SHORTER NOTES

WAKING UP TO *ILIAD* 7.434

At *Il.* 7.433–4, M. L. West in the most recent Teubner edition prints the following text:

> ἦμος δ' οὔτ' ἄρ πω ἠώς, ἔτι δ' ἀμφιλύκη νύξ
> τῆμος ἄρ' ἀμφὶ πυρὴν κριτὸς ἤγρετο λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν

West accepts Düntzer's emendation, *ἤγρετο* for *ἔγρετο*, which is in all the MSS.[1] The alteration reflects a *communis opinio* that is over a century old which sees *ἔγρετο*, *woke up* (from *ἐγείρω*), as a 'blunder of transcription',[2] thought to be impossible in the context, and offers *ἤγρετο*, *gathered* (from *ἀγείρω*), as preferable. It should be stressed that Düntzer's reading *ἤγρετο* was based on this same variant in a few MSS for *ἔγρετο* at *Il.* 24.789, which was posited on the same contextual grounds: *gathered* appears to make more sense than *woke up*.[3] This circular argument prevails despite the absence of variants for *ἔγρετο* at *Il.* 7.434 which might suggest that the text was seen as incorrect by ancient scribes or Hellenistic scholars, and despite Szemerényi's linguistic objections to the form *ἤγρετο*.[4] Szemerényi long ago argued that *ἤγρετο* is an implausible form of the verb *ἄγειρω* in Homer since it implies the coexistence of two kinds of thematic aorist, one formed on *ἀγερ-* and the other formed on *ἀγρ-*, which, as he claims, would be 'highly anomalous'. He also argued that the only actual Homeric form derived from *ἀγρ-* is the participle *ἀγρόμενος* since **ἀγερόμενος* cannot be adapted to the hexameter through metrical lengthening.

The appeal of Düntzer's emendation persists, nevertheless, because of the perceived contextual difficulty that even Szemerényi admits. Kirk in his commentary ad loc. insists that 'clearly the group in question did not sleep by the pyre, indeed (all) the Achaeans went back to the ships after burning the dead'. Yet after accepting Düntzer's emendation, he also expresses perplexity why the subject should be *κριτὸς . . . λαὸς*, since Nestor's proposal seems to imply that all the Achaeans went back to the ship. He finally suggests, echoing Leaf, that the verse 'is indeed modelled after 24.789 *vel sim.*, with *κριτός* not specifically thought out in context'.

All perplexity about *κριτὸς . . . λαός* disappears, however, if we consider that waking up by the pyre *is* appropriate in the context. Indeed, looking at Patroclus' funeral, we can see that Achilles and a select few remained behind to tend the pyre all

[1] Other editors print *ἤγρετο*: Christ, Nauck, Ameis and Hentze, and Mazon. Ameis and Hentze, *Anhang zu Homers Ilias* (Leipzig, 1887), 62, assert that the reading was originally proposed by La Roche.

[2] Leaf notes ad loc.: '*ἔγρετο*, *was awaked* (*ἐγείρω*), is an obvious blunder of transcription from *ΕΓΡΕΤΟ* = *ἤγρετο*, *gathered* (*ἀγείρω*). The same mistake has been made in 24.789, and the converse apparently in *υ* 123; cf. also *Ψ* 287.'

[3] Allen's *editio maior* lists thirteen instances supporting *ἤγρετο* at 24.789, but none at 7.434. The same mistake is assumed for 24.789. Relevant here also is N. Richardson's comment on 24.789: 'The burial takes place after dawn, as at 226–57. Cf. *Od.* 24.72, and *Il.* 7.433–6 (twilight before dawn), where 434 closely resembles 789; in both cases we should read *ἤγρετο* ("gathered"), with a few MSS here, for the vulgate *ἔγρετο* ("woke up").'

[4] O. J. L. Szemerényi, *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European* (Naples, 1964), 200 with n. 2.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.580 Published online by Cambridge University Press

night (*παννύχιοι*, 23.217, *πάννυχος*, 23.218), and at dawn the hero was awakened by the noise of Agamemnon and the others returning (23.233–4):

> *οἱ δ' ἀμφ' Ἀτρεΐωνα ἀολλέες ἠγερέθοντο·*
> *τῶν μιν ἐπερχομένων ὅμαδος καὶ δοῦπος ἔγειρεν.*

Hence, it is not impossible to imagine that a select group stayed behind, slept by the pyre, and woke up at dawn at *Il.* 7.434 as well. Moreover, Schol. bT ad loc. explains *κριτὸς . . . λαός* in precisely these terms: *εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο κριθεὶς τὰ περὶ τὴν πυρκαιὰν ἐκπονῆσαι*. There exists then no contextual impetus to change the unanimous reading of the MSS at *Il.* 7.434 or even at *Il.* 24.789.

Finally, I would draw attention to Ap. Rhod. 2.669–71 in direct support of the MSS reading at *Il.* 7.434.

> *ἦμος δ' οὔτ' ἄρ πω φάος ἄμβροτον, οὔτ' ἔτι λίην*
> *ὀρφναίη πέλεται, λεπτὸν δ' ἐπιδέδρομε νυκτὶ*
> *φέγγος, ὅτ' ἀμφιλύκην μιν ἀνεγρόμενοι καλέουσιν.*

These lines give a glimpse of Apollonius, not only as epic poet, but as Homeric commentator, and in this case he is explaining the *hapax* *ἀμφιλύκη* at 7.433.[5] Apollonius' explanation involves a verbatim imitation of the first half of the line; he then changes *ἠώς* to *φάος ἄμβροτον* and substitutes *ἀμφιλύκη νύξ* with *λίην ὀρφναίη*. These substitutions are followed by an explanatory description, *λεπτὸν δ' ἐπιδέδρομε νυκτὶ | φέγγος*, and then the phenomenon is labelled, *ὅτ' ἀμφιλύκην μιν ἀνεγρόμενοι καλέουσιν*. Particularly significant is the participle at Ap. Rhod. 2.671: *ἀνεγρόμενοι*, *waking up*. Although Apollonius is primarily concerned with the meaning of *ἀμφιλύκη*, these lines make it clear that the text of *Il.* 7.433–4 that he was working with also had the reading of our MSS, *ἔγρετο*.

University of Washington, Seattle JACKIE MURRAY
jdmurray@u.washington.edu

[5] A. Rengakos, 'Apollonios Rhodios und die antike Homererklärung', *Zetemata* 92 (1994), 49.

SEMONIDES, FR. 7. 41–2[1]

> *ταύτηι μάλιστ' ἔοικε τοιαύτη γυνὴ*
> *ὀργήν· φυὴν δὲ πόντος ἀλλοίην ἔχει.*

The lines come at the end of Semonides' account of the sea-woman, changeable from day to day, and his description of the varying moods of the sea itself (37–40 *πολλάκις μὲν ἀτρεμὴς | ἔστηκ', ἀπήμων, χάρμα ναύτηισιν μέγα, | θέρεος ἐν ὥρηι, πολλάκις δὲ μαίνεται | βαρυκτύποισι κύμασιν φορεομένη*). The whole passage has been suspected; Jordan, who thought it odd that only here does Semonides give a description of the element out of which the woman is made, deleted the simile from 37–40 as well as the concluding couplet.[2] This seems a little extreme; as Lloyd-Jones

[1] The following are referred to by author's name only: D. Gerber, *Greek Iambic Poetry* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1999); M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (Oxford, 1989–92[2]); E. Pellizer and G. Tedeschi, *Semonide* (Rome, 1990); H. Lloyd-Jones, *Females of the Species* (London, 1974). Fragments are cited after West.

[2] H. Jordan, *Hermes* 14 (1879), 280–4.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.580 Published online by Cambridge University Press