

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 New Lyric Fragments

A. S. Hunt

The Classical Review / Volume 28 / Issue 04 / June 2014, pp 126 - 127
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00007198, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00007198

How to cite this article:

A. S. Hunt (1914). The New Lyric Fragments. The Classical Review, 28, pp 126-127
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00007198

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

In amalgamating these various fragments I think he has confused the order of events and the geography; yet each passage appears to me to be from an authentic and true account.

The question remains: What river was the Skaras or Saras? Probably that can never be determined with certainty. Colonel Colin, to whom I am indebted for most of my ideas on the subject of Hannibal's route, suggests the Sorgues, to which I see no objection in the accounts of Livy and Polybius. But I think the Durance itself might be the Skaras. It better suits the general description of the Island and the comparison with the Delta. If Polybius found that river called Skaras and did not know the name Druentia, and if Livy knew of the Druentia, but not of the Skaras except from Polybius, the confusion (as I think it) of Livy would be explained.

The editors of both writers print *Isapas* and *Isara*, instead of *Σκαπας* and *Saras*, and no doubt had in mind the *Isère*. But even if the MSS. read *Isara*

it might mean the Durance. In the campaign of Marius against the Cimbri and Teutones, it is now believed¹ that Marius pitched his camp in the Alpilles, a small range of hills east of the Rhone and south of the Durance, stretching from near Tarascon towards Orgon. The barbarians had invaded Spain, and, returning from the Pyrenees, crossed the Rhone at Tarascon and moved by the south bank of the Durance, passing the camp of Marius, who followed them and defeated them near Aix.

Orosius, in his account of these events says that Marius pitched his camp near the confluence of the Isara and the Rhone ('cum iuxta Isarae Rhodanique flumina, ubi in sese confluent, castra posuisset.' V. 16). Here must not *Isara* mean the Durance?

SPENSER WILKINSON.

All Souls' College, Oxford.

¹ See Gilles, *Campagne de Marius en Gaule* (1870), and Berenger-Féraud, *La Campagne de Marius en Provence* (1895).

THE NEW LYRIC FRAGMENTS.

THE May issue of the *Classical Review* contained an article by Mr. J. M. Edmonds upon the fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus which were recently published in Part X. of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. With the numerous suggestions there made for the restoration of the fragments I am not here concerned, except in so far as they affect the decipherment of the originals or the length of lacunae. Mr. Edmonds makes a number of very positive assertions as to what can or cannot be read, and since they seem to me to be largely fallacious, I take an early opportunity of expressing dissent.

A word or two first on some general principles. Measurement of lacunae and estimation of the space occupied by various combinations of letters are, of course, an elementary part of the business of restoring defective MSS. In our editions of papyri losses are, where possible, represented approximately by dots; but generally the number of letters supplied may slightly exceed

or fall below the number of dots according to the proportion of narrow or wide letters in the supplement proposed. Moreover, with an irregular hand like that of Pap. 1231, a greater variation is possible than in a more careful text, such as Pap. 1233. Whether complete photographs are given or not, the indications supplied in the printed pages, if used with discrimination, should mostly suffice for practical purposes, though letter-tracing may conduce to greater accuracy. But the fact that a certain combination suits the given space is no proof of its correctness; the space limits the possibilities; probabilities depend largely on other considerations. Secondly, in Pap. 1231 fr. 1 Col. ii. Mr. Edmonds detects a serpentine initial line, and infers that the initial line of Col. i. may also be very slightly serpentine but not zigzag. Initial letters of lines in literary papyri do not usually zigzag, nor for that matter are they wont to pursue a serpentine course. Not seldom, how-

ever, scribes had a tendency, as they proceeded with a column, to begin lines slightly to the left of the perpendicular, so that the finished column appears to lean over somewhat to the right. In Col. ii. here the writer has in two places (ll. 6 and 24) begun a line further out by about the space of a letter than the line preceding. Otherwise the initial letters are practically vertical, except that just at the foot there is a slight tendency back towards the right owing to the projection of the last line of the preceding column. But there is no reason to suppose that Col. i. followed a like course; on the contrary the initial line is vertical so far as it can be traced, as is that of fr. 56. All that can be legitimately inferred in this regard from Col. ii. is that in this MS. the lines in the middle of a column sometimes began further to the left by about the space of one letter, those at the bottom by about the space of two letters, than those at the top. But without evidence that in the given case they actually did so, such assumptions are better avoided, if possible.

I turn now to details, which I take in the order in which they appear in Mr. Edmonds's article. In Pap. 1231 fr. 1 i. 27 (l. 15 of the poem: *Classical Review*, p. 73) either *νεμνα* or *μεμνα*, as stated in our note, can be read; to say that the word is glossed as *μέμναι* is misleading, the gloss referring only to the syllable *-μνα*. Mr. Edmonds continues: 'The letter before *μέμνα* is beyond all doubt *ν*. In l. 16 the Papyrus certainly has *παρεοίσας* and not *ἀπεοίσας*.' Both assertions may be rejected. It is doubtful whether any part of the letter before *μεμνα* or *νεμνα* is visible. The dark mark discernible (exaggerated in the facsimile) is not certainly ink, and may be of the same character as similar marks which proceed at intervals in a straight line below this point to the bottom of the column. If, however, it does belong to any letter, that letter was most probably *νοί ν*. With regard to *παρεοίσας*, this, as stated in our note, is the more suitable reading, but *ἀπεοίσας* is possible. If *παρεοίσας* is right, I should be sorry to deny that

μη can have preceded. At the beginning of l. 15 (=27) *δ* is quite improbable, and Mr. Edmonds's [*οὐ*]δέ is therefore unsuitable. The same may be said of *τις* in the preceding verse. He further declares (p. 74) that in l. 8 (=20) the papyrus must have had *κρίνεν*, not *κρίννεν*, and in l. 10 *κωῦδέ*, not *κωῦδέ*, which is too long, nor *οῦδέ*, which is too short; that for l. 11 *οὔδέν*, *οὔκετ'*, *τόσσον*, *πλείον* are too short; and that *Κύπρις ἔρασαν* or *ἔρωσαν* is too long in l. 12. *οὔδέν* (*οὔκετ'*) is certainly rather short, otherwise all these assertions are disputable. In l. 20 (=32), I agree that Mr. Rackham's *πεσοδομάχεντας* suits the conditions better than *ἵππομάχεντας*; this is the one contribution to the poem which I regard as a substantial improvement. Since the height of the columns is unknown, the number of the stanzas in the poem cannot be determined. In fr. 15. 2. *χρῦσανθι* (p. 75) is impossible, since the first letter cannot be *χ*. At the end of l. 3 *ο* is possible after *τ*, but so are several other letters.

In Pap. 1233 fr. 1 ii. 9 (l. 2 of the poem), Mr. Edmonds asserts (p. 76) that the letters *εη* in the papyrus are certain. The letter after *ε*, as stated in our note, may be *γ*, *η*, or *π*. Again in l. 11 (18) he pronounces that the papyrus had [*ᾶτ*]τα, not [*κα*]τα, which is too short. But the space occupied by *τ* does not differ appreciably from that occupied by *κ*. Mr. Edmonds has perhaps not noticed that the crossbar of *τ* usually comes very close to, if it does not touch, the adjacent letters. In ll. 8-9 (15-16), for instance, where a *κ* stands immediately below a *τ*, the latter takes slightly the smaller space. In fr. 4. 10,]*ντες* definitely ends the line, as is shown by the absence of a bracket in our transcript; the fact that a stop follows has naturally no bearing on the point. I may perhaps be permitted to observe, in conclusion, that the suggestion that the word following *λάμπροι* was some form of *πρότονος* had already been made in our note; and that it is possible to exaggerate our obligations, great as they are, to Wilamowitz.

A. S. HUNT.