

into account the insuperable practical difficulties of making any meaningful measurements of the enormously elongated and blurred shadows that would be obtained near sunrise and sunset—difficulties that Kahn and his advisers completely ignore.

No, my thesis remains unshaken; an equinox, unlike a solstice, cannot be determined by simple observation 'on the day when it occurs' (Kahn 114—his italics), until the theory of the celestial sphere and the relationships between its great circles and the horizon are known (cf. *JHS* lxxxvi [1966] 32 and especially n. 34). This is what all the *factual* evidence suggests (*loc. cit.* 33–5), and what anyone acquainted with the real problems would expect. For the rest, in those parts of his article in which he is not concerned with misrepresenting my views (for a true picture of which, see *Early Greek Astronomy to Aristotle*), Kahn devotes his efforts to rehashing the familiar 'evidence' for an advanced state of astronomical knowledge in sixth century B.C. Greece. He finds this 'evidence' convincing—I do not. I am content to have drawn attention to the very cogent reasons for rejecting it.

D. R. DICKS

Bedford College, University of London

### The Neatherd's Progress in 'Theocritus'

'Theocritus' *Idyll* xxvii describes how a neatherd progressively undresses a girl and then makes love to her. The progress of the neatherd's hand is accurately and humorously depicted. First the maiden says (19):

μη' πibάλης τήν χεῖρα· καὶ εἰσέτι; χεῖλος ἀμόξω.

The neatherd performs then a strategic withdrawal, but returns to the victorious attack in lines 49 ff. The girl exclaims (49)

τί ρέζεις, σατυρίσκει; τί δ' ἔνδοθεν ἄψω μαζῶν;

at which the neatherd is undeterred, so that she has to repeat her request (51)

. . . τειήν πάλιν ἔξελε χεῖρα.

The neatherd's hand proceeds to the garment of paramount importance, i.e. the *μίτρα* (55), and finally tears away the *ἀμπέχονον* (59):

τὰμπέχονον ποίησας ἐμόν ῥάγος·<sup>1</sup> εἰμι δὲ γυμνά.

I shall now put right line 55. The ms. reads

φεῦ φεῦ, καὶ τὰν μικρὰν ἀπέστειχες· ἐς τί δ' ἔλυσας;

Everybody agrees that *μίτραν* must be restored: this

<sup>1</sup> I think it would be wrong to alter the ms. reading: 'Theocritus' evidently wanted to reproduce the spelling *ῥάγος* which is in fact attested in papyri (cf. e.g. *LSJ*, s.v. *ῥάγος*).

is shown by the verb *ἔλυσας* (cf. Ap. Rh. i 288, Mosch. ii 164, Call. *Hymn.* i 21, Nonn. D. i 347, etc.), by the statement that the *μίτρα*, being the crucial article, will be dedicated *πράτιστον* by the grateful neatherd to Aphrodite (56), and by the fact that the context is concerned with the girl's clothes<sup>2</sup> (*εἴματα* 53,<sup>3</sup> *πέπλους* 54, *ἀμπέχονον*<sup>4</sup> 59). On the other hand, Scaliger's *ἀπέστειχας* is not convincing: it is palaeographically violent and, moreover, semantically inappropriate, because *ἀποσχίζω* (literally 'cut away from') is never used of *loosening* a *μίτρα*.<sup>5</sup> The best discussion of the problem is in Meineke, *Theocr.*<sup>3</sup> 392 (Gow, Cholmeley and Fritzsche-Hiller are unfortunately silent on the question): Reiske desperately tried to support *ἀπέστειχες*, but his defence failed in that the verb is intransitive and cannot in any case be made to mean 'remove'; Wordsworth, correctly seeing that Scaliger's *ἀπέστειχας* would be semantically incongruous as well as otiosely repetitive in company with *ἔλυσας*, proposed *καὶ τὰν μίτραν ἀπὸ στήθεσφιν ἔλυσας*, which is of course too violent.

Considering that the neatherd's hand, in line 55, has *proceeded to*, has *reached* the all-important piece of clothing,<sup>6</sup> as emphasised by the girl's desperate *φεῦ φεῦ*, and remembering that confusion between

<sup>2</sup> On *μίτρα* cf. Bühler, *Eur.* p. 117 ff. (add Schrader-Schaefer, *Mus.* p. 244 ff.) and p. 200.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *h. Ven.* 164 *λύσε δὲ οἱ ζώνην ἰδὲ εἴματα*, Nonn. D. xii 387 f. *μίτρας . . . εἴματα*.

<sup>4</sup> The opposition between *ἀμπέχονον* in line 59 and *ἀμπεχόνη* in line 60 is the obverse of 'pointless,' as Gow (*ad* xxvii 59) strangely says. Since the *ἀμπέχονον* appears to have been worn by 'vilioribus personis' (Thes., s.v. *ἀμπέχονον*, 160 B), it follows that it must have been a cheaper version of the *ἀμπεχόνη*. If this is so, the neatherd's words are very much pointed: he shrewdly (cf. xxvii 61) promises the girl *ἀμπεχόνην μείζονα* (60), i.e. a garment bigger (*μείζονα*) and better (as opposed to the cheaper *ἀμπέχονον* which he has just torn). My explanation shows that the notion 'better,' which Cobet, Naber and Platt wanted to introduce into the text (cf. Gow *ad loc.*), is in fact already contained in the text. The 'solecism' *τὸ ἀμπέχονον ἐμόν* is not only paralleled by xxvii 38 and 72 (as Gow notes *ad* xxvii 59), but also by other examples in Theocritus (listed by Ameis, *De art. usu apud poet. graec. bucol.* [Prgr. Mühlhausen 1846] 41).

<sup>5</sup> The notion 'cut away from' is inappropriate to the context, because a *μίτρα* is untied, loosened, not cut; the verb *ἀποσχίζω*, when not expressing the notion 'cut away from', entails the idea of 'tearing off' (material in Thes., s.v.), which is equally inappropriate to the context: the maiden herself specifies that the neatherd has loosened (*ἔλυσας*), not 'torn off', her *μίτρα*.

<sup>6</sup> On this motif cf. Call. *fr.* 75.45 *ἦψω μίτρας*. In the *Idyll*, the hand's progress starts with *ἄψω μαζῶν* (49). Cf. Nonn. D. xii 387 *ἦψατο μίτρας* and xvi 268 ff. *δεσμὸν λύσατο μίτρας . . . παλάμη*.

$\alpha$  and  $\epsilon$  is common,<sup>7</sup> it will become evident that the poet wrote

φεῦ φεῦ, καὶ τὰν μήτραν ἐπέστειχες· ἐς τί δ' ἔλυσας;

<sup>7</sup> *Ἐπιστείχω* + accus. means 'arrive at', 'reach' (cf. A. Eu. 906 ἀήματα . . . ἐπιστείχειν χθόνα) and belongs to the poetic language, whereby it fits with the high-flown diction used in the Idyll (the girl's φεῦ φεῦ is of course tragic in tone: the neatherd's hand has ominously reached the μήτρα; on the shades of meaning of φεῦ—tragic or mock-tragic—cf. Rumpel, *Lex. Theocr.*, s.v.). My restoration is not only palaeographically, semantically, stylistically and syntactically consonant, but also contextually apposite. The neatherd first reaches the μήτρα with his hand, and then proceeds to loosen it: the sequence is clearly expressed in line 55. <sup>8</sup> *Ἐπέστειχες* is followed by a full stop denoting a pause; after the pause—which indicates the time used by the neatherd to loosen the μήτρα<sup>8</sup>—the girl asks him ἐς τί δ' ἔλυσας; Once the μήτρα has been loosened, the maiden's fate is sealed: she tries to stop the neatherd's progress (μίμνε 57)<sup>9</sup>, but to no avail.

GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE

*Birkbeck College, University of London*

<sup>7</sup> Cf. e.g. Thes., s.v.  $\alpha$ , 7A7 f., quoting Schaefer.

<sup>8</sup> In the same way, the pause between μή πύβλησθαι τὴν χεῖρα and καὶ εἰσέτι; in line 19 denotes the interval between two attempts made by the neatherd's hand.

<sup>9</sup> Μίμνε means literally 'mane ubi es' (Rumpel, *Lex. Theocr.*, s.v. μίμνω: cf. e.g. Ap. Rh. i 304,833), i.e. in the context, 'stay where you have arrived with your hand' and do not proceed to remove the ἀμπέγονον.

## Parmenides' Sexual Theories.

### A reply to Mr Kember

In an article entitled 'Right and left in the sexual theories of Parmenides' (*JHS* xci [1971] 70–9) Mr Owen Kember challenges my statement (*Polarity and Analogy* [Cambridge, 1966] 17) that 'Parmenides probably held that the sex of the child is determined by its place on the right or left of the mother's womb (right for males, left for females)'. In his article Kember draws attention, usefully, to the confusions and contradictions of the doxographic tradition. He has, however, in my view, misinterpreted one crucial piece of evidence. This is the testimony of Galen, who quotes Parmenides Fragment 17 (δεξιτεροῖσιν μὲν κούρους, λαοῖσιν δὲ κόρας) in the course of his commentary on [Hippocrates] *Epidemics* vi ch. 48. Kember notes, correctly, that the meaning of the fragment by itself is quite unclear: 'the only deduction which can be safely made from the actual fragment is that Parmenides thought right and left were somehow connected with sex, and even here we must rely on Galen's judgement that the passage did in fact refer to sex in the first place' (*op. cit.* 76). But

Kember also maintains that Galen's own introductory comments and interpretation of the fragment are ambiguous: 'when he [Galen] says that "the male is conceived in the right part of the mother" he might well mean that a F<sup>1</sup> [first generation] male offspring is actually conceived in the right of the womb, i.e. that the sex of the offspring depends on position in the womb, or alternatively, he could be arguing that an offspring which is already male is conceived in the right of the womb, i.e. that position in the womb is determined by sex' (*ibid.*).

Now so far as the statement of Galen that Kember actually quotes goes, one may agree that by itself this is unclear. But Kember neglects the context in which Galen's remark occurs. All that Kember gives of Galen's introduction is the single sentence that is quoted in Diels-Kranz. But this is embedded in an extended discussion and commentary of *Epidemics* vi ch. 48 running, in Wenkebach's edition (*CMG* v 10, 2, 2) from 118 20 to 121 11. This Hippocratic text is, as Galen himself remarks, obscure. Galen observes that if this book of the *Epidemics* had been a treatise prepared for publication, Hippocrates would have made his meaning plainer, but this does not stop Galen himself from stating quite clearly what he takes to be the Hippocratic doctrine in question. First he quotes and amplifies a text from the *Aphorisms* (v ch. 48)<sup>1</sup> to the effect that male embryos are generally found on the right side of the womb, females on the left, adding that it is εἰκόσ for what is hotter to be formed in the hotter part of the womb and going on to say that the male is hotter, as the size of his veins and his colour (males being generally darker than females) show. Later in the same chapter (120 3) he refers to his work *On Mixtures* for proof of the truth of the opinion that the constitution of males is hotter than that of females. Finally (120 22) he states that the fact that males are mostly conceived in the right-hand side of the womb is proved by anatomical dissection, and he refers to his treatise *On Anatomical Procedures* for the cause (αἰτία) of this. And when at 121 4 ff. he summarises the cause of this supposed fact (that male embryos are on the right), he refers to the difference between the two sides of the womb, in particular to the purer quality of the blood on the right side. It is fairly clear that what Galen has in mind here is an

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Galen's remark in his Commentary on the *Aphorisms* (xvii B 840 f. Kühn): θερμότερα δὲ ἢ κρᾶσις γίνεταί τοις ἐμβρύοις οὐχ ἥκιστα καὶ διὰ τὸ χωρίον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ δεξιὸν τῆς ὑστέρας μόριον. The scholium of Theophilus shows that he, too, was in no doubt as to the meaning of the Aphorism: ἡ αἰτία ὅτι τὰ ἄρρενα θερμότερά εἰσι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς ὡς ἐν θερμότεροις δημιουργοῦνται (ed. Dietz, ii p. 469). Before Galen, too, Soranus had interpreted the view of 'Hippocrates' in a similar sense: ὤτετο γὰρ ἐν μὲν τοῖς δεξιοῖς μέρεσιν τῆς ὑστέρας συλληφθέντος τοῦ σπέρματος ἄρρεν ἀποτελεῖσθαι, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐκωνόμοις θῆλυ (Cyn. i 13 45, *CMG* iv 32).