

ON THE TEXT OF THE ORPHIC *LITHICA**

Giuseppe Giangrande

The text of the *Lithica*¹ still urgently needs to be explained in very many passages. In the light of our present knowledge of later epic techniques (Sprachgebrauch, metre, etc.) almost 90 lines, as I hope to show in the present paper, can be demonstrated to be sound, and not corrupt as they had been assumed to be by earlier scholars: the work encompasses 774 lines.

11: cf. our discussion of line 124.

38-39

... καὶ πόντοιο κυκωμένου οὐκ ἀλεγίζων
βήσεται ἐπὶ τραφερὴν ἀκυμάντοισι πόδεσσι.

Line 39 has been mutilated by scholars in very many ways (cf. e.g. the apparatus of Giannakis' edition). Yet the passage is perfectly sound. The stone which the poet is alluding to is said to protect sailors by preventing shipwreck; the sense, as Hermann underlined, is that a mariner thus protected «*e mari salvus* (καὶ πόντοιο κυκωμένου οὐκ ἀλεγίζων) *siccis pedibus* (ἀκυμάντοισι πόδεσσι) *in terram* (ἐπὶ τραφερὴν, = line 653) *redibit* (βήσεται)».

* The present paper is the result of research seminars which I held in the Universities of London, Milano, Padova, Urbino and Salerno. I am much indebted to Prof. B. Gentili, Prof. O. Longo and Prof. A. Tessier for their learned help and constructive criticism, which enabled me to eliminate errors and inaccuracies.

¹ The most frequently quoted works are the following: *Orphei Lithica*, rec. E. Abel, reprint Hildesheim 1971; *Orphica*, rec. G. Hermannus, reprint Hildesheim 1971; G. Dottin, *Les Argonautiques d'Orphée*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres 1930; *Orphei Hymni*, ed. G. Quandt, Berlin, Weidmann 1962; Γ. Ν. Γιαννάκης, Ὀρφῆως Λιθικά, Ioannina 1982.

Certain critics have interpreted the lines as meaning that the stone will enable a man to walk upon the water, as Jesus did. I think this latter interpretation is less probable, because the explicit mention of both the sea-storm (πόντοιο κυκωμένου) and the act of returning onto the *terra firma* (ἐπὶ τραφερῆν) clearly fits a sailor returning «*salvus*» from a dry ship-deck to the dry *terra firma salvus*, that is, insofar as he has met a sea-storm without suffering shipwreck; moreover, Jesus walked *upon*, not above, the water, and therefore presumably wet his feet: conversely, the point is that the feet of a sailor are the first part of his body that will become wet if his ship sinks and its deck is covered by sea-water, but they will remain dry (ἀκυμάντοισι) if his ship does not sink. The traditional threats to sailing were shipwreck and pirates: after mentioning the danger of suffering shipwreck in lines 38-39, the poet deals with the ληϊστῆρες in lines 40-42, and the very same coupling of shipwreck and pirates occurs in lines 583-585. In any case, lines 38-39, whether referring to the avoidance of shipwreck or to walking miraculously on water, are self-contained and need no addition, either linguistically or conceptually, because ἐπὶ τραφερῆν, in Epic, from Homer down to Oppian (*Hal.* 5, 313) and to the *Lithica* (cf. line 653) means precisely «*in terram*», so that intrusions like those suggested by modern scholars, such as ἐπὶ τραφερῆν (ἄλ'), ἐπὶ τραφερῆν (χθόν'), or by copyists (ἐπὶ (πρόα) τραφερῆν) would be unwarranted. Musgrave, realizing that ἐπὶ τραφερῆν does not tolerate any such intrusion, made matters worse by conjecturing ἐπὶ τροφίην (ἄλ').

Line 39 is sound not only linguistically and conceptually, but also metrically, in the light of post-Hellenistic prosody.

The critics have forgotten that α, ι and υ are dichronous in this kind of poetry (indeed, the dichronous nature of vowels established itself already in Hellenistic poetry, as I have often underlined: cf. lastly, my paper «*Interpretazione di testi poetici ellenistici*», forthcoming in «*Sicul. Gymn.*», and my observations in «*Sicul. Gymn.*» 1987, p. 8 f.): cf. e.g. Quandt, *op. cit.*, p. 40, 9, and especially Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXLIV f.). Here, the *alpha privativum* of ἀκυμάντοισι has been scanned long «au temps faible», just as the *alpha privativum* of ἀθάνατος has been scanned long «au temps fort» in *Argon.* 648 (Dottin, *loc. cit.*). In sum: the scanning ἀκυμάντοισι is one example of the «allongements au temps faible» noted by Dottin. An analogous «allongement au temps faible» is found in line 240 (δύω; cf. line 143, δύο).

58-60:

Τὰς ἐμὲ κηρύσσειν λαοσσόος Ἀργειφόντης
ἀνθρώποισιν ὄρινε, μελιγλώσσοιο κελεύσας
φθόγγον ἀπὸ στήθεσφιν ἀοιδοῦ γηρύσασθαι.

Orpheus speaks in the first person. Hermann asked: «*quis est ille ἀοιδός? Non dubito quin poeta ἀοιδῆς scripserit*», and all the subsequent critics have accepted Hermann's conjecture. In reality, the ἀοιδός is none other than Orpheus himself, who sings his poem *Lithica* at the request of the god. Orpheus was the ἀοιδός *par excellence* (e.g. *A.P.* VII, 9, 6 ff.). The sense is «to sing a poet's speech (φθόγγον ἀοιδοῦ) out of my breast», or, if we take the genitive ἀοιδοῦ to be adjectival (cf. Dottin, p. CIX), «to sing a speech from my poetic (ἀοιδοῦ) breast».

On adjectival genitives cf. especially P. Neumann, *Das Verhältnis des Genitivs zum Adjektiv im Griechischen*, Münster 1910, and Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* II, p. 176 ff.

Appel (*Würzb. Jahrbücher* 1983, p. 31) defends the mss. reading ἀοιδοῦ, which he takes to mean «Hesiod's»: this hypothesis is not tenable, because Orpheus (the «Ps.-Orpheus», in this case: Appel, *loc. cit.*) was «sprichwörtlich» (so Pape-Benseler, *Wört. Eigenn.*, s.v. Orpheus, with material) the greatest poet and singer of all, who as such could well sing with his own voice, and did not need to sing «nur» (Appel, *loc. cit.*) with Hesiod's «Stimme» (so Appel, *ibid.*); the words μελιγλώσσοιο and φθόγγον (lines 59 f.) are a pointed reference to the fact that Orpheus' γλώσσα and φθόγγος were proverbially (Pape-Benseler, *loc. cit.*) more sweet and persuasive than those of any other poet.

62:

...αἴψα δὲ πρέσβα δαημοσύνην ἀτίουσι.

The manuscript Q, which, unlike the other manuscripts, is directly descended from the archetypus, has preserved the *lectio difficilior* πρέσβα δαημοσύνην: this is, as we shall see, the correct reading. The other manuscripts have, against the metre, trivialized πρέσβα into the feminine accusative πρέσβαν, whilst modern scholars have trivialized the accusative δαημοσύνην into the vocative δαημοσύνη, and intruded, for good measure, the accusative ⟨σε⟩ into the line.

Orpheus in talking about his contemporaries, who neglected the old «didactic» type of epic poetry (Hesiod, down to Nicander): on this, cf. Giannakis' commentary *ad loc.* The substantive δαημοσύνην makes no difficulty; what has puzzled the critics is the word πρέσβα. For the conjectures proposed so far, cf. Giannakis, *loc. cit.*, and Abel, *ad loc.* The word πρέσβυς can, of course, be used as an adjective, in the sense «old»: therefore Gesner, followed by Hermann, wondered whether πρέσβυν δαημοσύνην could be somehow fitted into the line, whilst Toupius conjectured πρέσβυν ἀημοσύνην. The *vulgata* (cf. Hermann, *ad loc.*) had in fact πρέσβυν δαημοσύνην, which does not scan. The adjectival accusative πρέσβυν would be, in itself, perfectly orthodox (cf. Kühner-Blass, I, p. 504, quoting Soph. *Ph.* 665). From the point of view of grammatical agreement, a masculine adjectival form such as πρέσβυν referred to a feminine substan-

tive such as δημοσύνην would be typical of the epic genre (cf. e.g. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXII; Volkman, *Comm. Ep.*, p. 60 f.; Meineke, *Anal. Alex.*, p. 208 f.; Klauser, *De dicendi genere in Nic. Ther.*, p. 90; Schneider, *De Dion. Perieg. arte*, p. 26, n. 7; Quandt, *op. cit.*, p. 42, 3, b). In sum: the adjective πρέσβυν would be perfectly suitable to the noun δημοσύνην, were it not for the fact that it is metrically impossible. All the difficulties disappear when we realize that the mss. reading πρέσβα, which is metrically impeccable, is the masculine accusative form in -α of the word πρέσβυς: for such forms, which are used in the *Orphica*, cf. especially Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CVI and Lobeck, *Paral.* I, p. 183. Conclusion: the words πρέσβα δημοσύνην, meaning «ancient lore», «*artem antiquam*», are sound. To sum up: masculine forms in -α underwent a progressive development in epic poetry (cf. Risch, *Der homerische Typus ἰππότα Νέστωρ und μητίετα Ζεύς*, in *Sprachgesch. und Wortbedeutung, Festschrift Debrunner*, Bern 1954, pp. 389 ff.; *Aristonici* Περί σημ. Ἰλιάδος, p. 18 Friedlaender; Wyss, in his commentary on Antimachus, fr. 36); in the Orphic poems, accusatives in -α are created (Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CVI and especially Lobeck, *Paral.* I, p. 183), of which the accusative πρέσβα is one instance, like πολεμιστά in *Lithica* 312.

76 f.:

...οὔθ' ὑπ' ἀρωγὴν

θεσπεσίην φυγέτην φαεσίμβροτον ἐκ κακότητος.

The critics have changed φαεσίμβροτον into ὄλεσιμβρότου because they believed that «*requiritur adjectivum, quod cum κακότητος jungatur*» (cf. Abel, *ad loc.*). In reality the text is sound, because the two epithets θεσπεσίην and φαεσίμβροτον are joined with each other asyndetically (*cumulatio*), and both refer to ἀρωγὴν, whilst κακότητος is devoid of any epithet: I have noted several such cases of *cumulatio*² in my already quoted paper «*Interpretazione di testi poetici ellenistici*», with bibliography. The epithet φαεσίμβροτον, here, means «proceeding from the god Apollo» (by *enallage adjectivi*, because Apollo himself is φαεσίμβροτος; cf. *Thes.*, s.v. φαεσίμβροτος; cf. Gesner as quoted by Abel, *ad loc.*), or, more generally, «proceeding from the gods» (by *enallage adjectivi*, because φαεσίμβροτος could be used of any god, cf. *Thes.*, s.v.; *enallage* ὄργια φαεσίμβροτα Διοῦς quoted in LSJ, s.v. φαεσίμβροτος).

84-86:

φῶτα δὲ δίζηται ταλακάρδιον, ὃς κεν ἐκάστου
ἐμμεμῶς πειρῶτο, μενοιήσει τε κάμοι τε,
ὃς κε διδάσκηται καὶ ὃς εἰδότας ἐξερεείνοι.

It would be unwarranted to alter δίζηται into δίζημαι, as was done by Hermann, followed by the other editors. The poet, instead of using the first

² For asyndetic *cumulatio* of epithets in the *Lithica* cf. e.g. lines 279 (κρατεροῖο κυκαμένου, which we shall discuss), 714 (ἐριβόλου λαοβοτήρης), 715 (πολυῖδμονος ἀψαύστοιο), etc.

person (δίζημαί «I am seeking») uses the third person singular in the impersonal sense (δίζηται «on cherche», «man sucht»). Such usage, not current in classical Greek, developed in Hellenistic times: alongside the third person plural of verbs, either accompanied or not accompanied by ἄνθρωποι, the third person singular of verbs was used, either accompanied by ἄνθρωπος (Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf, *Gramm. neut. Griech.*, § 130), or not accompanied by such a word: for instance, at Archestr. 62, 6 Brandt we find φερέτω «man bringe». At *Lith.* 234, the variant κατόψεται is another such third person singular with impersonal sense («man wird sehen»), whereas the variant κατόψεαι is a trivialization, i.e. *lectio facilior* (= «you will see»). At *Lith.* 625 f., the third person singular δυνήσεται («on pourra») is another example of the construction in question. Such use of the third person singular with an impersonal sense is indulged in for purposes of *variatio*: at 83, the poet speaks in the first person ὑπισχνούμαι «I promise», and then, instead of continuing in the first person, i.e. instead of saying «I seek», he switches to the third (δίζηται «man sucht», «one seeks»); at 625, the poet first uses the third person singular («on pourra»), and then addressing directly his reader, he switches to the second person (θέλξεις «you will charm», instead of «on enchantera»)³. I take this opportunity of underlining that at 434 f.

...οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτῶ

ἐκ μάλα περ πολλῶν ἐλθεῖν κατεναντίον ἔτλη

the text is sound: the ellipse of τις with the partitive genitive πολλῶν, which perplexes Giannakis, is perfectly normal. The ellipse in question was recognized to be attested «*aliquoties*» in Attic Greek by Wiel (cf. Abel, *ad loc.*); cf. L. Bos, *Ellipses Graecae*, ed. G. H. Schaefer, Lipsiae 1808, p. 475, and now Blass-Debrunner, *Gramm. neut. Griech.* § 164, 2. It is attested already in Homer (cf. Kühner-Gerth I, p. 345 f., quoted by Blass-Debrunner: e.g. *Iliad* XIV, 121 ἔγημε θυγατρῶν, «*eine der Töchter*»).

Lines 85-86 have been wrongly mutilated by the critics, who were not familiar with the syntax of later epic. Stephanus, of course, could not know what we know now about the employment of moods and tenses in later epic poetry, and he therefore altered the indicative future μενοινήσει into the optative μενοινήσειε, in order to bring it into line with the optative κάμοι: for his part, Hermann, followed by Giannakis and Abel, altered the optative ἐξερεεῖνοι into the subjunctive ἐξερεεῖνη, in order to bring it into line with the subjunctive διδάσκηται. Only Wiel leaves the text unchanged, to Abel's horror («*mirum est*»). The text is, of course, sound: scholars (apart from Wiel) have forgotten that *enallage modorum* was indulged in by

³ Cf. also *Lith.* 590 f. οὐκ ἐνόησεν ἀνὴρ (ἀνὴρ = «on», «man»), and then δῆεις (593) «you will...». The third person plural τελέουσιν in line 592 is used impersonally, as correctly understood by Halleux-Schamp («quand des gens mettent en oeuvre...»). On the «*personae permutatio*» in Homer, whereby the poet switches from the second person singular to the third person singular and vice-versa, cf. Friedlaender, *Aristonici* Περί Σημ. Ἰλιάδ., p. 7-8, 16 («*tertia persona in secundam mutatur*», etc.).

post-Homeric poets, who followed the teaching of Hellenistic grammarians (*Aristonici* Περὶ σημ. Ἰλιάδ. ed. Friedlaender, p. 7 ff., and my *Scr. Min. Alex.*, II, p. 350, note 10). The subjunctive διδάσκηται and the optative ἐξερεῖνοι can certainly coexist in the same sentence: for the coexistence of these «deux modes» cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXVI f. 4); the indicativus futuri (μενοινήσει) inter duos optativos (πειρῶτο, κάμοι) positus» (Abel, *ad loc.*) is another example of such coexistence, given the fact that the particle κεν (in this case, ὄς κεν) can be used either with the «divers temps de l'indicatif» (including the future indicative) or with the optative or the subjunctive (Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXIII ff.). I take this opportunity of discussing other lines of the *Lithica involving the use of moods and tenses*. The use of κεν or ἄν with the indicative is very common in the Orphic corpus: cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXIII ff.; the phenomenon is rarely attested in Homer (Dottin, *ibid.*), but common in later epic (Oldenburger, *De Orac. Sib. Elocutione*, p. 11 ff.). In certain cases, the mss. of the *Lithica* hesitate between the indicative and other moods (308: πελάση, πελάσει, πελάσοι; 650: τεύξοι, τεύξει; 53: ποτιχρίμπτηται, ποτιχρίμπτοιο; 223: κομίζοι, κομίζη; 318: φυλάσοι, φυλάσσει; 323: ἐλαύνοι, ἐλαύνει. In other cases, however, the reading of all the manuscripts has been arbitrarily altered by Hermann, whom the other editors follow. So, for instance, at 314 nothing authorizes us to alter παλύνει or παλύνοι into παλύνη, as suggested by Hermann. Giannakis, in his note on line 314, follows Hermann, because the subjunctive is used in lines 205 and 386: but Giannakis has forgotten that the author of the *Lithica*, like any other author of the Orphic corpus and indeed any epic poet, likes *Selbstvariation*. In the case under discussion, the indicative or optative in line 314 as against the subjunctive in lines 205 and 386 is a typical case of syntactical *Selbstvariation*. We shall discuss *Selbstvariation* below. Another instance of κεν used with the indicative occurs in line 532, where κεν ἔστι was arbitrarily disfigured into δέ γε ἔστι by Hermann.

On the used of κεν with the indicative in Epic cf. especially H. White, *New Essays in Hellenistic Poetry*, p. 94, note 6.

The subjunctive and the optative are interchangeable, in later epic (Dottin, *ibid.*): in certain lines, the manuscripts hesitate (e.g. 251: εὔρης, εὔροισ), but when the unanimous reading of the manuscripts is an optative nothing authorizes us to alter it. For instance, at 189 ἀρπάξαις should not be changed into ἀρπάξης with Abel; at 267 f., ῥέζοι should not be altered into ἔζη with Hermann and Giannakis; likewise, at line 472 (βάλοισ) the optative is, according to late epic usage (Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXV), perfectly sound, and should not be altered into βάλης with Hermann and Giannakis. Cf. my discussion of line 617.

⁴ Cf. also Oldenburger, *op. cit.*, p. 21; the phenomenon occurs already in Homer, cf. Chantraine, *Gramm. Homér.* II, § 312.

On *enallage modorum* in Nicander cf. H. White, *Studies in the Poetry of Nicander*, p. 24.

Once and for all, I should like to underline that the data offered by Dottin, *op. cit.*, can be supplemented by those available in Weinberger, *Quaestiones de Orphei... Argonauticis, Diss. Philol. Vindob.* III, Wien 1891, pp. 239 ff. (cf. e.g. p. 259, on syntactical *Selbstvariation*, whereby the author of the Orphic *Argonautica* uses «conjunctivus et optativus promiscue») and in Oldenburger, *De Oracul. Sibyll. elocutione, Diss.* Rostock 1903 (e.g. p. 10 f. on syntactical *Selbstvariation*: «modo... modo...»; p. 21 f., on *enallage modorum et temporum*, because of which the «*dictio... concinna non est*»). Unfortunately, neither Dottin, nor Weinberger, nor Oldenburger has been utilized by Giannakis, as far as I can see. Likewise, Friedlaender's work (*Aristonici* Περὶ Σημ. Ἰλιάδ., pp. 9 ff.), on the interchangeability of optative and subjunctive in Homer according to ancient grammarians has been lamentably overlooked by Giannakis.

113:

οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἔξαπίνης ἰαχὴν ὄξειαν ὄρωντες
κ.τ.λ.

The reading ὄρωντες, as I have explained in *Mus. Phil. Lond.*, vol. X (in the press) is sound.

124 f.:

Κέκλετο γάρ μοι δεῖμα τανύπτερον αἰετὸν εἶναι
καὶ πνοιὴν ἀνέμου· παρὰ δὲ ποσσὶν κακὸν ἦεν.

The mss. reading δέ is perfectly sound, and should not be altered into γάρ, with Stephanus. Here, the particle δέ is explanatory, and stands exactly for γάρ: for explanatory δέ cf. e.g. Gow, on Theocr. XV, 15 f., and H. White, *New Studies in Greek Poetry, Select Index*, s.v. δέ = γάρ. The scanning is, of course, δε̄: this type of lengthening is common in post-Homeric epic, as has been demonstrated by Rzach, in his *Neue Beiträge* (cf., on all this, my paper «Interpretazione di testi poetici ellenistici», already quoted above). For the lengthening of final syllables cf. also Quandt, *op. cit.*, p. 40, 6 («*brevis syllaba finalis in elemento longo adhibetur*»), Maass, *Arati Phaenomena, Index II*, s.v. «*productio brevium*»), Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXLIV ff. The same kind of lengthening occurs in *Lithica* at e.g.⁵ lines 464 (μοῦνον, arbitrarily altered by the editors), 383 (χειρός, explained by H. White in her already quoted «*New Studies in Greek Poetry*»), 738 (πέπλον, arbitrarily changed into πέπλους by Abel), 154 (μοῖρᾶ μιν, where final -α is lengthened by the initial μ- that follows). Perhaps the variant reading ταναόν... αἰθήρα (11) is one more example of the kind of lengthening in question: the noun αἰθήρ is feminine, in the *Lithica* (cf. lines 90, 648), and the epithet ταναόν may here have been used, according to epic usage, as an adjective with two terminations (cf. H.

⁵ Cf. also Abel's apparatus *ad* line 35, with a list of examples wrongly altered by Hermann; cf. also line 600, where the scanning is τε̄, as correctly underlined by Giannakis, p. 179. For such lengthenings cf. Weinberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 243 ff., quoting Rzach's *Neue Beiträge und Studien zur Technik...*

White, in her already quoted «New Studies in Greek Poetry», *Index*, s.v. *Adjectives*). H. White has already explained, in her «New Studies in Greek Poetry», the epithet γλαφυρόν in line 267 as being applied to the feminine noun ἰασπιν because it is used as an epithet with two terminations. For the use of adjectives with two terminations in epic cf. e.g. Cássola, *Inni Omerici*, p. 625 f. («parecchi aggettivi semplici» are used «in un'unica forma, in -ος, per il maschile e il femminile»; Schneider, *De Dion. Perieg. arte*, p. 26, n. 7; Keydell, *Proleg.* to his edition of Nonnus, p. 44 f.; γλαφυρός is used as an adjective with two terminations at Tryphiod. 198; Loebe, *De elocut. Callim.* I, p. 15, § 19).

134:

μάρνασθαι μεμαῶτα ἰδών, εἰλεῖτο δὲ πυκνῶς

Platt, followed by Giannakis, inserted μ' before ἰδών, because he wanted to avoid hiatus and because he found the absence of the personal pronoun με unpleasant. Giannakis has already emphasized that the hiatus in line 134 is perfectly regular (for hiatus justified «par le souvenir de la présence ancienne d'un digamma» cf. also Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXI). It must now be added that the omission of a personal pronoun is, if anything, typical of epic poetry: cf. e.g. H. White, *New Essays in Hellenistic Poetry*, p. 83, with bibliography; in *Lith.* 103 certain critics (cf. Giannakis' apparatus) wanted, wrongly, to insert the pronoun σε, which the poet has omitted. In sum: both line 134 and line 103 are sound; in both lines, the omission of the personal pronoun (με, σε) is a phenomenon typical of epic poetry. 161: H. White (in her already quoted book «*New Studies in Greek Poetry*») has shown that the mss. reading λασία is sound, and should not be «Ionicized» into λασίη. Aberrant forms in -α instead of -η are an integral part of the epic language, as I stressed in *Scr. Min. Alex.*, I, pp. 65 ff. They appear, of course, in the Orphic corpus as well as in any other epic text of Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic age (cf. e.g. *Scr. Min. Alex.* I, p. 84, for the Orphic corpus). These forms in -α (which were, as a rule, meant by the poets to be Doricisms) were arbitrarily «regularized», i.e. trivialized, into Ionic forms in -η by modern scholars and, not seldom, by copyists. To quote but two examples: at *Lith.* 103, only C has preserved the genuine reading μακράν, whereas the other mss. have adopted the trivialized variant, i.e. the Ionicized form μακρήν; in other words, the reading μακράν is the *lectio difficilior*, i.e. the genuine variant. At *Lith.* 185, the genuine reading ἑτέρας φλογός has been arbitrarily trivialized, i.e. Ionicized, into ἑτέρης φλογός by Wiel (the genitive ἑτέρας φλογός is a typical case of «génitif remplaçant le datif»; on this syntactical feature cf. my *Scr. Min. Alex.* III, p. 187, and my paper «On the Text of Plutarch's Non Posse Suaviter Vivi», in the press; the feature is a late vulgarism, but ancient grammarians thought it was attested in Homer, cf. Wiel *apud* Giannakis, p. 188, and Friedlaender, *Aristonici* Περί Σημ. Ἰλιάδ. p. 21, «genitivum pro dativo...»).

As I have pointed out in my already quoted papers, many such forms in $-\bar{a}$ could be interpreted as Atticisms, like the forms in $-\bar{\alpha}$ (such as $\tau\rho\bar{\iota}\gamma\bar{\alpha}$) which occur in epic texts (cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CIII, CXXXVI, etc., and now my already quoted paper «Interpretazione di testi poetici ellenistici», where I deal with Doric and Attic forms like $\pi\omega\chi\epsilon\bar{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\zeta\mu\acute{\upsilon}\rho\nu\bar{\alpha}\nu$, $\gamma\alpha\bar{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\tau\rho\bar{\iota}\gamma\bar{\alpha}$, $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\bar{\alpha}$, etc. in Arcestratus). I take this opportunity of explaining two further lines of the *Lithica*, which have been arbitrarily disfigured by modern critics. Post-Homeric epic poets knew that Homer's dialect was composite, and strove to reproduce its composite nature. Now, in *Lith.* 621 we find the dative $\pi\upsilon\rho\sigma\acute{\alpha}\iota\sigma\iota\nu$, and in *Lith.* 673 we read $\gamma\lambda\eta\nu\alpha\iota\sigma\iota$: these two dative forms have been wrongly altered by Hermann into $\pi\upsilon\rho\sigma\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ and $\gamma\lambda\eta\nu\eta\sigma\iota$, and all the critics have followed Hermann's conjectures. In reality, the two dative forms $\pi\upsilon\rho\sigma\acute{\alpha}\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ (621) and $\gamma\lambda\eta\nu\alpha\iota\sigma\iota$ (673) are perfectly sound: they are intended to be Atticisms (or Aeolisms): for such «dativi plurali femminili in $-\alpha\iota\sigma\iota$ » cf. Cássola, *op. cit.*, p. 626. Forms in $-\alpha\iota\sigma\iota$ are attested in the *Iliad* (as variants) and in the Homeric Hymns; it is well known that the authors of the Orphic *corpus* were greatly influenced by the Homeric Hymns (Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXVIII), especially by the Hymn to Demeter, and it is significant that the said forms in $-\alpha\iota\sigma\iota$ are precisely attested in Homer's Hymn to Demeter. The influence of the Homeric Hymns on post-Homeric epic poetry is, as everybody knows, very great (cf. e.g. Weinberger, in *Wien. Stud.* 1896, p. 125); for instance, Attic forms in $-\tau\tau-$ such as $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\alpha$, which occur in Hellenistic poetry (cf. my already quoted paper «Interpretazione di testi poetici ellenistici») are explained not only by the general tendency of post-Homeric epic poets to introduce morphological Atticisms into their vocabulary, but also by the specific fact that a form like $\theta\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ is attested in Hom. Hymn. Herm. 255.

175:

Τὸν κ' εἰ περ μετὰ χεῖρας ἔχων περὶ νηὸν ἴκηαι.

The verb $\pi\epsilon\rho\kappa\kappa\acute{\nu}\epsilon\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ means here «reach»: we need not look any further than one of the models followed by the authors of the Orphic corpus, namely Apollonius, who, at *Arg.* IV, 436, writes

...εὗτ' ἄν πρῶτα θεᾶς περὶ νηὸν ἴκηται

«as soon as she reached the temple of the goddess». It follows that the mss. reading $\pi\epsilon\rho\bar{\iota}$ νηὸν ἴκηαι is perfectly sound; Hermann, who altered $\pi\epsilon\rho\bar{\iota}$ into $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$, was wrong, and all the editors who have followed his conjecture are equally wrong.

180:

αὐτὰρ δ' ἄγ' ἡελίοιο καταντίον αὐγάζοντος

This is the reading of all the manuscripts, apart from A, which offers $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$. Hermann correctly printed $\eta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\omicron$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$, but Abel, since we find $\eta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\omicron$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ ἀντέλλοντος at 212, conjectured $\eta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\omicron$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ here in line 180. His conjecture is unwarranted. The author of

the *Lithica*, like any other epic poet, likes phrasal *Selbstvariation* (cf. e.g. lines 403 and 769; 756 σεῖο, βροτοσσοέ πέτρη, 346 σεό, δαιμονή πέτρη): accordingly, he wrote αὐγάζοντος in line 180, but ἀντέλλοντος in line 212, and he said ἡελίοιο καταντίον in line 180, whereas he used ἡελίου κατεναντίον in line 212. The word καταντίον (or καταντία) is no less epic than κατεναντίον: in the Orphic *Argonautica* we only find καταντίον, καταντία, but never κατενάτιον. From all this it follows that it is more economical to accept the mss. reading ἡελίοιο καταντίον, in line 180, than to alter ἡελίοιο into ἡελίου, in order to accommodate the reading of A κατεναντίον. Since κατεναντίον is more common than καταντίον, and since A tended to introduce unmetrical errors into the text (e.g. line 95, line 546, line 617, line 342), the reading of A κατεναντίον in line 180 can be explained as the result of A having introduced the more common form κατεναντίον, which is unmetrical. The variant καταντίον in line 435 need not be unmetrical: the scanning was meant to be κᾶταντίον (for the «allongement au temps faible» cf. our discussion of lines 38-39).

209:

ἄμφι σε λεπτάλεοι γοερὸν περιμυκήσονται

Since the animals described by the poet are μῆλα (line 205), Wiel, followed by all the editors, altered περιμυκήσονται into περιμηκήσονται. This alteration is unwarranted, as H. White has demonstrated (in her already quoted «*New Studies in Greek Poetry*»). I should like to add that we read μυκηθμὸς μῆλων in Aesch. fr. 158 (cf. LSJ, s.v.). Of course it would be arbitrary to alter -σονται into -σονται, as Hermann did, followed by all the subsequent critics: the form περιμυκήσονται is a «subjonctif à voyelle breve» (Chantr., *Gramm. Homér.* I, p. 454 f.), i.e. a type of subjunctive of Homeric origin, which continued to be used in the Orphic corpus (cf. Weinberger, *Quaest. de... Argonauticis*, already quoted, p. 271), possibly under the influence of Apollonius Rhodius.

230 f.:

Χρῆ δὲ καὶ εὐπέταλον τετραυγέα λᾶαν ἔχοντας
ἀρᾶσθαι...

The mss. reading ἔχοντας, correctly preserved by Abel and by Halleux-Schamp (in their edition of «*Les Lapidaires Grecs*»: cf. below, my «Appendix»), was altered into ἔχοντα by Platt, whom Giannakis follows. The alteration is unwarranted: it is true (cf. Giannakis *ad loc.*) that the poet uses the second person in lines 226 f. (σε... ἔχοντα) and in line 232 (φέροις), but the use of the third person (ἔχοντας) in line 230 preceded and followed by the second person (lines 226 f., 232) is typical of the author's style: cf. e.g. 221, second person (σήν), 224, third person (τιθήνη), 226, second person (σε); 254, second person (τρίβοις), 257, third person (φέροιτο), 265, second person (σεῖο). Once more, we are faced with cases of *Selbstvariation*, aimed at reducing the monotony of the didactic tone.

The use of the plural participle (i.e. ἔχοντας in line 230) is not infrequent in the *Lithica*, cf. e.g. lines 732, 736, 740, etc.: such participles are correctly understood by Halleux-Schamp (*op. cit.*) to correspond to French «on», German «man».

233

μᾶλλον καὶ θάλπειτο θεῶν νόος αἰὲν ἔόντων.

Hermann, followed by all the editors, altered καὶ into κεν. The alteration is unwarranted: μᾶλλον καί, where καί is of course *postpositum*, means «still more»: that is, the gods will be «still more» favourably disposed than they are described to be in line 229. The optative θάλπειτο is here used without the particle κεν: for this phenomenon, common in Hellenistic and later poetry, cf. Gow, *Theocr.*, vol. II, p. 43 (cf. e.g. *A.P.* XI, 33, 3), and especially Schneider on Callim. *Hymn.* V, 103, with examples from Hellenistic and late epic poets.

271 f.:

Λύχνις δ' ἐκ πεδίου ῥόθιον τ' ἀπόερξε χάλαζαν
ἡμετέρου καὶ κῆρας, ...

In line 271, there exists the variant ἀπόεργε.

The text is sound, as oracular style clearly shows.

For a discussion of these lines cf. Abel *ad loc.* The critics have arbitrarily altered the nominative λύχνις δ' ἐκ into the vocative λύχνι, σύ δ' ἐκ because they could not understand the aorist ἀπόερξε or the word ἀπόεργε. Since there is the «apostrophe» καὶ σε γάρ in line 272, they took ἀπόεργε to be an imperative («à toi d'écarter...», Halleux-Schamp, *op. cit.*). The apostrophe to the stone *lychnis* is, of course, perfectly normal (cf. lines 346, 494, or 756). The text is sound, because the aorist (unaugmented) ἀπόερξε is here used «*pro futuro*», and the word ἀπόεργε is not an imperative, but an imperfect (unaugmented), also used «*pro futuro*». In oracular literature (of which the *Lithica* are an example), tenses denoting the past, such as the aorist (e.g. Alex. Aetol. 3, 27 Powell, φθέγγατο), the perfect (e.g. Lycophron 252, πέφρικαν) or the imperfect (*Orac. Sibyll.* XII = XIV, 235, 236, 237) are used «*pro futuro*», alongside the future (cf. e.g. Kühner-Gerth, I, p. 166). Here, the author of the *Lithica*, who as a rule «*futuro tempore lapidum virtutes praedicat*» (Abel, *loc. cit.*), has used, in line 271, either the aorist ἀπόερξε or the imperfect ἀπόεργε «*pro futuro*»: the sense, in sum, is «the *lychnis* will ward off... (ἀπόερξε, or ἀπόεργε)».

277-279:

ψυχρὸν ἐπειγομένοιο πυρὸς μένει ἔνδοθεν ὕδωρ.
εἴ δέ τις ἐν ψυχρῆσι λίποι κονίησι λέβητα
παφλάζει κρατεροῖο κυκωμένου ἔνδοθι χαλκοῦ.

Schneider changed κυκωμένου into κυκώμενον, thus referring the participle to the substantive ὕδωρ mentioned in line 277. In reality, both κρατεροῖο and κυκωμένου are two epithets both applied, in asyndetic *cu-*

mulatio, to χαλκοῦ. The subject is, of course, ὕδωρ, and the sense is: «the water boils (παφλάζει) inside the stout, seething (κρατεροῖο κυκωμένου ἔνδοθι) bronze». That is to say: the bronze λέβης (λέβητα, line 278) is said to be seething, insofar as it contains the seething water. The poet is overtly alluding to Homer, *Od.* XII, 235 ff. (λέβης ὤς... κυκωμένη): cf. Ital. «la pentola bolle», Engl. «the pot is boiling».

304 f.:

Αἶψα γὰρ ἠρώων σφιν ἐπέρχεται εἶδος ἀγαυόν,
οἷ τε θεοῦ μέγα δῶρον ἐπισταμένως φορέουσι.

The reading of α, objected to by Hermann (whom all the editors follow) is perfectly sound: the use of the relative pronoun (in this case οἷ) followed by non-copulative τε is well attested in Hellenistic and later epic, as Weinberger underlines (*Quaest. de Orph. Argon.*, p. 303). Such a phenomenon is regarded as non-Homeric by modern scholars (cf. Weinberger, *loc. cit.*), but ancient grammarians thought it was attested in Homer (cf. Friedlaender, *Aristonici* Περὶ Σημ. Ἰλιάδ., p. 34): this is why it occurs in Hellenistic and later epic poetry.

It remains to be added that the subjunctive φορέωσι, preserved in A, would in itself not be unparalleled, cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXVII, and Weinberger, *op. cit.*, p. 272 («*forma hypothetica*»).

330 ff.:

...τί τοι πλέον οὐραγιῶνων
φθέγγομαῖ; τῶν αἶψα καὶ ἰ ὑπόθι περ μάλ' ἐόντων

Line 331 has been arbitrarily altered by the critics (cf. e.g. the discussion in Abel, *ad loc.*). In reality, the line is sound, in the light of later syntax and late epic metre. I have indicated how the line scans, and now I shall comment on it. The indicative φθέγγομαι is *praesens indicativi deliberativum*: for its employment cf. H. White, *New Essays in Hellen. Poetry*, pp. 48 ff.

The scanning φθέγγομαῖ τῶν is, in later poetry, normal (cf. e.g. Jacobs, *Anthol. Graeca, Tomus Tertius*, Lipsiae 1817, p. 1024 («-αι *terminatio ante consonantem apud recentiores correpta*»). Most manuscripts read φθέγγομαι; ὦν, which is evidently a trivialization, i.e. an attempt at eliminating the perfectly normal, though rarer, type of scansion φθέγγομαῖ; τῶν. The final *alpha* in αἶψα is scanned long: this type of scansion is, as Rzach has shown, frequent in epic poetry, and the *Lithica* offer several examples of this phenomenon (cf. e.g. Giannakis, p. 59): in line 331, the final *alpha* of αἶψα is in arsis and is followed by initial κ-. The diphthong -αι in καί is in hiatus, scanned long and followed by initial ὑ-: for examples of this phenomenon cf. lines 100 (θυσιῶν ἱεροπρεπέες), 107 (ἦτοι εἴως), 149 (ἄνθρωπος ἕκτος, ὄλοσθ' ἀπό), 530 (κλάδοι ὄσα), 581 (εὐσέλω ἐνί).

336 f.:

...καὶ γὰρ τοι ἐπισπόμενός μοι ὄδ' ἀνήρ
ὄμοισι κρατεροῖσιν ἐὼν φέρει αἰόλον ὕλην.

The words αἰόλον ὕλην denote the multi-coloured stones which the servant (ἐπισπόμενος ἀνὴρ) carries on his shoulders. Stephanus, not being able to understand what ἑών could mean here, changed it into ἰών, «walking», which would be tautological after ἐπισπόμενος. Tyrwhitt altered ἑών into λίθων, a violent change which, furthermore, produces a superfluous word (λίθων is unwanted, because it is clear from the context that the αἰόλον ὕλην is the mass of multicoloured stones the servant is carrying on his shoulders). The text, in reality, is sound. Here, we are faced with a «*dativus relationis*» (so Mayser, *Gramm. Pap.* II, 2, 1, p. 149 f.; Oldenburger, *op. cit.*, p. 29), or (Keydell, in his *Prolegomena* to Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, pp. 59 ff.) a «*dativus sociativus*», or «*dativus comitativus*» describing a physical «*condicio*» (Keydell, *ibid.*): such a dative consists of a substantive denoting a physical attribute (ὤμοισι) accompanied by its epithet (κρατεροῖσιν), referred (in this case by the participle ἑών) to a person (in this case, the ἀνὴρ). The sense is that the man, being (ἑών) «strong-shouldered» (ὤμοισιν κρατεροῖσι: literally, «being with strong shoulders»), can carry the load of stones. Cf. e.g., for the type, οὔσα ἡδυτέρῃ τῇ φωνῇ (Mayser, *loc. cit.*), «being sweeter-voiced», literally «being with a sweeter voice», or Nonn. *Dionys.*, XLIII, 85 f. (explained by Keydell, *loc. cit.*, p. 61) γένοιτο... ἄλωεὺς... ἀγραύλοισ παλάμησι «let him become a vine-grower with rustic hands», «let him become a rustic-handed vine-grower». For ἑών as used in line 337, cf. line 105.

362:

ἦνδανεν ἄλλοισιν καλέειν ἄψυχον ὀρεῖτην

The adjective ἄψυχον was trivialized into ἔμψυχον by Tzetzes and others (cf. Giannakis' apparatus). Of course, ἄψυχον is sound: here, the *alpha* is not *privativum*, but *intensivum*, and the sense of ἄψυχον is therefore «very much alive». For this type of *alpha intensivum* cf. my observations below, in my discussion of line 763 (ἀμήχανα).

375:

μητέρι νήπιον υἰὸν ἑοικῶς δὴ κατεχούση.

Most editors have accepted Hermann's violent conjecture ἀγκὰς ἐχούση. Schamp (*Revue Belge de Philol. et d'Hist.* 1981, p. 34) suggests δὴν κατεχούση «serrant longuement contre elle». Of course Schamp is right in defending κατεχούση: here, μητέρι... υἰὸν κατεχούση means «a mother, holding her son» (*scil.*, in her arms: cf. line 629 χεῖρεςσι κατάσχοι, = 374 f. χερσὶν ἑαῖς... κατεχούση). It remains to be added that δὴ, here, is sound: it «emphasizes the word it immediately follows» (Denniston, *Gr. Part.*, p. 227), i.e. it emphasizes the participle ἑοικῶς, the sense being «just, exactly (δὴ) similar (ἑοικῶς) to a mother...». The position of δὴ in line 375 is correct: cf. the examples collected by Denniston, *op. cit.*, p. 227, II (1), and, as regards the Orphic corpus, cf. Orph. *Argon.* 946, where Hermann arbitrarily destroys δὴ, whereas Dottin rightly preserves the mss. reading.

Conclusion: the text of line 375 as given by the manuscripts is correct, and no alteration of it is justified; the sense is «just similar to a mother holding her son».

Note, once again, *Selbstvariation*: Hermann, a normative critic *par excellence*, who persecuted *Selbstvariation* wherever he found it, altered δῆ both here in *Lithica* 375 and in Orph. *Argon.* 946, because δῆ, in all other attestations in the *Lithica* and in the Orphic *Argonautica*, occurs «toujours en début de phrase» (Schamp, *Revue Belge de Philol.* 1981, p. 34): but both the author of the *Lithica* and the author of the Orphic *Argonautica* have, in *Selbstvariation*, used δῆ not «en début de phrase» once, respectively in line 375 and 946.

378-380:

ὄπότε γάρ μιν πάγχυ κάμης ἐνὶ χεῖρεσι πάλλων,
ἐξαπίνης ὄρσει νεογιλοῦ παιδὸς αὐτῆν,
φαίης, ἐν κόλπῳ κεκληγότος ἀμφὶ γάλακτι

In this simile, the noise emitted by the stone is compared with the noise made by a baby who wants to be breast-fed. As Eschenbach rightly understood, ἐν κόλπῳ means here «in (his mother's) bosom». The addition «his mother's» (cf. e.g. Ap. Rh., *Arg.* III, 155 μητρὸς ἔης κόλπῳ, Nonn. *Dionys.* XXXIII, 180 f. κόλπου μητρὸς ἔης) is not necessary, because the stone has already been compared to a baby held by his mother in her bosom (line 375). When it is clear from the context whose bosom the poet is speaking of, the addition of a genitive is not needed: cf. e.g. Nonn. XXXV, 209 ἀχράντοιο κόλπου «(the girl's) bosom», XLVIII, 841-2 ἀμαιεύτων ἀπὸ κόλπων κ.τ.λ. «from (his mother's) womb», XXXVII, 523 κόλπον «die Brust (des Gegners)», cf. Peek, *Lexikon zu den Dionys. des Nonnos*, s.v. κόλπος, etc. It is therefore unwarranted to alter φαίης into μαιίης. The optative φαίης is often used in similes. Cf. e.g. A. W. James, *Index to the Orpiani*, s.v. φημί, and Peek, *Wörterbuch zu den Dionys.*, s.v. φημί, where many cases of φαίης are collected. In the passage under discussion, φαίης is an *incisum*, to be put between two commas, the sense being «it will emit the voice, you would say, of a baby...». For such *incisa*, consisting in «ein kurzes Verb. fin.», cf. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf, *Gramm. neut. Griech.*, § 465, 3, with bibliography. A study of the *incisa* in question remains to be done: Menander, *Epitrep.* 735 Körte-Thierfelder φῆσεις «you may say» corresponds to the optative φαίης as used in the line of the *Lithica* we have discussed.

388 f.:

᾿Ωδε μὲν ᾿Ατρείδῃσιν ἀλώσιμον ἔφρασε πάτρην
Λαομεδοντιάδης φοιβήτορι λαῖ πιθήσας.

Hermann (cf. Abel's apparatus) changed ᾿ωδε into τ᾿ωδε, thus creating the sense «huic lapidi fatidico». But ᾿ωδε is sound: the adverb is used as we find it e.g. at Q.Sm. XIII, 5 (cf. Bauer, *Wört. N.T.*, s.v. ᾿ωδε, 2 b), i.e. it is

further clarified by φοιβήτορι λάϊ. The sense is: «under such circumstances» (ὥδε: «unter solchen Umständen», Bauer, *loc. cit.*) Helenus, persuaded by the prophetic stone...». The circumstances to which ὥδε refers are those mentioned in lines 384 ff. (θεοπροπίην κ.τ.λ.).

415:

ἦν δέ κ' ἀποπνεύση, τίς ἔτ' ἐλπωρὴ παρὰ νεκρῆς;

Hermann (cf. Abel's apparatus *ad* line 247) underlined that the construction ἦν κε, which we find in line 415, is perfectly legitimate in epic: he changed, here at line 415, ἦν into εἶ because the poet as a rule uses εἶ κε. But Hermann had forgotten that the poet of the *Lithica*, like all other epic poets, likes *Selbstvariation*: just as Homer and other epic poets use, as a rule, εἶ κε, but, exceptionally, employ ἦν κε (cf. Abel *ad* line 247), so the author of the *Lithica*, using the same principle of *Selbstvariation*, employed ἦν κε here in line 415, and εἶ κε elsewhere. *Selbstvariation* is a principle which is ever applied in epic poetry: «l'alternarsi di forme diverse... é normale» (Cássola, *op. cit.*, p. 626); in Hom. *Hymn. Herm.* 255 we read θᾶπτον, whereas in the same Hymn we read θᾶσσον at line 212.

To put it another way. The reproduction of «Homeric rarities and *unica*» (Chryssafis, Theocr. XXV, p. 287) is a compulsory ingredient of Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic epic poetry. For the *Lithica*, cf. H. White, *New Studies in Greek Poetry, Index*, s.v. *Reproduction of Homeric Rarities*. The Orphic *Argonautica* present many cases of the type of reproductions in question (cf. e.g. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXIV: «des exemples en sont rares et suspects chez Homère»). The author of the *Lithica* uses, as an *unicum*, ἦν κε in order to reproduce the Homeric *unicum* which he found at *Iliad* XIII, 127, not to speak of the «didactici et recentiores epici» (cf. Abel, *ad* line 247), just as he has reproduced the extremely rare Homeric dative ending -αισι(v) at lines 621 and 673, as we have already observed. Hermann, quite arbitrarily, has removed all these carefully reproduced rarities from the text of the *Lithica*. His «corrections intempestives» are rightly denounced by Dottin, e.g. p. XCVI.

444-446:

ἔσπετο σὺν θ' ἐτάροις, ἔθειλέν τε μιν οἶος ἔπεσθαι.

Ἥ μὲν κέν μιν πολλὰ πατήρ μενέαιεν ἐρύσσειν,

ἀσχαλῶν ἔδον υἷα φίλον θήρεσσι μάχεσθαι.

Hermann changed μιν (line 444) into οἶ, because ἔπεσθαι governs, in epic, the dative (cf. Abel, *ad* line 444). But the fact is that μιν, in epic, can be used as a dative (cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXIII; also Chryssafis, *Cor. Londin.* III, 1983, p. 15 f., and especially *Cor. Londin.* IV, 1984, pp. 18 ff.). In line 445, Musgrave altered ἐρύσσειν into ἐρύκειν: his alteration is accepted by Giannakis. The conjecture is unwarranted. Here, μενέαιεν governs the future infinitive ἐρύσσειν — a perfectly normal syntactical construction; the future ἐρύσσει (same *sedes*) occurs in *Lithica* 35. It is true that ἠρύκωναν occurs in line 449, but there is no need to alter the mss. reading ἐρύσσειν in

line 445. The poet has achieved a neat *Umkehrung* of the wording which occurs in *Iliad* XXI, 176. As regards the sense, we must note that the verb ἐρύω, in late epic, can mean «urge orally someone back from his intention», as is clear from e.g. Nonn. *Dionys.* XXX, 251 ff.: Dionysos was running away from the battle (φεύγοντα), and Athena was sent to «urge him back» («bring him back», Rouse, in his Loeb translation) into battle (εἰς ἐνοπήν) from his flight, by making him change his mind (μεταστρέψαντα μενοινήν). Here, the hero's father is described as wishing (μενείανεν) to urge his son back (ἐρύσσειν) from his determination to fight dangerous beasts.

457 ff.:

Τοῖον Γαῖα βροτοῖσιν ἀρηγόνα τίκτεν ὀρείτην,
 ὅστε καὶ οὐταμένοις ἄκος ἠρώεσσι κομίζει
 καὶ στειρήσι γυναιξὶ τεκεῖν φίλα τέκνα δίδωσι.
 Ποικίλα γὰρ θνητοῖσι θεοὺς ἔρδειν ἀγορεύω.

The mss. reading θεοὺς was violently changed into λίθους by Schneider, whom all the editors follow. This alteration is unwarranted. In line 492 (= 486 ed. Hermann), the poet says, of course, γαγάτην θέσκελα ῥέζειν οἶδα, but in line 460 he is alluding to the *Leitmotiv* of the *Lithica*, namely the fact that it is not the stones themselves, but the gods that, by creating for the benefit of mankind stones which are useful because of their medical or magical properties, accomplish miracles: cf. lines 175 ff., 225 ff., 289 ff., 302-305, 329-333, etc., cf. also line 171, line 644 (οὐρανόθεν), line 665 (οὐρανίην). In this case, the deity concerned is Γαῖα, who gave birth (τίκτεν, line 457) to the stone called ὀρείτην (line 457) for the benefit (ἀρηγόνα, line 457) of mortals (βροτοῖσι, line 457). In line 457, Γαῖα is of course personified as a goddess (she is invoked as a goddess in lines 713 ff., κλησιν... Γαίης; on the «pouvoirs» of the goddess Earth cf. Halleux-Schamp, *Les Lapidaires Grecs*, p. 106; cf. e.g. the powers of the god Ἡέλιος, lines 301 ff.).

481:

οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἀπὸ σφετέρου πεπαλαγμένοι...

Wiel changed ἀπὸ into ὑπό, because the poet elsewhere uses ὑπό to denote the agent or cause (cf. Giannakis, *ad loc.*). The alteration is unjustified, because, in late epic, ἀπὸ can be used, like ὑπό, to denote cause. Wiel, of course, hesitated to propose his conjecture, because he knew perfectly well that the principle of *Selbstvariation* is followed by the author of the *Lithica*, who could therefore use not only ὑπό, but also (i.e. in line 481) ἀπὸ to denote cause, consequence or agent: what made Wiel propose, however hesitatingly, his conjecture was the fact that he believed that ἀπὸ denoting cause or consequence was not found in late epic. We know now, instead, that ἀπὸ meaning «infolge von...» is well attested in Nonnus (cf. Peek, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. ἀπὸ, p. 159: «wirkende Ursache»). The *Sprachgebrauch* of Nonnus and of the *Orphica*, as everybody knows, has much in common.

507:

ὕδατος ἀτηρὴν ὀλέκει κατὰ γαστέρος ὕλην.

The mss. reading ὕλην was changed to ἰλύν by Schrader, whom everybody follows. The alteration is unwarranted, because ὕλη, in later Greek and indeed in the Orphic corpus, can mean precisely ἰλύς, as I have underlined in *Journ. Hell. Stud.*, 1975, p. 38 and *Journ. Hell. Stud.* 1978, p. 182, where I quote, *inter alia*, Abel, *Orphica*, p. 159.

511:

Καὶ Περσηΐδαο μένος μέγα κουραλίοιο

Schrader, followed by all the editors, changed Περσηΐδαο into Περσηΐάδαο, his conjecture is arbitrary, because the author of the *Lithica* patently wants to reproduce here the Homeric variant (Iliad XIX, 116 Περσηΐδαο which is attested in many manuscripts of the Iliad (cf. the apparatuses in the editions published by Ludwich and by Allen). Since, as we have already noted, ι was dichronous by the time the poet of the *Lithica* wrote his work, he evidently scanned Περσηΐδαο.

517-525:

χλωρὴ γὰρ βοτάνη πρῶτον φύει, οὐδ' ἐνὶ γαίῃ,
 ἦν γε φυτῶν ἴσμεν στερεὴν τροφόν, ἀλλ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ
 ἀτρυγέτω, ἵνα φύκι', ἵνα βρῦα γίνετ' ἐλαφρά.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κ' ἔλθησι μαραιομένη ποτὶ γῆρας,
 ἦτοι μὲν οἱ φύλλα περιφθινύθουσιν ὑφ' ἄλμης,
 αὐτὴ δ' ἐν βένθεσσιν ὑποφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης
 νήχεται, ὄφρα ἔ κύματ' ἀποπτύση αἰγιαλόνδε.
 ἔνθα δ' ἄρ' ἐξαπίνης μιν ἀναπνεύσασαν ὑπ' αἴθρην
 βάζουσ' οἱ περ ἴδοντο, κρατυνομένην ὄρασθαι.

This is perhaps the most debated passage in the *Lithica*: a look at Giannakis' apparatus and at his note *ad loc.* will show the numerous and often violent attempts at altering line 524. In reality, line 524 is perfectly sound. The passage describes the stone called κουράλιον it is born as a plant (βοτάνη), which is soft (ἐλαφρά), in the sea; at first it swims in the deep (βένθεσσιν) sea, but then it reaches the shore (522-523), where (ἐνθα), exposed to the air (524: ὑπ' αἴθρην: under the sky, i.e. no longer submerged in the deep sea), it hardens (κρατυνομένην) and finally becomes a stone (πετροῦται, line 527). The phrase ὑπ' αἴθρην «under the sky-air» is grammatically correct: for ὑπό governing the accusative, without any sense of motion, cf. e.g. LSJ, s.v. ὑπό, C, 2). What has caused incredible difficulties is the participle ἀναπνεύσασαν. The participle is, in reality, perfectly sound. All the critics agree that the κουράλιον is born as a living being, which as such swims (νήχεται, 523) in the sea. Here, ἀναπνεύσασαν means «having reposed», «having rested»: the κουράλιον first swims in the sea (ὑποφλοίσβοιο, correctly defended by H. White, in her already quoted monograph); such swimming evidently tired the κουράλιον, which can then

repose, i.e. have a rest, under the sky-air, on the shore where (ἐνθα) it starts becoming hard. For the verb ἀναπνέω meaning «repose», «have a rest», «enjoy a respite», cf. LSJ, s.v., and also *Diccionario Griego-Español*, s.v. ἀναπνέω («descansar»). To conclude: the verbs νήγεται and ἀναπνεύσασαν are metaphors, indicating that the κουράλιον is envisaged as a living being, which as such swims and then reposes, i.e. has a rest. On this type of metaphor, expressed by a verb alone, without any addition such as would be ὡσπερεί, «as it were», cf. my note in *Mus. Phil. Lond.* IV, 1981, pp. 62 ff., and also *Sicul. Gymn.* 1987, p. 11. The metaphorical use of ἀναπνέω made by the author of the *Lithica* is not original: this metaphoricis applied to a field which «rests», «reposes» in Chrys., *Migne* 62, 223, as noted in *Dicc. Griego-Español*, s.v. A, I, 3. The epithet ὑποφλοίσβοιο «making a gentle noise» is contextually apposite: the κουράλιον, being delicate (ἐλαφρά), swims only when the sea is comparatively calm, not stormy, because the powerful waves of a stormy sea would tear the delicate κουράλιον to pieces. In the passage of the *Lithica* under discussion, the verb ἀναπνεύσασαν means, metaphorically, «having enjoyed a respite», «having rested»: it cannot mean, non-metaphorically, «having resumed breathing real air», because the κουράλιον, like the field in Chrys., *loc. cit.*, never needed, by its nature, to breathe any air: it was born *under* the sea, and swam *under* the sea (βένθεσσιν) until it reached the shore. The metaphorical use under discussion of ἀναπνέω (= «enjoy a respite», «descansar») is attested, in Greek literature, from Homer to Nonnus (cf. *Dicc. Griego-Español*, *loc. cit.*). Pindar, *Nem.* I, 1, makes elegant use of ἄμπνευμα: the word (cf. the commentators *ad loc.*) can mean either that Alpheus «took a respite» after his pursuit of Arethusa under the sea, or that Alpheus «breathed real air again», after not being able to breathe air whilst swimming under the sea. My dear colleague Dr. Veneri (University of Urbino) refers me, for the use of ἀναπνέω, to Ebeling, *Lex. Homer.*, s.v.

532:

φλοιός θ' ὅσπερ ἔην· φλοιός κεν λάϊνός ἐστιν.

We have already noted, when discussing lines 84-86, that Hermann's conjecture φλοιός δέ γε is unwarranted, because there is no need to remove κεν. It remains to be added that there is no need to intrude δέ either, because the sentence beginning with φλοιός κεν is added *asyndetically*. *Asyndeton* is no less frequent in the *Lithica* than in any other late epic text: cf. line 58, line 100 (where δ' has been inserted, arbitrarily, after θυσίαί, by Wiel: the scanning is θυσίᾱ ἱερο-, in hiatus), line 405, line 764 (where Abel would like to remove the *asyndeton*).

533-537:

Τερπωλή δ' ἠδεῖα θεωμένου ἐς φρένα σείο
βήσεται· ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ, τι μοι θέλγητρον ἰδόντι
αἰὲν ἐπὶ πραπίδας καταλείβεται· οὐδὲ δύνανται

ὄσσε κορεσθῆναι θηωμένου, ἀλλὰ με θάμβος
σεύηται στέρνοισιν ὄιομένου τέρας εἶναι.

For θηωμένου (line 536) cf. Abel's apparatus *ad loc.* It would be unwarranted to alter σεύηται. This form is a regular subjunctive (cf. *Iliad* III, 26, XI, 415). Ancient grammarians taught that Homer liked to employ «non modo temporum, sed etiam modorum enallagen» (Friedlaender, *op. cit.*, pp. 7 ff.): the author of the *Lithica* has first employed the indicative future (βήσεται), then he has used two presents (καταλείβεται, δύνανται) (which have futural force: Friedlaender, *op. cit.*, p. 6), and then he has added the subjunctive σεύηται (with futural force: Friedlaender, *op. cit.*, p. 9⁶). The poet, in sum, is describing what will happen to his reader and to himself at the sight of the τέρας. The genitive ὄιομένου is evidently the correct (*difficilior*) reading, whereas the variant ὄίομενον is a trivialization: the genitive ὄιομένου referring to the accusative με is an anakolouthon of epic type («génitif du participe après un pronom à l'accusatif»: Chantraine, *Gramm. Hom.* II, Paris 1963, § 469 ff.). Such participial anakoloutha, which are, in Homer, traits of «archaïque» style (Chantraine, *loc. cit.*) continue to be employed in post-Homeric epic (cf. e.g. Alex. Aetol., fr. 3, line 13 καθαψαμένης; also lines 3-4, another anakolouthon: νύμφης... ἐλίσσομένη κ.τ.λ.). These anakoloutha were used by post-Homeric poets because they wanted to reproduce the «*simplicitas sermonis prisci*», i.e. the archaic style typical of Homer (cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.*, I, p. 152, note 74).

576 f.:

Θῆκε δ', ἀδελφειοῦ κλέος ἀφθιτον ὧς κε πέλοιτο,
αἰεὶ κουραλίου προτέρην φύσιν ἀλλάσσεσθαι.

Tyrwhitt altered κουραλίου into κουράλιον, in order to obtain the sense «fecit autem, ut fratris gloria immortalis fieret, Corallium in aeternum priorem naturam mutare». However, the middle ἀλλάσσεσθαι can mean not only «mutare» (transitive), but also «modificarse», «cambiarse», «alterarse» (Dicc. Griego-Español, s.v. ἀλλάττω, IV, 1 and 3): therefore the reading κουραλίου is correct, the sense being «and she, in order that her brother's glory might be immortal, caused the original nature of the κουράλιον (κουραλίου φύσιν) to change, to alter (ἀλλάσσεσθαι) for ever». In sum: here ἀλλάσσεσθαι is intransitive, and means «modificarse», «become altered».

583:

καὶ χόλον ἀνδροφόνον φεύγειν ἀπο ληϊστήρων.

Ruhnken changed χόλον into λόχον. The epithet ἀνδροφόνον is used in *enallage adjectivi*, and should therefore be preferred to the reading of S, ἀνδροφόνων, which is an evident trivialization aimed at eliminating the elegant *enallage*. Abel, for his part (cf. his apparatus) wonders whether the mss. reading χόλον might be correct here, but he cannot contribute any

⁶ Also Oldenburger, *op. cit.*, p. 12 f.

convincing factor. The mss. reading *χόλον* in line 583 is sound, because the word *χόλος*, in later epic (cf. Q. Sm. V, 457 and XII, 15), acquired the meaning «*insidiae*», i.e. it came to mean *δόλος*, which meaning the word *χόλον* has here in *Lith.* 583 (*χόλον... ληϊστήρων = insidias piratarum*). The word *χόλος* became synonymous with *δόλος* «*insidiae*» in later epic, because in the Homeric text *χόλος* is attested as a variant alongside *δόλος*. For instance, Quintus uses *χόλον* instead of, and as a synonym of, *δόλον* at *Posthom.* V, 457 because he approved of the variant *χόλον* (cf. the apparatus of Ludwig's edition at *Od.* X, 232) instead of the reading *δόλον* at *Odyssey* X, 232. There is no doubt that Quintus' phrase in *Posthom.* V, 457 *οἷσατο γὰρ χόλον εἶναι* is modelled upon Hom., *Od.* X, 232, as Koechly underlines: what remains to be said is that Quintus accepted, at *Od.* X, 232, the variant *χόλον*, and not the reading *δόλον*.

The word *χόλος* came to be used as a synonym of *δόλος* because *χόλος* is a tendency *εἰς τὸ δρᾶσαι τι πονηρόν* (*schol. Od.* II, 315, p. 108 Dindorf), and *δόλος* is by nature *πονηρός* (cf. LSJ, s.v. *δόλος*, 2). To conclude: the variant *χόλον* at *Od.* X, 232, and the mss. reading *χόλον* both in Q. Sm. V, 457 as well as in *Lith.* 583, means «*insidias*».

588-593:

φάρμακα δ' ὄσσα πέλονται ἀτάσθαλα καὶ κατάδεσμοι
 ἀραὶ τ' ἀγνάμπτοισιν Ἐρινύσι πάγχυ μέλουσαι,
 εἶτε μίσος κεύθων οἰκοφθόρον οὐκ ἐνόησεν
 ἀνήρ, εἶθ' ὄσα λύματ' ἐπὶ σφίσιν ἦδ' ἐπαιιδάς
 σχέτλιοι ἀλλήλοισι μεγαίροντες τελέουσι,
 593 πάντων ἀντίλυτον δῆεις κρατερώτατον εἶναι.

The mss. reading *ἀντίλυτον* has been changed to *ἀντίδοτον* by Nauck, whom Abel and Giannakis follow, whilst Stephanus conjectured *ἀντίλυτρον*, without, however, satisfactorily explaining the passage. The reading *ἀντίλυτον*, as I shall demonstrate, is perfectly sound, and the context eminently perspicuous. The poet is talking about *defixiones* and spells (*κατάδεσμοι* line 588, *ἐπαιιδάς* line 591) against which the stone called *κουράλιον* acts as a talisman, an amulet. As is well known, *λύματα* (here used in line 591) means, in its non-metaphorical sense, *λυτρώσιμα*, «redeemable things» (Thes., s.v. *λύμα*, 432 A). In the language of magic, *defixiones* and spells cast on a person were envisaged as metaphorical *λυτρώσιμα*, i.e. as physical or mental diseases which could be metaphorically «redeemed», i.e. got rid of, by means of appropriate amulets, which acted as «counter-magic» (cf. Moulton-Milligan, *Vocab. Gr. Test.*, s.v. *λυτρώω*; and *Pap. Gr. Mag.*, vol. II, p. 213, a text written on a «Papyrusamulett», «Bitte um Schutz gegen Krankheit»: *καὶ λυτρώσεις αὐτὴν ἀπὸ πάσης ἀρρωστείας τῆς περὶ ψυχῆς*). Here, the magic stone *κουράλιον* is described as the metaphorical «redemption», *ἀντίλυτρον*, i.e. as the counter-magic-producing amulet which «redeems», «gets rid of», *defixiones* and spells cast on people. The author of

the *Lithica*, instead of writing ἀντίλυτρον, prefers the late spelling ἀντίλυτον, i.e. he adopts the spelling (frequently attested in magical papyri) whereby the consonant -ρ-«evanuit» (Crönert, *Mem. Gr. Hercul.*, p. 81, with footnote 1). The reason why the author of the *Lithica* has adopted the spelling ἀντίλυτον resides in the fact that, as Professor Tessier makes me observe, the spelling in question enabled him to avoid *correptio Attica*: as a rule, the poet shuns *correptio Attica*, and employs it only when compelled by metrical necessity (cf. Giannakis, *op. cit.*, p. 60).

For ἀντίλυτρον as a real or metaphorical «redemption», «ransom», «Lösegeld» cf. especially Bauer, *Wört. N.T.*, s.v.

In sum: the λύματα in line 591 are the metaphorical λυτρώσιμα, i.e. the spells and *defixiones* against which the κουράλιον acts as a metaphorical «redemption», i.e. as a powerful ἀντίλυτ(ρ)ον, as a powerful talisman which gets rid of them. Of course κατάδεσμοι, ἀραί, μίσος, λύματα (= as already explained, λυτρώσιμα) and ἐπαιιδάς are all synonymous: the author of the *Lithica* uses them in lines 588-591, in conformity with the predilection late epic writers have for the display of synonyms. The word μίσος in line 590 caused difficulties to the critics (cf. e.g. Abel *ad loc.*) because they were not familiar with the ancient concept of φθόνος or βασκανία. Here, μίσος has the meaning attested in magical papyri (cf. *Pap. Gr. Mag.*, Reg. I, *Griechische Worte*, s.v. μῖσος⁷). The intended victim of a spell (i.e. *defixio*, μῖσος, ἐπαιίδα) never knows that the spell has been cast upon him or her: he or she will therefore, as a precautionary and preventative measure, carry a talisman which will undo (ἀντίλυτ(ρ)ον) the effect of any spell which might have been cast upon him or her. The variant μύσος «dirt», «*piaculum*» is contextually out of place, because the poet is describing the effect which the stone called κουράλιον has upon *defixiones*, and is not talking about garbage. The said variant μύσος was called into existence by someone who mistook λύματα in line 591 to mean «garbage» (whereas the word λύματα has here, as we have seen, the meaning λυτρώσιμα, = «spells»)⁸.

617:

ἀλλ' οἶος πάντων προφερέστατος, εἴ κέ μιν εὔροις,
εἶδος ἔχοντα δαφαινὸν κ.τ.λ.

Hermann changed the optative εὔροις into εὔρης, and his conjecture is accepted by Giannakis. The conjecture is unwarranted, because the optative after a primary tense is normal in later epic: cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXVI, Weinberger, *op. cit.*, p. 260 (in final sentences, «post tempus primarium... saepius optativus legitur»), pp. 275 ff., for the «enuntiata condicionalia», etc.

⁷ *Pap. Gr. Mag.* II, p. 47 (it is a φίλτροκατάδεσμος, cf. p. 45): διάσωσών με... ἀπὸ φαρμάκων (= φάρμακα, Lith. 588) καὶ βασκοσύνης... μῖσους; *Pap. Gr. Mag.* II, p. 228 («Amulett»): φθόνος... καὶ μῖσος; *Pap. Gr. Mag.* II, p. 234 («Trennungsauber», cf. p. 233): ὀδός... μῖσος κ.τ.λ.

⁸ For the scanning μῖσος in line 590; cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXLV.

The counterpart of this phenomenon is that «coniunctivus post praeterita frequenter occurrit apud huius aetatis poetas» (Abel, *op. cit.*, p. 39). Cf. my discussion of lines 85-86, where I deal with line 472.

The use of the optative after a primary tense is of course a Homeric rarity, as such reproduced by later poets: cf. H. White, «Three Epigrams from the Garland of Philip», forthcoming in «*Corolla Londiniensis*», vol. 5.

649 f.:

ὄφρα κε πάντ' αἰδήλα πολύτροχον ἀμφιπετάσσας
νῶτον ἐὼν τεύξει, μηδ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος
θυμὸν ἀνιήσας Κρόνος οὐρανὸν εἰσέτι ναίοι.

The optatives τεύξει and ναίοι would be regular after ὄφρα (cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXIV f.), but the indicatives τεύξει and ναίει (evidently a *praesens pro futuro*, parallel to the future τεύξει), attested as variants, are not impossible: cf. Oldenburger, *op. cit.*, p. 19. Abel's conjecture τεύξαι, accepted by Giannakis, is arbitrary: ὄφρα τεύξαι corresponds exactly, for instance, to ὄφρα καλέσσοι in Orph. *Argon.* 655 (where Hermann⁹ arbitrarily altered καλέσσοι into καλέσσαι).

The *optativus futuri* (for classical Greek cf. Kühner-Gerth, I, p. 183 and Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* II, p. 337) as used here in *Lith.* 650 (τεύξαι) and Orph. *Arg.* 655 (καλέσσοι), i.e. not as *optativus obliquus*, occurs not only in later Greek prose (cf. F. W. A. Dickinson, *The Use of the Optative Mood...*, Diss. Washington 1926, p. 64; Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of Rom. Byz. Per.*, p. 46 f.), but also in poetry (e.g. *A.P.* V, 100, 1, = Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*, 1056: μέμψοιτο).

664 f.:

...νημερτὲς ἀπόρροϊάν κεν αἰδοῖ
οὐρανήν καλέουσιν ἐς ἀνθρώπους ἀφίκεσθαι.

Schneider, followed by Abel and Giannakis, altered καλέουσιν into κλείουσιν. It is perfectly true that κλείω can be used with the accusative and the infinitive (cf. LSJ, s.v. κλείω, II; e.g. Ap. Rhod., *Arg.* I, 18 f. ἔτι κλείουσιν κ.τ.λ.), but καλέω, too, can govern the said construction (cf. Thes., s.v. καλέω, C): therefore the mss. reading καλέουσιν, in line 665, is sound and should not be tampered with.

673-674:

καὶ γλήναισι τεῆσιν ὀμιλήσας, κυλίκεσσι
ἀνδρός τ' αἰδοίων ἄκος ἔσσεται ὅς κε πῆσι.

We have already seen that the mss. reading γλήναισι, wrongly altered by Hermann whom all the editors follow, is perfectly sound. We shall now discuss the rest of this passage, which is one of the most debated in the *Lithica*: we shall namely see that the text is sound. The critics could not un-

⁹ Following Eschenbach: cf. Abel's apparatus in his edition of Orph. *Argon.* Cf. also Vian's apparatus, in his edition of the Orphic *Argonautica* (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1987).

derstand the grammatical structure of these two lines, and therefore they proposed more or less violent alterations (all of which are unwarranted). The grammatical difficulty has been seen by the critics in the fact that, although there are two sentences, connected with each other by καί... τε, there is only one *verbum finitum*, namely πίησι. In order to introduce a second *verbum finitum* into the passage, Abel postulated a lacuna between lines 673 and 674, but such a lacuna, as has already been observed and as I wish to underline now, is unnecessary from the point of view of the sense, because lines 673-674 say all that is needed, and all that we know from medical writers, i.e. that the liquid containing pulverized *haematites* can be used as a *collyrium* to be applied to the eyes (either instilled or anointed: ἐγχυματιζόμενος ἢ ὑπαλειφόμενος, Galenus XII, p. 196 Kühn) in order to cure their diseases, or as a potion to be drunk in order to cure the diseases of the urinary tract (Dioscor. Περί ὕλης ἱατρ. 5, 126 πίνεται... πρὸς δυσουρίας...; Περί ἀπλ. φαρμ. 2, 113 δυσουρίας δὲ θεραπεύει πινόμενα... αἱματίτης λίθος κτλ.): γλῆναισι, in line 673, refers to the use of *haematites* as a *collyrium* for the eyes, and αἰδοίων ἄκος in line 674 refers to the use of *haematites* used as a potion to cure the diseases of the uro-genital tract. The lacuna is not necessary from the point of view of grammar either, as we shall see soon. A factor which is decisive for the understanding of the text in lines 673 f. is that κολίκεσσιν «drinking cup» can only refer to the potion drunk as an αἰδοίων ἄκος, i.e. can only go with πίησι, and cannot refer to the *collyrium*, which was not drunk, but applied to the γλῆναι, i.e. to the eyes (therefore Giannakis' textual alteration and punctuation are untenable).

The text, as I have just said, is perfectly sound. In order to understand it, we must remember two important facts, both of which have been overlooked by the critics. First of all, the stone *haematites*, pulverized and mixed with a liquid, was used for two purposes: as a *collyrium*, it was applied¹⁰ to the eyes in order to cure ophthalmic diseases, and as a potion it was drunk in order to cure the diseases of the urinary tract¹¹. Secondly, the participle, in epic poetry, could be used instead of a *verbum finitum*, and often, in medical-didactic poetry, as the equivalent of the imperative (cf. in particular H. White, *Studies in the Poetry of Nicander, Select Index*, s.v. «Participle employed instead of the Imperative»). From these two facts we can draw the conclusion that the text of lines 673-674 is sound. The poet first states that the stone *haematites*, pulverized and mixed with a liquid,

¹⁰ On such *collyria*, which were applied to the eye (not drunk by the patient) cf. Halleux-Schamp, *op. cit.*, p. 320; Hippocr., vol. 8, pp. 458-459 Littré; Galenus, *Opera*, ed. Kühn, *Index*, s.v. *Collyrium, Collyria, Oculares Compositiones, Ocularia Medicamenta*; the technical term was ἐγχριόμενος, if the *collyrium* was an ointment which was smeared upon the eye, or ἐγχυματιζῶ if the *collyrium* was instilled into the eye (by means of a feather, the ancient equivalent of the modern dropper: Hippocr., *loc. cit.*), cf. Galenus, *Opera*, ed. Kühn, XII, pp. 753 and 754, and Thes., s.v. ἐγχυματιζῶ.

¹¹ Cf. Plin. XXXVI, 145: *bibitus*, as quoted by Halleux-Schamp, *op. cit.*, p. 321.

constituted a *collyrium* for the treatment of the diseases of the eyes (lines 666-672).

The fluid remedy made up of pulverized *haematites* mixed with a liquid constituted, however, not only a *collyrium* to be applied to the eyes, but also a potion to be drunk in order to treat the diseases of the urinary tract, as we have observed: therefore, the poet says, in lines 673-674, that pulverized *haematites* mixed with a liquid «on the one hand (καί) must come into contact (ὀμιλήσας) with your eyes (γλήναισι) —scil. as a *collyrium*—, and on the other (τε) will be a remedy (ἄκος ἔσσεται) for the genital organ (αἰδοίων) of the man who will drink it (ἄνδρὸς, ὃς κε πίησι) out of a drinking cup (κυλίκεσσιν)». For the emphatic position of κυλίκεσσιν cf. footnote 12.

My explanation of lines 673-674 is fully confirmed by the fact that the «ordre des recettes» (Helleux-Schamp, *op. cit.*, p. 321) is, evidently by tradition, the same in the *Lithica* as in the other medical sources: in the *Lithica* we are told first that *haematites* can be used as a *collyrium* for the eyes, and then that it can be used as a potion to be drunk to cure the diseases of the genito-urinary tract; in Pliny, XXXVI, 144 we are told first that *haematites* can be used as a *collyrium* for the eyes (perhaps as a dry *collyrium*: *uritur... oculis... mire convenit*), and then that *in vesicae vitiis efficax bibitur*. In the *Κηρύγματα*, p. 152 Abel we read first of *haematites* used as a *collyrium* (εἰς πᾶσαν ὀφθαλμίαν) and then of *haematites* used as a potion (μετὰ ὕδατος πινόμενον), and in Damigeron IX we read first of *haematites lapis* used as a *collyrium* (*inunctus... infusus*), and then of *haematites* used as a potion (*potatus cum aqua... per potionem*).

I shall now explain the two lines 673-674 from the point of view of Greek grammar and vocabulary. First of all: the participle ὀμιλήσας is here the equivalent of the imperative ὀμιλήσάτω, and means «it must come into contact with»; the verb ὀμιλέω, governing the dative of the part of the body with which something must come into contact, is a medical *terminus technicus* (cf. LSJ, s.v. ὀμιλέω V, 2, with examples); here, ὀμιλήσας governs the dative γλήναισι. The imperatival participle ὀμιλήσας is here coupled (by means of καί... τε) with the future ἔσσεται: such type of coupling was employed, as is well known, for reasons of *variatio* (cf. H. White, *loc. cit.* and Klauser, *De dicendi genere in Nic.*, Diss. Wien 1898, p. 83: «solo variandi studio»; cf. also H. Schneider, *Vergl. Untersuch. zur sprachl. Struktur der... lehrged... des Nik.*, Wiesbaden 1962, pp. 53 ff., a structuralistic view of the phenomenon; on the use of the participle «*pro imperativo*», cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 460 f.).

The particles καί... τε connect the two sentences γλήναισι ὀμιλήσας (where, as we have seen, ὀμιλήσας is the equivalent of the imperative ὀμιλήσάτω) and ἄνδρὸς αἰδοίων ἄκος ἔσσεται; the particle τε occupies, in the sentence it connects, the third position (i.e., it comes after the two words

κωλίκεσσιν ἀνδρός), which is perfectly normal (cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXII). The dative κωλίκεσσι is, as everybody agrees, a poetic plural, and is governed by πίησι (an epic construction, attested in Homer: cf., for πίνω governing the dative denoting the cup out of which one drinks, LSJ, s.v. πίνω, I, quoting *Od.* XIV, 112, Xenoph. *Anab.* 6, 1, 4 κερατίνοις ποτηρίοις; cf. also Gow-Page, *Hellen. Epigr.*, line 1858 πίνει... κάδοις). The double genitive ἀνδρὸς αἰδοίων («a remedy for the genital organ, αἰδοίων, of the man, ἀνδρός») is a construction typical of epic poetry, cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, pp. 392, 589, and H. White, *Cor. Londin.* I, 1981, p. 164; cf. *Lithica*, lines 138 or 711. Note the elegant enjambement, whereby the word κωλίκεσσιν is connected with the sentence which follows, in line 674 (on this type of enjambement, achieved by the «conjunction» τε in line 674, cf. McLennan, *Calim., Hymn to Zeus*, p. 136; cf. e.g. *Lithica* 303). The enjambement between lines 673 and 674, whereby the word κωλίκεσσιν, at the end of line 673, goes with the verb πίησι, at the end of line 674, is a very common type in the *Lithica*: cf. lines 29 f., 82 f., 208 f., 245 f., 317 f., 364 f., 499 f., 684 f., 746 f. The type of enjambement between lines 673 and 674 requires a comma to be placed before κωλίκεσσιν: for this type, cf. e.g. lines 499 and 684, where the comma is correctly printed by Abel and Halleux-Schamp.

For the enjambement of words which, like κωλίκεσσιν, are «*in versus exitu posita*» as discussed by the ancients¹² cf. Friedlaender, *Nicanoris Περὶ Ἴλιακ.* Στιγμῆς, reprint Hakkert 1967, p. 135 f. Line 673 of the *Lithica* contains two instances of the same case (datives γλήναισι and κωλίκεσσιν): such lines are not rare in the *Lithica* (25, 373, 620; 115, 243, 450).

To conclude: the text of lines 673-674 is perfectly sound, in the light of the medical and syntactical facts which I have explained. The variant πινόμενος in line 668, offered by A, is an evident mistake; the correct reading is of course μιννόμενος. That the reading of A, πινόμενος, is a mistake is proved by the fact that *collyria* were not drunk, but applied to the eyes, as we have already underlined: Wiel (*ap.* Abel, p. 102) rightly underlines that the ancients treated the diseases of the eyes by means of *collyria* which were applied as «*unguenta*» to the eyes, and not by means of «*potiones*». How did the mistaken reading πινόμενος arise? The reply is easy. Whenever a participle is used as a *verbum finitum*, as is the cases with ὀμιλήσας in line

¹² The reader understands that κωλίκεσσιν goes with πίησι and not with ὀμιλήσας because *collyria* are not drunk out of a drinking cup, and because the particles καί... τε (cf. Peek, *Lex. Nonn.*, s.v. τε, II, 1) indicate that κωλίκεσσιν, which cannot go with ὀμιλήσας, cannot but go with πίησι. Therefore a comma is to be placed before κωλίκεσσιν, just as a comma is to be placed before τινάσσων in *Ap. Rh.*, *Argon.* I, 753. For the type of enjambement under discussion, whereby a comma is to be placed before the last word in the hexameter, cf. e.g. *Ap. Rh.*, *Argon.* III, 1058, III, 1161, or IV, 962.

The mention of κωλίκεσσιν with πίησι is not otiose: the author of the *Lithica* wants to underline that, in order to render urination easy, it is necessary to drink the potion containing pulverized *haematites* in large amounts, as opposed to the small quantities of *collyrium* applied to the eyes (a κύλιξ contained, on average, one pint of liquid, according to Smith, *Dict. Antiq.*, sec. ed., s.v. *calix*). In order to underline his point, the poet places κωλίκεσσιν in an emphatic position, at the end of line 673.

673, copyists who did not understand that the participle was equivalent to a *verbum finitum* tried to give to the participle concerned a purely participial force, by eliminating the conjunction which joined the participle with the *verbum finitum* present in the sentence. In so doing, the copyists produced a sentence which was often logically impossible. Exactly this has happened in the case under discussion: in A, the conjunction τε was arbitrarily eliminated (A, instead of the correct text ἀνδρός τ' αἰδοίων, reads ἀνέρος αἰδοίων); the text of A offers words which are logically impossible (literally: «the liquid containing *haematites*, having joined the cup [δμίλησας κωλίκεσσιν, i.e. «drunk», = πινόμενος in line 668] for the treatment of your eyes [γλήναισι τεῆσιν: dative of advantage] will be a cure for the genital parts of the man who will drink it»). The words offered by A are logically impossible because *collyria* were not drunk, but applied to the eyes.

712-715:

Τοῦ δὲ διαμελεῖστί δαΐζειν ἔννεα μοίρας·
 τρεῖς μὲν ἐπὶ κλῆσιν πανδερκέος Ἥελίοιο,
 τρεῖς δ' ἑτέρας Γαίης ἐριβόλου λαοβοτείρης,
 τρεῖς δὲ Θεοπροπίης πολυῖδμονος, ἀψαύστοιο.

Musgrave, followed by all the critics, changed ἀψαύστοιο into ἀψεύστοιο. In reality, the epithet ἀψαύστοιο is perfectly sound. It is patent, as the word κλῆσιν (line 713) as well as the parallelism with Ἥελίοιο and Γαίης indicate, that Θεοπροπίη is here envisaged as a personified deity¹³; in any case, prophecy was «chaste», «pure» (μαντήϊον ἀγνόν, Orph. *Hymn.* 79, 3): the epithet ἀψαύστος means (examples in Peek, *Wört. Nonn.*, s.v.) precisely «chaste», «pure», «undefiled».

720 f.:

ἐν δέ σφιν καὶ δριμὺν ἐπήλυδα κόκκον ἄνωγα
 μῖξαι χρυσοχίτωνα, μελαγχροῖην, ἐρίτιμον.

Tyrwhitt, followed by all the editors, changed the adjective χρυσοχίτωνα into ῥυσοχίτωνα: he correctly understood that the lines contain a description of pepper, but he could not comprehend how χρυσοχίτωνα could be appropriate here. Tyrwhitt did not know, or forgot, that, whereas dried peppercorns are black (μελαγχροῖην), their outer skin is «bright red» (cf. *Chambers's Encyclopaedia*, vol. X, new edition, London 1961, s.v. *Pepper*). Before acquiring a fully red colour, the skin of the peppercorns goes through shades of «Rotgelb»: here, χρυσοχίτωνα means precisely «having a red (or: reddish) skin». Cf. E. Veckenstedt, *Gesch. der griech. Farbenlehre*, reprint Gerstenberg, Hildesheim 1973, pp. 120 ff., for χρυσο- = «red» or «reddish». In sum: the epithet χρυσοχίτωνα is sound.

¹³ For such personifications cf. H. White, *New Essays in Hell. Poetry*, p. 61; Roscher, s.v. *Personifikationen*, s.v. *Dynamis, Euergesia, Eukleia, Homonoia, Euphrosyne, Mneia, Metameleia, Pronoia, Pistis, Tolma*, etc. Personifications of abstract concepts abound in later Epic: Nonnus has Ἄρμονιή, Μέθη, Αἰών, φύσις, Νίκη, Πόθος, etc. Many such personifications occur in the Orphic Hymns (Ἀρχή, Εὐσεβία, Εὐνομία, etc.).

725-727:

τόφρα δὲ κικλήσκειν μακάρων ἄρρηκτον ἕκαστον
 οὔνομα· τέρπονται γάρ, ἐπεὶ κέ τις ἐν τελετῇσι
 μυστικὸν ἀείδησιν ἐπώνυμον οὐραγιῶνων.

Lectius changed the epithet ἄρρηκτον into ἄρρητον, because the poet is describing mysteries. But the epithet ἄρρηκτον is sound: we are faced, once again, with a case of adjectival *enallage*. It is the gods themselves, invoked in the Hymns (*Orph. Hymn.* 19, 11; 65, 1) who are ἄρρηκτοι, and therefore, here in lines 725 f., the epithet ἄρρηκτον is transferred, by *enallage adjectivi*, from the gods (μακάρων) to their name (οὔνομα). The epithet ἄρρητον is not necessary, because κικλήσκειν and μυστικὸν ἐπώνυμον suffice to indicate that the otherwise unutterable (μυστικὸν) names are being uttered aloud (κικλήσκειν). Perhaps the same *enallage adjectivi* occurs in *Orph. Argon.* 467, if the variant ἄρρηκτα is preferred to the reading ἄρρητα (ὄρκια θεῶν ἄρρηκτα: cf. Dottin's apparatus¹⁴). *Enallage adjectivi* is not rare in the *Lithica*, as H. White has shown in her already quoted monograph.

731:

ὄππότε δ' ἐψομένοισιν ἐπὶ κρεάτεσσιν ἴκηται

Hermann changed κρεάτεσσιν into κρεάεσσιν, and all the critics have accepted his alteration. His conjecture is unwarranted: «die Beugung κρέατος, κρέατα» is attested «später», as underlined in Passow, *Handwört.*, s.v. κρέας, and there is therefore no justification in eliminating the form κρεάτεσσιν from line 731. This type of «Beugung» was felt to be an Atticism (Rebmann, *Die sprachl. Neuerungen in den Kyneg.*, p. 11), as such permissible in an epic text like the *Lithica*.

739-744:

Μηδὲ μεταστρωφᾶσθαι, ἐπεὶ κ' ἀπονόσφι τράπησθε
 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ προτέρην ἐς ἀταρπιτὸν ὄσσε φέροντες
 ἔρχεσθ' ἐς μέγαρον· μηδὲ προτιμυθῆσασθαι
 εἴ κέν τις ξύμβληται ὀδίτης, ἔστ' ἂν ἰκέσθαι
 ἐς δόμον· ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτα θυηλὰς ἀθανάτοισιν
 744 ἐξαυτίς ῥέζοντας ἀρώματα ποικίλα καίειν.

The nominative φέροντες was changed into the accusative φέροντας by Tyrwhitt, whom all the editors follow. This alteration is unjustified, because we now know that the infinitive with imperatival force (here, the three infinitives μεταστρωφᾶσθαι, ἔρχεσθαι and προτιμυθῆσασθαι are imperatival) can be employed with the nominative instead of with the accusative: cf. H. White, *Studies in the Poetry of Nicander, Select Index*, s.v. «Imperatival infinitive employed with the Nominative».

¹⁴ If ὄρκια means «cérémonies», performed by the gods, it is the gods, not the ceremonies, that are ἄρρηκτοι.

Note the *Selbstvariation*: in the sentence beginning with ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτα, the poet has used the accusative ῥέζοντας. Cases of morphological, phrasal and syntactical *Selbstvariation* are frequent in the *Lithica*: cf. our observations on lines 180, 230, 314 (discussed by me when dealing with lines 84-86), 481; cf. also 533 (θεωμένου), 536 (θηωμένου, etc.). In line 742, the infinitive ἰκέσθαι has been altered to ἰκησθε: the alteration is unwarranted, because the infinitive could be used instead of a *verbum finitum*: cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXXI, and my observations in «Problemi di critica testuale nei *Moralia*» (*Quand. Dipart. Sc. Antich.*, Univ. Salerno, II, Salerno 1988, p. 72).

756:

καρτερὰ φάρμακα σεῖο, βροτοσσόε θέσκελα πέτρη

The mss. reading θέσκελα was changed by earlier editors into θέσκελε. This conjecture is accepted by Giannakis and Abel. The mss. reading θέσκελα is, in reality, perfectly sound. The accusative plural θέσκελαῖ is an adverb, the sense being «ο marvellously (θέσκελα) man-saving (βροτοσσόε) stone (πέτρη)». It is now known that such adverbial accusative plurals are far more common in later literature than used to be assumed: cf. L. Weber, *Anacreontea*, p. 23 f., and Klauser, *De dicendi genere Nicandr.*, p. 82 f.; for the Orphic corpus, cf. Dottin, *op. cit.*, p. CXII («le pluriel neutre s'emploie adverbialement»). Homer uses, for instance, as an adverb the singular καλόν, and also the plural καλά (cf. e.g. LSJ, s.v. καλός, C); the neutre θέσκελον is used as an adverb by none other than Homer at *Il.* XXIII, 107 (cf. LSJ, s.v.), and the author of the *Lithica* uses here, in line 756, the plural θέσκελα adverbially.

763:

ἔσσύμενος τάδε πάντα ἀμήχανα φησὶ πιφάυσκειν

This line has been wrongly mutilated at no fewer than two places. The subject of the sentence is the god Apollo; the sense is: «Latonius me haec omnia... aperire jubet» (Hermann, Abel, etc.). The critics could not understand how the epithet ἔσσύμενος could describe Apollo in the act of speaking (φησὶ), i.e. they could not understand why Apollo should be described as speaking speedily (ἔσσύμενος... φησὶ). The epithet ἔσσύμενος was, therefore, disfigured by many more or less violent conjectures (cf. e.g. Giannakis' apparatus). In reality, it is obvious that the epithet ἔσσύμενος «speedy» is perfectly sound and ideally suited to Apollo: the god, according to Orphic thinking (cf. Bruchmann, *Epitheta Deorum*, s.v. Ἀπόλλων, p. 35) was ὤκυπής.

The second word wrongly mutilated by the critics is the adjective ἀμήχανα. For details, cf. lastly Giannakis *ad loc.*, and especially Abel, *ad loc.* The adjective ἀμήχανος, normally, means «incapable of happening», «incapable of being carried out», «incapable of occurring» (Ital. «irrealizzabile»). Now, the *Leitmotiv* of the *Lithica* is that the poet describes marvels which, although astonishing and incredible, nevertheless do

happen, do occur, thanks to the miraculous properties of the stones: in other words, the marvels which the poet wants his readers to learn to carry out are, although astonishing, very much possible, so much so that they do occur (187 μέγα θαῦμα πωφάσκω; 538 ἄπιστον; 377 θαῦμα; 293 θάμβος; 536 θάμβος; 537 τέρας; 516 ψεῦδος... ἐτήτυμον οἶδα τετύχθαι). Now, if the poet were to say, in line 763, that he is narrating and revealing «things which are incapable of happening» (πάντα ἀμήχανα πωφάσκειν), he would grotesquely contradict himself. In reality, the text is sound, and the poet does not contradict himself: in line 763, the initial *alpha* of the adjective ἀμήχανα is not *privativum*, but *intensivum*: ἀμήχανα means here, in other words, «things that are *decidedly* possible». It is typical of later epic poetry to use adjectives, which were previously employed as compounds containing an *alpha privativum*, in a new meaning, whereby the *alpha* is not *privativum*, but *intensivum*. In the case in point, the adjective ἀμήχανος was previously used, in Greek, as a compound containing the *alpha privativum*, i.e. in the sense «impossible» (cf. *Lithica*, line 598). In line 763, the poet uses the adjective in a *Neuwendung*, whereby the *alpha* of the compound is not *privativum*, but *intensivum*: in other words, the author of the *Lithica* uses ἀμήχανα, in line 763, in the sense «very much possible». I have examined this stylistic feature in my paper «On the Text of Plutarch's *Non Posse Suaviter Vivi*» (forthcoming); H. White, in her already quoted monograph *New Studies in Greek Poetry*, has shown that the feature in question is abundantly used by a late epic poet whose connections with the *Lithica* is well known, i.e. Nonnus. We have already seen that the phenomenon under discussion is attested in *Lithica*, line 362, where ἄψυχον means «very much alive».

764-770:

αὐτοκασιγνήτην κεχολωμένος Ἄργυρότοξος
 Κασσάνδρην ἐκέλευσεν ἀκουόντεσσιν ἅπαντα
 θεσπίζειν Τρώεσσιν, ἐτήτυμά περ φρονέουσιν.
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ πρόσθεν ἀπώμοσα καρτερόν ὄρκον,
 ψευδέα μὴ ποτε μῦθον ἐνισπεῖν ἀνθρώποισι·
 καὶ νῦν ἀτρέκώς μάλα τοι λέξαντος ἕκαστα,
 ἡμετέροις, ἦρωες ἑκατηβόλε, πείθεο μύθοις.

The critics have first arbitrarily mutilated this passage, by altering the crucial word ἅπαντα in line 765, and then they have complained that these lines are «non bene nexa» (Hermann, *ad loc.*). In reality, the adjective ἅπαντα in line 765 is sound, and the connection between the lines is perfect. The critics have altered ἅπαντα in line 765 because it seemed contextually incomprehensible to them, not because it is preceded by πάντα in line 763. Everybody knows that the author of the *Lithica*, like any other late epic author, likes *iteratio* of words, so that the repetition πάντα 763,

ἅπαντα 765 is, in itself, perfectly regular¹⁵. The sense of the passage is clear, if we note the presence of the participle κεχολωμένος and if we remember the precise mythological background to which the author of the *Lithica* is alluding. Apollo was annoyed (κεχολωμένος) with Cassandra, and therefore, in order to punish her and make her suffer, he «made her at once a good prophet and unbelieved», Tryphiod. 417-418 τὴν γὰρ Ἀπόλλων ἀμφοτέρων μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὴν καὶ ἄπιστον ἔθηκεν. In other words, he compelled her (ἐκέλευσεν, *Lithica* 765) to utter prophecies which she, to her suffering, knew to be at the same time true and yet incapable of being heeded to. Apollo compelled her to utter such prophecies by possessing her (θεόφοιτος, Tryphiod. 374) and making her, as a possessed prophetess, speak out her prophecies; in uttering them, she suffered, because she knew reality, i.e. she knew that her prophecies were true and yet destined to remain unheeded (Tryphiod. 420 πάλιν, 442 κλαίειν ἐπισταμένη). Cf., on all this, Q.Sm. XII, 526 ff., Apollodorus, *Biblioth.* III, 12, 5, = vol. II, pp. 48-49 ed. Frazer, *Loeb Class. Libr.* (Ἀπόλλων ἀφείλετο τῆς μαντικῆς αὐτῆς τὸ πείθειν) and Aesch., *Agamemn.* 1202-1212, 1269-1294, where Cassandra bewails the reality she knows.

Here, the sense is: «Apollo, insofar as he was annoyed with my sister (κεχολωμένος), compelled her (ἐκέλευσεν) to prophesy all (ἅπαντα θεσπίζειν) to the Trojans, although (περ) she knew reality (ἐτήτυμα), i.e. although she knew that nobody would pay heed to her prophecies, which she knew were true». The particle περ, with the participle φρονέουσα, is concessive (Denniston, *Part.*, p. 485; cf. *Lithica* 351, 537, 549, etc.); φρονέουσα denotes the *knowledge* which Cassandra had, to the effect that her prophecies were just as accurate as they were incapable of being heeded to (cf. LSJ, s.v. φρονέω, I, 4, quoting Herodotus I, 46). Cassandra, in sum, was made to suffer by Apollo in that he made her utter prophecies to the Trojans, although in the very act of her uttering them she knew reality, i.e. she knew that the Trojans would not pay heed to her prophecies which were true. It is precisely this kind of suffering that rendered Cassandra ἐτερόφρονα (Tryphiod. 439).

In sum: we can conclude that the mss. readings ἅπαντα θεσπίζειν (lines 765 f.) is correct, indeed it is what the context requires; Cassandra was caused by Apollo to «forecast all» (ἅπαντα θεσπίζειν) that was going to happen, i.e. she did not fail to foresee even one single detail¹⁶, although she knew —and this was her punishment— that her listeners were decreed by Apollo not to be persuaded by her.

¹⁵ Examples of *iteratio* in the *Lithica*: ἀθανάτοισι(ν) 5 and 8; μόσχον 152 and 155; δαΐδων 179 and 191; πῦρ 183 and 184; λαῶν 225 and 230; πέτρη used twice in line 249. The phenomenon opposite to *iteratio*, i.e. the use of synonyms, is of course present in the *Lithica*: cf. e.g. φῶτες 43, ἀνθρώποις 46; πέτρη, λίθος and λαῶν 249-251. Note the *iteratio* μῦθον and μύθοις in lines 768-770.

In lines 667 ff., ὄσσε, βλεφάρων and γλῆναισι are used by the poet as synonyms to denote the eyes.

¹⁶ The Argives marvelled (ἐθάμβεον) at the fact that Cassandra knew and prophesied everything accurately (ἀτρεκέως εἰδοῦσα): Q.Sm., XII, 578 ff.; Cassandra's brother claims to have prophesied everything ἀτρεκέως (*Lith.*, line 769).

Having realized that the mss. reading ἅπαντα θεσπίζειν is correct, we can now *ipso facto* perceive that the words of the poet are the opposite of «non bene nexa», as Hermann contended: the poet's *Gedankengang*, as sign-posted by Λητοΐδης... τάδε πάντα ἀμήχανα φησὶ πιφαύσκειν (762 f.), ἅπαντα θεσπίζειν (765 f.), αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ (767), καὶ νῦν... πείθεο μύθοις (769 f.) is unimpeachable. The impeccable logic of the poet's argument was already recognized by all the critics, from Hermann to Abel, from Wernicke to Merrick. What the poet means to say has been clearly explained by Abel (*op. cit.*, p. 109): «mihi poeta haec dicere videtur: "quae nunc tibi dixi, omnia ab Apolline accepta vera esse affirmo. Cassandrae sane sorori meae nemo fidem habere potuit, ego autem olim vera omnia me vaticinaturum esse juravi, quare mihi quidem credere potes"». That this is what the poet wants to say is agreed by all the critics, but they have seen themselves compelled to change no fewer than two words, i.e. ἀμήχανα in line 763, and ἅπαντα in line 765. Now that we have seen that both these two words are sound and contextually perspicuous, we can conclude that the interpretation agreed upon by all the critics is not only correct in terms of logic, but does not require any conjectural alterations either. In the light of our explanation of the two words ἀμήχανα and ἅπαντα which has been provided above, we can account for the poet's *Gedankengang* very accurately. The poet first of all underlines that it is no less an authority than the god of prophecy and oracles, Apollo, who has ordered him to «reveal all these very possible things» (762 f. Λητοΐδης... τάδε πάντα ἀμήχανα φησὶ πιφαύσκειν). Since the poet himself had previously conceded that all the things which he claims to be «very possible» (ἀμήχανα, line 763) were revealed by Apollo, and yet difficult to believe (lines 514 ff. Φοῖβος... ψεύδος... ἐτήτυμον οἶδα τετύχθαι), the poet now makes one final effort at inducing his readers to believe him, and for this purpose he establishes a comparison between his sister Cassandra and himself. Cassandra, the poet says, was, like me, the poet, ordered by Apollo to foretell everything (πάντα, line 763 = ἅπαντα, line 765). However, Cassandra knew that her listeners had been decreed by Apollo not to believe her words (ἐτήτυμά περ φρονέουσιν, line 766). On the other hand, I (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ, line 767), who have been ordered by Apollo to reveal all these things which I claim to be very much possible (τάδε πάντα ἀμήχανα) and which I have repeatedly admitted to sound difficult to believe, have been from the outset compelled by Apollo to swear that I will never lie (lines 767-768): therefore (καὶ νῦν, followed by the imperative πείθεο: cf. Bauer, *Wört. N.T.*, s.v. καί, I, 2, f) you must believe all my words (lines 769-770), seeing that Apollo, who has not decreed my listeners to refuse to believe my words, has in fact made me promise that I will tell my listeners the truth».

We may now conclude. The interpretation of these lines which finds all the critics in agreement, from Abel to Halleux-Schamp, and which has been

best worded by Abel (*loc. cit.*), is supported not only by logic, but also by the text as written in the manuscripts: both ἀμήχανα in line 763, and ἅπαντα in line 765, give perfect sense, and none of the violent alterations proposed by scholars is justified.

773:

ἄῶϊ δὲ ποιήεσσιν ἐξ ἀκρόρειαν ἰούσι.

Schneider, asserting that ἄῶϊ could not be a dative, crudely changed the *Versanfang*; Wiel, in his turn, contending that ἄῶϊ could only be a nominative or an accusative, violently altered the whole passage, by conjecture; Abel (p. 111), following Buttmann (*Lexilogus*, I, sec. ed., Berlin 1825, pp. 53 ff.) conceded that ἄῶϊ, in *Lithica* 773, is inescapably a dative, but branded such use as ungrammatical («barbarum... ἄῶϊ pro dativo usurpatum»); Abel is followed by Giannakis (*op. cit.*, p. 221 f.), who refers the reader to modern grammarians such as Kühner-Blass. Di Gregorio, in his reprint of Pisani's edition of Theocritus (Milano, 1985) mistakenly believes that taking ἄῶϊ as a dative is a procedure which «non va d'accordo con la grammatica» (*sic*). The important point, which none of these scholars has seen, is that the use of ἄῶϊ as a dative was, according to *ancient* grammarians, a Homerism (cf. Düntzer, *De Zenodoti studiis Homericis*, Göttingen 1848, p. 57, and La Roche, *Die Hom. Textkritik im Alterthum*, p. 319 f.). Hatzikosta (*L'Ant. Class.* 1978, p. 163 f.) has acutely shown that Theocritus used ἄῶϊ as a dative in order to reproduce what was regarded by Zenodotus to be a Homerism, and the same is evidently the case with the author of the *Lithica*, who, by using ἄῶϊ as a dative in line 773, aimed at reproducing Homeric usage as accepted by Zenodotus and other ancient grammarians. In sum: seen with the eyes of *ancient* (not modern) grammarians, the use of ἄῶϊ as a dative is an elegant Homerism.

The point which I have tried to make is that the text of the Orphic *Lithica* has been studied in isolation, i.e. unhistorically, by recent scholars; if we investigate it on the basis of the historical method, i.e. on the basis of contemporary *Sprachgebrauch*, metre, literary conventions and religious-philosophical thinking, very many problems which modern critics could not overcome reveal themselves to be easily soluble.

APPENDIX

The edition of the Orphic *Lithica* contained in R. Halleux - J. Schamp, *Les Lapidaires Grecs* (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1985) is most useful because of the wealth of mineralogical and medical information it offers in its «Notes Complémentaires» and because of the welcome French translation facing the Greek text, but is less than satisfactory from the point of view of

textual criticism and grammatical interpretation. I hope that the following notes will prove serviceable to the reader.

Line 39: the apparatus is inadequate: the correct reading ἐπὶ τραφερὴν ἀκυμάντοισι πόδεσσι is preserved in γQP^{m8} (cf. Giannakis' apparatus).

Line 62: the apparatus is inadequate; the correct reading πρέσβα δημοσύνην is preserved in Q (cf. Giannakis' apparatus).

Line 154: a critical apparatus is absent; the reading of A is μοῖρά μιν ἀπήγαγεν (cf. the apparatus provided by Giannakis and by Abel).

Line 175: the sense required is certainly «si tu te rends au temple», but the mss. reading can be shown to have such a sense only by quoting Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* IV, 436, as I have indicated.

Line 279: κωκόμενον is not the reading of the mss., but a conjecture by Schneider, which I have shown to be unjustified.

Line 481: the mss. reading is ἀπό, not ὑπό.

Line 583: the sense is certainly «les pièges que tendent les pirates», but the crucial fact is that the mss. reading χόλον means, precisely, «les pièges», as I have shown.

Lines 591 ff.: λύματα nowhere means, in Greek, «philtres», nor can ἀντίλυτρον mean, in Greek, «antidote».

Lines 713 ff.: ἐπὶ κληῖσιν, in Greek, means «pour évoquer» «zur Herbeirufung» (cf. e.g. *Pap. Gr. Mag., Index*, s.v. κληῖσις), but not «pour obtenir».

Line 725: ἄρρηκτον nowhere means, in Greek, «inaltérable».

Line 763: ἀμήχανα nowhere means, in Greek, «les arcanes»; ἐσσύμενος cannot mean «dans sa turbulence» and cannot refer to the «mouvements convulsifs d'un bétyle», because first of all ἐσσύμενος, in the line, refers to Apollo in the act of speaking (φησί), and secondly because, as is clear from lines 369-384, the stone makes no «mouvements convulsifs»: all it does is to speak. The passage in Porphyry, II, 204, p. 159 Wolff, quoted by Schamp in *Revue Belge de Philol. et d'Hist.* 1981, p. 46, note 95, has nothing to do with ἐσσύμενος as used in line 763 of the *Lithica*: in the line of the *Lithica*, ἐσσύμενος refers to Apollo's speed in speaking (φησί), i.e. to the fact that Apollo was ὠκυπέτης, whereas in Porphyry, *loc. cit.* (μόλε δ' ἐσσυμένως τοισίδε μύθοις) ἐσσυμένως refers to the fact that every god, when invoked (τοισίδε μύθοις) is expected to come (μόλε) quickly (ἐσσυμένως): cf. my *Motivi epigrammatici ellenistici nell'elegia romana* (in «Dall'epigramma ellenistico all'elegia romana», Napoli 1984, p. 56 f.), in which I discuss the ἀγωγή.