ON A 4—5

αὐτοὺς δὲ ἔλωρια τεῦχε κῦνεσσιν
οἰωνοῖς 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 ἔλωρια (echoed by Apoll. Rhod. II, 264) cannot be interpreted as an adjective\(^1\), being a simple metric variant for ἔλωρα in the *fourth* foot of the hexameter (as are e. g. ἄθλια I 124 = 266; 127; 269; X 160; ᾑ 736; 823; ἄθλιον ᾑ 537; 748; 0 108; φ 4; 62; 117; ω 169; τοῦτο ποτότης τι 504; 530; Αἰτώλιος Δ 399 Ε 706; πελώριος 21 times, against πέλωρος Μ 202; = 220; τ 257; ο 161; etc.)\(^2\);

(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(c) has withdrawn his conjectures (cf.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 δείπνα (as a matter of fact, the latter word is not to be found in Homer in *plural*, in 37 instances), instead of παστά codd.: δαῖτα Zenodotus *teste* Ath. 12 F (hence Eust. p. 19,45 Bas. and Suda, s. δαιτός ἔσης).

(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, ἔτοις

---

\(^1\) Which is not documented in Greek: the remark of Σ Β (Τ) κτητικόν δὲ ἄτι τὸ ἔλωρον, ὡς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔλωρα ἐχρήσατο cannot be taken seriously.

δηλαδή ἀλφίτοις μεμιγμένον. καὶ ἐπίπαστα, φησίν, αὐτὰ τὰ ἀλφίτα; Hesych. ἔτος ἀλφίτοις μεμιγμένον; Phot.; cf. Aristoph. fr. 687 K. = Edm.

χορδαί, φύσκαι, πασταί, ζωμός, χόλικες

and Poll. VI, 56 πασταὶ δὲ εἰσὶ... 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 πάσασθαι is paretymologic.

ἐδέστόν Soph. Ant. 206, quoted by the author on pp. 33; 37, is a bad example, because in the phrase δέμας... ἐδέστον αἴκισθέν 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 δαίτα 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) 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(Ι) and (ΔΑΙ)ΤΑ (cf. pp. 32; 34; 37). But this was not necessary, since παστι and δαίτα are not to be considered as textual corruptions, but obviously as intentional variants (uariae lectiones antiquae), such as e. g.

τ 113 πάντα : μῆλα
Α 447 ἱερήν : κλειτήν
Δ 195 Ἀρτέος υἱόν : ἀρχόν Ἀχιλῶν
Ε 247 μεγαλήτορος : μὲν ἀμύμονος
Ι 653 φλέξα (Pl. Hipp. min. 371 C; Σ A) : σμύξις
Χ 478 ἐνι οἰκώι (Σ AT; Strabo 585) : κατὰ δῶμα
Ω 82 πῆμα (Plato, Ion 538 D; Σ A) : κῆρα

and many others.

3 Hesych. βροῦμα ἐκ τυροῦ ἄνελον μετὰ σεμιδάλεως καὶ σεμιχυμοῦ σκευα-ζόμενον is of different kind and origin.

4 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 Lehrs3 p. 87 n. 50a; Aristarchs 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. = 19306; Dindorf — Hentze6; Leaf2; D. Monro — Th. Allen (Ox. 1902 = 19203; but without any punctuation Allen, Ox. 1931, maior); A. T. Murray (Loeb, 1924); P. Mazon cett. (1938), and contra myself. Lehrs referred to Φ 485 (and to ζ 132; 134); the author referred to Φ 539 (and to ι 405). As for the meaning of λάβησιν in Ω 43, cf. I 324 and Φ 24.
The idea to look for a palaeographical 'common denominator' between the readings πασι and δαίτα [if so, then why not between πάντα and μήλα as well?] simply contradicts all we know about the transmission of the Homeric songs in antiquity.

(III) Thus, we have to chose between πασι and δαίτα, no other reading being either necessary or probable [and if we needed one, the best candidate would be χύρμα, in view of γ 271; ε 473; P 272; 151; E 488; etc.].

Now, I still think that δαίτα is the better reading here, although it is not used elsewhere in Homer as the food for animals. As is known, δαίτα has been accepted by:
2. G. Hinrichs, Bursians Jahresb. 26 (1881, appeared in 1883), 209 f.;
4. W. Leaf, II.¹ (London 1886) [but πασι in II.², 1900, reprint 1960];
5. C. Hentze in K. F. Ameis—Hentze, II.³ (1896), and P. Cauer in Ameis—Hentze—Cauer, II.⁴ (1913);
6. C. Hentze in W. Dindorf—Hentze, II.⁵ (1899 = 1931);
8. P. Cauer, Grundfragen d. Homerkritik² (Leipzig 1909), 54; (1921³), 57;
9. A. Römer, Rh. Mus. 66 (1911), 334 ff.; etc.

The reasons:
(a) Aeschylus Suppl. 800—1 (lyr.)
 κυσίν δ' ἐπετο' ἔλω ὅ ἀκάπιχωρίοις
 δρόνισι δείπνον

Sophocles Philoct. 957

θανὼν παρέξω δαίθ' ὅφ' ὄν ἐφερμόμην
(sc. πτηνοὶς δρόνισι Ἡ θηρσίν δρειβάταις and Euripides Ion 504—5 (lyr.)

πιτανοὶς ἐξώρισε θοίνα θηρσί τε φοινίαν δαίτα
(cf. 903 πιτανοὶς ... ἐφερμόμην and Hec. 1078 κυσίν τε φοινίκα δαίτα) seem to have read in A 5 δαίτα. Notice the bipartite structure κύνεσσιν + A : οἰωνοῖσι + B both in Homer and in Aeschylus — Euripides, which is not to be found elsewhere. Aeschylus probably has changed

" quoted for the first time by Nauck (1868), I. c. (and by M. Haupt teste G. Hinrichs, I. c., but is not to be found in Haupt' s Opuscula, I—III, Leipzig 1875—76, edited by Wilamowitz).
⁵ First quoted by Lehr¹ (1833) p. 164 = 1882³ p. 160.
δαίτα into δείπνον, because he elsewhere preferred this word: cf. *Agam.* 138 (lyr.) δείπνον αἰετῶν; *P. Ox.* 2256, 10a, 2 (de Sphinge?) στηροχτόνων ἐσ[ταί] δείπνον.7

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

(b) It seems that we can explain why δαίτα was changed into τῶς: 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, οίς δὴ οὐ παρὴν ἄφθονος ἢ τροφῆ, ἀρτι φαινομένης ἀθρόου ἐπὶ αὐτὴν ἱόντες βίαι ήρπαζον καὶ ἄφητον 
> τοὺς ἔχοντας, καὶ μετὰ τῆς ἀκοσμίας ἐγώντον [ἐγώντον codd.] καὶ φόνοι. (ἐξ ὧν εἰκὸς λεγὴναι καὶ τὴν ἀκαθαλικὴν, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς ἁλλαξὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἐξημάρτανον οἱ ἁνθρωποὶ εἰς ἀλλήλους). ὡς δὲ παρεγένετο αὐτοῖς πολλὴ ἐκ τῆς Δῆμητρος, διένεμον ἐκάστι ισηστῶι ἵ σην, καὶ οὔτως εἰς κόσμον ἠθέν τοῖς ἁνθρώποις τά δόρπα. διὸ ἄρτου τε ἐπίνοια πέμματος τῶς ἵ σον διακοσμουμένου ἀλείσσῳ καὶ γάρ τῶτα ἡς τῶν κατημένων ἀλείσσῳ ποιητῆς, ἠτατομὴ [Καιβέλ: ἐς ἵ σον <<τοι>> Desrousseaux (1956)] ἁρπώνων [Wilamowitz: χαρομίτων codd.] ἐγώντον. ὁ σταὶ τῇ τροφῇ δαίλι 
> ἐπὶ τῶν δαίλι ἱσθαι λέγεται, δ ἐστι διὰ μοίρασθαι ἐπ᾽ ἵσης (καὶ ὃ τὰ κρέα ὡς πῶν δαίτος, ἐπεὶ ἵ σην ἐκάστι ισηστῶι μοίραν ἐδίδου) καὶ ἐπὶ μόνῳ ἁνθρώπων δαίτα [δαίτας codd., ex Eust. corr. Καιβέλ] λέγεται ὁ θηρίων οὐκέτι. ἁγνοῦν δὲ τῶτας τῆς φωνῆς τὴν δύναμιν Ζηνόδοτος ἐν τῷ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐκδόσει γράφει:

> αὐτοῦς δὲ [δ᾽ codd.] ἐλώρια τεῦχη κύνεσσιν ἵσθαι τῶν δαίτα,

τὴν τῶν γυμνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀλλων οἰωνῶν τροφῆν οὔτως καὶ μόνου ἁνθρώπου χαρωνοῦντος <ἐς Καιβέλ> τὸ ἵσον ἐκ τῆς πρόσθεν βιας. διὸ καὶ μόνου τούτου ή τροφὴ δαίς, καὶ μόρια τὸ ἐκάστωι διδόμενον.

Zenodotus probably did not share this theory of ἱσσῆς, because he is said to have explained δαίς ἔσθη differently (12 CD): ἐξ τοῦτον δ᾽ [sc. Θ 98; Ι 225] ἐπείσθη Ζηνόδοτος δαίτα ἔσθην τὴν ἀγαθὴν


8 Probably allusion to ἵσος is intended.

9 The text given by Professor Petruševski is mutilated (cf. p. 17 n. 1).
Anyway, we find in the passage from Athenaeus a good reason why the grammarians should have changed δάίτα into πάσι (whereas a change πάσι > δάίτα cannot be taken seriously).

(c) A similar case of forgery has been adduced by A. Römer, o. c., 332 f., namely τίκτηι μήλα, θάλασσα δὲ παρέχηι ἰχθοὺς. Since μήλα 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 μήλα by πάντα (the latter being unfortunately accepted by V. Bérard).

(d) The defenders of the reading πάσι explained its meaning either as = παντοίοις, omnis generis (i. e. γυψί καί κόραξ κτλ.), or, more frequently, as promiscue omnibus (C. G. Heyne, Ox. 1821), "... sylleptisch: 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., Π, 89, n. 55 with examples); "... all that chose to come" (Leaf2); etc.

It can be so; nevertheless this πάντες with οιωνοί only here differs from the way in which Homer elsewhere uses κύνες τε καί οιωνοί (cf. X 354; γ 259; Ω 411; X 335; Θ 379; Ν 831; Ρ 241; Σ 271; X 42; ω 292; as for ξ 133 κύνες ταχέες τοίς οιωνοί, cf. Σ 283; X 89 and Ω 292; 310; o 526).

And let us add that πάσι would destroy the elegant Homeric structure κατά χιασμόν (a b : b1 : a1) ἐλώρια κύνεσσιν οίωνοίσι τε δαίτα (cf. e. g. Ε 839 δεινήν γάρ άγεν θεόν, ἄνδρα δ' ἄριστον; A 255—6).

Thus, δάίτα seems to be the most probable reading. By the way, Wilamowitz was progressive enough when in 1884 he wrote that Nauck's δάίτα 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.