

ON THE LANGUAGE AND STYLE OF EUPHORION OF  
CHALCIS

Many textual and interpretative problems presented by the fragments of Euphorion can be solved if we study them within the framework of the canons governing Hellenistic poetic composition.

In this article I shall discuss various textual and interpretative problems which are presented to us by the fragments of Euphorion of Chalcis. For the convenience of the reader I print van Groningen's text<sup>1</sup>.

Fr. 2 (= *A.P.* VII 651):

Οὐχ ὁ τρηχὺς ἔλαιος ἐπ' ὀστέα κείνα καλύπτει.  
οὐδ' ἡ κυανέη γράμμα λαβοῦσα πέτρη,  
ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν Δολίχης τε καὶ αἰπεινῆς Δρακάνοιο  
'Ικάριον ῥήσσει κῦμα περὶ κροκάλαις.  
'Αντί δ' ἐγὼ ξενίης πολυκηδέος ἢ κενεῆ χθῶν 5  
ὠγκώθην Δρυόπων διψάσιν ἐν βοτάναις.

Translation by W. R. Paton (*The Greek Anthology*, Loeb edition, London 1970, reprint, vol. 2, p. 349): «Craggy Elaeus doth not cover those thy bones, nor this stone that speaks in blue letters. They are broken by the Icarian sea on the shingly beach of Doliche and lofty Dracanon, and I, this empty mound of earth, am heaped up here in the thirsty herbage of the Dryopes for the sake of old friendship with Polymedes.»

In line 2 v. Groningen printed the alteration *κυανέη* rather than the mss. reading *κυάνεον*<sup>2</sup>. He stated in his commentary that since *ἔλαιος*, in line 1, is accompanied by the epithet *τρηχὺς* it is appropriate for the noun *πέτρη*, in line 2, also to have an epithet. Textual alteration is nevertheless not warranted.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. B. A. v. Groningen, *Euphorion*, Amsterdam 1977. Cf. moreover the excellent edition and commentary by L. A. de Cuenca (*Euforión de Calcis*, Madrid 1976).

<sup>2</sup> De Cuenca correctly retained the mss. reading *κυάνεον*: cf. *op. cit.*, p. 331.

V. Groningen has overlooked the fact that structural *inconcinnitas* was much favoured by Hellenistic poets: cf. my *Studies In Theocritus And Other Hellenistic Poets*, Amsterdam 1979, p. 38 and my *Studies In The Poetry of Nicander*, Amsterdam 1987, p. 97, note 1: «disbalance... is a favourite trick of Nicander's». Cf. moreover Euphorion fr. 63 where ἐν κνήμησιν follows the dative Σιθονίη.

## Fr. 4

Étienne de Byzance 248, 5 s. u. Δωδώνη: τὴν αἰτιατικὴν φησὶν Εὐφορίων Δωδῶνα ἐν Ἀνίῳ·

ἴκτο μὲν ἐς Δωδῶνα, Διὸς φηγοῖο προφήτιν.

Julien *Or.* 4 p. 149 B. (repris par Eustathe *In Iliad.* 83, 44): καὶ τοῦτο δὲ αὐτὸ Πρόνοιαν Ἀθηναῖν λέγοντες οὐ καινοτομοῦμεν, εἶπερ ὀρθῶς ἀκούομεν·

ἴκετο δ' ἐς Πυθῶνα καὶ ἐς γλαυκῶπα Πρόνοιῃν.

In his commentary on the words ἴκτο... ἴκετο, v. Groningen noted that the poet has purposely varied the form of the verb. For other examples of morphological *inconcinnitas* cf. my *Essays in Hellenistic Poetry*, Amsterdam 1980, p. 42, note 1, and F. Lapp, *De Callimachi Cyrenaei Tropis Et Figuris*, Diss. Bonn 1965, p. 125 ff.

## Fr. 6

Scholie à Lycophron 513: κρέξ δὲ ὄρνέον ἐστὶ θαλάσσοιν ποικίλον, ἴβιδι εἰκόσ, ὡς Ἡρόδοτος (II 76) ... Καλλίμαχος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ ὄρνέων φησί (fr. 428 Pf.) τοῖς γαμοῦσι δυσσιώνιστον εἶναι. Καὶ Εὐφορίων ἐν Ἀπολλοδώρῳ·

ποικίλον οὐδὲ μέλαθρον < ~ ~ > ὄρχιλος ἔπη

Κυζίκῳ, ὃν δ' ἤεισε κακὸν ἐχθομένη κρέξ.

In his commentary on line 1, v. Groningen stated that Sitzler proposed to read μέλαθρον (ὑπ' αἰθαλον). According to v. Groningen, however, the noun μέλαθρον has no need of two epithets. V. Groningen has failed to understand that *Adjektivhäufung* was a common feature of Hellenistic poetry: cf. W. Bühler, *die Europa Des Moschos*, Wiesbaden 1960, p. 212 ff. and my commentary on Theocritus' *Idyll XXIV* (Amsterdam 1979), p. 37.

## Fr. 11

— — — — — υ] δπισθε  
 — — — — — ]α φέροιτο  
 — — — — — ]θι κάππεσε λύχνου

— ⚭ — ⚭ — ]α κατὰ Γλαυκώπιον Ἔρση	
— - Ἀθηναίης ἱερὴν ἀνελύσατο κίστην	5
— ⚭ ]ης. Ἦ ὄσσον ὁδοιπόροι ἐρρήσσοντο	
Σκε]ίρων ἔνθα πόδεσσιν ἀεικέα μήδετο χύτλα	
ο]ύκ ἐπὶ δὴν· Αἴθρης γὰρ ἀλοιθεῖς ὑπὸ παιδί	
† νωιτέρης χέλυος πύματος <έ> λιπήνατο λαιμόν.	
Ἦ καὶ νιν σφεδανοῖο τανυσσαμένη ἀπὸ τόξου	10
ταιναρὴ λοχίσι γυναικῶν ἐμπελάτειρα	
Ἄρτεμις ὠδίνεσσιν ἐῷ ταλάωρι μετάσποι.	
Ὀκχοίη δ' Ἀχέροντι βαρὺν λίθον Ἀσκαλάφοιο	
τόν οἱ χωσαμένη γυίοις ἐπιήραρε Δηῶ,	
μαρτυρίην ὅτι μοῦνος ἐθήκατο Φερσεφονείη.	15

Translation by D. L. Page (*Select Papyri*, vol. III, Loeb edition, London 1950, reprint, p. 493 ff.): «(v. 4 sqq.) ... to Hersa at the Glaucopium, because she opened the sacred coffer of Athene: or as wanderers were dashed to pieces, where Sciron invented an unnatural washing for his feet, but not for long: crushed by the son of Aethra, he was himself the last to fatten the gullet of our tortoise: or may Taenarian Artemis, who comes to women in their pangs of travail, stretch her violent bow and reach him with her shaft therefrom: and on the Acheron may he bear the heavy boulder of Ascalaphus, which Demeter in her anger fastened upon his limbs, because he alone bore witness against Persephone...»

In line 11 Artemis is given the epithet *ταιναρὴ*. Page considered that this epithet is a synonym of *Λακεδαιμονίη* and that Euphorion is alluding to Artemis Orthia. According to v. Groningen, however, *ταιναρὴ* is a synonym of *ἀχεροντ(ε)ία* («infernale, apportant danger de mort»). I would like to suggest that Euphorion is alluding to the connection of Artemis with Hecate, a goddess who was concerned with the underworld: cf. *Orphic Arg.* 977 *Ταρταρόπαις Ἐκάτη*. Cf. also *Orphic Hymn* 36, 9 where Artemis has the epithet *χθονία*. For Artemis-Hecate cf. Callimachus, fr. 461 (Pfeiffer).

In his commentary on line 15, v. Groningen noted that the form *Φερσεφονείη* is «recherchée» and that Homer wrote *Περσεφόνεια* at *Iliad* IX 457. V. Groningen failed to notice that *Φερσεφόνεια* is attested as a Homeric variant reading: cf. I. La Roche, *Homeri Ilias*, Leipzig 1873, vol. I, p. 261. For the tendency of Hellenistic poets to reproduce Homeric variant readings cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alexandrina*, Amsterdam 1980, vol. I, p. 294. Euphorion employed Homeric variant readings again at fr. 19 d (*Ἀμφιαρήου*) and fr. 24 c 2 (*ἐπιδέρκεται*).

## Fr. 13

Choeroboscus *In Theodosii canones* 252, 26 Hilg.: ὅτι γὰρ (ἴλαος) ἐκτείνει τὸ  
 ᾧ ἐδήλωσε Παρθένιος ἐν τῷ εἰς Βίαντα εἰπῶν (fr. 4 Mart.): ἴλαος ταύτην δέ-  
 χνυσο πυρκαϊήν ... Καὶ ἐν τῷ Εὐφορίωνος Δημοσθενεῖ ὁμοίως ἐκτεταμένον εὐρί-  
 σκεται οἶον·

δαίμονος ἰλάσιο.

Commenting on this fragment v. Groningen stated that the same prosody is found at Theocritus' *Idyll* V 17 αἴτε μοι ἴλαοι and once in Homer at *Iliad* I 583 αὐτίκ' ἔπειτ' ἴλαος Ὀλύμπιος ἔσσεται ἡμιν. For the tendency of Hellenistic poets to reproduce Homeric *unica* cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alexandrina*, vol. I, p. 293.

## Fr. 15

Ἦ ταυροκέρωτι Διωνύσω κοτέσσασα  
 <— ̄̄ ?> ῥειώνη < ̄̄ — ?> βλαψίφρονα φάρμακα χεῦεν,  
 ὄσσ' ἐδάη Πολύδαμνα, Κυτηιάς ἢ ὄσα Μήδη.

This fragment concerns Dionysus. V. Groningen was puzzled by the fact that the two epithets Ἦ and ταυροκέρωτι are not connected and suggested that we should print ταυροκέρω τε. This alteration is unwarranted. V. Groningen failed to understand that *asyndeton* between adjectives is common in Hellenistic poetry: cf. Bühler, *op. cit.*, p. 212 ff., and Lapp, *op. cit.*, p. 80 f.

In his commentary on the aorist ἐδάη in line 3, v. Groningen stated that one might have expected to find the perfect or pluperfect tense. I would like to point out that the aorist could have a pluperfect meaning: cf. my commentary on Theocritus' *Idyll* XXIV, p. 32.

## Fr. 19 e

]ας	
]η	
]νύμφη	
]ωροισ.	
]καεσσαί	5
]ν ἤβην	
]τη	
] . ιησι .	
]ροικον	
] . ορείην .	10

] . [            ]ξατο μήλων ·  
 ] . ολε    [...]ες ἀλοίτην  
 Ἔ]ρεχθέος, ὅς μιν ἔμελλε  
 ]ἀπο πενθερίοιο  
 αἰ]πήεσσ[α]ν Ἄφιδναν                    15  
 ]ενος Ἡράκλειος  
 ]έσσυτο βουφόντης λῖς  
 ] . λλομένας ἀνὰ κώμας

V. Groningen commented as follows on line 5: «Barigazzi dit, à juste titre, que la forme *πευκάεσσα*, étant dorienne, ne s'expliquerait pas». It should be noted, however, that Doric forms were regularly employed in Hellenistic epic poetry: cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alexandrina*, vol. I, pp. 65 ff. and 292 f.: «Homer's language was a mixture of dialects: the background was Ionic, but there was an infusion of Doric and Attic elements. Apollonius deliberately reproduced such a mixture in his own poem». Cf. also v. Groningen's comments on p. 95, n. 1, and p. 118: «*ἠυδάξαντο*: forme 'dorienne'». Moreover at fr. 153 the form *ναυαγόν* need not be altered.

## Fr. 22

Stobée 124, 12; V 1126 H. (*Παρηγορικά*), Εὐφορίωνος·  
 Τῷ καὶ μέτρια μὲν τις ἐπὶ φθιμένῳ ἀκάχοιτο,  
 μέτρια καὶ κλαύσειεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ πάμπαν ἄδακρυον  
 Μοῖραι ἐσημήναντο.

Commenting on this fragment, v. Groningen (*op. cit.*, p. 91) suggested that since no pronoun is expressed in these lines we might understand that the second person is intended. I would like to add that the omission of the personal pronoun is a Homerism: cf. my *New Essays In Hellenistic Poetry*, Amsterdam 1985, p. 83.

## Fr. 24 a

]τηρσι.[  
 ].ησγα[  
 ]ηλιεδε .. [     ]ρ[  
 ]παιδὸς ἀγάστρ[οφ]ος.[  
 ]δεῖπνα λυγρῆ ἐπ[                    5  
 θ]αρσές · ἀπὸ κλυτὸν ὦ[.].[

βουλ]ήν τε καὶ ἔργματα κ[α]λλυνο[  
 πρό]δομόνδε διέκ θαλάμοιο π[  
 ]θύρετρα καὶ ὑψόθ[ι] δωμηθέν[τα  
 ]ος ἐπ' [ε]ύρυρόη Αἴαντι 10  
 ].ν ὑ[πει]ρέχει ἀκρεμόνεσ[σι  
 ἔ]κητι θεοὶ καὶ ἀεικέος αἴκλου  
 ]ν Ἀθηναίης θεράπαιναν  
 ].ροισιν ἀπεχθομένην ὄρνισιν  
 ἀ]παρεστος ἐψ̄ θάνεν ἀμφὶ σιδήρ[ω 15  
 ]ενου Κλυμένου, ἐπ[ε]ῖ αἶνος ἔρωτο[ς  
 ἐ]πιμίσηται Ὀκεανοῖο  
 ].κορέσσομεν, ἧ ποτε Μηδ.ς  
 ]σσαναν.[...]α[.....]ρ.υ...ν  
 ]φωεσ[ ]..[ 20  
 ]χερασ.[  
 ].αισ[  
 ]...[

This fragment is from Euphorion's *Θράξ*. V. Groningen commented as follows on line 9: «καὶ ὑψόθι δωμηθέντα: offre diverses possibilités d'interprétation: a. comme seconde épithète de θύρετρα, ce qui ne convient guère; b. 'nachgestelltes καί' (Latte); ce serait vraiment unique». It should be noted here that καὶ *postpositum* is well attested in Hellenistic poetry: cf. A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus*, Cambridge 1965, reprint, vol. II, p. 175, and G. Giangrande, *Apophoreta Philologica M. Fernández-Galiano*, Madrid 1984, vol. I, p. 368. Cf. also my *New Studies In Greek Poetry*, Amsterdam 1989, p. 53.

## Fr. 24 c I

[...].φι.[...]αἶον ἀτερ[.....]. αμοιο  
 [...].γ ἀφυ[σ]σάμενος βορ[.....]γε...θω.  
 [...] Συρηκούσης φορέοις λ[.....]ο]γ ὕδωρ  
 [...]ου δτ' ἀεθλα Διὸς στελλ[.....]σ[ρον] ἠ'.  
 [Ο]ύ[δ]ε νεκ.ταρ.ος κενεὸν μάλα λέκτρον ἴκοιο 5  
 [Ἀ]λλὰ σύ γ' Ἀκ[τ]ιδίων δαίσα[ι]ς γάμον η[...].[.].ρος.  
 Ἡ Ἰφικλείδαο δαιθρασέος Ἰολάου  
 ἀκτωρ λειπεφίλην θ[ο]λ[ε]ρὴν μνήσαιο θύγατρα.  
 καὶ δέ σ' ἐράσμιον Σεμ[ε]ίραμις ἀγκάσσαίτο  
 δφρα σοι εὐδόμοιο [π]αρά πρόδομον θα[λάμο]ιο 10  
 παρθενίω χαρίεντα ποδὶ κρ[α] ὄ' τέοιτο[...].ε[  
 Ἡ νύ τ[ο]ι Ἀπριάτης εὐξω γάμον, ὦκ[.]ο. α[.]δος.  
 ἦν δτ[ε] Τραμβήλοιο λέχο[ς] Τελαμωνιάδα[ο]  
 εἰς ἄλα δειμήνασα κατ' αἰγίλιπος θόρε πέτρ[ης  
 [.]ργι. [ἔ]τι πνείου[σαν..].....ιῆ.[ 15

δελφῖνες πηγοῖο δ[ι] ὕδατος ἐγκονέεσκον  
 αὐθις ἴν' ἀει[δ]ωμεν ἀ[μ]όρδιον ἰχθύσ[ι] κύρ[μα]·  
 αὐθι δὲ Τραμβήλο[ι]ο μόρον Ἀχιλῆι δ[α]μέντος.

Translation by Page (*op. cit.*, p. 495 ff.): «“... may you come to a... bed. Go, celebrate a wedding with... or like Actor woo some fair Leipephile, daughter of Iolaus the warrior son of Iphicles. Or may a Semiramis embrace you, her pretty husband, that on the threshold of her fragrant boudoir she may trample the corpse of her charming bridegroom. Now, shameless wretch, a new sort of wedding will I make for Apriate!” She spoke; and for terror of the bed of Trambelus, son of Telamon, leapt from a steep rock into the sea. And... dolphins hastened through the dark waters (to rescue) her still alive; that we might sing hereafter... and hereafter the fate of Trambelus, vanquished by Achilles...»

This fragment concerns Apriate and Trambelus. V. Groningen commented as follows on line 2: «ἀφυσσάμενος: il est donc question d'un sujet masculin.» I would like to add that participles were sometimes treated as having two terminations only: cf. Gow, *Theocritus*, vol. II, p. 297.

In his commentary on line 16, v. Groningen stated that Euphorion varies the Homeric κύματι πηγῶ (*Od.* V 388, XXIII 235). It is worth noting that the poet has purposely reversed the Homeric word-order. For other examples of *imitatio cum uariatione* cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alexandrina*, vol. I, p. 296.

At line 17 Euphorion has used the Attic form αὐθις which is attested as a Homeric variant reading. For the employment of Attic forms in Hellenistic epic verse cf. G. Chrystafis, *A Textual And Stylistic Commentary On Theocritus' Idyll XXV*, Amsterdam 1981, p. 119, and my *New Studies In Greek Poetry*, p. 46.

## Fr. 24 c 2

Παν[δ]ώρη κακόδ[ωρ]ος ἐκούσι[ον] ἀνδράσιν ἄλγος,	45
[.]ρ[.] νωμήσειεν ἐὼν ἐπίχειρα ταλάντω.	
Αὐτις δὲ κρυόεντος ἐρωήσας πολέμοιο	
Εἰρήνην πολύβοιαν ἐπ' ἀνέρας {ε}ἰθύσειεν.	
Ἐν δ' ἀγορῇ στή[σ]αιτο Θέμιν, τιμωρόν ἐάων,	
σὺν δὲ Δίκην, ἢ τ' ὠκά τ[ε] γρήιον ἴχνος ἀει[ρ]ει	50
σκυζομένη μετὰ ἔργα, τέων τ' ἐπὶ ᾗ ἔρκεται ἀγδρῶν	
οἳ ῥα θεοὺς ἐρέθωσι, παρὰ ῥήτρας δ' ἀγάγωντ[αι],	
[ἡ]πεδανούς ἢ οἳ κεν ἀγηγορέωσι τοκῆας	
στύξαντες ζώων τε παρὰ ἰφ[ρ]άσιās τε καμόν[των],	
ἢ οἳ ξείνια δόρπα Διός τ' ἀλίτῳσι τραπέζας.	55
Ο[ὔ] κεν ὁ κουφότατος ἀνέμων ἀλληκτον ἀε[ν]των	

ῥε[ῖα φ]ύγοι, λαιψηρὰ Δίκης ὄτε γούνατ' ὄρηται.  
 Οὐ γάρ κεν νήσοισιν Ἐχινά[σ]ιν ἐσκήψαντο  
 οἴκ[ο]ν ἐὼν Κεφάλαιο καὶ Ἀμφιτρύωνος ἀμο[ρ]βοί,  
 ἐκ [δὲ τ]ρίχα χρυσέην κόρησος ὦλοψε Κομ[αιθ]ῶ  
 πα[τρ]ὸς ἐοῦ, ὡς δὴ ῥ' ἄταφος τάφος εἶο πέλοιτο,  
 εἰ μὴ ληιδίησι γύας ἐτάμοντο βόεσσι  
 Τηλ[εβό]αι διὰ πόντον ἀπ' Ἀρσίνοιο μο[λόν]τες.

60

Translation by Page (*op. cit.*, p. 497 ff.): «... Pandora, donor of evil, man's sorrow self-imposed. Ares allot them their wages in his scales, and rest again from chilling warfare, and send Peace with her Prosperity to men! And in the market let him set Themis up, requiter of good deeds: and, beside her, Justice, who leaps up like a tiger at once in anger at the deeds of men upon whom she looks even them who provoke the gods and turn their commandments aside, and such as treat their feeble parents with arrogance, scorning the counsel of the living and the dead; or sin against the hospitable feast and the table of Zeus. The lightest of winds that blow unceasing could not easily escape the swift knees of Justice when up she leaps. Never in the islands Echinades had the companions of Cephalus and Amphitryon pressed on their vessel's..., nor had Comaetho cut the golden hair from her father's temple, that a wild beast might be her monstrous tomb — had nor the Teleboans cleft the field with stolen oxen, coming over the sea from Arsinus.»

At line 47 Euphorion has employed the Homeric form αὔτις rather than the Atticism αὔθις which we find in fr. 24 c, line 17. For the tendency of Hellenistic poets to reproduce both alternative Homeric readings or forms cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alexandrina*, vol. I, p. 294 f.

V. Groningen commented as follows on line 62: «γύας ἐτάμοντο: 'labourer'; cf. Solon I, 47 D γῆν τέμνων. Le moyen s'explique». It is worth adding that the middle form of the verb is frequently employed by Hellenistic poets instead of the active: cf. my commentary on Theocritus' *Idyll XXIV*, p. 105 f. Cf. also v. Groningen's comments on pages 95 (ἐντύνεσθε) and 123 (λιχμῶντο).

## Fr. 25

Étienne de Byzance 130,8 s. u. Ἀσβωτος: πόλις Θεσσαλίας · τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἀσβώτιος · Εὐφορίων Θρακί·  
 Τὸν μὲν ἄρ' ἐκ φλοίσβου Ἀσβώτιοι ὠκα φέροντες  
 ὑστάτιον ῥώσαντο κονισαλέησιν ἐθειραῖς  
 ἵπποι καλὰ νάουσαν ἐπορνύμενοι Φυσάδειαν·  
 περὶ τῶν ἵππων Ἀμφιαράου.

This fragment mentions the horses of Amphiaraus. The following statement was made by v. Groningen concerning line 3: « Ἐς Φυσάδειαν



ne signifie rien d'autre que ἐς Ἄργος; Euphorion évite l'indication banale. Le nom de n'importe quelle partie d'un pays peut remplacer chez lui le nom du pays même». For similar examples of metonymy in Hellenistic poetry cf. Lapp, *op. cit.*, p. 22, and K. Alexander, *A Stylistic Commentary On Phanocles And Related Texts*, Amsterdam 1988, p. 111.

## Fr. 29

Scholie à Clément d'Alexandrie, *Protr.* 27, II p. 308, 3 St.: Ἴπποκόων τις ἐγένετο Λακεδαιμόνιος, οὐ υἱοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς λεγόμενοι Ἴπποκοωντίδαι ἐφόνευσαν τὸν Λικυμνίου υἱόν, Οἰωνὸν ὀνόματι, συνόντα τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ, ἀγανακτήσαντες ἐπὶ τῷ πεφονεῦσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κύνα αὐτῶν. Καὶ δὴ ἀγανακτήσας ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Ἡρακλῆς πόλεμον συγκροτεῖ κατ' αὐτῶν καὶ πολλοὺς ἀναιρεῖ, ὅτε καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν χεῖρα ἐπλήγη. Μέμνηται καὶ Ἀλκμάν ἐν α' (dans le parthénée, cf. Garzya p. 17 ss.). Μέμνηται καὶ Εὐφορίων ἐν Θρακί τῶν Ἴπποκόωντος παίδων τῶν ἀντιμνηστήρων τῶν Διοσκούρων.

In his discussion of this fragment, v. Groningen noted that normally the Apharidae (i. e. Idas and Lynceus) are said to have sought to marry the Leucippides (cf. Teocritus' *Idyll XXII*). Here, however, Euphorion states that the sons of Hippocoön wanted to marry them. According to v. Groningen, «l'idée de considérer les Hippocoontides comme concurrents des Dioscures est conforme à la préférence d'Euphorion pour les traditions insolites». For the fact that Hellenistic poets often prefer to mention obscure versions of a myth cf. my *Studies In The Poetry Of Nicander*, p. 45. Cf. also v. Groningen's comments concerning fr. 77.

## Fr. 30

Scholie à Lycophron 451: Κυχρεὺς Σαλαμῖνος καὶ Ποσειδῶνος υἱός: ἐβασίλευσε δὲ οὗτος Σαλαμινίων, ὡς Εὐφορίων ἐν Ἴππομέδοντί φησι: τοῖος γὰρ κυχρεῖος ἐνὶ ψαφάρῃ Σαλαμῖνι: ἄλλοι δέ, ὅτι ὄφισ ποτὲ ἐλυμαίνετο τὴν Σαλαμῖνα καὶ δοίκτηρον ἐποίησεν, ἕως ὃ Κυχρεὺς αὐτὸν ἀπώλεσε.

V. Groningen commented as follows on the word *κυχρεῖος*: «les manuscrits donnent en outre des variantes dont la seule intéressante est *Κυχρηῖος*, génitif de *Κυχρεὺς*, le nom du roi de Salamine. *Κυχρεῖος* est l'adjectif correspondant au nom propre, comme *θησεῖος* correspond à *Θησεύς*. Les deux sont possibles, mais l'adjectif semble être plus probable dans le contexte (voir ci-dessous) et plus recherché que le simple génitif et donc plus conforme aux habitudes du poète». It is worth adding that the adjective representing the genitive of a proper name is

frequently found in Hellenistic poetry: cf. Gow, *Theocritus*, vol. II, p. 294. Cf. also Lapp, *op. cit.*, p. 130 f.

## Fr. 35

Scholie à Denys le Périégète 620: καὶ ἡ Ἀττικὴ δὲ Ἀσία πρῶν ἑκαλεῖτο, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Διονύσιος ὁ Κυζικηνός · οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ Ποσειδωνία ἑκαλεῖτο, ὡς Εὐφορίων φησὶν·

Ἀκτῆς δὲ παρτίτερα φωνηθείσης·  
οἱ μὲν δὴ ἐνέπουσι καὶ Ἀσίδα κικλήσκεισθαι,  
οἱ δὲ Ποσειδάωνος ἐπώνυμον αὐδηθῆναι.

Commenting on this fragment, v. Groningen noted that Euphorion has composed three consecutive spondaic hexameters. For spondaic verses in Hellenistic poetry cf. my commentary on Theocritus' *Idyll* XXIV, p. 9, and Gow, *Theocritus*, vol. II, p. 239. V. Groningen also noted that Euphorion has employed three synonymous verbs. For the use of synonyms in hellenistic verse cf. my *New Studies In Greek Poetry*, pp. 45-46. Cf. moreover Lapp, *op. cit.*, p. 116 f.

## Fr. 37

Choeroboscus, *Orthogr.*, dans Cramer *Anecd. Oxon.* 2, 239, 6: Λείπω· λέγει ὁ Ὀρος ὅτι πάντα παρὰ τὸ λείπω διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου γράφεται, οἷον... Ὁ δὲ Ὀριγένης διὰ τοῦ ἰ λέγει γράφεσθαι... ἔλλιπέες παρὰ Εὐφορίωνι.

V. Groningen commented as follows: «Westerink, *l. c.*, remarque que ἔλλιπής est un terme de la prose; il est donc peu probable qu'Euphorion l'ait employé ailleurs que dans le contexte indiqué par le fragment précédent, c'est-à-dire dans la Mopsopia». It is worth remembering that «Hellenistic poets employed many prosaic words, meanings of words and syntactical constructions»: cf. G. Giangrande, *Scripta Minora Alexandrina*, vol. II, p. 391.

## Fr. 38 a et b

Choeroboscus, in *Theod. Canones* 7, p. 191, 25 Hilg.: εἰ γὰρ καὶ εὐρηται τὸ λῖς συνεσταλμένον ἔχον τὸ ἰ ποιητικῶς, ὡς παρ' Εὐφορίωνι ἐν Μοψοπία {ὡς} ἐπὶ τοῦ·

οἰοὶ ἐπιθύουσι βοῶν λῖες, (a)

καὶ πάλιν·

κάπροι τε λῖες τε, (b)

ἀλλ' οὖν καὶ ἐκτεταμένον ἔχει αὐτό, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ· λῖες μέντοι λῖεσσι (= Antimaque fr. 113 Wyss).

V. Groningen noted that Meineke proposed the alteration *οἱ δ' ἐπιθύουσιν βουσίην λίεσσι*. He then added that this alteration is not necessary because «le génitif est normal pour indiquer le but, la direction d'un mouvement». For other examples of this use of the genitive cf. G. Giangrande, *L'Ant. Classique*, 1986, p. 310, and Kühner-Gerth, vol. I, p. 351.

## Fr. 40

Etymologicum Magnum 50, 38 s. u. ἀκόνιτον: βοτάνη δηλητηριώδης· ὅτι ἐν τοῖς Ἀκοναίοις ὄρεσι τῆς Μαρυανδυνίας φύεται... Εὐφορίων δὲ θηλυκῶς λέγει τὴν βοτάνην, ἣ ἦν οὐδεὶς δύναται κονίσει, τουτέστι νικῆσαι. Κονιορτοῦνται γὰρ οἱ νικώμενοι τῶν παλαιστῶν. Οὕτως Μεθόδιος.

V. Groningen commented as follows: «Ceci nous apprend que, dans ce poème, Euphorion ne disait pas, comme tout le monde, τὸ ἀκόνιτον, mais ἡ ἀκόνιτος, savoir βοτάνη». For the fact that plant-genders are erratic in Hellenistic Greek cf. my commentary on Theocritus' *Idyll* XXIV, p. 85.

## Fr. 44

Scholie K à Théocrite 10, 28: τὴν γραπτὴν ὑάκινθον φασὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Αἴαντος ἀναδοθῆναι· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχειν ἐγγεγραμμένον αἰ αἰ, τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Αἴαντος. Εἰς δὲ Εὐφορίων ἀπιδῶν εἶπε·  
Πορφυρὴ ὑάκινθε, σὲ μὲν μία φῆμις ἀοιδῶν  
'Ροιτεῖης ἀμάθοισι δεδουπότος Αἰακίδαο  
εἶαρος ἀντέλλειν γεγραμμένα κωκύουσιν.

line 2 'Ροιτεῖης Brubach: 'Ροιτεῖοις UA

In line 2 v. Groningen printed Brubach's alteration 'Ροιτεῖης. There is, however, no need for us to alter the mss. reading 'Ροιτεῖοις. The poet has obviously restricted the adjective to two terminations: cf. my *Studies In The Poetry Of Nicander*, p. 16. Similarly at fr. 193 e Euphorion may have restricted the adjective 'Αόνιος to two terminations: cf. v. Groningen's comments on p. 242.

In his commentary on line 3, v. Groningen stated that the noun εἶαρος may mean either 'blood' or 'spring' in this passage. The reader should note that such ambiguity is typical of Hellenistic poetry: cf. my *Studies In Theocritus And Other Hellenistic Poets*, p. 37 f., and my *New Studies In Greek Poetry*, p. 42.

## Fr. 48

Stobée 59, 16, IV 403 H. (περὶ ναυτιλίας καὶ ναυαγίου), Εὐφορίωνος  
Φιλοκτῆτου:

τὸν δ' ἐκάλυψε θάλασσα λιλαιόμενον βιότοιο,  
καὶ ὁ πήχες ἄκρον ὑπερφαίνοντο ταθέντες  
ἀχρεῖα σπαίροντος ἄλις Δολοπιονίδαο  
δυστήνου· ζῶν δὲ μεθ' ὕδατος ἐκβαλε πᾶσαν  
χεῖρας ὑπερπλάζων, ἄλμη δὲ κάλυψεν ὀδόντας. 5

V. Groningen made the following observation concerning the verb κάλυψεν in line 3: «afin d'éviter la répétition du verbe et afin d'obtenir une image plus normale on a voulu corriger; Sitzler propose ἐκλυσσεν, Elter ἐπέρησεν». Textual alteration is again unwarranted. The critics have failed to understand that repetition is a common feature of Hellenistic poetry: cf. my commentary on Theocritus' *Idyll XXIV*, p. 106, and Lapp, *op. cit.*, p. 54 ff. For repetition in Euphorion cf. fr. 22 (μέτρια.../ μέτρια), fr. 57,8 (ἡ που... ἡ που), fr. 96 (τέκνον.../... τέκνον), fr. 100 (Βοιωτοῖο /... Βοιωτόν), fr. 101 (δῆριν ἐθεντο.../... δηρινθέντες) and fr. 190 (καλαί... καλαί).

## Fr. 57

αιπ[  
ξανθός δι[  
καὶ οἱ δειμαίνοντι  
ταρφέες ἀφλοισμῶ δι[  
Οἱ δ' ὀπιθεν λασίη ὑπὸ γαστέρι πεπτηῶτες 5  
οὐραῖοι λιχμῶντο περὶ πλευρήσι δράκοντες,  
ἐν καὶ οἱ βλεφάροις κυάνω ἡστράπτειρον [ἔσσε  
Ἦ που θερμάστραις ἢ που Μελιγουνίδι τοῖται  
μαρμαρυγαί, αἴρησιν ὅτε ῥήσσοιτο σίδηρος,  
ἡέρ' ἀναθρῶσκουσι, βοᾷ δ' εὐήλατος ἄκμων, 10  
† ἢ Αἴτην φολόεσσαν, ἐναύλιον Ἀστερόποιο. †  
Ἴκετο μὴν Τίρυνθα παλιγκότῳ Εὐρυσσῆφι  
ζῶς ὑπέξ' Αἶδαο δωδέκα λοῖσθος ἀέθλων·  
καὶ μιν ἐνὶ τριόδοισι πολυκρίθοιο Μιδείης  
ταρβαλεῖ σὺν παισὶν ἐθηήσαντο γυναῖκες. 15

Translation by Page (*op. cit.*, p. 493): «Behind, under his shaggy belly cowering, the serpents that were his tail darted their tongues about his ribs. Within his eyes, a beam flashed darkly. Truly in the Forges or in Meligunis leap such sparks into the air, when iron is beaten with hammers, and the anvil roars beneath mighty blows, — or up inside smoky Etna, lair of Asteropus. Still, he came alive to Tiryns out of Hades, the last of twelve labours, for the pleasure of malignant Eurystheus; and at the crossways of Mideia, rich in barley, trembling women with their children looked upon him...»

This fragment describes how Heracles brought Cerberus from Hades to Tiryns. Cerberus is said in line 6 to have a tail which consists of serpents (οὐραῖοι... δράκοντες). Euphorion has constructed a hexameter which is encased by an adjective and a noun in agreement: cf. G. R. McLennan, *Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus*, Rome 1977, p. 97, for other examples of this stylistic device.

In line 13 Cerberus is said to come alive (ζωός) from Hades. Similarly at *Arg. I* 126 Apollonius Rhodius states that Heracles brought back the Erymanthian boar alive (ζωὸν φέρε κάμριον) for Eurystheus.

## Fr. 59

Scholie à Pindare *Ol.* 8, 41 a p. 247 Dr.: ἰδίως φησὶν ὁ Δίδυμος καὶ τούτοις χρῆσασθαι τὸν Πίνδαρον· τὸν γὰρ Ποσειδῶνα καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα εἰς τὴν τοῦ τείχους κατασκευὴν φησὶ τὸν Αἰακὸν προσλαβεῖν. ... Παρ' οὐδενὶ δὲ πρεσβυτέρῳ Πινδάρου ἢ ἱστορία. Ὁ δὲ Εὐφορίῳ φησὶν·

Ἦ γὰρ δὴ Φοῖβός τε Ποσειδάων τ' ἐκάλεσαν  
Αἰακόν, οὐκ ἀβοηθὶ περὶ κρήδεμνα δέμοντες.

V. Groningen commented as follows on line 1: « Ἦ γὰρ δὴ: Denniston *s.u.* enregistre ἦ γὰρ et ἦ δὴ, de même γὰρ δὴ ('arresting attention at opening of narrative'), mais non pas la combinaison ἦ γὰρ δὴ. Le sens est clair: c'est un γὰρ δὴ renforcé». It should be noted that the combination ἦ γὰρ δὴ occurs in the same metrical *sedes* at Moschus, *Europa*, line 74, and Manetho, II 64.

V. Groningen then comments on the words Φοῖβός τε Ποσειδάων τ(ε): «En Φ 441 ss. Poséidon rappelle à Apollon qu'ils ont dû servir Laomédon, lui, en bâtissant les remparts de Troie, Apollon, en gardant les troupeaux; mais en 452 s. les deux dieux sont occupés à construire les murs». For another case where a poet has deliberately alluded to two different versions of the same myth cf. my *New Studies In Greek Poetry*, p. 67. Cf. also fr. 120 where Euphorion is said to have stated that Pelops was both Lydian and Paphlagonian:

Scholie à Apollonios de Rhodes 2, 358 s. (Pélops, roi des Paphlagoniens): τὸν δὲ Πέλοπα Παφλαγὸνα τὸ γένος εἶπεν, ἄλλοι δὲ Λυδὸν αὐτὸν ἱστοροῦσιν, ὁ δὲ Εὐφορίων ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς δόξαις συντίθεται.

## Fr. 62

Etymologicum Magnum 181, 28 s. *s.u.* Ἀχιλλεύς: ... διὰ τὸ μὴ θιγεῖν χεῖρσι χιλῆς, ὃ ἐστὶ τροφῆς. Ὅλως γὰρ οὐ μετέσχε γάλακτος, ἀλλὰ μυελοῖς ἐλάφων ἐτράφη ὑπὸ Χείρωνος. Ὅτι ὑπὸ Μυρμιδόνων ἐκλήθη, καθὰ φησὶν Εὐφορίων·

Ἐς Φθίην χιλοῖο κατήιε πάμπαν ἄπαστος·  
τοῦνεκα Μυρμιδόνες μιν Ἀχιλέα φημίζαντο.

This fragment explains how Achilles got his name. Euphorion has repeated the same *Wortstamm* (χιλοῖο... Ἀχιλέα) in order to achieve an etymological word-game: cf. my *Studies In Late Greek Epic Poetry*, Amsterdam 1987, p. 137. Cf. also fr. 91 Ὀρχομενόν... ὄρχηθέντα and fr. 191 Περσῆα... πέρσεν. For the repetition of the same *Wortstamm* cf. my *New Studies In Greek Poetry*, p. 40.

## Fr. 63

Scholie à Lycophron 495: Διομήδης καὶ Ἀκάμας ὁ Θησέως υἱὸς πρὸ τοῦ ναυστολήσαι τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἐπρέσβευσαν πρὸς τοὺς Τρῶας διὰ τὴν Ἑλένην. Καὶ συνέβη Λαοδίκη τῇ Πριάμου μιγῆναι Ἀκάμαντα καὶ τεκεῖν υἱὸν Μοῦνιτον κληθέντα. ... Ἀλούσης δὲ τῆς Τροίας ἀναγνωρισθεῖσα (savoir Aethra qui avait pris sur elle le soin de l'enfant) τῷ Ἀκάμαντι ἀπήρε μετ' αὐτοῦ κομιζουσα καὶ τὸν Μοῦνιτον. Παραγενομένων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς Θράκην καὶ ἐξελθόντων ἐν κυνηγεσίῳ ὄφισ τὸν Μοῦνιτον ἔτρωσε καὶ οὕτως ἐτελεύτησεν, ὡς φησὶν Εὐφορίων·

Ἦ οἱ Μοῦνιτον υἱὰ τέκεν πλομένῳ ἐνὶ ὦρῳ.

Ἄλλὰ ἔ Σιθονίη τε καὶ ἐν κνήμησιν Ὀλύνθου

ἀγρώσσονθ' ἄμα πατρὶ πελώριος ἔκτανεν ὕδρος.

V. Groningen was puzzled by the fact that Olynthus is mentioned together with Sithonia in line 2 and stated that this is «une nouvelle preuve du peu de précision des indications topographiques d'Euphorion». It should be noted, however, that a connection between these two places is attested elsewhere: cf. *Thes. Gr. Ling.*, s.u. Ὀλυνθος: «πόλις Θράκης πρὸς τῇ Σιθονίᾳ τῆς Μακεδονίας κτλ., Steph. Byz.»

## Fr. 85

Hypothesis b à Pindare *Pythiques* p. 3, 5 ss. Dr.: Εὐρύλοχος ὁ Θεσσαλὸς καταπολεμήσας Κιρραίους ἀνεκτήσατο τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦ θεοῦ. Οἱ δὲ Κιρραῖοι ληστρικῇ ἐφόδῳ χρώμενοι ἐφόνευσαν τοὺς παραβάλλοντας εἰς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. Περιεγένετο δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι μὲν Σιμωνίδου, Δελφοῖς δὲ Γυλίδα... Τὸν δὲ Εὐρύλοχον νέον ἐκάλουσαν Ἀχιλλέα, ὡς Εὐφορίων φησὶ·

ὀπλοτέρου τ' Ἀχιλέως ἀκούομεν Εὐρυλόχοιο,

Δελφίδες ᾧ ὑπο καλὸν Ἰήϊον ἀντιβόησαν,

<Κρίσαν> πορθήσαντι, Δυκωρέος † οικία † Φοίβου.

In his discussion of this fragment, v. Groningen stated that *Κρίσαν* «est une excellente conjecture de Boeckh». He was, however, puzzled by the phrase *Δυκωρέος οικία Φοίβου* and commented as follows: «Mais est-il admissible que Crisa, ce repaire de bandits impies, ait été appelé 'demeure du Phoebus delphique'?» V. Groningen has forgotten that

there was a temple of Apollo at Crisa: cf. *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, lines 269 and 438 ff.

## Fr. 90

Étienne de Byzance 244, 5 s.u. Δυρράχιον: λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἡ χώρα τῆς Ἰλλυρίας Δυρραχία. Εὐφορίων ἄστυα Δυρραχίης τε καὶ ἔθνεα Ταυλαντίνων.

V. Groningen commented on this fragment as follows: «Le pluriel ἄστυα oblige à étendre le sens de Δυρραχίη à celui d'Illyrie, en tout cas de la partie colonisée de celle-ci». I would like to point out that ἄστυα may also be regarded as a poetic plural; cf. my *Studies In The Poetry Of Nicander*, p. 73, and Nonnus, *Dion.* XIII 237 ἄστυα κατὰ Κυταίου («the fair city of Cytaion»). For another poetic plural in Euphorion cf. fr. 96, line 1 ἀνθερεῶνας.

## Fr. 123

Étienne de Byzance 35, 21 s.u. Ἀθύρας: ἐπίνειον καὶ ποταμὸς περὶ τὸ Βυζάντιον, ἔστι δὲ καὶ κόλπος Ἀθύρας. Κλίνεται δὲ <ἀν>ισσοσυλλάβως ὡς Εὐφορίων ὕδατα δινήεντος ἀμευσάμενος Ἀθύραο.  
Ἔστι δὲ καὶ Σκυθίας ποταμὸς Ἀθύρας, ὡς Νυμφιδώωρος (*FGrHist.* 572 F 12).

The following observation was made by v. Groningen concerning the word ἀμευσάμενος: «Impossible de dire quel personnage —de sexe masculin— a passé le fleuve. On notera encore l'allongement amétrique de la dernière syllabe du participe». It is worth noting that similar metrical lengthenings<sup>3</sup> are to be found in Theocritus: cf. Chryssafis, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

## Fr. 131

Col. I	Ἰερὶδροσος ἀνθεα τέρσαι	
	Ἰαγ ἄλις καρφοίατο ποῖαι	
	Ἰ. νου θέμις ἀνδρὶ δ[α]ῖ[ναι]	
	Ἰτι μνηστὴ Περὶβοια	
	Ἰλαοδ' ὕδατα Γάλλου	5
	Ἰεπευθεας Ὠρομέδον[το]ς	
	Ἰ. δηγ ταυρώπιδος Ἥρης	

<sup>3</sup> For metrical lengthening in Euphorion cf. also De Cuenca, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

]αραστρ . φέρωσι θαα[ ]σρον	
]αναιολον οψευσ ἼΑργο[ς	
κα]ι ὄς μάλα παῦρα δαεῖη	10
]ωνιδε [.]ηλητῆρες	
πα]λίγκοτ[ο]ν ἴσχετε φλοιό[ν	
]κεδόν[ ]ἐ]νόρκιο[	
]έφορήσα[τ]ο κρωσσ[όν	
]μαλδύνοντο θαλα[	15
]τεῶνες ἐφ' ἄρματος[	
]λη τότε γίνεο γαῖα	
]υφολμ.δεκτην .. ἄ[	
πολ]υπώεος ἄγχι Πελίνγη[ς	
]γάρ πεζῆσιιν Ἀχαιῶν	20
Τιτα]ρήσιος ο[ ]ος δειραι	
]ν ἐπικλείουσι θυεῖην	

V. Groningen commented as follows on line 8: «ἄστρα φέρωσι: n'offre pas de sens, à moins de songer à la voûte céleste (?); le neutre ne peut être le sujet d'un verbe au pluriel». It should be noted, however, that the use of a plural verb with a neuter plural subject is well attested in Hellenistic poetry: cf. Gow, *Theocritus*, vol. II, p. 55, and Callimachus, fr. 75,16 (Pfeiffer). Cf. moreover v. Groningen's note on fr. 193 f., line 6 (καὶ γούνατ' ἀναρδέα σειραίνονται).

The following observation was made by v. Groningen concerning the verb ἀμαλδύνοντο in line 15: «L'imparfait indique une habitude, ou bien il se situe dans une partie descriptive du récit». It is also possible that the poet used the imperfect instead of the aorist: cf. Gow, *Theocritus*, vol. II, p. 83, and my *New Studies In Greek Poetry*, p. 106.

#### Fr. 193 e

] Ἄονιο[ι]ο περαῖης	
] κροκάλαις ὑπο κυμανθεῖσα	
] σανήλυδε Ληλάντοιο·	
] .ο πόλ[ι]ν ἀλιτειχέα Κόμβης	
μέ]λαν περιτέτροφε φῦκος	5
]ς, νοτερῆ δ' ἀνεκῆκιεν ἄλμη	
]ς βρεκτῶν τε κομάων	
π]ολυνεΐκεος αἰθύσσησιν	
θα]λασσο γενῆ Διο[ν]ύσου	
]ατα ρίγηλά βεβή[λ	10

V. Groningen was puzzled by line 6 and commented as follows: «νοτερῆ: curieux pléonasmе auprès de ἄλμη». It should be noted that



such pleonasms are quite common in Hellenistic poetry: cf. Lapp, *op. cit.*, p. 70, quoting e.g. Callimachus, *Hymn IV* 211 νότιος... ἔρρεεν ἰδρώς.

## Fr. 193 f

].ε.. [  
 ]εὐθυδίκοισι πο[  
 ]ν· τοῖοί μιν ἐκαρτύ[ναντο  
 ]'Ἀρισταίοιο θεοφροσ[ύνη]ς ἀλέγο[ντες  
 ὀππό]τε διψαλέω Κυνὶ κάρφεται ἡμερίς [ῥ]λη 5  
 ]ων καὶ γούνατ' ἀναρδέα σειραίνονται,  
 ]α φράζονται καματώδεος ἀστέρα Μαίρη[ς  
 ].αι· δὴ γάρ.[.] το [σι]νεται ἡδ' ὀνίνησιν·  
 ἐκφανθ]εῖς ὀνίνη[σιν, ἐσίνα]το δ' εὖτε λάθησι·  
 ]ναμφοτερα[ ]ιος ἰλήκοιτε 10  
 ]φλεγύησι σὺν ἀνδράσιν εὐνηθε[ῖ]σα.  
 ].οι καὶ ἔπειτα φίλε μνησαίμεθ' ἀριδέ,  
 Μούσας ] παρπεπιθόντες, ὃ σοι χαριτήσιον εἶη  
 Φοίβου ]μειλιχίης, ἧς ἂν περι.μ[.]·αφαιη.[

In his commentary on line 11, v. Groningen noted that Lobel thought that there are references in this line to the Phlegyae and to Macelo, the mother of Dexithea. However Lobel could not understand «how all the details to which allusions seem to be discernible could be crushed into these two verses». I would like to point out that Hellenistic poets, when narrating a well-known legend, were usually allusive: cf. my *Studies In Theocritus And Other Hellenistic Poets*, p. 68. In other words, Euphorion need not have mentioned all the details of the legends concerning Macelo and the Phlegyae in this passage. Cf. moreover v. Groningen's comments on p. 88 («Euphorion aime les allusions passagères») and p. 90 («Le poème a été riche, semble-t-il, en allusions compactes et passagères à des mythes divers»).

HEATHER WHITE