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](#)

Notes on the Text of the Parian Marble.—II

J. Arthur R. Munro

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 07 / October 1901, pp 355 - 361

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00030961, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00030961

How to cite this article:

J. Arthur R. Munro (1901). Notes on the Text of the Parian Marble.—II. The Classical Review, 15, pp 355-361 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00030961

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

for all. (1) The sense *with the legs up* is established beyond any reasonable doubt by the occurrence of ἀναβάδην καθήσθαι in Plut. Mor. 336 c u.v. Wyttenbach: Dio Chrys. 62. p. 323: Athen. 528 F (all apparently taken from Ctesias): by Pollux' recognition of the phrases ἀναβάδην καθήμενος (3. 90) and ἀναβάδην καθίζειν 6. 175: and by the passage in Plutus 1123 where Hermes, now out of work, says νυνὶ δὲ πεινῶν ἀναβάδην ἀναπαύομαι. The repeated junction with the idea of sitting really admits of no other interpretation, and the ἀναβάδην of Hermes emphasises the notion of inactivity. (2) On the other hand the sense *upstairs* is not established for any passage anywhere. It is true that a scholiast here says τὸ ἀναβάδην ἄνω τοὺς πόδας ἔχων ἐπὶ ὑψηλοῦ τόπου καθήμενος: and so Suidas ἀναβάδην· ἐφ' ὕψους ἄνω τοὺς πόδας ἔχειν καὶ κοιμᾶσθαι. These explanations at first sight seem to jumble the two suggested meanings together, unless indeed we are to put a stop before the ἐπὶ ὑψηλοῦ and the ἐφ' ὕψους respectively; but perhaps those phrases mean no more than the height, e.g. the couch, on which the feet rest. On Plut. 1123 the scholia say nothing of a ὑψηλὸς τόπος: they give the alternatives of *legs up* and *feet crossed*. No passage elsewhere has yet been cited in which the meaning *upstairs* seems needed, and it is probable that the scholiasts had no more to go on than we have. (3) Euripides is evidently brought out by the eccyclema, and there is not the slightest reason for thinking that this or anything like it could be worked except on the ordinary level.

An eccyclema on the first floor is a thing unheard of. (4) The point of οὐκ ἐρὸς χαλοὺς ποιεῖς, *no wonder you bring in lame people*, is not the danger of falling down from an upper story. Why should adults be unable to take care of themselves? It is the suggestion of inability to walk conveyed by the reclining or half-reclining attitude. If the poet does not put down his own legs (καταβαίνειν 408: καταβάδην 411: cf. Phaedo 61 c) and get up, no wonder his characters can't use theirs.

Line 412 presents considerable difficulty to my mind. The meaning of course must be that his wearing rags himself accounts for the raggedness of his heroes, just as his not using his legs accounted for their being lame. But then the point of this is spoiled if he is said to wear *rags taken from tragedy*. The rags of tragedy should come from his own, not his own from tragedy. We must not go behind his rags and start with (1) ragged heroes, whose tatters he then (2) takes and wears, and therefore (3) naturally produces new heroes in rags. The joke is lost, if the thing does not *begin* with him. To avoid this, I have sometimes thought of writing εἰς τραγῳδίαν for ἐκ τραγῳδίας, ἐκ and εἰς being liable to confusion (EK, EIC), and taking it to mean 'to write tragedy in,' 'for tragedy.' But I am not very well satisfied with that.

549 Should we write

ἄσκούς, τροπωτήρας, κάδους ὠνουμένων?

HERBERT RICHARDS.

(To be continued.)

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE PARIAN MARBLE.—II.

At line 46 we recover the assistance of the Marble itself, and can to some extent control the restoration of the text by vestiges of letters or measurement of gaps. Unfortunately the upper part of the Oxford fragment, especially the right hand corner, has suffered very severely even since Selden's time, and the centre of the lower part of the new Parian fragment is entirely obliterated.

It would be tedious to notice here all the small corrections to be made in the text by deciphering a few more letters already rightly supplied, or changing the divisions of lines. I confine these notes to more material alterations, except where it seems

desirable to confirm or confute a doubtful restoration.

If I am right in reverting to Selden and splitting up Boeckh's Ep. 76 into three, the number of *epochs* on the Arundel Marble will become 80. I have denoted the *epochs* of the new Parian fragment by the letters of the alphabet (a, b, c,—i and j, v and w counted as one), and when these run short by the same letters doubled (aa, bb, cc).

II.

Ep. 30. Lines 45–47. 'Αφ' οὗ Φ[ε]δων δ' Ἀργείος ἐδήμειν[ε τὰ μ]ε[τρὰ, καὶ || σταθμὰ]

κατεσκεύασε, καὶ νόμισμα ἀργυροῦν ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἐποίησεν, κ.τ.λ.

Κατεσκεύασε is certain, and I fancy I can make out -αθμα. In any case σταθμὰ seems to be required by the verb. For the fact compare Strabo 358, quoting Ephorus.

Boeckh was betrayed by Forster's notes into reading ἀνεσκεύασε. He rejected σταθμὰ, which had been inserted by Prideaux and Chandler.

Ep. 31. Lines 47-48. We must restore Συρακούσας, for the name is spelt with σσ wherever it is preserved on the Marble. So too [Συρακουσσών] must be read in *Ep. 53.*

Ep. 32. Line 48. Ἡρξεν is distinctly legible. Boeckh has ἦρ[χ]εν.

Ep. 33. Lines 48-49. The substance of this epoch is lost, and there is not sufficient material for a restoration, although Baumgarten's suggestion, that Archilochus was mentioned, is plausible. But the dating clause is preserved—ἐτη ΗΗΗΗΔΓΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι ΛΥΣΙΑ. Now Pausanias (IV, 15, 1) says according to the received text that in the 4th year of the 23rd Olympiad Ἀθηναίους Τλησίας ἦρχεν. And Palmerius, objecting to the genitive Ἀνσία, suggested that Τλησία might be substituted. Boeckh was ready to swallow the genitive as a Parian form, but adopted the suggestion Τλησία, suspecting that Selden had misread the letters. But Selden's reading is confirmed by vestiges of ΛΥΣ still visible on the stone, and, even granting that Pausanias intended the same archon, we might argue that Pausanias is to be corrected by the Marble (as Lydiat hinted) rather than the Marble by Pausanias. Selden's reading however appears to be incomplete. ΛΥΣΙΑ will not fill the space before the Αφ' οὗ which follows. There is room for about three letters more. I propose therefore to read Ἀνσιῶ[δου], and get rid of the anomalous genitive.

Ep. 34. Lines 49-50. Ἀφ' οὗ Τέρπανδρος δ' Δερδένεος δ' Δέσβιος τοὺς νόμους ΤΟΥ Α . . . ΩΝ . . . Δ . . ΟΥΣΘΑΙΑΥΛΗΤ . . || ΛΗΞΕ καὶ τὴν ἐμπροσθε μουσικήν μετέστησεν, ἐτ[η] κ.τ.λ.

The end of line 49, from about νο in νόμους, has been broken off since Selden's copy was made, and I do not believe that Forster's collator ever saw it. At the beginning of line 50 there is rather more room than Selden allowed, but nothing can

now be read for certain before καί. Boeckh restores on the model of Palmerius τοὺς νόμους τοῦ[ς] κιθ[αρ]ωδ[ῶν] [ἐδ]ι[δ]α[ξ]εν, οὗς [κ]αὶ αὐλητ[ῆς] συν-||-ἡλύ[θη]σε. But his restoration seems forced, and the relative clause particularly inept. Perhaps τοὺς νόμους τοῦ[ς] τῶν π[ρ]ο[α]λ[α]ίων [ἐπανορθ]οῦσθαι αὐλητ[ῶν] || ἐτόλμ[η]σε might stand. Αὐλητῶν would be in antithesis to Terpander, the κιθαρωδός.

Ep. 36. Lines 51-52. The double σ in Συρακούσας is plainly legible. There seems to be just enough room for [γεω]μόρων, although it is a tight fit and the letters are gone.

Ep. 38. Lines 53-54. Boeckh's insertion of [ἐν Δελ-||-φοῖς] is unnecessary. Line 54 began with στεφανίτης. Ν is to be added to Ἀθήνησι.

Ep. 39. Lines 54-56. Ἀφ' οὗ ἐν Ἀθ[η]ναῖς κωμω[ιδῶν] χο[ρο]δ[ός] ἡρ[ξ]ε[το] [στη]σάν[τ]-||-ων πρῶ[των] Ἰκαριέων, εὐρόντος Σουσαριώνος, καὶ ἄθλον ἐτέθη πρῶτον ἰσχάδω[ν] ἄρσιχο[ς] καὶ οἶνου με[τ]ρ[η]τῆς, ἐτη κ.τ.λ.

Boeckh has [στη]σάν[των] αὐ-||-τῶν τῶν Ἰκαριέων. But in the first place Selden evidently took his ΣΑΝΙ to be the end of line 54, for he put no dots after it, and the stone seems to confirm him.¹ Secondly the article before Ἰκαριέων is contrary to the usual practice of the Marble.²

After ΟΙΝΟΥ Selden has ΕΡ ΟΣ, which may be variously interpreted. Bentley (Phal. 209) restored οἶνου ἀμφορεὺς from Plutarch, de cupid. divit. 8, and is followed by Boeckh, who takes Selden's ΕΡ to represent ΕΥ, and ΟΣ to be the end of ἄρχοντος. Perhaps ΕΡ may only be ΕΤ in ἐτη, but I think I can read ΜΕ . Ρ after οἶνου, which would give μετρητῆς, and Selden may have read the Ε and the Ρ but missed the Τ between them.

Ep. 41. Lines 56-57. Ἀφ' οὗ Κροῖσος [ἐξ] Ἀσίας [εἰς] Δελφο[ῦ]ς Α . . || [ἐτη ΗΗ||] ΔΔΔΔΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν ΕΥΘΥδήμων.

The Ν at the end of Ἀθήνησιν and the archon's name, which had been correctly

¹ The right edge of the stone is a little less hopelessly disintegrated than most of the right upper corner, and I fancy I can detect ΣΑΝ in spite of Dr. Mill (Bentley, Phal. 207).

² And therefore I suspect its insertion before Ἀθηναίους in *Ep. 19.*

elicited from Selden's ΤΟΥΔΗΜΟΥ,¹ are legible on the stone.

Most editors have supplied ἀ[πέστειλεν] in the lacuna, and Boeckh fancying that the line was shorter than its neighbours hazards the suggestion ἀπέστειλεν Αἰσωπον μαντευσό-μενον. I think that what was foremost in the chronicler's mind was rather the offerings of Croesus than his envoys. I should supply ἀπέπεμψε τὰ ἀναθήματα. Compare Herod. I, 14 and 51. The shortness of the line is largely illusory, and due to Selden's having written .| to represent the whole word Ἀθήνησι.

Ep. 42. Lines 57–58. 'Αφ' οὗ Κῦρος ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεὺς Σάρδεις ἔλαβε καὶ Κροῖσον ΥΠΟ ΗΣΣΦΑΛ κ.τ.λ.

Boeckh following the lead of Palmerius reads ὑπὸ [Πυθία]ς σφαλ[έντα ἐξώγρησεν, ἔτη ΗΗΠΔΔΓΙΙΙ, ἀρχοντας Ἀθήνησι . . . ἦν || δε] καὶ Ἰππῶναξ κ.τ.λ. But this supplement expands line 57 to the outrageous length of something like 150 letters. The simplest remedy would be to omit ἐξώγρησεν, for the chronicler uses the word ἔλαβε of persons as well as places (cf. line 7 of the new fragment), or possibly ὑπο[πρ]ήσ[α]ς [ῆ]φά-νισεν would not be too far from the text.

Ep. 43. Lines 58–59. Boeckh's restoration runs 'Αφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητὴς [ἐφάνη], πρῶτος ὃς ἐδίδαξε [δρ]ᾶμα ἐν ἀ[σ]τ[ρ]ει, καὶ ἐ[τ]-έθη ὁ [τ]ράγος [ἀθλον], ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

It is difficult to fit this version to the traces on the stone, but it is equally difficult to suggest another. One point however may be noted. Dr. Mill's πρῶτος ὃς (v. Bentley Phal. 240), whether right or wrong, is easily recognisable, and the Π is particularly distinct. But ἐφάνη would only fill half the space between ποιητὴς and πρῶτος. Moreover the word seems to me to savour of the Heroic age and to be inapplicable to a poet so late as Thespis. There is a wide field for conjecture, but I fancy the vestiges give a slight preference to a word ending in -το or perhaps -ατο.

Ep. 44. Line 59. The stone supports ἐβασίλευσε against ἐβασίλευε, and does not preclude reading Γ| for ΙΙΙ in the numeral.

¹ I believe that a similar misreading underlies the curious passage at the beginning of the forty-first chapter of the Aristotelian Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, where the writer, or his authority, is thinking of the archon Euthydemus who succeeded Pythodorus in the year 431, and we ought to read δοκοῦντος δὲ δικαίως τοῦ δήμου (i.e. originally Εὐθύδημου) λαβεῖν τὴν [ἐπω-νύμ]αν κ.τ.λ.

Ep. 45. Lines 59–61. 'Αφ' οὗ Ἀρμόδιος καὶ [Ἀριστογέ]ιτων ἀπέκτε[ιναν] || Ἰππα[ρ]χον Πεισιστράτου / . . Δ . . ON καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι κ.τ.λ. After Πεισιστράτου Selden has A ON. I give the letters as I should read them on the stone. The supplement Ἀ[θηνῶν] τύρανν[ον], adopted by Boeckh from Prideaux, is much too long. Perhaps [τύρ]α[νν]ον might stand, but the traces rather favour [δι]ά[δ]ο[χ]ον.

The name of the archon according to Ἀθ. πολ. 19 was Ἀρπακτιδης, and the traces on the marble point to Ἀθήνησιν Α[Ρ]Γ|[ακτιδου].

Ep. 46. Line 61. Boeckh gives the date as ἔτη ΞΗΗΔΔΔΔ[ΙΙΙΙ], ἀρχοντας Ἀθήνησιν [Ἰ]σαγόρου. I should read Γ| on the stone for ΙΙΙ, and ΛΥΣαγόρου is quite plain. If the chronicler intended Isagoras and the year 508 one would expect Γ (245). Γ| ought to mean the year 509, and we do not know the archon of that year. He may have been named Lysagoras, or the chronicler may have put Isagoras in 509, or the marks on the stone may be deceptive.

Ep. 47. Lines 61–62. Selden has 'Αφ' οὗ ΝΕ ΙΠΠΙΑ || EN Ἀθήνησιν, ἔτη κ.τ.λ., out of which Boeckh spins a yarn about an imaginary Nestor, or Neileus, son of Hippias, who may have been caught in a plot to bring back the tyrant and put to death. I should read ΜΕ rather than ΝΕ, and have little doubt that we have to restore Με[λαν]τιπί[δης] || ἐνί-κ[η]σεν Ἀθήνησιν. After Μελαντιπίδης I see Μ, which naturally suggests Μ[ή]λιος, and although it is not easy to fit into the space I think this suggestion is the most probable, and preferable to μέλει for example. With Ἰππία disappears the last of Boeckh's Parian forms.

Ep. 48. Lines 62–64. 'Αφ' οὗ ἡ ἐμ Μαραθῶνι μάχῃ ἐγένετο Ἀθηναῖοις πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας Ἀρ[ταφρένα] τὸν Δαρείου ἀδελ[φ]-δοῦν καὶ Δατί[ον] τὸν στρατηγόν, ἦν ἐνίκων Ἀθηναῖοι, ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

The interval shown in Selden's copy between Πέρσας and Ἀρ[ταφρένα] does not exist, so we cannot insert [καὶ]. On the other hand there is more room than Selden allows at the beginning of line 63. I have given the obvious restoration, but I fear it is 2 or 3 letters too long for the space, and suspect that we must either read καὶ Δά[ρι]ον

στρατηγόν, or allow that the chronicler has confused father and son and restore ἀδελ[φ]-
|όν καὶ Δάτι|ν. The ἦν before ἐνίκων is on
the stone, as Boeckh rightly inferred from
Forster's notes.

Ep. 49. *Lines 64–65.* Boeckh wrongly
inserted Περσῶν after βασιλεύει, where there
is no room for it and the Ε of ἔτη is still
legible. Selden notes that the numeral may
be read as either ΗΗΔ]ΔΓ or ΔΠΙ. The
stone rather favours the latter, and we should
expect 226, because the chronicle normally
puts the archons before the year 399 one
year above their orthodox dates. There
seems to be no Ν at the end of Ἀθήνησι.

Ep. 50. *Lines 65–66.* Add ὁ between
Στησίχορος and ποιητής, as Boeckh desired.

Ep. 52. *Lines 67–69.* The last clause
ought to run καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἐρήν ἐ[ν || Σι]κελίου
περὶ τὴν Αἴτην. Selden mistook the Ε in
ἐν for Κ, and left too much space at the
beginning of line 69. There was therefore
a natural tendency to look for ἐρρύηκεν,
which Palmerius suggested, or ἐρρύη as in
the parallel passage of Thucydides (III. 116).
I imagine that Forster's collator approached
the marble with the expectation of seeing PP,
and that his eye fell upon ΕΡΜΟ (in Θερμο-
πύλαις) exactly above ΕΡΥΗ two lines higher
up, which in the present condition of the
stone is at first sight most deceptively like
ΕΡΡΥ. Hence the pencil note in Forster's
margin 'ΕΡΡΥΗΚ,' and the subsequent
correction in ink 'ΕΡΥΗΚ recte.' But
Boeckh was misled into reading ἐρρύη κῶν ||
ἐν Σικελίᾳ. Chandler seems to have looked
at the stone, for he suggests ἐρήν[σε, mis-
taking Ε for Σ, and omits the Κ. The
stone confirms Boeckh's Αἴτην for Αἰτνίαν.

Ep. 54. *Lines 70–71.* There is no Ν
at the end of the first Ἀθήνησι. One would
rather restore 214 than 213 for the numeral
(see note on Ep. 49), but it is a tight fit.
So also Ep. 60, etc.

Ep. 55. *Lines 71–72.* The ΣΣ in
Συρακοισσῶν is plain. So too Ep. 62.

Ep. 56. *Line 72.* Ἀψηφίωνος is clearly
legible, not -ovos.

Ep. 59. *Lines 74–75.* ΕΓ is clearly
legible, not ΕΝ.

Ep. 63. *Lines 77–78.* Ἀθήνησι, not
Ἀθήνησιν.

Ep. 64. *Lines 78–79.* The stone clearly
gives 92, not 91, for the age of Sophocles at
the time of his death.

As to the archon, Καλλίου τοῦ ΠΡΟ. ΕΡΟΥ
is plainly legible, but as προτέρου is evidently
repeated from Ep. 59 by one of those slips
of which we have seen an example in Ep. 27,
it does not necessarily follow that we must
read δευτέρου here and not τρίτου, although
the former is perhaps the easier and more
natural.

Ep. 66. *Lines 79–80.* Surely [κατῆλθον,
rather than [ἐπανῆλθον, οἱ || μετ]ὰ Κύρου ἀνα-
βάντες would be the natural word. The stone
confirms the Α before Κύρου. I cannot see
Ο between Σωκράτης and φιλόσοφος, and
there does not appear to be any room for it.

Ep. 67. *Lines 80–81.* Ἀφ' οὗ Ἀρ[ι]στ
[ἐνίκη||σεν] Ἀθήνησιν, ἔτη
ΗΔΔΔΓ, ἀρχοντας Ἀθήνησιν Ἀριστοκράτους.

I read ΑΡ[ι]ΣΤ[Ο] or ΑΡ[ι]ΣΤ[Α], the
last letter might be either. Chandler gives
ΑΓ, Forster ΑΙ. Chandler restored Ἀ[στου-
δάμας πρῶτον ἐδίδασκεν], (cf. Diod. Sic. XIV.
43), which Boeckh accepted with the quali-
fication 'valde incertum supplementum.'
There were many poets with names in Arist-
living about the time, but I know no evi-
dence to connect any one of them with a
victory, probably a first victory, in the year
399–8.

Ep. 68. *Lines 81–82.* Ἀφ' οὗ Π[ολ]ύιδος
Σηλυμβριανὸς διθυράμβωι ἐνίκησεν Ἀθήνησιν,
ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

ΥΙΔΟΣ is certain and Γ very probable.
There can be no doubt that Πολύιδος is right.
The date is lost, but the limits 399 to 380
cover the acme of Polyidus, and a reference
to him would be in every way appropriate.
I cannot see how Chandler arrived at Ξ, or
Forster's collator at Ο, for Π. Σηλυμβριανὸς
had already been reached by Flach, but as
applied to Polyidus it appears to give us a
new fact. Baumgarten guessed Polyidus
(or Timotheus), but met with little atten-
tion.

Ep. 71. *Line 83.* Ἀφ' οὗ Ἀστυδάμας
Ἀθήνησιν ἐνίκησεν, ἔτη ΗΓΠΠΠ, ἀρχοντας
Ἀθήνησιν Ἀστειῶν κατεκάη δὲ τότε ΚΑ[

].
Boeckh, like his predecessors, followed
the cue suggested by Aristotle Meteor. I. 6
and Diodorus XV. 50, and restored κατεκάη
δὲ τότε κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἢ πυρίνη δοκίς]. The

suggestion was plausible, but, I believe, illusory. *Κατεκάη*, which is quite clear on the stone, is a very strange word to use of a comet, as Dopp felt when he attempted to resolve it into *καὶ ἐκάη*. But a more natural restoration is ready to hand. A fourth century inscription of Delphi (Homolle in Bull. de Corr. hell. XX. p. 679, Dittenberger no. 93, who give further references) alludes to the destruction of the temple there in the words, ἐπ[εὶ] ὁ ναὸς κατ[εκα]-ύθη. M. Homolle argues that there is only room for two letters after *κατ*, and therefore rejects *κατ[εκα]ύθη*, which had been originally proposed by Schmidt, Pomtow, and Dittenberger. But it is obvious from the photograph which he publishes that there is no physical impossibility in supplying the *three* letters—they would only be a little crowded. On the other hand the year of Asteius, 373, is the very year fixed upon by M. Homolle for the destruction of the temple, and when we put the Parian Marble, which records the *burning down* of something in the year 373, beside the Delphic inscription, we can hardly refuse to interpret them in the light of one another, and read in the one case ἐπ[εὶ] ὁ ναὸς κατ[εκα]ύθη, and in the other *κατεκάη δὲ τότε καὶ ὁ ἐν Δελφοῖς ναὸς*.

This is not the place for a detailed discussion of the archaeological and other evidence as to the destruction of the Delphic temple. A full and lucid account of the problem will be found in M. Homolle's admirable paper, and I am aware of the objections which may be brought against my suggestion. But I hold that the burden of proof has now been shifted on to those who would deny that the temple was *burnt* down, and that evidence which might suffice to set aside statements of Macrobius or 'Epaphus' will not be conclusive against the convergent testimony of the two inscriptions.

Boeckh rejected 'istud καὶ,' but it is adequately supported by parallel cases in lines 13, 15, and 18 of the new fragment.

Ep. 72. Lines 83–85. After Φραυκλείδων Forster's notes add ΚΑΙΟΑΑ'.. ^ (καὶ ὁ 'ΑΛ[έξανδρος κ.τ.λ.]). The traces on the stone favour the omission of the O, which Boeckh wished away. I do not feel confident that the collator really read all the letters.

Ep. 73. Line 85. The stone has 'ἸμερΔιος for 'Ἰμεραῖος.

Ep. 74. Lines 86–87. I should restore Περδίκκας ὁ Ἀμύντων in place of Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἀλωπίτης. Ptolemy was not the legitimate

sovereign, and there is no room for a notice of Perdiccas' accession before Ep. 77 (76), which certainly referred to Philip.

Ep. 75. Lines 87–88. 'Αφ' οὗ Φωκεῖς τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς μα[ρτυρεῖον κατέλαβον], ἔτη ΗΙΙ, ἄρχωντος 'Αθή[?]—νησι Κηφισοδώρου.

After Δελφοῖς Forster's notes have IPON, which is suspiciously like a conjecture, although Dopp seems to have persuaded himself that he could see the P on the squeeze. I should read MA on the stone, which gives μα[ρτυρεῖον]. Κατέλαβον, which Boeckh retained from Baumgarten, is probably right, but not long enough to fill the whole space. ΚηφισοΔ[?]ου is plainly legible.

The restoration of the date raises a difficult question. The year of Kephisodorus is according to the accepted list 366–5 B.C., or by the reckoning of the Marble ἔτη ΗΙΙ. But all historical authority puts the seizure of Delphi in or about the year of Agathocles, 357–6. And the archon before Agathocles was, according to the received authorities, named Kephisodotus. Lydiat, Prideaux, Chandler, Clinton, and Boeckh therefore suppose that the name Kephisodorus was either an alternative reading in the lists for the archon of 358–7, or a mistake of the chronicler's (or mason's) for Kephisodotus, and restore the numeral 94. But this solution, however plausible at first sight, leads to serious difficulties. It is only made possible by the desperate expedient of throwing the whole of the next two and a half lines, from Αφ' οὗ Τιμόθεος down to ἄρχωντος 'Αθήνησιν Ἀγαθοκλέους, into one *epoch*, in defiance of the usages of the Marble and historical probability. Admitting, therefore, that a confusion between the two archons lies at the root of the blunder, I prefer to think with Palmerius and Müller that the chronicler has thrust back the seizure of Delphi to the year 366 simply to suit the name Kephisodorus. Boeckh could not believe that he could be guilty of an error of eight years or more, but Boeckh seems to me to have misconceived the method of the compiler, who is not (I take it) composing a chronological abstract of Greek history, political and literary, but having made a collection of historical facts, which he could by literary or monumental evidence connect with certain archons (or reigns), he arranges them in chronological sequence and calculates their dates from the list of archons. In other words the archon gives the evidence

for the numeral, not the numeral for the archon. This procedure would, I think, go far to explain the apparently arbitrary selection of the facts recorded. They are those facts about which the compiler happened to have the required information at hand.

Err. 76, 77, 78. *Lines* 88–90. (76) 'Αφ' οὗ Τιμόθεος βιώσας ἔτη [Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ] ἐτελεύτησεν, ἔτη [η] ἄρχοντας 'Αθηνησι. (77) ['Αφ' οὗ Φίλιππος ὁ 'Αμύντου Μα]-κεδόνων βασιλεύει, καὶ 'Αρτοξέρξης ἐτελεύτησεν, Ὄχος δὲ ὁ υἱὸς β[ασιλεύει, ἔτη [Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Γ], ἄρχοντας 'Αθήνησι Καλλιμάχους]. (78) ['Αφ' οὗ 'Αθήνη-|σι] ἐνίκησεν, ἔτη [Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ ΙΙΙ], ἄρχοντας 'Αθήνησιν 'Αγαθοκλέους.

All those who date *Ep.* 75 at 358 B.C. are obliged to combine these three *epochs* into one. Instead of the natural ἔτη Boeckh restores ἐτ[ελεύτησεν δὲ καὶ Περδίκκας κ.τ.λ., a form of expression which never occurs on the Marble except *after the date*, where a supplement or postscript is tacked on at the end of an *epoch*. Secondly there are grave historical objections to setting the accession of Philip and of Ochus in the year of Agathocles, 357. Thirdly it is singular to find the accession of the kings sandwiched in between two literary notices; for ἐνίκησεν probably refers to an agonistic not a military victory, not merely on a simple enumeration of the instances, but also because no very famous battle was fought in the year of Agathocles, and because, where the word ἐνίκησεν ends a clause in the chronicle, it always does refer to a literary or musical contest. Lastly the length of the combined *epoch* is suspicious, although not beyond all parallel.

For ΙΙΙ in the last numeral Forster's notes give ΙΙ, which is certainly all that can now be read, but the two strokes are rather wide apart, and faint traces on the stone between them may indicate a lost third, and although it is hard to account for the obliteration of this middle stroke while the others remain distinctly legible, yet its former existence seems sufficiently attested by Selden and Chandler and the orthodoxy of this part of the Marble in its dates for the archons.

Περσῶν after β[ασιλεύει is unnecessary, cf. *Ep.* 49.

Ep. 79. *Lines* 90–92. Nothing is left before the date except ἐγένετο. I do not believe in Boeckh's ὁ πρὸς τοὺς Φωκεῖς πόλεμος. And the date is one year too late for the

birth of Alexander, which was first suggested by Prideaux.

At the beginning of line 92 are some remnants of what was evidently a postscript after the archon's name. Selden has ΣΟΦΟΣ Τ . . . ΤΟΥΤΟΥ, which is more like the spacing than Chandler's version. Forster's collator estimated 9 letters before ΟΥΤΟΥ. I should read . . . Σ ΕΥΤΟΥ. The letter before Σ looks like Α or Η, and the letters next after Σ suggest ΑΓΩ or ΑΜ rather than Σ[ΟΦΟΣ.

Ep. 80. *Lines* 92–93. Nothing certain can now be made out after 'Αφ' οὗ. Selden has ΚΛ, Forster ΚΛ^ΛΙ ΓΤ, which suggests Κάλλιππος, or was perhaps suggested by it, for Lydiat and Prideaux had already made the conjecture. Line 93 has now been broken away and totally lost.

III.

Err. a and b. *Lines* 1–2. It is tempting to restore the traces in the first line to ἄρχοντας 'Αθηνησι Χαϊρών]δο[ν, referring *Ep.* a to the battle of Chaeronea, and starting *Ep.* b in line 1. But it is not easy to adjust this restoration to the marks.

Ep. k. *Lines* 9–10. 'Απὸ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ γενομένου ΠΕΡΙ [] ΛΑΜΙΑΝ 'Αθηναίους πρὸς 'Αντίπατρον κ.τ.λ.

Between *περὶ* and *Λαμίας* is an erasure which might contain either *two* broad letters, or *three* narrow ones such as Ι, Ρ, or Υ. The traces on the stone point to two broad letters, of which the first seems to have had an horizontal top stroke, and the second was certainly Α or Λ or Δ. The two last letters of *Λαμίας* are engraved over a second erasure, and the letter which originally stood in place of the Α was a 'square' letter with two vertical strokes. I believe that the cutter originally wrote ΣΑΛΑΜΙΝΑ, and then corrected it to ΛΑΜΙΑΝ by erasing the first two letters and changing the last two.

Ep. s. *Lines* 20–21. The Σ in 'Αθήνησι and ΣΙ in Σίμωνιδου are visible, and the space between them shows that we must read 'Αθήνησιν.

Ep. t. *Lines* 21–22. The first letter after the gap appears to be certainly Γ, but I do

not feel sure that there is not room for an E between it and [ζη].

Ep. v. Lines 22-24. 'Οφέλας [ε]ἰς [Κ]αρ[χηδόνα στρατεύσας ἐτελεύτησεν, rather than μεταβὰς ἀνηρέθη, seems the natural restoration, unless Wilhelm has any reason to the contrary. Cf. *Ep. m*, line 12.

I could not make out on the stone the letters ΣΛ read by Wilhelm on a squeeze.

Ep. y. Lines 25-26. One might feel tempted to restore φ[υ]λ[αί] π[ρὸς] ταῖς δέκα προσετέθησαν Ἀθήνησιν ἐπώνυμοι Ἀντιγόνου καὶ Δημητρίου, cf. *Diod. xx. 46*, *Plut. Demetr. 10*, but the stone refuses any other reading than ΦΙΛΛΓ. Either Λ might be Α, but I doubt the point which Wilhelm marks before Γ, where I take the scratch to be accidental.

Near the middle of the lacuna, about under ΛΣΤ in Θεοφράστου, I thought I could detect ΟΝ, and in the third place before ΟΥ something like Σ.

Ep. z. Line 27. 'Αφ' οὗ Σωσιφάνης ὁ ποιητῆς [ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ. Assuming that ἐγένετο is right, (ΕΓΕΝ is hard to distinguish from ΕΤΕΛ, ἐτελ[εύτησεν), we have here the birth of a younger Sosiphanes, having already had the death of an elder in *Ep. q*, lines 18-19. It is curious that nobody ever heard of two before the discovery of this part of the Marble. There was, to be sure, considerable uncertainty as to the date of Sosiphanes, for the notice of him in *Suidas* is evidently confused or corrupt, and his claim to a place in 'the Pleiad' is not a very strong one (*v. Clinton Fast. Hell. III p. 502*). Wilhelm suggests that a confusion

between the two poets may have contributed to muddle the accounts. But perhaps it is not impossible that there was after all only one Sosiphanes, that he died in the year 313, and that he was wrongly reckoned among the Seven Stars. *Sosithus* has a better claim to a place in the Pleiad, and possibly the engraver may have here repeated Σωσιφάνης from line 18, instead of writing Σωσίθεος, just as he repeated Μενεσθέως τρεῖσκαδεκάτου ἔτους in *Ep. 27*, and Καλλίου τοῦ προτέρου in *Ep. 64*.

Ep. aa and bb. Lines 27-29. In line 28 the vestiges before the gap might be read as Π . Ρ . Α . Β . . Ξ . Η, and in the third place before the Ν after the gap there appears to be something like Ο. These readings only confirm Wilhelm's ingenious restoration.

Ep. cc. Lines 29-30. 'Αφ' οὗ [κομήτης ἀσ]τήρ ἐφ[άνη κ.τ.λ. Wilhelm goes to Chinese records for confirmation of his convincing restoration. I see no reason why this should not be the star seen by Philochorus and mentioned in his ninth book, vide *Dionys. Halic., Dinarch. 3*, p. 637, where the two quotations need not refer to consecutive years.

Ep. dd. Lines 30-31. In line 31 I should read the two strokes marked by Wilhelm under ΗΡ as Ν, and ΚΑΣ-ΣΑΝ . ΡΟ seems to be certain.

Ep. ee. Lines 32-33. The number 35 in line 33 is certain, for there is an appreciable vacant space, which was never inscribed, between the Γ and the edge of the stone.

J. ARTHUR R. MUNRO.

NOTES.

NOTE ON SOPH. FRAGM. 626.—With this fragment—the isolated line

ἀλλ' ἔσθ' ὁ θάνατος λαισθος ἱατρὸς νόσων—

may be compared the Welsh proverb *nid iach ond a fo marw*, or *Death alone brings healing* (word for word: *not whole but who is dead*). The sentiment embodied for Englishmen, once for all, in the great line

After life's fitful fever he sleeps well,

is no doubt common to all languages because common to all peoples. But the Welsh parallel will probably be new to most readers of the *Classical Review*. With it may be coupled another striking proverb, in which the reference is to the impartiality of Death: *ni edrych angen pwy decaf ei dalcen*, or *Death cares not*

whose forehead is the fairest (lit. *not looks Death who fairest his forehead*).

A few Welsh and Greek proverbs are, I may perhaps be allowed to add, brought together for comparison on p. 38 of *Chapters on the Aims and Practice of Teaching*, edited by Professor F. Spencer; and a popular collection of Welsh proverbs, with English verse renderings, is accessible in H. H. Vaughan's *British Reason in English Rhyme*. A science (if science it could ever become) of Comparative Paroemiography, or International Folk-Wisdom, would possess great interest. But bold will be οἱ παροιμιαζόμενοι who venture to grapple with so vast and vague a theme.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

* * *