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These epigrams are all modelled on A.P. IX 99 (Leonidas of Tarentum) = Gow-Page, *Hell. Ep.* 2161 ff., in which the poet exploits the popular belief that the sacrifice of certain animals is a just punishment for offences against the god concerned. In strongly ironic vein a goat which has eaten vine-shoots is warned by the vine itself that the stock will survive to produce wine that will be used for the libation when the goat is sacrificed to Dionysus 1).


Λάθριον έρπηστήν σκολίῳν πόδα, κισσή, χορέσας
δέσμευς δ' οὖχ ἦμας, διέκεισ δ' σέ. τίς γὰρ ἔλιοτο
κισσόν ἐπὶ κροτάφους, μὴ κεράσας Βρόμον;

The variation on Leonidas' theme achieved by Philip is unique in that the vine's enemy here is not an animal but a plant. Nevertheless the structure of the epigram is very closely modelled on that of Leonidas' poem and scholars have long seen that the same irony is to be found in the point. Cf. the comment of Jacobs (*ad loc.)*: "Quis enim te, nisi in compotationibus, coronis adhibeat? Quodsi me enecas, tu quoque tuo honore privaberis".

1) The same incident is recounted by Euenus, A.P. IX 75 and Aesop 404 Halm: see Gow-Page in their introduction to Leonidas' epigram. On the punishment of the goat see also Virgil *Georg.* II 380 ff. *non aliam ob culpam Baccho caper omnibus aris / caeditur*, with Servius' comment; Ovid *Fast.* I 353 ff., a passage which includes a translation of Euenus' epigram and where Bömer gives further material; *RE* s.v. Ziege, XIX 423, 65 ff. At *Fast.* I 349 ff. the pig is similarly said to be sacrificed for offences against Ceres; cf. *Met.* XV 111 ff.
Gow-Page read ἐλοις' ἦν 2) but the emendation is unnecessary. The optative without ἀν is regular in rhetorical questions introduced by τίς, as is demonstrated by Barrett ad Eur. Hipp. 1186, with further examples from tragedy. Cf. Gow, Theocritus, Id. II, 34, Legrand, *Etude sur Théocrite*, 303 3). Therefore Planudes has here preserved the correct reading 4).

Agathias, *A.P.* VI 72

Εἶδον ἐγὼ τὸν πτῶχα καθήμενον ἐγγύς ὅπόρης
βαστάδος, πουλῦν βότρυν ἀμεργύμενον;
ἀγρονύμω δ' ἀγόρευσα, καὶ ἑδρακεν ἀπροδῆς δὲ
ἐγκαθάφειν πλήξας ἐξεκύλισε λίθῳ.
ἐλπη δὲ καὶ χαίρων ὁ γεωπόνος: "Ἀ τάχα Βάλχω
λοιβῆς καὶ θεόν μικτὸν ἐδώκα γέρας".

Scholars have not been able to understand the force of δὲ καὶ in line 5, with the result that some have emended away καὶ: Maas conjectured καγκαλόων (which is accepted by Beckby), Stadtmüller καγκάζων. Waltz and Viansino 5) preserve the reading of the manuscripts, but fail to see that the words δὲ καὶ play an important part in the structure of the epigram.

δὲ καὶ means 'aber auch', 'aber sogar': Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (1971) s.v. δὲ 4a, quoting Ev. Matt. X 30 ὅμων δὲ καὶ αὐτὲς τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαν ἥμισυμενα εἴσι, Ev. Luc. XVI 22, Ev. Ioh. XVIII 2, al. That is to say, δὲ καὶ is used by the narrator to alert the reader to a surprising or significant fact which follows. Cf. in Agathias, *A.P.* VII 551, 1-3:

Ἀγαθός καὶ Παῦλος ἀδελφῶν ἄμφω ἔντε
ξυνὴν μὲν βίτον συζυγίνην ἑχέτην,
ξυνὰ δὲ καὶ Μοίρης λαχέτην λίνα . . .

2) They attribute the emendation to Jacobs.
3) The use of the optative without ἀν is dealt with more fully by Professor Giangrande in *Vierunddreissig Epigramme*, Grazer Beiträge 7 (1978), 57-89.