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 word $\phi\alpha\delta\upsilon$

R. C. Seaton

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 01 / February 2009, pp 29 - 31

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00029401, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00029401

How to cite this article:

R. C. Seaton (2009). On the word $\phi\alpha\delta\upsilon$. The Classical Review, 15, pp 29-31 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00029401

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

δυσμόρφῳ, ὃς δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἀπο πῆματα
 πάσχει
 50 νάσω ἐν ἀμφιρύντῃ, ὅθι τ' ὀμφαλός ἐστι
 • θαλάσσης,
 νῆσος δεινδρήσσσα, θεὰ δ' ἐν δώματα ναίει.

Most exegetical editions put a period at the close of 50, and speak of the 'asyndeton of vivid description'; but the critical editions of Bekker and of Ludwig have a comma there, and Hayman rightly says that νῆσος is 'epanalepsis, see on 23, with case varied by attraction of ὀμφαλός preceding.'

The third passage to which I would apply this explanation is at the opening of Aeschylus's *Seven against Thebes*.

Κάδμον πολῖται, χρὴ λέγειν τὰ καίρια.
 ὅστις φυλάσσει πᾶγος ἐν πρύμνῃ πόλεως,
 οἶακα νωμῶν, βλέφαρα μὴ κοιμῶν ὑπνω.

Paley says of the last clause quoted: 'μὴ κοιμῶν is to be closely taken with νωμῶν, for which reason it seems better to omit the comma usually placed after the latter word, "managing the helm without closing his eyes." The μὴ depends on the indefinite ὅστις.' Verrall places a period at the close of the first verse, saying that to the connexion of the three verses 'there are two fatal objections: (1) the case of κοιμῶν... and (2) the want of connexion between χρὴ λέγειν τὰ καίρια and the following figure; λέγειν τὰ καίρια is the business of everyone, not of a statesman in particular, still less of a sleepless pilot.' Wecklein-Zomarides say: ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἶακα νωμῶν ἐπεξηγείται οὐ μόνον τὴν εἰκόνα ἐν πρύμνῃ, ἀλλ' ἐμφαίνει καὶ τὸ καθήκον τοῦ ἀρχοντος... διὰ ταῦτα προσκολλᾶται ἐν παραθέσει ὁμοιοπαύτως ἡ ῥῆσις βλ ἑ φ α ρ α μὴ κοιμῶν ὑπνω· ἄλλως ὀφειλέ τις νὰ εἰκάσῃ, ὥσπερ ἤθελεν ὁ Heimsoeth, κοιμῶν θ' ἐν τῇδε τῇ συναρτήσει τῶν λέξεων, 'χρὴ λέγειν τὰ καίρια ἐκείνον, ὅστις—πόλεως οἶακα νωμῶν, βλέφαρα μὴ κοιμῶν θ' ὑπνω.' ἀμφοτέρων δὲ τῶν μετοχῶν

οὐσῶν τροπικῶν ἀναφέρεται ἡ μὲν νωμῶν εἰς τὸ ἐν πρύμνῃ, ἡ δὲ κοιμῶν εἰς τὸ φυλάσσει: ὅστις ἐν πρύμνῃ πόλεως φυλάσσει τὰ πράγματα αὐτῆς ὡς οἰακοστρόφος ἄγρυπνος. Heimsoeth's emendation is the less likely because Eustathius had κοιμῶν before him, and it is unnecessary, since the participle is naturally attracted to the construction of the relative clause, even though it is most closely connected in thought with the subject of λέγειν τὰ καίρια. The thought of Eteocles is, then: 'I am here *before the break of day*, and must devise the wisest plans, since I bear the responsibility for the safety of the ship of state.' The scholiast's comparison of B 24:

οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εἶδεν βουλευφόρον ἄνδρα,

is entirely in point, and Verrall's remark, 'The hour (it appears to be scarcely yet light, vv. 29, 66) lends significance to the figure,' is correct, but not sufficiently emphatic. This opening sentence of the play informed the audience of the time of the action, as distinctly as the opening of the *Clouds*—ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τὸ χρῆμα τῶν νυκτῶν ὅσον! The ἄγγελος κατὰσκοπος of the Thebans visited the Argive camp at night, and returned before day-break; by day he could not have mingled with the Argives without recognition. In 66 he promises to have an ἡμεροσκόπον ὀφθαλμόν for the day, i.e. to watch by day the movements of the enemy from a distance, as he had served as a spy by night.

The reader will remember that Euripides in his *Phoenician Women* (97) caused the Paedagogus to explain to Antigone his knowledge of the Argive army—he had been to their camp with a message to Eteocles; but the messenger of the *Seven against Thebes* had enjoyed no such opportunity.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

ON THE WORD ἀφειδεῖν.

A critic in the current number of *Hermathena* raises an interesting point on the text of Apollonius Rhodius. In ii. 98 the MSS. reading is

οὐδ' ἄρα Βέβρυκες ἄνδρες ἀφείδισαν βασιλῆος.

Choeroboscus however (Bekk. *Anecd.* p. 1353) quotes the line with ἀκήδισαν, which

has been adopted by Merkel and is considered as certain by Bonitz and Prof. Jebb. On the other hand Jacobs (on *Anth. Pal.* v. 279) and Meineke (*Anal. Alex. ad Euphor.* civ.) defend the text. In my recent edition of the text I have after consideration seen no sufficient reason for deserting the MSS. The objection to the text is of course

ἀφειδεῖν = ἀμελεῖν, and if this were the *only* instance in Apollonius of this sense of the word the proposed correction ἀκήδησαν would be more convincing. This however is not the case, for we find iii. 630

ἡ δ' ἄφνω τὸν ξείνον, ἀφειδήσασα τοκήων,
εἶλετο.

ii. 869

Αἰακίδῃ, πῶς καλὸν ἀφειδήσαντας ἀέθλων
γαίῃ ἐν ἀλλοδαπῇ δὴν ἔμμεναι;

where the sense of ἀφειδεῖν is the same as in ii. 98, and we also have the adjective (in an active sense) in iv. 1252

αἶθ' ἐτλημεν, ἀφειδέες οὐλομένοιο
δείματος κ.τ.λ.

If then ἀκήδησαν is to be read in ii. 98 we must make the corresponding changes in the other three passages. But neither Bonitz nor any one else proposes to do this. Besides this Apollonius has the aor. partep. three times absolutely (= freely, ungrudgingly) and the adv. ἀφειδέως once—a usage which is common enough. Again, Choeroboscus is not always accurate in citing Apollonius, e.g. he quotes (iii. 386)

Αἰήτῃ, χρεόμεν (for σχέο μοι) τῷδε στόλῳ, and, as it happens, Apollonius does not use the verb ἀκηδεῖν. I do not lay any stress on the unlikelihood of a more difficult word ἀφειδήσαν having supplanted a less difficult ἀκήδησαν, because there are two or three instances where κηδόμενος and φειδόμενος are confused in MSS. Writers later than Apollonius also use ἀφειδεῖν = ἀμελεῖν, 'to disregard, neglect, pay no heed to.' Examples may be found in *Strab.* p. 17 (Cas.) ad fin., *Mus.* 302, *Nonn.* viii. 217, 389, but it is unnecessary to quote them. So we find οὐ φείδεσθαι in the same sense, e.g. *Anth. Pal.* vii. 706

οὐδ' ἐφείσατο οὐ τῆς στοῦς, οὐδ' ἧς πάτρας
οὐ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀλλ' ἦλθε δῶμ' ἐς Αἶδεω,

and *ib.* v. 279

ἀλλ' οὐτ' ἀνθρώπων φείδεται οὔτε θεῶν.

The latter example appears to me to give the clue to the much-discussed locus Vergilianus *nec divom parcimus ulli* 'nor do I care for any of the gods.'

The meaning of ἀφειδεῖν may be traced as follows:—(1) 'to give or spend freely of, be lavish of' with a gen. of something more or less under one's own control such as βίου, χρημάτων, σωμάτων, etc., e.g. *Soph. El.* 980 ψυχῆς ἀφειδήσαντε, (2) absolutely, in the

partep. 'freely, ungrudgingly,' e.g. *Eur. I.T.* 1354—cf. the adv. ἀφειδῶς—(3) 'to act freely or lavishly' with regard to something outside oneself, so 'to be careless, neglectful of, not to reckon of' with a genitive of this object. This use seems to be quite established for later Greek, the question is, does it occur in classical Greek? It will be said that its use in later Greek is no warrant for its use in classical Greek. True, but it makes a *prima facie* case for the use in classical Greek, and is perhaps of more avail to support a text than a conjecture. However I venture to think that we have at least two examples of this third use of ἀφειδεῖν in classical Greek. One is in *Soph. Antig.* 414 εἴ τις τοῦδ' ἀφειδήσοι πόνου. Here Bonitz has conjectured ἀκηδήσοι, in which he has been followed by Dindorf, Mekler and Prof. Jebb. Bonitz however chiefly relies upon Choeroboscus, for he says 'Die einzige Stelle welche eine Beweiskraft haben könnte ist entfernt, indem Merkel aus Chöroboskos ἀκήδησαν für ἀφειδήσαν geschrieben hat,' but, as we have seen, *Apoll.* ii. 98 is by no means 'die einzige Stelle' even in Apollonius. Prof. Jebb remarks in his note ad loc. that ἀφειδεῖν πόνου could mean only 'to be unsparing of labour,' but, with all respect to him, the phrase seems exactly similar to ἀφειδήσαντας ἀέθλων quoted above from Apollonius where there is no doubt about the meaning. It is not therefore absurd to suppose that ἀφειδεῖν πόνου could also mean 'to neglect the labour.' The other place is *Thuc.* iv. 26 where it is said of the helots attempting to land provisions on Sphacteria τοῖς δὲ ἀφειδῆς ὁ κατάπλους καθεστήκει, 'their landing was made recklessly,' without regard to consequences, because, as we are immediately told, their boats were valued at so much money. If *Thuc.* can thus speak of a κατάπλους ἀφειδῆς there seems no reason why he could not have said also ἡφειδήσαν τοῦ κατάπλου 'they were careless of the landing.' It appears to me that the passages from Sophocles and Thucydides support one another, and so in fact Prof. Campbell takes them.

I may perhaps take this opportunity of noticing two other points where my critic in *Hermathena* takes me to task. In the critical note on i. 110 I quote Rzach's conjecture ἦλυθ' ἐλδομένοισιν for the text ἦλυθεν ἐλδομένοισιν. I think it highly improbable, but I do not see why it is called an 'impossible ending for a Greek hexameter.' I do not see why it is more objectionable than μετὰ πέντε κασιγνήτησιν (*Il.* 10, 317), the rule against the trochaic

caesura of the fourth foot not applying where the line ends with a word of four or more syllables.

In ii. 1260 ἐννύχιοι δ' ἄργιοι δαημοσύνησιν ἴκοντο Φᾶσιν τ' εὐρὺν βέοντα κ.τ.λ. the word δαημοσύνησιν is a correction of George D'Arnaud for ἀλαιοσύνησιν and this correction has been adopted by Brunck and every editor since. It is however considered by the critic referred to 'not even probable.'

On the other hand it appears to me a *certissima emendatio* (as Wellauer calls it), both on the ground of sense—and the Scholiast explains τῇ ἐμπειρίᾳ—and on account of the obvious resemblance in uncials between αλ and δα. In short, as Merkel says, 'δαημοσ. restituit G. Arnaldus.'

R. C. SEATON.

GRAMMATICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.

I.—ACCIDENCE.

THE following notes are collected from a reading of recently published papyri, as given below.¹ They do not profess to be in any way an exhaustive grammar of the papyri, for the reading was undertaken solely with an eye to the grammatical illustration of the New Testament, and phenomena which had no bearing on this were only observed ἐν παρέρῳ. The ground has been occupied, quite exhaustively for the small part of it attempted, by Mayser in his programm *Grammatik der griech. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, i. Teil 1898 (only Phonology); and Deissmann in his two well-known works has touched on grammar to some extent, though dealing mostly with

vocabulary. There is however plenty left to glean, if only because no less than four volumes of texts have been published since the *Neue Bibelstudien* by the untiring energy of Drs. Grenfell and Hunt—apart from the *Amherst Papyri*, the literary character of which makes them unsuitable for the purpose of this investigation—, while the *Berliner Urkunden* have been steadily growing in bulk all the time. For completeness, I have generally put in all my material, independently of Deissmann's notes, where they cover the same ground. I write under the disadvantage of not knowing what additional material has been brought into the forthcoming English edition.

I.—Orthography.

The ordinary rules for division of words are very generally observed in the papyri. The close attachment of prepositions to their noun comes out strikingly thereby: thus we have κα-τ' ἔτος, κα-θ' ἕκαστον, ἐκ τοῦ, and similarly ὦ-ς ἄν, οὐ-κ (five times in one document)—ἐξυνημύσεως (= ἐκ συνν.) in RL illustrates the same principle.² There are a good many irregularities—such as τοῦ σοῦ γ-νῶναι FP 123 (1/2), φάσ-ω OP 294 (1/, an uneducated writer, as the editors observe), ἀποκαθεσ-ταμένον G 18 (2/ B.C.), γεγρα-μμένα BU 827, δρα-χμάς, etc.—, but I have made no list of them. See Grenfell's note, RL p. 82.

In verse we sometimes find elided vowels written as in Latin: see exx. in Mayser *op. cit.* p. 38. Add IMA i. 1037 [τίς μ] ἐν ἐγὼ παίδων, τοῦ δ' ἐ, ἡ λί[ος ἐγγραφος α]ῦτη. This supports the MSS writing of the quotation in I Cor. 15³⁸, χρηστὰ ὁμλίαι.

² If the dignity of the *C.R.* will permit it, we might quote our cockney's 'not a t'all, not a bloomin' t'all.'

¹ The following abbreviations are used:—

Papyrus Collections.

BM=British Museum Papyri, ed. F. G. Kenyon.

BU=Berliner Urkunde, 3 vols., ed. Wilcken, Krebs and Viereck (3rd vol. 5 parts have appeared).

CPR=Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, ed. Wessely.

PP=Petrie Papyri, ed. Mahaffy.

RL=Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, ed. Grenfell.

G=An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment etc., ed. Grenfell.

GH=Greek Papyri, second series, ed. Grenfell and Hunt.

OP=Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 2 vols., ed. Grenfell and Hunt.

FP= Fayûm Towns and their Papyri, ed. Grenfell and Hunt.

Eud.=Eudoxus Papyrus, ed. Blass.

Dresd.=Die griech. Papyri Sachsens, ed. Wessely, (in Berichte der Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Leipzig, 1885) p. 278.

Miscellaneous.

WM=Winer-Moulton, *Grammar of N. T. Greek*.³

WH=Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament.

Deissmann BS=*Bibelstudien*, NBS=*Neue Bibelstudien*.

IMA=Inscriptiones Maris Aegaei, vols. i. and ii., ed. de Gärtringen and Paton.

Centuries A.D. are denoted by 1/, 2/3, etc.: earlier centuries have B.C. attached.