

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



On the Oxyrhynchus Papyri

Arthur Platt

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 01 / February 1900, pp 18 - 20

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00080161, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00080161

How to cite this article:

Arthur Platt (1900). On the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. The Classical Review, 14, pp 18-20

doi:10.1017/S0009840X00080161

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the *American Journal of Archaeology* II. No. 5, p. 347 sq. It is of the second century A.D.; its peculiarities are the omission of v. 6—some ten or more mediaeval MSS. want this line, and the date of the omission is

thus taken back to the age of this document—and of v. 59, for the absence of which there is no other authority.

T. W. ALLEN.

THE NEW SCHOLIA TO *ILIAD* XXI.

OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, VOL II. P. 63.

The difficulties of col. ix. p. 64 may perhaps be best removed by reading as follows: ὁ μέντοι γ' Ἀρίσταρχος ὁμηρικὸν αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνει· τὰ γὰρ ρεύματα ἐξ ὠκεανοῦ εἶναι. Σέλευκος δ' ἐν ε < ὅτι κοινῶς πᾶν ὕδωρ ἀχελῶς καλεῖται καὶ Δημόδοκος ἐν ε > Ἡρακλείας· Πῶς δ' ἐπορίσθης ρεῦμα ἀχελωίου ἀργυροδίνεω, | ὠκεανοῦ ποταμοῖο δι' εὐρέος ὕγρὰ κέλευθα; τοῦτο δὲ ἐμφαίνειν καὶ Πίνδαρον, λέγοντα τὸν αὐλητικὸν κάλαμον,—ἀχελῶν κρανᾶν, τοῦ ὕδατος—· Πρόσθα μὲν σ' ἀχελῶν τὸν αἰοδότατον εὖ ῥώπια κρανᾶν ἑλικὸς τε ποταμοῦ ῥοαὶ τρέφον κάλαμον· ἐτέρως γοῦν λέγειν ὠκεανοῦ πέδα κρανᾶν· πολλοὺς τε πρὸ Δῆμητρος θύειν Ἀχελῶφ ὅτι πάντων ποταμῶν ὄνομα ὁ Ἀχελῶς, καὶ ἐξ ὕδατος καρπός.

Ἀριστάρχης, however, declares that the line (195) is Homer's, arguing that flowing waters come from ocean; whereas Seleucus in 5 < asserting that water in all circumstances is called by one general name of ἀχελῶς, e.g. Demodocus in 5 > of his poem on Heracles.—Tide of achelous breaking in silver, by what means wast thou furnished forth in all the liquid walks of ocean's broad river?; further, that Pindar also shows as much in speaking of the reed of which the flute is made, where 'wells of ἀχελῶς' is for 'wells of water.'—Most melodious now, once thou wast a reed that the quags of the springs bravely grew, and the streams of the circling river' (i.e. oceanus): that at any rate he

has another phrase (for the same thing i.e. for ἀχελῶν ῥώπια κρανᾶν) viz. 'the floors of ocean's springs': also, that many sacrifice to Achelous rather than to Demeter, because Achelous is a name for all rivers, and water brings increase.' It would seem that Seleucus, like Aristarchus, defended l. 195, but on different grounds, namely, that ἀχελῶς is a general name for water, and that in other poets it is co-ordinated with ὠκεανός.

The hypothesis of a lacuna not only makes sense out of nonsense, but gets rid of a *Heraclea* by Seleucus. Demodocus, Pisander, Rhianus, and Panyasis each wrote a poem with this title.

The word ῥώπια has been preserved in E.M. 705 fin., where it is said to mean τὰ οὐ στερέμνια. Its literal sense is, spots that 'sink' or 'give.'

Col. x. 21, p. 65 read τότε ἔκειτο ἐν ταῖς ἄμμοις <καὶ> αἱ ἐγχείλινες ἤδη αὐτοῦ ἦσθιον.

Col. xi. 13, p. 66. The Sophocles here mentioned is the commentator of the name.

Col. xi. 19. The ἐγώ is the redactor of the commentary. He thereby introduces as his own an explanation of the dative with πειρᾶσθαι based upon a special etymology for the verb.—Ἐκτορι πειρηθῆναι ἀντιβίην· ἐγώ, ἕως πέρας ἐξ ἐναντίας πολεμῆσαι, 'face to face to fight with Hector to the end.'

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

ON THE *OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI*.

CCXI.

12. Qu. ἀ[περίσκητος ὦν. 13. cf. Ar. *Plutus* 863: νῆ Δία, καλῶς τοῖνυν ποῶν ἀπόλνται. 18. τῶν γεγονότων ποθομένων looks a rather astonishing phrase, better τῶν γεγονό-

των ποθ' οὐνεκα, 'for what has happened at last.'

CCXII.

Col. II. The following attempt at restoration of the first twelve lines will show most

easily what I take to be the situation. I am glad to see that my amiable friend the editor has adopted my view so far as previously divulged. I enclose my own additions in brackets.

A. ὑβρίζομεναι. B. μὰ Δί' ἀλλ' ἐγὼ [οὐκ ἀνέξομαι.

ἦν νοῦν ἔχωμεν, σκεψόμεθα [τοὺς ἄνδρας, ὡς μηδὲν πλέον τούτου σθένωσιν [οὐνεκα.

A. τί οὖν γένοιτ' ἄν; B. ἔχ' ἀπόκριναι μοι τόδε.

5 τί ἐστὶ τοῦθ' ὃ λέγουσι τὰς [Μιλησίας παίζειν ἐχούσας, ἀντιβολῶ, τὸ [σκυτινόν;

A. φλυαρία καὶ λήρος ὕβρεως ἔμπλεως κἄλλως ὄνειδος καὶ κατ[απυγοσύνη γε πρὸς. τούτῳ γὰρ ὥσπερ τοῖσιν ῥοῖς χρηστέον

10 τοῖς ἀνεμιαίοις, ὅτι νεοτ[οὺς οὐ ποιεῖ. εὐχὴ δὲ καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστίν· εὐ..... ἐς τοῦτο χρήσει· καὶ πόνο[υ πολλοῦ πλέον.

7. ἔμπλεως Postgate. 8. Cf. *Lys.* 137.

11. I think the meaning may be: 'but even that is a vain dream, for you will need (I can't imagine what) for this, and it is a troublesome business besides.' *χρήσει* future of *χρή*, as certainly in Herodotus, though in Attic everyone would expect *χρήσται*. However *χρήσει* is quoted from Plato *Laus.* 13-16. Cf. *Lys.* 135.

CCXIX.

11. λ[ίθο]ις κεί[σαι] παρ' ἀλιδρόσοις, or ἦσαι.
13. ὃν ἀντ[ι]παιδός. 14. καθάπερ].

17. [παί] φέρε τὸ ἐρνίον.

22. It seems probable that Θακοθαλάδος would do for the name of a sitting hen. The characteristic attitude of the hen is squatting on her seat. I take θακο- to mean the ground on which she sits. Very similar is the phrase used by Herondas of *sitting birds* (vii. 48), ὅπως νεοσσοὶ τὰς κοχόνας θάλποντες, the beautiful and certain correction of Dr. Jackson.

CCXXI.

Col. I. *init.* In connexion with the questions here raised on the accentuation of *ὅτε* δῆ, it is noticeable that Aristophanes begins a sentence at least five times with the words *ὅτε* δῆ δέ (*Wasps* 121, where see Starkie's note, *Lys.* 523, *Eccl.* 195, 315, 827). The only conceivable reason for the words being put in this order seems to be that *ὅτε*δῆ was felt to be one word, and the accentuation of Aristarchus therefore can hardly be so παράλογον as it appeared to Herodian.

10. Read Ἀλφειοῖο πόρον καθ' [ὃν διαβατὸς ἦ]ν¹ καὶ πορευτός.

Col. VII. 4. I think this a fragment of some lyricist, and so would read [ἀρι]στοπ[όν]ον, a Pindaric word.

5. The next quotation is not from Pindar but Anacreon, for καὶ [π]α[ρ] Ἀνακ[ρέοντι] is plainly the right supplement. The metre is Ionic as one might expect in *Parthenia*; it is curious that none of the fragments of Pindar's *Parthenia* are written in it, but Anacreon of course was fond of it. In CCXX., Col. XIII., we are told that the Parthenian metre was — — — — —, which is obviously in reality Ionic with the usual variation between — — — — — and — — — — — so familiar in Galliambic and other Ionic verses.

Col. IX. 5-17. I take the sense of this very puzzling passage to be as follows: 'Aristarchus points out that the line (Φ 195) is Homeric, because all streams are said to be ἐξ Ὀκεανοῦ [whereas if 195 be omitted Homer is represented as saying they are all ἐξ Ἀχελωίου. And Ocean and Achelous are different things.] So Seleucus says: "How camest to the river of Achelous over the watery ways of Ocean?" [thereby shewing that he does not think them the same]. Aristarchus adds that Pindar's evidence goes in the same direction, when he calls the piper's reed child of the founts of Achelous: "of old wert thou reared by Achelous and the streams of the winding river" [so that Pindar meant a *river* by Achelous]; at any rate Pindar means a very different thing when he says "beyond the founts of Ocean."

No doubt some critics had argued that Achelous in Homer, as in some other poets, meant simply *water*, and therefore that Homer would not say 'not even Achelous nor Ocean,' and therefore it was that they omitted 195. They quoted the passage of Pindar as one of their arguments,² and Aristarchus retorts that Pindar there did not use the word Achelous as they supposed, but simply for a river; when he wanted to talk of Ocean, he said so straight.

In 9 *ρεῦμα* is the Attic accusative and so the difficulty about *ἐπορεύθης* is imaginary. In 17 πε[δ]α κρανᾶν is surely a rather improbable phrase; πε[ρ]α is common with *πόντον* and the like.

24. πάντ' ἄ[ν] is apparently right. 'The oracle regularly told the Greeks to sacrifice to Achelous, and hence they would naturally

¹ So Allen (*supra*).—ED. C.R.

² Their syllogism seems to be: in one place Pindar says Ἀχελωίου κρανᾶν, in another Ὀκεανοῦ κρανᾶν; therefore Achelous = Ocean.

consider [being a foolish race in the opinion of Ephorus] every river as Achelous.'

Col. X. 22. I should prefer to insert καὶ between ἄμμοις and αἰ, rather than to read ὅτε for τότε in 21 (see editor's note).¹ 'Either Homer anticipates what would happen on the third day, or else at the time he is speaking of [opposed to τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ] the body was lying in the sand and the eels were already busy over it.'

27. ἐπεὶ γὰρ has no construction; read ἐπί: 'for the word ἐρέπτεσθαι is properly used of creatures picking up a thing from the ground with the tongue.' Is the derivation supposed to be from ἄπτομαι as well as ἔρα?

Col. XI. 19. Possibly ἐγὼ arose from a dittography of ἔως (εωεως). Omitting it, I would construe: 'Ἔκτορι πειρηθῆναι for "fight against Hector to the end," governing Ἔκτορος by ἐξ ἐναντίας and taking τοῦ to be neuter. To explain ἀντί τοῦ Ἔκτορος as

¹ So Rutherford (*supra*).—ED. C.R.

meaning that the dative Ἔκτορι is here used for the genitive is inconsistent with the explanation of πειρηθῆναι directly given. For if πειρηθῆναι were 'ἔως πέρατος πολεμήσαι,' it could not govern a genitive, but a dative would in the nature of things be expected, 'to fight with Hector.' It was the dative which caused the absurd derivation.

Col. XII. 2. [ἀρίζε]το. Cf. Col. III 15.

3. Possibly [δύο· δέλη μὲν ἀπὸ] τῆς ἕως ἐκείνῃ μέχρι τῆς . . δεκάτης· αὕτη [i.e. ἡ δεκάτη] δὲ ὀψία.

Col. XVII. 19. A blister is a swelling up of the skin, [τοῦ δέρμα]τος. Dr. Postgate compares ἔκζεμα. A blood-blister might also be thought of, in which case we might read [τῶν αἱμα]τος. Postgate also observes that in the scholion quoted by the editors on line 18 we should read ἀνάζεμα for ἀνάστημα.

ARTHUR PLATT.

MISCELLANEA.

PLATO, *Apol.* 17 οὗτοι μὲν οὖν, ὥσπερ ἐγὼ λέγω, ἢ τὴ ἢ οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς εἰρήκασιν· ὑμεῖς δ' ἐμοῦ ἀκούσεσθε πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν—οὐ μέντοι μὰ Δι', ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κεκαλλιεπημένους γε λόγους, ὥσπερ οἱ τούτων, ῥήμασί τε καὶ ὀνόμασιν, οὐδὲ κεκοσμημένους· ἀλλ' ἀκούσεσθε εἰκῇ λεγόμενα τοῖς ἐπιτυχούσιν ὀνόμασι—πιστεύω γὰρ δίκαια εἶναι ἃ λέγω—καὶ μηδεὶς ὑμῶν προσδοκῶν σάτω ἄλλως· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν δῆπου πρόποι, ὧ ἄνδρες, τῇδε τῇ ἡλικίᾳ ὥσπερ μειρακίῳ πλάττοντι λόγους εἰς ὑμᾶς εἰσιέναι. I need not speak particularly of the chiasmic double contrast at the beginning of this passage

(οὗτοι ~~ἐγὼ~~ / ~~ἐμοῦ~~ ~~ἐμεῖς~~) nor of some other minor points.

I have tried to make these clear by the way in which I have written and pointed the words. It is about a common misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the words from κεκαλλιεπημένους to ἐπιτυχούσιν ὀνόμασι that I wish to speak here. Stallbaum's explanation of these words, which has doubtless led many astray, runs thus:—Praeterea commemorat Socrates λόγους κεκοσμημένους, h.e. orationes ornatas, videlicet tropis, figuris, numero; in his enim rebus maxime cernitur κόσμος s. ornatus orationis. This way of interpreting, or rather misinterpreting, is due to failure to heed the chiasmic contrast in the Greek and to mis-

understanding of the meaning of κεκοσμημένους. κεκοσμημένους (λόγους) is contrasted with εἰκῇ λεγόμενα and κεκαλλιεπημένους λόγους ῥήμασί τε καὶ ὀνόμασιν with λεγόμενα τοῖς ἐπιτυχούσιν ὀνόμασι. κεκοσμημένους means 'marshalled,' 'ordered,' 'arranged,' as opposed to εἰκῇ λεγόμενα. We find something similar in Eur. *Med.* 576, where εἰ τοῖσδ' ἐκόσμησας λόγους may be, I think, most simply interpreted 'well have you marshalled these words.'

Aesch. *Prom.* 629

μή μου προκήδον μάσσον ὥς ἐμοὶ γλυκύ.

It seems a pity that the latest editors still cling to this reading. It stands in both the annotated edition of the *Prometheus* of Messrs. Sikes and Willson (1898) and the Parnassus Library text of Professor Campbell (1898). Professor Campbell puts Elmsley's μασσόνως ἢ μοὶ at the foot of the page, and Messrs. Sikes and Willson say of the same conjecture: 'Were emendation necessary, this would be good.' Though the latter editors have examined Dr. Wecklein's large Greek edition, they do not seem to realize that he has practically given up his former view of the construction in question. His Greek note is decidedly