

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](#)



Critical Notes on Bacchylides

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 04 / May 1898, pp 210 - 218
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0003064X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0003064X

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1898). Critical Notes on Bacchylides. The Classical Review, 12, pp 210-218
doi:10.1017/S0009840X0003064X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

CRITICAL NOTES ON BACCHYLIDES.

To the very great number of corrections proposed by English and foreign scholars I add the following observations:

iii. 43. Perhaps:—θεότιμον ἄστυ. Cp. xi. 2, ix. 98.

57. ἄπιστον οὐδὲν ὅ τι θεῶν μέριμνα | τεύχει. I prefer the subjunctive τεύχῃ as in the similar passage xvii. 117 ἄπιστον ὅ τι δαίμονες | θέλωσιν (no change is needed) οὐδὲν φρενοάrais βροτοῖς.

69. Possibly: [θεοφι]λῇ φίλιππον ἄνδρ' ἄρῃον (this with Headlam). Θεοφίλης is a very apt epithet for Hieron, whom the poet compares with the θεοφίλης Croesus.

76. ὁ δ' ἀναξ—εἶπε Φέρη[τος νῦ]. Rather: ὁ δ' κτέ. *Quod—dixit.*

87. εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός. These words without αἰεὶ offer no sense whatever, and the same objection can be made against Prof. Housman's εὐφρόσυνος δ'. One expects something like οὐ φθόριμος δὲ χρυσός, without the article. Χρυσοῦ οὐχ ἄπτεται ἰός. However, the article seems to be chosen in reference to vs. 17, and therefore I conjecture with the slightest change: οὐ σάπετ' ἄ' (= ἀέ) εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός. 'Αέ is a Pindaric form. The sense would be *perennis fons laetitiae*.

v. 48. ἱεται (rather ἱεται) νεόκροτον | νίκαν Ἱέρωνι—τιτύσκων. Instead of the obscure νεόκροτον I propose νεόκριτον. Cp. fr. 12, 6. Possible also is νεόκτετον. Cp. xvii. 126.

65. οἶά τε φύλλ' ἄνεμος | Ἴδος ἀνὰ μῆλο-
βότους | πρῶνας ἀργηστὰς δονεῖ. The metre favours rather more this reading: οἶά τε φύλλα πνέων—Ἀργηστὰς. The subst. ἄνεμος could be a gloss.

106. Perhaps: ἐς καλλίχορον Καλυδῶν', <ὅς> | ἐνθα πλημύρων σθένει κτέ.

146. Write ἐξαναρίζων for ἐξαναρίζων. Cp. xiii. 118 and Pindar N. vi. 57.

200. τοὺς—Ζεὺς ἀκνήτους ἐν εἰρήν[α φυλάσσει]. Rather φυλάσσει.

viii. 6–9. I propose: οὐτις ἀνθρώπων κ[λεεν] | νᾶς <τοῦδ'> ἐν ἀλικι χρόνῳ | παῖς ἔων ἀνήρ τε π[οσι] στεφάνους πλεῦ | νᾶς ἐδέξατο νίκας, admitting the correction κλεεν-νᾶς for κλεεννᾶς and the insertion ποσὶ κτέ. of Prof. Platt.

ix. 35, 36. αἰθέρ' ἐκ χειρός, βοάν<τ'> ὤρινε λαῶν | ἧ τελευταίας ἀμάρνυμα πάλας. For ἧ there is proposed δῆ or οἱ or καὶ, but the H of the MS. signifies ἧ. Cp. Pind. O. xiii. 63 and Bergk's evident correction of N. iv. 64. The addition of τ' and the reading ὤρινε

instead of ὥτρυνε (the same has occurred to myself) are due to Prof. Housman.

ix. 55, 56. In regard to the metre I should prefer μέγ[ιστον] | [Ζηνὸς ἃ πλαθεῖσα λέ]χει to ἃ Διὸς πλαθεῖσα λέχει, proposed by Prof. Blass and other critics.

63. Perhaps κ[ἡνδαῖ]ς αἶτ' ἄλλαι θεῶν. Cp. xiii. 63. In the preceding verse Aegina seems to have been mentioned, as in the other passage.

96. Possibly: [κ]αὶ Διων[ύσοι] ἱερὰν | θεοτί-
ματον πόλιν. Cp. ii. 2, x. 34, 35.

101. Perhaps: [ὅτ]τι καλὸν φρ[όνιμόν τ'].

102. αἰνέοι τίμῳ [—] Mr. Kenyon edits. But the iota in τιμῇ and its composites being long, τι and μο ought to be separated.

x. 20. [ἐνθα προύφηνας] Ἑλλασιν κτέ. Write προύφαναs.

23. ἔστα[.....] δ' αὖτε θεατήρων ἐλαίφ. The reading of the first hand θατήρων can be defended by θάσθαι, ἄσαι and similar Aristophanic forms. Cp. θαητός and θαέομαι in Pindar.

48. ἄνδρα πολλῶν ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων πολυζήλωτον ἔμμεν. This single verse corresponds with the last two verses of the strophe. Therefore I conjecture:

48. ἄνδρα πολλῶν ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων

<----->

48b. <-----> πολυζήλωτον ἔμμεν.

The first hemistichion can have been for instance: ἀγασθέντ' ἀμφὶ νίκας.

xi. 26, 27. δίκας κέλευθον εἰ μή τις ἀπέτραπεν ὀρθᾶς. A most awkward and unnatural expression! Read δίκαν κελεύθου κτέ., and all will be right.

69–72. λίσσοντο δὲ παῖδας Ἄβαντος | γὰν πολύκριθον λαχόντας | Τίρυνθα τὸν ὀπλοτέρων | κτίζειν. Perhaps λαχόντα. However, the plural may be right.

85. τὸν δ' εἶλεν ἄχος κραδίαν, ξείν|α τέ νιν πλᾶξεν μέριμνα. The accent of ξείνα is added by Mr. Kenyon, who compares Aesch. Prom. 707, where nevertheless ξένος has the usual signification of *strange*. I don't hesitate a moment to correct: δεινὰ τέ νιν πλᾶξεν μέριμνα.

xiii. 17–20. [οὐ γὰρ] δαμασίμβροτος αἰθῶν | [χαλκ]ὸς ἄπλάτου θέλει | [πείρε]ιν διὰ σώματος.

Better would be, I think: [χωρ]εῖν διὰ σώματος.

77–80. Perhaps: ὅππότε Π[ηλείδας] | [ἀν]ά-
[να]τ' ἀ[λκὰν κῆρ τε μ]άνιν | ὥρινα[το, Δαρδανι-

δαν] | τ' ἔλυσεν ἄ[ταν]. To Prof. Platt are due ἡνάναρ' (but Bacch. and Pind. are using the Doric augment) ἀλκὰν and ἄταν, to Profs. Blass and Jebb μᾶνιν. The reading of the MS. ὠρεῖνα... is the orthography of the imperial era, like τεμῖα, etc., not of the fifth century B.C. The inverse error Ποσειδᾶν for Ποσειδᾶν has sometimes been corrected by the editor, often not.

150-153. σὺν εὐ | κλείᾳ δὲ φιλοστεφ[άνω] | πόλιν κυβερνᾷ, εἰνομία δὲ σαόφρων.

Rather εἰνομία τ' ε σαόφρων.

xiv. 23. Possibly :

ὃς φιλοξείνου τε καὶ ὀρθοδίκου |
[πατρὸς πέφυκεν (or πεφυκώς)]...

xvi. 6. δολιχαύχετι κύ[κνω] [ὅπῃ ἢ] δεῖα φρένα τερπόμενος. The poet wrote κύ[κνου], using the notorious *transpositio epithetorum*, and [ἀ]δεῖα.

xvi. 34. ὅτ' ἐπὶ ποταμῷ ῥοδόεντι Λυκόρμα.

After first reading this passage, I proposed to Mr. Kenyon ῥοθέοντι or ῥοθέοντι, and he answered me that ῥοδόεντι might be defended by ἀνθεμόεντα Ἑβρον v. 5. Wild flowers on the banks of a river are not unusual, but roses, I think, very uncommon. Now Prof. W. Christ has also proposed the last conjecture ῥοθέοντι; this offers the smallest change, but because this word is found nowhere, ῥοθέοντι may seem still more probable.

xvii. 41-45. οὐ γὰρ ἄν θέλοι | μ' ἀμβρότοί' ἔρανν' ἄσ[ω]ς | ἰδεῖν φάος, ἐπεί τιν' ἠθέ[ων] | σὺν δαμάσειας ἀέκοντα.

I should like to read : ἰδεῖν φάος ἔτ', εἴ τιν' κτέ.

77-80. Κρονί[δας] | δέ τοι πατὴρ ἄναξ τελεῖ | Ποσειδᾶν ὑπέρτατον | κλέος χθόνα κατ' εὐδενδρον. The metrical correction of Mr. Kenyon, ἡνδενδρον, is very unsatisfactory, because this is a most awkward epithet of the earth. If I don't deceive myself, the reading ΕΥΔΕΝΔΡΟΝ is a corruption of ΕΥΡΥΕΔΡΟΝ, χθόνα εὐρυέδρον, as the poet wrote in imitation of his greater uncle Simonides, cited in Plato's *Protag.* 345 C εὐρυεδοῦς ὅσοι καρπὸν αἰνύμεθα χθονός, exactly as he imitates the same xiii. 72 by writing πανδαμάτω χρόνος.

xvii. 129. ἦβροι δ' ἐγγύθεν | νέοι παιάνιξαν ἐπαῖα ὅπῃ.

I am at a loss to understand what ἐγγύθεν means here. Could it be said in opposition to the widespread and distant sound of the waves : ἔκλαγεν δὲ πόντος, or is the word the corruption of some other, for instance δὲ κηρόθεν (= ἐκ καρδίας) or δὲ πάντοθεν? For the metre cp. 62, 63. But a more probable

correction seems to be δ' ἐνδοθεν, said in antithesis to the waves out of the ship.

132. ὅπαζε θεόπομπον ἐσθλῶν τυχάν. I don't believe that ἐσθλῶν is defensible, and should like to read ἐσθλὰν.

xix. 9. ὕφαινε νῦν ἐν ταῖς πολυηράτοις τε κλεινὸν ὀλβίαις Ἀθάνας.

With Prof. Tyrrell I prefer the reading of the first hand, καὶ νῦν. Cp. Horat. *Carm.* iii. 26, 13; iv. 2, 10. The novelty of this poem was perhaps the celebration of Io in her quality of *προμήτωρ* of Dionysos.

29-36. εἴτ' οὖν—Ἄργον· ἢ ῥα—, ἢ—ἀνάπανσιν. These words contain a triple supposition of the poet, and therefore ought to be written : εἴτ' οὖν—, ἢ ῥα—, ἢ—.

Fragm. 46, 6. ἐν δὲ σιδεροδέτοις πόρπαξιν αἰθᾶν | ἀραχνᾶν ἱστοὶ πέλονται. Are not Soph. *fr.* 264 (Nck.²) πέλτα δ' ἐρίθων ἀραχνᾶν βρίθει and Eur. *fr.* 369 κείσθω δόρυ μοι μίτον ἀμφιπλέκειν ἀράχλαις to be considered as imitations of this passage? V. 12 παιδικοί θ' ὕμνοι φλέγονται. Bergk's correction φλέγοντι seems indubitable.

H. VAN HERWERDEN.

Utrecht.

i. 6. ἀχρεὶ ολοὶ μάχας.

If the letter before ολοι is β the word cannot well be anything but συμβολοί. Mr. Kenyon says the first letter in the line is 'perhaps cancelled' and I believe Mr. Nairn was on the right track in proposing χρεῖα or something of the sort. Possibly χρεῖαισι συμβολοί, adopting the same scholar's beautiful θυμὸν ἔχων ὅποτε in the line before. The number of letters is just that marked by Kenyon, if we count ι and σ as half one each, which they about are. But χρεῖαισι is not quite satisfactory, I think, though I do not believe anyone would have challenged it had it been found in the MS.

iii. 33. ἔνθα σὺν ἀλόχῳ τε κενᾶ
σὺ[ν τ'] εὐπλοκάμοις... θυγατράσι.

The facsimile shows that there is not room for ντ' in 34, and Mr. Kenyon confirms my opinion. We must read then σὺν εὐπλοκάμοις, the construction being σὺν τε—σὺν = σὺν τε—καί. So at 15 of the same ode we have βρύνει μὲν—βρύουσι = βρύνει μὲν—δέ. For illustrations of both see *C.R.* vol. x. p. 381.

iii. 55. Ζεὺς ἐπιστάσας μελαγκευθὲς νέφος
σβέννυν ξανθὰν φλόγα.

This detail of the cloud and rain which extinguishes the pyre of Croesus shows that already in Bacchylides the myth appears in a contaminated form. If Apollo carried Croesus off to the Hyperboreans it could not much matter whether the fire were put out or not. As both the poet and Herodotus agree in this detail, it is likely to be original, and perhaps the common foundation of the two different accounts was a story that Croesus was about to burn himself when a storm of rain came on and put out the fire and that Cyrus thus took him alive and treated him kindly. The natural ornament would be to ascribe the deliverance from death to the god Croesus had so munificently honoured, and thence diverged two distinct legends.

The words ξανθὰν φλόγα suggest that we should read βόας αἱ φλόγ' ἀπὸ ξανθὰν (ξανθὰν vulg.) γενῶν πνέον at *Pyth.* iv. 225. If one thinks of it, ξανθὰν γενῶν is an odd phrase, especially of the fire-breathing bulls. Cf. also Bacch. frag. xlv. 4.

iii. 92. τρέφει seems too short; rather τράφει.

v. 8. δεῦρ' ἄθρησον < σὺν > νόῳ.

No doubt νόῳ was in the papyrus and Mr. Kenyon's σὺν is technically very good, but I think B. more likely wrote εὐνός. A poet does not say to a king 'attend if you can,' he asks him to listen graciously. Cf. *Pyth.* ii. 69.

16. αἰεὶ Ἱέρωνα first hand, rightly I suspect; the whole passage has got into such confusion that one cannot guess how it stood at first. Besides the metrical impossibilities, and κλεινὰν and κλεινός close together, surely γάρων ἐκ στηθῶν χέων is a bald sort of phrase.

56. [τλήναι] would be a better supplement than [καὶ μὲν]. The first hand wrote ἐρεψιπύλαν corrected to ἐριψιπύλαν; was the correction meant for ἐρεψιπύλαν? Fick would restore ἀντρέψαντο in Homer. If so it would mean 'he who carried off or tore away the gates.' More probably however the corrector was confusing the word with ῥίπτω (cf. L. and S. s.v. ἀνερείπομαι). It is curious that at *Septem* 867 the Medicean has ἐρριψίταχοι corrected to ἐρριψίτοιχοι. For the meaning of the epithet see Mr. Leaf on *Iliad* E 395; Heracles broke open the gates of Hades.

ix. 35. βοάν τ' ὤρινε (Housman) λαῶν
ῆ τελευταίας ἀμάρνγμα πάλας.

The subject to ὤρινε (or ὤτρυνε either)

ought to be Automedes. To say that the *wrestling* roused the spectators to enthusiasm calls away our attention from the athlete himself to the struggle. This objection is obviated no doubt by Mr. Housman's οἱ for ἦ, but do you like οἱ? I should prefer his καί. There is not much transcriptional probability about ἐς but it would give better sense, 'to the very end of the wrestling,' and also gives much more force to τελευταίας, which is plainly weak if it only mean that the wrestling came last in the pentathlon. Perhaps, however, the sense I desiderate can hardly be got fairly out of τελευταίας πάλας.

- x. 15 ὅσσ' < κίς > Νίκας ἔκατι
ἀνθεσιν ξανθ[αν] ἀναδησάμενος κεφαλὰν
κῦδος εὐρείαις Ἀθάναις
θήκας, Οἰνεΐδαις τε δόξαν
ἐν Ποσειδάωνος περικλειτοῖς ἀέθλοις,
20 as Ἑλλασιν ποδῶν ταχέϊαν
ὁρμάν.
..... ροισιν ἐπὶ σταδίου
θερμ πνέων ἄελλαν
ἔστα δ' αὖτε θεατήρων ἐλαΐφ
φάρε ν ἐμπίτνων ὁμίλον.
25 τετρ νεπει
καμ μον Ἴσθμιονίκαν
δίς ν ἀρυξαν εὐβούλων
ων προφᾶται.

This passage is perhaps the most tantalizing in Bacchylides; it looks as if it could be filled up *somehow* with ease, and yet when one tries one is met by a veritable hedge of obstacles. I despair of making a satisfactory whole, but am in hopes of having at least made some way towards a restoration. Let us begin by distinguishing between the practically certain and the merely probable or purely speculative, though one cannot lay down strict bounds between them.

Certain then appear to me to be the following points. First, we must put a full stop at the end of 18. It is impossible to suppose that the poet, when beginning a catalogue of the victor's successes at many games all over Greece (19—35), started by saying 'how often he won victories at the Isthmus.' He said of course: 'We will sing how many crowns he has won. First, two at the Isthmus' and so on. That ὅσσ' < κίς > (Tyrrell, Wilamowitz and myself) is right in 15 appears clear, but whatever you read there the general sense is the same. The second thing that appears almost certain, and for this I am indebted to Mr. Housman, is that in 21 we must accent ἐπι and suppose . . . ροισι to be a dative governed by it, τέρμασιν or the like being in the

lacuna. Mr. Jebb's *κούρουσιν* looks very plausible at first sight but his restoration makes the victor run *behind* his competitors. And ἐπὶ σταδίου is at least very strange. Thirdly in 23 we are bound to suppose δ' (if for δὲ and not the last letter of some other word) to be the second word in its clause, for Bacchylides scarcely ever puts it third; and when he does, it is in a very mild way, as at x. 46, xviii. 53. Therefore we must supply a verb before it, and this verb must have been something like *βαίνειν* or *μίαεν*. Ridiculous indeed it appears to me to say that the victor 'rushed into the throng of the spectators and smeared their garments with oil,' but there seems no help for it. Fourthly in 24, as ἐμπύττων cannot govern an accusative (at *Nem.* vii. 31 ἐν = ἐς), we must begin the line with *φάρε' ἐς*. Then 25 must begin with *τετράκι* and must go on with a connecting particle, for otherwise we have no connexion in the whole passage. In 27 νῦν (Kenyon) and ἀγκάρυξαν (Jebb) are clearly right, and in 28 I have before observed that we must read *ἀγωνάρχων* or something of the kind.

We have now got a considerable framework into which to fit some more guesses. At 20 we seem compelled to accept *προῦφηνας* (Kenyon) or some other second person. The difficulty is that we have got to shift from the second to the third somewhere for in 27 we have the third and apparently also in 25. And the transition seems very abrupt wherever we put it. The only natural place for bringing in the third person seems to be this very line; hence I long tried to get some word in -ασε (-ασ') but can find none that will do, and besides the papyrus so regularly marks elisions that it is great odds there was no elision here. The transition must be made then at the epode (21). In 21 I think *τέρμασιν τ'* (or δ' or even γ') *ἄκρουσιν ἐπὶ σταδίου* extremely probable; compare *Pyth.* ix. 114, *τέρμασιν ἀγῶνος*, 118, *ποτὶ γραμμῇ τέλος ἄκρον*. In both these lines appears the verb *ἔστασε* which reminds one of the *ECTA* here, but it seems impossible to get an accusative in if we read *ἔστασ'* or *ἔστασε(ν)*. And another curious parallel between the two passages is Pindar's *ψαύσειε πέπλοις* (120) beside the *φάρσα* which the hero of Bacchylides apparently besmirches; and again we have *ὄμιλον* directly after in both poets. Had Bacchylides got the whole passage of Pindar in his head? If so the ode would probably have been written soon after 478.

In 22 the only thing possible seems *ἀπο-*

πνέων. I had thought of *ἔθει πνέων*, but the next line seems to bar that. In 23 *faute de mieux* I propose *ἔστα μίαεν* (or *μίαινεν*). If we accept δ' αὖτε, the reading of the third hand, and I think we are bound to do so, and if we look at the way αὖτε is used by Pindar, it is clear that we want some contrast of *time*; the meaning then would be: 'At the goal of the course, with hot tempestuous panting, he stood (a moment), and then again dashed into the throng of the spectators, smearing their dresses with oil.' We often do see the winner of a race stand thus for a moment and then turn and run off among the spectators or to the dressing-room. And in the circumstances of Greek running a man might well amuse himself by scattering the spectators in their clean new cloaks, all of them flying right and left to escape his greasy body; nor is it inconceivable that a poet might deign to commemorate the jest. The picturesqueness of the description is like the manner of Bacchylides. But *μίαεν* is hardly the right word—if I could get it in I should prefer *χραίνειν*. Possibly *ἔστας*, *ἔχραινες*. Cf. v. 44.

For the rest I will simply write out the passage in the form I have got it into:

- 15 ὅσσά<κ> Νίκας ἔκατι
 ἀνθεσιν ξανθὰν ἀναδησάμενος κεφαλὰν
 κῦδος εὐρέϊαις Ἀθάναις
 θῆκας Οἰνεΐδαις τε δόξαν.
 ἐν Ποσιδάνος περικλειτοῖς ἀέθλοις
 20 πᾶσι προῦφηνας Ἑλλασιν ποδῶν ταχεῖαν
 ὁρμάν.
 τέρμασιν τ' ἄκρουσιν ἐπὶ σταδίου
 θερμὰν ἀποπνέων ἄελλαν
 ἔστα, μίαεν δ' αὖτε θεατήρων ἐλαίῳ
 φάρε' ἐς ἀγλὰν ἐμπύττων ὄμιλον.
 25 τετράκι δ' — ἐπεὶ
 κάμψας δρόμον, Ἰσθμονίκαν
 δῖς νῦν ἀγκάρυξαν εὐβούλων — — — προ-
 φᾶται.

We might also begin 20 with νῦν γε. To follow up τ' by δ' is common enough to need no apology. I am not aware of any evidence for a race of the length implied by *τετράκι κάμψας δρόμον*, but it would be hard to say why such a distance should not be run sometimes. In 25 I can think of nothing better than δ' ἀνεῖ, which seems too long for the gap and is the wrong tense; δ' ὠκὺν looks harder still to get in.

Mr. Jebb defends Mr. Kenyon's *χαρίτων* in 28, as more poetical, and thinks it is Dorian verse. He says truly that -ων *χαρί* is a dactyl, and -των *προφᾶται* a second epitritus. But — — — | — — — | — — — | being what he

says and what I thought, the question is: Can this figure stand in a Dorian rhythm? Let him quote an example from Pindar or Bacchylides and I give way, but there is none unless in the corruption of some fragment. (*Nem.* x. 1 is of course not to the point; Pindar has other instances of a short introduction something like it, as in *Pyth.* ix., and the two short syllables before the dactyl seem essential). 'Αεθλάρχων he says is too long, but χαρίτων is manifestly too short¹; considering the small space occupied by ε, θ, ρ, I think αεθλάρχων might go in; I certainly have much doubt whether αγωνάρχων could. To say that αεθλάρχων προφάται is too prosy is to appeal to taste; I appeal to Pindar who talks of the Έλλανοδίκας giving the prize at *Olymp.* iii. 12, and says Πυθιάδος κάρυξ ἀνέειπέ νιν in *Pyth.* i. 32. Doubtless αεθλάρχων προφάτης is more prosy than these, but not much; it stands to them as B. in general does to Pindar. And what were the λευκίππων Μυκηναίων προφάται in Pindar, frag. 216? If εἰβούλων is not the prostiest word to apply to the Graces which any poet could have found by trying, it is hard to say what would be; Mr. Kenyon saw this and therefore forced the interpretation 'favouring' upon it. But I wish someone would hit on a better supplement than mine.

x. 41. ἡ τινα θευπροπιάν εἰδώς.

Spoilt from *Iliad* Δ 794, II 36. There it is apt, because it is a question of a single oracle; here a single oracle would be nonsense, and the word must mean prophetic skill, the τινα being a meaningless echo of Homer.

xi. 77. τεῖχος δὲ Κύκλωες κάμον.

Mr. Jebb objects to κάμοντ' that the middle use of it in Homer precludes its use here, where the middle is inappropriate. But the Homeric use is not so very clear. At Σ 341 no doubt καρόμεσθα means 'we won for ourselves by toil,' but at ι 130 the use is plainly different, for ἐκάμοντο there does not mean 'for themselves'; on the contrary σφιν is added, meaning 'for the Cyclopes.' And surely the real middle force of the verb consists in its meaning *for oneself*. The old explanation of νῆσον εὐκτιμένην ἐκάμοντο was 'tilled the fertile island' and I believe it is right. (Eust.

¹ Of this an easy demonstration may be obtained by taking the measure of the same word lower down in the column and comparing it with the gap here. By similar measurement of ἀεθλ and αρχ in other passages it appears that αεθλάρχων will just go in.

1619, 49 apud Ebeling). Ebeling says further on: οἱ κέ σφιν νῆσον εὐκτιμένην ἐκάμοντο i.e. κάμνοντες ἐποίησαντο.' This predicative use of εὐκτιμένην looks more Virgilian than Homeric; however, let it be predicative, still if, as great authorities say, ἐκάμοντο = κάμνοντες ἐποίησαντο, it is evident that κάμοντο exactly suits the sense in Bacchylides.

Or again let us admit for a moment that Mr. Jebb is right in saying that ἐκάμοντο in the *Odyssey* means 'won.' Well, in Apollonius it certainly does not. And Bacchylides is half way between the two. And why should he not have mistaken the meaning of Homer's word as much as Apollonius, who was much more of a Homeric scholar in all probability?

Hence it seems that κάμοντ' does not involve any serious difficulty. Whereas κάμον does, for it involves such a piece of scansion as _ _ _ _ = _ _ _ _ in Dorian rhythm.² And it does not correspond to the third epode any better than to the first, for in the third we have _ _ _ _ !

xi. 119. 'γοννός (cum γόνν composit Doed. Gl. 1011 cf. Curt. Et. 170) locus editus. I 534 Σ 57 438 γοννῷ ἄλωης—sch. A Σ 57 τῷ γονίμῳ τόπῳ τῆς γῆς, ἣ τῷ ὑψηλοτάτῳ, μεταφορικῶς ἀπὸ τῶν γονάτων τῶν ἐν τῷ σώματι, ἅπερ ἐξέχει et: τῷ γονίμῳ, τινὲς δὲ τὸ γεώλοφον κ.τ.λ., α 193 ἀνὰ γοννὸν ἄλωης οἰνοπέδιο sch. Q. τὸν γονιμώτατον τόπον, melius sch. A (La Roche) τὸν ὑψηλὸν τόπον ἢ τὸν τραχύν, cf. λ 193 h. Merc. 207, λ 323 ἐς γοννὸν Ἀθηναίων cf. Apoll. Lex. 55, 20, Eust. 23, 28, 772, 28, Hes. utramque expl. habet E. M. 239, 4 et 12 (Herodian.), Or. 38, 6. 39, 5. (Γονόεσσα?).' Ebeling.

Why one should not make an ἄλσος in front of a hill as much as beside a river I do not see.

xiii. 94. Possibly ἀναπαλλομένων or -οις, 'rocked in the cradle of the deep.' The plural refers to ναντίλους (Blass) in 91. At 97 I agree with Blass and Housman in thinking that the MS. had δ' ἐκόλπωσαν. Or rather δὲ κόλπωσαν, as elision is almost always marked, and there is no mark here. And Bacchylides does not trouble himself about augmenting gnomic aorists.

- xv. 57. ἃ δ' αἰόλοις ψεύδεσσι καὶ ἀφροσύναις ἐξαισίους θάλλουσ' ἀθαμβῆς

² Better to say the last syllable of κάμον is lengthened by metrical ictus (I do not believe in it myself, but see Gildersleeve on *Pyth.* iii. 6). Of course the second syllable of πρόγονοι could not be so lengthened in any case. But I hope to say more on the metre on a future occasion.

- ὑβρις, ἃ πλοῦτον δύναιμι τε θοῶς
 60. ἄλλότριον ὥπασεν, αἴτις
 [δ]’ ἐς βαθὺν πέμπει φθόρον.
 κείνα καὶ ὑπερφιάλους
 γὰς παῖδας ὤλεσσαν γίγαντας.

The trouble of this passage is caused by the relative ἃ followed by δ’, to obviate which I proposed σφ’ in 61. But it certainly seems, as Mr. Jebb remarks, that δ’ was the reading of the MS. I now suspect that δ’ ought simply to be omitted, not merely because it introduces a construction foreign to our poet, but on metrical grounds. We learn from the only other surviving epode that lines 61 and 62 are not in reality two, but one. And hence one is naturally inclined to suppose that the true division of lines is this:

- ἃ δ’ αἰόλοις ψεύδεσσι καὶ ἀφροσύναις ἐξαισίοις
 θάλλουσ’ ἀθαμβῆς
 ὑβρις ἃ πλοῦτον δύναιμι τε θοῶς ἄλλότριον
 ὥπασεν αἴτις
 [δ]’ ἐς βαθὺν πέμπει φθόρον. κείνα καὶ ὑπερ-
 φιάλους
 γὰς παῖδας ὤλεσσαν γίγαντας.

For though there is the highest uncertainty about it, yet this arrangement seems to me at any rate far more reasonable than any other. But if so, δ’ or σφ’ would either of them be very dubious. Pindar indeed, does not mind beginning a line with an enclitic or a particle like δ’; Bacchylides I believe never does such a thing,¹ being by nature an easy-going man averse to any sort of boldness or harshness. Thus on converging evidence of grammar (somewhat strong) and metre (in itself most uncertain) we are led, it seems, to conclude that δ’ should be struck out.

xvii. 43. ἰδεῖν MS., ἐσιδεῖν Housman *metri gratia*. I should prefer ἐπιδεῖν, ‘I should not care to live to see to-morrow dawn.’

51. I should have expected δὲ for τε. Minos was angry, *but* instead of showing it, tried to catch Theseus in a trap.

56. *πυρίθειραν ἀστραπὴν* can hardly mean anything but a meteor. Hyginus (Kenyon p. 155) speaks of *tonitrum et fulgorem caeli*, Bacchylides says *ἀστραψε* at 71 which by itself would naturally mean lightning, but an explosion often attends the fall of a meteor, and lightning and meteors are popularly confused even now.

Frag. xiii. 6. Probably ἐσπέραν.

9. [ἀ]ν[δ]ήροις ἀλὸς. I should be glad to

¹ There are apparent but only apparent instances in the papyrus, as x. 36, 46, xi. 18.

restore this beautiful word to a more respectable poet than has hitherto guaranteed it.

Frag. xlii. (Bergk 3).

παύροισι δὲ θνατῶν τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον τῷ
 δαίμονι δῶκεν
 πρᾶσσοντας ἐν καιρῷ πολιοκρόταφον
 γῆρας ἰκνεῖσθαι, πρὶν ἐγκύρσαι δῦα.

The rhythm of the first line is very suspicious to say the least, and the sense still more so if any sense there be. Read *δαίμων* ἔδωκεν and all is smooth. Cf. frag. 50. Nor does ἐν καιρῷ seem right in connexion with τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον; perhaps ἐγκαίρως (ΕΝΚΑΙΡΩΣ for ΕΝΚΑΙΡΩΙ).

The case for digammatizing *λαῖνω* is greatly strengthened by Mr. Richards’ reference to Hesychius. There is perhaps an instance of it in Pindar. In the older editions *Olymp.* ii. 13 runs thus: ἀέθλων τε κορυφὰν πόρον τ’ Ἀλφεοῦ, *ἰανθεὶς* αἰδαῖς. In the modern the line is divided after Ἀλφεοῦ, and so in all the other strophes. The only reason, I suppose, for this division is the hiatus after Ἀλφεοῦ, but if *ἰανθεὶς* was digammatized there remains none at all. It is true that it upsets the colometry, as arranged by J. H. H. Schmidt, to go back to the old division of lines, but then the colometry of a Paeonian ode is another name for a kaleidoscope.

Talking of the digamma, Böckh observed truly that this letter never makes position in Pindar, neither does it in Bacchylides; hence I retract *μεγαίνητος* Ἴερον at iii. 64.

After working out the colometry of Bacchylides I am more convinced than ever of the futility of that pleasing pastime. It is extremely easy in a way no doubt, but there is hardly a strophe in which there are not obvious alternatives between which it is absolutely impossible to choose with any sort of certainty. The following points are the only ones of much interest which I raised in the inquiry. The third line of the strophe in ode xiii. is not to be scanned as I proposed in the February number, but as —|—|—|—|. For this remarkable colon cf. the first line of the strophes of the eighth Nemean, the only other instance of it with which I am acquainted. (Even here the colometry is not decisive, but I do not think my former proposal will do any way; to discuss the question fully would take more space than it deserves.) At xvi. 19 as usual there are several possibilities, but I think that μέλλε is right; the second period of this strophe beginning at 17 and being 555.

4. It is the division of lines 19 and 20 that is wrong; they form of course one line in reality and if divided anywhere should be so after κόρα. At xvi. 30 there is a very beautiful effect of a kind not uncommon in Greek verse, the first $\tilde{\alpha}$ being double the value of the second; the most splendid of all such effects is probably εἴη Ζεῦ τὴν εἴη ἀνδάνειν in *Pyth.* i. 29, the first εἴη filling two bars and the second only one. In xvi. 35 I believe πάρ (first hand) to be right; the period begins at 31 and runs 4 3 3 4 3 3; hence the last line breaks rhythmically in the middle, whereas if we read παρὰ it breaks after the the second foot.

ARTHUR PLATT.

FIRST let me restore to their rightful owners four conjectures which I published after they had been published by others: i 8 καλῶν Blass, iii 63 γε μὲν Blass, vii 10 Ἀριστομένειον παῖδ' Wilamowitz, xvii 58 καὶ σέ Platt.

v 8-16. δεῦρ' ἄθρησον σὺν νόφ, | εἰ σὺν Χαρίτεσσι βαθυζόνοισ ὑφάνας | ὕμνον ἀπὸ ζαθέας | νάσσον ξένος ὑμετέραν | πέμπει ἐς κλεινὰν πόλιν. | χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας | καὶ ἰνὸς θεράπων ἐθέλει | γάρν' ἐκ στηθέων χέων | αἰνεῖν Ἴέρωνα. In 12 I have written ἐς κλεινάν (ἐς θεῖαν Richards) for κλεινὰν es, since πέμπει must not be altered. Then in 14 I have written καινός for κλινος. This is Bacchylides' first ode to Hiero; and he begins 'You, Hiero, must be, if any one is, a judge of poetry: look hither and see if the Graces had a hand in the verse which a stranger sends from Ceos to Syracuse. A new poet would fain sing Hiero's praises; and a world-wide field for him they are.' The metrical superabundance of 11, 14, 26, 29, is due to a scribe whose ear was displeased by the catalexis: when he came to the second strophe he desisted in despair.

v 129. Ovid *Met.* viii 304 has nothing to do with the name Aphareus or Aphares in this passage. It is true that the best MSS and most modern editors read 'duo Thestiadae, proles Aphareia, Lynceus | et uelox Idas'; but when you come to 434 and 440 sq. you find that the Thestiadae are not Lynceus and Idas, but Plexippus and Toxeus: therefore Heinsius is right as usual in following those MSS which give *prolesque*.

v 184. My conjecture (p. 70b) should be printed

[ῆλθ]εν Φερένικο<ς ἔ>ς εὐπύργους.

It is merely CECÉ for CÉ.

xi 118-120. Write

ἄλσος τέ τοι ἱμερόεν
κάπευσαν εὐδρον πρὸ γου-
νοῖ ἑσάμενοι, Πριάμοι' ἐπεὶ κτλ.

κάπευσαν scripsi, κάσαν παρ' MS. πρὸ γουνοῖ Platt, πρόγονοι MS. The scribe glanced from the first εν to the second and wrote καπευδρον: then he added overhead the omitted σαν, but forgot by a natural inadvertence to add also the other εν: then σαν, wrongly inserted, gave κασανπευδρον, and π was expanded to πάρ'. Certainly κάπευσαν and εὐδρον go well together: compare the ἀκήρατος λειμών of Eur. Hipp. 78, which Αἰδῶς ποταμίαισι κηπεύει δρόσοις: Pindar *Ol.* iii 24 calls the ἄλσος at Olympia a κάπος. Our ἄλσος was in front of a γουνός (= ὑψηλὸς τόπος: the word has no other authenticated meaning), i.e. between the hill and the sea.

'Palmer's von Kenyon aufgenommene Correctur scheint unmöglich' says Blass; '119 steht πρόγονοι ἑσάμενοι wider die Construction und wider das Metrum, von Palmer unglücklich behandelt' says Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. So far so good: but they both propose the violent alteration προγόνων ἑσασμένων, in which -ον προγόνων corresponds to -ες κάμον ἔλθ- at 77 and would fain correspond to -οι βροτῶν ἄμ- at 35, -ου- to -ου-; and on this I have to make the following remarks.

No type of lyric metre is better known to metrists than the dactylo-epitrite: its nature is simple and its relics are abundant: they form more than half of Bacchylides and Pindar. This correspondence, -ου- = -ου-, is so extraordinary that Christ, *Metrik* p. 93, declares that he knows no example of it. Crusius, in the paper on Bacchylides with which he has filled twenty-four pages of the first part of this year's *Philologus*, adduces one instance, the last line of the strophes of Alcman's Parthenion, frag. 23 Bergk: that poem is not written in this metre, and even that instance is disputed by Bergk iii p. 27. As for the examples which can be quoted from the MSS of Bacchylides and Pindar, they resemble in nature and in number the examples of an anapaest in the third foot of the iambic senarius which can be quoted from the MSS of the Attic tragedians; and if anyone is in danger of heeding them I advise him to write them out on a sheet of paper, look at them, read Porson's preface to the Hecuba, and look at them again. When I say that in two out of the scanty sum the short syllable which

should be a long one is the first syllable of Ὀλυμπος, that fact is φωνᾶν συνετοῖσιν. There are perhaps a couple of instances which cannot easily be corrected; but hear Porson: 'loca, quae huic doctrinae aduersantur, tam pauca sunt, tam facilia emendatu pleraque, ut si unus et alter forte supersint, quibus nos mederi nequeamus, non idcirco sana iudicanda sint.' In the present case however the question hardly arises: other things being equal, a conjecture which makes 119 tally with the normal metre of 35 will be preferred before a conjecture which makes it tally with the abnormal metre of 77, even supposing 77 to be incorrect. Moreover there is another way of scanning 77 to match 35: not indeed a legitimate way, but at any rate a less outrageous one. It is to reckon the -ον of κάμον as long. The hypothesis that a short final syllable can be lengthened even at a point which is not the end of a measure has a larger number of MS corruptions to support it, and will help you to defend not merely κάμον at 77 but also πόλιν at 114, μεγαίνητε at iii 64, ἀπωσάμενον at v 189, and ἐσθλόν at xiv 3, where the other theory will prove a broken reed.

xiii 97. The MS, as I said on p. 140b, must have had οὔρῃαι νότου δ' ἐκόλπ[ωσαν πνοαί]. But the position of δέ is improbable and the change of subject in ἐκόλπωσαν and ἐξίκοντο is awkward; therefore Bacchylides most likely wrote

στόρεσεν δέ τε πόντον
οὔρῃα, νότου δ' ἐκόλπωσαν πνοᾷ
ἰστίον κτλ.

and the scribes mistook ΠΝΟΑΙ. Compare Meleager in Anth. Pal. ix 363 9 sq. quoted in the lexicons. Ludwig (February) has proposed ἐκόλπωσεν πνοᾷ, but that will not account for the οὔρῃαι of the MS.

xiv 1-7. Write

εἶ μὲν εἰμάρθαι παρὰ δαίμονος ἀν-
θρώποις ἄριστον
συμφορὰ δ', ὃν θέλ' ἀμαλδὺ-
[ναι β]αρύτατος μολῶσα,
[θαητ]ὸν ἰδ' ὑψιφανῇ τε[ύ]-
[χει κ]ατορθωθεῖσα. τιμὰν
δ' ἄλλος ἄλλοιαν ἔχει.

τεύχει Platt and Wilamowitz (February). In 3 the accent on the last letter looks to me like a circumflex, so I write ἀμαλδύναι rather than ἀμαλδύνειν. I have altered ἐσθλόν to ὃν θέλ': as ΕΣΘΛΩΝ at x 47

stands for ΕΣΘΛΩΝ, so here does ΕΣΘΛΩΝ stand for ΕΘΕΛ'ΩΝ, though Bacchylides hardly put the words in that order. The stop at the end of 4 marks off, as in many other places, the relative clause from the main part of the sentence. For the metre see iii 83 and xiii 31; for the sense Hor. serm. ii 7 86 sqq. 'in se ipso totus, teres atque rotundus...in quem manca ruit semper fortuna,' where Bacchylides will defend quem against Lucian Mueller's quo. The μέν of 1 is answered by the δέ of 7: 'it is first and best to be a good piece of God's handiwork, and then disaster does but exalt the man she meant to ruin; but there are more sorts of worth than one.' I have given this paraphrase because, in the other conjectures which I have seen, I do not understand what is supposed to be the connexion in meaning between lines 3-6 and the preceding and following context.

xvii. My εἰσιδεῖν for ἰδεῖν at 43 becomes quite unnecessary if φεράτοιοι (Platt and Wilamowitz) is read at 20; for the last four lines of the strophe, 20-23, 43-46, 86-89, 109-112, can then be scanned thus (see p. 136):

υ ὀ: - - - - | - - - - | -
φ - - - | - - - - | -
χ - - - | - - - - | -
ψ - - | - - - - | - - - - ||

The penultimate of πατρός in 109 must still be reckoned long, to avoid the concurrence of five short syllables. Then the following alterations will be made in the table of equivalents on p. 137b:

(ζ)ρρρ - - - = - - - -
ξυφ - - - = - - - -
νξτυ - - - = - - - -

and the equivalent - - - - = - - - - will disappear.

On this hypothesis Mr Pearson's τᾶ[φ]εν will be metrically admissible at 86; and it, like τᾶ[ξ]εν, gives such a sense as the context demands. The purport of this simple tale is so much misunderstood that I must try to explain it, though I do not know how I am to succeed where so lucid a writer as Bacchylides has failed. Minos was sailing before a fair wind from Athens to Crete with the youths and maidens on board, and smitten with love he laid hands on Eriboea, who called to Theseus for help. Theseus cried 'Hold: if you are Zeus' son, I am

Posidon's; and sooner than suffer this I will stand up against you and fight, let come what may.' The seamen were astounded at such audacious words from a stripling to a warrior king: Minos was angered, as anyone would be; but he did not draw sword on the meddlesome youth, nor knock him overboard, nor even have him laid by the heels: he mastered himself and ἔφαινε ποταμίαν μῆτιν. 'Zeus,' said he, 'if I am your son, show me a sign from heaven,'—and immediately it lightened,—and Theseus, if you are Posidon's, fish me up this ring out of your father's realm.' He believed of course that Theseus was the son of Aegeus, and expected him to shrink from the test: the young braggart, abashed by detection, would then sit still and hold his tongue. What other motive for the stratagem is conceivable? But Theseus plunged forthwith into the sea, and the heart of Minos was molten in his breast: Posidon's son or not, thought he, this is a brave lad. Eriboea was clean forgotten: we hear her name no more: the return of Theseus finds Minos not pursuing his amour but sunk in thought. No correction of τά[.]εν will be even sufferable unless it signifies some strong revulsion which put Cyprus and her gifts altogether out of his head. He accordingly did not order the ship to sail on, which she was doing already without his orders, but he ordered her to be stopped, κέλευσεν ἵσχειν νᾶα: therefore κατ' οὐρον in 87, as I said on p. 139b, is corrupt, and must either be made

into κάτουρον agreeing with νᾶα or else into some substantive like ἐπίουρον or ἀκάτουρον (= ναύκληρον) as object of κέλευσε. He gave orders, I say, to stop the ship; but fate ordained another course. The Greek word ὁδόν, between the words ἵσχειν νᾶα and ἵερο δόρυ, means the course of the ship. How did fate prevent the stopping of the ship? well, the simplest way of ascertaining is to read what Bacchylides has written. Compare Cowper, *Castaway* 19-24:

He shouted; nor his friends had failed
To check the vessel's course,
But so the furious blast prevailed,
That, pitiless perforce,
They left their outcast mate behind,
And scudded still before the wind.

On therefore they sailed, the youths and maidens trembling and weeping; but Theseus meanwhile was borne by dolphins to the palace of his father, and graced with gifts by Amphitrite, and lo, he reappeared of a sudden by the vessel's side. Ah, in what a train of thought did he arrest the king of Cnossus! The sea-nymphs lifted up their voices, the youths and maidens sang in answer, and all was joy; for the Minotaur, as Wilamowitz-Moellendorf observes, is thrown far into the background. So runs the story. The question is whether you will amend κατ' οὐρον and so remove the single incongruity which breaks its tenour.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

LUTOSLAWSKI'S ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF PLATO'S LOGIC.

The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic, with an account of Plato's style, and of the chronology of his writings, by WINCENTY LUTOSLAWSKI. Longmans, Green and Co. 1897.

IN this elaborate and learned work Mr. Lutoslawski fulfils the promise made in his tract *Sur une nouvelle Méthode pour déterminer la chronologie des dialogues de Platon* (Paris 1896) and in the *Classical Review* for July 1897 pp. 284-286. A preliminary essay on the same subject had been printed in the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 1895, pp. 67-114, and the substance of a considerable portion of the work has already appeared in the author's native tongue. English scholars may consider themselves

fortunate that a writer who seems equally at home in all civilised languages should have selected English as the best medium in which to publish the first complete account of his investigations.

In an introduction of sixty-three pages the author gives an able survey of earlier investigations into the logic of Plato and the chronology of Plato's dialogues. The progress of this discussion affords an opportunity of examining the tradition about Plato's sojourn at Megara, which is accepted by Zeller and other Platonic scholars. Mr. Lutoslawski attempts to disprove the story, but (as it appears to me) without success. Hermodorus, according to Diogenes Laërtius (ii. 106) 'says' (φησιν) 'that after the death of Socrates Plato and the other philosophers