

## SIMONIDES AND EROS

Simon. fr. 575 P. (= Σ Ap. Rhod. 3.26, p. 216 Wendel):

σχέτλιε παῖ δολομήδεος Ἀφροδίτας,  
τὸν Ἄρη δολομάχανον τέκεν.

I have printed this fragment with two emendations, one old and generally accepted, the other new. The former is *δολομήδεος* for *δολόμηδες* advanced by Ernst Rickmann (1) on the grounds that it would be stylistically unidiomatic for Eros to be given a second epithet while his mother went quite unadorned. "Probus poeta adiectiva non cumulat, sed inter substantiva distribuit" (2). This generalisation cannot be extended as widely as its author intended, but it still holds true of the fragments of Simonides, more numerous now than when Rickmann made his correction (3). The meaning Rickmann placed upon the passage as thus emended was "timendus es, Cupido: nimirum mater paterque timendi" (4).

This brings us to the second line, where the *paradosis* is *δολομηχάνω*, an epithet which most scholars have found incomprehensible

(1) In his dissertation *In cumulandis epithetis quas leges sibi scripserint poetae Graeci maxime lyrici*, Rostock 1884, p. 36f. For the sort of corruption presupposed see Rickmann pp. 34ff., M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart 1973, Index s. v. 'assimilative corruption'.

(2) Wilamowitz, "Hermes" 14, 1879, 169 = Kl. Schr. 4.7.

(3) See especially Simonides fr. 541 P. (= P. Oxy. 2432) 9f.: *κέρ]δος ἀμάχητον ἢ δολοπλ[όκου | με]γαθενῆς οἴστρος Ἀφροδί[ας* which was compared with *σχέτλιε παῖ δολομήδεος Ἀφροδίτας* by Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1961, p. 203 n. 2. On this fragment's authorship see Gentili, "Gnomon" 48, 1976, 741.

(4) Pretty much the same meaning is extracted by G. Giangrande, *Simonides und Eros*, "A. C." 38, 1969, 147ff. with reference to the topos *qualis pater, talis filius* (cf. Hes. Op. 235 *τίκτουςιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἐοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσιν* with West ad loc., Theocr. 17.43f. and 53ff. and 25.38f. with Gow ad locc.). He rejects Rickmann's correction, however: but his grounds are inadequate (he cites irrelevant passages such as Opp. Hal. 4.9 *σχέτλι' Ἔρως, δολομήτα* where there are not two names for the epithets to be distributed among equitably, or Sappho 1.1 LP *ποικιλόθρον' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφροδίτα | παῖ Διὸς δολόπλοκε* which is not by Simonides; he claims that the "Verschlagenheit" of Eros' mother is irrelevant — but cf. Hes. Op. 235 cited above). A similar interpretation to Giangrande's is entertained by Gentili, "Maia" 16, 1964, 304.

as applied to Ares. Farnell, it is true, thought it "not inapplicable to Ares here, with reference to his intrigue with the wife of Hephaestus", but this interpretation (5) is objectionable from several points of view. The allusiveness of such an indirect reference is quite uncharacteristic of early Greek poetry (6). Furthermore, though the story of Ares and Aphrodite's intrigue may be familiar to *us*, we should not automatically assume its familiarity for early Greek poets. On the contrary, it is extremely rare outside of *Odyssey* 8 (7). The tradition that Ares and Aphrodite were legitimately married is in fact far more popular in early literature (8).

Some emendation, then, is required. In his app. crit. Page cites Bergk's *κακομαχάνω* (9), and Wilamowitz's *θρασυμαχάνω* (10), conjectures which presume (11) that the *first* element of the compound adjective has been contaminated by that of the preceding epithet. A

(5) Greek Lyric Poetry, London 1891, p. 370 approved by Giangrande (sup. cit. n. 4) p. 147 n. 2 who supports it by citing the only remotely comparable instance offered by Buchmann's *Epitheta Deorum*, Nonnus *Dionys.* 4.242 ff. *δολόεις τάχα φώριος* "Ἄρης | ἔζεται ἐν πρύμνησιν ἔσω Λιβάνοιο κομίζων | ἔσπεριν πλώουσιν ἀπὸ Θρήκης Ἀφροδίτην. Here, however, the context is deliberately denigratory and comically unelevated (note especially *φώριος* — cf. Callim. fr. 331 Pf. — which also instantly clarifies *δολόεις*). Besides, Nonnus often applies eccentric, and demeaning epithets to his gods (e.g. *γυναμμανέων... κυανοχαίτης* in *Dionys.* 8.235). Nor does this detail fit Giangrande's overall interpretation (above n. 4) since the *dólos* practised by father and son is so very dissimilar.

(6) See, for instance, West on Hes. Th. 276 *Μέδουσα τε λυγρὰ παθοῦσα*, who observes that "this kind of allusion to a single event in an epithet or participial phrase is most uncommon in early epic" and cites as the closest parallel *Od.* 12.70 *Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα*.

(7) Burkert, "Rh. Mus." 103, 1960, p. 133 and n. 7 (cf. B. K. Braswell, "Hermes" 110, 1982, 135, Hainsworth on *Od.* 8.267 [2.271]) rightly stresses the idiosyncrasy of the marital situation described in the song of Demodocus and the rarity outside this passage of the tradition that Hephaestus and Aphrodite were married. The idea was doubtless an *ad hoc* invention of the *Odyssey*'s poet, designed to achieve the sort of correspondences with the poem's main plot that Burkert and Braswell explore. Cf. Σ A Il. 21.416 (5.224 Erbse) = Chozizontum fr. 8 Kohl οἱ χωρίζοντες φασὶ τὸν τῆς Ἰλιάδος ποιητὴν εἶδέναι συνοῦσαν τῷ Ἄρει τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, τὸν δὲ τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας διαφώνως Ἥφαιστον.

(8) Ares was regarded as the legitimate husband of Aphrodite at least as early as the sixth century: see e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 4.81f., West's note on Hes. Th. 933 (p. 415), Burkert sup. cit. (n. 7) p. 133 n. 6.

(9) In his edition of the lyric poets (3.409).

(10) Sappho und Simonides, Berlin 1913, p. 152 n. 4.

(11) As does Wendel's mode of indicating the corruption (Scholia in Ap. Rh. *Vetera*, Berlin 1935, p. 216): *+δολο+μηχάνω*, an unhappy typographical device, for reasons which will soon become clear.

simpler remedy would be to suppose that the *ending* of the troublesome word has suffered assimilation to that of the adjacent Ἄρη. This is the reasoning behind *δολομάχανος*, a conjecture independently proposed by G. H. Schaefer (12) and F. G. Schneidewin (13), and mentioned by Bergk but not Page. The suggestion was made, of course, at a time when *παῖ δολόμηδες* was still thought acceptable as a reading. In the light of our present knowledge, we may wonder whether having just called Aphrodite *δολομήδης* Simonides would at once proceed to call her *δολομάχανος* too.

As Schneidewin says (14), *δολομάχανος* would be an epithet “*aptisimum Veneri δολοπλόκῳ*” (15). But when he adds that it is “*Veneri unice conveniens*”, we must retort that it would be still more appropriate for Aphrodite’s son, to whom, after all, it is applied in the only other occurrence of the word that is attested: *τὸν δολομάχανον*!... Ἔρον (Theocr. 30.25f.). Hence my preference for *δολομάχανον* in the present fragment. For the epithet’s application to Eros compare also such passages as Alpheus, Anth. Plan. 212.5 = Gow-Page, GP 2582 (*δολοπλόκος*), Athen. 13.609 D = Page, Further Greek Epigrams 1482 (p. 401: *ποικιλομήχανος*) (16), Nonnus Dionys. 33.9 and Musaeus 198 (*αἰολόμητις*). For the accusative cf. Il. 13.450 ὃς *πρῶτον Μίνωα τέκε Κρήτη ἐπίουρον*, 14.318 ἧ *τέκε Πειρίθοον, θεόφω μῆστωρ’ ἀτάλαντον*, Hes. Th. 984 *Τιθωνῶ δ’ Ἡὼς τέκε Μέμνονα χαλκοκορυστήν* and numerous other passages. The repetition in *δολο-μήδης ... δολο-μάχανον* is highly effective: the mother plans guileful acts and her son carries them out, a distribution of labour that can be inferred from several passages in Greek literature (17).

Oxford  
St. John’s College

MALCOLM DAVIES

(12) Schaefer made this conjecture in his edition of the relevant Apollonian scholia (full title given by Wendel [sup. cit. n. 11] p. XXVII).

(13) Schneidewin first suggested the conjecture in: *Ibyci Rhegensis Carminum Reliquiae*, Göttingen 1833, p. 124 n. 28. He repeated it (this time with due acknowledgement to Schaefer) in: *Simonidis Cei Carminum Reliquiae*, Brunsvig 1835, p. 93f. placing it in the text; and in his *Delectus Poetarum Iambicorum et Melicorum Graecorum*, Göttingen 1839, p. 394 (this time confining it to the app. crit.).

(14) In his editions of Ibycus and Simonides (see the previous note) respectively.

(15) Colluthus 81 calls her *δολόμητις*: cf. H. H. Aphr. 249ff., Eur. Hel. 1103f. ἔρωτας ἀπάτας δόλια τ’ ἐξευρήματα | ἀσκοῦσα, West on Hes. Th. 205f. and 224.

(16) Cf. Plato Sympos. 203 D Ἔρως ... *αἰεί τινας πλέκων μηχανάς*.

(17) For other passages which distinguish the functions of Aphrodite and Eros see e.g. Alcman fr. 58 P. (Ἀφροδίτα μὲν οὐκ ἔστι μάργος δ’ Ἔρως). On the repetition of the prefix in two successive words see D. Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin 1969, p. 247.