

favoured theme of Augustan literature, largely for the opportunity it gave to stress how Rome arose out of its ashes.²⁰

S. J. HARRISON

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

²⁰ For the theme of Troy's destruction turned to praise of Rome cf. above all the *Aeneid* and Propertius iv 1.87 *Troia cades, et Troica Roma resurgens*.

BHPICOC

In $\bar{\Lambda}$ 101-112 Agamemnon kills Isos and Antiphos, who were travelling on their chariot. They were sons of Priam, the former a νόθος, the latter γνήσιος. Agamemnon recognises them because earlier in the war they had been ransomed by Achilles, who, having captured them, bound them with withies on Mount Ida, where they had been tending their flocks of sheep.

The text of line 101 is not secure. Editors, Monro and Allen, for example, customarily give: αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ ῥ' Ἰκόν τε καὶ Ἄντιφον ἐξενάριζων, but several manuscripts omit ῥ'. So did Zenodotos, perhaps because, as Walter Leaf insisted, ῥ' is 'quite otiose'. Leaf thought a name consisting of the simple adjective $\Phi\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ unlikely, adding Ἰκός, however, even without the Φ , is equally unknown as a proper name. ῥῆσιν or even ῥῆσιν (another unknown name), may be right.¹ Yet Ἰκός should not be ruled out, since it may be toponymic: 'Der eine Priamossohn heisst Ἰκός; ihn hat <E.> Maass (Herm. 24, <(1889)> 645 <-647>) scharfsinnig als Eponymen von Ἰκός auf Lesbos gedeutet'.²

However, Poseidippos the epigrammatist adopted a different collocation of letters. He is reported to have proposed, or to have accepted, Βήρικον,³ with—one must suppose—ἐξενάριξεν to supply the missing indicative. The name Βήρικος according to a reported statement of Aristarchos was not 'now' in the epigrams of Poseidippos, but it had stood in the so-called 'Pile' (Ὠρός).⁴

The problem is to explain why Poseidippos preferred Βήρικον to βῆ ῥ' Ἰκόν. The solution, I suggest, is again toponymic. In the Athenian quota lists there are named among tributaries in the Troad, in 453 and at intervals thereafter, Βηρύσιοι ὑπὸ τῆ Ἰδῆ. The spelling of their name and of their city's name is not consistent. Stephanos of Byzantion (165, 8 Meineke) has Βέρυσις, Τρωικὴ πόλις, with the *ethnikon* Βερυτίτης. To be compared is Βήριθρος, πόλις Τρωικῆ, with the

ethnikon Βηρίθριος (167, 6 Meineke). Coins have BIPY,⁵ recalling the form Birytis. The city has not been identified, but J.M. Cook, after noting the frequency of BIPY coins at Ilion, was inclined to place Birytis nearby, possibly at the site on the Ballı Dağ.⁶

In taking the letters BHPICON in $\bar{\Lambda}$ 101 as one word Poseidippos understood them to be the name of the eponymous hero of the *polis* of the Βηρύσιοι in the Troad. Why he included an epigram for the hero in the 'Pile', but not in another work, we are not told; but doubts about the correct spelling of the placename, and so about the soundness of the grouping of letters BHPICON, may have caused him to change his mind. However, he was interested in at least one other hero connected with a locality in the Troad: Stephanos (295, 5 and 8-11 Meineke) cites him for the variant form Ζελίτη of Ζέλεια and quotes from his epigram or elegy on Pandaros son of Lykaon, whom, as Aristotle seems also to have done (Fr. 151R), he may have regarded as a Lykaonian, not a Lykian.⁷

Berisos, to conclude, is a hero with little authority in the text of $\bar{\Lambda}$ 101, but behind Poseidippos' hesitant interpretation of a group of letters in the line there stood his knowledge of a real place in the Troad.

GEORGE HUXLEY

Trinity College, Dublin

⁵ J.M. Cook, *The Troad* (Oxford 1973) 311.

⁶ Cook, *op. cit.* 357.

⁷ *Suppl. Hellen.* 700 L.-J./P.

οὐδὲ Λυκαονίη δεξατό τε Ζελίτη
ἀλλὰ <παρὰ> προχοῆσι Τιμουντίσι τοῦτο κοί Ἐκτώρ
σῆμα καὶ ἀγγέμαχοι θέντο Λυκαονίδα.

1 Λυκαονίη Meineke: Λυκάων codd. ('Nisi malis Λυκάν et sequente versu Ζελίτη' Meineke).

2 <παρὰ> Bergk: Τιμουντίσι Wilamowitz (προχοῆσι Τιμουντίσι Bergk): ἀλλὰ προχοῆσι Τιμόντος διὰ τοῦτο κοί Ἐκτώρ codd. (p. 295, 10 Meineke, app.crit.).

Redistribution of land in Solon, fragment 34 West

οἱ δ' ἐφ' ἀπραγίῃσιν ἠλαθόν· ἐλπιδ' εἶχον ἀφνεήν,
κάδοκ[ε]ον ἕκαστος αὐτῶν δάβον εὐρήσειν πολύν,
καί με κατίλλοντα λειῶς τραχὺν ἐκφανεῖν νόον.
χαθὺνα μὲν τότε ἔφρασαντο, νῦν δέ μοι χολοῦμενοι
λοξὸν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὄρωσιν πάντες ὥστε δῆϊον.
οὐ χρεῶν' ἅ μὲν γὰρ εἶπα, σὺν θεοῖσιν ἦνυσσα,
ἅ, λλ, α δ' οὐ μάτην ἔερδον, οὐδέ μοι τυραννίδος
ἀνδάνει βίη τι[.]εἶν, οὐδέ πει[.]ρητὸς χθονὸς
πατρίδος κακοῖσιν ἐσθλοῦς ἰσομοιρίην ἔχειν.

Part of the standard account of Solon's reforms is that Solon, though pressured to do so, refused to expropriate the land of the wealthy and redistribute it to the poor.¹

¹ A notable exception to this standard account is the view of G. Ferrara, *La politica di Solone* (Napoli 1964) 124-26, that Solon, fr. 34 W is addressed to 'nobili "demagoghi" ' who wished to take advantage of the peasants' discontent, using the peasants' support to gain riches and power for themselves, but were thwarted by Solon who did not revise the constitution to give poor and rich an equal share in government. Something of the same view appears to be expressed more briefly by T.C.W. Stinton, 'Solon, fragment 25,' *JHS* xcvi (1976) 159-62.

¹ *The Iliad* I (repr. Amsterdam 1971) 476. For instances of the name Ἰκός or Ἰκός see R. Walzer, *Greek into Arabic* (Oxford 1962) 54-55.

² Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin 1920) 185 n. 2.

³ 'ex epigrammatis sive e Soro (de Beriso)', *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 701 L.-J./P.

⁴ Schol. Ven. A $\bar{\Lambda}$ 101 (3.144, 13-16 Erbse). Ζηνόδοτος ἔξω τοῦ ῥ' βῆ Ἰκόν. μὴ ἐμφέρεσθαι δὲ φησὶν ὁ Ἀριστάρχος νῦν ἐν τοῖς Ποσειδίππου ἐπιγράμμασι τὸν Βήρικον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ Ὠρῶ εὐρεῖν. For problems concerning the Ὠρός, which need not detain us here, see Gow and Page, *Hellenistic epigrams* ii (Cambridge 1965) 483-84; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* i (Oxford 1972) 560; and Hugh Lloyd-Jones, *JHS* lxxxiii (1963) 96.