

swifter one', so called because he is 'swifter' or 'stronger' than his father. I believe that in this way sense can be made of the 'etymologizing' words $\delta\gamma\alpha\rho\ \alpha\delta\tau\epsilon$. . .⁸ An etymological explanation of the sort involved here, far from being sophisticated, is in fact one of the naive elements in Homeric poetry. At *Il.* xx 404 also a name is given an 'etymological' explanation of a highly unsophisticated nature: $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\kappa\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota\omicron\nu$.⁹ And, as would be expected in a corpus of poetry which contains many allusions to folk-lore and popular belief, etymological explanations abound in the works of Hesiod.¹⁰

As is well known, three other passages of the *Iliad* contrast the human and the divine term for one and the same thing: *Il.* ii 813–14, xiv 291, xx 74. In none of these passages, nor elsewhere in the Homeric poems, is there an indication of the motive which has led to the adoption of the human appellation. In each case we are presented with a simple, unexplained opposition: the gods call a certain bird $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, men call it $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\mu\nu\nu\delta\iota\varsigma$; the gods call a river $\Sigma\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$, men call it $\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$; and so on. The opposition has been accounted for in three different ways.

(i) The suggestion made by J. van Leeuwen, and sometimes revived, that in these pairs the divine appellation represents what was 'barbarous' or 'had vanished from Greek speech' and the human appellation represents the gloss¹¹ is rendered untenable if we take account of $\acute{\Lambda}\iota\gamma\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega\nu/\text{B}\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, for both of these terms are transparently Greek.¹²

(ii) The theory which holds that the divine name is a creation of the poets, while the human name belongs to the vernacular language, also fails to account for the $\acute{\Lambda}\iota\gamma\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega\nu/\text{B}\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ doublet.¹³ If $\text{B}\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ was a poetical construction, it is that name, and not $\acute{\Lambda}\iota\gamma\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega\nu$, which would call for an etymological gloss. The poet gives an explanation of $\acute{\Lambda}\iota\gamma\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega\nu$ precisely because it is *not* the usual name of the giant, for the same reason that Hesiod explains his use of the term $\eta\rho\omega\varsigma$, *Op.* 159–60.

⁸ The $\gamma\alpha\rho$, however, seems pointless in Zenodotus' variant $\delta\gamma\alpha\rho\ \alpha\delta\tau\epsilon$ $\beta\acute{\iota}\eta\ \mu\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$, which Wackernagel thought might be the older reading: *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916) 233. I prefer to regard it as a substitution made by someone to whom 'the history of the gods which is lost to us' (Wackernagel's words) was equally unknown.

⁹ Wackernagel (n. 8) 241–2.

¹⁰ Cf. E. Risch, *Eumisia: Festgabe für E. Howald* (Erlenbach/Zürich 1947) 72–91; K. Deichgräber, *ZVS* lxx (1952) 19–28; K. Strunk, *Glotta* xxxviii (1959) 79; W.-L. Liebermann, *Donum Indogermanicum: Festschr. A. Scherer* (Heidelberg 1971) 130–54; M. L. West on Hesiod's *Op.* 3, 66 (1978 edn.).

¹¹ *Mnem.* xx (1892) 139–40.

¹² Cf. A. Heubeck, *Würzburger Jahrbücher* ii (1949–50) 214.

¹³ A theory expounded by H. Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister* (Halle 1921) 111. C. Watkins reverts to it, using the ponderous jargon of modern linguistics, whereby Güntert's 'poetical' terms are called 'rarer, more "charged", semantically marked': *Myth and law among the Indo-Europeans: studies in Indo-European comparative mythology* (1970) 2. But the theory is no more acceptable in this guise than it was when put forward by Güntert. We have only to apply Watkins' principle to the passage under consideration to see how meaningless it is; for in what sense can $\text{B}\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ be said to be 'semantically marked', in contrast to $\acute{\Lambda}\iota\gamma\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega\nu$? R. Lazzaroni maintains that 'men call Briareos by the name Aegaeon because he is stronger than his father Poseidon' and that 'men bestow upon Briareos the epithet proper to his father because he is stronger than his father': *Studi linguistici in onore di T. Bollelli* (Pisa 1974) 167, 169. To my mind, Lazzaroni is doubly mistaken in this mode of argumentation: first because he takes it for granted that the giant was regarded as stronger than Poseidon (an assumption which seems to me impossible), but also because he wrongly interprets the text. If this were the only Homeric passage referring to a double system of nomenclature, it might be possible to understand it in the way postulated by Lazzaroni; but our passage should, if possible, be interpreted according to a method which is applicable also to the other Homeric instances of double nomenclature.

(iii) Many scholars, including Güntert and Watkins, have compared the etymological explanations of the Greek poets with passages of the Elder Edda such as *Alvissmál* x, which present a whole series of synonyms used by different races of beings: men, aesir, vanir, and so forth. But the comparison is unapt. The recitation of such synonyms points to a profound stylistic difference between Homeric and Eddic poetry. The Eddas are much concerned with the vital importance of *knowledge*, especially knowledge of the appropriate names to bestow on things. In such knowledge great power often resides. But Homer says nothing of this. His heroes are already aware of their own destiny, and they do not have to seek it out by mastering names through the kind of guessing-game described in the Edda.¹⁴

It seems best, following Lobeck's example, to find no essential difference between the human and the divine terms used by Homer.¹⁵ For, in truth, the divine terms do not amount to a linguistic 'system' of the sort envisaged by the Eddic poets. In Homeric poetry the double terminology is used very sparingly: that it is used at all perhaps arises from a feeling on the part of the epic poets that, if they did not call attention to *some* respects in which gods differ from men, the distinction between them would become intolerably blurred. Immortality the gods had to enjoy, if they were to be distinguished from men in any essential particular. The other differences observed by Homer are not essential, but they do help the listener to keep separate the mortal from the immortal order. For example, the gods dwell in serenity on Olympus; and it may be no coincidence that the only formal description of Olympus is inserted at *Od.* vi 42–46, as if to make it clear that even the Phaeacians, with all their enviable advantages, nevertheless live in circumstances markedly inferior to those of the gods.¹⁶ Other differences are not very significant in themselves, and they should not be invested with a significance which they do not possess. These include the fact that $\iota\chi\acute{\omega}\rho$ and not $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ flows in the veins of the gods, that they use ambrosia and nectar as food and drink respectively, and that on occasion they call a person or an object by a name different from that used by mortals.

J. T. HOOKER

University College London

¹⁴ Watkins (n. 13) again goes astray in explaining the word $\mu\acute{\omega}\lambda\nu$ (*Od.* x 305) in terms of black magic. The correct account of the matter is given by J. Clay, *Hermes* c (1972) 127–31.

¹⁵ *Aglaophamus* (Königsberg 1829) 858–63.

¹⁶ Cf. R. Spieker, *Hermes* xcvi (1969) 136–61.

ΒΟΥΠΠΟΡΟΣ ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ

In the *Coma Berenices* (fr. 110.44–6 Pfeiffer) Callimachus mentioned Mount Athos and the canal dug for Xerxes at the northern end of the Akte Peninsula:

$\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\iota\nu\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota,$
 $\beta\omicron\nu\pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\Lambda}\rho\sigma\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\eta\varsigma\ \mu\eta\eta\tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omicron,$ και διὰ μέσσου
 $\text{M}\eta\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\ \delta\lambda\omicron\alpha\iota\ \nu\eta\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \acute{\Lambda}\theta\omega.$

Two problems require solutions in these lines: (1) Why is Athos called the 'ox-piercer of Arsinoe'? (2) Who is the descendant of Theia? The second of these problems, I shall argue, is solved by the solution to the first.

Arsinoe, wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, is here given

the courtesy-title 'mother' of Berenike. There is no difficulty in the poet's association of her with Mount Athos: she had formerly been married to King Lysimachos of Thrace, who won Macedonia and Thessaly from Demetrius, and her ties with the northern Aegean world were close. As queen in Thrace she had made a dedication to the Great Gods of Samothrace;¹ it was to Samothrace also that she came after Ptolemy Keraunos had murdered her sons by Lysimachos.² Callimachus has these northern Aegean connexions of Arsinoe in mind in another poem, the *Ektheosis Arsinoes*, in which Charis sees from Athos the funeral smoke of the queen's pyre at Alexandria (*fr.* 228.57), having been sent from Lemnos to the mountain by the spirit of Arsinoe's dead sister Philotera (*fr.* 228.44-7).

The difficulty lies not in the mention of Arsinoe, but in her 'ox-piercer', *βουπόρος*. Catullus in his translation left out the apposition by which the mountain is called 'the ox-piercer of Arsinoe', perhaps because he did not understand it.³ Modern scholars have been baffled by the expression: 'qua de causa Athos a. 246/5 ita appellatus sit, adhuc plane ignotum est', writes Pfeiffer;⁴ Fraser calls it 'mysterious';⁵ and Trypanis remarks that we do not know why Athos was called thus.⁶ Since the scholiast wrote *βουπόρος ὁ ὀβελίσκος* [s], Trypanis supposes that the mountain 'would be, strictly speaking, the obelisk of Queen Arsinoe II'; but if *βουπόρος* simply signified the mountain or its summit the scholiast would hardly have glossed it by the word *ὀβελίσκος*, as Fraser points out. An obelisk stood in the precinct of the unfinished temple of Arsinoe at Alexandria;⁷ but there is no connexion between the mountain and the Egyptian monument.

A notable phenomenon produced by Mount Athos is the long shadow it casts eastwards across the Aegean at sunset. The shadow was mentioned by Sophocles (*fr.* 776 Pearson), who in an unidentified play wrote

Αθως σκιάζει νῶτα Λημνίας βοός.⁸

The line, with the variants *καλύπτει* and *πλευρά*, became proverbial.⁹ The shadow was well known in the time of Callimachus, because Apollonius Rhodius described it in the *Argonautica*, saying that it reached even as far as Myrina near the southwestern extremity of Lemnos: *ἀκροτάτη κορυφή σκιάει* (*sc.* **Αθω κολώνη*) *καὶ ἐσάχρη Μυρίνης*.¹⁰ The distance according to Apollonius was equal to that sailed by a well-trimmed ship from dawn to noon (*ἐς ἔνδιον*).¹¹

Athos is about forty miles from the nearest point on Lemnos. In clear conditions the shadow falls on the southwestern parts of the island about one month before the summer solstice and again one month after the solstice, when the sun is seen from Myrina, or from the modern Kastro, to set immediately behind Mount Athos.¹² At

¹ P. M. Fraser, *Samothrace* ii 1: *The Inscriptions on Stone* (New York 1960) 48-50, no. 10.

² Justin xxiv 3.9.

³ P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* ii (Oxford 1972) 1024.

⁴ *Callimachus* i (Oxford 1949) 115.

⁵ *Loc. cit.* (n. 3).

⁶ *Callimachus*, Loeb edn (London 1975) 82-3 note c.

⁷ Fraser (n. 3) i 25 and nn. 168, 169.

⁸ *Et. Mag.* s.v. **Αθως* (p. 26, 16 Gaisford). *Schol. Theoc.* vii 76d (p. 98 Wendel).

⁹ See e.g. Makarios 1.46 [ii 139 Leutsch-Schneidewin] and Suda (A 749, 1.71 Adler).

¹⁰ i 604.

¹¹ i 603.

¹² A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* iii (repr. Amsterdam 1963) 27 reports observations of travellers.

these times part of the island is in the shadow cast by the summit of Athos and part is in sunlight.

As the fragment of Sophocles shows, the shadow of the mountain was believed to fall on the back of a cow in Lemnos. The cow was a statue made either of bronze (*Et. Mag.*)¹³ or of white stone (Suda),¹⁴ but since its exact position is not known, the precise dates on which it was struck by the shadow before and after the solstice cannot be determined. Apollonius says that the shadow extended to Myrina, but he does not mention the cow.

When the statue was struck by the shadow of the summit, neighbouring parts of Lemnos were still in sunlight; thus the cow was, in the Callimachean metaphor, skewered by the shadow cast in the sunlight on Lemnos. The poet with characteristic neatness alluded to an astronomical phenomenon, even as he praised in an astronomical poem the deified queen of Egypt who formerly had been the wife of a king of Thrace; and from the metaphor of the ox-piercer it follows that the 'bright descendant of Theia' who travels beyond Mount Athos is the Sun, as Bentley supposed—not, as Pfeiffer suggests, Boreas. For it was Helios setting in the west who caused the shadow of Athos to fall on the statue of the cow in Lemnos.

G. L. HUXLEY

The Queen's University of Belfast

¹³ See n. 8 above.

¹⁴ See n. 9 above.

An Epigram on Apollonius of Tyana¹

PLATE Ib

An inscription of major importance, now in the New Museum of Adana, contains an epigram on Apollonius of Tyana. Almost simultaneously, a preliminary text has been provided by E. L. Bowie, and a full publication with discussion and photograph by G. Dagron and J. Marcillet-Jaubert.² I offer here a text, translation, and commentary, and look for a historical and cultural setting.

The inscription is cut on a single large block, now damaged on the left, which originally served as an architrave or lintel. The photograph (PLATE Ib) makes detailed comment on the palaeography superfluous: but it is worth noting the sign of punctuation (:) after *ἐπώνυμος* and of elision (σ) after *τὸ δ'*; the leaf filling the vacant space at the end of line 4; and generally the very affected script, notably the *rho* shaped like a shepherd's crook, the complicated *xi* and the lyre-shaped *omega*.³ This strange lettering makes it more than usually hazardous to date the inscription from this feature alone. A date in the third or

¹ I am indebted to Glen Bowersock and Louis Robert for their comments, and to Jean Marcillet-Jaubert for supplying the photograph (PLATE Ib). *Bull.* = J. and L. Robert, 'Bulletin épigraphique', followed by the year of publication of *REG* and the number of the item. All dates are A.D.

² E. L. Bowie in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der röm. Welt* xvi 2 (Berlin/New York 1978) 1687-8 (henceforth 'Bowie'); G. Dagron and J. Marcillet-Jaubert, *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten* xlii (1978) 402-5 (henceforth 'Dagron-Jaubert').

³ For the critical and punctuation marks used in inscriptions see W. Larfeld, *Griechische Epigraphik*³ (Munich 1914) 301-5, M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca* i (Rome 1967) 391-7. The same omega in *JG* x 2.1 551 (Thessalonica), which C. Edson dates 'ante med. s. iv p.'.