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This paper attempts to suggest a possible context for some Hesychian glosses related (or conceivably related) to Philitas. It contains some of the possibilities which I shall raise in my new edition of the poetic and grammatical fragments of the Coan poet and scholar. The nature of these suggestions essentially contains a degree of speculation, but it may not be entirely fortuitous, as the glosses here attributed to Philitas’ poetic works, other than their metrical form, fulfil three prerequisites, i.e. they have a Hellenistic/Callimachean ring, they can be related to a conceivable context in Philitas or his conceivable influence on Callimachus/Theocritus, and it is possible to identify the passage of Callimachus or Theocritus, in an ancient scholium of which the Philitan reference could survive. The idea for this article incurs an apparent debt to the contribution of A. S. Hollis, Some neglected verse citations in Hesychius, published in ZPE 123 (1998), 61 f. 1 It may not be extraneous to the aims of this paper to note my suspicion — and hope — that the future editors of Stephanus Byzantius may discover more verse citations than already noticed.

The last editor of Philitas noted of his author’s presence in Hesychius that “in Hesychio si miraculo unaquaeque glossa nomen inventoris recuperaret, Cous certe passim resurgeret”. 2 Among the many Hesychian entries pertaining to grammatical fragments of Philitas (one is discussed here as entry (h), three others are postulated in entries (c) and (e)), there is one that comes from a poetical work of his, namely θ 405 Θέσσαλια: οι Κώβα παρά Φιλήτα καί οι φαρμακίδες = SH 675C. Two others are transmitted anonymously in Hesychius, but from other sources we know that they come from the Coan, namely α 7862 ἀστραγγάς (M. Schmidt: ἀστριγάς cod.) – ἀγάς (EtM α 1979 L.–L.: ἀγάς cod.). ἡ ἀστριγάς = SH 675B – the fragment is therefore to be edited in the accusative plural – and ν 552 νήχων (Mususus: χινον cod.) – πολυό = CA 21. Double interpretation of the type ‘x or/and y’ would appear to be a feature in the exegesis of Philitian terminology. This speaks for an author employing some very oblique language. These anonymous entries suggest the possibility that other anonymous verse citations in Hesychius may be derived from Philitas, though their presence should not be imagined as widespread as that of e.g. Callimachus. The certain poetic fragments of the Coan in Hesychius indicate that the main sources supplying Philitan expressions or vocables to Diogenianus were the ancient commentaries on the great Hellenistic poets reproducing notes which would go back to Theon. All these fragments possibly come from Demeter, the poem which Callim. Aet. fr. 1.9 f. praises. 3 The entry

* Hesychius α–ο is cited according to the numeration of K. Latte’s edition (Copenhagen 1953/1966), χ–ω according to that of M. Schmidt (Halle 1861/1862). Abbreviations of modern collections of fragments are as in P. G. W. Glare (ed.), Liddell–Scott–Jones: A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised Supplement, Oxford 1996, except of Suppl. Hell. = SH. Note also:


Cook Bee  A. B. Cook, The Bee in Greek Mythology, JHS 15 (1895), 1–24.


2 Kuchenmüller 115.

3 A possibility outside Demeter may be the entry μ 699 Μελιγονίς: οὔτος ἢ Λιπάρα ἐκελέτο νήσος which is derived from a comment on Callim. HyDian. 47–8 νήσος ἐπὶ Λιπάρα (Λιπάρη νέον, ἀλλὰ τότε ἔσκεν / σύνομα οἱ Μελιγονίς). Parthenius Erot. path. 2 summarising an episode from Philitas’ Hermes (CA 5) begins Ὀδυσσεύς (Δῆ)
The scholion on Theocr. 7.5–9f (79.6 f. Wendel) says of the Coan princess Chalcon and Antagoras that οὖν τὸ δὲ εἰσίν ... οἱ ύποδειγμένοι τὴν Δήμητραν, καθ’ οὸν καρόν περιήτε τὴν Κόρην ξητοῦσα and it has long been recognised that the reference here is to Philitas’ *Demeter*. ύποδειγ-μένοι implies reception and entertainment in a house viz. palace and from such a scene may come the fragments *incertae sedis* CA 4 (discussed here in entry (f)), CA 19 διωμίδες εἰς ταλάρους λευκοῦν ἐχόμενον ἔρι (female slaves are a *sine qua non* of an insight in a royal house) and CA 16 γηρύσαστο δὲ νεβρός ἀπὸ ψυχὴν ἔλεσσασα / ὃξείς κάκτος τόμμα φυλαξαμένην. The last fragment is a request for the *aulos* to play, which is typical in banquets and very appropriate of aggrieved Demeter, cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1342 ff. This postulated hospitality banquet in Philitas may largely define Lycidas’ experiences in Theocr. 7.63 ff. and the feast in Longus 2.35.1–2 with Philetas playing the pipes may be a reworking of it.

The Hesychian entry may preserve a detail from Demeter’s entrance in Chalcon’s palace, similar to the one described in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 188 ἢ δ’ ἄρ’ ἐκ’ οὐδὸν ἐβην ποσὶ in Celeus’ house (in Ovid *Fasti* 4.537 this is only *limen ut intravit*). In theoxenies the entrance of a god is often paid attention to and it would appear that Demeter made a prosperous step while crossing the threshold. Entrance with the good right foot is a lasting superstition in antiquity documented by Mayor on Juv. 10.5, who notes that “the gods are entreated to come *pede secundo* (i.e. Serv. Aen. viii 302 *omine prospero* Aen. x 255”). Besides, such superstitions would be appropriate of a people, the Coans, whose religious practices led R. Herzog to characterise as ἀνθρώπως δεισιδαιμονεῖτοι. 4 But ἔτερον, as Hesychius ε 6567 explains, can mean ἄλλον ... ἢ ἐν τῶν δυοῦν. ἢ ἄριστερον and the Hesychian entry suggests that Philitas might have used oblique terminology as to the foot with which Demeter actually straddled the threshold of the Coan palace. The expression would seem to toy with an ambiguity in the description of Thersites in Il. 2.217 χωλὸς δ’ ἔτερον πόδα, where Schol. AbT (ex.; 1.230 Erbse) note ἢ τὸν ἄριστερὸν ἢ τὸν δεξίον, Schol. D ὑπὸ ἑνὶ τῶν ποδῶν. Pindar *Pyth.* 3.34 and Callim. *Hec.* fr. 300 Pf. (51 Hollis) τὸς ... δεσμῶν / τῶν ἐτέρον ἐμπλαῦσα ἐπί τοῦ ἐτέρον in the sense κακοποιοῦ. The rendering in Hesychius with εὐόνυμον admirably preserves this ambiguity, see *LSJ* s.v. II.2 ‘prosperous’ and III.2 ‘ill-omened’ and contrast e.g. Pindar *Nem.* 8.47–8 (athletic victory) ἑκατὸ ποδῶν εὐόνυμων / ... δυοῦν with [Aesch.] *Prom.* 489–90 (omens) ὀιτίνες τε δεξιῶν φόσιν /
and Philitas with which foot they entered their pede ingressi? Attic sense 'auspicious'. Next, Propertius 3.1.5–6 the phrase (combined with the short alpha of and religious applications) any minute now. As Williams ad loc. remarked, "the un-Homeric flavour of the phrase (combined with the short alpha of καλῶ) . . . suggest that here καλῶ is being used in its Attic sense 'auspicious'". Next, Propertius 3.1.5–6 dicite, quoe pariter Carmen tenaustis in antro? quoque pede ingressi?, in a reference which has long remained unaccounted, asks the shades of Callimachus and Philitas with which foot they entered their nemus. Here Propertius' intake of Philitas via Callimachus would become apparent. But Propertius' puzzlement as to the foot with which his two predecessors straddled the entrance of their grove may in fact hint at an actual interpretative question in Philitas. Then a hint at the same ambiguity may come up in the description of Elegy, whom Ovid met with a dark head-dress, vv. 41–2 as Demeter’s feet, would be nicely divided between the two halves of the verse. In what may be a similar contrast, in Callim. 107 τὸν Θεόν ὁπόλλον ποδὶ τ’ ἠλάσεων.

b. i 60 ἵανοκρήδεμους οὐς δὸμοιν τὸ ἐπικράνσιμα . . .

"Alexandrinus ni fallor poeta" remarked M. Schmidt = fr. anon. 175 Schneider. ἵανοκρήδεμους means ‘with a dark head-dress’, cf. Alcman PMGF 1.68–9 νεονίδων / ἵανογιλεφόρων, Adesp. Pap. Hex. SH 906.13 ἵανοφόρων – Theocr. 3.18, al. κυανόφρος and Quint. Sm. 4.381 (mourning Thetis) κυανοκρήδεμου/. The model is termed on ἵαπαρκρήδεμον ἵανοκρήδεμον ‘with a bright head-band’, a Homeric hapax of Compounds such as τινιδής, ἵατς or ἵανδήπτης were normally interpreted as ‘dark- (μέλα-)’, i.e. violet-coloured. I might wonder whether this could be a novel attribute to mournful Demeter, who is 4x κυανόπεπλος in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter and in deep sorrow decides to go around the world covered with a dark head-dress, vv. 41–2 κρήδεμα δαίζετο χερσὶ φίλασι / κυάνεων δὲ κάλλιμα κατ’ ἵμφοτέρων βάλετ’ ὄμων (see Richardson on v. 42) and on the way to Celeus’ palace στέεχε κατὰ κρήδειν κεκαλυμμένην, ὀμφί δὲ πέπλος / κυανεος ῥαδινοῦσι τέκνης ἐλελιζετο ποσσιν (vv. 60–1). If one assume a similar ambiguity involved with its twin question quamque bibistis aquam?? In Callim. Aet. fr. 3.6 Massim. Ἄγωνιπτη and 7 Περιπλασιοῦ appear the Heliconian spring Aganippe and the river Permessus, in fr. 4.1 Massim. Hippocrene. There is some confusion with regards to their identity as the Oxford Scholiast of Callimachus (p. 67, lemma 6 Massim.) seems to imply that Aganippe and Hippocrene are the same springs. Aganippe draws its waters on Permessus and its purity may be pointed out in fr. 3.7 τοῖς θέοις (and fr. 3.8 ‘Ἀονίου’). Later, Propertius 2.10.25 f. and 3.3.5 f. envisages Hippocrene as the spring of heroic verse, Aganippe as the one of heroic elegy, see Massimilla Callimaco, 236–7. In what may be a similar contrast, in Callim. HyAp. 108 f. the waters of the muddy Assyrian river and the trinkles of Demeter’s pure spring are contrasted. And Phoebus asks Propertius in 3.3.15–6 quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te / carminis heroi tangere iussit opus? before he leads him to a grotto of the Muses through a path, where Calliope moistens his lips with ‘Philian’ water’ from a spring (vv. 51–2 λυπησθε a fonte petitis / ora Philitae nostra rigavit aqua). The last two references may imply that the duality of contrasted waters may hark back to Philitas.

Of Thetis, of whom ἵαπαρκρήδεμον occurs in two plus-verses in *Il. 16.867a and *Od. 12.133a. The adjective in Quintus is therefore a variation of Homeric ἵαπαρκρήδεμον, independent of ἵανοκρήδεμος. The derivation from ἵανος ‘thin garment’ in LSJ s.v. ἵανοκρήδεμος is false, but etymologies out of date are not corrected in the LSJ Revised Supplement, as stated there at p. vi.
182–3). This may derive support by the Scholiast’s explanation ἵνας ὀμοιον, as Demeter is closely associated with violets, see Richardson on Homeric Hymn to Demeter 6 (Persephone gathering) ἵνα καλά (add Ovid Fasti 4.437), and cf., in Sicily, Bacchyl. 3.2 Δῶματρα ἱσοτέφανον τε Κούρην.

Such an explanation might have also been suggested by the context. Propertius 4.6.3 ser·tā? Philetioς cetet Romana corymbis seems to know about festive garlands in Philitas. Lycidas’ garland in Theocr. 7.64 λευκάιον στέφανον περί κρατή φυλάσσον καὶ ἀμφότερα featuring in Philetas’ garden in Longus 2.3.4 may suggest that violets appeared in Philetas’ Demeter as a garland-flower. Note that in Ovid Fasti 4.616 happy Ceres imposuitque suae speica ser·ta comae and in Nonnus Dion. 6.44 during a feast held in her honour at the palace of her host Astraeus, the latter’s son Eosphoros στέφανος ἔπλεξεν ἀνθέα δήσις οὔρφρινος κομόωντα δροσιζόμενος κορόμβως. For Philitas’ interest in the subject cf. Inc. sed. CA 18, Ataktoι Glossai frr. 40, 42 (Lesbian ύποσθυμίς consisting of ἵνα) Kuch. The varying constituents of Demeter’s στέφανος (commonly glossed καλλιστέφανος etc.) became an issue in antiquity, cf. Schol. Soph. OC 681 (36.6 f. de Marco) = Istrus FGrH 334 F 29. Salustius (on whom see here entry (d) ad fin.) wrote commentaries on both Sophocles, in which he introduced plenty of Callimachian material, and Callimachus.

c. 222 ἰδίον ὀφθαλμοὶ

Latte placed the whole entry in cruces and (ingeniously) noted in his apparatus criticus “ἵνα: θάλπητ (Hes. Sc. 397)”. M. Schmidt and others before him had tried various emendations of which it would suffice to mention ἱλίον = ὀφθαλμοῖ on the strength of Pollux 2.54 (cf. also Hesych. έ 3109 s.v. ἐνίλα-λώφας), which is though hardly possible as it violates already with the second letter the strict alphabetical order in that part of Marcianus. This entry may in fact be a relic from Philitas’ argumentation on the interpretation of the Homeric phrase ἀχρεῖον ἱδῶν, cf. Schol. A (Ariston.) Il. 2.269c (1.242–3 Erbse) ἅλγησες δ’ ἀχρεῖον ἱδῶν ὅτι Φιλήτας (+τός Α) τὸ ἱδῶν περισσὰ, οἷον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ἱδῶν. οὐδέποτε δὲ ὅμηρος ἱδᾶς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶπεν. ἔστιν οὖν τὸ ἀχρεῖον ἱδῶν εὐτέλος (R. van Bennekom LFrE I, 1779.9: εὐτέλος Α) σχηματίσας, cf. Schol. Aiv ad loc. (II.312.33 Dindorf) ἰδίον ὀξύνεται: μέτοχη γάρ ἔστα. This piece of information would be drawn on an ancient Homeric scholium of Aristarchean provenance, which eventually found a place in Apoll. Soph.’s entry on the Homeric expression in question (49.20 f. Bekker) > Hesychius α 8915, whence this lemma would be detached. So ἰδίοι may be sound.

d. κ 1074 κατά δείπνον εἶδος καύματός . . .

The entry was acknowledged as a verse citation in the form καταδίψην ἰδόν / καύματος by A. Meineke, Philologus 13 (1858), 557 = fr. anon. 180 Schneider (SH 1083); “epicus incertus” wrote M. Schmidt ad loc. δύτησον is Callimachian,8 but the term in need for explanation here is εἶδος ‘heat’ (first in [Hesiod] Sc. 397 ἵδει (εἶδει Wackernagel Kl. Schr. I, 746) ἐν σύνοντα τοι σε κιαίδα-ίματο σε κιαίδα-ίματο), which is normally glossed as καύμα, e.g. by Hesychius ε 750 εἶδες θάλπος, καύματος. I might raise the possibility of this being a citation from Philitas, as king Chalcon, the host of Demeter at Cos (Schol. Theocr. 7.5–9f, partly quoted here in entry (a)), created Bourina (Theocr. 7.6–7 Χάλκικον, Βούρινον ος ἐκ ποδός ἀννε κράναν / εν ἑνεργεισάμενον πέτρα γόνυ) in circumstances which may have been similar to those implied in this anonymous fragment. The creation of the celebrated Coan spring by Chalcon may have been described in detail in a poem of Philitas (Demeter?), as the Scholia ad loc. (79.20 f. Wendel) quote

---

8 Act. SH 240, 10 = 100.10 Massim., cf. Nic. Ther. 147, ibid. 436 ἐπιδήμησιν and the Illiad unicum 4.171 πολλαπλάσιον

9 Ἀργος, 12x in Nonnus Dion.
a corrupt verse of his, which is published as CA 24 νάσσατο δ’ ἐν προχόρσῃ μελαμπέτρῳ Βυζίνης. The refreshing reference to Bourina and its surroundings in Theocr. 7.6, shortly before Simichidas’ meeting with divine Lycidas, comes as he and his friends walk in harsh midday-sun, 7.2, 21 (quoted ff.). It would appear that in the original treatment of Philitas the ardent thirst due to the Coan sun was the driving force behind the creation of Bourina. The motif is well known, cf. e.g. Heracles in Apoll. Rhod. 4.1441–42 ἀ τε χθόνα πεζὸς ὀδύνον / ἰὸς καρχαλέος seeking for water and welling out a spring from a rock, τὴν ὄ’ γ’, ἐπιφανεῖς ἢ καὶ θεοῦ ἔννεσιν; / λάζει τῷ ποῖῳ ἐνέρεα: τὸ ὃ’ ὀρθόν ἔβλησεν ὀδόρ (vv. 1445–46), Rhea in Callim. HyJov. 15 f. or Hermes in the scholion on Lycophron 835 (261.31 f. Scheer) ἐν Αἴθωπίᾳ Ἐρμής . . . διψής εἴλακτισε τὴν γῆν καὶ ὄνεδω-κεν ὀδόρ. Bourina’s miraculous appearance (Theocr. l.c.) implies divine help and the Theocritean scholium 7.5–9o (81.9 f. Wendel), which we now have in a Byzantine revision, says with regards to its

The midday meeting of Lycidas with Simichidas may reproduce the circumstances in which Chal- con and Demeter met in Cos in Philitas’ poem, i.e. at midday and close to a well, which can not be any other than Bourina. Note that in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter 100 the goddess sits to rest near the well Parthenios ἐν σκήνῃ under the shade of an olive-tree (in Callim. HyDem. 16 at the well Callichoros κυσταλέα ὑπὸ τοῦ τε) and Celes’ daughters in ibid. 106–7 meet Demeter ἐρχόμενα μὲθ’ ὀδόρ εὐήρυτον ὄρα φέροιεν / κάλλιστη χαλκίεσθι φίλα πρὸς δώματα πατρός. Wells are conventional meeting points (cf. esp. Od. 17.212 f.), while the midday is the usual time for epiphanies and the burning glare of the sun is often pointed out in such contexts, cf. Od. 4.400, Apoll. Rhod. 4.1312–13 ἐν δύο ἡμέραι ἡμέραι, περί δ’ ὁξιτετά θέρον αὐγά / τῆλον, Callim. HyPal. 73. Note that in Longus 2.4.1 Philetas meets Eros in his garden ὁμόθημα μέσην ἡμέραν.

καῦματος should be part of the explanation, and it is suitable to imply the burning midday sun -heat, as e.g. in Soph. Ant. 417, Plato Phaedr. 242a, Theocr. 10.51. The genitive might be a puzzling remnant of the interpretation (e.g. ὑπὸ καῦματος ἡ μεθυσμένον ἐν τῷ ὀρειχαλκίῳ); unless we assume that it is due to the other poetic citation of ἐδοξα ‘heat’ in Hesychius ἐ 751 ἐδοξα ἐνδιόπο-καῦματος μεσημβρίνῳ from Callim. Hec. fr. 304.3 Pf. (46.3 Hollis), where the Scholiast might have referred to this verse citation as a parallel (even more so, if the citation is from Philitas), which was then detached into a separate lemma. Meineke proposed to read καῦμα in the comment. A verb describing painful walking such as ⟨}$/铒ύρνου⟩ or ⟨}$/στείχου⟩ may be expected near such a phrase, as in Theocr. 7.2/ἑρσκομεῖ ἐκ πόλους, 7.2.11 τὸ: τὸ v.l. μεσαμέρων πόδας ἐξέλεξεν, both of Simichidas.

The Suidas entries referring to Callim. Hec. l.c. may suggest that Salustius, on whose commentary on Hecale Suidas drew, 9 discussed the term. The undated Salustius (4th/5th cent. AD?) disposed of information on Philitas which is meanwhile lost, as a marginal scholium on Callim. HyAp. 33 ἠξέμαται quoting a verse of Philitas (SH 673) shows (in P.Oxy. 2258A of the 6th/7th cent. AD, attributed to Salustius by Pfeiffer Callimachus II, xxix).

e. μ 886 μέροπες . . . Ἡ ὧπο Μέροπος, τοῦ πατρὸς Φαέθοντος, Κώνων, λέγονται δὲ καὶ Κών Μέροπες.

The suggestion that Cos was named Merops after its indigenous leader Merops (Steph. Byz. p. 402.13 Meineke ἄπο γιγνευού Μέροπος. Schol. Pindar Isth. 4.42a (III.70 Drachmann) δικοκύσι γὰρ ἐνικα γιγνευείς) and the fact that its inhabitants identified themselves and were identified by others as Meropes are both well attested. The Hesychian entry is though the only evidence of the fact that some would derive the Homeric adjective μέροπες from the legendary Coan king Merops, the father of

---

Phaethon. The origins of this derivation are to be sought in a Coan ambience. In a fragment from the Athenian comic poet Strato, which presents a Homericising cook uttering καίνα 
ρήματα, μέροπες occurs three times in three consequent verses, first in the sense ‘people, men’, then misunderstood by the cook’s master as Meropes ‘Coans’, 1.6–8 K.–A.:

\[\text{‘πόσους κέκληκας μέροπας \text{ἐπὶ δείπνοιν; λέγε.’} }\]

\[\text{‘γῆ \κέκληκα \text{Μέροπας \text{ἐπὶ δείπνοιν; χολάς.}} }\]

\[\text{τοὺς \text{δὲ Μέροπας τούτους με \γινόσκειν δοκεῖσ.’} }\]

Strato’s fragment contains a reference to Philitas’ Ataktoi Glossai, which the cook’s master needs to take in hand to comprehend his servant’s vocabulary, vv. 42–4 ὡςτ’ ἐδει / τὰ τοῦ Φιλίτα λαμβάνοντα βυβλία / σκοπεῖν ἐκαστὸν τὶ δύνατα τῶν ρημάτων. Mr A. S. Hollis privatim wondered whether the erudite cook’s insistence on μέροπες/Μέροπες harbours an entry of the Ataktoi Glossai, which would explain the application of this term to Philitas’ homeland. I would think that this evidence corroborated constitutes a basis for postulating a Philitan entry on Homeric μέροπες as deriving from Coan Μέρος. H. Koller, Glotta 46 (1968), 23 f. has in fact argued for the possibility that a specifically Coan, ‘oral’ formula Κου… ὲ πλη’ Μέροπον ἀνθρώπον now attested only in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo 42, may have been misunderstood early enough as being capable of applying to all mortal people. The impetus of μέροπες in Hellenistic verse (Callim. Hec. fr. 298 Pf. (115 Hollis), Apoll. Rhod. 4.536) may partly be due to this conceivable entry in Ataktoi Glossai.

Two further remarks may be made with regards to the above suggestion. First, the fact that a similar suspicion has been raised for the controversial Homeric πηγός,11 which in Strato’s fragment v. 36 πηγὸς πάρεσθι; comes up as ‘salt’. The derivation of this usage was excellently explained by V. Schmidt apud K.–A. ad loc. (PCG VII, pp. 619–20) from Od. 5.388–9 κύματι πηγῷ / πλάξετο = εἶν αὖλι, whence πηγὸς = ἀλεξ. cf. Euphor. CA 127 πολύτροφοι δέκρυα βύνης = τοὺς ἄλας. The origin of this κατὰ μεταφοράν application could hardly be attributed to Strato, so here we might have to do with a detail from Philitas’ conceivable discussion of πηγὸς.

Secondly, there may be noted a reference in the Homeric Scholia whose origin may be traced back to a Coan milieu (I do not imply Philitas), namely the alleged Coan parentage of the Homeric physician Machaon from Merops’ daughter Epione in Schol. AD II. 4.195 Μαχαῖον δὲ οὖσα χαί Ἀσκληπιοῦ κατὰ Ἀρσινόης ἢ Κυραφίδος, κατὰ δὲ τινὸς Ἡπείρου τῆς Μέροπος, κατὰ δὲ Ναίδον (fr. 53 M.–W.) Ξανθής.12 For the Coan tendency to appropriate the literary tradition cf. Herodas 2.98 κτιστέε λητοῦ ὀδὴ τεῦ χάριν Φοίβη on the basis of a misinterpretation of Hesiod Theog. 404, where Leto’s father Coeus is mentioned.

f. ν 354 νεοστεφέος: νεοκράτου

This entry was singled out as a dactylic verse citation by A. S. Hollis, ZPE 123 (1998), 68. νεοστεφής is a scholarly coinage glancing at the ancient dispute on Homeric κρητήρας ἐπιστεφέας οἶνω/ ‘filled to the brim’ or ‘crowned’, see Erbse (I.131) on Schol. II. 1.470b, Thomas on Virg. Georg. 2.528. The comment νεοκράτου brings this lemma into association with Hesychius ε 5241 ἐπιστεφεῖς: πλήρες, κεκραμένον, ε 5239 ἐπιστεφεῖ· κεραννυτ (cf. id. ν 243 νεοφυτῷ νεοκράτου). This is a rare interpretation13 which to a Hellenistic scholar may have been suggested by an approximation of II.

---

12 On Machaon’s Thessalian/Coan associations see U. von Wilamowitz, Ilysoles von Epidnauros, Berlin 1886, 48 f.  
13 (ἐπι)στέφεος = κεραννυτ, other than here, only in Hesychius σ 1804 στέψαι: πληρώσαι. στεφανώσαι. κεράσαι. κυκλώσαι, cf. Scholia Theocr. Is.
The term seems to refer to wine,\(^{14}\) of which there may have been word in Philitas CA 4 (Demeter?) as 'stopper (of a wine-jar)'. Theocritus' commentator Amarantus (2nd century AD or later) on Theocritus 3.21 (wine) ποίμα διεκρανόσατε apud EiG (AB; in Wendel, Schol. Theocr. vet. p. 114.9 n.), s.v. διεκρανόσατε: διεκαρανόσατε ... δοκεί γὰρ τῶν πιθῶν ἡ καλυφή (cod. Voss.: ἀλοιφή AB) κάρα εἶναι.\(^{15}\) The conceivable reference to Philitas might have once stood in a more complete form of Schol. Theocr. 3.21 (122.15 f. Wendel) τῶν στέφανων τίλα: ... στέφανος γὰρ ἐρχόταν ἐν τῷ στυμπσίῳ, ὡς φησὶν Ἁριστοτέλης (fr. 101 Rose), εὐερτήσαν καὶ ἀθόρυβαν καίνιττόμενοι τροφῶν: στέψας γάρ τὸ πληρώσα, ὡς Ὀμήρος: 'κούροι δὲ κρητίρας ἐπεστέψαντο' (II 1.470). The superstitious symbolism of the garland referred to in the Scholia may suggest a context which would be in favour of the proposed ascription to the Coan. On the ancient habit of crowning the mixing bowl in a symposium see Arnott on Alexis fr. 124.5–6, of crowning the cups Kassell–Austin on Aristoph. fr. 395.

Of the two explanations advanced in the lemma the first is easily comprehensible. The ending -(t)άδες is appropriate of Nymphs and ὀρόδεμναιδες would refer to their habitat (> ὄρος + δέμνοι). Subsequently, the term would appear to be an exquisite variation of the Homeric hapax Il. 6.459 ὀρέστιτιδες.\(^{16}\) The application to bees, on the other hand, is not readily intelligible. But if, as the second explanation supplied in the lemma asserts, the term is taken to be derived from ὀρόδαμνον, it could apply to bees following an ancient etymology of the word μέλισσα recorded in Schol. Theocr. 3.13b (120.12 Wendel),\(^{17}\) according to which μέλισσα derives its name παρόσον ἐπὶ τῶν μήλων ἵζανεν: μῆλα δὲ πάντα τὰ ἀκρα τῶν δένδρων = ὀρόδαμναιδες, cf. Schol. Theocr. 7.138a (110.15

\(^{14}\) Hollis suggests νεοστηπέδες (ὁινοῦοι') by analogy with Nic. Ther. 591 παλαιστάρκες οἶνοτα, of which is a rare rhythm in Callimachian terms (Hollis on [Hecale] fr. 166), attested though in an elegiac hexameter in Philitas Demeter CA 2.3 κορασάμενος κλαυμισμιοι'/.

\(^{15}\) The motif is older, cf. Soph. OC 473 (κρητίδης) ὁν κράτει ἔρευνον, Eubulus fr. 56.6 K.–A. (κρητίδης) καταβρύσσαν. Note also the metaphorical κρητίκεραμον as 'stopper (of a wine-jar)' in Od. 3.392.

\(^{16}\) Occurring also in the Homeric Hymn 19.19, cf. Bion Epit. Adon, 19 ὀρηταῖδες with Reed ad loc. ("nymphs were generically 'of the mountains'...", and were given any adj. deriving from ὄρος"). H. Horer, RE XVII.2 (1937), 1539.

\(^{17}\) Cf. also Orion Theb. 102.29 Sturz > EtGud. 385.55 Sturz, EiM 577.35 Gaisf. The appeal to Il. 9.542 (the Calydonian boar destroying many trees) κατακρήνες ἐνθέθη μῆλῶν in the entries of the ancient lexica advancing such an etymology of μέλισσα, indicates that this was incorporated in the discussion on the disputed Homeric μήλα.
Wendel) ὀρόδεμνίδες δὲ παντὸς δέντρου τοὺς κλάδους λέγουσι. Such an association may have been facilitated by the image of bees nesting in hollow trees, which was widespread in didactic poetry.18 ὀρόδεμνον is glossed by Hesychius ο 1273 as κλώνες, κλάδοι, βλαστήματα, ὀρτήκες. The word originally appears as a botanical term in Theophr. Hist. plant. 9.16.3, where it applies to the big twigs of δίκτυμον 'dittany', a plant occurring, as nowadays, mostly in Crete. It is subsequently introduced into poetry and appears in Callim. Inc. sed. fr. 655, whence perhaps Antip. Thess. GPh 35.3, 106.3, and Nic. Ther. 863, Alex. 603, used of various trees or plants. In Theoc. 7.138 ὀρόδεμνίνην the term occurs as an hapax in the elsewhere unattested -τις form (Doric coloured?, see Bulloch on Callim. HyPal. 94).

From its formulation it would seem that the lemma envisages the term ὀρόδεμνίδες as comprising at the same time (i.e. in a single passage) meanings suitable as attributes to both Nymphs and bees. The word then seems to be of Nymphs Melissai (Cook Bee, 19).19 In ZPE 121 (1998), 60 f. I argued that the association of basic constituents of an Ithacan locus amoenus (including its Nymphs) in Od. 17.205 f. with Demeter’s precinct in Callim. HyDem. 37–8 and with the farm of Thalyssia-celebrating Phrasidamus in Theoc. 7.136–7, is to be referred to Philitas’ Demeter, and that these may be the Nymphs which appear in Theoc. 7.92 and possibly in Callim. Aet. fr. 1.11–2 as performing a didactic task traditionally assigned to the Muses. These Coan Nymphs, who conceivably featured in a Philitan locus amoenus, could suitably comprise the notions of ‘Nymphs’ and ‘bees’ and therefore be specified as Melissai, so as to point out their association with Demeter.20 It is also conceivable that the details about the Nymph whom Demeter entrusts for a mission to Hunger in the Erysichthon episode in Ovid Met. 8.786–7 montani numeris unam / . . . agrestem . . . oreada may be indebted to scholastic information about the Nymphs dallying in Demeter’s grove in Callim. HyDem. 38. Attention to the Nymphs’ habitat would accord with a similar preoccupation of Callimachus, and Cos’ former name Nymphæae (Pliny NH 5.134) suggests that in mythical times the island was believed to be frequented by such creatures. Hesychius’ source here may draw on an ancient comment on Theoc. 7.138, which would elucidate the Philitan context and would suggest dependence of the Theocritan term on Philitas.

A word of such a form is redolent of a Hellenistic, Callimachean aroma.21 Its metrical shape would strongly suggest that it covers the second hemistich of a pentameter, preceded by a long monosyllable.

---

18 Cf. Hesiod WD 232–3 φιέσι ού δέρας: ἀκρίν μὲν τὰ ἔφυρ αὐλάνους, μέσηθε ν μὲλίσσας, see Cook Bee, 8, West on Hesiod Theog. 594. On the association of Nymphs with μῆλον cf. also Mnaseas of Patara apud Schol. Pindar Pyth. 4.106a (Π.112–3 Drachmann) κατέχουσαν αὐτὰ [sc. the Nymphs Melissai] σταρκοσυγωνίγοντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πεσίρασα τῇ ἀπὸ τῶν δέντρων χρήσει στροφήν, Eustathius Comm. Od. p. 1963.39 f., F. Díez-Platas, LIMC II1, 445 no 1 for an Attic cylix of the 5th cent. BC representing two Nymphs close to a tree, one of whom holds an apple and the other bears the name ΜΕΛΙΔΑ, the Nymphs Μηλίδες, Μηλίδες etc. So were apparently perceived the Hamadryads in Sicyon, cf. Hesychius α 3387 (= Phot. a 1096 Theod.) άμμαράς κοκκάληηα. Σικυώνιος. See further on apples/fruits and Nymphs H. Herter, RE XVII.2 (1937), 1543.

19 The association of Nymphs with bees (therefore = Melissai) is very old, cf. Od. 13.104 ff. and see Cook Bee, 15–6, Roscher, Myth. Lex. II.2, 2637–38. In [Opp.] Cyn. 4.275 and Dion. Per. 327 the Nymphs are said to be protectors of bees.


21 “Call. uti solet huimosodi formis, v. Ἀκτιτάξεις, Πέλαγοστάξεις etc.” noted Pfeiffer on Aetia fr. 185, see also F. Lapp, De Callimachi Cyreni tropis et figuris, Diss. Bonn 1965, 146. For full documentation see E. J. Kenney, CQ n.s. 99 (1999), 330–2 who concludes: “With the exception of a few such as Εἰκονοτάξεις, Ὀλματάξεις, and Πηλάται, names formed in this way were evidently not especially favoured before the Hellenistic period. […] Callimachus and Apollonius provide most of the Greek examples . . . in him [sc. Callimachus] and Apollonius it verges on a mannerism.”
This is a common pentameter clausula at all times and a favourite placing of Nymphs’ attributes in Hellenistic pentameters, cf. Theocrit. HE 5.2 (~ Antip. Sid. HE 8.8) – ‘Ελικονιασίαν, Theodor. HE 2.2 (κούρατος) – ‘Αμαρυνθάσια, Alex. Aet. CA 3.22 (Νύμφας) – ‘ημυδράςας, ‘Πλατο’ FGE 16.6, p. 175 Νύμφας άμωδράςας, Anon. (4th cent. BC) FGE 125.2, p. 432 = Lobo Arg. SH 520.2 Μούσας άλωμπας and Callim. Aet. fr. 43.49 Pf. (50.49 Massim.) – Κλοκολάςας, further Aet. fr. 66.9 Pf. = HyPal. 4.4 – Πελασγιαδάςας, fr. 75.41 Pf. – Δομονισιάδας. The second hemistich of a pentameter in Parth. SH 626.3 survives as έψεσα χαμνήν. This would tally with Philitas’ elegiac Demeter.

If Philitas CA 22 (~ Antip. Car. Mir. 19.2) Βουγενέας φθάμενος προσεβησόκο μοικρά μελίσσας, it is, as it is possible, a fragment from Demeter, Βουγενέας, hinting at bugony (the spontaneous generation of bees from the putrefying corpse of an ox), would have a distinguishing power too: these are the oxen-born bees. The possible appearance of real bees does not speak against the featuring of Nymphs Melissai, as Demeter’s presence could provoke the appearance of creatures which were associated with her – and with Cos. In Charon Lamps. FGrH 262 F 12 a bee is said to herald the appearance of a Nymph, see further Búhler on Zenobius 2.32 σερηνίν μὲν ἄγγελα ηεηγέλη, ξείνων δὲ μέλισσα.

The considerations set out here would provide a foothold for elucidating the background of the reference to Demeter’s bees in Callim. HyAp. 110–2, where they are contrasted to the λύματα of the Assyrian river:

Δηρὶ δ’ οὐκ ἔπε παντὸς ὥδορ φορέουσι μέλισσαι, ὀλλ’ ἣτις κυαρηψε τε καὶ ἀχρόναντος ἀνέπρεπε
πεδίοκος ἐξ ἤρης ὀλίγη λαῖθας ἄκρον ἁκτων.

The Hesychian entry would supply a piece of evidence supporting Pfeiffer’s suggestion that in these lines an image from Philitas’ Demeter is at work. It would in fact point to a passage in which the ambiguity of μέλισσα as ‘Nymphs/initiates of Demeter’ and ‘bees’ featuring in Callim. HyAp. 110–2 prefigured in Philitas.

If this hypothesis is correct, there would be two immediate repercussions for the Aetia-prologue. First, the Nymphs/Melissai (if the allusion is to them) teaching that Mimnermus is discussed here as entry (a).

Secondly, another latent correspondence between the first and the second Aetia-prologues would emerge with the reference to Nymphs/Melissai in fr. 1.11–2 and fr. 2.2 Pf. (4.2 Massim.) Μουσέων ἐσμιῶς, cf. Philicus SH 680.52 γυναικῶν . . . ἔσμις of Demeter’s initiatives.

---

22 The occurrences of a hexasyllabic word of the form οὐκ ~ οὐκ as a pentameter clausula are overwhelming (not least so in Callimachus). Such a formation could find a place in a Hellenistic hexameter, either before the masculine caesura preceded by a monosyllable (Callim. HyDel. 152, Theocr. 7.7, 23, Apoll. Rhod. 1.821, 2.794, 4.560, al.), or, if inconveniently (see McLennan on Callim. HyJov. 58) after it (Callim. HyJov. 58 and Apoll. Rhod. 4.268 are due to Antim. SH 527 = fr. 41.a.7 Matthews, cf. then Apoll. Rhod. 3.76, Nic. Ther. 318). But this seems a less likely possibility.

23 In an Excursus in History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age, Oxford 1968, 284 (which he then described as a “rather rash suggestion”), C. W. Müller, Erzsicthton. Der Mythos als narrative Metapher im Demeterprolog des Callimachos, Mainz 1987, 40–1 (cf. id., in: P. Steinmetz (ed.), Beiträge zur hellenistischen Literatur und ihrer Rezeption in Rom, Stuttgart 1990, 28) from a rather different point of view claimed that the Callimachean lines “scheinen geradezu ein Philitas-Zitat zu sein”. Another point of possible influence of Philitas on Callimachus HyAp. 3 is discussed here as entry (a).

24 For correspondences between the two prologues see Kambylis Dichterweise, 89 f., Cl. Meilier, Callimache, Aitia, fr. 1, v. 7, et l’unité probable des fragments 1 (Invective) et 2 (Sone), REG 92 (1979), 164 f. (= ZPE 33 (1979), 39 f.), E. Livrea, Callimaco, fr. 114 Pf., il Sommiet ed il Prologo degli ‘Aitia’, Hermes 123 (1995), 47–52, A. Cameron, Callimachus and his Critics, Princeton 1995, 129 f. (the Prologue not a later addition, but an original “action of the Aetia”), Massimilla Callimaco, 237. A closer examination of the two passages may yield more information on Philitas, but this will have to be the subject of a separate study.
The discussion of the Hesychian μ 1294 runs μητροπόλοςς τὰς πάλας Μελίσσας for which Latte refers to gloss μ 719 μέλισσας οἱ τῆς Δήμητρος μύστικες. Bodson Hiera zōia, 35 n. 162 suggests a Thesmophoric context. μητροπόλος (a Pindaric rarity, 'tending mothers' in Pyth. 3.9 μητροπόλος σὺν Ἑλείθυω) may suggest a relation of immediate parentage (cf. LSJ s.v. μητρόπολις). If Philitas named his Coan Nymphs Melissai and accorded to them poeological duties with which they were able to teach their precepts in Theoc. 7.92 and possibly in Callim. Aet. fr. 1.11–2, he might have hinted at their parentage from the Heliconian Nymphs/Muses, i.e. τὰς πάλας Μελίσσας.25 In broad lines, all Nymphs with a poetic tinge can be conceived as drawing their origin from Parnassus, but this assumption gains particular support by the invocation to the Castalian Nymphs, to whom the inspiration of two poetic themes is attributed, in a firmly Coan environment in Theoc. 7.148 Νῦμφαι Κασταλίδες Παρνάσσιον ὁποίος ἔχοσσα, side by side with their Coan counterparts appearing in vv. 92 and 136–7. Cf. Posidippus' SH 705.1 f. Μούσαι πολυήτιδες being taught Παρνησσού νυφόντος ὁνὰ πτύχας and, further, the Cean Nymphs once expelled from Parnassus in Callim. Aet. fr. 75.56–7 Fp. These πάλαι Μελίσσας are perhaps to be identified as the daughters of the Heliconian king Melisseus,26 who features in a recondite tradition referred to in Nic. Ther. 11–2 Ἀσκράλος μυχάτου Μελίσσηντος ἐγ' ὀγχος / Ἡσίόδος . . . παρ' ὀδόσα Περιμήσσεσο, where Scholia 11c (39.6 f. Crugnola) explain Μελίσσηντα δὲ φησιν τοῦ τόπου τοῦ Ἑλικώνας ἐν ὑ ὑφὲς τοῦ Μούσας ὡς οὕτως ἑκλήθη ἀπὸ Μελισσείως βασιλεύσαντος τοῦ τόπου. Callim. Aet. fr. 2.2 Pr. (4.2 Massim.) Ἡσίοδω Μουσέων ἑσμός ὁ τ' ἤντισσαν may hint at this version.

h. ν 262 ὑπ᾽ αὐλήν, ὑπ᾽ Ἐκαταιώ, Φιλίτας (fr. 51 Kuch.).

fort. ὑπ᾽ αὐλήν, cf. ν 260 παρεκτάε (cod.: corr. Musurus (FGH 1 F 365))

"Glossam non expedio" despaired M. Schmidt and all attempts to sanate the corruption are seriously hampered by the loss of the entire version, almost every word of the entry has been suspected as corrupt. Jacoby on Hecataeus l.c., pondered an emendation of Philitas' name into φιλήτης, a synonymous gloss of which would lurk in the corrupt lemma. LSJ s.v. αὐλή considered establishing ὑπ᾽ Ἀχνήν with reference to Philitas SH 675D Αχνήν = Steph. Byz. p. 342.18 Meineke s.v. Ἀχνήν. Likeler sees the course of corruption proposed by Kuchenmüller 107 who saw this entry as a detached resumption of ν 260 ὑπ᾽ αὐλήν ὑπ᾽ οἴκον and tentatively fused them into ὑπ᾽ αὐλήν ὑπ᾽ οἴκον, παρ᾽ Ἐκαταιώ, Φιλίτας. Before him ὑπολυλήν was conjectured by Toup, ὑπολύλην by Voss. The lemma contains a term or phrase which Philitas seems to have picked from Hecataeus of Miletus. Little though we know of Ataktoi Glossai, this would be the only existing entry of it drawing on an author of prose. Alternatively, R. Tosi27 accepted ὑπ᾽ αὐλήν, but would favour a reference to ἐκάταιων, an apotropaic statuette of Hecate set at road junctions or outside house doors.28

Kuchenmüller's treatment of this entry derives support from the possibility involved being Homeric, as some interpreted αὐλή as ὀικος and others, such as Aristarchus, ὑπαχθρος

25 On the original Verschmelzung of the Parnassian Nymphs with the Muses (initially residing in Olympus) see Kambylis Dichterweihen, 38–9, 46–7.
26 The name is typical of a king with daughters-Nymphs, cf. Melisseus in Crete in Theog. cycl. Arg. p. 10 Bernabé, Melissos in Paros in Apollodoros of Athens FGrH 244 F 89.
tόπος, 29 Philitas, in contrast to Aristarchus, apparently opined that Homeric αὐλή can denote a covered space in a residence. Such a misunderstanding would be facilitated by passages such as II. 6.247–8 ἐνδόθεν αὐλής / δόδεκ’ ἔσαν τέγεον θέλλωμι of O. d. 1.425, or the formula II. 9.472, αλ. ύπ’ αὐλοτόσῃ εὐπρεπεός αὐλής/ (on which see Fernández-Galiano on O. d. 21.389), where Aristarchus proposed to eliminate ύπ’ for ἕν. Hecataeus could have used this word (12x in Herodotus, ‘house’ in 5.92γ,2) and Philitas may have adduced him to support his view. Ionian logographers, as shown by Herodotus, had a lively interest in dialect and foreign glosses (see K. Latte, Kl. Schr., 649–50), and all-searching Philitas would be expected to take their works into account. As an Ionian-prose authority, Hecataeus in particular was often adduced to assist — or, for some, to impede — Homeric exegesis, but, as a matter of principle, he was disregarded in this respect by Aristarchus, cf. Schol. T (ex.) II. 24.228h (V.559 Erbse) {καὶ} φωρταμών φωρταμός . . . Αρισταρχος δε φησι την κιβωτον λέξιν νεωτέ- ρων ενοικ. ἄγνοι τι την Σμωνινής (PMG 623) καὶ Ἐκκαταῖος (FGrH I F 368) μέμηνται αὐλής. 30 His language became a point of attention by Callimachus, cf. EtG (AB) γέρετος· ὁ ἄρχαίος . . . έκρη- τα παρ’ Ἐκκαταίω (FGrH I F 362) καὶ Κωλλιμίνχῳ followed by Inc. sed. fr. 510 Pf. and Hec. fr. 277 Pf. = 102 Hollis (the last only in cod. B), next Hecataeus FGrH 363 F 1 έπισσα α – [Callim.] Fr. inc. auct. 735 Pf. = [Aert.] fr. 140 Massim. 31

All extant references to Philitas’ interpretations in the Homeric Scholia seem to be due to Aristarchus’ monograph Πρός Φιλίτσιν (Against Philitas) (Schol. A (Did.) II. 1.524c (I.142 Erbse) and 2.111b (I.202 Erbse)). This gloss in Hesychius may have been derived from a now lost note of a Homeric commentary, ultimately writing on Aristarchus’ polemic against Philitas’ conceivable interpretation (and method of approaching the νεωτέρων) from that same source. For information possibly coming from Πρός Φιλίτσιν in Hesychius (< Didymus?), cf. σ 893 σκέψις· ρήτως, καὶ οἱ δρίμοι τυρός, καὶ άλλος καὶ δρύμος (Aristarchus ad II. 23.332–3). Φιλήτος δε (fr. 49 Kuch.) την ῥυπώδη (Meineke: πυρρώδης cod.) γήν and possibly 122 discussed here as entry (c).

Rethymno
Konstantinos Spanoudakis

29 Aristarchus read in Od. 4.74 Ζηνος που τοιχί β’ Ὀλυμπιον ἐνδόθεν αὐλή and deemed that Homer τὴν αὐλήν αὐτό τότε ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπάθρων τόπων. Athenaeus 5.189e, see A. Ludwig, Aristarchus homerische Textkritik I, Leipzig 1884, 538. In the ancient Scholia there is only Schol. b II. 6.136α ἀυλή, ὁ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐξήθερον, ἱερ. τοῦ ὑπάθρατος, cf. also EtG (AB) α 1399 L.–L. (EtM α 2083) ὁ περιτετειχισμένος καὶ ὑπάθρως τόπος. Seleucus Hom. fr. 22 Müller apud Athenaeus 5.189b rejected this reading as allegedly equating αὐλή to ὑπάθρον of cf. Eustathius Comm. Od. p. 1483.39 (< Athenaeus l.l.) τῷ τῆς αὐλῆς ὁνόματι τὰ δώματα δηλοῖ arguing inter alia that ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπάθοις ἀμύστετε ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑπάθους ἢ αὐλῆς ἀμύστετε ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑπάθους ἢ αὐλῆς λέγεται etc.

30 Hecataeus became so often involved in Homeric questions because, as it seems, in several cases he essayed to refute information supplied by the Homeric poems. His polemic in FGrH I F 1 οἱ γάρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοί τε καὶ γελάοι, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαένοντα, εἰσὶ is likely to include Homer, see Jacoby, FGrH 21α, Nachträge 535.26 f.

31 Massimilla Callimaco, 41 notes that the quotation can hardly be by Callimachus, as it seems to violate Hilberg’s law.