On the Text of ps.-Oppian, *Cynegetica*

Giuseppe Giangrande

IN the following pages I shall explain certain passages of the *Cynegetica* which so far have not been understood. For the sake of brevity I expect the reader to have read Schmitt's monograph[1] before proceeding to this discussion.

I 26f.   Λείψομεν, ὡς κελέαι τὰ cὰ βάζειν, νύκτερα θύcθλα·
δηθάκις ἀμφεχόρευcα Θυωναίῳ Διονύcῳ.

The reading τὰ cὰ βάζειν is the opposite of 'unverständlich', as the commentators so far have believed.[2] The sense is: "I shall leave Bacchus' nocturnal rites (λείψομεν νύκτερα θύcθλα) because you are ordering me to sing (ὡς κελέαι βάζειν) things which are of concern to you (τὰ cά)." For λείψομεν= 'omit to sing' cf. e.g. *Cyn* 2.586, 605; for βάζειν as used here cf. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* 587.5, already quoted by Boudreaux in his apparatus; κέλομαι governs here an infinitive (βάζειν) as usual in Homer;[3] the phrase τὰ cὰ βάζειν corresponds to τὰ δ' ἐν φρεcὶ cῇcι μενοινᾷc . . . λέξομεν in lines 22f: both phrases refer to the order given by the goddess in lines 20f.

I 29   μηδὲ μόθουc μερόπων, μή μοι Βροτολοιγὸν ἀείδῃc

The reading μή ἀείδῃc commands acceptance for two reasons. First of all, the employment of prohibitive μή with the second person singular of the present subjunctive is a Homeric rarity;[4] the reproduction of Homeric rarities was cultivated by late epic poets[5] no less sedulously than by their Hellenistic colleagues. Secondly, the construction under discussion, blamed by grammarians ancient and modern as a

---

[1] W. Schmitt, *Kommentar zum ersten Buch von Pseudo-Oppians Kynegetika* (diss. Münster 1969), hereafter cited as SCHMITT (cf. my review, *CR* n.s. 22 [1972]).

[2] *Cf.* Schmitt *ad loc.*

[3] *Cf.* C. Capelle, *Vollständiges Wörterbuch . . . des Homeros*[9] (Leipzig 1889) *s.v.* κέλομαι "mit blossem Infinitiv," and *cf. e.g. Cyn.* 1.134.

[4] *Cf.* H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum* I (Leipzig 1885) *s.v.* μή VII.2 (c), p.1088, quoting *Od.* 18.10, a rarity ignored by D. B. Monro, *Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*[2] (Oxford 1891) 255.

[5] *Cf. e.g.* W. Weinberger, *Quaestiones de Orphei quae feruntur Argonauticis* (Vienna 1891) 259; F. Vian, *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris 1959) 201 ("raretés homériques").

'solecism', is in fact well attested in late poetry (*e.g.* Eratosth. 35.8f Powell, *Anth.Pal.* 12.16.1: *cf.* Steph. *TGL*³ ed. Hase-Dindorf *s.v.* μή, V.953D). Since ps.-Oppian is known to have indulged in syntactical solecisms (*cf.* R. Keydell, *RE* 18 [1939] 707.1–10 *s.v.* OPPIANOS 2), there is no reason why we should eliminate μὴ ἀείδῃc here, seeing that the solecism in question, far from being 'unsicher' (so Schmitt *ad loc.*), is shared by him with other late poets. It could in fact well be that both the reasons indicated by me are not mutually exclusive, in the sense that ps.-Oppian deliberately used the construction under discussion as a 'solecism' which was justified in Epic upon Homer's authority.[6]

I 89   τοὔνεκά μοι δέμαc ὧδε κεραccάμενοι φοιτώντων

The variant φοιτώντων is genuine, whereas φορέοιεν, which Schmitt, Mair and others prefer, has not a leg to stand on. It is easy to explain φορέοιεν as a syntactical trivialization prompted by the desire to assimilate to the contiguous optatives (ἴοιεν, ἐπικραδάοιεν, etc.) the imperative φοιτώντων (used by the ps.-Oppian in variation with the optatives in question, just as he used the imperative ἔcτων in line 81),[7] whereas it would be difficult to explain why anyone should have replaced φορέοιεν by an imperative, if φορέοιεν were what the poet had originally written. φοιτώντων is not only supported by the *usus auctoris* as I have illustrated, but also stylistically *difficilior*, therefore *potior*. φοιτώντων is used here by the poet "of young men *strutting about* to show their persons" (*cf.* Eur. fr.282.11, quoted in LSJ *s.v.* φοιτάω I.1), and δέμαc is internal accusative[8] governed by κεραccάμενοι, whereas the construction δέμαc φορέοιεν is in itself common and here, therefore, a banalization. Once and for all I wish to point out that trivialization is known to have often affected ps.-Oppian's text (*cf. e.g.* Schmitt p.54); as for the line under discussion, the diaskeuast utilized *Cyn.* 1.200 or 2.107 for his trivialization φορέοιεν.

I 104   ἠχὴ τριβομένων cτιβαροῖc ὑπὸ ποccὶ πεδίλων

The variant λιπαροῖc, preferred by Schmitt and Mair, is an evident

---

[6] For such cases in late epic, *cf.* E. Oldenburger, *De oraculorum Sibyllinorum elocutione* (Rostock 1903) 16f.

[7] *Cf.* also *Cyn.* 1.393–401: μελέcθω ... ἐπιμίcγεο ... κεράcειαc ... τεκμήραιντο ... πελέcθω. The *usus auctoris* shows that ps.-Oppian liked to mix imperatives with optatives.

[8] This type of accusative was *usitatissimus* by the Oppiani: *cf.* O. Schmidt, *De elocutione Oppiani Apameensis* (Jena 1866) 47, and *e.g. Cyn.* 1.295, 3.185, 4.26.

trivialization. Schmitt defends λιπαροῖc on the ground that ποccὶ δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροῖcιν . . . πέδιλα (Il. 2.44, 10.22, 10.132, 14.186, Od. 2.4, etc.) is a 'geläufig' Homeric phrase: but the point is precisely that ps.-Oppian, in adherence to the epic canon of imitatio cum variatione, in alluding to this Homeric phrase (the allusion is 'deutlich', to put it with Schmitt) changed[9] Homer's λιπαροῖcιν into cτιβαροῖc. The presence of cτιβαροῖc in ps.-Oppian's line is therefore easy to explain in so far as it is perfectly in keeping with the epic canon in question, and conversely the intrusion of λιπαροῖc as a trivialization aimed at restoring to ps.-Oppian's line the orthodox Homeric form is equally understandable. Apart from the canon just mentioned, another factor, i.e. the context, proves that cτιβαροῖc is genuine: 'stout' (cτιβαροῖc) is the suitable epithet for feet which, on account of their weight, cause the sandals to make a noise by grating on the soil, whereas 'sleek' or 'smooth' (λιπαροῖc) is contextually incongruous.[10] The epithet λιπαροῖc was introduced because a diaskeuast not only wanted to substitute the orthodox Homeric epithet for the one used by ps.-Oppian but also thought that cτιβαροῖc was contradicted by ποccὶν ἐλαφρίζοντα in line 85. There is in reality no contradiction: ps.-Oppian says that the hunter must be neither too fat (81 μάλα πίονεc, 86 πιαλέοι) nor over-light (λεπταλέοι 87); he must be of the correct stoutness which renders him strong, cθεναρόc (90). cτιβαροῖc ποccί ('stout, strong[11] feet') is paralleled by cθεναρῶν ὤμων ('strong shoulders') in line 100. ἐλαφρίζω does not mean 'be light' as a permanent quality, but 'use one's limbs in a light, swift manner, when circumstances require' (cf. e.g. Callim. Del. 115, Opp. Hal. 3.300): ps.-Oppian says in line 85 that the hunter must be able to use his feet lightly often (δηθάκιc 84) when pursuing wild beasts, not that the hunter must have feet permanently light (and weak) by nature.[12]

I 129   χείματι δ' ἐν μεcάτῳ μέcον ἥματοc ἀγρώccοιο

---

[9] On imitatio cum variatione practised de industria by ps.-Oppian cf. K. Lehrs, Quaestiones epicae (Regimontii Prussorum 1837) 308.

[10] In sum, the diaskeuast, in importing into ps.-Oppian's line the epithet λιπαροῖc from Homer's phrase quoted above, did not realize that the epithet, whereas appropriate in Homer's phrase, is inapposite in ps.-Oppian's sentence. For an analogous example of inapposite intervention by a diaskeuast cf. my discussion of Cyn. 1.149.

[11] cτιβαρόc means at the same time 'ponderosus' (i.e. 'stout') and 'robustus': cf. Steph. TGL³ s.v.

[12] Stoutness is synonymous with strength, and leanness denotes weakness, in the Cynegetica: cf. Cyn. 3.350 (καρτερόν, εὔcαρκον), 2.106 (λιπόcαρκοι κτλ.).

The reading μέcον ἤματοc, also supported by metrical reasons (*cf.* Schmitt p.93) is sound. Phrases like μέcον ἡμέραc, μέcον ἤματοc have already been studied by Lobeck, *Phrynichus* p.54. In such phrases, μέcον is not prepositional (as in the cases studied in Blass-Debrunner § 215.3 and quoted by Schmitt *ad loc.*): it is a substantivized neuter (= 'the middle'), as demonstrated by the context (*cf.* Plut. *Cleom.* 37.5 μέcον ἡμέραc ἦν, a phrase frequent in Xenophon, *cf.* F. W. Sturz, *Lex. Xenophonteum* (Leipzig 1803) *s.v.* μέcοc 1 [d]). In the line under discussion the substantivized neuter μέcον is an accusative denoting a point of time (literally 'at the *middle* of the day'). Such accusatives are common in Hellenistic Epic,[13] and it is known that ps.-Oppian employed this Hellenistic peculiarity.[14]

I 149ff   ἔντεα τ' εὐθήροιο μέγα πνείοντα φόνοιο,
    ἄρκυας εὐcταλέαc τε λίνουc ταναόν τε πάναγρον
    δίκτυά τε cχαλίδαc τε βρόχων τε πολύcτονα δεcμά

As a variant to εὐcταλέαc τε λίνουc there exists εὐcτρεφέαc τε λύγουc. λίνουc is regarded by most scholars as genuine, because the poet is talking about nets, not about twigs: λίνουc evidently denotes a type of net (*cf.* λίνοc=τὸ δίκτυον, quoted by ancient lexicographers, Steph. *TGL*³ *s.v.* λίνοc, V.310D). Besides, the reading λίνουc is supported by paraphrasis (*cf.* Boudreaux's apparatus *ad loc.*), and it is evident— although nobody seems to have noticed this—that the poet's λίνουc ταναόν τε πάναγρον is aimed at producing a 'Klangwirkung' with Hom. *Il.* 5.487 λίνου ἁλόντε πανάγρου. What has hitherto caused difficulties is the epithet εὐcταλέαc. I shall demonstrate that the epithet is felicitous: nets had to be made of *light* thread (*cf.* Xen. *Cyn.* 2.4 ἄρκυc . . . λεπτοῦ λίνου . . . δίκτυα), and εὐcταλέαc (= 'light') is therefore perfectly appropriate. Note the neat metaphor: the tools of the hunter are being compared by the poet to war equipment, and τὸ εὐcταλὲc πρὸc πόλεμον (Hdn. 3.8.5) denotes precisely light military equipment. The reading εὐcτρεφέαc λύγουc is a typically diaskeuastic (*i.e.* learned) 'correction': the diaskeuast could not understand the sense of the epithet εὐcταλέαc in the context any more than modern critics did, and was misled by line 151 (δίκτυά τε cχαλίδαc) into thinking that line 150 required not λίνουc but, by parallelism with cχαλίδαc (*cf.* Schmitt *ad*

---

[13] *Cf. e.g.* Mooney *ad* Ap.Rhod. 1.278 (also *ad* Ap.Rhod. 2.1251, where ἕcπερον='at even'); V. J. Loebe, *De elocutione Arati Solensis poetae* (Halle 1864) 41.

[14] Schmidt, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 48.

loc.), something denoting wooden props; so he borrowed εὐcτρεφέαc λύγουc from Homer (*Od.* 9.427), forgetting that net-props must be the opposite of 'easily twisted' (εὐcτρεφέαc) for they must be *stiff* and stand upright (*cf.* Xen. *Cyn.* 2.7ff). In sum, the epithet εὐcτρεφέαc, which the diaskeuast borrowed from Homer, is as contextually inappropriate at *Cyn.* 1.150 as the epithet λιπαροῖc, which the diaskeuast borrowed from Homer at *Cyn.* 1.104.

I 166f   ἵππων δ' αἰόλα φῦλα ὅc' ἔθνεα μυρία φωτῶν,
           ὅcca βροτοῖcι γένεθλα δεδμημένα cῖτον ἔδουcιν.[15]

Once more, a trivialization (δεδαcμένα) has been preferred by critics. The reading δεδμημένα, neglected by most editors, is obviously correct: it means 'tamed', 'not wild', *i.e.* 'civilized', and pointedly refers to the fact that civilized peoples eat cῖτοc, in opposition to savage tribes who eat flesh only (*cf.* LSJ *s.v.* cῖτοc 2). Ancient diaskeuasts were just as much puzzled by ps.-Oppian's pointed δεδμημένα as modern scholars, and replaced it by the contextually incongruous δεδαcμένα ('scattered': the fact that human races are 'scattered' is extraneous to their eating cῖτοc). The verb δαμάω, when denoting domestication, refers as a rule to wild animals. Its employment by the poet with reference to humans is a typical example of the basic conception underlying the philosophy of the Oppiani: animals and humans are zoologically not different, and the terminology used by the poets with reference to men and beasts is therefore often the same.[16]

[15] Sicherl (*ap.* Schmitt *ad loc.*) has rightly stressed that the reading ὅc' in line 166 is the correct one. A few points may be added here. The phrases ὅc' ἔθνεα μυρία φωτῶν and ὅcca βροτοῖcι γένεθλα . . . cῖτον ἔδουcιν are an obvious case of *epiphora* (*cf.* F. Lapp, *De Callimachi Cyrenaei tropis et figuris* [diss. Bonn 1965] 59f): φωτῶν is synonymous with βροτοῖcι (*cf.* LSJ *s.v.* φώc III= 'mortal', *i.e.* βροτόc). The alternation between the genitive φωτῶν and the dative βροτοῖcι is neatly paralleled by *Cyn.* 3.393 (on such 'commixtae constructiones' *cf.* Schmidt, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.8] 47). The variant τόc' came into being in order to eliminate the hiatus, which copyists notoriously abhor and try to obliterate: ὅc' was changed into τόc' under the influence of τόccoι . . . ὅccoι in lines 168f.

[16] *Cf.* A. W. James, *ProcCambrPhilolSoc* 12 (1966) 30; there exist ἄγρια φῦλα of humans (*Cyn.* 1.470) as well as of animals (*Cyn.* 4.7), because the species ἄνθρωποc, like other animal species, can be either ἄγριον or ἥμερον (Arist. *Part.An.* III 643b5). Note the poet's accuracy: in the two parallel sentences (*cf.* previous footnote) the plain φωτῶν without an epithet suffices with ἔθνεα, because ἔθνοc denotes civilized races, whereas the epithet δεδμημένα is necessary with γένεθλα, which in itself denotes breeds of beings not necessarily civilized (often animals: *cf.* A. W. James, *Index in Halieutica Oppiani Cilicis et in Cynegetica poetae Apameensis* [Hildesheim 1970] *s.v.* γένεθλον and γενέθλη). The employment of synonyms in ps.-Oppian's *epiphora* is therefore impeccable. It will be noted that the poet's *epiphora* is no

I 236f　　　　　　　... τὸ δὲ πάμπαν ἄπιστον

ἐc φιλότητα μολεῖν, τὴν οὐ θέμιc.

Gesner's conjecture ἄπυcτον, accepted by all the editors, is ungrounded. The manuscripts' reading ἄπιcτον is neatly paralleled by *Cyn.* 2.614 βάξιc ἄπιcτοc κτλ. In both cases ps.-Oppian is concerned about refuting a rumour which is not attested outside the *Cynegetica*: in the latter passage, the rumour connecting Phineus with the mole has not come down to us in any source other than ps.-Oppian's words (*cf.* Mair in his Loeb ed. *ad loc.*), and the same is the case with the rumour concerning mares which ps.-Oppian refutes here. Mares were believed to be λαγνίcταται (*cf.* Ael. *NA* 4.11 and Arist. *HA* 572a8): this explains how the tale contradicted by ps.-Oppian arose.

I 272ff　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　... οἵτε νέμονται

καὶ τρικάρηνον ὄροc ὅθι τοι cκέπαc Ἐγκελάδοιο

πυρcοῖc αἰθερίοιcιν ἐρευγομένοιο κεραυνοῦ

Cικελικῆc Αἴτνηc ἀνεκάχλαcεν ἀέναον πῦρ.

The passage has been hitherto misunderstood; for the latest discussion *cf.* Schmitt *ad loc.* The text is perfectly sound. cκέπαc Ἐγκελάδοιο denotes the sea of fluid lava occupying the crater of Aetna, and ἀέναον πῦρ designates the lava being emitted[17] by the eructing volcano. The sense is literally: "they inhabit the three-peaked mountain, where the ever-fluid fire of Aetna bubbles, whilst the thunderbolt belches forth, in beams reaching to the sky, a cover for Enceladus." In other words, the verb ἀνεκάχλαcεν is intransitive (= 'bubbles': *cf.* Schmitt *ad loc.*), and is followed by its subject πῦρ, just as the subject πῦρ follows the verb ἀμαρύccει in *Cyn.* 2.596f; cκέπαc denotes the sea of lava which is inside the crater and which covers Enceladus; ἐρευγομένου is transitive and governs an accusative (cκέπαc) as in *Hal.* 2.488. Zeus' κεραυνόc goes on belching lava (hence the present participle ἐρευγομένου) because "das Feuer von Gottes Blitz verlischt nicht wieder, sondern brennt

---

less impeccable from the conceptual point of view: he states that "the swift breeds of horses are as numerous as the civilized peoples" (which latter are known to be a great number; nobody could know the number of *un*civilized peoples, *i.e.* of those peoples not yet reached by, or known to, civilized man).

[17] ἀέναον means here 'ever flowing', because lava was regarded as liquid fire: it is in fact called διερὴ φλόξ in *Anth.Pal.* 7.123.1 (= 'liquid fire': *cf.* line 3, ῥόον Αἴτνηc) just as it is called ἀέναον πῦρ here; *cf.* Pind. *Pyth.* 1.23 τὰc ἐρεύγονται ἀπλάτου ... πυρὸc ... παγαί, of the lava, and *Pyth.* 1.5f κεραυνὸν ... ἀενάου πυρόc.

... fort und fort."[18] ἐρευγομένοιο κεραυνοῦ is a genitive absolute, and πυρcοῖc αἰθερίοιcιν a modal dative, as already realized by scholars (Mair, Schmitt *et al.*)

I 313   καλὸc ἰδεῖν, ἀταλόc τε φέρειν εὐπειθέϊ δεcμῷ

The text is sound; δεcμῷ means 'rein' (*cf.* Xen. *Eq.* 5.3–5), and εὐπει-θέϊ, which has puzzled scholars (*cf.* now Schmitt *ad loc.*) is a typical case of adjectival *enallage*, common in the Oppiani (*cf. Eranos* 68 [1970] 80f): the rein is said to be 'obedient' in that it is applied to a horse which is itself obedient. There is no need to take εὐπειθέϊ δεcμῷ as *dativus modalis* (*cf.* Sicherl *ap.* Schmitt *ad loc.*); the sense is, "beautiful to behold and amenable to transporting on account of its obedient rein (= its being obedient to the rein)."[19]

I 352f   εὖτε γὰρ ἐc φιλότητα θοαὶ τρήρωνεc ἴωcι,
          μιγνύμεναι cτομάτεccι βαρυφθόγγοιc ἀλόχοιcι

Neither θοοί nor μιγνύμενοι is necessary, as Desrousseaux and Schmitt believe. The word τρήρωνεc here, although of feminine gender, denotes male animals.[20]

I 478f   ... ἐπεὶ καὶ γαῖαν ἰόντων
          ἴχνιον εὑρέμεναι μέγα δὴ coφόc, κτλ.

The phrase καὶ γαῖαν ἰόντων, which has perplexed the critics (*cf.* Schmitt *ad loc.*) is an Ionism; on εἶμι used as here with *acc. loci, cf.* Schweighäuser, *Lex.Herod., s.v.* ἰέναι. Morphological and syntactical Ionisms are, as is well known, a traditional ingredient of Hellenistic and late epic.[21] Apollonius borrowed from Ionic authors the transitive use of verbs,[22] and ps.-Oppian, who knows Apollonius well, is evidently following the latter's example.

---

[18] H. Fränkel, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonius* (München 1968) 313.

[19] In sum, Lehrs' rendering (in his Didot edition) *pulcher aspectu, mollisque ad portandum facili habena* is correct, provided we realize that εὐπειθέϊ is used in *enallage* as I have explained. On this type of *enallage* in ps.-Oppian *cf.* Schmitt himself, pp.187, 197. Lehrs rightly took δεcμῷ to mean 'rein' but could not find any parallels; others (*e.g.* Mair) understood δεcμῷ as 'bit'. The discussion on this point in Schmitt *ad loc.* is now ended by the conclusive evidence which I have brought to light (Xen. *Eq.* 5.3–5).

[20] *Cf.* C. A. Lobeck, *Pathologiae sermonis Graeci prolegomena* (Lipsiae 1843) 24f.

[21] *Cf. e.g.* Oldenburger, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 16ff.

[22] *Cf. e.g.* G. Boesch, *De Apollonii Rhodii elocutione* (Göttingen 1908) 33, 44.

I 484ff   ἑρπύζει δὲ πάροιθε παραὶ βατὸν ἀτραπιτοῖο

πρῶτα μὲν ἰθεῖαν, μετέπειτα δὲ δοχμὸν ἐλαύνων,

λαιῇ, δεξιτερῇ, cκολιὴν ὁδὸν ἀμφὶς ἑλίccων.

The ghost-word παραιβαδόν, created by Rittershusius in 1597 and accepted by most critics, is unwarranted. The poet's words παραὶ βατὸν ἀτραπιτοῖο are sound. The preposition παραί means that the hunter walks not *on* but *alongside* the beaten track, now to its left, now to its right. For the verb, cf. Soph. fr.85.5f (Nauck) ἕρπειν . . . πρὸc τὰ βατά. βατόc commonly refers to paths (cf. Steph. TGL³ s.v. βατόc: βατὴ τρίβοc, βατὴ ὁδόc). Here, βατόν is a substantivized neuter with abstract force, βατὸν ἀτραπιτοῖο being the equivalent of βατὴν ἀτραπιτόν (on the type ἁβρὰ παρηΐδοc= ἁβρὰν παρηΐδα cf. e.g. Kühner-Gerth I.278). For a neat parallel[23] cf. *Cyn.* 4.433, where ἀτραπιτοῖο πολυcτιβίην means ἀτραπιτὸν πολύcτιβον.[24]

BIRKBECK COLLEGE, LONDON
May, 1972

---

[23] The genitive ἀτραπιτοῖο is governed by a non-articled word denoting an abstract notion, i.e. the neuter βατόν (lit. 'passability') and πολυcτιβίην ('frequent treading'). For another parallel cf. Hdn. 3.1.4, where τὸ δύcβατον τοῦ ὄρουc means, as all the critics agree (cf. e.g. Whittaker, in his Loeb ed.; E. C. Echols, *Herodian* [Berkeley 1961]: 'impassable mountain'), δύcβατον ὄροc (for δύcβατον "mit dem Artikel" here, cf. Kühner-Gerth, *loc.cit.*; on *flosculi* used by the Oppiani and late prose writers cf. *Eranos* 68 [1970] 84).

[24] Steph. TGL³ s.v. πολυcτιβίη, and O. Rebmann, *Die sprachlichen Neuerungen in den Kynegetika Oppians von Apamea* (Basel 1918) 104. The type βατὸν ἀτραπιτοῖο and πολυcτιβίην ἀτραπιτοῖο is not Homeric: on ἁβρὰ παρηΐδοc(= ἁβρὰν παρηΐδα) Eur. *Phoen.* 1486 and εὐγένεια παίδων (= εὐγενεῖc παῖδεc) Eur. *Tro.* 583, cf. G. Bernhardy, *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der gr. Sprache* (Berlin 1829) 52f; Kühner-Gerth I 278–81. As far as late Epic is concerned, a study of such genitival constructions has not been made yet. In Orph. *Lith.* 338 Ab. there is ἀτραπιτοῖο πολὺ πλέον (not a Homeric type) and Opp. *Hal.* 1.105 has the periphrastic ἔργα ὀνίcκων (cf. T. Lohmeyer, *De vocabulis in Oppiani Halieuticis* [diss. Berlin 1866] 27f). ἅλιc+genit., avoided by Homer and Apollonius Rhodius (cf. O. Linsenbarth, *De Apollonii Rhodii casuum syntaxi comparato usu homerico* [Leipzig 1887] 30), occurs in *Hal.* 3.260.