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 ναύτησιν 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/52.2.581 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has indicated, we should not expect complete symmetry in the way Semonides treats each type of woman. However, while lines 37–40 are linguistically unremarkable, *ἀλλοίην* in line 42 remains a problem. From what has been said of the sea, we expect the sense to be 'the sea has a variable nature' (Gerber). But for this to be the meaning we need something like *ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοίην* (Hartung), as at line 11 *ὀργὴν δ' ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοίην ἔχει* (of the vixen-woman).[3] By itself, *ἀλλοῖος* cannot mean 'changeable'. Nor is there any sense in saying at this point 'the sea has a different nature [i.e. from that described above]', the most obvious translation.

Lloyd-Jones (whose translation is rather free: 'like the ocean, she has a changeful nature', as if he read Grotius' *φυὴν δ' ὡς πόντος ἀλλοίην ἔχει*), followed recently by Pellizer and Tedeschi, ingeniously suggests that *ἀλλοῖος* can have sinister overtones; thus, 'a different nature (i.e. unlike that of other things, sinister, uncanny)'. But as the only two passages he cites for this usage show (Hdt. 5.40.1 Anaxandrides warned not to resist, *ἵνα μή τι ἀλλοῖον περὶ σεῦ Σπαρτιῆται βουλεύσωνται*; Arcesilaus [letter to Thaumasia] ap. Diog. Laert. 4.44 *διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολλάκις ἀρρωστεῖν καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀσθενῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξέ μοι διαθέσθαι ἵνα εἴ τι γένοιτο ἀλλοῖον, μή τι σὲ ἠδικηκὼς ἀπίω τὸν εἰς ἐμὲ ἐκτενῶς οὕτω πεφιλοτιμημένον*), the locution is in fact *τι ἀλλοῖον*, and the sinister overtones in each case are due in part to the context, but more precisely to the fact that *τι* is left unspecified. Similarly, where *ἄλλος* or *ἕτερος*, whose uses Lloyd-Jones compares, has a sinister connotation, this is supplied by the context. Thus, for example, at Pind. *Pyth*. 3.34 *δαίμων . . . ἕτερος* means 'an adverse fate' because it is contrasted with the happy one which Coronis might have expected (as mother of Asclepius, or else as the result of the distant hopes mentioned at lines 19–23).[4] But I doubt we can read so much into Semonides' brief statement here.

Schneidewin suggested deleting simply line 42 (a suggestion not reported by West, but in Lloyd-Jones, and Pellizer and Tedeschi). While lines 41–2 are not necessarily an organic whole, the accusative of respect *ὀργήν* helps avoid the abruptness which would result if the passage ended simply with 41. Possibly, however, both lines are in fact Pseudo-Semonides, interpolated by someone who, influenced by the common Homeric structure 'as . . . so', felt that the simile required a concluding passage. This would readily account for the flatness of the couplet and particularly the clumsiness of *φυὴν δὲ πόντος ἀλλοίην ἔχει* as an inept imitation of line 11.[5] The interpolator may have been further led astray by the presence of the bitch-simile at 34–6, though this is embedded in the description of the woman on a bad day, just as the stranger's comments at 30–31 are embedded in the description of the woman on a good day.

If both lines are omitted, we need a comma, not a stop, at line 36.

Berlin J. H. HORDERN
jhordern@zedat.fu-berlin.de

[3] Cf. also Hes. *Op*. 483 *ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖος Ζηνὸς νόος*.

[4] Cf. perhaps also *χωρίς* in Semon. fr. 7.1 *χωρὶς γυναικὸς θεὸς ἐποίησεν νόον*, which, if it means 'differently (from men)', does so because of the all-male sympotic context in which the poem was probably performed (Lloyd-Jones ad loc.); in fact, not so much 'differently (from men)' as 'differently (from us)'.

[5] For what it is worth, *ἔοικε* does not otherwise appear in the iambic poets, though it is attested in Homer (e.g. *Il*. 3.158 *θεῇς . . . ἔοικέ*). Semonides elsewhere uses *ὥσπερ*, *οἷον* (both also common in Archil.), *δίκην* + gen. (fr. 12; cf. Archil. fr. 124a), and *ὡς*. This may also raise doubts, but is certainly not conclusive. Anacr. fr. ia. 1.1 has *ἔστε ξένοισι μειλίχοις ἐοικότες*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.581 Published online by Cambridge University Press