bar [5]), the doors open spontaneously at the approach of the divine maidens [6]).

ZEIST, Homeruslaan 53 W. J. VERDENIUS

1) Mnemos. IV 30 (1977), 135-7.
2) Mnemos. IV 20 (1967), 405.
3) In that case we should read ἀναπταμέναι = ἀναπεπταμέναι; cf. 1, 13 πλῆνται for πεπλῆνται.
4) These arguments seem to me to carry more weight than the one put forward by Diels in his commentary: "Die ἡνιόχοι verlassen den Wagen in solchen Fällen natürlich so wenig wie unsere Kutscher". V.15 seems to imply that the Heliads had to leave the chariot in order to address Dike, especially if the latter is assumed to stay behind the gate, as is argued by J. Mansfeld, *Die Offenbarung des Parmenides und die menschliche Welt* (Assen 1964), 241-2.
5) Wiersma, *loc.cit.*, rightly points out that this idea has to be supplied from the context.
6) For πυλαί equivalent to 'doors' Karsten refers to *Iliad* 12, 291 and 454. The assumption of a reflexive meaning of ἀναπταμέναι is simpler than his suggestion to supply θύρετρα as the object of ἀναπταμέναι. A passive translation, 'when the doors were thrown back' (Burnet, Kirk-Raven), is less probable in this context, where the gate itself performs the turning of the posts.

EURIPIDES *I.T.* 110-115

(Πυ.) ὅταν δὲ νυκτὸς ὄμμα λυγαίας μόλῃ, 110
τολμητέον τοι ξεστὸν ἐκ ναοῦ λαβεῖν
ἄγαλμα πάσας προσφέροντε μηχανάς·
ὅρα δέ γ' †εἴσω† τριγλύφων ὅποι κενὸν
δέμας καθεῖναι· τοὺς πόνους γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ
τολμῶσι, δειλοὶ δ' εἰσὶν οὐδὲν οὐδαμοῦ. 115

In line 113, ὅποι will do the job: εἴσω is redundant and most probably corrupt. Thus read:

ὅρα δέ γ' εἰ σόν, τριγλύφων ὅποι κενὸν
δέμας καθεῖναι·

"Now, see if it is *thy* part to let thyself inside through the empty space in the triglyphs". The situation is as follows. Orestes is despondent: "Let us take flight!" (φεύγωμεν, 103). Pylades cheers him up by reminding him of his *duty*. Of course, Pylades is here

to help (συλλήπτωρ, 95): hence the dual in 111 f., τολμητέον (sc. νῷν) . . . προσφέροντε. But it is Orestes, not Pylades, who is supposed to seize the image of Artemis: μ(ε) . . . λαβεῖν τ' ἄγαλμα θεᾶς (85 and 87); μ(ε) . . . λαβεῖν / ἄγαλμ(α) (977 f.); compare 1381-85; 1439-41. Hence the change from the dual προσφέροντε in 112 to the singular ὅρα δέ γ' εἰ σὸν (sc. ἔργον ἐστί) in 113.

Σόν (for σὸν ἔργον): Aesch. *Sept.* 232; Soph. *El.* 1215; Eur. *H.F.* 314; *Her.* 132; *Ion* 1020; *Suppl.* 98; *I.T.* 1203. Compare *I.T.* 1079 σὸν ἔργον ἤδη καὶ σὸν ἐσβαίνειν δόμους. As for ὅρα εἰ, compare Plato *Phaedo* 118 a 9 ἀλλ' ὅρα εἴ τι ἄλλο λέγεις; Aesch. *Prom.* 997; Eur. *Alc.* 1105 εἰ χρεών (sc. ἐστιν αὐτὴν ἀπιέναι), ὅρα (or ἄθρει).

My objections to the reading recently suggested by Dr. David Sansone (Mnemos. IV 29, 1976, 79), ὅρα δέ γ' εἰ σῷ (or εἴ πως) . . . δέμας καθεῖμεν, are: (1) πως and καθεῖμεν are palaeographically not very likely; (2) σῷ (for σῶοι) cannot be established for Tragedy; (3) the sense obtained is not very encouraging for Orestes.

URBANA, The University of Illinois M. MARCOVICH

GODS AND GATE-CRASHING

Miss Heather White has observed in a recent article [1]) that "every Hellenistic reader knew that doors unfailingly and automatically opened whenever a god (or goddess) was near them"; as she points out, this kind of epiphany-miracle has been very fully documented by Weinreich [2]). However, like most rules, this too has its exceptions, which serve to prove its general validity. One such occurs at Ovid, *Met.* 8, 628 ff., the introduction to the famous episode of Philemon and Baucis. Jupiter and Mercury, disguised as mortals, are seeking hospitality in the highland villages of Phrygia:

> mille domos adiere locum requiemque petentes
> mille domos clausere serae.

The expression 'mille domos clausere *serae*' is surely a little odd, but commentators do not explain it [3]). It becomes clear in the light of the *Türöffnung* motif: at the approach of a deity doors should open spontaneously, as they are urged to in the opening scene of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* (6-7):

αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχῆες ἀνακλίνασθε πυλάων,
αὐταὶ δὲ κληῖδες· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακράν

but the doors of Phrygia (even the very door-fastenings) are as irreligious and inhospitable as their owners. Let it not be thought, incidentally, that the fact that Jupiter and Mercury are disguised adequately excuses such churlishness: a sensitive man, like Anchises in the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* (5,92 ff.) or Aeneas in Virgil (*Aen.* 1,327 ff.), can sniff out a deity masquerading as a mortal, and a pious door would surely be equally responsive [4]).

Another significant exception is found in Virgil, *Aen.* 7,618 ff.: king Latinus shrinks from the awesome step of opening the gates of war in the temple of Janus (618-9):

> abstinuit tactu pater aversusque refugit
> foeda ministeria, et caecis se condidit umbris.

The repugnance so creditably felt by the mortal king is completely absent from the goddess Juno (620-2):

> tum regina deum caelo delapsa morantes
> impulit ipsa manu portas, et cardine verso
> Belli ferratos rumpit Saturnia postis.

Rather than open the gates, as he is empowered by custom (*mos* 601, *hoc more* 616-7) to do, Latinus shuts himself away in darkness:

Juno by contrast comes down from heaven, and manifesting herself, usurps the king's priestly function (note *pater* 618). He will not even touch the gates: Juno *impulit ipsa manu*. This phrase is fraught with meaning: doors should spontaneously fling themselves open at a god's approach, but Juno is not satisfied with this. She violently forces the gates open, and one remembers that when the gates were ritually and rightfully opened, the consul in all solemnity *unbolted* them (611-3):

> has, ubi certa sedet patribus sententia pugnae,
> ipse Quirinali trabea cinctuque Gabino
> insignis *reserat* stridentia limina consul

—a ceremony not hastily performed, since the gates were held fast by *centum aerei vectes aeternaque ferri robora* (609-10). Juno's intervention is in itself and in its manner profoundly shocking, like her employment of Allecto to stir up hatred against the Trojans: pointedly, her epiphany is not marked by the usual miraculous *Türöffnung*, for she is behaving neither as a goddess should, nor as the king whose functions she has arrogated might, but as the fiend

Discordia, described by Ennius in words which Virgil has here transferred to Juno (*Ann.* 266-7 V.):

> . . . Discordia taetra
> belli ferratos postes portasque refregit.

University of SOUTHAMPTON FREDERICK WILLIAMS

1) *Doors and Stars in Theocritus, Idyll XXII*, Mnemos. IV 30 (1977), 135 ff.

2) *Türöffnung* . . . , originally published in Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 5 (1929), now accessible in *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Darmstadt 1968).

3) E.g. A. S. Hollis, in his commentary on Book VIII (Oxford 1970) is silent here.

4) It is only fair to point out that the inhabitants of Lystra at least mended their ways, and did not make the same mistake twice (*Acts. Ap.* 14: see Hollis, *op. cit.*, 108-9).

TREES IN CAECILIUS STATIUS

The eminent Roman comic poet of the second century B.C., Caecilius Statius, adapted a comedy of Menander's, the *Synepheboi*. In this play there was evidently a scene in which an old farmer was seen planting trees and upon questioning responded that he was planting for the coming generation, just as his forefathers had planted for him: *serit arbores quae alteri saeculo prosint. . . . <sero> dis immortalibus qui me non accipere modo haec a maioribus voluerunt sed etiam posteris prodere* (Cic. *Sen.* 7, 24). It seems not to have been noted, either by classicists or by folklorists, that we have here a fairly widespread folktale. Stith Thompson (*Motif-Index*, J 701.1) has noticed examples from e.g., Rabbinic and Arabic literature. Thus, for instance, the Midrash tells much the same story of the emperor Hadrian and an old farmer planting fig trees (Tanhuma, Kedoshim 8). But this example is, as far as I know, the earliest recorded instance of the motif, particularly so if we assume that the episode was also in Menander's play [1]).

URBANA, University of Illinois HOWARD JACOBSON

1) If, however, Cicero's words after *prosint* are his own elaboration and not a paraphrase of Caecilius, then we should have to draw down this instance of the folktale to the first century B.C.