

3. *κναξζβί* (so LSJ<sup>9</sup>). “Thespis”, fr. 1 F 4, 1:  
*ἴδε σοι σπένδω κναξζβί τὸ λευκόν*  
 As this word is a compound of *κνάξ* [“milk”] and *ζβίχ* [“white”], Salmasius’ emendation *κναξζβι<χ>* [τὸ] *λευκόν*, adopted by Snell, deserves acceptance.
4. *λαλοβαρνπαραμελορνημοβάτας*, read at Pratinas, fr. 4 F 1, 13 (mss. reading) is accepted by no editor. Suggestions include *λαλοβαρύοπα <πα>ραμελ.* (Bergk) and *λα. <βραδνπα>ραμελ.* (Wilamowitz).
5. *μετοικίζω* (intrans. in act.). A reference should be added to Dymas, fr. 130 F 1:  
*(sc. ὁ θυμός) τὰ δεινὰ πράσσει τὰς φρένας μετοικίσας*
6. *δς* used as a demonstrative pronoun (LSJ<sup>9</sup> def. A II): reference should be added to Ezechiel, *Exagogé* lines 43 (as emended by Dindorf and Wieneke), 45, 136 and 240.
7. *σκνίω*. LSJ<sup>9</sup> incorrectly reports the accusative, read at Ezechiel, *Exagogé* 135a, as *σκνίπας*. The reading of the mss., *σκνίπας*, is guaranteed by the meter.
8. *τριέλιξ*, read at Chaeremon, fr. 71 F 7, 1. This is marked “dub.” in LSJ<sup>9</sup> although the reading has been queried by no editor. The notation should be defended or deleted.
9. *τροφεύω*. c. acc. at Ezechiel, *Exagogé* 29:  
*τοῦτον, γυναί,*  
*τρόφευε.*

## New Words from Satyric Fragments

By DANA FERRIN SUTTON, The University of Illinois  
 at Urbana-Champaign

Since the appearance of Viktor Steffen’s *Satyrographorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Poznań, 1952) a number of new fragments have come to light, yielding words, forms, and definitions not previously attested, that should be entered in future lexicons.

1. *ἄθνητος* [“immortal”]. *P. Bodmer* 28, an anonymous satyric *Atlas*, reads in line 41 *ΔΩΡΗΜΑΘΝΗΤΩΝ*, to be articulated *δώρημα θνητῶν* or *δώρημ’ ἀθνήτων*. E. G. Turner, *MusHelv* 33 (1976) 14 points out that the reference is to the apples of the Hesperides,

so that the former possibility would improbably describe the Hesperides as mortals.

2. (dub.) ἀμπολή [“ploughing, cultivation”]. Aeschylus, *P. Oxy.* 2256 fr. 8, 7 reads οἱ δὲ γῆς ΕΠΕΜΒΟΛΑΣ. As B is corrected to Π we should perhaps read γῆς ἐπ’ ἐμπολάς. But H. Lloyd-Jones, Loeb Library *Aeschylus* II<sup>2</sup> 574 observes that since desiring land (the evident sense of the context) for trade seems unlikely, we might better read γῆς ἐπ’ ἀμπολάς. ἀμπολή, derived from ἀναπολέω [“plough”], would be new. Cf. further No. 6 below.

3. ἀντισέληνος [“like the moon, as bright as the moon”]. Read at Aeschylus, *P. Oxy.* 2245 fr. 1–12, 67 as joined by F. C. Görschen, *ArchPap* 17:1 (1960) 32–34. For the formation of the composite cf. ἀνταμοιβός, ἀντίγραφος, ἀντίθεος, ἀντίμιμος, ἀντίπλαστος.

4. δρόμος [“runner, messenger; office of runner, messenger”]. *P. Bodmer* 28, 19 reads:

ἦ τοι πάρο[ε]δρον θεῶν δρόμον κεκτημένη  
Δίκη δέδορκεν ὄξυ

Despite Turner’s statement to the contrary, *op. cit.* 72, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that here δρόμος has the meaning suggested above, since no attested lexicon definition serves to translate the line. A parallel of sorts is perhaps provided by τρόχισ, derived from τρέχω by way of τροχός, used for messengers of the gods at Aesch. *PV* 941 and Soph. *P. Tebt.* 692, 21 (*Inachus*).

5. ἐπανζέω [“re-boil”]. ἐπανζέ[ο]μεν is read at Aesch., *P. Oxy.* 2245 fr. 1–12, 72 (context mutilated).

6. λῶ (Dor. = ἐθέλω). *P. Oxy.* 2256, fr. 8, 7f., partially discussed above, read οἱ δε γῆς ΕΠΕΜΒΟΛΑΣ/[θν]μῶι λέληνται. λέλησμαι, middle perfect of λανθάνω, does not appear to suit the context. Lloyd-Jones, *loc. cit.*, observes that “we should . . . expect the verb in l. 8 to mean ‘turn towards’ or ‘wish for’”, and debates whether this form should be associated with λανθάνω, λαμβάνω, or λίπτω. But admission of dialect forms not encountered in tragedy, especially in dialogue, is a notorious peculiarity of satyr plays and λέληνται might better be regarded as a previously unattested middle perfect of λῶ. On the analogy of (e.g.) χράομαι — κέχρηται, λέληνται is the form we should expect.

7. (dub.) λινεργός [= λινουργός, “spinning, working flax”]: Lobel’s restoration of Sophocles, *P. Oxy.* 23.2369, 43. But R. Pfeiffer, *Ein neues Inachos-Fragment des Sophokles*, *S. B. Bayer. Akad.* 1958, 24f.

suggests *λινεργής* as if the transformed Io is being compared to a sphinx woven on a tapestry. In view of the obscurity of this passage, it is difficult to choose between these interpretations.

8. (dub.) *ταυρώψ* [= *ταυρωπός*, “cow-eyed, cow-faced”]: Richard Carden, *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles* (Berlin-New York, 1974) 66 follows Lobel in arguing that the short gap at *P. Oxy.* 23.2369, 38 favors a form of *ταυρωψ* (also attested as a v.l. for *ταυρωπός* at Ion, fr. 8 D.<sup>2</sup> and Cornut. *ND* 22) rather than a form of *ταυρωπός*. But Pfeiffer, *ibid.* 22, points out that a superscript o suggests correction to a form of *ταυρωπός*.

9. *τηλέγνωτος* [“seen, recognized from afar”]: Read at Aeschylus, *P. Oxy.* 2245 frs. 1–12, 67.

### Dio Chrys. XI 23: διαστὶ διαλέγεσθαι?

By R. J. PENELLA, New York

In the eleventh or Trojan oration Dio Chrysostom takes Homer to task for claiming to know the language of the gods: *ὡς οὐ μόνον ἐξὸν αὐτῷ τὰς ἄλλας γλώττας μιγνύειν τὰς τῶν Ἑλλήνων, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν αἰολίζειν, ποτὲ δὲ δωρίζειν, ποτὲ δὲ ἰάζειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰαστί διαλέγεσθαι* (23). The manuscripts’ *ἰαστί* is obviously corrupt. Rhodomann and Casaubon proposed a clever emendation, *διαστὶ* (“in Zeus’s language”)<sup>1</sup>, which was accepted by subsequent editors and found its way into the standard lexica (*TGL* [1830–65], *LSJ*). A rival emendation is suggested by the recension of 22–24<sup>2</sup>). The relevant section of the recension is as follows: *ὡς ἐξὸν αὐτῷ μὴ μόνον τὰς τῶν Ἑλλήνων φωνὰς μιγνύειν, μηδὲ τοῖς σφόδρα ἀρχαίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς δαιμονίοις χρῆσθαι ὀνόμασι, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν αἰολίζοντα, ποτὲ δὲ δωρίζοντα, πάλιν δὲ ἰάζοντα διαλέγεσθαι . . .* The phrase *τοῖς δαιμονίοις χρῆσθαι ὀνόμασι* suggests the emendation *δαιμονιστί* or even *δαιμονιαστί*, the latter form to be explained as mimicry of *ἰαστί*. Corruption of *δαιμονι(α)στί* to *ἰαστί* is psychologically plausible, attributable to the influence of the preceding *ἰάζειν*.

<sup>1</sup>) Cf. the emendations *θεαστί*, *θειαστί* (J. J. Reiske [ed.], *Dionis Chrysostomi orationes*<sup>2</sup> [1798] I 315n), and *θειστί* (H. von Arnim [ed.], *Dionis Prusaensis . . . omnia* [1893–96, repr. 1962] I 121, app. crit.).

<sup>2</sup>) On the recension, see K. Münscher, *Philologus* 76 (1920) 95–96.