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](#)

The Poems of Bacchylides *The Poems of Bacchylides*. From a papyrus in the British Museum. Edited by F. G. Kenyon. [Printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1897. Demy 8vo, lii. 247 pp. 58. nett.]

J. A. Nairn

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 09 / December 1897, pp 449 - 453

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00051970, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00051970

How to cite this article:

J. A. Nairn (1897). The Classical Review, 11, pp 449-453 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00051970

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

e contextu; it is all about a *θρέμμα* (cp. *ἔθρεψεν* l. 717, *τροφῶς* l. 728).

The restoration of *προσετρίβη* receives some special support from l. 395 of the same play, where the poet is likewise referring to the crime of Paris and Helen:

πόλει πρόστριμ' ἄφερτον ἐνθείς.

προστρίβω occurs twice in Aeschylus else-

where: in *Prom.* 329 *γλώσση ματαία ζημία προστρίβεται*; and in *Eum.* 238, *ἀλάστορα.... ἀμβλὺν ἥδη προστετριμμένον τε πρὸς ἄλλοισιν οἴκοις καὶ πορεύμασιν βροτῶν*, where the participle has the double sense of *inflicted* and *worn away by rubbing*. For the use of the 1st Aor. pass. it is enough to refer to *τριφθεῖσα ἔλη* in *Thucydides*, 2, 77.

J. B. BURY.

THE SUN'S RAYS SHINING UNDEFILED ON FILTH.

THIS illustration of the principle, 'to the pure all things are pure,' is not uncommon in the later Greek and Latin writers. I do not remember to have seen any collection of texts, and have myself let slip not a few. The following may serve as a beginning. I cannot recover passages in which rulers are praised for keeping an eye on all their subjects, down to the meanest and the worst, even as the sun shines impartial on all things.

Diog. Laert. vi 63 (saying of Diogenes the cynic):

πρὸς τὸν ὀνειδίζοντα ὡς εἰς τόπους ἀκαθάρτους εἰσίοι, Καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφη, εἰς τοὺς ἀποπάτους, ἀλλ' οὐ μαιίνεται.

Orig. c. Cels. vi 73 οἶται δὲ ὁ τὸν Στωϊκὸν λόγον ἐκτιθέμενος καὶ μὴ προσποιούμενος τὰ περὶ ἀδιαφόρων μεμαθηκέναι, εἰς μίasma ἐμβεβλήσθαι τὴν θείαν φύσιν, καὶ μεμιάσθαι εἴτε γενομένην ἐν γυναικὸς σώματι, ἕως περιπλασθῇ αὐτῇ τὸ σῶμα, εἴτε σῶμα ἀνελιφθῆναι παραπλήσιον τι ποιῶν τοῖς οἰομένοις τὰς αἰγὰς τοῦ ἡλίου μαιίνεσθαι ἐν τοῖς βορβόροις καὶ τοῖς δυσώδεσι σώμασι, καὶ μὴ μένειν ἀκακέ καθαράς. [Similarly *Athan. de incarn. Verbi* 17 f. (i. 126 c d, *Migne*); *Macar. hom.* 7 § 2 pr. (*Migne, patrol. Gr.* xxxiv 524 d.); 11 § 13 (553 d); 16 § 3 f. (616 a b); *Append. Basil. hom.* in

s. Christi generationem (ii 602 c, ed. *Bened.*). To these five references I was led by David *Hoeschel's* note.]

Aug. de agone Christiano § 20 (vi. 245 a, ed. *Bened.*) *nec eos audiamus, qui non verum hominem suscepisse dicunt Filium Dei, neque natum esse de femina, sed falsam carnem et imaginem simulatam corporis humani ostendisse videntibus. nesciunt enim quomodo substantia Dei administrans universam creaturam inquinari omnino non possit: et tamen praedicant istum visibilem solem radios suos per omnes faeces et sordes corporum spargere, et eos mundos et sinceros ubique servare.*

Hier. ep. 120 ad *Hedibiam* c. 11 (i 845 c d, ed. *Ven.* 1765, 4to.): *nec hoc mirandum de Apostolo, cum etiam de Domino legerimus: ecce hic positus est in ruinam et in resurrectionem multorum in Israel. . . . solisque radios tam munda loca excipiant quam immunda, et sic in floribus quomodo in stercore luceant: nec tamen solis radii polluantur. sic et Christi bonus odor, qui numquam mutari potest nec suam naturam amittere, credentibus vita est, incredulis mors.*

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

THE POEMS OF BACCHYLIDES.

The Poems of Bacchylides. From a papyrus in the British Museum. Edited by F. G. Kenyon. [Printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1897. Demy 8vo, lii. 247 pp. 5s. nett.]

WHEN it became known early in the year that a volume of papyrus had been discovered containing a considerable number of the poems of Bacchylides, a feeling of expectation akin to that experienced in 1891 on the announcement of the new *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, was aroused in the scholars of this and other countries. That

in Bacchylides a notable rival of Pindar was added to our store of Greek poetry; that from 107 lines (many of little interest from our ignorance of the context), which some months ago were all that we had of this poet, at the present time 'about 1,070 are either perfect or admit of satisfactory restoration' (p. xxiii.), while of these one ode alone (V.) contains 200; that, moreover, fourteen centuries had passed since Bacchylides was last read in such a form as we have him, all these were facts which justified the eagerness displayed for further information since the first announcement of

the British Museum Trustees. The fact that the first editor was to be Mr. Kenyon was a sufficient guarantee, to those who could appreciate the ability shown in his earlier work of the excellence of its successor. The latter now lies before us; and it may safely be said that Mr. Kenyon has confirmed his high reputation. His task indeed was easier than before. The 'fine uncial hand of good size' (p. xvii.) would present no such difficulties in deciphering as the crabbed minuscule of the Aristotle, with the additional complication of the number of scribes. Also, in establishing the text of Bacchylides, where reconstruction or conjectural emendation found legitimate scope, the editor had the assistance (p. lii.) of such scholars as Prof. Jebb, Prof. Palmer, Prof. Blass, and Dr. Sandys. The advantage gained by the collaboration of the first-mentioned scholar in particular may be studied in the apparatus criticus. Perhaps the most remarkable circumstance in the history of the Aristotle was the wealth of resource with which the scholars of this country treated from every point of view the problems presented; and the same may be said of the Bacchylides.

The present is hardly the occasion for discussing the merit of Bacchylides as a poet. I find myself, however, in general agreement with the editor (pp. xliii. sq.). The final verdict on Bacchylides will probably be flattering. He suffers by comparison with Pindar; he offends at first by certain mannerisms such as the keeping up of epithets often commonplace; but he is excellent in narrative, and he expresses the simpler emotions with dignity and grace. The poems numbered v., xvii., xviii., are of special interest.

Mr. Kenyon does not claim finality for his text. There are a number of passages where an emendation may yet be made which will displace the suggestions here adopted, although the editor has been slow to admit alterations for which a considerable amount of evidence was not forthcoming. One good principle he has adopted: that of excluding from his text any reading which involved a change in any part of a mutilated passage; even when, as at xvii. 86, a practically certain emendation is thus excluded. Again, it is impossible to regard as certain all the restorations proposed where the text presents *lacunæ*. Continued study of the poems may lead to more definite results in matters of detail; but, in the main, future editors of Bacchylides will have few textual problems to grapple with.

I proceed to discuss some passages where the editor's text or notes do not satisfy me.

Ode i. vv. 1 sqq.

Mr. Kenyon says of vv. 1-12: 'The drift of these mutilated lines can hardly be restored with certainty: but apparently ll. 1-8 refer to Melas himself.' I shall first propose my restoration of the passage and then offer some remarks.

πολ[ὸν πρῶτον, τῷ]ν βαθυ-
δείελο[ν ξῖσ]μεν γένος,
ἐπλε[το καρτε]ρόχειρ
'Αργείο[ς ἀγαλμα], λέοντος
5 θυμὸ[ν ἔχων], ὅποτε
[ξ]αχρεί[ος ἐξέ]λθοι μάχας,
ποσσὶ[ν τ' ἐλα]φρό[ς, π]ατρίων
τ' οὐκ [ἀπείρατος π]αλῶν.

I have adopted in vv. 3, 7, and 8 restorations already in the text: save that in v. 7 ἐλαφρός appears instead of ἐλαφροῖς. The nom. sing. seems necessary, even if it will not fill the vacant space quite so accurately. In v. 8 ἀπείρατος is Prof. Jebb's. From the editor's silence on the epithet βαθυδείελο[ν] I am emboldened to say that it means 'very famous,' lit. 'very conspicuous,' much as εὐδείελος, only metaphorical. Bacchylides is fond of compounds with βαθυ- as the first part.

πολὸν πρῶτον goes with ἀγαλμα, and τῶν is the relative. ξῖσμεν gains in probability from the editor's statement that the letter before M in the papyrus 'is perhaps Σ,' that is, apparently, C. That ὅποτε should be read as one word, not divided as in the text, seems clear: while in the ΟΑΟΪ of the following line must be concealed a trace of the optative 'of frequency.' The right reading of v. 6 is very difficult to ascertain. The MS. (v. critical note) has a vowel at the beginning, making hiatus with the final of ὅποτε. This is very rare (v. note on x. 15, p. 87) in the poems. But the meaning is the chief difficulty of ΑΧΡΕΙ: 'when he came forth to battle' must be the general sense, and ζαχρεῖος μάχας, meaning 'eager for battle,' is possible, cf. Theocritus xxv. 6. I had thought of ΧΡΕΙ[Α ΝΙΝ ΕΚΚ]ΑΛΟΪ ΜΑΧΑC, but this does not agree with ΑΧΡΕΙ or with ΟΑΟΪ. For ἐξέλθοι it may be said that it involves the common confusion of Θ and Ο, though transposition complicates the question. The accent on ΟΪ in the MS. is not a serious objection (v. note on iii. 30, p. 21). Finally, ἐξέλθοι satisfies the metre of the antistrophic v. 14.

In the light of this restoration we may now approach Ode ii. vv. 4-5, where is to be found the rest of the evidence for the name of the athlete whose praises form the subject of these two odes. Mr. Kenyon reads here:—

ὅτι Μ[έλ]ας θρασύχειρος Ἀρ-
γείο[ν ἄ]ρατο νίκαν.

Considering the difficulty of Ἀργείων νίκαν (see his note), and the passage in the first ode just discussed, where no proper name other than Ἀργείος could well find a place, it is probable that the name of the athlete was Ἀργείος, not Μέλας: that Μ[]ΑC of v. 4 is to be restored as ΜΕΓΑC: cf. μέγαν Θησέα (xvii. 98) which may remove Mr. Kenyon's scruples as to the epithet: and lastly that Ἀργείος is to be read, with Blass and Sandys, in both passages.

Ode i. vv. 42-3.

I am inclined to read, with Prof. Jebb, τόνδ' ἔλαχεν τιμάν, neglecting the punctuation of the MS. But the τίμάν; of the text has a tone of good-humoured contempt which will lead some to prefer it.

Ode ii. 8. Ἐυξανίδα νᾶσον. Mr. Marindin has suggested to me a reference to Strabo p. 487, where it is stated that Nestor, on his return from Troy, founded a temple to Athene Nedusia (of Nedon in Elis cf. Strabo p. 360) at Poessa in Ceos. This, added to the fact that one of the founders of Miletus was the Pylian Neleus, forms a link between Pylus Miletus and Ceos like that established by the editor on p. 195.¹

Ode iii. vv. 21-22. θεὸν θεόν τις | ἀγλαΐζέτω γάρ, ἄριστον ὄλβον. The γάρ is exceedingly weak, and a 2nd person imperative seems required: 'whoever thou art, give God the glory.' ἄριστον ὄλβον also is unsatisfactory, nor is ἄριστον ὄλβω any more suitable. Prof. Butcher, who has very kindly helped me with his advice throughout the preparation of this review, suggests

θεὸν θεόν τις | ἀγλαΐζε, δώτορ' ἄριστον ὄλβον.

TOP and GAP are very close, and the corruption of OABΩN to OABON would be rapid after the disappearance of ΔΩΤΟΡΑ. It would perhaps be over refining to say that the transition from ἈΓΛΑΙΖΕΔΩ to ἈΓΛΑΙΖΕΘΩ is less violent than that postulated in the text.

¹ [It may be added, that it also explains why Bacchylides (if we accept Professor Palmer's excellent suggestion in Ode xi. 120) speaks of the founders of Metapontum as his ancestors. G. E. M.]

Mr. Marindin would read ἀγλαΐζε, θεῷ γάρ ἄριστος ὄλβων, giving a causative sense to θεῷ.²

Ode iii. 48. Read Ἀβροβάταν (a proper name) with Prof. Palmer.

iii. 49. ξύλινον δόμον = funeral pyre might have had a note, with a reference to Pindar's ξύλινον τεῖχος (Pyth. 3, 67). The whole passage should be compared, esp. οἰκτροτάτῳ θανάτῳ with v. 52 of Bacchylides.

iii. 60. The spelling τανισφύροις of the MS. should hardly be introduced into the text: (cf. Stephanus, *Thesaurus* s.v.)

iii. 63. The sentence which begins ὅσοι μὲν ends with the word πέμψαι v. 66. βροτῶ (v. 66) for which we should perhaps read βροτῶν (cf v. 109), goes with πάρεστιν of v. 67: the infinitive dependent on πάρεστιν lies hid in []εῖν: perhaps [αἶνε]εῖν, though the editor reports a Γ before εἰν: cf. however xiii. 166 ff. From ὅστις τοιαύτηται is parenthetical, and in v. 69 perhaps [Δαμοκ]λη should be restored: while the epithet of Διὸς in v. 70 may be [ξεν]ιον, but is more probably some local title of the God, familiar to the poet as a native of Ceos. For the deprecatory tone of vv. 67-68 cf. xiii. 166 ff. above quoted. Is Damocles then the trainer of Hiero's horses?

iii. 76-7. Prof. Jebb's [Ἀπόλλων] and [ὁ βουκόλος] are worthy of being received into the text.

iii. 88. πολὺν π[αρ]έντα γήρας. I am disposed to read παρέντα with Prof. Jebb, but in the sense of 'passing over,' 'omitting,' not as Prof. Jebb 'having seen it go by.' This meaning seems scarcely so suitable, and barely borne out by the parallels quoted, both of which refer to seeing youth, not old age, go by. I question whether, in the sense in which Plato uses the word, it is possible for any one γήρας παρίεναι.

iii. 90. μινύθει with ὦ is indeed a novelty. Is it impossible that the form μινύνω posited by Mr. Purser (on v. 151 p. 54) should have been used intransitively (as μινύθω is used in both ways)? Its displacement by the common form μινύθω would be almost certain. No corruption of a deeper kind seems at all probable.

iv. 19. παντοδαπῶν. This word, a formation like ποδαπός (cuia) meant originally 'from all lands,' and was then generalized. The primitive meaning will suit the present

² [Professor Butcher's proposal makes a much better line. My only difficulty in regarding it as altogether preferable to my own is that it is hard to conceive a scribe altering so common a word as δώτορ' into θωγαρ, whereas he might conceivably write the monosyllabic θεῷ as θω. G. E. M.]

passage, for Hiero, as Mr. Kenyon says, had won victories at Olympus, Pytho and Thebes. I had thought of παντοδροπῶν, another ἀπαξ εἰρημένον, comparing Horace's undique decerptam—oliuam, but there does not seem to be room for three letters between O and Π.

v. 26. δυσπαίπαλα is a strange epithet of κύματα. In pre-Christian poetry it is applied elsewhere only to the glens of mountains. δυσπέμφελα (v. L. and S.) is much more appropriate, and may be worth consideration, perhaps as δυσπέμπελα, cf. εὐπέμπελος.

v. 67. Prof. Jebb's ἀργεστάς ought, I think, to be read.

v. 80. For γελανώσας, a strange formation, and one hardly warranted by Pindar's θυμῷ γελανεῖ, Mr. Marindin suggests with much probability γαλανώσας (: γαλάνη = γαλήνη).

v. 107. For πλημυρῶν read probably πλημύρων and cf. Steph., *Thes.* s.v. πλημυρίων.

v. 151. I have referred on iii. 90 to Mr. Purser's view, which is probably right: certainly a finite verb. seems wanted rather than the adverb μίνυνθα even with ἦν.

v. 194. ὅπ[ασσαν] should be read with Prof. Jebb for ἔπ[λησαν].

vi. 4 (note). The translation which Mr. Kenyon rejects is probably correct: that which he approves is impossible. 'Iachon obtained great glory on account of the praises of Ceos sung by the young men': the praises being Iachon's exploits.

vii. 1. While agreeing with Mr. Kenyon that Ἡμέρα is probably meant, I would parallel the first line by Frag. 66 (40 Bergk) Ἐκάτα δαδοφόρε, Νυκτὸς μελανοκόλπου θύγατερ.

vii. 7. ἐρισταλκές (σθένος). Read ἀρισ-ταλκές.

viii. 7. The expression ἐν ἀλικί χρονῷ surely requires a note. ἀλιξ is apparently equivalent to τηλικούτος, a transition similar to that seen in aequalis.

viii. 10. With κεραυνεγχές might have been compared Pindar's εγχεικέραυνος.

ix. 10. νικάσπιδες is a very strange compound. 'With victorious shields,' the meaning preferred by the editor, seems a rather infelicitous epithet, as the victory is presumably won by the offensive, not the defensive, weapons. It is at least curious that at xi. 62 we have χαλκάσπιδες ἡμίθεοι, not indeed of Adrastus, but with Argos in the immediate vicinity. Given X in the lacuna (and there seems to be space for it) the strokes of ΝΙ would equally well give ΑΛ, thus giving ΧΑΛΚΑΣΠΙΔΕΣ ΗΜΙΘΕΟΙ in both passages.

ix. 13. ἀωτεύοντα, in view of the striking parallel quoted in the note, seems the best suggestion for the corrupt ΑCΑΓΕΥΟΝΤΑ. At the same time, ἀωτεύειν, like ἀωτεῖν, commonly means 'to sleep': and it may be that this is the sense here. Prof. Butcher suggests ἀθαλεύοντα (: ἀθελῆς weaned).

ix. 46. There can be little doubt that καθ' ὑψιπέλου Τροίας ἔδος should be read with Prof. Jebb. The difficulty in the mythology might be lessened if we could interpret σᾶς γενεᾶς loosely as 'the daughters of thy wife Harmonia.' It is not quite certain that Bacchylides regarded Thebe and Aegina as daughters of Ares: for κυανοπλοκάμουν θήβας πόλιν may be a periphrasis for Thebes, of which the ἀγναιτίδες were Semele and her sisters. But the introduction of Thebe is strange if she is not a daughter of Harmonia: contrary to the usual form of the legend, which makes her the daughter of the river-god Asopus and Metope.

ix. 86. Perhaps κάλλιστον εἰ[ρήνας ἀγαλμα].

ix. 95-6. Perhaps

π[αύροις
ἀν]δρ[ασιν πάντως ὁράται] τὸ μέλλον.

x. i. Perhaps

σὺ γὰρ [αἰὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποις πεδ]οιχνεῖς
ἄθλα :

or ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις cf. vii. 9.

x. 10. νασιώταν seems to satisfy the conditions best. I had thought that the name of the athlete might lurk in these lines, and tried both v. 10 and v. 11 with that in view, impelled by the neighbourhood of τεῶν ἀρετῶν (v. 13). But I now think that v. 11 begins ἤγειρε θ' ἵνα κτλ. The letter before ΕΙ in the first word, which Mr. Kenyon reads now as Λ now as Χ, may be Γ. If ἐκείνησεν ... ἤγειρε θ' seems prosaic, the fault lies in ἐκείνησεν.

x. 45 sqq. Mr. Kenyon, usually a stout champion of the punctuation in the MS., here abandons it without reason. We should read

τὸ μέλλον
δ' ἀκρίτους τίκτει τελευτάς
πᾶ τύχα βρίσει.

πᾶ...βρίσει enforces ἀκρίτους. What meaning παῖ, τύχα βρίσει can have, the ode not being addressed to a boy, I fail to realise. It is moreover open to question whether ΠΑΙ could be παῖ. At xiii. 62 that vocative is written ΠΑΙ without any line above.

xi. 11. [κατέχ]ουσι seems better than

[κελαδ]οῦσι: cf. xiii. 129 *sq.* There is no accent over ΟΥ.

xi. 52. Mr. Kenyon prints εὐρυβία, taking it with Διός, but the MS. has clearly εὐρυβία with πλούτῳ. Cf. xvi. 31 φθόνος εὐρυβίας.

xi. 101. ἱππώκεος. A reference to Herodotus lib. i. *ad fin.* might be added.

xiii. 50. Mr. Kenyon puts a period after αἰνεῖ, but surely the subject to αἰνεῖ is contained in the following lines.

xiii. 126 *sqq.* I suggest [κλάζ]ντες ὑπερφιάλον

[μέγιστ' ἐθάρσουν]
[Τρῶ]ες ἱππενταὶ κνανώπιδας ἐκ
[φλέξασιν ἐνσέλμους] νέας
[παύραις χόρον εἶλα]πίνας τ' ἐν
[ἀμέ]ρ[α]ις ἕξειν θεόδματον πόλιν.

ἐκφλέξασιν = when they had burnt. I adopt κλάζοντες, τρῶες, and εἰλαπίνας from Mr. Kenyon.

xiii. 160. For ἄμα δὴ, which I do not understand, perhaps θαμὰ δὴ, space permitting.

xiii. 166. For θερσοεπὴς I would prefer ἀθερσοεπὴς, to which the punctuation points rather (*v. note*), but I would connect the first part of the word with ἀθερίζειν. Prof. Butcher plausibly conjectures ἀτερψιεπὴς (*cf. infra*. 197 *τερψιπέης*).

xiii. 189. Perhaps φοινικοκραδέμους τε Μούσαις rather. The poet trusts in his hope and the Muse's help.

xiii. 190. Perhaps τὰν δε[χάνορ] ἐστίαν].

xiii. 195. ἐτύμως may mean 'true to her name,' as Dr. Verrall holds for Aeschylus.

xiv. 22. Πυρρίχον may be supported by *v.* 182 *ff.*

xv. 5-6. Perhaps Ὀδυσσεῖ

[Λαρτιάδα Μενελά]ω τ' Ἀτρείδα βασιλεῖ.

xvi. 34. With ῥοδόεντι of a river *cf. ἀνθεμόεντι* Ἐβρω *v.* 5.

xvii. A reference to Baumeister *Denkmäler*, Band iii. p. 1793 (the Euphronius vase), might have been given with advantage.

xvii. 38. Νηρηίδες, but *infra v.* 102-3 Νηρηὸς δαβρίον κόρας. There cannot well be any such difference in this ode, at least between these expressions, as Ammonius refers to (Bergk 10).

xvii. 102 (*note*). Philological reasons would surely preclude the possibility of a form Νερῆος = Νηρέος, which seems to be hinted at.

xvii. 112. Prof. Jebb's εἰανόν (and πορφύρεον) may be accepted. Mr. Marindin points out that ἀμφὶ γυίοις *v.* 124 is only consistent with the mention of a garment here. He suggests also ἀμφέβαλε ταινίαν as a possible alternative.

xix. 15. For the corrupt ΤΙΗΝ. Mr. Marindin has a very attractive suggestion ΤΙΕΝ, another Doric Infinitive (*cf. line* 25 and *note*). He would take γέρας τῖεν together, comparing Aesch. *Ag.* 706 μέλος τῖόντας, and regard τῖεν as epexegetical of ἕζοχον γέρας. This would possibly not necessitate the removal of the stop (middle point) after γέρας: *cf. xiii.*, iii. where this stop is equivalent to a comma.

Frag. 7, 5. πο]λυαμπελ[ον] In *vi.* 5 ἀμπελοτρόφον is applied to Κέον.

J. A. NAIRN.

NICOLE'S FRAGMENTS OF MENANDER.

Le Laboureur de Ménandre: fragments inédits sur papyrus d'Égypte, déchiffrés, traduits et commentés par Jules Nicole, Professeur à l'Université de Genève. [Geneva; Georg & Co., 1898 (*sic*)]. 2s. 6d.

THE announcement, which appeared in some of the daily papers a few weeks ago, that a play of Menander had been discovered in a papyrus manuscript, must have raised the hopes of many scholars. It has always been surprising that the discoveries of papyri, which have been so plentiful of late years, should have included no portion of Menander, probably the most popular of authors in the Alexandrian and subsequent ages. It has been suggested that the cause is to be found in the hostility of the Christian Church; but the chapter of accidents which

has given us Aristophanes and Herodas and certain parts of the Anthology and Petronius and Martial can hardly have owed much to ecclesiastical favour. In any case the influence of the Church would have been very ineffectual before the fourth century; and all the literary papyri which have yet been brought to light have belonged to earlier dates than this. The non-appearance of Menander must be put down to an accident—an accident which any day may repair. Unfortunately it is not repaired by the discovery, interesting though it be, which has now been made public by Prof. Nicole.

Prof. Nicole's discovery, which is published in a convenient pamphlet of some eighty pages, consists of two fragments of papyrus, the largest about 6 inches by 7,