

GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE

Καθηγητοῦ τοῦ Παν/μίου τοῦ Λονδίνου
(Birkbeck College)

TEXTUAL AND INTERPRETATIVE PROBLEMS IN HERMESIANAX*

First of all, we shall examine lines 3-6

.... ἐπλευσεν δὲ κακὸν καὶ ἀπειθέα χῶρον
ἐνθα Χάρων ἀκοὴν ἔλκεται εἰς ἄκατον
ψυχὰς οἰχομένων, λίμνη δ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν αὐτεῖ,
ρεῦμα διέκ μεγάλων ῥυομένη δονάκων.

These lines will be fully analysed by Miss Kobiliri in her commentary on *Hermesianax* which is in preparation: I shall confine myself to discussing line 4, where the epithet ἀκοὴν, referring to Charon's ship, has puzzled the critics. Innumerable conjectures have been proposed, none of which is convincing: no wonder they do not convince, since the epithet is perfectly sound. *Hermesianax*, as we shall see later, often employs glosses otherwise attested in Hesychius or the *Etymologicum Magnum*. We know that not only the Acheron was full of the noisy lamentations of the dead (Ἀχέροντα πολύστονον, Theocr. XVII, 47; πολυκλαύτου Ἀχέροντος, A.P. XVI, 270, 3; cf. Thes., s.v. πολύστονος), but also the ship of Charon itself: the dead loudly bewailed their fate, so much so that Hermes says, to

* This paper is the revised text of a seminar lecture which I gave at the Universities of Athens and Ioannina. I am very grateful to my colleagues Professor M. M. Kokolakis and M. Papathomopoulos for their kind invitation, which greatly honoured me. I am much indebted to them, as well as to my colleagues N. Livadaras and F. Kakridis, for many valuable suggestions. I have also profited from Professor E. Degani's acute criticism.

the dead embarked on Charon's ship (Luc. *Dial. Mort.* XX, §11): τι οἰμώξετε, ὦ μάταιοι; Now in *Et. Magn.* 51,24 we read that the adjective ἀκοός means ἐπήκοος, ἀκουστικός, "noisy" (cf. Thes. s. v. ἀκοός). Charon's ship, we may conclude, is described as "noisy" (ἀκοήν) because of the wailing of the dead it transported. Hermesianax has treated ἀκοός as an adjective with three terminations, cf. θοός, θοή, θοόν. Our conclusion is supported by the context: the noise made by the dead aboard the ship is echoed, we may add, by the noise made by the waves which the ship produces and which clash against the reeds (λίμνη δ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν ἄντει means "and the lake makes a noise in accompaniment", i.e. a noise accompanying the noise made by the wailing dead aboard the ship; the verb here is ἐπαυτέω in tmesis; all this will be discussed by Miss Kobiliri; cf. in particular Callim. *Hymn.* 3,58 μέγαλιν δὲ βοήν ἐπὶ Κύρνος ἄντει and *Hymn.* 2,102 ἐπηύθησε δὲ λαός).

We shall now examine lines 21-26

Φημί δὲ καὶ Βοιωτὸν, ἀποπρολιπόντα μελάνθηρ,
 Ἑσίοδον, πάσης ἥρανον ἱστορίας
 Ἀσκραίων ἐσικέσθαι ἔχων Ἑλικωνίδα κώμην
 ἐνθεν δγ' Ἑοῖην μνώμενος Ἀσκραϊκῇν
 πόλλ' ἐπαθεν, πάσας δὲ λόγων ἀνεγράψατο βίβλους,
 ὅμων ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἀνερχόμενος.

This passage presents two main problems, i.e. the participle ἔχων in 23, and the meaning of ἀνερχόμενος in 26. Since Hesiod himself states that he had to migrate, compelled by necessity,⁽¹⁾ the participle ἔχων is, in itself, perfectly apposite: "having", or "having had" (ἔχων) to go (ἐσικέσθαι) to the Heliconian village of the Ascræans. Ἐχων, in the sense under discussion and governing the infinitive ("having to go", or "having had

(1) "Hesiodus scripsit se paupertate coactum migravisse": C. Giarratano, *Hermesianactis fragmenta*, Milano 1905, *ad loc.*; it was universally known ("notum omnibus") that Hesiod had been compelled to emigrate ("Hesiodum patrium solum mutasse... necessitate coactum"): N. Bach, *Philetæ Coi, Hermesianactis Colophonii atque Phanoclis reliquiae*, Halle 1829, p. 129

to go”), is attested in Hellenistic and later prose (cf. Bauer, *Wört. N.T.*, s. v. *ἔχω*, 6b: “müssen”): it is as such a feature typical of Hermesianax’ style (I shall soon mention the many prosaic words and meanings of words which Hermesianax, like all Hellenistic poets, liked to employ) as well as contextually appropriate. However, the participle *ἔχων* in line 23, though contextually apposite, has been transformed into *ἔχονθ’* or *ἔχειν* by editors (conjectures listed in Giarratano’s apparatus), because the nominative *ἔχων* seems to be syntactically impossible: Ellenberger⁽²⁾ states that the nominative *ἔχων* is “verbum nullo modo explicandum”. Ludwig⁽³⁾ tried to save *ἔχων* by reading

Ἀσκραίων ἐσκέσθαι ἔχων <δ’> Ἑλικωνίδα κώμην: “I say that Hesiod... went to the land of the Ascræans; and, occupying the Heliconian village,...”

This alteration is regarded as a “palmar” emendation by Jurenka (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1902, col. 641), but is in reality impossible, for no less than two syntactical reasons. First of all, the preposition *ἐς* can govern the genitive (type *Il.* 24,160 *ἔξεν δ’ ἐς Πριάμοιο*) only when it is a preposition, but never when it is a preverb; moreover, the double *δέ* (*ἔχων δέ* in line 23, followed by *πάσας δέ* in line 25) would be grammatically impossible.

The nominative *ἔχων* governed by *φημί*, and the conjectured accusative *ἔχονθ’*, also governed by *φημί* are impossible (cf. footnote 2, for details). We are left with the slight alteration, favoured by many, of *ἔχων* into *ἔχειν*. However, even if we altered *ἔχων* into the infinitive *ἔχειν*, the

(2) O. Ellenberger, *Quaestiones Hermesianactaeae*, Diss. Giessen 1907, p. 35. One cannot of course explain *φημί... ἐσκέσθαι ἔχων* (instead of *ἔχοντα*) as an anacoluthon of the type described by Degani (*Lirici Greci*, Florence 1977, p. 50 f.), for two reasons. First of all, in such cases the participle is separated from the infinitive (e.g. *Il.* 2,350 ff., quoted in Kühner-Gerth II, p. 106), whereas here *ἔχων* is not separated from *ἐσκέσθαι*; secondly, in such cases the participle does not govern the infinitive (*ἔχων ἐσκέσθαι* = “having to go”): some scholars, in order to provide *ἐσκέσθαι* with a predicate participle, conjectured *ἐκόνθ’* Ἑλικωνίδα (*φημί... ἐσκέσθαι ἐκόνθ’* Ἑλικωνίδα “I say that he went voluntarily”), because the conjecture *ἔχονθ’* is contextually and grammatically impossible (cf. Bach, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*: *φημί... Ἡσίοδον... ἐσκέσθαι ἔχονθ’* Ἑλικωνίδα “I say that Hesiod, having to go...” is a sentence which remains interrupted in the context).

(3) A. Ludwig, *Coniectaneorum in Athenaeum fasc. II*, Königsberg 1902, p.4.

difficulties would not be over, because the declarative clause which would then be governed by φημί (φημί... Βοιωτόν... Ἡσίοδον... Ἀσκραίων ἐσικέσθαι ἔχειν Ἑλικωνίδα κώμην: "I say that the Boeotian Hesiod had to emigrate to the Heliconian village of the Ascræans") would constitute an absurd statement on the part of Hermesianax, as the critics have underlined: the emphatic φημί could only be used to introduce a declarative clause constituting a novel statement made by Hermesianax ("verbum... quum affirmationem in se contineat, novi quid vel miri inducat necesse est": Ilgen, quoted by Bach, *op. cit.*), whereas the fact that Hesiod had had to emigrate was "notum in vulgus" (Bach, *ibid.*).

Both difficulties, i.e. the absurdity which would be constituted by a declarative clause governed by φημί, and the participle in the nominative, ἔχων, are eliminated at one stroke if we remember that Hellenistic poets like to introduce, asyndetically, long parenthetical sentences of an explanatory nature.⁽⁴⁾

All we need, therefore, is to read

Φημί δὲ καὶ Βοιωτόν, ἀποπρολιπόντα μελάρηρην,
Ἡσίοδον, πάσης ἥρανον ἱστορίης
(Ἀσκραίων ἐσικέσθαι ἔχων Ἑλικωνίδα κώμην
ἔνθεν ὄγ' Ἡοίην μνώμενος Ἀσκραϊκὴν
πόλλ' ἔπαθεν, πάσας δὲ λόγων ἀνεγράψατο θίβλους,
ὑμνων ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἀνερχόμενος).

Φημί only governs the accusative Ἡσίοδον... ἀποπρολιπόντα... ἥρανον, not a declarative clause, and the sense is "I mention Boeotian Hesiod, master of all lore, who left his hall (having to emigrate to the Heliconian village of the Ascræans, he then [ἔνθεν] suffered many pangs, wooing Eoee, maid of Ascræa, and [δέ] wrote many books of stories, rising from the maid placed first [ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἀνερχόμενος])": ἀνερχόμενος "rising" will be discussed below. The word λόγων here means, as scholars agree, "rhapsodies".⁽⁶⁾ Hermesianax, in his catalogue of poets, strives, as

(4) Cf. e.g. Fr. Lapp, *De Callim. tropis et figuris*, Diss. Bonn 1965, p. 52 ff., 150 ff.; the model was of course Homer, cf. L. Friedlaender, *Nicanoris Περὶ Ἰλιακῆς στιγμῆς reliquiae*, p. 76 ff.

(6) For λόγοι="rhapsodies" cf. e.g. LSJ, s.v. λόγος, V, 1.

was compulsory for all authors of catalogues,⁽⁷⁾ to achieve variation, and introduces each poet in a new manner: here, he uses *φημί* with the accusative, in the sense "I mention Boeotian Hesiod". *Φημί* governing the accusative of a person is attested in Homer (*Il.* 5,184); if it was felt by Hermesianax, however, as a prosaic construction (cf. LSJ, s.v. *φημί*, II,7), its employment by the poet would be nothing unexpected, because Hermesianax, like all Hellenistic poets,⁽⁸⁾ employed many prosaic words, meanings of words and syntactical constructions. For the convenience of the reader I shall mention a few examples now: *ἀνέμῳ* in line 19 "by means of the wind of religious teaching" is a prosaic meaning of the noun, attested in Hellenistic and later prose, as I have shown elsewhere⁽⁹⁾; *καίῳ* with the genitive *Ναννοῦς*, in line 37, is attested in late prose (Charit. 4,6 *ἐκαίετο τῆς Καλλιπρόρης*), cf. Bach, *op. cit.*, ad line 37; *στελλομένην*, in line 52, has a meaning which, as we shall see, is attested in Hellenistic prose; *ἀνατείνομαι*, in line 29, is also used, as we shall see, in a meaning found in prose; the construction *αὐτός ἐστιν οὗτος*, in line 27, also pertains to prose, as we shall see; *βίος* "the public", in line 98, is also a prosaic meaning of the word *βίος*, and the same is the case with *ἀποτάσσομαι* (line 88) in the sense "renounce the world".

The participle *ἔχων* expresses here anteriority, "having had to emigrate": this feature is common in epic (cf. my observations in *Am. Journ. Phil.* 1975, p. 35), and is, of course, also attested in non-epic poetry (e.g. Parmeno 1,4 Powell, where *πίνων* means "having drunk"). The statement included in the bracket is, in sum, added asyndetically by Hermesianax as an explanatory parenthetical sentence, explaining, that is, why he mentions Hesiod in his catalogue of poets who were motivated by love to write their works.

(7) E.g. P. Händel, *Beobachtungen zur epischen Technik des Apollonios*, München 1954 (*Zetemata* 7), p. 16.

(8) Cf. e.g. G. Giangrande, *L' humour des Alexandrins*, Amsterdam 1975, p. 15 ff.; *JHS* 1975, p. 39, n. 27; p. 41, n. 30.

(9) *Boll. Ist. Fil. Class. Padova*, forthcoming: Hermesianax' *ἀνέμῳ* in this sense ("wind of divine inspiration") is paralleled by *ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας* at *Ephes.* 4,14, just as *λοιπὸν* "now" in Theocr. XXI, 61 is paralleled by *λοιπὸν* "now" at *Ev. Matth.* 26,45, and 2 *Ep. Tim.* 4,8 (cf. Gow, *ad loc.*).

Let us now proceed to the second difficulty, represented by ἀνερχόμενος in line 26. The problems presented by these lines are summarized by Defradas, *ad loc.*⁽¹⁰⁾: the critics have changed ἀνερχόμενος into ἀπαρχόμενος in the belief that "cette correction seule permet de comprendre les deux compléments ὕμνων ἐκ πρώτης παιδός 'commencer ses poèmes par le nom de la jeune fille comme premier mot'. Ceux qui adoptent le texte du manuscrit ἀνερχόμενος écrivent ὕμνων et comprennent 'en revenant toujours au même début'". As you can see from Defradas' statement, the difficulties are far from solved. To begin with, there is no need to alter ἀνερχόμενος into ἀπαρχόμενος, nor must we eliminate one of the two genitives, ὕμνων, by transforming it into ὕμνων: a verb of "beginning" (such as ἀπαρχόμενος) is not necessary to explain "les deux compléments", because we are faced with a typical case of double genitive (a very common Greek construction which I have dealt with in *Liv. Class. Monthly* 1977, p. 203; it occurs in Hermesianax himself, at line 86, ἐλίκων.... γεωμετρίας).

That is to say, in the phrase ὕμνων ἐκ πρώτης παιδός only the words ἐκ πρώτης παιδός are the "complément" of, are governed by, ἀνερχόμενος, whilst ὕμνων is governed by the genitive παιδός, the sense being "from the.. girl of the hymns", i.e. "from the girl sung in the hymns". The genitive ὕμνων, which all the critics agree is a synonym⁽¹¹⁾, in its context, of the λόγων mentioned in line 25, and denotes the single narrations constituting the Ἡοῖαι ("singulae narrationes," Giarratano, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*) is, in sum, not a "complément" of ἀνερχόμενος, but of παιδός. Having clarified that we are faced with a common or garden case of double genitive (ὕμνων ἐκ πρώτης παιδός "from the... girl of the hymns", i.e. "from the.. girl sung in the hymns"), let us now examine ἀνερχόμενος.

Since the "initium singularum narrationum" (Ellenberger, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*), i.e. the beginning of the single narrations which constitute the

(10) J. Defradas, *Les élégiaques grecs*, Paris 1962.

(11) On synonyms in Hellenistic poetry cf. e.g. *Mnemosyne* 1976, p. 145 f.; the employment of synonyms in Theocritus and in Hellenistic poets has been exhaustively studied by Dr. H. White and Dr. G. Chrissafis in their respective commentaries on Idyll XXIV and XXV (both in the press). Cf. my note in *JHS* 1975, p. 44, n. 36. The synonyms οἰνηρὴν and εἰδωλὸν occur in lines 54 and 55 of Hermesianax' elegy.

Ἡοῖαι, was the name of the girl loved by Hesiod, Ἡοίη, used as the formula ἦ οἴη; there is no doubt that πρώτης here means "placed first". But what can ἀνερχόμενος mean? Ἀνέρχομαι can mean either, less usually, "go back, return" (in this case ἀνα – having the sense "backwards"), or, more usually, "rise, ascend" (in this case, ἀνα – having the sense "upwards"). The critics have, so far, tried to force the less usual meaning into ἀνερχόμενος, but this is grammatically and contextually impossible. Ellenberger, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*, suggests interpreting the words ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἀνερχόμενος as "semper semperque revertens ad puellam", but the text has here ἐκ παιδὸς, not εἰς παῖδα. Gulick⁽¹²⁾, following Ellenberger, suggests "with a maiden as his theme at the beginning, and ever returning to a maiden", whilst Defradas (*op. cit.*) proposes the same interpretation ("commencer ses poèmes par le nom de la jeune fille comme premier mot... en revenant toujours au même mot"), but the notion "ever returning to a maiden", "en revenant toujours au même mot" is simply not present in the Greek text: the words ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἀνερχόμενος could mean, if ἀνερχόμενος meant "reverting", nothing but "reverting from the girl placed first".

Since, in conclusion, the meaning "reverting", "going back from" is impossible for ἀνερχόμενος here, we are left with the alternative meaning "rising, ascending". We shall see that this meaning is not only grammatically impeccable in the context, but indeed the correct one, or, to be more precise, the one which the context requires.

In order to understand the passage we must remember four factors. First of all: the notion of "achieving success", in Greek literature, was expressed by the notion of metaphorically "rising": this was a common *topos*, first attested in Hesiod, which has been recently studied by Bassett and Φ. Ι. Κακριδῆς⁽¹³⁾. Secondly, one of the *Leitmotive* in Hermesianax' elegy is that poets achieved success and metaphorically "rose", i.e. rose to fame, because of the poetry they wrote for the love of the girl they were

(12) Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists*, vol VI. London 1959, p. 221.

(13) Φ. Ι. Κακριδῆς, *Κόιντος Σμυρναῖος*, Athens 1962, p. 54 f.; achieving success was metaphorically envisaged as "rising", as "ascending"; cf., on the *topos*, Bassett, "The Hill of Success", *Class. Journ.* 20, 1925, p. 414 ff.

enamoured of. Antimachus, as we shall see, rose to success because he wrote poems in honour of his beloved Lyde. Thirdly: ἀνέρχομαι, in Greek, means "rise, ascend", "heraufkommen, hinaufgehen" (Bauer, *Wört. N. T.*, s.v.). Fourthly: metaphors, in Greek, are often expressed by one noun or one verb, used on its own⁽¹⁴⁾. In lines 44f. ἄκρον ἐς κολοφῶνα denotes, as we shall see, not a real "collis", "fastigium", but the metaphorical "hill of success" which Antimachus ascended. Here, the metaphorical rising to fame of Hesiod is expressed by the verb ἀνερχόμενος, "rising". In conclusion: given the fact that achieving fame as a poet was envisaged as a metaphorical rising which was a common *topos*; given the fact that Hesiod rose to fame because of the poetry he wrote in honour of the girl whose name was placed first, at the beginning of the "narrationes" which constituted his poem; given the fact that a metaphorical *topos* could be expressed, in Greek, by one verb or by one noun, we can conclude that the words ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἀνερχόμενος mean here "rising (i.e. rising to fame) from the girl placed first (in his narrations)".

To sum up. Ἀνέρχομαι ἐκ, in Greek, means (cf. LSJ, s.v. ἀνέρχομαι, I) "go up, rise from", not "revert, go back to". Accordingly, the Greek phrase ἐκ πρώτης παιδὸς ἀνερχόμενος can only mean "going up, ascending, rising from the girl placed first". Is this meaning contextually possible? Not only is it possible, it is just the one which the context requires, as I hope I have demonstrated.

Let us now proceed to Homer, who is mentioned in lines 27-32:

Αὐτὸς δ' οὗτος ἀοιδός, δν ἐκ Διὸς αἶσα φυλάσσει,
 ἥδιστον πάντων δαίμονα μουσοπόλον·
 λεπτὴν δ' εἰς Ἰθάκην ἀνετείνεται θεῖος Ὀμηρος
 ᾠδῆσιν, πινυτῆς εἵνεκα Πηνελόπης,
 ἦν διὰ πολλὰ παθὼν ὀλίγην ἐσενάσσατο νῆσον,
 πολλὸν ἀπ' εὐρείης λειπόμενος πατρίδος·

(14) For a verb on its own, used metaphorically (as ἀνερχόμενος here) to express an established *topos* (such as, here, the *topos* of metaphorically rising, to indicate achieving fame), cf. *Ant. Class.* 1973, p. 525, n. 13, *Quad. Urb.* 15, 1973, p. 28; *Zu Sprachgebr. des Apollonios*, p. 6 (χέω, with reference to a metaphorical monument, which is envisaged as metaphorically "erected"), p. 37f. (τρέψαιο).

ἔκλαιε δ' Ἰκάρου τε γένος, καὶ δῆμον Ἀμύκλου,
καὶ Σπάρτην, ἰδίῳ ἀπτόμενος παθέων.

In order to introduce Hesiod, Hermesianax used a couplet (21-22), followed by a syntactically separate (in the form of a parenthesis) unit of four lines, in which he describes what motivated Hesiod to write poetry, i.e. Hesiod's love for a woman. The same procedure is adopted by Hermesianax in order to deal with Homer: Homer is introduced by a couplet (27-28), which is then followed by four lines, constituting an independent unit (insofar as introduced by δέ: λεπτήν δέ), in which Homer's motivation to write poetry—Homer's love for Penelope—is described. The construction in line 27, αὐτὸς δ' οὗτος ἀοιδός, δν "here is now the very poet whom" is prosaic, as was already pointed out by Ellenberger, *ad loc.*: the complete construction should be αὐτὸς δ' <ἔστι> οὗτος ἀοιδός, δν (cf. Plato, *Tim.* 19 Α αὐτὰ ταῦτ' ἦν τὰ λεχθέντα, Aristoph. *Ach.* 239 οὗτος αὐτὸς ἔστιν δν ζητοῦμεν): here we have the ellipse of ἔστι, the most common, indeed almost compulsory, ellipse in Greek poetry⁽¹⁵⁾. After saying "here is the bard himself, whom the decree of Zeus ordains to be the servant of the Muses (μουσοπόλον) sweetest of all (ἡδιστον πάντων) and divine (δαίμονα)" [the two epithets ἡδιστον and δαίμονα are coupled asyndetically and both refer to the substantive ὕμνοπόλον: this is a common Hellenistic feature, cf. *J.H.S.* 1975, p. 35, n. 12], Hermesianax proceeds: "the divine Homer (θεῖος⁽¹⁶⁾ Ὀμηρος)..." The new sentence, starting in line 29, is correctly introduced by δέ; the adjective λεπτήν is defended by its synonym ὀλίγην in line 31: both synonyms are in pointed opposition to εὐρείης in line 32. The only difficulty is represented by ἀνετείνετο. Most critics tend to defend ἀνετείνετο by interpreting it as "he went": but, as has been correctly observed (e.g. Ellenberger *ad loc.*; Bergk, *Kl. Philol. Schriften*, vol. II, Halle 1886, p. 172), ἀνατείνομαι never means "go" in Greek, and, moreover, the notion "he went to Itha-

(15) Cf. e.g. O. Knauer, *Die Epigr. des Asklepiades*, Diss. Tübingen 1935, p. 39 and 53; Gow, *Theocritus*, vol. II, *Index*, s.v. *Ellipses*, ii, *copula.*; in a paper "Textual Problems in Theocritus Idyll XXI (*Antiq. Class.* 1978, in the press) I have analysed several cases of ellipse of ἔστι in Theocritus.

(16) Note the synonyms δαίμονα and θεῖος.

ca" is already explicitly expressed by ἐσενάσσατο νῆσον in line 31, so that ἀνετείνετο cannot mean "went". To boot, the notion "he went to Ithaca together with his poems" (ᾠδῆσιν) is "*praepostera*", as noted by Bergk: Homer went to Ithaca in order to write his poems there, as is made clear by lines 33-34. Bergk has already realized that the context requires lines 29 f. to mean "divine Homer mentioned, dealt with, in his poems, the island of Ithaca, for love of wise Penelope". It is well known, in fact, that Homer describes the island so much in detail "ut putandus sit Homerus non omnino ignorasse naturam regionis", as critics ancient and modern have maintained (cf. Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.*, s.v. Ἰθάκη); Hermesianax, true to his attempt to employ every piece of evidence possible in order to transform Homer into a love-poet, utilizes Homer's familiarity with Ithaca in order to prove that Homer described the island because he was in love with Penelope, who lived there. Bergk is perfectly right, but there is no need to transform the mss. reading into ἐνετείνετο in order to obtain the meaning "mentioned", as he proposes: ἀνατείνομαι εἰς, πρὸς literally means "direct oneself towards" (Thes., s.v., 582), and can be used precisely in the sense "make reference to" (Lampe, *Patr. Lexicon*, s.v.); this sense is attested in later prose. I have already underlined that words, or meanings of words, otherwise only attested in later prose not seldom first occur in Hellenistic poets.

In lines 41-46 we meet Antimachus:

Λύδης δ' Ἀντίμαχος Λυσηίδος ἐκ μὲν ἔρωτος
 πληγείς, Πακτωλοῦ ρεῦμ' ἐπέβη ποταμοῦ
 Δαρδάνη δὲ θανοῦσαν ὑπὸ ξηρὴν θέτο γαῖαν
 κλαίων, αἰζᾶν δ' ἦλθεν ἀποπρολιπὼν
 ἄκρον ἐς κολοφῶνα· γόων δ' ἐνεπλήσατο βίβλους
 ἱεράς, ἐκ παντὸς παυσάμενος καμάτου.

Since the scribe of A is just as casual in wrongly omitting or wrongly adding the ι, when he writes η, as all scribes are, there is no doubt that Δαρδάνη (or, as we shall see, Δαρδανίη) here is meant to be Δαρδάνη or Δαρδανίη. The only reason why scholars object to this word is that "the Dardanian land" seems to be out of place in the context. Let us first of all examine the context.

As usual, a couplet coming first (41-42) is followed by four lines, syntactically separate from the first couplet and connected with it by means of the particle δέ (Δαρδάνη δέ). It would be very easy to correct Δαρδάνη into Δαρδανίη: since the sound of ι and η was the same, it could well be that a scribe, by mistake, spelled Δαρδάνη instead of Δαρδανίη, which latter form Hermesianax wrote (cf. e.g. line 90, where Hermesianax' σοφίη was spelt by the scribe, in error, σόφη). However, given the fact that the forms Δαρδάνιος and Δάρδανος are interchangeable (cf. Thes. s. v. Δαρδάνιος; Pape-Benseler, *Wört. Eigenn.*, s.v. Δαρδάνιος and Δάρδανοι), it could well be that Hermesianax has preferred here the spelling Δαρδάνη. If he wrote Δαρδανη, he scanned, of course, Δαρδάνη: Hellenistic poets were fond of such scansion, in proper and geographical names (cf. e.g. M. Schneider, *De Dionys. Perieg. arte metrica et gramm.*, Diss. Leipzig 1882, p. 12 f., for interchange between \check{a} and \bar{a} cf. also Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.*, on lines 420, 1299f., 1447 Μυτιλᾶνα, Ἄρητος Ἄρητος, Ἰάλυσος): in line 33, Hermesianax has preferred the rarer spelling Ἰκάρου to the more common spelling Ἰκαρίου⁽¹⁷⁾, and consequently he scanned Ἰκάρου. There is no doubt that the events described in the lines under discussion occurred in Lydia, where the Pactolus flows: we shall discuss the details soon. Why, if Λύδη died and was buried on the banks of the Pactolus, in Lydia, is she said by Hermesianax to have died in Δαρδανίη? This problem has baffled the critics, who have tried to remove the puzzling Δαρδανίη by conjecture. The text is, in reality, sound. The point is that Hermesianax is talking about heroic, olden times, when poets such as Antimachus lived. Hermesianax' chronology is of course shaky: he makes, for instance, Anacreon a contemporary of Sappho (cf. Gulick, *op. cit.*, p. 598, n.g). Hellenistic poets, when referring to towns or regions as they were in the heroic past, in the olden times, call such regions according to the Homeric, or old, toponymy as distinct from the more recent one (cf. my observations in *Liv. Class. Monthly*, 1976, p. 11ff.). Now, in the olden times, as we learn from *schol. T* on *Il.* XVIII, 291, the region later called

(17) The name Ἰκάριος is also attested (cf. Pape-Benseler, s.v. Ἰκάριος) in the rarer form Ἰκαρος, which latter Hermesianax preferred to reproduce in his poem. Cf. J. Bailey, *Hermesianactis fragmentum*, London 1839, p. 41: "sic alii quoque in hoc nomine variant".

Λυδία did not yet have such a name, and was envisaged as part of Φρυγία or Τρωάς (it was "mit unter Rhrygien verstanden", cf. Pape-Benseler, *Wört. Eigenn.*, s.v. Λυδία). Since Δαρδανίη is one of the Homeric, older names of Φρυγία or Τρωάς, Hermesianax uses here Δαρδανίη as the Homeric, older name to denote precisely the region called Λυδία in later times. Now let us examine the rest of the passage. Πακτωλοῦ ῥεῦμα ἐπέβη cannot possibly mean "trod the ground where the Pactolus river flows", as suggested by Gulick (*op. cit.*, *ad loc.*): Πακτωλοῦ ῥεῦμα (cf. Nonn. *Dionys.* 25,332 Πακτωλοῦ χεῦμα; for phrases like τὸ τοῦ Νείλου ῥεῦμα="the river Nile" cf. Thes. s. v. ῥεῦμα) can only mean, in Greek, the river itself, so that the phrase means that Antimachus, on a boat, "entered the river Pactolus", "sailed up the Pactolus". Ξηρὴ γαῖα, in Greek, denotes the *terra firma*, the banks of a river as opposed to the water of the river concerned (cf. LSJ, s.v. ξηρός, III): here, ξηρὴν γαῖαν, as opposed to the Πακτωλοῦ ῥεῦμα denotes the banks of the Pactolus. Lyde was, in sum, buried on the banks of the river Pactolus. Such banks were regarded as "heights" (Πακτωλὶς δχθη Nonn. *Dionys.* 21,148; 41,86). Now let us consider lines 44-45. The first word, καλλιῶν, has been correctly restored to κλαίων by Ilgen, whom everybody follows⁽¹⁸⁾. All the critics agree that, the structure being chiasmic, αἰζᾶν must be governed by ἀποπρολιπών, and κολοφῶνα by ἤλθεν. The sense is clearly that Antimachus, having left (ἀποπρολιπών) the river bank in Lydia where he had buried Lyde, went to ἄκρον κολοφῶνα, and sang his deceased mistress, thereby acquiring fame as a poet. What can the phrase ἐς ἄκρον κολοφῶνα mean? We are faced with a typical case of Hellenistic ambiguity, of the type studied by Lapp, *op. cit.*, p.99 ff. and more recently by me in *Quad. Urbin.* 24, 1977, p. 97ff., and *Arca* II p. 279 ff. In this type of ambiguity, the Hellenistic poet's lexical traps are usually based on the fact that the relevant word used by the poet at first sight appears to have a meaning which is contextually absurd, but upon closer examination the word concerned reveals itself to have precisely the meaning required by the context.

(18) Cf. e.g. Giarratano, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.* Defradas, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.* A typical case of *Verschlimmbesserung*: ΚΛΑΙΩΝ became ΚΑΛΙΩΝ, which latter was mistakenly "corrected" into ΚΑΛΛΙΩΝ.

In the case under discussion the reader, finding κολοφῶνα, thinks that Hermesianax is alluding to the town of Colophon, where Antimachus lived—the sense of the passage seems to be that Antimachus went from Lydia to Colophon: but the epithet ἄκρον has presented hitherto two difficulties. First of all, the town of Colophon (cf. Bach, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*) is of the feminine gender, so that one would expect ἄκρην here, and in fact the critics, falling into the trap set by Hermesianax, have altered ἄκρον into ἄκρην. This difficulty, however, is not insurmountable, because one could take ἄκρον, here, to be an adverb referring, instead of the attribute ἄκρην, to the town of Colophon (cf. LSJ, s.v. ἄκρος, V, and especially Degani, *op. cit.*, p. 40). The second difficulty is insurmountable: the attribute ἄκρην (or the adverb ἄκρον) referring to the town of Colophon is contextually meaningless. Even if the town of Colophon were situated on a height—which is not the case—why should Antimachus be said to have gone “to the top, to the summit of the town of Colophon”? Because of this difficulty, West (cf. N.X. Κονομῆς, *Ἕλληνες Ἐλεγειακοί*, Thessaloniki 1975, p. 66), falling even more deeply into the trap set by Hermesianax, did worse than those critics who merely altered ἄκρον into ἄκρην: he went as far as to obliterate ἄκρον altogether, changing it into ἀθρήν. But masculine κολοφών, in Greek, means “collis”, “fastigium”, and can denote as such either a real height, or the metaphorical summit of fame and excellence⁽¹⁹⁾. Here the sense is that Antimachus, after his girl friend died, reached the top (ἄκρον) of the summit of excellence (κολοφῶνα) because (δέ, in γόων δ' ἐνεπλήσατο βίβλους, is explanatory: explanatory δέ is, of course, exceedingly frequent in Hellenistic poetry: cf. e.g. Rumpel, *Lex. Theocr.*, s.v. δέ, 2: “explicantis superiora”: in this case, δέ, in γόων δ' ἐνεπλήσατο βίβλους, explains the preceding words ἦλθεν ἄκρον ἐς κολοφῶνα, “reached the top of the summit”) he wrote, after her death and not before, the poems which made him famous and made him reach the top.

(19) Cf. Bach, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.* who, however, after noting that masculine κολοφών means “collis”, “fastigium”, falls into Hermesianax' trap and alters ἄκρον into ἄκραν; cf. also Thes., s.v. κολοφών; Pape-Benseler, *Wört. Eigenn.*, s.v. Κολοφών. The adjective ἄκρος, destroyed by West in Hermesianax' line, was, I need hardly add, a regular ingredient of the *topos* “hill of success”: cf. Hes. *Op.* 291 ἐπὶ δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται (Κακριδῆς, *op. cit.*, p. 55).

For the benefit of those not familiar with Hellenistic and later poetry, I should perhaps add that Hermesianax' scanning of —ov (in ἄκρον, line 45) as a long in thesis is an instance of a feature well attested in post-Homeric poetry (cf. Rzach, *Neue Beitr.*, p. 8, 17, 81, 103 with two examples, 109 f.). The attestations were eliminated by critics such as Rzach, but it is clear that post-Homeric poets used this feature in order to reproduce what they saw as a Homeric rarity (cf. e. g. Spitzner, *De versu graec.*, p. 81: e.g. Hom. *Od.* 8,215. Now to the word αἰζᾶν, which, according to the critics, is "sine sensu" (so Defradas, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*). We know that Hermesianax, like all Hellenistic poets, uses glosses otherwise attested only in Hesychius or the *Etymologicum Magnum* (Ellenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 33, 71). Now, in Hesychius, we find the word αἰζᾶς said to denote "heights" (αἰζᾶν ὄρων ὑψηλῶν).⁽²⁰⁾ The sense is now clear: Antimachus had buried Lyde on the river bank, which was an ὄρη, a "height": having left the αἰζᾶς, the "height", the ὄρη where she was buried, he proceeded to reach the other "height", "fastigium", "collis", i.e. poetic fame.

The κολοφῶνα mentioned by Hermesianax is, we may conclude, not a real "collis", a real "height", but the metaphorical "collis", the metaphorical "hill of success" which we have already mentioned when discussing lines 25f., where Hesiod's rising to fame is mentioned by Hermesianax. This time, to indicate the topos whereby achieving success was envisaged as a metaphorical rising, Hermesianax has employed not one verb on its own, as he employed ἀνερχόμενος on its own in line 26, but one noun on its own, namely κολοφῶνα: for such employment of nouns to denote metaphorical topoi cf. *Eranos* 1970, p. 87ff.; *Philologus* 1973, p. 111, n. 7.

In lines 51 ff. we read how Anacreon wooed Sappho:

Καὶ γὰρ τὴν ὁ μελιχρὸς ἐφωμίλῃς Ἀνακρεῖων
στελλομένην πολλαῖς ἄμμιγα Λεσθιάσιν,
φοῖτα δ' ἄλλοτε μὲν λείπων Σάμον, ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτὴν
οἴνηρὴν δούρι ἔν κεκλιμένην πατρίδα,

(20) Cf. Thes. s.v. αἰζᾶς. Forms in α, of course, were most welcome in Epic (cf. *Hermes* 1970, p. 257 ff.), so that Hermesianax could utilize the gloss αἰζᾶς without any difficulty. Cf. especially G. Hermann, *Opuscula*, Hildesheim 1970, volume IV, p. 245.



Λέσθον ἐς εἰδονον, τὸ δὲ μύριον εἶσιδε λέκτρον
πολλάκις Αἰολικοῦ κύματος ἀντιπέρας.

The phrase *πολλάκις ἄμμιγα Λεσθίαισιν* has been correctly understood as "multis circumfusa puellis" (cf. Giarratano *ad loc.*). On the other hand, *στελλομένην* has until now not been explained: no explanation suggested by the critics can be paralleled from Greek usage. Yet the correct explanation is easy: in Hellenistic Greek (cf. Bauer, *Wört. N.T.*, s.v. *στέλλω*), *στέλλομαι* means "try to avoid", "shy away from", "keep away from". Sappho, says the malevolent Hermesianax, was a homosexual, i.e. a woman only interested in female lovers (*πολλάκις ἄμμιγα Λεσθίαισιν* and therefore avoided Anacreon's attentions. The epithet *εἰδονον* reveals itself, now, as very ironic: Anacreon, the bibulous poet *par excellence*, cannot but have been born in a wine-growing region (*οἰνηρήν*); *εἰδονον* is not an "avantage susceptible, outre la présence de Sappho, d'attirer Anacréon" (Defradas, *ad loc.*): *εἰδονον* denotes the *only* "avantage" available to the unfortunate Anacreon. Since Sappho kept spurning him, he kept going (the imperfect *φοῖτα* denotes repetition!) to the island of Lesbos because at least he could drink wine there no less easily than in his own town, Teos, which was *οἰνηρή*. Now we can understand the words *μύριον λέκτρον*, changed by the critics who could not comprehend them. The critics, that is, asked themselves: a) what is this bed (*λέκτρον*), seeing that we are dealing here with the promontory called *Λεκτόν*? and, b) : why should this bed be *μύριον*, "gigantic"? Not being able to answer these two questions, the critics rashly proceeded to alter both words, *μύριον* as well as *λέκτρον*. The critics are wrong: there is no doubt that *λέκτρον* here denotes the promontory called *Λεκτόν*, which is opposite Lesbos (*κύματος ἀντιπέρας*). However, it would be unwarranted to alter *λέκτρον* into *Λεκτόν*, because Hermesianax is here offering a very apposite etymological word-game. The name of the promontory *Λεκτόν* was explained by ancient grammarians as being *λέκτρον*, "bed", *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ κατακλιθῆναι Δία καὶ Ἥραν*. (material in Thes., s.v. *Λεκτόν*). Gods being believed to be of gigantic proportions, the whole promontory was envisaged as a gigantic (*μύριον*) bed (*λέκτρον*). Anacreon, frustrated at his not being able to go to bed with Sappho, often (*πολλάκις*) looked, in his frustration, at the gigantic bed opposite him, on the other side of the sea. This is a

typically Hellenistic piece of grammatical humour, based on the etymology of a place-name such as Λεκτόν. We may conclude: the words μύριον and λέκτρον, both of which have been objected to by the critics, support and explain each other, and reveal themselves to be both perfectly sound, indeed the basis of Hermesianax' humorous point.

We shall now find the counterpart of homosexual Sappho. In lines 63ff. we read that Euripides, the notorious hater of women

...ὕπο σκολιοῖο τυπέντα
τόξου, νυκτερινὰς οὐκ ἀποθέσθ' ὀδύνας·
ἀλλὰ Μακεδονίης πάσας κατενίστατο λαύρας,
Αἰγείων μέθεπε δ' Ἀρχελάφ ταμίην.

The words Αἰγείων μέθεπε δ' Ἀρχελάφ ταμίην literally mean "and ran after (μέθεπε δέ) the administrator (ταμίην) of the Aegeans (Αἰγείων) on behalf of, in the service of, Archelaus (Ἀρχελάφ)".⁽²¹⁾

The critics have realized all this (cf. e.g. Bach, *op. cit. ad loc.*), but could not understand why Euripides should be running after a man, and consequently changed Hermesianax' words. The fact is that Euripides hated women, as Hermesianax has underlined in lines 61ff.: consequently, he was struck by homosexual love, ὑπό σκολιοῖο τυπέντα τόξου: σκολιός, in this context, means "homosexual", as I have shown in analysing the epigram A.P. VII, 29:

Εὐδεις ἐν φθιμένοισιν, Ἀνάκρεον, ἐσθλὰ πονήσας,
εὐδαι δ' ἢ γλυκερὴ νυκτιάλως κιθάρη.
εὐδαι καὶ Σμέρδης, τὸ Πόθων ξαρ, φ' σὺ μελίσδων
θάρβιτ' ἀνεκροῦ νεκταρ ἐναρμόνιον.

(21) For the dative Ἀρχελάφ cf. Thes. s.v. ταμίας, 1798f.; Mayser, *Gramm. Pap.* II, 2/2,1, Berlin Leipzig 1933, p. 270, for the dative "in the service of" as a Hellenistic construction. The particle δέ, in Αἰγείων μέθεπε δέ, stands third, as in Λέσθιος Ἀλκατος δέ, line 47. There is no need to alter μέθεπε into μέθεπεν: cf. Fr. T. Friedemann, *Diss. de media syllaba pentamentri* (in F. Spitzner, *De versu graec. heroico*, Leipzig 1806, p. 269 ff.), and *Entr. Hardt* XIV, Geneva 1969, p. 158, n. 2 and p. 173. For the scanning Ἀρχελάφ cf. Miss Kobiliri's commentary *ad loc.*

ἡτθέων γὰρ Ἔρωτος ἔφυς σκοπός, εἰς δὲ σὲ μόνον
τόξα τε καὶ σκολιάς εἶχεν ἐκηβολίας.

Σκολιάς ἐκηβολίας means here "homosexual love", cf. *Class. Rev.* 1967, 19f. Note that the construction φημί with the accusative and infinitive

Φημί κάκεῖνον ἄνδρα... σκολιοῖο τυπέντα τόξου... οὐκ ἀποθέσθ' ὀδύνας

"I declare that..." is perfectly apposite: Hermesianax' declaration is here either an insinuation invented by him, or a piece of information not generally known, so that the use of φημί, in the construction under discussion, can certainly be said, in this case, to introduce "*novi quid vel miri*" (cf. Bach, *op. cit.*, p. 129).

The insertion of Euripides' love for a man is in keeping with what we know about Hermesianax' elegy. The poem, which Athenaeus correctly calls, "a catalogue of love-affairs" (*Deipn.* XIII, a-b: κατάλογον ἐρωτικῶν) has as its *Leitmotiv* the demonstration of the fact that neither poets nor philosophers could escape "amoris vim" (Giarratano, *op. cit.*, p. XIII): like Pythagoras and Aristippus, who were stern philosophers but ended by yielding to love (lines 85 f., 95ff.), so Euripides, who was stern enough to hate women, did not escape "amoris vim" and became enamoured of a man. It is already known that Hermesianax, in the books of elegies of which the fragment we are examining forms part, inserted examples of "puerorum quoque amorem" into lists of ladies loved by famous men or heroes (Bach, *op. cit.*, p. 97): the insertion of Euripides' homosexual love at lines 63ff. is a case in point. Euripides' homosexual love-affairs are well known (Plut., *Erot.* 24; Ael., *V.H.* 13,4; Athen. XIII, 604, E), but his love-affair narrated by Hermesianax in the lines we have discussed is not attested elsewhere.

In lines 77f. we read of Philitas' love for Bittis:

Βίτιδα μολπάζοντα θοήν, περὶ πάντα Φιλητᾶν
ρήματα καὶ πᾶσαν ρυόμενον λαλίην

The epithet θοήν has caused difficulties to the critics, who have alter-

ed it by conjecture. There is no need to alter it: according to ancient lexicographers* (Hesychius: *θοήν μεγάλην*; *Et. Magn.* 453, 6ff.) *θοός* could mean, amongst other things, also "excellent" (*ἀγαθός*) or "tall", "big" (*μέγας*): since being *μεγάλη* was an essential attribute of female beauty (cf. lastly Gomme-Sandbach, *Menander*, p. 508) there is no doubt that Hermesianax has, *hellenistico more*, used *θοή* in one of its rarer meanings here, in the sense, that is, *μεγάλη*, "tall",⁽²²⁾ or *ἀγαθή*, "excellent" (cf. *πινυτής Πηνελόπης*, line 30). If Bittis was a singer, like Nanno, *θοήν* could here mean "skilled in singing" (cf. *Mus. Phil. Lond.* II, p. 162, n. 37). Far from being incomprehensible, in sum, *θοήν* is capable of even more than one apposite explanation.

In lines 85 ff. we meet Pythagoras enamoured:

- 85 Οἷη μὲν Σάμιον μανίη κατέδησε Θεανοῦς
 Πυθαγόρην, ἐλίκων κομπᾶ γεωμετρίας
 εὐράμενον καὶ κύκλον ὅσον περιβάλλεται αἰθῆρ
 88 ῥίθις† ἐν σφαίρῃ πάντ' ἀποτασόμενον.

What can the sense of lines 87 f. be? The word *θίης*, which cannot scan, was emended to *γαίης* by Kaibel. His emendation can be improved upon, from the palaeographical point of view. Confusion between *αι* and *ι* is common in manuscripts (cf. Bach, *op. cit.*, p. 171). However, confusion between *θ* and *γ* is not common. On the other hand, confusion between *α* and *θ* is frequent (cf. Bast, *Comm. Pal., Index*, s.v. "α et θ confusa"). Since Hellenistic poets, as I have underlined (*Class. Rev.* 1970, p. 156) used *αἶα* instead of *γαῖα*, there is no doubt that Hermesianax wrote *αἷης* here: for

(22) One thinks of Mimnermus' *μεγάλη γυνή* in Callim. *fr.* 1, 11ff. Pf. W. Kuchenmüller (*Phil. Reliq.*, Diss. Berlin 1928, p. 25 ff.; cf. RE, s.v. *Philetas*, 2166, 42 ff.) thinks that we should change the mss. reading *Βίτιδα* into *βάτιδα*, and interpret the word as *γλωσσα*. He maintains (*op. cit.*, p. 28, with n.1) that *θοήν*, in Hermesianax' line, can somehow be referred to *θίτιδα*=*γλωσσα*, because he thinks that, according to the scholiast on Simias' *Ovum*, *θοός* refers to the god Hermes representing language, "sermo": but in the *scholia* on the *Ovum* the adjective *θοός* is clearly understood as referring to the god's speedy feet, not to the language (*τὴν τῶν ποδῶν ὁρμήν*: cf. H. Fränkel, *De Simia Rhodio*, Diss. Göttingen 1905, p. 87).

αἶα in the same *sedes*, i.e. at the beginning of the line, cf. Leonidas, *A.P.* IX, 346, 1. Kaibel's interpretation of Hermesianax' passage is wrong, because he misunderstood ἀποτασσόμενον. I shall try to demonstrate that the phrase κύκλον... αἶης ἐν σφαίρῃ is perfectly accurate astronomical terminology, and what is more, that the phrase is precisely what is required by Hermesianax' context, by offering the right explanation of ἀποτασσόμενον, which participle is the clue to the whole passage, and which until now scholars have failed to comprehend.

Most of them translate "orbem, quantum aether cingit, exigua in sphaera digessit" (Giarratano, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*): but ἀποτάσσομαι never means "arrange in order" ("digessit"), in Greek. Others, to avoid this difficulty, have altered ἀποτασσόμενον into ἀπομασσόμενον: thus they have created the sense "modelling in a small globe the mighty circuit of the enveloping aether".

There is no need to force into ἀποτασσόμενον a meaning which the verb does not have in Greek, nor must we alter the participle ἀποτασσόμενον. It was a common *topos* that Pythagoras led a monastic life, far from the temptations of the flesh. Now, ἀποτάσσομαι, used either with τῷ θίῳ or absolutely (Hermesianax has used the verb absolutely here) means, precisely, "renounce the world". "lead a monastic and eremitical life" (cf. Lampe, *Fatr. Lexicon*, s.v. ἀποτάσσομαι II D, esp. 4; Thes., s.v. ἀποτάσσω, 1974 D). Secondly, we must observe that scholars agree on the fact that Hermesianax is alluding here to Anaximandrian-Pythagorean theories (cf. Bach, *op. cit.*, p. 170) according to which the earth was surrounded by a sphere: the earth's sphere in question enveloped the outermost layer of the air above the earth, so that the air could be breathed (σφαίραν περιφυῆναι τῷ περὶ τὴν γῆν ἀέρι κ.τ.λ.: Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokr.*, I, seventh ed., p. 83, 35f.). The earth, with its air, was contained inside the earth's sphere, inside the "Weltkugel": τὰ ἐν τῇ σφαίρᾳ... καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡρ: Diels-Kranz, *op. cit.*, I, p. 412, 16 ff.).

It has thus become evident that we must punctuate as follows:
 Πυθαγόρην, ἐλίκων κομψὰ γεωμετρίας
 εὐράμενον καὶ κύκλον ὅσον περιβάλλεται αἰθῆρ
 αἶης ἐν σφαίρῃ, πάντ' ἀποτασσόμενον.

The words αἴης ἐν σφαίρῃ are in enjambement, and are as such governed by περιβάλλεται, not by ἀποτασσόμενον, which is used here absolutely (enjambement is common in Hermesianax, although he also has conceptually self-contained pentameters, such as 32, 66, 68, which are not connected by enjambement with the preceding hexameter.

The sense is "Pythagoras, who had discovered (εὐράμενον) the niceties of the spirals of geometry (ἐλίκων κομψὰ γεωμετρίας: another double genitive, like ὕμνων πρώτης παιδός!) and the circuit that the aether envelops (κύκλον ὅσον περιβάλλεται αἰθήρ; note Hermesianax' accuracy: αἰθήρ is the outermost layer of ἀήρ, the layer which is, in its turn, enveloped, by, contained in, the earth's sphere, the "Weltkugel"!) inside the earth's sphere (αἴης ἐν σφαίρῃ: this σφαῖρα surrounds the αἰθήρ!) and who was leading a life of absolute monasticism (πάντ' ⁽²³⁾ ἀποτασσόμενον⁽²⁴⁾)".

The two participles εὐράμενον and ἀποτασσόμενον are in correspondence and joined asyndetically—this is a common construction in Greek⁽²⁵⁾, used by Hermesianax in lines 31-32 παθών... λειπόμενος.

Pythagoras, in sum, whilst he was leading a monastic life, fell a victim to love: not only poets, but also ascetic philosophers cannot resist love. This concept is most elegantly expressed by Hermesianax in lines 85-88, on which I hope I have now thrown complete light.

To sum up. All scholars have been misled by the fact that they thought that Hermesianax' words ἐν σφαίρῃ were an allusion to a globe built by Pythagoras, like the one built by Archimedes (cf. Bach, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*: Cic. *Tusc.* I. 25,6 *Archimedes lunae, solis, quinque errantium motus in*

(23) Πάντα, here, is adverbial, and means "totally", "absolutely", "durchaus", "ganz und gar": cf. Bauer, *Wört. N.T.*, s.v. πᾶς, 2 δ. The sense is literally: "he totally (πάντα) abstaining from the pleasures of the world (ἀποτασσόμενον)".

(24) The present participle ἀποτασσόμενον could, of course, express anteriority, like the already discussed ἔχων in line 22; in this case, ἀποτασσόμενον would mean "having absolutely renounced the world".

(25) From Homer (Il. I, 472 f. μέλποντες... ἀείδοντες...) to Apollonius Rhodius (*Arg.* IV, 1129f.) down to Colluthus and Musaeus (frequent examples: cf. Weinberger, *Wien. Stud.* 1896, p. 138). On "Homerisches Asyndeton zwischen Partizipien" cf. Kühner-Gerth, vol. II, p. 103, n. 1.

sphaera illigavit). This led them into insoluble difficulties: not only because Pythagoras is known to have taught his disciples about the existence of spheres surrounding, in the sky, the various planets, and not to have built any globes (on the "*coelestes sphaerae*" surrounding the planets cf. Thes. s.v. σφαῖρα, 1570, C), but also because the word ἀποτασσόμενον did not allow taking Hermesianax' word σφαίρη in the sense "globe built by Pythagoras". The solution is arrived at as soon as we realize that ἀποτασσόμενον is here used absolutely by Hermesianax, in the sense "renounce the world and lead a monastic life". The words κύκλον.... ἐν σφαίρῃ, we can now realize, are not governed by ἀποτασσόμενον, but by περιβάλλεται αἰθήρ: this is in fact fully confirmed by astronomical terminology (on phrases like οἱ ἐν τῇ σφαίρᾳ κύκλοι, cf. Thes. s.v. σφαῖρα, 1570, C); πάντα, in the phrase παντ' ἀποτασσόμενον, is an adverb, meaning "totally, absolutely": the verb ἀποτάσσομαι was often accompanied, when it meant "renounce the world", by such adverbs (e.g. παντελῶς ἀποτεταγμένον Nil. Magn. 32, quoted in Lampe, *Patr. Lex.*, s.v. ἀποτάσσω, II, D). Kaibel's emendation, we may conclude, is, in the light of my explanation, cogent: Hermesianax says αἴης ἐν σφαίρῃ because each "*coelestis sphaera*" surrounding a planet was accompanied, as a rule, by the name of the relevant planet in the genitive (σφαῖρα Ἡλίου, σφαῖρα Σελήνης, etc: Thes. s.v. σφαῖρα, 1570), so that the genitive αἴης is used by Hermesianax to make it clear that he is alluding to the sphere surrounding the earth, not to any other "*coelestis sphaera*". However, even if Kaibel's emendation is not what Hermesianax wrote, I need hardly say that my explanation of Hermesianax' passage remains unaffected: even if we leave θίης between *crucis*, the rest of Hermesianax' words make perfect sense as I have explained them, because what hides behind the corrupt θίης is not essential to the sense of the passage (the corruption could contain an epithet to σφαίρῃ, for instance).

We find now, at lines 95ff., another scholar who behaved as Pythagoras, namely Aristippus:

Ἄνδρα Κυρηναῖον εἶσω πόθος ἔσπασεν Ἴσθμοῦ
 δεινόν, ὅτ' Ἀπιδανῆς Λαῖδος ἠράσατο
 ὀξὺς Ἀρίστιππος, πάσας δ' ἠνήνατο λέσχας

φεύγων, †οὐδαμενον† ἐξεφόρησε βίῳ.

Line 95, which does not scan, is easy to emend. The final line has hitherto presented problems. The critics have gone as far as to change the words into οὐδὲ μένων ἐξ Ἐφύρης ἐβίω (Defradas, *op. cit.*), because they thought that the line, in our manuscripts, is “profondément altéré”, “seriously corrupt” (Defradas, *ad loc.*). Yet the text is perfectly sound, as I shall demonstrate. Ἐξεφόρησε “he expounded” is supported by ἐξεφόρει in line 18. Ἐκφορέω in the sense “expound” governs the dative: just as we have πολυμήστησιν ἐξεφόρει in lines 17f. (“she expounded to chaste ladies”) we have here ἐξεφόρησε βίῳ “he expounded to the general public”. Βίος denoting the “general public”, as opposed to the philosophers, is a common term (cf. LSJ, s.v. βίος, III, ὁ βίος Sextus Empiricus *Pyrr.* I, 211, “opp. the philosophers”; cf. also Lampe, *Patr. Lex.*, s.v. βίος, 8,⁽²⁵⁾ *Thes.* s.v. βίος, 254 C-D). Aristippus, after he fell in love, no longer frequented the λέσχαι, where the public was, and—we may conclude—never taught philosophy to the public who frequented the λέσχας. Οὐδαμὰ meaning, in Greek, “never”, the complete correction of line 98 has thus been arrived at: φεύγων – οὐδαμ’ ἐνὸν ἐξεφόρησε βίῳ

“he never expounded (οὐδαμὰ.... ἐξεφόρησε) to the public (βίῳ) what he should have expounded (ἐνὸν)”. The participles ἐνὸν, or ἐνόντα (material in *Thes.* s.v. ἐνείμι, 1055 A-B) when used with a verb of saying (such as ἐκφορέω) denote what the person concerned should say and actually cares to say or, as in the case of Aristippus after he fell in love, neglects to say (*Thuc.* IV, 50 τὸ ἐνὸν ἐκλέγων; *Isocr.* 104 D κατιδὼν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐνόντων εἰπεῖν; *Luc.*, *Charid.* 28: πολλὰ τῶν ἐνόντων μοι εἰπεῖν ἀφελών;

(26) It is well-known that the vocabulary of Christian religion and later philosophy (e.g. Sextus Empiricus) was not the product of abrupt innovation, but, hardly surprisingly, drawn from Hellenistic Greek. We are not astonished, therefore, to find meanings of words current in Christian texts or later philosophers to be already attested in a Hellenistic author such as Hermesianax: ἀνεμος, in line 19, means “religious inspiration, *afflatus*”, “holy ghost”, cf. Bauer, *Wört.*, s.v. ἀνεμος, 2, and Lampe, *Patr. Lex.*, s.v. ἀνεμος; βίος “the general public as opposed to the philosophers” occurs in line 98; ἀποτάσσομαι “renounce the world”, “lead an ascetic life” occurs, as we have seen, in line 88.

Plat., *Phdr.* 235,B τῶν ἐνόντων ἀξίως ῥηθῆναι... οὐδὲν παραλέλοιπεν.

This use of ἐνόν, in the line, is contextually supported and confirmed by ἡνῆνατο λέσχας: Aristippus, after he fell in love, neglected to frequent the λέσχαι—he neglected, that is, to expound to the public (βίῳ) what he should have expounded (ἐνόν). The words οὐδαμ' ἐνόν ἐξεφόρησε βίῳ are added asyndetically as a parenthesis (they should be placed between brackets or be preceded by a dash) which explains the consequence of Aristippus having abandoned the λέσχας. Schweighäuser understood the nature of the parenthesis in question, and suggested: φεύγων – οὐδαμενὴν ἐξεφόρησε βίον (cf. Bach, *op. cit.*, p. 178).

There is, of course, no need to read οὐδαμ' ἐνόν <δ'> ἐξεφόρησε, because the scanning οὐδαμ' ἐνόν ἐξεφόρησε is, in the *media syllaba pentamentri*, perfectly normal, cf. note 21. Ἐνόν, as used by Hermesianax here, is another prosaic ingredient of his vocabulary: the attestations collected in Thes., s.v. ξνειμι, 1055 A-B are from prose authors.

We may now draw a few conclusions. I have already had occasion to show that the text of Hellenistic poets badly needs interpretation. To quote two instructive examples: Callimachus' epigram 5 Pf. presented, within the narrow compass of no more than 12 lines, as many as seven problems (the meaning of παλαιότερος in line 1; the corruption in line 6; the meaning of περίσκεπτον in line 8; the meaning of ἀπνοος in line 9; the reading ἀλκυόνης in line 10, arbitrarily altered by the critics; the reason why Σμύρνης Αἰολίδος should be mentioned in the final line; the relevance of θνας Ἰουλίδας in line 7). I have, I hope, solved all these problems by analysing the epigram on the basis of Hellenistic diction and literary conventions (*Arca* 1976, p. 254 ff.; to what I observe about Κορησσία being called Ἀρσινόη, p. 264, add now R.S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden 1976, p. 141f.). Once we have understood Callimachus' epigram in the light of Hellenistic diction; we can see that the poem is far more learned and witty than the critics had hitherto thought: words that the critics found incomprehensible or wanted to alter prove to be, of all things, the *clou* of Callimachus' humor. The same holds true of Theocritus' Idyll XXI: as I have underlined, (*"Textual Problems in Theocritus' Idyll XXI"*, in the press), out of the 67 lines which constitute the Idyll no fewer than 22 had

been misunderstood or even disfigured by the critics. Once again, Theocritus' Idyll reveals itself to be, when analysed in the light of Hellenistic diction and literary conventions, far more learned in its allusions to Homer and far more witty than the critics had hitherto believed.

I hope I have now shown that Hermesianax' elegy is far more elegant, in its employment of diction, and far more pointed than the critics had until now believed. The trouble is that Hermesianax' poetry has been until now studied by scholars who looked at it as though it were not Hellenistic, but Attic: "viri docti parum Hermesianactis aetatem atque indolem, scilicet quae non fuerit attica, respexerunt" (R. Schulze, *Quaestiones Hermesianactae*, Diss. Bonn 1858, p.8). Misled by their lack of familiarity with Hellenistic diction, many critics accused Hermesianax of being "*obscurus*", or even devoid of sense of humour (cf. Giarratano, *op. cit.*, p. XIII f.). In reality, as I hope I have demonstrated, Hermesianax is perspicuous and witty, provided we read him in his historical context, i.e. with the eyes of a Hellenistic reader, provided, that is, we read him on the basis of Hellenistic literary language and Hellenistic literary conventions.