

## CONJECTURAL EMENDATIONS

Towards the beginning of Xenophon Ephesius' novel there is a passage where the author describes Anthia, the heroine of the story (I 2 6 Dalmeyda). The words devoted to her looks are clear enough (she was blonde of course, like every self-respecting literary heroine, and her eyes did not fail to be bright), whereas the description of her apparel is not entirely perspicuous, as it stands in the Laurentianus: κόμη ξανθή, ἡ πολλή καθειμένη, ὀλίγη πεπλεγμένη, πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων φορὰν κινουμένη· ὀφθαλμοὶ γοργοί, φαιδροὶ μὲν ὡς κόρης, φοβεροὶ δὲ ὡς σώφρονος· ἔσθῃς χιτῶν ἀλουργής, ζωστὸς εἰς γόνυ, μέχρι βραχιόνων καθειμένος, νεβρίς περικειμένη, γωρυτὸς ἀνημιμένος, τόξα † ὄπλα, ἄκοντες φερόμενοι, κύνες ἐπόμενοι.

Hercher, in his Teubner edition, was the first to notice the unsatisfactory state of our text and accordingly deleted both ἔσθῃς and ὄπλα, considering these words as "lemmata in Xenophontis orationem introducta". This is, I think, typically Hercherian rashness: the passage is doubtless not in order, but the remedy must be found with less precipitation.

As far as ἔσθῃς is concerned, it is true that the evident parallelism with κόμη ξανθή and ὀφθαλμοὶ γοργοί would require the elimination of this word, but an intentional variation on the part of the writer cannot be excluded: the text is, as we read it in the manuscript, sufficiently smooth and offers no great difficulties: "*pour vêtement*, une tunique de pourpre serrée à la taille tombant jusqu'aux genoux et descendant sur les bras; une peau de faon l'enveloppait, un carquois pendait à ses épaules, elle portait un arc et des javelots, des chiens la suivaient". Thus runs Dalmeyda's translation, who on the one hand leaves ἔσθῃς untouched and on the other, following in Hercher's footsteps, ejects ὄπλα. The latest editor of Xenophon is right: if it is true that ἔσθῃς, however dubiously, can be tolerated, this is not the case with the much more troublesome ὄπλα. Why, however, delete it so hurriedly?

It must be recognized that the word in question is not only out of place and superfluous, but also disturbs the whole structure of the sentence. We know that the author, certainly

having in mind a statue of the type called by modern archaeologists "Artemis amazonenhaf" (cf. in particular Roscher, s. v. Artemis, 602, 604, 606, on the different variants), has dressed up his Anthia like the goddess, with great accuracy. No statuary detail is missing: even the dogs are present.

Let us confine ourselves to the weapons: Anthia, like Artemis, is armed with a bow and arrows (τόξα), a quiver (γωρυτός), and carries spears in one hand (ἄκοντες φερόμενοι). The identity between sculptured goddess and described girl is complete <sup>1)</sup>. Where could ὄπλα fit in?

For one moment we may suppose that ὄπλα, by analogy with ἐσθής, should be moved before γωρυτός or τόξα ("as arms . . ." = Dalmeyda's "pour vêtement . . ."), but this procedure would not help very much: in creating an analogy of structure we would automatically destroy one which is revealed to be in existence by a closer examination of the suspect ὄπλα: the noun τόξα does require an attributive determination, if possible in the form of a participle. We have thus reached an essential point in our analysis: the whole sentence is carefully constructed with ἰσόκωλα. In particular, the ἐσθής, being the most important element of the apparel, receives a longer description ending with a predicate participle, καθειμένος: the other implements are, more shortly, supplied with a predicate participle each. In other words, it is most likely that ὄπλα, instead of a lemma, is a corrupt participial form. What could now hide in the impossible word? In -λα, it is easy enough to recognize -μενα (μ,α); I think that we must simply restore ἐπάρμενα, either in the sense "ready", "prepared", or "well fitted" into the γωρυτός (if this old epic word is to be taken to mean "bow-case"). The old epic *flosculus* ἐπάρμενα (which was revived by late poets) is far from unexpected in Xenophon. Most probably, ἐπμ,α gave birth to ὄπλα.

A. P. 6, 297.

This epigram by Phantias evidently needs emending in line 3:

\*Αλκιμος ἀγρεῖφναν κενοδοντίδα καὶ φιλοδούπου  
φάρσος ἄμας, στελεοῦ χῆρον ἐλαϊνέου,

1) This ecphrastic procedure is the same as in *Aen.* 1, 315 ff., where Vergil "alludeva a qualche scena figurata o a un passo di qualche poema, dove Arpalice era rappresentata in questo atteggiamento" (Sabbadini, comment. ad l.).

ἀρθροπέδαν † στήμόν τε καὶ ὠλεσίβωλον ἀρούρης  
 σφύραν καὶ δαπέδων μουνουρχάν ὄρυγα  
 καὶ κτένας ἔλκητῆρας ἀνά προτύλαιον Ἀθάνας  
 θῆκατο καὶ βραπτὰς γειοφόρους σκαφίδας  
 θησαυρῶν ὅτ' ἔκυρσεν, ἐπεὶ τάχ' ἂν ἅ πολυκαμπῆς  
 ἰξὺς κείς Ἀΐδαν ᾤχετο κυφαλέα.

That στήμον is corrupt everybody admits<sup>2)</sup>, and more than one critic has suspected the sibylline ἀρθροπέδαν as well: a detailed and judicious discussion of the problem will be found in Dübner's commentary, ad l.

I think that the substantive ἀρθροπέδη is best left alone: it is correctly formed (cf. χειροπέδη, etc.) and, if it is true that a fetter is rather out of place in a list of tools for labouring the soil, we cannot exclude the possibility that the word may have also been used as a metaphorical terminus technicus, that is to say, as the name of some instrument. Such a type of names is not unknown<sup>3)</sup>: after all, had it not been for Athen. *Mechan.* 38, 11 Wescher, who would have imagined that ἀρετή, of all words, denoted an engine of war? To remain within the -πέδη compounds, ἵπποπέδη not only meant "horse-fetter", but was also an astronomical term (though not denoting an instrument).

Suidas quotes the line under discussion s. v. ἀρθροπέδη, without explaining the word: this seems to indicate that, at least in later times, the exact meaning of the technical term in question was unknown. The word, however, was still correctly preserved — as it is in our manuscript of the Anthology — when the lexicographer composed his work; on the contrary, the evidence offered by Suidas shows that the impossible στήμον was further disfigured, in the course of various attempts to emend it: some manuscripts of the lexicon have στείαν, others read στείμον.

2) Waltz, who supplies this word with a crux, notes, however: "le mot στήμον ou στήμος nous est tout à fait inconnu; il paraît seulement se rattacher à la racine de ἵστημι. Peut-être désigne-t-il le lien qui unissait les deux anneaux de l'entrave, attachés aux deux pattes de l'animal qu'on voulait empêcher de galoper."

3) In the case of instruments, tools, etc., the metaphorical acceptance of the word very often is produced by allusion to the shape of the object in question: cf. the very good note by Waltz on A. P. VI, 298 (note 1, p. 149 of the volume).

The structure of the epigram is clear, and was quite common: the poem contains a list of substantives, connected with each other by *καί*; only the substantive placed at the beginning of the third line, *ἀρθροπέδη*, is inserted asyndetically, exactly as is the case e. g. with *ἰοδόκη* in the epigram that immediately precedes the one we are examining (A. P. 6, 296, 3; cf. also 6, 205, 3, where the same holds true of *στάθμαι*). It must further be noted that both these substantives are not accompanied by any attributes.

Let us now examine the "Epigrammsituation". Who was Alkimos? He was either a peasant, obviously not enthusiastic over the burdensome labour inevitable in his profession, or someone who did a considerable amount of digging, in order to find a treasure: in any case, such was the fellow's inclination for work that he got rid of all his tools as soon as he found the treasure which addicted him to gracious living.

In the light of what we have observed so far, we may perhaps emend the line as follows: *ἀρθροπέδαν τημόσδε καὶ ὠλεσίβωλον ἀρούρης, κτλ.* *Τημόσδε* for *τῆμος* is attested in Alexandrian poetry (it survived later, cf. A. P. 9, 384, 7 and Maximus' *Περὶ Καταρχῶν*, where it occurs frequently, as Ludwig's index shows); the construction *τῆμος ~ ὅτε* occurs in Nicander, *Ther.* 31 and in A. P. 8, 26, 10. Cf. also Arat. 292 (*τῆμος ~ ὁπότε*). The word *τημόσδε*, which very adroitly keeps our curiosity awake, is inserted into the enumeration according to a procedure Phantias appears to like (cf. e. g. 6, 299, 3 and 307, 3, where respectively *πάρκειται* and *ἀπέπτυσσε* interrupt the monotony of the list). There is perfect parallelism in the position of *τημόσδε* and *ὅτε* in our epigram: both occupy the second *sedes* in their respective lines. Our *τημόσδε* is nearer to *ὅτε* in line 7 than e. g. *ῆμος* is to *τῆμος* in A. Rh. 1, 1172 ff.

The corruption of *τημόσδε* to *στῆμον τε* is not difficult to explain: in *τημό*, τ was misread for στ, the abbreviation for *ος* (in the group *μος*) was mistaken for that representing *ον*, whilst the confusion between *ῆ* (*δέ*) and *τ* (*τε*) is too well known to need any comment.

A. P. 6, 299.

This epigram by Phantias enumerates the offerings dedicated to Hermes and Cypris by some real or fictitious devotee: after mentioning some grapes, a piece of cake, figs, olives, and cheese, the list continues (v. 5—6):

ἀκτά τε Κρηταιῖς εὐτριβέος τε †ρόειπα  
 θωμός και Βάχχου πῶμ' ἐπιδορπίδιον  
 (sc. πάρεινται).

The corrupt *ροειπα* has offered unyielding resistance to the attacks repeatedly made by the critics: cf. in particular Stadtmüller's apparatus. I think that we must call the gods to our rescue. Since Bacchus' liquor is mentioned, it is only too natural that Demeter's product (and name) should be present alongside with it, as we see e. g. in A. P. 6, 257. Where could the mention of the goddess fit? Obviously in the unsound *ροειπα*. It is true that corn is already mentioned on the list (*ἀκτά*), but it is equally clear, from *εὐτριβέος*, that in addition to the corn there is also a heap of something pulverized, milled, in other words, flour<sup>4</sup>). After making these considerations, I saw from Stadtmüller's apparatus that Salmasius must have been following the same trend of thought: "in *ροειπας* (ap. B.<sup>m</sup>) Cereris nomen latere censet Salmasius". Since *Δημήτηρ* was used tout court for *bread* or *corn* (cf. in particular Pape-Benseler, s. v.), *milled* Demeter will of course mean *flour*.

As no word or name beginning with *ρο-* seemed to be of any use for the restoration of the passage, I long suspected that the epithet of Demeter should be one beginning with *ερο-*, *ορε-*, etc., so as to read in the line τ' *ερο-*, τ' *ορε-* etc. My suspicion became certitude when, in consulting the Etymologicum Gudianum, I came across Ἐρυσίβη (210, 15): this, as I learned, was one of Demeter's names. It has now become evident that the line must be healed as follows:

... εὐτριβέος τ' Ἐρυσίβας  
 θωμός κτλ.

The tachygraphical sign for *ας* was mistaken for the one representing *α*; confusion between minuscule *β* (*μ*) and *ω* is not impossible, if we assume that the accent of the word, being moved to the right<sup>5</sup>), over *β*, was mistaken for the stroke representing the upper part of the letter *π*: to sum up, Ἐρυσίβας was written *Ερυσιμ̄*. Confusion between the voiced *β*

4) Nothing else can be taken into consideration: Hecker conjectured *ροττα*: "sed quid tum *εὐτριβέος*?" rightly asks Dübner. *θωμός* would also present some difficulty. In Waltz's apparatus Hecker's conjecture is erroneously ascribed to Desrousseaux.

5) Cf. e. g. the abbreviated *μίας* under the heading *ας*, in Blaß, *Griech. Paläogr.* (*Handbuch der Altertumswiss.* I<sup>1</sup>, München 1886, Tafel III c, Zeichen und Abkürzungen).

and the voiceless  $\pi$  in a name that meant absolutely nothing to the copyists is, of course, not to be excluded.

A. P. 9, 159.

This anonymous epigram tells the story of a man who threw a stone at a skull lying in the road: the stone rebounded and hit the unfortunate, but undeniably disrespectful fellow so as to blind him <sup>6</sup>). It is the conclusion of the piece that is corrupt:

καὶ πάλιν εἰς Ἀΐδην †κωλάζετο, τὴν ἰδίην δὲ  
ἐκλαυσεν χειρῶν εὐστοχὸν ἀφροσύνην.

Planudes emended κωλάζετο to ἐκολάζετο: this is a Verschlimmbesserung which has hardly found any convinced supporter: in fact, not only is ἐκολάζετο rather dull and pointless just where we expect, at the end of the epigram, something biting or brilliant, but, in particular, the syntactical structure and the meaning of the sentence would be anything but clear. Jacobs (cf. Dübner's commentary, ad l., in the Didot edition) noted: "Si sincerum est εἰς Ἀΐδην, sic accipi debet, ut dicatur ille poenam retulisse, cuius usque ad Orcum et in ipso Orco memoriam habiturus erat. Ut autem ille, cuius erat cranium, ἐπλήχθη λίθῳ ἐν Ἀΐδῃ, ita hic πάλιν, vicissim, puniebatur εἰς Ἀΐδην". This very contorted explanation has not convinced anybody, but what others have suggested is no better alternative. Of those who tolerate Planudes' correction faute de mieux, Paton, rather vaguely, renders "until his death he was punished . . ." (in his Loeb edition), whilst Waltz puts a crux before εἰς Ἀΐδην and translates "celui-ci, nouveau châtement, s'en alla dans l'Hadès et il déplora . . .", noting in his apparatus "quid re vera scripserit poeta, non liquet". Other critics (cf. Lumb, Notes on the Greek Anthology, London 1920, p. 58) imagine Planudes' text to mean, somehow, "he was punished here, and will be punished in Hades" (in other words, the enigmatic πάλιν is interpreted as "again", in contrast with Jacobs). In reality, such contortions merely prove that Planudes did his best to correct the corrupt κωλάζετο, with no success: he altered the word to ἐκολάζετο, which verb conveys the most obvious (though banal) idea occurring to the reader,

6) This story does take some believing; the text, however, is clear and allows no doubts. Perhaps we must infer that the stone, when hitting violently the man's head, produced an internal lesion causing blindness.

but does not fit into the context from the point of view of either grammar or sense.

More drastic emendations have been propounded: a long list is in Stadtmüller's apparatus, to which I should like to refer the reader. One of these attempts is notable, because its author, Reisig, had, in my opinion, an inkling of the truth. He wanted to read εἰς ἀτῆν κωμάζετο, referring, as Jacobs writes (in his commentary, vol. 3—4, p. 487), the words εἰς ἀτῆν "ad hominis caecitatem". Independently of Reisig, I had reached the same conclusion: these two words must somehow be an allusion to the man's blindness.

We cannot follow Reisig's argumentation in detail (because it has come down to us only in Jacobs' short report), but he must have meant the literal translation of the passage to be, as Sternbach puts it, (Meletemata, p. 174) "irridebatur propter caecitatem" (cf. σκώπτειν εἰς). Unfortunately, it was Reisig himself who was laughed at: his "mira commenta" are merely mentioned in passing, not even quoted, by Dübner, and Sternbach seems to have had no better opinion of the conjecture in question than Dübner had.

The main difficulty preventing us from accepting Reisig's emendation is the fact that κωμάζω εἰς clearly means "break in", "burst in", "rush in", or, simply, "come (in)to a place" 7); the verb never means "mock", "ridicule" 8). Besides, the idea of the man being laughed at is rather incongruous and in any case pointless.

The fact remains, however, that Ἀτῆς here, in my opinion, means, metaphorically, "blindness": the best emendation of the passage is καὶ πάλιν εἰς Ἀτῆν ἠδύναζετο, τὴν ἰδίην δὲ . . . "thus, in his turn (Jacobs' interpretation of πάλιν is correct, from the purely grammatical point of view: *vicissim* here means, of course, *like the dead man* whose skull he had hit with a stone) *he was sent to sleep* (i. e. his eyes were closed, he was deprived of his eyesight) *into Darkness*". The author is

7) Cf. in particular Thes. Gr., s. v., 2191 A; Wernicke's commentary on Tryphiodorus, p. 282; Δημητράκου Μέγα λεξικόν, s. v., 5. The sense "come" is clear in passages like A. P. 7, 186, A. Pl. 4, 12, Nonn. *Dionys.* 5, 557 and 47, 266, Tryphiod. 314.

8) If λυγάζω were attested (cf. Thes., s. v., and Passow<sup>5</sup>, s. v.), it could be taken into consideration; but even Meineke, who conjectures λυγάζων at A. P. 7, 648, must admit (*Delectus Poetarum Anthol. Graec.*, p. 125) that this verb is not attested anywhere.

playing, in biting irony, with sepulchral formulas which must have been fairly common: cf. in particular Kaibel, Epigr. 237 (= Appendix Cougny, ed. Didot, 2, 192), v. 3—4:

(τὸν . . . ἀνέρα . . .)

Ἄψδεω νυχίοιο<sup>9)</sup> μέλας ὑπεδέξατο κόλπος  
εὐσεβέων θ' ὁσίην εὐνάσεν ἐς κλισίην.

Not only is there similarity of image, but actually the construction of εὐνάζω, εὐνάω is the same (εἰς . . .)<sup>10)</sup>; from the palaeographical point of view, we must note that ἦσιν can easily be misread for κωλ.

A. P. 9, 544

The author (Addaeus) describes a gem representing one of the Nereids, Galene: the figure was evidently carved in the act of swimming, as is clear from line 5, where Galene says that, were it not for the envious stone, she would demonstrate her natatory skill:

Ἴνδῆν βήρυλλον με Τρύφων ἀνέπεισε Γαλήνην  
εἶναι καὶ μαλακαῖς χερσὶν ἀνῆκε κόμας·  
ἦνίδε καὶ χεῖλη νοτερὴν πλείοντα θάλασσαν  
καὶ μαστοὺς, τοῖσιν θέλω ἀνηγεμίην·  
ἦν δέ μοι ἢ φθονερὴ νεύση λίθος, ὡς ἐν ἐτοίμῳ  
ᾠρημμαι, γνῶση καὶ τάχα νηχομένην.

Jacobs appropriately noted: "*labia per mare navigantia aut natantia mihi nunquam non offensionis fuerunt*". This remark is perfectly correct; he proposed *λειοῦντα*, observing: "Galene undas ventis excitatas sedat, unde nomen habet et ipsum mare tranquillum reddit, *λεαίνει*". Dübner, in his commentary ad l., considers this as a "certissimam emendationem", but Dilthey (*Rh. Mus.* 1872, 27, p. 301) was not wrong in retorting that *χεῖλη* for "voice" would be a rather strained expression: "es ist zu korrigieren *πνέοντα*", he peremptorily concludes. To be a stickler for precision, we should also note that τὰ *χεῖλη* could hardly be discerned in a gem, and that the poet must rather have wanted to draw our attention to some more conspicuous feature. Dilthey's suggestion, in any case, is hardly acceptable: it is true that, as the critic notes, the

9) Kaibel reads *νυχίοιο*, whereas Cougny has *μυχίοιο* ("Ditis *latebrosi* sinus").

10) Cf. also Eur., *Tr.* 589 *κοιμισασθαί τινα ἐς Ἄιδου*.

function of placating the waves by seduction (θέλγειν) is entrusted to Galene's μαστοί, and that therefore the verb in line 3 must not necessarily be a synonym of θέλω, but to say that Galene's breath smelled of the sea would be a rather strange piece of imagery. Stadtmüller likes neither these two conjectures nor other attempts: "ἀπλοῦντα olim conieci; πτύοντα et λείχοντα, quae tentantur, in nymphae imaginem parum videntur quadrare nec multo magis σταλάοντα vel λείβοντα"; he ends by stating, dubiously, "praestare puto κηλοῦντα (an στέλλοντα, θάλλοντα?)". His sense of style was sure and keen, and his hesitation helps us, this time, to find the solution to the problem: the corruption, in reality, lies somewhere else, not in the πλείοντα which Stadtmüller only reluctantly modifies.

The expression πλείν θάλασσαν is too current to be immediately suspected of deterioration: in itself, it is perfectly appropriate to the context. We have already noted that the verb must not necessarily be a synonym of θέλω, and that, on the other hand, the poet must have wanted to emphasize in his description some rather conspicuous feature in the swimming figure: apart from the breasts, what could be more conspicuous in the part of the Nereid emerging from the surface than her long hair? Luxuriant κόμαι were frequently attributes of marine deities. We should perhaps read ἦνιδε καὶ χλιδῆ νοτερὴν πλείοντα θάλασσαν "look at my hair floating on the water, and at my breasts..." The word χλιδος<sup>11</sup>) may have been used here with the same meaning (and in the same number, plural) as Sophocles' χλιδαί in *El.* 51 and 452. The preceding κόμας (line 2) would make the meaning of χλιδῆ clear, in any case. Much better, however, would be δειρή (*neck*, nt. plur., cf. Euphor. 38 Pow.): the sequence of hair, neck and breasts becomes patent in the description. Δ and χ, ρ and λ are often confused.

11) On the quantity of the -ι-, as is well known, there was in later Greek an uncertainty which has lasted down to us, because grammarians connected the substantive with the verb χλιτῶ and the adjective χλιτῆρος. In Pape-Sengebusch we read "χλιδος oder χλιτῆρος", in Dindorf's *Thesaurus* (where the question is discussed at length) and in Bailly's *Dictionnaire* we find χλιτῆρος, while Nauck (*TGF*<sup>2</sup>, p. 732) gives χλιδος in Ion's fragment and χλιτῆρος in Hesychius' commentary on it. Cf. χλιτῶ, and also χλιτῆ in ps. Phoc. 200. Both Boisacq and Hofmann, in their etymological dictionaries, consider χλιτῆρος as the only legitimate form.

## A. P. 9, 563 (Leonidas)

Τὸν φιλοπωριστὴν Δημόκριτον ἦν που ἐφεύρης  
 ὦνθ' ἄγγειλον τοῦτο τὸ κοῦφον ἔπος,  
 ὡς ἡ λευκοόπωρος ἐγὼ καὶ ἐφώριος ἦδη  
 κείνῳ συκοφορῶ τὰς ἀπύρους ἀκόλους·  
 σπευσάτω, οὐκ ὀχυρὴν γὰρ ἔχω στάσιν εἴπερ ὀπώρην  
 † ἀκρήτου † χρεῖται δρέψαι ἀπ' ἀκρεμόνος.

The ἀκρήτου has satisfied nobody. Paton, in his Loeb edition, conjectures ἀβλήτου and translates "let him make haste, for my position is not secure, if he would pluck the fruit from my branches before they are stoned". Who on earth would dream of stoning the delicious figs? Boissonade is certainly right in seeing an allusion to thieves: "servavi ἀκρήτου, *puri, non furum manibus contacti, etsi sic posse ἀκρητος adhiberi dubitem valde*" (apud Dübner). Salmasius and Grotius wanted to read ἀχράντου ("*intactae opes arboris*", cf. Stadtmüller's apparatus and Dübner's commentary), certainly having the activity of thieves in mind. Geffcken, in his monumental edition of Leonidas (*Neue Jahrb., Suppl.* 23, 1897, p. 1 ff.) adopts a moralist's attitude: there are no thieves involved. "Der Feigenbaum bittet nicht, komm und pflücke, sonst holt ein anderer meine Früchte, sondern: komm und pflücke die reifen Früchte, ich bleibe nicht mehr lange so, so reine (vollsäftige) Früchte bekommst du nicht wieder vom Zweige" (p. 95): he wants to read ὀπώρην ἀκρητον<sup>12</sup>). These legalistic considerations do not hold water<sup>13</sup>). Leonidas, when making the tree say that its "position is not secure" is pointedly alluding to the eternal war which is still being fought in southern Europe (and, I presume, in other parts of the world) between gardener (φιλοπωριστής) and children: the former wants to leave the fruit on the tree till they are fully ripe, whilst the children try to anticipate him — if possible by as little as a few hours, so that they may enjoy the sweetest possible spoil — in plucking the product of his labours. "My position is not strong", says the tree, and the following line explains this statement: if we understand "the gardener must hurry up, if he wants to pluck the fruit from the branch

12) Olivieri, *Epigrammatisti greci della Magna Grecia e della Sicilia*, Napoli 1949, p. 94 follows — as usual — Geffcken "faccia presto, ché non ho stasi durevole (ché il mio stato non é garante di durata) se mai desidera cogliere dal ramo frutto puro (nella sua piena maturità, pieno di succo)."

13) This was seen by Stadtmüller (cf. his apparatus), who conjectured ἀβληχροῦ, ἀκλήρου and ἀκρήβου.

that is now in full ἀκμή!" We should consequently read ἀκμηνοῦ χρήξει δρέφαι· ἀπ' ἀκρεμόνος. The *sedes* of the adjective ἀκμηνός — a Homeric rarity, revived in late Greek — would be the same as in *Od.* 23, 191. Considering, however, that ὀχυρή στάσις is a technical military expression, we shall restore a good pun (and preserve the alliteration) by reading ἀχρήστου. The joke is evident: ἀχρηστος at first baffles the reader, who takes it to have its ordinary meaning *useless*, but the adjective has here, in reality, its technical military sense *weak, unfit for war* (= οὐκ ὀχυρός): cf. Passow<sup>5</sup>, s. v. ἀχρεῖος (*adde* Plato, *Resp.* 371 C) and Boissonade *ad* Eunap. p. 471 (who quotes D. Chrysost. *Or.* 6, p. 201). If the gardener wants to find the branch still in its weak position (i. e. exposed to the attacks of the thieves because loaded with figs) he must make haste.

A. P. 9, 746 (Polemon)

Ἐπτά βοῶν σφραγιδα βραχὺς λίθος εἶχεν ἰασπις,  
 †ὡς μίαν ὡς †πάσας ἔμπνοα δερκομένας.  
 καὶ τάχα κὰν ἀπέρεψε τὰ βοῖδια· νῦν δὲ κέκλειται  
 τῇ χρυσῇ μάνδρα τὸ βραχὺ βουκόλιον.

This epigram was written as a variation to the one by Plato, which follows it immediately in the manuscripts and reads as follows:

Εἰκόνα πέντε βοῶν μικρὰ λίθος εἶχεν ἰασπις,  
 ὡς ἤδη πάσας ἔμπνοα βοσκομένας·  
 καὶ τάχα κὰν ἀπέφευγε τὰ βοῖδια· νῦν δὲ κρατεῖται  
 τῇ χρυσῇ μάνδρῃ τὸ βραχὺ βουκόλιον.

The words ὡς μίαν are highly perplexing<sup>14</sup>). Jacobs (cf. Dübner, ad l.) proposed, not without hesitation, ὡς βῖον, Lumb (*op. cit.* p. 83) wants to read "εἰς μίαν, construing with εἶχε = «so as to form one» (we should supply ἀγέλην). Paton, on the other hand, renders ὡς μίαν "looking like one", noting that the expression, "if not corrupt, must mean that they (scil. the cows) were represented one standing behind the other, only the heads of six showing". This is what Grotius seems to have thought (cf. his Latin version, in Dübner's edition), but is hardly persuasive.

Headlam, in his manuscript notes on his copy of Dübner's *Didotiana* (which is now here in King's College Library), tried

14) On the contrary, ἀπέρεψε is perhaps not corrupt, if we assume a form ἀπορέπω, cf. e. g. Bailly, *Dict.*, s. v. and LSJ, s. v.

to restore the text by conjecture, and wrote tentatively "ὥς: λίαν? ὥς ἐτύμως". His considerations are, as very often, *bahnbrechend*. Even before examining his attempts, I had come to the conclusion that in the ὥς μίαν there must hide an adverb, parallel with Plato's ἤδη<sup>15</sup>): there is, I think, very little doubt about that. Now, the cows carved in the cold stone are almost alive: the correct text should therefore be ὥς χλιαρῶς πάσας ἔμπνοα δερκομένας. Confusion between λ and μ, as well as between ρ and ν is frequent, and the disappearance of the χ is easily explained if we consider that the group χλ was often written λ (a stroke crossing the left stalk of the λ). Χλιαρός (cf. LSJ, s. v.) was used with reference to the warmth emanating from living beings<sup>16</sup>). Of course the poet's insistence on the smallness of the gem (βραχύς, βραχύ) is intended not to emphasize the fact that the cows were closely packed, but rather to stress the carver's skill in obtaining figures true to life in spite of the size of the stone.

King's College,  
Cambridge, England

Giuseppe Giangrande

## LEOGORAS AT ENNEA HODOI

The scholiast on Aischines 2.31 gives a list of Athenian defeats at Ennea Hodoi (later Amphipolis) in Thrace:

Ἐννέα ὁδῶν ἠτύχησαν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐννάκις περὶ τὰς Ἐννέα καλουμένας ὁδοῦς . . . τὰ δὲ ἀτυχήματα ἐγένοντο τάδε· τὸ πρῶτον μὲν Λυσιστράτου καὶ Λυκούργου καὶ Κρατίνου στρατευόντων ἐπ' Ἡϊόνα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι διεφθάρησαν ὑπὸ Θρακῶν, εἰληφότες Ἡϊόνα, ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Φαίδωνος· δεύτερον οἱ μετὰ Λεωγόρου κληροῦχοι ἐπὶ Λυσικράτους . . .

Lysikrates was archon in 453/2. In this mention of Leogoras and Lysikrates it has generally been thought (e. g. by Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* iii: 170) that either the scholiast is confused or his text corrupt, and that the reference is to the defeat of Leagros at Drabeskos (or Daton) in the archonship of Lysitheos (465/4),

15) Headlam would read ὡσεὶ δὴ, but ἤδη (cf. the identical evolution in the English *actually*) means, here, *really*: cf. LSJ, s. v. I, 4.

16) The adverb χλιαρῶς (γλγληρῶς) is attested, whereas λιαρῶς is not.