The passages quoted from περὶ ὑψοῦς follow D. A. Russell’s Oxford edition (1968), except where otherwise noted. The critical apparatus supplied is based on Russell’s. Other Greek or Latin quotations are taken from Oxford or Teubner editions.

For ease of reference, the author of περὶ ὑψοῦς is called Longinus. “MS”, referring to the manuscripts of περὶ ὑψοῦς, means Codex Parisinus graecus 2036.

The translations given of the passages from περὶ ὑψοῦς are my own. They are rather crude, aiming primarily at closeness of word-order and syntax.

4.4

In Chapter 4, Longinus inquires into τὸ ψυχρόν. He quotes Xenophon and Plato to show that even the greatest may be victims of this vice, if they fall into the temptation of μικροχαρῆ, i.e. petty wordplay.


The theses in this article were originally presented at Prof. Jerker Blomqvist’s instructive Roman Athens seminars (Athens, 4–8 March 1996). I am grateful to all the participants in those seminars. I am especially grateful to Dr. Karin Blomqvist, my tutor and examiner on the preparatory courses for the paper. Her help, support and criticism made it possible. I would also like to thank Prof. Staffan Fogelmark, who read an earlier version of the text and supplied beneficial criticism.

1 Xen. Resp. Lac. 3.5.
2 οὐδὲν Immisch: οὐδὲν MS.
3 οὐδὲν Immisch.
4 ὡς ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, κτίσω καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἀριστείδις τοῦ Ἀριστείδειος ἡμείδίζων τὸ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς> ιταμένοι... ex. gr. supp. Russell, similé Cibet.
5 H. I. 225.
(The text contains a conjecture by Immisch and differs slightly from the Oxford edition: see notes 2–4.)

Translation

The former writes in “The Constitution of the Lacedaemonians”: “from those you would hear less sound than from the marbles, less would you make their eyes turn than the bronzes’, more bashful would you consider them than even the eyes’ very maidens.” As Amphicrates and not Xenophon had it befitted to call the pupils in our eyes “bashful maidens”; by Heracles, to reason oneself into believing that all men’s pupils are modest, when they say nothing reveals some people’s shamelessness as the eyes’ boldness! “You wine-heavy drunk, with the eyes of a dog”, he says.

(1)

In the last three lines of 4.4, there is a difficulty regarding a sentence and a half (ὅπου φῶσιν κ.τ.λ.). If one tries to read the passage without emendations, the problems will probably start with ἵταμον, and the quotation following abruptly. Reading the sentence as it is given in the MS (cf. note 8), it might at first seem natural to read οὐδένι as an instrumental dative: “in no way does someone’s shamelessness show so much as in the eyes.” But the rest would be hard to reconcile with this reading.

I assume that the MS is in some places corrupt. Many conjectures have already been proposed. Some of the most attractive make a supplement, assuming one whole line has fallen out in transcription (see note 4).

The version given above, however, is Immisch’s conjecture. οὐδένι is changed to οὐδέν, and an article τό is placed before ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἱταμόν. This may appear a bold emendation, but there are some arguments which support it.

(a) I think <τό> ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἱταμόν should be read, with ἱταμόν in an emphasized position at the end of a sentence. It would be meant as an ironic contrast to, and a rhythmical reiteration of, the earlier similar expressions τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς παρθένων and τῶς ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν κόρας. I give it here with these expressions in italics, to try to give a feeling of the rhythm that the text ought to have:

“...αἰδημονεστέρους δ’ ἂν αὐτοίς ἡγησαί καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς παρθένων.” Ἀμφικράτει καὶ οὐ Ξενοφῶντι ἔπρεπε τός ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν κόρας λέγειν παρθένους αἰδήμονοις οὖν δὲ Ἡράκλεις ἐν τοῖς ἰπάντων ἐξῆς κόρας αἰσχυντικῶς εἶναι πεπείθθαι, ὅπου φῶσιν οὐδέν οὕτως ἐνσημαίνεσθαι τὴν τινα ἀναιδείαν ὡς τό ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἱταμόν. “οἰνοβαρές, κυνὸς ὀμματ’ ἔχον” φησίν.

The quoted text (which differs slightly from the extant MSS of Xenophon) plays on the double meaning of the word κόρη, which may mean “girl” or “pupil”. For the sake of literary effect, it changes κόρη for παρθένους, which is not normally used in the meaning of “pupil”.
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το ιταμόν in the eyes is sarcastically contrasted with τον παρθένον above. Even stylistically it would be an amusing contrast; compare the ending clauses of the sentences!

(b) ἔνσημα ἄνεσθαι seems normally to be transitive in the sense of "indicate", "show" (see Isoc. 20.22, X.Cyr. VIII.2.3). LSJ gives the above passage as the sole example of a middle/passive form of the verb intransitive in sense, except for a papyrus (POxy. 396) in which the aorist is used.

(c) οὐδὲν for οὐδένι is probable; the expression οὐδὲν οὕτως ... ὡς occurs twice in peri άψως, 8.4 and 41.1. οὐδένι does not occur elsewhere.

(d) According to Rhys Roberts' transcription,⁸ the MS has an acute accent on ιταμόν, which strengthens the thesis that earlier it had an emphasized position at the end of a sentence.

Corruptions in texts are not bound to follow rational, easily explainable patterns, but I may perhaps offer this explanation: ὡς τό ἐν becomes ὡστε ἐν, altered by the hand of someone who did not really follow the meaning of the text, but dimly conceived of οὐδὲν οὕτως ... ὡστε ("nothing shows ἀνοιχθεῖον so much that in the eyes ιταμόν"). Some other scribe tried unsuccessfully to make sense of this by deleting τε and adding ι to οὐδέν.

(2)

Stating that pupils are not intrinsically ἀδήμονες, Longinus at the same time hints that girls are hardly intrinsically bashful either. The keyword is Ἡρώκλεις. Elsewhere, Longinus exclusively invokes Zeus in his oaths, of which there are quite a few. Although this is another type of oath, where νῆ Δία or μὰ Δία would not have been adequate, choosing to invoke Heracles in this context, with κόρα and παρθένοι and ἀνοιχθεῖα all around, Longinus would know that his contemporary Roman or Greek reader would associate it with the legends of Heracles' love-life: "By Heracles! to believe that everybody's girls are bashful."⁹ Legends of Hercules were very well known among the Romans, as Galinsky (128) observes. I shall venture to propose that Longinus had one particular legend in mind when he wrote the words οἷον δὲ Ἡρώκλεις το τόσο ἀπάντων ἐξῆς κόρας ἀσχαντήλας εἶναι πεπείσθαι, namely the one about Heracles and the fifty daughters of king Thespius (or Thestius).

---

⁷ A similar construction is found in 32.5, where οὐκ ἄλλο τι is substituted for οὐδέν, but otherwise fulfills exactly the same function in the sentence.
⁸ In his apparatus criticus, Rhys Roberts presents this transcription from Parisinum 2036: τῆν τιναν ἰνόδεσθαι ὡς ἐν τοῖς ὦφολισμοῖς ἰταμόν σινοβρασί.
⁹ Longinus, as if wanting to show Xenophon how to do his job, follows his example of playing on the meaning of the word κόρη.
Pausanias relates it, and his account suggests that the fable was popular: he had heard two versions (IX.27.6–7):

καὶ Ἡρακλέους Θεσπεύδσαν ἔστιν ἱερόν: ἱεράται δὲ αὐτοῦ παρθένος, ἔστιν ἐν ἔπλαθῃ τὸ χρεών αὐτήν. αὕτην δὲ τούτου φασίν εἶναι τοιόνδε, Ἡρακλέα ταῖς θυγατράσι πεντήκοντα οὖσας ταῖς Θεσπίοις συγγενέσθαι πόσαι πλὴν μίας ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτί τούτῃ δὲ οὖκ ἐθελήσατο οἱ τῇ μίαν μιχθήναι. ** * νομίζοντα δικάσαι μένειν παρθένον πάντα αὐτήν τὸν βίον ἱερώμενην αὐτῷ. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἦκουσα μὲν καὶ ἄλλον λόγον, ὡς διὰ πασῶν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς τῶν Θεσπίοι παρθένων διεξέλθοι τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτί, καὶ ὃς ἄρσενος παῖδας αὐτῷ πόσα τέκοιεν, διδύμος δὲ ἢ τε νεωτάτη καὶ ἢ πρεσβυτάτη.

Other authors’ versions of this legend vary slightly in details, but their main theme is the same. Here are, exempli gratia, nine authors between the late first century B.C. and the early third century A.D. who either give a full account of the story or just refer or allude to it. They are selected from the instances given in Roscher (s.v. Thespius et Thespiades): Diodorus Siculus IV.29; Pseudo-Seneca, Herc. Oet. 369–370; Apollodorus II.4.10 and II.7.8;10 Statius, Silvae III.1.39–43; Theon, Progymnas. in Rhet. Graec. 2, p. 67; Spen- gel; Harpocratio 1, p. 278, 15, Dindorf; Pausanias IX.27.6–7; Clement of Alexandria, Protrept. II.33.4; Athenaeus XIII.556.E-F.

The two Latin poets strengthen the thesis that educated Romans in general were familiar with Hercules’ pursuits, even this particular one: they refer to the legend very briefly.11

Finally, the expression τὸ τῶν ἀπάντων ἐξῆς κόρος αἰσχυντιλός εἶναι contains some expressive hints. ἐξῆς had originally, in Homer and later, the explicit meaning of “one after another,” “in order,” “in a row,” which has a bearing on the Thespius myth. And αἰσχυντιλός may have the meaning “shameful”, referring to things.12

Longinus would thus know that this call to Hercules in connexion with “everybody’s virgins in a row” would make Postumius smile. They were indeed both familiar with the story and might even have read one or another of the versions listed above, although this may never be proved.13

---

10 Apollodorus lists the names of all (in his version 51) the sons of Hercules who were begotten on Thespius’ daughters.
12 For this observation I am indebted to Dr. Karin Blomqvist.
13 It may be mentioned that Matrix, the Hellenistic rhetorician whom Longinus censures in 3.2, wrote an ἐγχείομεν Ἡρακλέος (Athenaeus X.412.B), in which this adventure of the Hero may well have appeared.
9.10-9.11

Longinus has just quoted II. XVII, 645–647, where Ajax begs for light, which is needed to get on with the battle—light, even if Zeus is to destroy him in it. Longinus praises Ajax’ heroic courage and goes on:

&ως οτι ταχυτα αιτεται, ως παντος της ορετης ευρησαν εντατης αξιων, και αυτω ζευς αντιπατητης. άλλα γαρ ομηρος μεν &ενθοδε ουρος συνεμπνει τοις ογασι, και ουκ άλλο τι αυτωσ πεπονθεν &ή

μαίνεται, ως οτι ’Αρης έγχεσας ὁ ολον πυρ

ουρος μαίνεται, βοθες έν τάφεσιν άλης,

άφλοσμός δε περι στόμα γίγνεται.15

δείκνυσι δ’ ομως δια της ’Οδυσσείας (και γαρ ταύτα πολλών ένεκα προσεπηθε’

αριτέον), ότι μεγάλης δύνασις ὑποδερμένης ήδη ίδιον έστιν έν γήρα το φιλό-

μονθον.

Translation

... he demands light as fast as possible, so as to find, at any price, a burial worthy of his virtue, even if Zeus should oppose him. But Homer breathes favourably there with the combatants. And he suffers not otherwise than

rages, as when Ares wielding his spear or ravaging fire

rages in the mountains, in the thickets of a deep forest,

and foam comes round his mouth.

All the same, he shows throughout the Odyssey (because this too is for many reasons worth looking into) that a characteristic of a great nature in decline in old age is the love of stories.

The position of &μεν after ’Ομηρος in the MS has caused some confusion. It has been regarded as preparatory for δείκνυσι δ’, and scholars of old have therefore re-arranged the word-order and otherwise conjectured the words (see note 14 for two examples), so as to produce a sense of comparison between the Iliad and the Odyssey. Later commentators, however, have wanted to maintain the word-order. De Vries, Bühler (41f.) and Russell (1964) argue for the text as it stands (cf. also Rothstein’s suggestion, 540).

Still the common ground for their readings—shared by the earlier ones of Wilamowitz et al.—is the anxiety to retain, already at this stage in the text, an antithesis (expressed in a &μεν ...δε complex) between the Iliad and the Odyssey. The argument of de Vries, Bühler and Russell is that Homer is given special emphasis as being more of his “true self” in the Iliad and that &μεν therefore “ent gegen seiner logischen Zugehörigkeit hinter das erste Substantiv vorgerückt ist” (Bühler 41, referring, like de Vries, to Denniston 372-373,

15 II. XV, 605–607.

Eranos 94
where transpositions of μέν in μέν ... δέ complexes are described), μέν in their reading “logically” goes with ἐνθάδε. Translations put the primary emphasis on “here” in the text; “here”, as opposed to “in the Odyssey”, e.g. Russell (1964): “But here it is the real Homer...”; cf. Rhys Roberts, Müller, Hoogland, Rostagni, Fyfe, Lebègue, Brandt, Russell (1972) and Fyfe & Russell. Mazucchelli's translation is perhaps more neutral: “Ma se qui Omero spirasse propizio alle battaglie...”, but he does not elucidate the passage in his commentary. I think the main emphasis should be on Homer, as is evident in my translation (see above).

The division into chapters has been misleading in this case. The beginning of sub-chapter 9.11, ἄλλα γὰρ ὁμηρὸς μέν, does not in fact introduce the new subject of Iliad vs. Odyssey, but follows up the preceding passage. The μέν clause is contrasted with the preceding, not the following, a usage especially common in the combination ἄλλα ... μέν (see Denniston (377)).

The overlooked word is οὐρος. This is an epithet of Zeus (see Roscher s.v. Urios et Zeus) and LSJ (s.v. οὐρος): “Zeus οὐρος as sending fair winds, i.e. conducting things to a happy issue”).

The contrast looked for is then to be found between Homer and Zeus. Zeus is in the end of chapter 9.10 portrayed as hostile: “...even if Zeus should oppose him”. He is thus contrasted with Homer, who is given an epithet that normally befalls Zeus in a good mood. Zeus may be displeased, but Homer is οὐρος in his place here: ... κἂν αὐτῷ ζεὺς ἀντιτάτηται, ἄλλα γὰρ ὁμηρὸς μέν ἐνθάδε οὐρος συνεμπνεῖ τοῖς οἰκείοις ...

Still δέικνυσι δ’ οὕμως κ.τ.λ. clearly contrasts with what has been said before. οὕμως (“all the same”) is adversative to the whole passage about Homer, but especially the quotation, where he is described as “raging”; certainly Longinus there alludes to the Platonic theories of poetical creation. The inspired poet is contrasted with the story-telling old man. But δ’ may be seen as simply connective, having no relation to the μέν earlier, while οὕμως is the sole adversative in the sentence.
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