

Aesch. fr. 300 R.<sup>2\*</sup>

γένος μὲν αἰνεῖν καὶ μαθῶν ἐπίσταμαι  
 Αἰθιοπίδος γῆς, Νεῖλος ἔνθ' ἐπτάρροος  
 γαῖαν κυλίνδει πνευμάτων ἐπομβροίας,  
 ἐν ἧι † πυρωπὸν μηνὸς ἐκλάμψας φλόγα†  
 τήκει πετραίαν χιόνα· πᾶσα δ' εὐθαλής  
 Αἴγυπτος ἀγνοῦ νόματος πληρουμένη  
 φερέσβιον Δήμητρος ἀντέλλει στάχυν.

5

**1** καὶ μαθεῖν **Tz** : καταμαθῶν **Fb** : ἐκλαθῶν **x** || **2** Νεῖλος ἔνθ' ἐπτάρροος Dindorf<sup>1</sup> : ἔνθα Νεῖλος ἐπτάρρους **FTz** : ἐπτάρρους **FaFb** : ἐνθάδε **dEH** : ἐντάδε **C** || **3** κυλινδεῖ **Tz** : κυλίνδων **F** | ἐπομβροία **x** || **4** ἐν ᾧ Heath<sup>2</sup> | πυρωπὸν ... ἐκλάμψαν **F** : πυρωπὸς ἥλιος ἐκλάμψας χθονί **x** | φλόγα : φόως **FaFb** | fort. πυρωτοῦ μηνὸς ἐκλάμψασα φλόξ || **5** πετραίην **F** | αἰθάλης **Tz** || **7** ἀγγέλλει **F**

**F** = *Laur.* pl. 56,1, f. 12<sup>v</sup> (s. XIII/XIV), **Fa** = *Marc.* gr. 414, f. 136<sup>v</sup> (s. XV), **Fb** = *Vat. Urb.* gr. 107, f. 136<sup>v</sup> (s. XV); **Tz** = *Cant. Coll. Trin.* R 16,33, ad II. I 427 (s. XIV); **C** = *Par.* suppl. gr. 841, f. 238 (s. XV ex.), **d** = *Laur.* pl. 60,19, f. 220<sup>v</sup> (1503), **E** = *Laur.* pl. 60,2, f. 400 (s. XIV), **H** = *Brit. Mus. Reg.* 16 D X, ff. 255<sup>v</sup>-256<sup>v</sup> (s. XVI), **x** = **CdEH**

The text printed above is a fresh edition of verses preserved together with other poetical and doxographical fragments in *De incremento Nili*, a short collection of opinions of notable Greeks on the problem of the inundation of the Nile. The compiler is sometimes known as Anonymus Florentinus (so in *FGrHist* 647), the best ms. being a Florence miscellanea, the relevant part of which is usually dated to the late 13<sup>th</sup> or early 14<sup>th</sup> century (**F**)<sup>3</sup>. There are two apographs of **F** by

\* I would like to thank the editors and anonymous referees of «Eikasmós» for valuable information and suggestions which have been adopted to the improvement of this article. I also thank James Diggle for assistance with a palaeographic difficulty.

<sup>1</sup> *Athenaeus*, ex rec. G. D., I, Lipsiae 1827, 165.

<sup>2</sup> *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschyli, Sophoclis, Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias*, auct. B. H., Oxonii 1762, 164.

<sup>3</sup> Currently digitized at <<http://teca.bmlonline.it/ImageViewer/servlet/ImageViewer?idr=TECA-0000865892>> (f. 12<sup>v</sup>-13, accessed on 2.6.2017). A better image, later unavailable, was accessed on 5.6.2016 at <<http://mss.bmlonline.it/s.aspx?Id=AVKovHtvfJ8ZMcf2ikYE#/oro/34>>.

Michael Apostolius (**Fa**, **Fb**)<sup>4</sup>. *De incremento Nili* appears also in another (later) Florence miscellanea (**d**)<sup>5</sup> and in mss. of the epitome of Athenaeus, here **E**<sup>6</sup> and **H**<sup>7</sup> in addition to the previously edited (see below n. 10) **C**. **CdEH** are all now thought to be descendants of an identified but lost Vatican miscellaneous codex, designated **x**<sup>8</sup>. The Aeschylus fragment is cited also in John Tzetzes' *Exegesis in Iliadem*, which seems to be dependent on *De incremento Nili*<sup>9</sup> for this exegetical *scholium* (*ad Il.* I 427) but preserves an independent strain of the textual tradition of the fragment (apparently only in one ms., **Tz**).

Of the two texts preserving the fragment only selective and/or provisional editions exist to date<sup>10</sup>. To my knowledge, the readings of **d**, **E**, **H**, **Fa** and **Fb** have not

<sup>4</sup> Further removed descendants of **F** exist, primarily *Escor.* T. I. 12 (s. XVI), copied from **Fa** (cf. A. Dain, *Un manuscrit de Polyen: Le Scorialensis T-I-12*, «Emerita» XVIII, 1950, 428-434; J.M. Fernández-Pomar, *Copistas en los códices griegos escorialenses: complemento al catálogo de Revilla-Andrés*, Madrid 1986, 6). On **F** and its descendants see F. Schindler, *Die Überlieferung der Strategemata des Polyainos*, Wien 1973, 15-18, 75-85, and A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, Oxford 2004, 335-337.

<sup>5</sup> Currently digitized at <<http://teca.bmlonline.it/ImageViewer/servlet/ImageViewer?idr=TE-CA0000870058>> (ff. 220-222, accessed on 2.6.2017). A better image, later unavailable, was accessed on 5.6.2016 at <<http://mss.bmlonline.it/s.aspx?Id=AVKoV3HrfJ8ZMCf2ioHy#/oro/445>>. On this ms., which was produced by Alexios Celadenus in Rome in the first half of 1503, see D. Speranzi, *Appunti su Alessio Celadeno: anelli, stemmi e mani*, in A. Capone et al. (edd.), *Circolazione di testi e scambi culturali in Terra d'Otranto tra Tardoantico e Medioevo*, Città del Vaticano 2015, 199-221: 200-205.

<sup>6</sup> Currently digitized at <<http://teca.bmlonline.it/ImageViewer/servlet/ImageViewer?idr=TE-CA0000869548>> (ff. 400-401, accessed on 2.6.2017). A better image, later unavailable, was accessed on 5.6.2016 at <<http://mss.bmlonline.it/s.aspx?Id=AVKoVy1-fJ8ZMCf2im8P#/oro/805>>.

<sup>7</sup> Currently digitized at <[http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=royal\\_ms\\_16\\_d\\_x\\_fs-001r](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=royal_ms_16_d_x_fs-001r)> (accessed on 2.6.2017).

<sup>8</sup> On **x** and its descendants, with particular reference to the tradition of Athenaeus, see P. Canart, *Démétrius Damilas alias le Librarianus Florentinus*, «RSBN» n.s. XIV/XVI (1977/1979) 281-347: 288-292; Anna Lucia Di Lello-Finuoli, *Ateneo e Stobeo alla Biblioteca Vaticana: tracce di codici perduti*, «BBGG» n.s. LIII (1999) 13-55: 35-55; Speranzi, *l.c.*

<sup>9</sup> Or, perhaps less likely, directly on the lost work of Aristotle on which *De incremento Nili* may depend: see R. Kannicht, *Euripides. Helena*, I, Heidelberg 1969, 86; and cf. Arist. frr. 686-695 G., 246-248 R., *FGrHist* 646 T 1, FF 1f.

<sup>10</sup> **C** is edited by Dindorf (*o.c.* 163-167), and the text of Aeschylus in **Tz** by M. Papatomopoulos, *Nouveaux fragments d'auteurs anciens*, Ioannina 1980, 36. The provisional edition of **Tz** by A. Lolos (*Der unbekannt Teil der Ilias-Exegesis des Johannes Tzetzes (A 97-609)*, Königstein i.T. 1981), featuring the Aeschylus fragment on p. 120, is useless for the purposes of textual criticism, but Papatomopoulos (*Pour une nouvelle édition de l'Exégèse à l'Iliade de Jean Tzetzes*, «Dodone(philol)» XVI, 1987, 193-204) has published the parts of his collation of the ms. that correct that of Lolos. See also D.I. Iakov, *Προκαταρκτικές προτάσεις για την έκδοση της «Εξήγησις» του Τζέτζη*, «EETHess» XXII (1984) 143-189; *Προκαταρκτικές προτάσεις για την έκδοση της «Εξήγησις» του Τζέτζη, Β'*, «Hellenica» XXXVI (1985) 27-77; Ineke Sluiter, *Some notes on the edition of Tzetzes' Ilias-Exegesis*, «Mnemosyne» s. 4 XLV (1992) 482-500. **F** is

been reported before. I have looked at photographic reproductions of the relevant pages of these five mss. as well as of **F**, where discrepancies and uncertainties appear in the previous reports of the text (see n. 10). Most images are currently available online to the general public (see nn. 3, 5-7). The results presented above confirm that the text of Aeschylus in **E**, **H**, and **d** belongs to the inferior tradition found in **C**, being only insignificantly better (v. 2). On this family, for which has here been used the same siglum **x** as usually designates its lost ancestor, see further on v. 1 below. Apostolius has made fair attempts at emending the text in **Fa** and **Fb** (reported here in cases of discrepancies from their exemplar **F**), anticipating Grotius' ἐπτάρους<sup>11</sup> in v. 2 and substituting the syntactically correct φόως in v. 4 (on his καταμαθών in v. 1, see below). Stephanus did in all likelihood use **F** (and not as I initially suspected either of the known apographs) for the *editio princeps* of *De incremento Nili*<sup>12</sup>, in which case the discrepancies, which in the fragment of Aeschylus consist in transposition of vv. 5f., are the result of his own emendation.

Translation: "I also know and can laud the race of the land of Ethiopia, where the seven-flow Nile with the winds' addition of rains turns the earth, in which †shining forth the month's fiery flame† melts snow from rocks; and filled with holy flow, all of flourishing Egypt makes the life-bringing corn of Demeter rise".

Due to the mention of Ethiopia, the fragment has been attributed to the *Memnon* (so recently Sommerstein, who edits it as fr. 126a), but Herington suggested that it might as well belong to the *Danaides* («there is really no sufficient ground to assign it to any particular play»)<sup>13</sup>.

The treatment of K. Wilkens has had the misfortune of being misrepresented and/or misunderstood by Friis Johansen-Whittle (henceforth FJW) on Aesch. *Supp.* 559-561 and later entirely ignored<sup>14</sup>. Wilkens fails to draw the right conclusions

---

edited by C. Landi, *Opuscula de fontibus mirabilibus, de Nilo, etc. ex cod. Laur. 56,1 descripta*, «SIFC» III (1895) 531-548, whose reading in the fragment corrects that of Vitelli reported by A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1889<sup>2</sup>, 94 (see below on v. 3).

<sup>11</sup> *Excerpta ex tragoediis et comoediis Graecis tum quae exstant, tum quae perierunt*, emendata et Latinis versibus reddita ab H. G., Parisiis 1626, 55.

<sup>12</sup> *Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ Θεοφράστου = Aristotelis et Theophrasti scripta quaedam*, ex officina H. S. Parisiensis typographi, <Parisiis> 1557, 144-146. Di Lello-Finuoli's opinion (*o.c.* 53f.), that Stephanus, apart from **F**, also collated **d**, finds no support in his text of Aeschylus, nor, as she notes, in his text of Eur. fr. 228 K.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. A.H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus. Fragments*, London-Cambridge, Mass. 2008; C.J. Herington, *A study in the Prometheus*, «Phoenix» XVII (1963) 180-197, 236-243: 190 n. 39.

<sup>14</sup> K. Wilkens, *Tragödienstruktur und Theologie bei Aischylos*, München 1974, 154-180; H. Friis Johansen-E.W. Whittle, *Aeschylus. The Suppliants*, I-III, Copenhagen 1980. The latter apparently added their note with reference to Wilkens in II 440 at the very last minute before printing, without revising their enormous, wayward article on the same verses printed separately on pp. 442-447. But the arguments of the latter are in fact invalidated by Wilkens.

with regard to the textual constitution of the fragment (among other things accepting Nauck's lacuna after v. 3) but shows quite clearly that there is nothing problematic about the winds mentioned in v. 3 (and in *Supp.* 560, on which see below). Nor is the mentioning of winds and rain together with melting snow unique for Aeschylus, which Wilkens ought to have stated clearly (cf. 177-180). As he argues, though, the fragment describes the inundation of the Nile, explaining its causes as a combination of rain-inducing winds (πνευμάτων ἐπομβρίας) and melted snow from the mountains (τήκει πετραίαν χιόνα). I will attempt to clarify the general case before addressing the particular problems of the text.

The annual Nile flood was much debated among learned Greeks due to the oddity of its appearing in the summer, not winter. The oldest attested theory is that of Thales, who suggested that the ultimate cause of the flood are the Etesian winds, blowing from the North at the height of summer and somehow encumbering the river flow: Θαλῆς τοὺς ἐτησίαις ἀνέμους οἶεται πνέοντας τῆι Αἰγύπτωι ἀντιπροσώπους ἐπαίρειν τοῦ Νείλου τὸν ὄγκον διὰ τὸ τὰς ἐκροὰς αὐτοῦ τῆι παροιδήσει τοῦ ἀντιπαρήκοντος πελάγους ἀνακόπτεσθαι (*VS* 11 A 16 = *Aët. Dox.* IV 1,1); similarly the geographer Euthymenes of Massalia (*ap. Sen. Nat.* IV 2,22 and *De incremento Nili* 5 = *FGrHist* 647 F 1,5). The *iunctura* πνευμάτων ἐπομβρίας in our fragment follows a much improved version of the theory which added rain to the equation, coming close to what is currently seen as the correct scientific explanation (not, to be sure, North, 'Etesian' winds, but South East trade winds and monsoons bringing moisture of conflicting temperatures resulting in heavy rainfall over the Ethiopian highlands: see Lloyd on *Hdt.* II 19-27<sup>15</sup>, FJW on *Supp.* 559). The oldest known proponent of the cloud-gathering Etesian winds theory may be Thrasyalces of Thasos, inadequately edited in *VS* 35 [A] 1f., where the most comprehensive fragment is left out: καὶ Θρασυάλκης ὁ Θάσιος τοὺς ἐτησίους φησὶν ἐξωθεῖν τὸν Νεῖλον· τῆς γὰρ Αἰθιοπίας ὑψηλοῖς παρὰ τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὄρεσι διεζωσμένης ὑποδεχομένης τε τὰς νεφέλας πρὸς τῶν ἐτησίων ὠθουμένας ἐκδιδόναι τὸν Νεῖλον (*Lyd. Mens.* IV 107; cf. *Strab.* XVII 1,5). W. Capelle (in *RE* VIA/1, 1936, 566) is inclined to believe that Thrasyalces, an obscure figure τῶν ἀρχαίων φυσικῶν (*Strab. l.c.*), took his theory from Democritus, but its appearance in Aeschylus (cf. also *Supp.* 559f. cited below and fr. 303a R.<sup>2</sup> *ap. Aristid. Or.* 36,345) is evidence that it is current in the first half of the fifth century<sup>16</sup>. We should note that Ethiopia is explicitly named in the fragments of both Aeschylus and Thrasyalces. In later antiquity (Posidon. *FGrHist* 87 F 79 *ap. Strab. l.c.*), the 'wind and rain' theory of the inundation was ultimately attributed to Homer, who

<sup>15</sup> A.B. Lloyd, *Herodotus. Book II. Commentary* 1-98, Leiden 1976, 92f.

<sup>16</sup> The very obscurity of Thrasyalces might be interpreted in favour of an earlier *floruit*, due to the increase of book culture and accordingly written sources in the later classical period. One would simply have expected a notable philosopher active in the late fifth or early fourth century to be better documented.

speaks of διυπετής Αἴγυπτος, the “Zeus-fallen” or “heaven-fallen” Nile (*Od.* IV 477, 581). Aelius Aristides suggests that this theory is the majority opinion in his day or in his written sources: τὴν τῶν πολλῶν δόξαν ... οἱ φασὶν ὑεὶν περὶ τοὺς ἄνω τόπους, ὅταν ὤσιν ἐτησίαι, καὶ τὰ νέφη παρ’ ἡμῶν ἐλαυνόμενα ἐκεῖ καταρροήγυσσθαι (*Or.* 36,336; cf. 339 ταῦτα δὴ τὰ τοῦ Νεῖλου πνεύματα). The summerly north winds are mentioned also in Egyptian sources in connection with the Nile flood, so that some have looked for Egyptian influence on the Greek learned tradition, but this notion is rejected by Lloyd on *Hdt.* II 20. For further ancient sources for the debate see *Hdt.* II 19-27, Arist. *FGrHist* 646 T 1, FF 1f., Anon. *FGrHist* 647 FF 1-3, Radt on our fragment, Diels in *Doxographi Graeci*, Berolini 1879, 226-229, and *P. Oxy.* 4458 with the elucidation of Fowler<sup>17</sup>.

The winds are accordingly highly topical<sup>18</sup>. But Aeschylus refers in the fragment also to the other dominant and perhaps even more famous ancient theory of the Nile inundation, that which gives the reason as melted snow from the mountains. This may have originated with Anaxagoras (*VS* 59 A 91, cf. A 42,5) and was endorsed by the other tragedians: Eur. *Hel.* 1-3 (whose ἀντὶ δίας ψακάδος may hint at opposition to the rain-theory), fr. 228 K., Soph. fr. 882 R.<sup>2</sup> But the combination of the two theories (which are not necessarily *inter se pugnantes*, pace Radt, *ad l.* and Rösler<sup>19</sup>) is implied also in Aesch. *Supp.* 559f. λειμῶνα χιονόβοσκον ὄντ’ (or ὄν τ’?) ἐπέρχεται / Τυφῶ μένος, and is later in one version attributed to Democritus (τῆς χιόνος τῆς ἐν τοῖς πρὸς ἄρκτον μέρεσιν ὑπὸ θερινὰς τροπὰς ἀναλυομένης τε καὶ διαχεομένης νέφη μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἀτμῶν πιλοῦσθαι τούτων δὲ συνελαυνόμενων πρὸς μεσημβρίαν καὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐτησίων ἀνέμων ἀποτελεῖσθαι ῥαγδαίους ὄμβρους, ὑφ’ ὧν ἀναπίμπλασθαι τὰς τε λίμνας καὶ τὸν Νεῖλον ποταμόν, *VS* 68 A 99 = Aët. *Dox.* IV 1,4), in another to Aristotle (fr. 686 G. ~ 246A R., *ap. Phot. Bibl.* 441a-b). The *schol.* *Ap. Rh.* IV 269f. attributes a different theory to Democritus, though.

The poetical representation of the combined theory both here and in the *Supplices* is evidence that it either predates Democritus in some form (without necessarily being an innovation of Aeschylus himself) or possibly that the dating of the works of Democritus (and/or Anaxagoras<sup>20</sup>) should be revised. We cannot assume that Aëtius and other doxographical sources available to us are complete and accurate in all respects and certainly should not take them as evidence in favour of emendation of poetry which slightly contradicts details in their attributions or chronology.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. S. R., *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, III. Aeschylus, Göttingen 1985 (2010<sup>2</sup>); R.L. Fowler, *P. Oxy.* 4458: Poseidonios, «ZPE» CXXXII (2000) 133-142.

<sup>18</sup> The emendation ῥευσμάτων is to be firmly rejected but it may be noted that it appears first to have been suggested by Grotius (*l.c.*), not Vossius, to whom it is usually attributed (I. V., *Observationes ad Pomponium Melam de situ orbis*, Hagæ-Comitis 1658, 53).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. W. Rösler, *Reflexe vorsokratischen Denkens bei Aischylos*, Meisenheim 1970, 60f.

<sup>20</sup> See A.F. Garvie, *Aeschylus’ Supplices: Play and Trilogies*, Exeter 2006<sup>2</sup>, 158f.

1. If γένος refers to the race of one particular person, it may be Memnon, described by someone else (so Sommerstein). But the expression might just as well (or better) refer to the Ethiopians as a collective (as in the translation given above), uttered by a learned man who, among other things, or in addition to related matters mentioned by a previous speaker, has also learned to know (καὶ μαθὼν) this. The words might be part of an ethnographic catalogue of some sort (cf. *Supp.* 277-290). In the absence of the context, the precise nuances of μέν and καί are impossible to ascertain; γένος has also been suspected, but there are several ways in which all three words could be apposite (μέν may be *solitarium*<sup>21</sup>). We should not be beguiled by Schweighäuser's ἐκμαθὼν<sup>22</sup>, following ἐκλαθὼν in *x*, «des- sen Text», as Jacoby observed (*ad FGrHist* 647 F 1,1, in the critical apparatus), «schlecht und voll willkürlicher Änderungen ist», referring to *C*, the only ms. of this family known to him. Regarding the epitome of Athenaeus, deficiencies in the extant mss. have been attributed to a lost exemplar (i.e., *x*), which according to a hypothesis was difficult to interpret due to obscure abbreviations<sup>23</sup>, but as the text of Aeschylus in the four mss of this family is virtually identical, exhibiting the same aberrant readings<sup>24</sup>, the problem here, and maybe for the entire text of *De incremento Nili*, seems to be of another kind, perhaps indeed, as Jacoby suggested, «willkürlicher Änderungen», inept emendation, whether in *x* or earlier in this branch of the tradition. A study of the entire text of *De incremento Nili* in *dEH*, comparing it with the known texts of *C* and *F*, should produce further insight. That is to say that a proper critical edition of the text should be welcome.

For a fragment preserved by quotation, the editorial precepts *iuxta lacunam ne mutaveris* and *lectio difficilior melior* ought to be adapted into a general caution against emending its beginning in order to make it self-contained, as well as against transmitted alternative readings that effect this result, of which Apostolius' καταμαθὼν in *Fb* is another example (cf. Finglass on *Soph. El.* 256<sup>25</sup>).

3. γαῖαν: apart from the winds being wrongly suspected, most editors are adverse to the earth mentioned in this verse (Hermann's γάνος<sup>26</sup> is presented as a certain reading by LSJ<sup>9</sup> 1008 *s.v.* κολίνδω). But the intent may be innovation. Instead of rolling waves (as *per* the Homeric examples, *Od.* I 162, etc.), the Nile is rolling (turning) the earth during the famous inundation. Hermann's objection

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Denniston, *GP*<sup>2</sup> 380-384.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *Athenaei Naucraticae Deipnosophistarum libri quindecim* [...] instr. I. S., I, Argentorati 1801, 280.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *Athenaei Naucraticae Dipnosophistarum libri XV*, rec. G. Kaibel, I. *Libri I-V*, Lipsiae 1887, XV; Canart, *o.c.* 288; Di Lello-Finuoli, *o.c.* 42.

<sup>24</sup> *x* is never alone in preserving the correct reading in the fragment unless you count v. 3 κολίνδει, where *Tz* misaccentuates.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. P.J. Finglass, *Sophocles. Electra*, Cambridge 2007, 176.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. G. H., *Disputatio de Aeschyli Psychostasia*, Progr. Lipsiae 1838, 7 (= *Opuscula*, VII, Lipsiae 1839, 348).

(*l.c.*) that Aeschylus would have said ἰλόν seems pedestrian, the perspective here being wider, existential and cosmological. On the existential level, the emphasis on the sensual interaction between water and earth adds credibility to the picture of the inundation as the reason for fertility (cf. Aesch. fr. 144 R.<sup>2</sup>; see Wilkens, *o.c.* 177-179), on the cosmological one, the passage showcases the synergy of all four elements, earth, air, water and fire (see Herington, *o.c.* 190; Wilkens, *l.c.*). In both respects, γαῖαν (in contrast to ἰλόν) is perfectly apposite.

ἐπομβρίαις is the best reading, given not only by Tz, but also by F (*pace* Vitelli *teste* Nauck, who reports ἐπομβρία), as kindly confirmed to me by the paleographic expertise of James Diggle.

4f. ἐν ἧ refers back not to Ethiopia but to γαῖαν, the earth into which the melted snow is ultimately absorbed. Heath's ἐν ᾧ may be worth considering in combination with κυλίνδων (F) in v. 3; a lacuna after v. 3 (Nauck) is detrimental.

The rest of v. 4 is in great disarray in the textual tradition, but we should in particular be suspicious of the readings of x (see *ad* v. 1). Its alternative ἥλιος, hesitantly accepted by Radt and indeed by most editors and critics, is facile and looks like an intruded gloss or perhaps conjecture; μηνός represents the better tradition and would be attractive in combination with an attribute, which prompts the suggestion πυρωτοῦ μηνός ἐκλάμψασα φλόξ, “the flame of the fiery month shining forth”. This restores the normal intransitive and absolute sense of ἐκλάμπω, which to me looks like an improvement, even though the verb is found combined with an internal accusative or direct object in Eur. fr. 330,3 K. οὔτος [*scil.* ὁ αἰθήρ] ... λαμπρὸν ἐκλάμπει σέλας and fr. 472e,14f. K. The construction of λάμπω and composites with an accusative describing the light that is shone is attested five times in Euripides (also *Hel.* 1131, *Ph.* 226f., and *Ion* 82f.; see Kannicht, *o.c.*, II 291), and probably once in *Trag. adesp.* fr. 33 Sn.-K., which may well be by Euripides, but not, apart from the present corrupt reading, anywhere else in the literature of the classical period. One may well suspect it to be a Euripidean mannerism.

The month's flame of F and Tz should at least be preserved somehow, as it almost certainly refers to the proverbial heat of the Dog days, and to the star Sirius in equal measure with the sun. The Dog star is topical here, as it rises at precisely the same time as the Etesian winds in the formalized Greek calendar (cf. Eudox. *ap.* Gem. *Calend.* p. 99a). It is mentioned in conjunction with both the Nile flood and the Etesian winds by Callisth. *FGrHist* 124 F 12c, preserved immediately subsequent to the fragment of Aeschylus in *De incremento Nili*. The proverbial effect of the Dog star is regularly conflated by the poets with the actual one of the sun, as in *Ag.* 966f. φυλλὰς ... / σκιάν ὑπερτείνας Σειρίου κυνός. The star is not explicitly named here, but πυρωτοῦ μηνός would suitably indicate the *dies caniculares*, which had the approximate duration of a month and would occasionally coincide, depending on the phases of the moon, with the Attic civil month of either Hecatombaeon or Metageitnion. For the poetical expression, describing a period of the year as a ‘month’ with a certain characteristic, apparently

without reference to a specific civil month, cf. Hes. fr. 333 M.-W. φυλλοχόος μῆν (μείς Rzach<sup>27</sup>), Call. *Hec.* fr. 260,12 Pf. φυλλοχόος μείς, Ap. Rh. IV 216f.<sup>28</sup> The “month’s flame” here refers at the same time to the star, the sun, and the heat in general.

Paleographically, ἐκλάμψασα φλόξ is not too close to the paradosis, but the quality of the textual tradition seems to rule out an easy solution. The reading **φλόγα** perhaps has to be put down as an unconscious or conscious adjustment in order to join the flame with what was seen as its obvious attribute, the accusative **πυρωπὸν** or **πυρωτόν**, which may have been the initial corruption that started the process of deterioration. The corruption might have been abetted by the accusative form having replaced the nominative in the vernacular (for some less striking examples of modernizing corruption, see FJW III 387), in collusion with the *vitium Byzantinum*, which could have been triggered by the two previous verses ending with paroxytone words in the mss πυρωτ- may be preferable to -ωπ-, being *difficilior lectio* and with the cognate adjective πυρετός appearing in a seminal passage of the *Iliad* (XXII 32), where “the Dog of Orion” φέρει πολλὸν πυρετὸν δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν. For the Dog star and Dog days in archaic poetry see also Hes. *Op.* 582-587, Archil. fr. 107 W.<sup>2</sup>, Alc. fr. 347 V. (where φλόγιον appears in the context, if the reconstruction of Bergk is correct<sup>29</sup>). For the explicit mention of the Dog star in conjunction with the Etesian winds, see Eudox. *l.c.*, Arist. *Mete.* 361b-362a, Clodius Tuscus *ap. Lyd. Ost.* 65<sup>30</sup>.

An alternative way of following the lead of the better ms. tradition was suggested by Burges<sup>31</sup> with the emendation γλῆνος, considered «probable» by LSJ<sup>9</sup> 351 s.v. Together with F ἐκλάμψαν, this would align the construction with that of Eur. fr. 330,3 K. However, the emendation removes the attractive reference to a month of the year, and while glossed φάος by Hesychius, the attested instances of γλῆνος, invariably in the plural, mean ‘precious things’ (*Il.* XXIV 192), ‘money’, perhaps with reference to coins (*schol. Il. l.c.*), ‘stars’ (Arat. 318), and, like the cognate word γλήνη, ‘eyeballs’ (Nic. *Th.* 228). This suggests that the ‘light’ attested by Hesychius as a possible meaning of the word (and exemplified by Aratus with the reference to stars) should be of a delicate kind, as in ‘gleam’, ‘glint’ (cf.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *Hesiodi carmina, accedit Homeri et Hesiodi Certamen*, rec. A. R., Lipsiae 1902, 404.

<sup>28</sup> The *dies caniculares* do not seem to be referred to explicitly as a ‘month’ elsewhere in Greek, but it may be interesting to compare the Swedish expression *rötmånad* (where *röt-* in the preserved tradition from the 17<sup>th</sup> century onwards is understood as cognate with English *rot*, not *red*).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. T. B., *De aliquot fragmentis Sapphonis et Alcaei*, «RhM» n.F. III (1835) 209-231: 219-221.

<sup>30</sup> Further references to the Dog star in Greek literature are supplied by Otta Wenskus, *Astronomische Zeitangaben von Homer bis Theophrast*, Stuttgart 1990, 176.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *Αἰσχύλου τραγωδιοποιῶν λείψανα = Aeschyli quae supersunt fabulae et fragmenta. Supplices*, rec. G. B., Londini 1821, 154 (*ad Supp.* 559).



also Hesych. γ 589 L. and *Et.M.* 232,40f. s.v. γλαϊνοί or γλαῖνοι, glossing τὰ λαμπρόσματα τῶν περικεφαλαίων, οἷον ἀστέρες). The word γλῆνος to all appearances emphasizes the ornamental quality of illuminated reflective surfaces or minor sources of light, and seems inappropriate as a poetical periphrasis of the sun, especially in a context where, as subject of τήκει and ἐκλάμψαν φλόγα, its pertinent quality is not its light but its intense heat.

**5f. εὐθαλής** is correct<sup>32</sup>, **πᾶσα ... / Αἴγυπτος** being proper use of the name with specific reference to the land watered by the Nile, the surrounding desert being ‘Libya’, ‘Arabia’, ‘Ethiopia’ (see R. Pietschmann, in *RE* I, 1894, 981). Αἴγυπτος may also refer to the river itself (cf. *Od.* IV 477, etc., cited above). Still in the fourth century AD, Hellenophones living near the Dakhla Oasis in the Roman province Aegyptus speak of going away to and coming from Egypt with reference to the Nile valley (cf. *P. Kell. G.* 23,20, 76,16, 81,5)<sup>33</sup>.

Department of Linguistic, Literary and Aesthetic Studies  
University of Bergen

PÄR OLA SANDIN  
Par.Sandin@uib.no

### *Abstract*

Aesch. fr. 300 R.<sup>2</sup> is edited following inspection of F and some formerly uncollated sources in photographic reproduction, including three mss related to C. Landi’s reading ἐπομβροίαις in F is confirmed. Some formerly unknown emendations by Michael Apostolius are unearthed. C’s tradition is so inferior that its readings are inherently suspect. The fragment depicts the Nile inundation as the combined result of snow melting in the mountains and rains induced by the Etesian winds. Either theory of the origin of the inundation occurs frequently in the doxographical tradition; the combined one, hinted at also in *Supp.* 559f., is elsewhere attributed to Democritus and Aristotle. The “month’s flame” in v. 4 refers to the heat of the *dies caniculares* period that coincides with the Etesian winds, alluding to the star Sirius. Read perhaps πυρωτοῦ μηνὸς ἐκλάμψασα φλόξ.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. J. Diggle, rec. Papathomopoulos, *Nouveaux fragments* cit., «CR» n.s. XXXII (1982) 90.

<sup>33</sup> See K.A. Worp, *Greek Papyri from Kellis*, I. Nos. 1-90, Oxford 1995, 199.

