The story of Xerxes and Masistes' wife near the end of the *Histories* echoes that of Gyges and Candaules' wife near the beginning (1.8.13).[7] Yet while the earlier story is a tragedy of choice, into which Gyges is innocently drawn, the latter is a quasi-Sophoclean tragedy of error[8] that climaxes when Xerxes, as he nods, recognizes the disaster – which, if not yet a fact, is now inevitable – and, worse still, knows that he has caused it.

Scholars have seen Biblical parallels in the book of Esther, with Ahasuerus as Xerxes and Esther as a most un-Herodotean Amestris, or the story of Salome.[9] To my knowledge, however, no one has seen the Semele myth as a formal model. No doubt something like what Herodotus says *did* occur; I suggest only that Herodotus has added colour to his narrative by shaping his tale through the myth of Zeus and Semele.[10]

Queen's University at Kingston, Canada R. DREW GRIFFITH
griffitd@queensu.ca
doi:10.1017/S0009838810000571

[7] See esp. E. Wolff, 'Das Weib des Masistes', *Hermes* 92 (1964), 51–8, at 56.

[8] I am thinking of such figures as Creon, Deianira and Oedipus. Sophocles and Herodotus, incidentally, shared views on many topics: e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 908–12 = Hdt. 3.119.6; Soph. *El.* 417–23 = Hdt. 1.108.1; Soph. *OC* 337–41 = Hdt. 2.35.2; Soph. *OT* 1528–30 = Hdt. 1.32.5; Soph, *El.* 62–4 = Hdt. 4.95; and Soph. *OC* 1224–47 = Hdt. 7.46.3–4.

[9] For Esther, see R.W. Macan, *Herodotus: The Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books* (London, 1908), 1.2.812. For Salome (cf. Matthew 14: 3–12 and Mark 6: 21–6), see W.W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1912), 2.334 *ad* 9.110, and E.S. Schuckburgh, *Herodotus IX: Kalliope* (Cambridge, 1954), 164.

[10] I am grateful to Dr Rhiannon Ash and to an anonymous referee for *CQ* for helpful comments on an earlier version.

NOT A NEW FRAGMENT OF EPHORUS

In 'Ephorus (?) on the Spartan consititution',[1] David Whitehead suggests that a new fragment of the historian Ephorus is to be found in the Suda[2] and Eudemus[3] gloss ἀγαθοεργοί· αἱρετοὶ κατ᾽ ἀνδραγαθίαν ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων, where for the last word he would read Ἐφόρου. The Spartan ἀγαθοεργοί are known in literature (as distinct from lexica) only from Herodotus 1.67.5, who says they are the five oldest former ἵππεῖς in each year. Among the lexica Hesychius[4] agrees with and

[1] *CQ* N.S. 55 (2005), 299–301.

[2] A. Adler (ed.), *Suidae Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1928–38), α 115. That 'Suidas' is the title, not the author, and that the correct form is 'Suda' is now generally accepted, after F. Dölger, 'Der Titel des sog. Suidaslexikons', *SBAW* (1936), 6. The fundamental treatment of the lexicon and its sources is Adler's article in *RE* IV A 1 (1931), 675–717.

[3] For this work see below p. 313.

[4] K. Latte, P.A. Hansen, I.C. Cunningham (edd.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* (Copenhagen and Berlin–New York, 1953–2009), α 251 (and hence *lex. rhet*. 209.4 Bekker, *Anecd. Gr.* 1; for the interpolations in this work from Hesychius see Latte, 1, XXI). This gloss will derive from his principal source, Diogenianus (2nd c.), who used various earlier compilations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881000056X Published online by Cambridge University Press

cites Herodotus, while Timaeus,[5] Photius[6] (who omit ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων) and the two already mentioned have the different explanation of selection by merit. Whitehead argues that this reflects a different source, to be located in the final words in the Suda and Eudemus, which may have been either added by Eudemus to the gloss in Timaeus (if the latter is older than the former) or omitted by Timaeus in excerpting Eudemus (if Eudemus is the older).

Unfortunately this is a house of cards, built on a foundation of sand. That this is so is immediately obvious when one considers the real nature and relationship of these lexica.[7]

(1) The *Lexicon Platonicum* of Timaeus has survived in an epitomized and interpolated state, directly only in the manuscript Paris, Coisl. 345 (saec. x). That the interpolations include many glosses relating to Herodotus, and that ἀγαθοεργοί is one of these, was recognized by the first editor, David Ruhnken.[8] The date of the interpolations is uncertain: between Timaeus himself (almost as uncertain, between the second and fifth centuries) and the early ninth century (below 2).

(2) Timaeus, substantially as in the Coislinianus, was included in the expansions of the Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων, compiled and expanded in the early ninth century (before the lexicon of Photius of *c*. 840), some in the first expansion Σ′, more in the later Σ″ and Σ‴.[9] ἀγαθοεργοί is one of those in Σ″, which is represented here by the lexica of Photius and the Suda.

(3) The so-called lexicon of Eudemus is unpublished, apart from some excerpts from Paris, gr. 2635 (saec. xiv–xv) provided by B. Niese to K. Rupprecht.[10] The ascription to the known rhetorician (date uncertain, probably between the second and fifth centuries)[11] is in itself highly dubious, as it derives from an addition by a second hand to the anonymous title in the manuscript.[12] It is rendered impossible by the fact that this lexicon to a large extent derives from the Suda (tenth century).[13]

[5] *Timaei Sophistae Lexicon vocum Platonicarum*, α 1. A new edition is being prepared by S. Valente; in the meantime I cite from his doctoral thesis (Firenze, 2006/7). The only usable older edition is that of D. Ruhnken, revised by G.E. Koch (Leipzig, 1828). The recent edition by M. Bonelli amd J. Barnes, *Timée le Sophiste. Lexique platonicien* (Leiden–Boston, 2007) is unreliable: see K. Alpers' review, *Mnemosyne* 62 (2009), 664–74, and also id. *ZPE* 166 (2008), 85–99. Whitehead's reference for the gloss in question, '971a15', is to the Baiter–Orelli–Winkelmann edition in their Plato (Zurich, 1839), doubtless via the *TLG* CD; although it does not affect this gloss, that edition is quite unusable, as it rearranges the material and incorporates into it Platonic glosses from a variety of (unacknowledged) sources.

[6] Ch. Theodoridis (ed.), *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon* (Berlin–New York, 1982–), α 79.

[7] A good modern survey of Greek lexicography (the study of which was revolutionized by G. Wentzel and R. Reitzenstein at the end of the nineteenth century) is given by K. Alpers, *Der neue Pauly* 15/1 (Stuttgart, 2001), 126–31.

[8] *Timaei Sophistae Lexicon vocum Platonicarum* (Leiden, 1754). See Alpers (n. 5 [2008]).

[9] See the edition by I.C. Cunningham (Berlin–New York, 2003), pp. 52, 56 and 57 (Σ″ is not included in this edition). The expanded version is often referred to as the 'erweiterte Συναγωγή' with the symbol Σ*.

[10] K. Rupprecht, 'Apostolis, Eudem und Suidas', *Philol*. Suppl. 15,1 (1922), excerpts pp. 145–60.

[11] Suda ε 3411. For other references to him, and new fragments from Vatic. gr. 7 see G. Ucciardello, 'Nuovi frammenti di oratori Attici nel Vat. Gr. 7', *Miscell. Bibl. Apost. Vatic.* 14 (2007), 431–83, esp. pp. 456–64.

[12] Ucciardello (n. 11) at 466, after G. Wentzel, *GGA* (1893), 38 n. 1.

[13] Wentzel (n. 12) at 30 ff. This was denied by Rupprecht (n. 10) but definitively proved by A. Adler in her review, *GGA* (1923), 124–35, esp. pp. 127–9 and on ἀγαθοεργοί 129.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881000056X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Taking account of these facts, we can now follow the history of the gloss *ἀγαθοεργοί*. It began as an explanation of the word as it appears in Herodotus (so in Diogenianus = Hesychius). Then with a new explanation, of unknown authority, *αἱρετοὶ κατ᾽ ἀνδραγαθίαν*, it is inserted into Timaeus, and in this form is added, with the rest of Timaeus, to the expanded *Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων*. Each of the extant representatives of that, Photius and the Suda, adds to Timaeus material from other sources, as is very common; that in Photius need not concern us, that in the Suda is *ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων*,[14] and 'Eudemus' duly copies the gloss with this addition.

It is clear that *ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων* does not derive from the real Timaeus (and probably not from the interpolated version), much less from the real Eudemus, whatever the chronological relation between them in fact is; nor therefore is it to be linked to the new explanation in Timaeus. It appears in the tenth-century Suda, possibly a fragment of ancient scholarship not recorded elsewhere, but much more probably a comment by a Byzantine compiler who knew that ephors and Sparta went together. That it has anything at all to do with Ephorus is unlikely in the extreme.

Though it is not immediately relevant, one should consider what *ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων* was intended to mean. The most obvious sense probably is 'selected from the body of ephors'; in that case its author was not familiar with the original passage of Herodotus, and is not likely to have been an ancient scholar. Perhaps possible is 'by the ephors', with *ἐκ* = *ὑπό* (LSJ s.v. III 5);[15] that usage is more likely in an ancient (Ionic?) source than in a Byzantine one, when *ἐκ* even in its basic sense was being replaced by *ἀπό*.[16]

Cove, Minard, Argyll I. C. CUNNINGHAM
i.c.cunningham@btinternet.com
doi:10.1017/S000983881000056X

[14] The change of source is indicated in Adler's edition by a large space. Why she prints *Ἐφόρων* is not clear.

[15] So N. Richer, *Les éphores: études sur l'histoire et sur l'image de Sparte* (Paris, 1998), 472 n. 124, who finds this the natural explanation (and sees no contradiction between Herodotus and the Suda).

[16] Cf. e.g. A. Debrunner, *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1953–4), 2, 116.

VIRGIL, *ECLOGUE* 4.53–4: ENOUGH OF WHAT?*

Near the end of the fourth *Eclogue* Virgil contemplates his own role as poet in the new age that lies ahead, praying that he may live long enough to sing the praises of the man whose birth he has heralded and that he may do his deeds justice. The text below is from Mynors's OCT:

* I would like to thank Tony Woodman and *CQ*'s anonymous referees for helpful criticisms.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881000056X Published online by Cambridge University Press