



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

IV.—SUGGESTIONS ON SOME EPIGRAMS OF THE  
THIRD VOLUME OF DIDOT'S EDITION OF  
THE ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA.

This work, which appeared in 1890, has elicited a considerable amount of criticism. In particular, van Herwerden, in his *Studia Critica in Epigrammata Graeca* (Leiden, 1891), has pointed out the insufficiency of the editor, Cougny, and has made many most excellent corrections of the text of the Epigrams. A large number of these have had the advantage of being previously edited by Prof. Kaibel, whose widely known *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta* was published as far back as 1878. The suggestions which I offered in *Hermes* (1879, pp. 258–62) after a perusal of Kaibel's volume, I wish now to supplement, after a renewed examination of his views and with the extra light supplied by Cougny.

I 328. 5, 6 C [907 Kaibel]:

Δέρκεό μοι, φίλος, ἴδδε νοήμονα τέκτονα χαλκοῦ  
Ἕφάιστου σοφίῃ σῶμα μιμησάμενον.

The original gives *σοφίης σωμα*, and Kaibel states that this is attested by no less than three copies. Cougny prints *σοφίῃ*, from Kaibel; yet it seems possible that *σοφίης σῶμα* should mean 'a form embodying the skill.' For *μιμησάμενον*, an almost inconceivable false quantity, the author of the epigram may have written *τι μιησάμενον*.

II 117, on Paris:

Ἐνθάδε πῦρ τὸ Τρώων Ἑλλάδος ἄλγος ἀπάσης  
ὁ Πριάμοιο Πάρις ψύχομαι ἀκρολόφοις.

Herw. suggests *Ἐνθάδε πῦρ Τρώων*, [τῆς] *Ἑλλάδος ἀ. ἀπ.*; possibly *Ἐνθάδ' ἐγὼ Τρώων πῦρ*. The *v.* can hardly be without caesura, though the instances quoted by Herwerden show that this sometimes happened in late writers.

170:

Μικκὸς Μυρσινῶν, παῖς Μυρσίνου, Ἄστακίδου δὲ  
χρηστοῦ γραμματικοῦ θρέμμα ποθεινότατον.

Rather perhaps *Μυρσινίων*.

172. 4 [96 K.]:

ἀλλὰ φίλοι τ' ἤμυναν καὶ μοι κτέρισαν τάφον οὔτη.

The writer of the inscription may have intended ἐπὶ κτέρισαν τε μοι οὔτ.

174. 3-6 [190 K.]:

Ἐννεακαίδεκέτης γὰρ ὑπὸ στυγερῆς ἑδαμάσθη  
 νούσου, καὶ λείπω τὸν γλυκὸν ἀέλιον  
 ἀνίκ' ἔδει με γονεῦσι τίνειν χάριν· ἡ δὲ συνήμων  
 ΛΛΘΔ εἰς ἀφανῆ τόνδε.

In v. 6 Böckh conj. *Δάθα εἰς ἀφανῆ τόνδε* [μ' ἔκρυψε τάφον], a quite uncertain restoration, which Kaibel rejects. No one has objected to the rare word *συνήμων*. It looks to me wrong; *συναίμων* was probably the word written by the composer of the epigram. So 231. 5 *φιλίοις τε συναίμοις*, 7 *δισσῶν δὲ συναίμων*.

224. 2, 3 [627 K.]:

μὴ δέομαι γελάσης εἰ κυνὸς ἐστὶ τάφος.  
 Ἐκλαύσθη

ΕΥΛΑΥCOHN points rather to *Εῦ κλαύσθη*.

229. 12, 13:

τῶν ἐπ' ἀτρεκέεσ  
 δῆθ' ἐξ ἀπάντων τ' ἐσθλὸν ἄρατο κλέος.

Couigny seems rightly to disserve τῶν from the preceding καὶ μῆνις ΑΚΑΡΝΙΑ, whatever may lurk in these letters, at present impossibly supposed to represent ΑΙΑΚΙΔΑΟ.<sup>1</sup> But δῆθ' cannot begin a verse, and it seems probable that ΔΑΘΕΓ or ΔΑΘΕΞ was ἦλθ' ἐξ.

231. 3, 4 [413 K.]:

ᾧ γόνον οὐχ ὑμένοιον ἑδαδουχῆσατο μήτηρ  
 οἰκτρὰ σὺν γενέτη Χρυσίον ΩΔΕΞΑΤΟΣ.

Kaibel thinks the last word here contains some lost superlative like *οἰκτροτάτῳ*. Herwerden conj. *ᾧλετ' Ἄτος*. It looks to me like a real name, a mere mistake for *ᾧδεσάτῳ*. The father, Odesatus, and the mother, ChrySION, would naturally be mentioned together as mourning for their child.

<sup>1</sup> It is more likely to have been a fem. in -ειᾶ, like *Ἐκτόρεια* Rhos. 762, *Διομήδεια* Eccles. 1029, *Πολυθεύκεια Ἀγαμειμόνεια*.



astrologer, who predicted rightly the exact amount of his own life. *ἔλεγον* is thus 1st person: for *ὡς* I suggest *ὄσ' οὖν*.

333. 2 [261b K.]:

τῆ ψυχῇ μεταδὸς καλῶν ΤΕΧΘΕΙΞ  
καὶ τὸν βίον τρυφῇ παρηγόρησον  
εἰδὼς ἦν καταβῆς ἐς πῶμα λήθης  
5 οὐχ ἐν τῶν ἐπάνω κάτω που ὄψει  
ψυχῆς ἐκ μελέων ἀποπταθείσης.

2. *ὁ τεχθεῖς*, Böckh; *τεχθείση* vel *δοθείση* vel *τραφείση*, Kaibel; *καλῶν τεχνῶν σῆ*, Herwerden. *τάχιστα* ego. 3. *καὶ τρυφῇ βίον* π., Böckh, uix probabiliter: fort. *τὸν ζῶντα*. 4. *πὸμ' ἐς τὸ Λήθης*, Böckh; cf. 559. 10. Num *σὺ δῶμα*?

*τάχιστα* seems quite in keeping with the apolaustic tone of the hendecasyllables. In 3 *βιοτήν* would be a better word than *βίον*; but I think the original may have been *τὸν ζῶντα* 'thy living self.' Again, I doubt Böckh's *πὸμ' ἐς τὸ Λήθης*; the corruption is more easily explained by *σὺ δῶμα* Λ., a perfectly intelligible combination.

340. 1, 2 [222 K.]:

τὸν δ' ἀρετὰν ἀμείψασα Λεοντέα Εὐρυδικοιο  
τίμησεν πάτρα γυμνάδος ἐν τεμένει.

Kaibel gives *ἀρετᾶ λάμψαντα*, which appears to me an unnecessary and not very probable change. The easiest emendation is *τόνδ' ἀρετᾶ μείψασα* 'requiting with kindness' or 'goodness' for his good service to the city.

346. 3, 4 [\*663 K.]:

Αἰεὶ δὲ μνήμη σε φυλάξομεν ὡς παρεόντα  
εἶνεκεν ἡείας εἵνεκα τ' ἀγλαΐης.

Herwerden has restored this most convincingly *εἵνεκ' ἐνηείας*.

348. 8 [566a K.]:

]ηλεόθυμε Χάρων τί σε τόσσον ἐνήης  
]υψε λιπούσα πατρὶ πένθος ἀπειρέσιον;

None of the supplements mentioned by Böckh, nor yet that of Kaibel, satisfy. The first of the two verses, I imagine, began with an interjection, *οἶμοι*, or something similar. If *υψε* is rightly reported in the second, *κρύψε* might be the word. *Eheu inimitis Charon, cur tam bona te celauit quod relinqueret patri dolorem inmensum?*

361. 3, 4 [329 K.], over a dog:

Δουλίδα καὶ σύμπλον πολλῆς ἀλὸς· ἦ κε παράσχοις  
ἀνθρώποις ἀλόγοις ταῦτὰ χαριζομένη.

So Cougny, after Aeneas Piccolomini; the original gives ΤΙΝ καὶ παράσχοις. Is not ἀλόγοις an error for ἀλόγῳ 'a brute'? E. L. Hicks conj. ἄν, i. e. ἄ ἄν.

386. 1 [299 K.]:

Εὐσεβὲς εἰς θρέψασαν, Διοκλῆ, δόσιώτατε πάντων  
Κουφοτάτης φίλτρον ἄ λίθος . . .

As the name Diocles is prefixed to the inscr., Διοκλῆ seems to have supplanted a word, possibly ἔδρας. The other v. may have ended εἰ κόμιος: I do not understand εἰ φίλιης.

395. 2 [265 K.]:

ἄς κλέος ἐν Κρήτῃ μίμνεται ἀθάνατον.

Herwerden reasonably objects to μίμνεται, offering instead λείπεται or γίγνεται. It might be μίμνει ἔτ'.

426. 9, 10 [615 K.]:

Κεῖθει γαῖα φίλη με. τί δ' ἀγνὸν ὅμως ὄνομ'; ἦμην  
πάσι Φίλιτος ἀνὴρ τῆς Λυκίης Λιμύρων.

This is the correction of Wilamowitz. The letters of the original, as reported by Kaibel, are ONO/NHΛH or ONO/MAMHN. I doubt ὅμως, which seems to have little meaning, and offer τί δ' ἀγνὸν ὅπως ὀνομήνης; 'what does it matter how you name (what name you give to) a righteous man?' Then φίλιτος will be a mere adj.: 'I was a man well loved by all, of Lycian Limyra.'

453. 13, 14 [646 K.]:

τοῦτ' ἔσομαι γὰρ ἐγὼ· σὺ δὲ τοῦτοις γῆν ἐπιχώσας  
ΕΙΤΕ . ΟΤΕ . ΟΥΚΗΝ τοῦτο πάλιν γέγονα.

Such is Kaibel's report; Orelli gives ΕΙΤΕΟΙΕΟΥΚΗΝ. The passage has been dealt with by Hecker in Anth. Graec. I, p. 196, and Meineke, Callim., p. 298. The former edits Εἰφ' ὅτι οὐκ ἄν ἦν τοῦτο πάλιν γέγονα; and so Meineke, except that he writes ὁ, τι, altering besides σὺ δὲ τοῦτοις into σὺ δ' ἐπ' ὅστοις or σὺ δέ γ' ὅστοις. A relative<sup>1</sup> seems required to correspond to τοῦτο, but the tradition of the letters is not quite certain. Possibly they point to

<sup>1</sup> Orelli, however, conj. εἰπέ· πότ' οὐκ ἦμην· τοῦτο π. γέγονα. [Cougny.]

EITETOTΓΩΝΟΥΚΗΝ 'dic, id quod cum essem, nondum eram, iterum me hoc factum esse.' Say 'that I have returned to that, at the time of being which I had as yet no existence.'

459. 4 [587 K.]:

Ἐπτὰ μόνους λυκάβαντας δύο καὶ μῆνας ἔζησα

If we compare 505. 1, 2 Εἰκοσιῆξ λυκάβασιν ἐγὼ ζήσασα Σαβίνα καὶ μῆσιν τέτρασιν, εἴθ' ἐνδέκατον πάλιν ἡμαρ, we may believe that μόνους λυκάβαντας is an error for μόνους λυκάβασι.

514. 3 [604 K.]:

Μαρκιανὸς δέ μ' ἔθαψε καὶ ἐκήδευσεν ὀδίται.

'ἐκήδευσεν augmenti syllaba male producta,' Kaibel. Yet τε might easily fall out when the epigram was engraved; and nothing proves careless metre on the part of the epigrammatist.

520. 3 [608 K.]:

Συμπάσχω κείνους οἷσπερ κινεῖτο προσώποις.

Manil. V 479:

Externis tamen aptus erit nunc uoce poetis,  
Nunc tacito gestu, referetque affectibus ora,  
Et sua dicendo faciet, solusque per omnis  
Ibit personas et turbam reddet in uno.

531. 1 [\*266 K.]:

Κοινὸν φῶς ἰδοῦσα τὸ κοινὸν ἔχω τέλος αἰεί.

Add πρὶν after φῶς.

548. 1, 2:

ὡς ῥόδον εἰαρινόν σε βροτοφθόρος ἤρπασεν Ἄιδης  
Σέμνην \* τλητὰ θεὸς ζωῆς † ἀφίλαμεν αὐτῇ.

Cougny corrects τλητὰ θεὸς ζωῆς † ἀφείλε μ' ἐν αὐτῇ. Following in his footsteps, I would write Σέμνη (vocative): ἄτλητα θεὸς ζωῆς ὅσ' ἀφείλε μ' ἐν αὐτῇ. ζωῆς might depend on ἄτλητα, or perhaps on ὅσ'. 'Unendurable is the loss to my life that the God brought on her dying.'

555. 2 [1051 K.]. The word εἰοι in this inscript. should not be altered to εἶφν, which in no way suits it.

564. 6 [395 K.]:

καὶ κατέθηκεν [ἄγων] ἔνθα περ οἱ πρόγονοι.

ἄγων is a possible supplement.

566. 4 [373 K.]:<sup>1</sup>

Κεῖμαι ἐρῶν πολλῶν, ἐράμενος πλεόνων.

The monument gives ε . . . μενος, which Welcker would retain as ἐράμενος. Wilamowitz conj. ἐσσόμενος, with ἔρωσ for ἐρῶν. The antithesis of the two clauses in this way perhaps becomes more pointed; but the space, as given by Le Bas, leaves room only for two letters. Le Bas' conj., ἡράμενος, appears to me worth consideration: it might be a passive participle fluctuating in form between a strict perfect ἡρασμένος and an aorist with passive meaning: so οὐτασμένος, οὐτάμενος. The meaning, if ἐρῶν is right (E' is all that remains), must be 'loved by more.'

III 171. 5, 6. These verses I would write thus, as formerly conjectured in the Cambridge Journal of Philology for 1877, p. 259:

τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ κακὸν μέγα σύμβολον ἄλλων  
'Ἐστὶ' τόσον τούτῳ τῷ πυρὶ πῦρ ἕτερον.

'This, in itself a great evil, is a sign of others to come: there is a second fire as great to complete this fire': unless it seems preferable to punctuate ἄλλων. "Ἐστι τόσον.

175. This epigram is to be explained, not of night-watchmen patrolling the streets with torches, but of men moving round in a mill by moonlight. The moon speaks.

Εἴς τινος νυκτὸς ἀλοῶντας, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς Σελήνης.  
"Ἄρματος ἡμετέρου τίς ἔβησεν ἐλάστορας ἄλλους,  
δῖνον ἀειστρεφέα παντόσ' ἐλανομένους;  
"Ἡλιε, τεθρίπποις νεμεσήσης μηκέτι μούνοισ.  
οἶδ' ἐπιτολμῶσιν ἡμετέροις τε δίφροις.

These men of the mill, thus moving round in the moonlight, are fancifully represented as driving the moon's chariot. The sun is therefore told that his anger at Phaethon's usurping his horses and chariot has found a parallel in the usurpation of the moon's chariot by the νυκτὸς ἀλοῶντες. I cannot understand how these words can refer to ἀλᾶσθαι; or how the dative τεθρίπποις can mean 'propter quadrigas tuas' (Herwerden). The single point of language which calls for remark is the use of τε, which here corresponds closely to Latin *que* = *quoque* in *hodieque*, and similar cases cited in my Catullus, CII 3.

<sup>1</sup> The actual remaining letters of the inscription are given in *Revue de Philologie*, 1845, p. 334, by Le Bas.



197. This epigram is clearly in scazons. It may, with no great deviation from its recorded form, be thus restored:

ὁ γαυριῶν μέγιστα Περσικῶ στίφει,  
καὶ Βόσπορον πλοῦν ὡσπερὲ δειξας,  
Ξέρξης ὁ βασιλεύς, Δαρίου παῖς κατόσσης.  
Ἰαόνων ἄθρυμα δείκνυται θραυσθείς.

IV 49 [1029 K.]:

Οὐρανίων πάντων βασιλεῦ χαῖρ', ἄφθιτ' Ἄνουβι,  
σός τε πατήρ χρυσοστέφανος πολίσεμνος Ὀσειρις,  
αὐτὸς Ζεὺς Κρονίδης, αὐτὸς μέγας ὄβριμος Ἄμμουν,  
κοίρανος ἀθανάτων ΠΡΟΤΕΤΙΜΗΤΑΙΞΕ Σέραπις,  
σὴ τε, μάκαιρα θεά, μήτηρ, πολυώνυμος Ἴσις.

If Cougny has rightly recorded the capitals, they would more naturally be an error for προτετίμησαί τε than for προτετίμηται δέ. A similar displacement of syllables perhaps exists in 1015, 2 K. φεισάμενοι χώρης ΠΥΡΙΔΑΜΑΖΟΜΕΝΗΣ, where I suggested that the right reading was πυραμίδ' ἄζομένης (Hermes for 1879, p. 260), and in VI 261. 8, where ἦς ὑπερῶρησαι ὀρίνων φωτὶ σεαντόν may be a mistake for ἦσπερ ὕπ' ἠώρησαι (Herwerden ἦ or ἦ γ' ὑπερ.).

92. 5, 6:

Γαῖα βροτὸς καὶ ὕδωρ· τὰ ἀπ' αὐτόφιν εἰς τάδε δύνει.  
ὥστε μάτην ὁ βίος καὶ ὄσα τις πονέει.

Rather χῶσα τις ἐκπονέει.

VI 8:

Εἰς πόλιν ἦν κτίσῃτε (κτίζῃσθα Bücheler and Kiessling,  
κτίζει most MSS) θεοῖς σέβας ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ  
θεῖναι καὶ φυλακαῖς τε σέβειν θινσῖαις τε χοροῖς τε.

This is from an oracle which Dionysius of Halicarnassus cites (Antiqq. I 68) as given to Dardanus, when he transferred his home, with the Palladia and images of the gods, from Samothrace to Asia. The historian introduces the oracle with these words: διαμαντευόμενον δὲ περὶ τῆς οἰκίσεως τὰ τε ἄλλα μαθεῖν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τῆς φυλακῆς τόνδε τὸν χρησμὸν λαβεῖν. In c. 69 he says ποιήσασθαι τοὺς Ἰλιεῖς νεῶν τε καὶ ἄδουον αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ἄκρας καὶ φυλάττειν δι' ἐπιμελείας ἦς ἐδύνατο πλείσσης. Hence it would seem that there is ground for defending φυλακαῖς. But Herwerden justly calls attention to the combination φυλακαῖς σέβειν as odd, and conj. either καὶ σφεας αἰεὶ σέβειν or καὶ τελεταῖς τε σέβειν. After reading his note (Stud. Critic.

in Epigr. Graec., p. 84) it occurred to me that the word which had been supplanted by *φυλακαῖς* might be *φιάλαις*: libations would be a natural adjunct of sacrifice and dancing.

31. 4:

καί τε χορῶν στεφάνωμα πικροῦς οἰκίτορας ἔξει.

Neither Schubart, in his edition of Pausanias, nor Cougny remarks on this extraordinary *χορῶν*. I cannot but believe it to be a mere error for *καί τ' ἐχρῶν*. The word *στεφάνωμα* has the same meaning in Sophocles, *Antig.* 122 *στ.* *πύργων*.

81. 16:

Ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε δέμας θύσας ζωοῖο ποτηροῦ  
καὶ μέλι φυρήσας †δηῖω ἀλφίτω ἔνθεν  
ἀτμούς τε λιβάνοιο καὶ οὐλοχύτας ἐπίβαλλε.

*δηῖω* seems to be a corruption of *Δηωίω*, from *Δηῶ*: 124. 7 Cougny *λήια δ' εὐαλδῆ κομέειν σταχυιτρόφα Δηοῖ*. The adj. recurs, I think, in 196. 4 *εἰς χθόν' ἐπειγομένως Δηῶιον αἴσσουσι*.

92. 3, 4, oracle on Alexander the Great:

ὄν Ζεὺς †ἀρίσταισι γοναῖς ἔσπειρεν ἀρωγὸν  
εὐνομῆς θνητοῖσιν Ἄλέξανδρον βασιλῆα.

Cougny gives *ἀρρήταισι*, surely a strange form: possibly *ρήίσταισι* or *ραίσταισι*.

94. 1 [Suidas, s. v. *τόνος*]:

Διακίδη προφύλαξαι μολεῖν Ἀχερούσιον ὕδωρ.

*προφύλαξο* Gaisford, after Toup and Valckenaer: possibly *πεφύλαξο*, as in 205. 4 Cougny.

102. 7-9 [1037 K.]:

Δίψη δ' εἴμ' αἶη καὶ ἀπόλλυμαι· ἀλλὰ δότ' αἶψα  
ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ προρέον τῆς Μνημοσύνης ἀπὸ λίμνης.

These vv. strangely recall Propertius' elegy on the thirst of Hercules, IV 12. 8.

172. 10 [1035 K.]:

φαῖνη κ' ἀτρεκέως ἀψεύδεσιν ΑΛΚΑΙΞΙΟΜΟ  
ὡς μὴ δηρὸν ὑπ' ἀργαλή τρῦνιτό γε νόσφω  
Διακίδης λαός.

Böckh conj. *ἀψεύδεσι νάμασιν ὀμφῆς*, Kaibel *ἀψεύδεσιν ἄλκαρ ἐπ' ὀμφαῖς*, which he calls 'certa coniectura.' Cougny gives *ἀ. ᾄσμασιν ὀμφῆς*. The suggestion of Kaibel is in my opinion right, but not

the words, which may more plausibly be restored ἀψεύδεσιν ἄρκεσιν ὀμφαῖς. ἄρκεσις = ἐπάρκεσις is found in Sophocles.

188. These vv., which are cited in a prose abridgment, except v. 1, by Cedrenus, *Histor. Compend.* I 20, and Suidas, s. v. Θούλις, I would write conjecturally thus, slightly otherwise than as Herwerden, p. 87 :

πρῶτα θεός, μετέπειτα λόγος, καὶ πνεῦμα σὺν αὐτοῖς.  
 σύμφυτα ταῦτα δὲ πάντα καὶ εἰς ἓν ἰόντα τέτυκται.  
 οὐδ' κρείσσον εἰς αἰῶνα· σὺ δ' ὠκέσι ποσοὶ βάδιζε  
 θνητέ,

The rest of v. 4 is hardly recoverable from the words ἀδελον διανύων βίον of both Cedrenus and Suidas.

193. 1, spoken of Hecate :

Ἦδ' ἐγὼ εἰμι κόρη πολυφάσματος οὐρανόφαιτος.

Rather οὐρεσίφαιτος, Catullus' *cultrix montibus*. Christod. *Ecphr.* 306 Φοίβου οὐρεσίφαιτος ὁμόγυιος ἴστατο κούρη. Orph. *hymn.* I 7, to Hecate, Ἦγεμόνην, νύμφην, κουροτρόφον, οὐρεσιφοῖτιν.

194 (Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* V 7) :

οὐδὲν ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς ποτ' ἴαδείματον  
 οὐδ' ἀκράαντον ἔλεξε σοφοῖς Ἐκάτη θεοφύταις.

Couigny prints the usually received ποτε δια μάταιον, which is found in several MSS. I should prefer ποτε δείμα μάταιον.

200. 1, 2 (Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* V 15) :

τίς βροτὸς οὐ πεπόθηκε χαρακτήρας ὀπάσασθαι  
 χρυσοῦ καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου αἰγλήεντος ;

Herwerden conj. πάσασθαι = κτήσασθαι. I think it may be χαρακτήρ' ἀσπάσασθαι.

202. 1 (Philopon. *de Creat. Mundi*, IV 20) :

Λυέσθω φύσεως δεσμὰ ἵνα σοῖσι πίθωμαι

The balance of clauses points to ἐμὰ δέσμ' ἵνα σοῖσι π.

203 (Euseb. *Demonstr. Evang.* III 7). Gaisford has admirably restored this from the Paris MS, as follows :

ὅτι μὲν ἀθανάτη ψυχὴ μετὰ σῶμα προβαίνει  
 γινώσκεις· σοφίης τετμημένη αἰὲν ἀλάται.  
 ἀνερός εὐσεβίῃ προφερεστάτου ἐστὶν ἐκείνη  
 ψυχὴ.

It is inexcusable in Couigny not to have examined Gaisford's edition (Oxford, 1852).

216. 26, oracle ap. Phlegon. Mirabil. X :

σεμνήν Πλουτωνίδα παντοδίδακτοι  
ἐν πάτρᾳ εὐχέσθων μίμνεν.

παντοδίδακτοι should not be altered to παντοδίδακτον, an epithet not specially suited to Persephone. It refers to the careful training of the ministering priests in all the details of the cultus.

29-31 :

θησαυρὸν δ' ἕτεροι καὶ παρθένοι ἔνθα φερόντων  
ιστῶ θειοπαγεῖ νυμφάσματα ποικίλα σεμνήν  
Πλούτωνι κοσμίετο ὅπως σχεσίησι κακοῖσι.

29. *an* θησαυρόνδε? κόροι *pro* ἕτεροι *Emper*. 30. νυμφάσματα *in* καὶ ὑφάσματα *mutavit Emper* : *potest esse* ἐνυφάσματα. 31. *an* κοσμοῖντο *uel* κοσμοῖεν Πλουτωνίδ'? σχέσις ἦσι *Xylander*. κακοῖο *ex* 49 ὅπως λύσις ἦσι κακοῖο *reponendum erat*.

I make ἐνυφάσματα depend on ιστῶ θειοπαγεῖ, and suppose an asyndeton after ποικίλα. But the passage is very doubtful. Yet the pause after the fifth foot, ποικίλα, recurs in 38 λαμπροῖς εἵμασι κοσμητοῦ μετὰ ποιμένος, ὅστις.

47, 48 :

ἀτὰρ οἶδατε πάντες  
λίσσέσθω Φοῖβον Παίηονα.

Cougny translates οἶδατε as an imperative. Surely it is indic. 'you all know' = 'as you all know.'

50 sqq.:

ὑμνεῖν αἶ κε γένοι προφερέστεραι ὧσ' ἐν λαοῖς  
καὶ νήσων νάεται τὴν ἀντιπάλων ὅταν αἶαν  
οὐ δόλω ἀλλὰ βία Κυμαῖδα πρόφρονες αὐται (?)  
νάσσονται σεμνῆς βασιληίδος οἴσεταιίθενται  
55 ἐν πατρίοισι νόμοις Ἴηρας ξοανόν τε κατ' οἶκον.  
ἔξει δ' ἂν μύθοισιν ἐμοῖς τάδε πάντα τίθηνται  
σεμνοτάτην βασιλίσσαν ἐπέλθης ἐν θυσίαισιν.

Though the exact allusion in 51-3 is uncertain, it seems dangerous to alter the words τὴν ἀντιπάλων ὅταν αἶαν to τῶν ἀγχιάλων ὅταν εἶεν, as C. Müller suggested, *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* III, p. 620; for the construction of the words given in the MS tradition is at least coherent, καὶ νήσων νάεται ὅταν νάσσονται τὴν ἀντ. αἶαν, whereas, if Müller's conj. be received, it is difficult to see why εἶεν should be substituted for ὧσι, and not easy to elicit any quite satisfactory meaning from the verses following. Cougny seems to me to be

right here in his retention of the MS reading. But in the next vv. emendation is easier and comparatively sure. I would write οἶσι τιθῆται Ἐν πατρίοισι νόμοις Ἡρας ξόανόν τι κατ' οἶκον. And if οἶσι is right, it is probable that v. 52 ended with οὔτοι.

In 55 Emper altered τίθηνται to πίθηται, which is printed by Otto Keller in his edition of the Paradoxographi (1877, Teubner). This cannot be considered certain: τιθῆται might mean 'is instituted,' and is very much nearer τίθηνται. But σεμνοτάτην must contain something which connects with the v. preceding and gives a construction to ἐπέλθης: this is, I believe, Σεμνά τε τήν. The whole passage, then, I would write thus:

ὑμνεῖν αἶ κε γένοι προφερέστεραι ὄσ' ἐνὶ λαοῖς,  
καὶ νήσων ναέται, τὴν ἀντιπάλων ὅταν αἶαν,  
οὐ δόλω ἀλλὰ βία Κυμαῖδα, πρόφρονες οὔτοι  
νάσσωνται, σεμνῆς βασιλῆϊδος οἶσι τιθῆται  
ἐν πατρίοισι νόμοις Ἡρας ξόανόν τι κατ' οἶκον.  
ἕξει δ', ἂν μύθοισιν ἐμοῖς τάδε πάντα τιθῆται,  
σεμνά τε τὴν βασιλίσσαν ἐπέλθης ἐν θυσίαισιν.

The words οὐ δόλω ἀλλὰ βία Κυμαῖδα seem to imply that the territory had been violently seized by the Cumaeans, and that they had subsequently been dispossessed by the islanders (οὔτοι).

62 sqq.:

νηφαλίμων ἀρνῶν τε ταμῶν χθονίοις τάδε ῥέξον  
ἦμος ἂν ἦδη ἔχοις μεγάλητην οὐκ ἄπαντη  
ξεστοδύταν ξοάνησιν καὶ τᾶλλ' ὄσ' ἔλεξα σαφι  
65 ἐν πετάλοισιν ἐμοῖς ὑπὸ κερκίδος ἀμφὶ καλύπτρας  
ἕμερτός σε βάλεν γλαυκῆς ἐλάας πολυκάρπου  
ἀγλαὰ φύλλα λαβοῦσα λύσιν κακοῦ.

In 63 μεγάλητην can hardly be μεγάλην θεόν: it should contain ἀλοιτ- or ἀλειτ- (ἀλειεῖν): possibly the dative plur. μεγαλοίτισιν 'great sinners,' viz. females, who had violated the laws of chastity or marriage, and to whom Hera would be hostile (ἀνάντη), and therefore requiring propitiation (οὐκέτ'). The following v. may easily be restored: ξεστὰ δ' ὅταν ξόαν' ἦσι καὶ ἄλλ' ὄσ' ἔλεξα σαφηνῆ (σαφηνῆ, Alexander). 65, 66 are more doubtful, possibly ὑπὸ κερκίδος ἀμφὶ καλύπτρας ἕμερτοῖσι βαλεῖν κτλ. In this way the difficulty of λαβοῦσα is avoided: it could hardly be λαβόντα. βαλεῖν is the infinitive used for the imperative.

ROBINSON ELLIS.