

# 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 and an Apology

T. W. Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 02 / March 2011, pp 97 - 98

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00029668, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00029668](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00029668)

### How to cite this article:

T. W. Allen (2011). Notes and an Apology. The Classical Review, 15, pp 97-98 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00029668

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

# The Classical Review

MARCH 1901.

## NOTES AND AN APOLOGY.

### 1. Hymn to Demeter 398.

εἰ δὲ πᾶσα πάλιν ἰοῦσ' ὑπ' . . .

So far the Mosquensis, which here is torn. The second hand completed the line by writing ὑπὸ κεύθει γαίης. In the first edition of the hymn Ruhnken accepted Wyttenbach's conjecture ἐπάσω and added αὖτις after πάλιν to complete the metre, and εἰ δ' ἐπάσω πάλιν αὖτις ἰοῦσ' ὑπὸ κεύθει γαίης the line has remained ever since, with only Alfred Goodwin's suggestion εἰ δέ τι πάσασαο πάμπαν as alternative. On looking at the facsimile I am struck with the violence that has been done to such an excellent word as πᾶσα, and I propose to read the line

εἰ δέ, πᾶσα πάλιν <συ γ'> ἰοῦσ' ὑπὸ κεύθει γαίης

The idiom εἰ δέ is found at I 42 and frequently in prose. Πτῆναι is unhomeric, but ἐξέπτῃ occurs in Hesiod and the Batrachomachia. A syllable must be supplied after πάλιν. The line I venture to think gains in force: 'but if so, back you fit—.'

2. Townley scholia on II 170. This note is peculiar to T and V; it is one of the scholia that have fallen out in A, and only the first part remains in B. The subject is the small number of Achilles' ships (50): πῶς says the schol. B ἐν ἅπασιν αὖξων Ἀχιλλέα τούτῳ μειοῖ, ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα μόνον λέγων ἔχειν τὰς ναῦς; τινὲς μὲν οὖν φασὶν ὅτι οὐκ ἐν πλήθει ἢ ἀρετῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς περὶ αὐτὴν σεμνύ-

νεται. Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ φησιν ὅτι διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ κληῖσιν ἐδήλωσεν ὡς μόνοι οἱ ἐρέται ἦσαν ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα: τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν πλῆθος τῶν πολεμιστῶν οὐκ ἐμνημόνευσεν, ὅπερ ἐπιφέρονται αἱ νῆες. The Townley version agrees as far as the first λύσις, the moral one, and then proceeds: Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ φησιν ν' ἀρετὰς εἶναι διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ κληῖσιν ν, ἢ λιτὰς κ' πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν. Διονύσιος δὲ τὸν μέγιστον ἀριθμὸν ρκ' τίμιον, τὸν δὲ λοιπὸν ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τούτων ἄγεσθαι, ὡς φθάνειν πάσας ἀπὸ τῶ ἀνδρῶν. The corruptions ἀρετὰς (for ἐρέτας), and ἐπὶ κληῖσιν ν (for ἐπὶ κληῖσιν) are easily emended out of B, but in what follows Maass and Wilamowitz-Möllendorf have obscured the meaning by writing ναῦτας for λιτὰς κ', μὲν ἐρετῶν for μέγιστον, τιμῶν for τίμιον, τὸ λοιπὸν for τὸν λοιπόν, and declaring the numerals ρκ' and τε corrupt. λιτὰς must be the remains of ὀπλίτας, and κ' is καὶ mistaken for a numeral. 'Aristarchus said that the words ἐπὶ κληῖσιν showed that the fifty in question were rowers, or soldiers also for rowing': his contention was as we see from B that the πεντήκοντα did not comprise the whole complement of each ship: they were either mere rowers who did not fight, or they were fighting men who could also row.

Dionysius (also quoted on 159—he of Sidon is apparently meant) gave a reference to Thucydides' well-known system (I. 10) of computing the total of the Greek armament by striking an average between the largest and the smallest crew and multiplying by the number of ships. 'Dionysius says the

highest number 120 was honourable, the other numbers were reckoned between these two [i.e. between 120 and 50], so that the ships generally start from 85.' ρκ therefore is correct, it is the number of Agamemnon's crews, τε needs the slight correction into πε = 85 the Thucydidean average (which is correctly given by schol. L on B 488). I am unable to justify the sense I have given to φθάνειν but it is what is evidently required: the total of ships × 85 gives the sum required. I do not know if there is any special use of φθάνειν in mathematics; in late and modern Greek it seems to mean to arrive and to suffice.

3. This is not the only place where the editor and Wilamowitz together have deranged these scholia. E 500 the Victorian apograph and the Leipzig MS. read Πτολεμαῖος τοὺς δωδεκασυλλάβους στίχους ἐκτιθείς φησι καὶ τοῦτον οὕτω γράφεσθαι, εὐτ' ἂν ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ. This is perfect as it stands: 'Ptolemy, exhibiting the twelve-syllabled lines, says that this one is also written εὐτ' ἂν ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ,' in which case it would have twelve syllables, and not, as with the usual reading, ὅτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ, thirteen.

The Townley MS. has made the clerical error δώδεκα συλλαβάνων for δωδεκασυλλάβους; Wilamowitz improves this into δύο συλλαβάνων 'Ptolemy running two lines together,' a performance of which there can be no question here; and the editor, accepting the conjecture, keeps the rest of the original and prints the singular sentence;

Πτολεμαῖος τοὺς δύο συλλαβάνων στίχους ἐκτιθείς φησι καὶ τοῦτον οὕτω γράφεσθαι, εὐτ' ἂν ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ.

4. I take the opportunity to repeat my conjecture (*C.R.* 1900, p. 17 n. 2) that in these scholia O 10 εἰ δὲ ἐψιλοῦτο, ἦν ἂν, φησὶ κοώμενος, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦσαν ἔασαν, instead of κοώμενος we should read ὁ Κωμανός. This scholar appears in many places, e.g. A 314, N 137, 529. Wilamowitz's πλανώμενος has not much to recommend it.

These remarks are not intended to disparage the edition of these scholia published by Dr. E. Maass in 1887, an edition which may be said to be as excellent as the scholia which it contains. I have in fact a reparation to make to Dr. Maass, which has long been upon my conscience.

The date of the manuscript Burney 86 is, it is well known, uncertain; the subscription is mutilated. Dr. Maass in his preface and elsewhere endeavoured to prove that the missing date was 1059 A.D. In a paper which I wrote in the *Journal of Philology*, 1891, I combated this view. I have now come round to Dr. Maass' opinion, and I have to apologise to him, not for differing from him, which is venial, but for the terms in which I expressed my dissent. The language I adopted appears to me absolutely unjustifiable, and I hereby express to Professor Maass my sincere regret for it.

T. W. ALLEN.

## NOTES ON EURIPIDES.—II.

(Continued from p. 25.)

IPH. AUL. (with Wecklein 1899)

228 τὰν γυναικείον ὄψιν ὀμμάτων  
ὥς πλήσαιμι, μείλινον ἁδονάν.

In such a case, where there is a slight pause after πλήσαιμι, it would be according to the common practice to leave it unelided though a vowel followed. After more than one attempt, I suspect the original was

ΩΣΠΛΗΧΑΙΜΙΑΔΕΙΜΟΝΑΔΟΝΑΝ  
ἁδαιμον ἁδονάν α *pleasure without danger*. The word has disappeared from literature, but it is recorded by the lexicons, Hesychius having ἁδαιμον: ἁφοβον, and it seems that φάσματ' ἁδαιμα should be read in *El.* 709.

328 ἐκκεκόμεψεναι πονηρὸν γλῶσσ' ἐπίφθορον  
σοφή.

Without prejudice to other notions I may suggest that a good sentence would be made by reading the infinitive, εὖ κεκομψεῖσθαι πονηρόν.

334-40 δυσπρόσιτος 'unaccessible,'

ἀπρόσιτος, οὐκ εὐπρόσιτος, δυσέντεκτος, δυσπροσήγορος, the characteristic of the tyrant as opposed to the *civilis* who is εὐπροσήγορος *Hipp.* 94, for mankind hate τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ τὸ μὴ πᾶσιν φίλον *ib.* 92. It will be seen that in Alexis 116 (*Ath.* 237 b) we should read