty in view of the fact that Kretschmer's-Locker's, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griech. Sprache*, p. 77 records 39 composite words with second component -*αγωγή*.

6. Hesch. μ 1509 \**μηῆστεια*: γάμον δῶρα r. AS

*μηῆτεια* H: rK

Probably *μηῆστεια* the form which occurs in a Glossarium, see LSJ. Supplement s.v., a very rare synonym for *μηῆστρα*.

<sup>1)</sup> Professor Andriotis (*Ἐτυμολογικό Λεξικό τῆς κοινῆς Νεοελληνικῆς ad loc.*) derives Mod. Gr. *μποῦφος* from Latin *bufus*. This is far from certain. Firstly it is doubtful whether the forms *bufus* and *bufa*, which occur to the best of my knowledge only once, were early in use, since they are recorded only from mediaeval times. Secondly though the recording of *bufus* in Latin is so late its meaning is only *βούπρηστις*, a poisonous beetle. On the other hand the presence of *μπ-* at the beginning of the word as against *β-* of the Greek form perhaps indicates Latin influence.

7. Hesch. *Tanagraiōn* φυήν: κήτει † δμοιότητα. Ἐφορος λέγει εἶναι τίνα ἐν *Tanágora* παχύτατον, δις ἐλέγετο Κητεύς.

In view of the explanatory information from Ephorus supplied by the gloss itself one should perhaps tentatively suggest ⟨τὴν⟩ Κητεῖ δμοιότητα unless the entry is *Tanagraiōn* φυή: ⟨τὴν⟩ Κητεῖ δμοιότητα. Cf. also Gramm. Gr. III ii p. 533 Κητειοι γένος Μυσῶν ἢ μεγάλοι.

8. LSJ. s.v. ἐγκόλλονρα, *torunda*, a kind of bread. Gloss.

To read *rotunda* by an easy ἀναγραμματισμός? For ἐγκόλλονρα cf. κολλύρια.

9. LSJ. s.v. καταβόλια· confectores (sic) Gloss.

Entry and explanation do not agree; perhaps καταβολεῖς· confectores.

10. LSJ. s.v. *τανισια* = *epinia*, Gloss. (dub.).

Θαλύσια· *epimenia*? If this is so then *epimenia* has the meaning of LSJ. s.v. ἐπιμήνιος II 1 which is not recorded in Latin dictionaries.

11. Eustath. p. 1672.16sq.: Τὸ δὲ οὐτάμενοι γενικῶς καὶ νῦν κεῖται ἐπὶ τε τῶν τετρωμένων ἐπὶ τε τῶν βεβλημένων. οὐ γὰρ ἀν πιθανῶς εἴποι τις τῶν μὲν οὐταμένων ἦν τις φασία, τῶν δὲ βεβλημένων οὐ.

Read φα<ντα>σία. Cf. 1672,24sq. καὶ οἱ πεσόντες νεοπενθεῖς ἐν σκυδρωπῇ καταστάσει φαίνονται, καὶ οἱ ἐν ὅπλοις θαρόντες δμοιοι φαντασιοῦνται, . . . καὶ αἱ τῶν βεβλημένων φαντασίαι μετὰ ὡτειλῶν ἐπιφαίνονται . . .

12. Schol. Od. i 219 (423,7 Dindorf): στείνοντο δὲ σηκοί] ἐστενοχωροῦντο αἱ μάνδραι καὶ τὰ περίβολα, ἐν οἷς ἐγκεκλεισμένα εἰσὶ τὰ θρέμματα. P. Q. V. ἢ αἱ καταδύσεις τῶν θρεμμάτων P.V.

Read καταλύσεις i.e. καταλύματα.

13. Schol. Pindar, Ol. I 24d: ὁ δὲ νοῦς· οἴα παῖζομεν φίλαν ἄνδρες] ὅποια μάλιστα μουσικὴν οἱ ἄνθρωποι συνεχῶς κατὰ τὰ συμπόσια περὶ τὴν προσφιλῆ τράπεζαν παῖζομεν . . . συχνῶς?

14. Schol. Pindar, Ol. I 118: σχεδὸν φάρη] οὐ τοπικῶς τὸ σχεδόν, ἀλλὰ τοπικῶς πρὸς τὴν φωνὴν ἀκούσας τοῦ Πέλοπος.

1 πρὸς corrupt. vid., Very likely: τροπικῶς πως

15. Schol. Pindar, Ol. II 29d: . . . φασὶ γὰρ τότε Σιμωνίδην τὸν λυρικὸν περιτυχόντα διαλῦσαι τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τὴν ἔχθραν.

19 παρατυχόντα C

The reading of C is preferable. In another passage Schol. in Ol. II 65c δν (sc. Λάϊον) δὴ συμβέβηκεν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἴδιου παιδὸς φονευθῆναι Οἰδίποδος, ἐν δδῷ περιτυχόντα κατὰ τὴν Φωκίδα . . ., περιτυχόντα seems perfectly in place.

16. Schol. Pindar, Ol. II 76b: τὸ δὲ ἔξῆς τοῦ λόγου· λείφθη δὲ ὁ Θέρσανδρος τοῦ Πολυνείκους πεσόντος οὐκ ἦν . . .  
2 οὐκ ἦν verba corrupta.

Read ⟨ἔ⟩λειφθη<sup>2)</sup> and then perhaps ϕ ἦν . . . cl. 76c λείφθη δὲ Θέρσανδρος: τὸ ἔξῆς ἐλειφθη δὲ τοῦ Πολυνείκους πεσόντος Θέρσανδρος, Ἀνδρότιμος, Ἀλαστος. δ δὲ Θέρσανδρος ἐν Μυσίᾳ τρωθεὶς ὑπὸ Τηλέφου τελευτᾶ. d. ἄλλως· ἐλειφθη δὲ λοιπὸν ὁ νὺς Πολυνείκους ἀναιρεθέντος Θέρσανδρος, δστις αὐτῷ ἔξ Άργείας τῆς Ἀδράστου θυγατρὸς γέγονεν. The sequence seems to have been something like ϕ ἦν ⟨ἔξ Άργείας τῆς Ἀδράστου θυγατρὸς γέγονώς⟩.

17. Schol. Pindar, Ol. II 104a: . . . τὸ δὲ περὶ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας ἀρχαιότερον ἔστι· παραδέδοται γὰρ ἔτι ἀνέκαθεν, ὡς "Ομηρός φησιν (σ. 79).  
νῦν μὲν μήτ' εἴης, βονγάie, μήτε γένοιο.

πρῶτος δὲ δοκεῖ τούτῳ τῷ δόγματι χρῆσθαι Πυθαγόρας  
Preferably χρήσασθαι.

18. Schol. Pindar, Ol. II 121a: *Toὶ δ’ ἀπροσόρατον: οἱ ἀσεβεῖς.*  
ἀπροσόρατον δέ, ἥτοι δν οὐκ ἀν τις ὑπομείνειε, δεινόν· ἢ ἀνεπίδεικτον  
καὶ θεοῖς πόνον ἔχοντιν, οὐδὲ ὑπὸ θεῶν δυνάμενον προσοραθῆναι.

1. ἀπροσόρατον (alt.) Drachmann: ἀπροόρατον      2. ἀνεπίδεικτον: b(V).

Probably \*ἀνεπίδερκτον = 'that which cannot be seen'. The word does not seem to occur elsewhere and would be rather poetic, but ἐπιδερκτός = 'that can be seen' occurs in Emped. 2. 7.

19. Schol. Pindar, Ol. II 168: ἐκατόν γε ἐτέων: λέγεται τὴν Ακράγαντα πεντηκοστῇ Ὀλυμπιάδι ἐκτίσθαι, ἐκεῖνην δὲ ἄχοι τῆς Θήρωνος νίκης ἔτη εἶναι ἐκατὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπιάσιν κε· γίνονται δὲ πρὸς ταῖς ν' Ὀλυμπιάσιν οε'. ἐνίκα οὖν οε'. κέχρηται οὖν τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ ἀριθμῷ εἰπὼν ρ'.

3 οὖν: δὲ ci. Schneider      οε' Gerhard: ιε'

Probably ἐνίκα οὗτος οε'. If οὗτος was abbreviated οὗτ̄ and for whatever reason the ο (= οε') became illegible, τ could easily be read as ν.

<sup>2)</sup> A similar case: the omitted augment at Schol. Hom. ψ 503 where the explanation ψύχωσε δὲ αὐτὰ (sc. τὰ ἀρμάτα) should be restored ⟨ἔ⟩ψύχωσε.

20. Schol. Pindar, Ol. II 58b: *τιμάσαις πόρον Ἀλφεοῦ μετὰ δώδεκ'*  
*ἀνάκτων θεῶν: καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγκαταριθμεῖται τοῖς οὐ' θεοῖς. ὁ δὲ ἐν*  
*'Ολυμπίᾳ βωμὸς οὐ δύναται ἐξ ἄλλου ὕδατος γενέσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ*  
*Ἀλφειοῦ.*

ἢ γενέσθαι: βρέχεσθαι vel ἀρδεύεσθαι? Beck φάνεσθαι? Heyne  
Perhaps ὑγραίνεσθαι?

## Part II: The Differences between free and obligatory ut-clauses

By A. M. BOLKESTEIN, Amsterdam  
(vgl. Glotta 54, 1976, 263–291)

### 1. Introduction<sup>1)</sup>

Clauses of the form *ut* plus subjunctive are found as fillers of the syntactic functions OBJECT (as with the verb *imperare* ‘to order’), COMPLEMENT (as e.g. with the verb *admonere* ‘to admonish’) or SUBJECT (as e.g. with the verb *accidit* ‘it happens’). In those cases their presence is required by the governing verb, that is, they are part of the role-function frame of the verb.

However, we also find clauses of precisely the same form as fillers of role-function complexes, which are not required by the governing verb. They may freely be added to sentences with a great variety of main verbs<sup>2)</sup>. These role-function complexes are the role-function complex of ADJUNCT + Purpose, and that of ADJUNCT + Result. An example of the first is (1).

- (1) *legum idcirco omnes servi sumus, ut liberi esse possimus* (‘we are therefore all slaves of the law, *in order that* we may be free’ Cic. *Cluent.* 146)

Now, in traditional grammars the basic distinction between clauses of the form *ut* plus subjunctive as fillers of required, or obligatory, role-function complexes and as fillers of non-required,

<sup>1)</sup> For a survey of the main theoretical assumptions underlying my terminology I refer to section O at the head of part I.

<sup>2)</sup> Not to any sentence, whatsoever, of course. There seem to be semantic restrictions on the type of sentences which allow of the addition of an ADJUNCT + Purpose clause, apart from the one that the Agent of the main verb must be [+ animate].