

# 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 Plants of the *Odyssey*

R. M. Henry

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 09 / December 1906, pp 434 - 436

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00995209, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00995209](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00995209)

### How to cite this article:

R. M. Henry (1906). On Plants of the *Odyssey*. The Classical Review, 20, pp 434-436  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00995209

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

the mass, and insist that knowledge impairs enjoyment,

Good scholars who sit still in easy chairs  
And damn the world for standing up,

to adapt words from *Aurora Leigh*? We shall not sit and wonder that these avowed enemies of learning are among its professed exponents in a land where the dangerous spirit of independent thought has so long been confined in the strait-jacket of examinations. But we shall point out that truth is the most powerful solvent, and its pursuit the most potent motive, that the world has known; that studies decay the moment that they cease to grow; and that there is a doom awaiting the intellectual as surely as the moral Sybaris.

Day by day we are drifting further from antiquity. Harder and harder does it become to learn the lessons which it alone can teach us. And of the current fallacies there is none more mischievous than that which insinuates that we can dispense with the motive, the practice, and the fruits of research in any department of its study.

Most mischievous of all is it when it is dangled before a class which circumstances have already predisposed to receive it. The suggestion to the hard-worked and ill-paid teachers of Classics in our schools, that their duties do not comprise the acqui-

sition of fresh knowledge, and that they may subsist upon their original capital, however scanty it may be, is one of the most noxious errors that complaisance has ever presented to its victims. If these will reflect why their experience and capacities should become unmarketable at an age which in other walks of life is held to be most ripe for preferment, they will see that, when the old fires, unfed by fresh interests, have burned to extinction, when the mind's agility has been crushed by drudgery and its keen edge dulled by routine, what is left is not a teacher but a teaching machine, which perhaps has a claim to be tolerated but which can have no hopes of promotion.

It is then, we conceive, no part of the functions of Classical journals to provide diversion for an unamused and unamusing generation. But those who desire that both for themselves and others the Classics shall remain a thing alive will, it is trusted, find in the new departure a satisfaction of real wants perhaps insufficiently regarded in the past, and that the *Classical Review*, in one or both of its branches, will be found worthy of encouragement by the new friends whom it seeks to attract and the old ones whom it desires to retain.

*Cras amet qui numquam amaruit quique  
amaruit cras amet.*

J. P. POSTGATE.

## ON PLANTS OF THE ODYSSEY.

### I.—μῶλον.

THE attempt to identify the magic 'moly,' which Hermes once to wise Ulysses gave, has lately been responsible for two very elaborate and learned pieces of investigation. M. Bérard in *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssee*, ii. 288 ff. discusses the plant at length and ends by identifying it with the *atriplex halimus*, for which he finds strong support in one of his favourite Semitic roots. More lately M. Champault, *Phéniciens et Grecs en Italie d'après l'Odyssee*, pp. 504 ff. discusses it at still greater length and decides positively for the *peganum harmala*. That the Homeric description

ρίζη μὲν μέλαν ἔσκε, γάλακτι δ' εἴκελον ἄνθος  
(κ 304) is not of itself likely to carry one far on the road to deciding the question, most people will agree. The attempt to find a

third characteristic in the following line: χαλεπὸν δέ τ' ὀρίσσειν | ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι has been shown by M. Champault to be a false scent. His quotation from Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 6, 3) on the difficulty of procuring the magic *baaras* is on the right track. The difficulty of pulling the plant is purely imaginary: it is a magic plant and, according to the magicians, dangerous to procure unless for some one who understands the proper ceremonies. It is strange that neither scholar seems to be aware of the light that is thrown upon the passage by the Magical Papyri. It may seem hazardous to illustrate Homer by a literature composed in Egypt during the Christian era. But to any one who understands the fanatical persistence of magical ideas and practices such a parallel will carry considerable weight. We can illustrate the magic of the pre-Christian era

from the *Grimoire du Pape Honorius*, and find the same practices persisting unchanged for a thousand years.

Thus in the great Paris Magical Papyrus (ed. C. Wessely in *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, 1888) l. 2967 we read παρ' Αἰγυπτίους ἀεὶ βοτάναι λαμβάνονται οὕτως· ὁ ῥιζοτόμος καθαίρει πρότερον τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, πρότερον νίτρω περιράνας καὶ τὴν βοτάνην θυμιάσας ῥητείνῃ ἐκ πίτυος εἰς ᾗ περιενέγκας τὸν τόπον. ἔτα κῦφι θυμιάσας καὶ τὴν διὰ τοῦ γάλακτος σπονδὴν χεάμενος μετ' εὐχῶν ἀνασπᾶ τὸ φυτὸν, ἐξ ὀνόματος ἐπικαλούμενος τὸν δαίμονα ᾧ ἡ βοτάνη ἀν' ἱερῶται κτλ. Then follows the invocation of the plant (ἐπίκλησις) in which it is, among other epithets, addressed as ἡ καρδία τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ; and again αἱ δὲ δυνάμεις σου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ εἰσὶν . . . συνοπλισθητι ἐπ' εὐχῇ καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν δύναμιν ὡς ὁ Ἄρης καὶ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ· ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἑρμῆς. This last phrase will concern us later.

In the same Papyrus ll. 286 ff. we have a βοτανήμασις· χρῶ πρὸ ἡλίου· λόγος λεγόμενος (i.e. 'the formula is as follows') αἴρω σε ἦτις βοτάνη χειρὶ πενταδακτύλῳ ἐγὼ ὁ δεῖνα καὶ φέρω παρ' ἑμαντὸν ἵνα μοι ἐνεργήσης εἰς τὴν τινάκρειαν· ὀρκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ ἀμιάντου ὀνόματος τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐὰν παρακούσης, ἡ σε τεκοῦσα γαῖά τε οὐκέτι βρεχθήσεται πόποτε ἐν βίῳ πάλλιν, ἐὰν ἀπορηθῶ τῆσδε τῆς οἰκονομίας μου θαβαρ (here follow five 'words of power') τελείσατέ μοι τὴν τελείαν ἐπαοιδὴν. Evidently the proper culling of these simples was a task demanding trained skill.

Now the *moly* was hard for mortal men to get, θεοὶ δὲ τε πάντα δύνανται. It will be noted in the above formulae, that in the first the magician expressly identifies himself with the deity on whose authority he is acting. This is too common a practice with magicians to call for detailed illustration. One may compare the Egyptian magical texts in which the deceased identifies himself with Osiris. In the second he uses the language of divine authority and threatens the recalcitrant plant with divine vengeance. One cannot help comparing οὐ μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ καρπὸς γένηται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· καὶ ἐξηράνθη παραχρῆμα ἡ συκῆ (Eu. Matth. xxi. 19). In the case of the *moly*, Hermes himself plucked it up for Odysseus; but any magician who knew the proper way to proceed, and the words necessary to identify himself with Hermes, could have produced the same effect. Further the 'gods' call the plant μῶλυ. 'Gods' must here be taken in the same extended sense. The magician in such cases used the same 'large language' as the gods. What language is meant?

In the Leyden Papyrus J 384 we find the following (xii. 17 ed. Dieterich, Leipzig 1888). Ἑρμηνεύματα ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν μεθρημηνεύμενα, οἷς ἐχρῶντο οἱ ἱεροὶ γραμματεῖς· διὰ τὴν τῶν πολλῶν περιεργίαν τὰς βοτάνας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα οἷς ἐχρῶντο εἰς θεῶν εἰδῶλα ἐπέγραψαν, ὅπως μὴ συλλαβόμενοι περιεργάζωνται μηδὲν διὰ τὴν ἐξακολούθησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας· ἡμεῖς δὲ τὰς λύσεις ἡγάγομεν ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ἀντιγράφων καὶ κρυφίμων πάντων. There follows a list of plants and other 'medicine' with the names by which they were known in magic. The list has been drawn from two sources, to only one of which (those containing the names of gods) the opening description applies, e.g. γόνος Ἑρμοῦ = ἄνηθον. But there are others in which no god is named, e.g. αἶμα ὄφεως = ἀνδράχνη. We have the same thing in Pap. Leyden J 395 where ζμύρνα and κρίνονον μύρον are referred to by their magic names (xxv. 21 ed. Dieterich). That these names were often borrowed from foreign languages, e.g. Hebrew, we know from other passages. In Pap. J 395, we find (viii. 1) in a recipe τὸ καλούμενον βαλλαθὰ τὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων: in the line before we have a substance called βιεβενησι, the derivation of which is unknown. To such a class of words μῶλυ evidently belongs and we must look for its derivation in either Phoenician or Egyptian. As to M. Bérard's derivation, I am not competent to express an opinion.

## II.—λωτός.

The same two scholars have given considerable attention to the identification of the λωτός. M. Champault (*op. cit.* p. 400 n. [2]) decides for the date: M. Bérard more cautiously leaves the exact fruit an open question, but has no doubt that a tree-fruit is meant. He admits indeed (*op. cit.* ii. 102) that the *Greek* word λωτός as used in Od. iv. 603-4 denotes a different thing—a kind of clover: and he even quotes Strabo xvii. 829 A who speaks of a tribe inhabiting the Mauretanian desert who σιτοῖντο δὲ λωτόν, πόαν τινα καὶ ῥίζαν ἀφ' ἧς οὐδὲν δέουτο ποτοῦ. But then he regards the *lotus* of the Lotus-eaters to be a Semitic word. There are two definite statements made about the lotus; it is called an ἄνηθον εἶδος (Od. ix. 84) and it is called μελιηδῆς καρπός (*ib.* 94). The first does not seem a very apt description of a tree-fruit, and the latter does not suit the taste of the jujube (according to M. Champault) nor of the date. If Strabo's πῶα had the proper taste it would satisfy both requirements. Now Sulpicius Severus (*Dialogi* i. 4, 4) tells of a friend of

his who being storm-bound on his way from Carthage to Alexandria put in at the *extrema Cyrenorum ora*: he was entertained by a hermit who had not much to offer him in the way of food but *fasciculum herbae intulit, cuius nomen excidit, quae menthae*

*similis, exuberans foliis, saporem mellis praestabat*. If this be Strabo's ποά, might it not be Homer's λωτός?

R. M. HENRY.

Queen's College, Belfast.

### ON DIODORUS: BOOKS XVI.-XVIII.

IT is well known that Greek MSS. are sometimes corrupted by the substitution for the right word of another word suggested by the context, a mistake which we are all conscious of making from time to time in writing and in speaking. In this *Review* I have many times tried to explain a difficult passage by the hypothesis of such corruption; and I think it worth while now to publish the following notes on the fourth volume of the new Teubner Diodorus, without waiting to put into shape others which I have by me on the earlier volumes, because so many of them turn on the same point. In book 17 especially occur a remarkable number of passages, the text of which may be explained in this way, and which are not uninteresting in themselves.

16. 1. 1 γενέσθαι should be γίνεσθαι. A 'gnomic' or 'frequentative' aorist infinitive has—in spite of Goodwin—no existence.

ιδ. 6 ἐπὶ τὸ συνεχές τῆς ἱστορίας πορευσόμεθα, βραχεία τοῖς χρόνοις προαναδραμόντες.

In this and some other passages (see the references to Polybius l. 12. 8, etc. in Liddell and Scott) it seems clear that προαναδραμόντες should be written. In all of them the writer gives first a brief account of earlier events and then goes on with τὸ συνεχές τῆς ἱστορίας. πρόσ would be unmeaning.

16. 22. 3 Should καθ' ἑαυτούς be καθ' ἐκάστους? The two words do get confused. But ἑαυτούς may very well be right, though the other would be clearer.

16. 35. 4 πέζῃ βοηθήσαντος μετὰ πεζῶν δισμυρίων.

πέζῃ. *Del. Reisk.*; fort. *scribendum* ὀξέως (Fischer). πέζῃ is obviously due to πεζῶν. I suggest σπουδῇ as the original.

16. 44. 1 τὴν φιλίαν ἔφασαν τὴν πρὸς Πέρσας τηρεῖν, συμμαχίαν δὲ ἀποπέλλειν ἀντίπαν.

ἀντίπαν cannot be used thus with an infinitive in the sense of *refused*. It means

probably *answered*. It would be possible to read οὐκ ἀποστελεῖν ἀντίπαν, but I incline to think that οὐκ ἔθελειν has been lost. This would help τηρεῖν too.

16. 45. 1 τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους τῶν πολιτῶν ἑκατὸν ὡς συμβούλους.

Perhaps <εἰς> ἑκατόν. ΕΙC and ΕΚ are very like one another.

16. 59. 2 καὶ <ὀλίγον> τὸ τῶν μισθοφόρων ἔχοντα πλήθος? Or some such word.

16. 92. 3 ὁ μὲν τεχνίτης κρίνας οἰκίον ὑποληφθήσεσθαι τὸ ποίημα, τῇ διαβάσει τοῦ Φιλίππου καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἐπιπλήξαι βουλόμενος τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως, καίπερ οὐσαν μεγάλην καὶ περιβόητον, ὅπως μεταπέσοι' ἂν κ.τ.λ.

There seems no reason for Fischer's doubt of διαβάσει. It is a perfectly suitable word and occurs again 17. 16. 1 προῦθηκε βουλήν περὶ τῆς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβάσεως. On the other hand ἐπιπλήξαι, which he does not question, can hardly be right. (1) It is not a suitable word. εὐδαιμονία, *prosperity, power*, etc. is not a fault to be rebuked. A man may be found fault with for pride, harshness, injustice, and so on, not for being very prosperous. (2) ὅπως κ.τ.λ. cannot follow properly on a verb of *rebuking*. If it is wrong, we may safely conclude that D. wrote ἐπιδείξαι, which goes perfectly with ὅπως μεταπέσοι' ἂν, and in which δ is the λ (Δ Λ) of ἐπιπλήξαι. ἂν with the future optative is of course doubtful.

17. 7. 5 ὁρᾶσθαι δὲ τὸν ἥλιον ἔτι νυκτὸς οὐσης ἀνατέλλοντα, τὰς ἀκτῖνας οὐκ ἐν κυκλοτερεῖ σχήματι τετραμμένον, ἀλλὰ τὴν φλόγα κατὰ πολλοὺς τόπους ἔχοντα δισπαρμένην.

On τετραμμένον, which is clearly impossible, Fischer notes *ita* *RX*, *μένοντα* *F*; *συνεστραμμένον* *vel* *συνέχοντα* *coni. Hertl.* II. 2 p. 3, *πέμποντα* *Dind.*; fort. *τετορνευμένον* (cf. *Plat. Tim.* 33 B).

Remembering how easily Γ and Τ get confused, we may, I think, confidently