

## ON A 4—5

αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν  
οἰωνοῖσιν τε δαῖτα

(I) I am happy to know that Professor Petruševski after my Note (*Humanidades*, University of Mérida, Venezuela, 3, 1961, 75 f.):

(a) has admitted that ἐλώρια (echoed by Apoll. Rhod. II, 264) cannot be interpreted as an adjective<sup>1</sup>, being a simple metric variant for ἔλωρα in the *fourth* foot of the hexameter (as are e. g. ἀέθλια I 124 = 266; 127; 269; X 160; Ψ 736; 823; ἀέθλιον Ψ 537; 748; θ 108; φ 4; 62; 117; ω 169; πτολιπόροθιος ι 504; 530; Αἰτώλιος Δ 399 E 706; πελώριος 21 times, against πέλωρος M 202; = 220; ι 257; ο 161; etc.)<sup>2</sup>;

(b) has agreed that Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides (quoted under III a) probably allude to A 4—5;

(c) has withdrawn his conjectures (cf. this Review 11, 1961, 172) δόρπα or δεῖπνα (as a matter of fact, the latter word is not to be found in Homer in *plural*, in 37 instances), instead of πᾶσι codd.: δαῖτα Zenodotus *teste* Ath. 12 F (hence Eust. p. 19,45 Bas. and Suda, s. δαιτός ἐΐσης).

(II) But Professor Petruševski has come back to this topic, trying to show at length (in twenty one pages of this Review, 13—14, 1964; 27—37) this time that παστά would be the right reading here.

I am sorry to say that his δεύτεραι φροντίδες were no happier than the first ones. To my way of thinking, παστά is improbable:

(a) Because a noun τὸ παστόν or τὰ παστά '*repas, nourriture*' (p. 37) is not documented either in Homer or in Greek. (I very doubt if it ever existed, in view of the reduced use of the Epic — Ionic verb πατέομαι).

The late Greek gloss παστά 'barley — broth', quoted by the author on p. 34, probably comes from πάσσω (so already *Thes.*, s. v), not from πατέομαι: cf. Ael. Dion. fr. 173 Schwabe ap. Eust. p. 1278,55 . . . τὸ ἀλίπαστον καὶ τὸ παρὰ Αἰλίῳ Διονυσίῳ παστά, ἔτνος

<sup>1</sup> Which is not documented in Greek: the remark of Σ Β (Τ) κτητικὸν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐλώριον, δι' ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔλωρα ἐχρήσατο cannot be taken seriously.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. K. Witte, in *RE* VIII (1913) col. 2228 („Neubildungen hinter der Cäsar κατά τρίτον τροχαῖον“, περικλυτός, ἀγακλυτός, πολύφρονος); K. Meister, *Hom. Kunstsprache* (Preisschr. d. Jablonowskischen Gesellsch. 48), Leipzig 1921, 13 ff.; P. Chantraine, *Gramm. Hom.*<sup>3</sup> I, 96.

δηλαδὴ ἀλφίτοις μεμιγμένον. καὶ ἐπίπαστα, φησίν, αὐτὰ τὰ ἄλφιτα; Hesych. ἔτνος ἀλφίτοις μεμιγμένον;<sup>3</sup> Phot.; cf. Aristoph. fr. 687 K. = Edm.

χορδαί, φῦσσαι, πασταί, ζωμός,  
χόλικες

and Poll. VI, 56 πασταὶ δέ εἰσι... ζωμός ἀλφίτων.

The word παστάς, quoted by the author on p. 32 n. 37 and on p. 37, according to its meaning probably comes from παραστάς, and the relation to πάσσαθαι is paretymologic.

ἐδεστόν Soph. *Ant.* 206, quoted by the author on pp. 33; 37, is a bad example, because in the phrase δέμας... ἐδεστόν αἰκισθέν τ' the word is clearly participle (= eaten, cf. Trach. 677), and not a noun, as παστά is supposed to be.

(b) If the author rejects the reading δαῖτα on the ground that the word is not documented in Homer as the food for animals (in 29 instances in the *Iliad* and in 53 in the *Odyssey*)<sup>4</sup> and if he gives up δόρπα (which is also unknown in such use in Homer, in 40 instances), how then can he accept παστά, which is not documented in any use in Homer?

(c) ΠΑΣΤΑ has been chosen by the author with the main intention of explaining palaeographically ΠΑΣ(I) and (ΔΑΙ)ΤΑ (cf. pp. 32; 34; 37). But this was not necessary, since πᾶσι and δαῖτα are not to be considered as textual corruptions, but obviously as intentional variants (uariae lectiones antiquae), such as e. g.

τ 113 πάντα	:	μῆλα
Δ 447 ἱερὴν	:	κλειτήν
Δ 195 Ἄτρεός υἱόν	:	ἀρχὸν Ἀχαιῶν
Ε 247 μεγαλήτορος	:	μὲν ἀμύμονος
Ι 653 φλέξαι (Pl. <i>Hipp. min.</i> 371 C; Σ Α)	:	συῦξαι
Χ 478 ἐνὶ οἴκῳ (Σ ΑΤ; Strabo 585)	:	κατὰ δῶμα
Ω 82 πῆμα (Plato, <i>Ion</i> 538 D; Σ Α)	:	κῆρα

and many others.

<sup>3</sup> Hesych. βρῶμα ἐκ τυροῦ ἀνάλλου μετὰ σεμιδάλεως καὶ σησαμίου σκευαζόμενον is of different kind and origin.

<sup>4</sup> Ω 43 being not an exception, and I am glad to say that Professor Petruševski is right in following K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Hom.* (Leipzig 1833, p. 96=3rd ed. by A. Ludwich, Leipzig 1882, p. 87), I. Bekker (in his second edition of the *Iliad*, Bonn 1858, not yet in the first edition, Berlin 1843) and H. Ebeling, *Lex.* I, 269 b, and punctuating after μῆλα (not after βροτῶν), contra e. g. A. Nauck (1868 etc., quoted under III); M. Hecht, *Quaest. Hom.*, Diss. Königsberg (1882), 16 ff.; A. Ludwich, in Lehrs<sup>9</sup> p. 87 n. 50a; *Aristarchus homer. Textkritik nach den Fragm. d. Didymos*, II (Leipzig 1885), 88 n. 54 and in his edition of the *Iliad*, Leipzig 1902; G. Hinrichs (quoted under III); Ameis—Hentze (1886), 115 f.=1930<sup>6</sup>; Dindorf—Hentze<sup>5</sup>; Leaf<sup>2</sup>; D. Monro—Th. Allen (Ox. 1902=1920<sup>8</sup>; but without any punctuation Allen, Ox. 1931, maior); A. T. Murray (Loeb, 1924); P. Mazon cett. (1938), and contra myself. Lehrs referred to K 485 (and to ζ 132; 134); the author referred to Φ 539 (and to ι 405). As for the meaning of λάβησις in Ω 43, cf. I 324 and Φ 24.

The idea to look for a palaeographical 'common denominator' between the readings  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota$  and  $\delta\alpha\tilde{\iota}\tau\alpha$  [if so, then why not between  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$  and  $\mu\tilde{\eta}\lambda\alpha$  as well?] simply contradicts all we know about the transmission of the Homeric songs in antiquity.

(III) Thus, we have to choose between  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota$  and  $\delta\alpha\tilde{\iota}\tau\alpha$ , no other reading being either necessary or probable [and if we needed one, the best candidate would be  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$ , in view of  $\gamma$  271;  $\epsilon$  473; P 272; 151; E 488; etc.].

Now, I still think that  $\delta\alpha\tilde{\iota}\tau\alpha$  is the better reading here, although it is not used elsewhere in Homer as the food for animals. As is known,  $\delta\alpha\tilde{\iota}\tau\alpha$  has been accepted by:

1. A. Nauck, *Bull. Acad. Pétersbourg* 12 (1868), 482 ff. = *Mél. Gréco—Rom.* 3, 12; in his edition of the *Iliad* (Berlin 1877), and in *Mél. Gréco—Rom.* 4 (1880), 428;

2. G. Hinrichs, *Bursians Jahresb.* 26 (1881, appeared in 1883), 209 f.;

3. U. v. Wilamowitz, *Homer. Unters.* (Ph. U. 7, 1884), pp. 20; 385 f.;

4. W. Leaf, *Il.*<sup>1</sup> (London 1886) [but  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota$  in *Il.*<sup>2</sup>, 1900, reprint 1960];

5. C. Hentze in K. F. Ameis—Hentze, *Il.*<sup>3</sup> (1896), and P. Cauer in Ameis—Hentze—Cauer, *Il.*<sup>7</sup> (1913);

6. C. Hentze in W. Dindorf—Hentze, *Il.*<sup>5</sup> (1899 = 1931);

7. Ed. Schwartz, *Adversaria*, Progr. Univ. Göttingen, 1908, p. 7 ff.;

8. P. Cauer, *Grundfragen d. Homerkritik*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig 1909), 54; (1921<sup>3</sup>), 57;

9. A. Römer, *Rh. Mus.* 66 (1911), 334 ff.; etc.

The reasons:

(a) Aeschylus *Suppl.* 800—1 (lyr.)

$\kappa\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \delta'\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\theta'\ \epsilon\lambda\omega\rho\alpha\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\chi\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\varsigma$   
 $\theta\rho\nu\iota\sigma\iota\ \delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\nu\omicron\nu$ <sup>5</sup>

Sophocles *Philoct.* 957

$\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega\ \delta\alpha\tilde{\iota}\theta'\ \acute{\upsilon}\phi'\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \epsilon\phi\epsilon\rho\beta\acute{o}\mu\eta\nu$

(sc.  $\pi\tau\eta\nu\acute{o}\iota\varsigma\ \theta\rho\nu\iota\sigma\iota\ \eta\ \theta\eta\rho\sigma\iota\nu\ \theta\rho\epsilon\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ )<sup>6</sup> and Euripides *Ion* 504—5 (lyr.)

$\pi\tau\alpha\nu\acute{o}\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\xi}\acute{\omega}\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\ \theta\omicron\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\alpha\nu$   
 $\theta\eta\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\ \tau\epsilon\ \phi\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \delta\alpha\tilde{\iota}\tau\alpha$ <sup>6</sup>

(cf. 903  $\pi\tau\alpha\nu\acute{o}\iota\varsigma\ \dots\ \theta\omicron\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\alpha$  and *Hec.* 1078  $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \phi\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \delta\alpha\tilde{\iota}\tau$ )<sup>6</sup> seem to have read in A 5  $\delta\alpha\tilde{\iota}\tau\alpha$ . Notice the *bipartite* structure  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$  + A :  $\omicron\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\acute{o}\iota\varsigma$  + B both in Homer and in Aeschylus—Euripides, which is not to be found elsewhere. Aeschylus probably has changed

<sup>5</sup> Quoted for the first time by Nauck (1868), *l. c.* (and by M. Haupt *reste* G. Hinrichs, *l. c.*, but is not to be found in Haupt's *Opuscula*, I—III, Leipzig 1875—76, edited by Wilamowitz).

<sup>6</sup> First quoted by Lehrs<sup>1</sup> (1833) p. 164 = 1882<sup>3</sup> p. 160.

δαῖτα into δεῖπνον, because he elsewhere preferred this word: cf. *Agam.* 138 (lyr.) δεῖπνον αἰετῶν; P. Ox. 2256, 10a, 2 (de Sphinge?) σπ[αρακτὸν ἔσ[ται] δεῖπνον.<sup>7</sup>

If so, then the reading δαῖτα is much older than Zenodotus. This has been admitted even by Lehrs, *l. c.*

(b) It seems that we can explain *why* δαῖτα was changed into πᾶσι: *because it contradicted the peripatetic (according to Schwartz, *l. c.*) theory of justice and equality of civilized man, opposed to the violence in primitive society.* This piece of 'cultural history' is well preserved in Ath. 12 D—13 A (hence *Suda* and *Eust.*, *ll. cc.*). The passage reads:

ἐπεὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἄνθρωποι, οἷς δὴ οὐ παρῆν ἄφθονος ἡ τροφή, ἄρτι φαινομένης ἀθρόον ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἰόντες βίαια ἥρπαζον καὶ ἀφαιροῦντο τοὺς ἔχοντας, καὶ μετὰ τῆς ἀκοσμίας ἐγίνοντο [ἐγένοντο codd.] καὶ φόνοι. (ἐξ ὧν εἰκὸς λεχθῆναι καὶ τὴν ἀτασθαλίαν, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς θαλίαις τὰ πρῶτα ἐξημάρτανον οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἰς ἀλλήλους). ὡς δὲ παρεγένετο αὐτοῖς πολλὴ ἕκ τῆς Δήμητρος, δένεμον ἐκ ἄστωι ἴσην, καὶ οὕτως εἰς κόσμον ἤλθε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ δόρπα. διὸ ἄρτου τε ἐπίνοια πέμματός τε εἰς ἴσον διαμεμοιραμένον καὶ τοῖς διαπίνουσιν ἄλεισα<sup>8</sup>· καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα ἐς <τὸ> ἴσον [Kaibel: ἐς ἴσον <τι> Desrousseaux (1956)] χωροῦντων [Wilamowitz: χωροῦντα codd.] ἐγίνετο. ὥστε ἡ τροφή δαῖς ἐπὶ τῷ δαίεσθαι λέγεται, ὅ ἐστι διαμοιρᾶσθαι ἐπ' ἴσης (καὶ ὁ τὰ κρέα ὀπτῶν δαιτρός, ἐπεὶ ἴσην ἐκ ἄστωι μοῖραν ἐδίδου)· καὶ ἐπὶ μόνων ἀνθρώπων δαῖτα [δαῖτας codd., ex *Eust. corr.* Kaibel] λέγει ὁ ποιητής, ἐπὶ δὲ θηρίων οὐκέτι. ἀγνοῶν δὲ ταύτης τῆς φωνῆς τὴν δύναμιν Ζηνόδοτος ἐν τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκδόσει γράφει:

αὐτοὺς δὲ [δ' codd.] ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν  
οἰωνοῖσι τε δαῖτα,

τὴν τῶν γυπῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἰωνῶν τροφήν οὕτω καλῶν, μόνου ἀνθρώπου χωροῦντος <ἐς Kaibel> τὸ ἴσον ἐκ τῆς πρόσθεν βίαιας<sup>9</sup>. διὸ καὶ μόνου τούτου ἡ τροφή δαῖς, καὶ μοῖρα τὸ ἐκ ἄστωι διδόμενον.

Zenodotus probably did not share this theory of ἰσότης, because he is said to have explained δαῖς ἔτση differently (12 CD): ἐκ τούτων δ' [sc. θ 98; I 225] ἐπέισθη Ζηνόδοτος δαῖτα ἔτσην τὴν ἀγαθὴν

<sup>7</sup> Late imitations are: Quint. Smyrn. E 209 δαῖτα κυσὶ (= Ὀδυσσεύς); Opp. *hal.* V, 55; Ael. *V. H.* 12, 27 ἀπολείπειν αὐτοὺς (sc. τοὺς νεκροὺς) κυνῶν δεῖπνον εἶναι. (Ps. Hom. *epigr.* 11 [Loeb Hesiod. p. 470] κυσὶ δεῖπνον probably imitates B 383).

<sup>8</sup> Probably allusion to ἴσος is intended.

<sup>9</sup> The text given by Professor Petruševski is mutilated (cf. p. 17 n. 1).

[cf. Ψ 810; ο 507] λέγεσθαι: ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡ τροφή τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀγαθὸν ἀναγκαῖον ἦν, ἐπεκτείνας, φησὶν, εἴρηκεν ἐῖσθην. So he let δαῖτα stay in the text.

Anyway, we find in the passage from Athenaeus a good reason why the *grammarians* should have changed δαῖτα into πᾶσι (whereas a change πᾶσι > δαῖτα cannot be taken seriously<sup>10</sup>).

(c) A similar case of forgery has been adduced by A. Römer, *o. c.*, 332 f., namely τ 113

τίκτηι δ' ἔμπεδα μῆλα, θάλασσα δὲ παρέχηι ἰχθῦς.

Since μῆλα usually means in Homer 'small cattle, sheep or goats', and it is clear that here the word implies 'flocks' or συλληπτικῶς πάντα τὰ τετράποδα (as in ρ 170, cf. 181 and Eust. p. 1814,33; 1648,60), some ancient purist must have been shocked, and therefore substituted μῆλα by πάντα (the latter being unfortunately accepted by V. Bérard).

(d). The defenders of the reading πᾶσι explained its meaning either as = παντοίους, *omnis generis* (i. e. γυψὶ καὶ κόραξι κτλ.), or, more frequently, as *promiscue omnibus* (C. G. Heyne, Ox. 1821), „sylliptisch: allen, die gerade in der Nähe waren und überhaupt von Leichen zehren“ (Ameis, 1868); „allen ohne Unterschied, so viel ihrer kamen“ (J. U. Faesi, 5 th. ed. by F. R. Franke, 1871); „allen, die daran theilnehmen wollten“ (Ludwich, *o. c.*, II, 89 n. 55 with examples); „all that chose to come“ (Leaf<sup>2</sup>)<sup>11</sup>; etc.

It can be so; nevertheless this πάντες with οἰωνοί only here differs from the way in which Homer elsewhere uses κύνες τε καὶ οἰωνοί (cf. X 354; γ 259; Ω 411; X 335; B 393; Θ 379; N 831; P 241; Σ 271; X 42; ω 292; as for ξ 133 κύνες ταχέες τ' οἰωνοί, cf. Σ 283; X 89 and Ω 292; 310; ο 526).

And let us add that πᾶσι would destroy the elegant Homeric structure κατὰ χιασμόν (a b : b<sup>1</sup> a<sup>1</sup>) ἐλώρια κύνεσσιν οἰωνοῖσι τε δαῖτα (cf. e. g. E 839 δεινὴν γὰρ ἄγεν θεόν, ἄνδρα δ' ἄριστον; A 255—6).

Thus, δαῖτα seems to be the most probable reading. By the way, Wilamowitz was progressive enough when in 1884 he wrote that Nauck's δαῖτα will be acceptable to all scholars who are not slaves of tradition („für alle nicht unfreien köpfe“), and Professor Petruševski on pp. 30 f., I would say, was not fair to the greatest classical scholar of our age indeed.

Cambridge (England), October 1964.

M. Marcovich.

<sup>10</sup> The latter opinion was shared by Ed. Kammer, *Bursians Jahresh.* 9 (1877), 82, and by A. Ludwich, *o. c.*, II, 89; „... dass obige und ähnliche Stellen aus den Tragikern zurückwirkenden Einfluss auf Homer [i. e. on Zenodotus] ausgeübt haben“.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also Ebeling, *Lex.*, II, 143 ab, and Σ B εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ πάντες ἦσθιον, ἀλλ' οὖν ἀνέδην πᾶσι προύκειντο; Eust. p. 19,43 πολλοὶ προύκειντο ἔλωρ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπιχωριάζουσι (cf. Aeschyl. *l. c.*?) σαρκοφάγους ὀρνέοις.