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THE OPISTHODOMUS ON THE ACROPOLIS AT
ATHENS.¹

BY JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE.

In inscriptions of the fifth century and fourth century B.C. and in
Aristophanes, Demosthenes, and Lucian, references occur to
a structure on the Acropolis at Athens which is called simply
dι' οπισθόδωμος, without further designation. The scholiasts, however,
on the passages in which the Opisthodomus is thus referred to and
the ancient lexicographers define its situation.

August Boeckh believed that the Opisthodomus in question was
the western chamber of the cela of the Parthenon, and maintained
this view with vigour.² So Leake,³ K. F. Hermann,⁴ Boetticher,⁵
Michaelis,⁶ and many others. This has been and remains the
generally accepted view. It makes the "Parthenon" in the restricted
sense,—the well-known treasure-chamber named in inscriptions,⁷

¹ The following discussion was first made public in a lecture delivered at the
American School of Classical Studies at Athens on March 1, 1894. It was sub-
sequently privately printed in London, in a limited number of copies, under date
of May 5, 1894. Contemporaneously, Professor Arthur Milchhöfer of Münster pub-
lished in the Philologus (Heft 2, 1894) a searching discussion of the same theme,
in which he independently established the main contention of my paper, namely,
that the Opisthodomus on the Acropolis at Athens was a separate building. On
the secondary question of the situation of the Opisthodomus we held and hold
divergent views. My reasons for regarding Professor Milchhöfer's view on this
question untenable constitute a part of the present revision of my original argument.

² Staatshaushaltung der Athener³, 1886, i. p. 517 ff., especially p. 519, note c.
See also CIG. i. p. 177 f.
³ Topography of Athens⁴, 1841, i. p. 559.
⁴ Die Hypäthraltempel des Alterthums, 1844, p. 27 f.
⁵ Philologus, 1862, XVIII., plan; Untersuchungen auf der Akropolis, 1863,
p. 165 ff.
⁶ Der Parthenon, 1871, p. 26 f. See also p. 109.
⁷ See the important series, CIG. i. 161 ff.
— a part of the νῶς ἰκαρομυκώς, and places within it the great chryselephantine statue of Athena. Ussing believed that the western chamber of the cella was the "Parthenon," that the western portico was the Opisthodomus proper, and that the two together constituted the Opisthodomus of the inscriptions.\(^1\) This is also Petersen's view.\(^8\) Köhler maintains that the statue stood in the Hecatompedos, not in the "Parthenon," but refuses to identify the western chamber of the cella, which he believes to have been the Opisthodomus, with the "Parthenon."\(^8\) Lolling also believed this to be the Opisthodomus, although he held new and revolutionary views in regard to the application of the terms "Parthenon" and Hecatompedos.\(^4\) Dörpfeld, on grounds independent of those on which Ussing had based his argument, concluded that the western chamber of the cella was the "Parthenon," and that, in official language, Opisthodomus always meant the western portico of the temple.\(^6\) This view was adopted by Fränkel,\(^6\) and is held by Frazer.\(^7\) On his discovery of the Hecatompedon,\(^8\) Dörpfeld relinquished this view, and now main-

---


2 *Mitth. d. Inst. Athen*, 1887, xii. p. 70 f. Petersen was the first to endeavour to establish the proposition that the same room might have in contemporary documents two official names, namely, "Parthenon" and Opisthodomus. In the first edition of his *Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik* (1893, p. 177) Furtwängler supported the same proposition, and declared for a complete identification of "Parthenon" and Opisthodomus. He has now relinquished this view, and believes that the Opisthodomus was a separate building. See his *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture*, the English edition of his *Meisterwerke*, edited by Eugénie Sellera, London, 1895, p. 425 f.


4 *Aθήνα*, 1890, ii. p. 627 ff.


8 The temple of Athena whose foundations lie close to the Erechtheum on the south. For Dörpfeld's description of it as a structure, see *Mitth. d. Inst. Athen*, 1886, xi. p. 337 ff. See also *Mitth.* 1885, x. p. 275 ff. and *Antike Denkmäler*, 1886, plates I., II. Dörpfeld himself names it "alter Athena-Tempel," but this name seems to be misleading to those who do not believe that it was the oldest temple of Athena on the Acropolis. Petersen calls it "Peisistratäischer Tempel" (note 2 above), Frazer "Pre-Persian Temple" (note 7 above). Dörpfeld main-
tains that the term Opisthodomus in the inscriptions and authors designates the three rooms constituting the western half of this temple, which, as is well known, he believes to have been still in existence in the time of Pausanias.\footnote{Mith. 1892, XVII. p. 158, note 1.} Finally, Fowler has advanced the original hypothesis that the Opisthodomus was the western chamber of the cella of the “Parthenon,” that this room was doubtless divided into three parts by two partitions of some sort, probably of metal, running from the eastern and western walls to the nearest columns and connecting the columns, and that the middle division of the three between the partitions was the “Parthenon” proper.\footnote{Mith. d. Inst. Athen. 1887, XII. p. 25 ff., 190 ff., 1890, xv. p. 420 ff. Dürrfeld’s view, both that the Opisthodomus was in the Hecatompedon and that the latter was still in existence in the time of Pausanias, is accepted by Miss Harrison, *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, 1893, pp. 505 ff., and by Müller, *Amer. Jour. Arch.* 1893, VIII. pp. 500 and 528.}

I am unable to accept any one of these views, and venture again to present for consideration our sources of information about the vexed structure called the Opisthodomus. I purpose to discuss as the main thesis of this paper the following proposition:

**The Opisthodomus on the Acropolis at Athens, referred to in inscriptions and in authors simply as ὁ ὀπισθόδωμος, was not a part of any existing temple, but was a separate building, complete in itself.**

The current view, if I may so name it, would seem to be expressly contradicted by the testimony of the scholiasts and lexicographers. An important part of this testimony, with the original passages in the authors of which it is an explanation, is the following:

οἶνον (ὅπως δὲ μὴ θορυβήσει μοι μνήμει, πρὶν δὲ ἀπαντᾶ εἰπω) ἀνέφεξαν ὅπως πρώην τινὲς τῶν ὀπισθόδωμον. [Dem.] xiii. 14.

Δημοσθένης ἔν ἑῷ πέρι συντάξεως: ἀνέφεξαν ὅπως πρώην τινὲς τῶν ὀπισθόδωμον. οὐκ ἐστὶν τοῦ νεῶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς οὗτω καλεῖται, ἐν ὧν ἀπετίθετο τὰ χρήματα. Harpocratio s.v. ὀπισθόδωμος.

\footnote{Amer. Jour. Arch. 1893, VIII. p. 10 ff.}
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οἶκος ὄπισθεν τοῦ νεῶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐν δὲ ἀπετίθεντο τὰ χρήματα. ἦ ἐν τῷ ἄκροπόλει τόπος ἐνθα τὸ δημόσιον ἄργυριον ἄπικειτο καὶ ὁ φόρος. Schol. FY [Dem.] xiii. 14.1

μέρος τὶ τῆς ἄκροπόλεως τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἔθα ἦν τὸ ταμιεύων, ὄπισθεν τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ναοῦ, ἐν δὲ ἀπετίθεντο τὰ χρήματα. Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ συντάξεως ἁνέγαψεν ἑνήν πρώτη τινὲς τῶν ὀπισθόδομον. Suidas s.v. ὀπισθόδομος.2

ιδρυσόμεθ' οὖν αὐτίκα μάλις, ἄλλα περίμενε, τῶν Πλοῦτον, οὗτος πρότερον ἦν ἰδρύμενος τῶν ὀπισθόδομον ἀεὶ φυλάττει τῆς θεοῦ.


Ἀλλωσ. ὅπισῶ τοῦ νεῶ τῆς καλουμένης πολιάδος Ἀθηνᾶς διπλοὺς τοῖχος (οἶκος?) ἔχων θύραν, ὅπως ἦν θησαυροφυλάκιον. ἐπεὶ τὰ χρήματα ἐν τῷ ὀπισθόδομῳ ἀπίκειτο. μέρος δὲ τῆς ἄκροπόλεως. Schol. V Arist. Plut. 1193.3


. ταμιεύων τῆς πόλεως ἐν ἄκροπόλει ὄπισθεν τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεώ. Photius s.v. ὀπισθόδομος.

καὶ οἱ ταμιέως ἐφ' ἄν τὸ ὀπισθόδομος ἐνεπρήσθη, καὶ οἱ τῶν τῆς θεοῦ καὶ οἱ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν, ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι τούτῳ ἦσαν ὡς ἡ κρίσις αὐτῶς ἐγένετο. Dem. xxiv. 136.

Ἰστιόν ὅτι χρήματα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ιερῶν τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἕκατο εἰς τινὶ οἰκήματι ὥς ὀπίσω τῆς ἄκροπόλεως, τῷ καλουμένῳ ὀπισθόδομῷ.

1 The statement, ἐν τῷ . . . φόρος, is also in B.
2 ὀπισθόδομος μέρος τῆς ἄκροπόλεως . . . χρήματα. Schol. V Lucian Fig. 7. The Scholiast did not observe that Lucian was talking about an opisthodómos at Olympia.
3 See Dübner's note (Schol. Graeca in Arist. 1841, p. 613), who also gives the variant in Par. 2821.—οἶκος is the conjecture of Michaelis (Paus. descrip. arc. Athen. 1880, p. vi. add. ad e. 24, 47 u. 7 a fine), and must be right. He compares Paus. 1. 26. 5, διπλάνων γάρ ἔστι τὸ οἰκήμα.
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καὶ ἔσσαν τινες τεταγμένοι ταμία ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ τούτων. Schol. ATCV Dem. xxiv. 136.1

ἐν τῇ ἄκρωτω ἐκεῖ, τὸ δὲ δημόσιον ἄργυρων ἀπέκειτο [πρὸς τῷ ὀπισθόδωμῳ] καὶ ὁ φόρος. Hesychius s.v. ὀπισθόδωμος (sic).2

The meaning of the interpreters here seems to be clear. Their testimony is that the Opisthodomus was a house, or a place on the Acropolis, or a part of the Acropolis, that lay behind the temple of Athena, and that it was used as a treasury.

These old Greek interpreters have been variously dealt with by modern writers who have discussed the Opisthodomus.3 By the most of the scholars named above they have been silently ignored, for whatever reason; by others they have been taken seriously4; by others still their testimony has been rejected as worthless.5 In some instances it is impossible to tell by what interpretation of the Greek scholiasts and lexicographers some of the moderns arrive at the conclusion embodied in the current view.6

If in the interpreters as quoted above the words νεώς and ἵστατον mean temple, it is possible to obtain the definition of Opisthodomus adopted in the current view only by attaching to ὀπισθόδωμος the meaning

---

1 The Scholiast's meaning, probably, is treasure that belonged both to the sanctuaries of the other gods and to Athena's. ὀπισθόδωμος τῆς ἄκρωτου is as it stands nonsense, since it removes the Opisthodomus from the Acropolis altogether. Compare the definition in Pollux (ix. 40), τὸ κατὸν τῆς ἄκρωτου (sic. δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ) ὀπισθόδωμον.
2 Cf. the schol. [Dem.] xiii. 14 quoted above.
3 See, as to the credibility of this ancient testimony, p. 41 ff.
4 By Boeckh, for example (CIG. i. p. 177 f.), whose interpretation is discussed p. 43 f.
5 By Michaelis, whose treatment of the evidence is considered on p. 12.
6 Leake, for example, cites the scholiasts and lexicographers, but gives no explanation how from their statements he reaches the conclusion that the Opisthodomus was the western apartment of the cella of the Parthenon. Dörpfeld also, who believes that the Opisthodomus was the rear part of the Hecatompedon, twice in interpreting the scholiasts and lexicographers translates the phrase οὐρανὸς τοῦ τῆς 'ἄνωτας νεώς, 'hinter dem Tempel,' 'hinter dem Athena-Tempel.' See Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. pp. 34, 39. This is, I think, the right interpretation; but it is difficult to see how, if the Opisthodomus lay 'behind the temple,' it was at the same time a part of it.
in the back part of. ὁκεῖος ὑποθέθηκε τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ναῷ would then mean a room in the back part of the temple of Athena. But this meaning of ὑποθέθηκε with the genitive cannot be established. It is recognized by none of the lexicographers. In order to express the desired meaning ὑποθέθηκε must be combined adjectively with the article; the genitive that follows is then partitive. Pausanias, for example. in telling where certain paintings are in the temple of Messene, daughter of Triopas, says (iv. 31. 11), γραφαὶ δὲ κατὰ τοῦ ναοῦ τὸ ὑποθέθηκε οἱ βασιλεύσαντες εἰσὶ Μεσσήνης. i.e. in postica templi parte.

It may be well to establish the uses of ὑποθέθηκε in this author, who naturally had occasion to use the word often. In Pausanias ὑποθέθηκε may be used, as above, adjectively. Sometimes it is used adverbially. In the great majority of the instances of its occurrence, it is followed, as an adverb of place, by the genitive. In the most of these it clearly means behind: in some cases the meaning is indeterminable, because the statement is brief, and we have no other means of arriving at the facts; in no instance can it be proved that the word means in the back part of.

In the following cases ὑποθέθηκε signifies, in my judgment, behind: καὶ σφαῖρα ὑπερβαλλοντο Ἀθηναίων τῶν κολοσσῶν ἀναβάτες ὑποθέθηκε τοῖς ναοῖς. 1. 18. 6. Pausanias has just said that the peribolus of the temple (the Olympieum at Athens) is full of statues of Hadrian; but the Athenian colossal overtopped all the rest. The statue had a commanding position, facing the Acropolis. Cf. vii. 9. 6; 30. 7; 30. 8. ἢστι δὲ ὑποθέθηκε τοῦ Δικείου Νίκου μοίμα. 1. 19. 4. Cf. ii. 31. 3; iii. 16. 6; viii. 14. 10. μετὰ ταύτα ἐσὶ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς τίμειον ἰσελθοῦσι ναοῖς ἢστι βιάς ἄξιος: τὸ δὲ ἐγκαλμα οὐκ ἐγερασθή τοῦ Διὸς ... ὑποθέθηκε δὲ τοῦ ναοῦ κατὰ ξύλα ἡμέρα ... ἐν δὲ αὐτῷ τῷ ναῷ γραφαὶ ἀνάκαινα χαλκοῦν ἵμβαλον. 1. 40. 4. 5. The phrase ἐν δὲ αὐτῷ τῷ ναῷ makes it certain that the ξύλα ἡμέρα were not in the temple. τὴν δὲ πηγήν, ἢ ἀποκρύφην ναός ὑποθέθηκε τοῖς ναοῖς. 11. 5. 1. τοῦτον δὲ (i.e. τοῦ θαύματος) ὑποθέθηκε φιλοδομηταί σταδίου πλευρὰ μία, ἀνέχοντα τε αὐτὴ τὸ θέατρον καὶ ἄτι ἐρείσματος ἀναλογὸν ἐκείνη χρωμάτῃ. 11. 29. 11. ἢστι δὲ τῆς στοάς

1 1. 24. 5; ii. 20. 7; v. 10. 8; vi. 5. 6; viii. 45. 7; x. 19. 4.
2 1. 3. 3; v. 20. 2; vi. 5. 6; x. 26. 5.
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ta τῆς ὅπισθεν ἥρα. III. 15. i. Cf. i. i. 3. ὅπισθεν δὲ τῆς Χαλκοίκου ναὸς ἄστιν Ἀφροδίτης. III. 17. 5. καὶ ὅπισθεν γυνὴ αὐτοῦ. V. 17. 9. Cf. v. 19. 6. ἵπτεὶ δὲ (i.e. Κλεοθέτινος ἄρμα) ὅπισθεν τοῦ Δίως τῶν ἀνατεθῶντος ἀπὸ Ἑλλήνων. VI. 10. 6. Cf. x. 9. 9. ὑπομένοντες τῆς τάξεως ὅπισθεν οἱ οἰκήται τοσάδε σφίσιν ἐγίνοντο χρήσιμοι. X. 19. 10. 
The following are indeterminable, but that in them ὅπισθεν means behind can hardly be doubted in view of the preceding clear instances of this meaning: II. 11. 1; II. 13. 7; V. 15. 7; VIII. 22. 7. In Pausanias ὅπισθος is almost always an adverb accompanying a verb of motion; the following example shows its meaning when followed by the genitive: ἔστι δὲ τῆς στοάς ὅπισθος Ἀφροδίτης ναὸς. VI. 25. 2. It should finally be noted, as important in establishing the meaning of ὅπισθεν and ὅπισθος with the genitive of place, that the counter-idea is generally expressed by πρὸς with the genitive, where by no contrivance can the preposition signify in the front part of.

In view of these facts, it is impossible to interpret ὅπισθεν τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεῶ to mean in the back part of the temple of Athena.

But, as is well known, νεῶ may signify cella, as well as temple, although, when the entire number of cases of the word’s occurrence is taken into account, this is very rare both in the literature and in inscriptions. If this signification of the word could be established for the phrase ὅπος ὅπισθεν τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεῶ, we should arrive at the meaning demanded by the current view as to the situation of the Opisthodomus.

The question is limited to the use of νεῶ in its actual application to temples of Athena on the Acropolis at Athens. Fortunately

---

1 This form occurs in the schol. V Arist. Plut. 1193 and in the schol. Dem. xxiv. 136 quoted above.

2 The consideration of the etymology of the word πρόσων is pertinent, but does not establish the meaning cella for ναῦς. That which πρόσων names doubtless marked the first stage of development of the original ναῦς from a single room to a more complicated structure; at this time πρόσων meant (porch) before the temple. ναῦς and ἄνθρωποι were then identical. The original ναῦς kept its name when, with the permanent addition of the porch in front and the porch behind, that name received a larger application and designated (as it had exclusively at first) the entire structure. Cf. δύναμις and πρόσωπος (ἐν πρόσωπῷ δύναμιν, Od. iv. 302), and the theatre-terms ἀπηροῖ and προεκτικοί. The original etymological force of πρόσων is seen in its adjectival use, which is not uncommon. Cf. βασιλεύς πρόσων,
the successive labours of scholars have collected the existing literary and epigraphical evidence not only for the word νεώς but also for the other terms designating these temples and their parts,¹ and it is now not difficult to reach trustworthy conclusions in regard to their use and application. The law of use for νεώς and ἱερών² requires that, when they have the limited sense κελλα, this shall always be clearly indicated either by an added epithet or by the context. Such instances are surprisingly rare. I proceed to an examination of the evidence.

We meet first cases in which the old temple of Athena³ is referred to as Ἀρχαιόν ή ταλαιώς νεώς,⁴ where the epithet excludes the meaning κελλα for νεώς. Xenophon records that the old temple was set on fire; Strabo contrasts it with the Parthenon. It would be as forced to suppose that νεώς means κελλα in any of these instances as in the scholium on Arist. Pax 605, the source of which is Philochorus, καὶ τὸ ἀγαλμα τὸ χρυσοῦν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐστάθη εἰς τὸν νεών τὸν μέγαν, in which it is important to note the epithet. Here ὁ μέγας νεώς is the Parthenon, and yet we know that the statue was in the κελλα.

The meaning κελλα for νεώς is excluded also in the inscriptions that relate to the building of the old temple of Athena and to its restoration after the burning described by Xenophon; also in those referring to the setting up of stelae παρὰ τὸν νεώ and to the approach of the panatheniac ship.⁵

---


² Iepōn occurs above, in the schol. Arist. Plut. 1191. It occurs also in E. M. s.v. ἑσπέρας.

³ In this paper “old temple of Athena” means the Erechtheum or its predecessor on the same site.

⁴ C.I.A. iv. 1 c, 27 (p. 3 f.); i. 93, 6; ii. 74 a, 14; 163, 9; 464, 6; 672, 43; 733 a, col. ii. 6; Xen. Hell. i. 6. 1; schol. Arist. Lyg. 273; Strabo ix. p. 396; C.I.A. ii. 751 b, d, 19, and 752 a, col. ii. 8, do not belong here. See Lehner, Uber die athenischen Schatzausschis, 1890, p. 79.

⁵ C.I.A. i. 60, 31, 322, 1, 4, 8; iv. 321, col. iii. 27 (p. 74 ff.); ii. 332, 44; 829, 3; Mith. d. Inst. Athen, 1883, viii. p. 59, 25; C.I.A. iii. 776, 3.
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There are other instances in which νεώς certainly means temple, although it is not easy to categorize them. Some of these refer to the Parthenon, \(^1\) others to the old temple of Athena. \(^2\) In some of them, although the object referred to was probably in a specific part of the temple, it is still clear that the temple as a whole was in the speaker’s mind when he used the word νεώς. \(^3\) These are of the same nature as the quotation from Philochorus above (schol. Arist. Pax 605). \(^4\)

There are three passages in dispute. \(^5\) If in these δὲ τῆς Πολιάδος νεώς means the cella of the Polias, it should be observed that this results solely from the demands of the context, \(^6\) for in the majority of

---

\(^1\) Aristot. hist. an. vi. 24, p. 577 B, 29 (cf. Aelian de nat. an. vi. 49); Philochorus in schol. Arist. Pax 605; Plut. de soll. an. 13, p. 970 B; Paus. i. 24. 5 and 8; Arist. i. p. 548, 14 Dind.; schol. Dem. xxii. 13; Hesych. s.v. Ἐκατόμπεδος; Lex. Pat. in Bull. corr. Hell. 1877, i. p. 149, Ἐκατόμπεδος; E. M. s.v. Ἐκατόμπεδος (cf. Bekk. Anc. i. p. 283, 15); Suidas s.v. Ἐκατόμπεδος νεώς.

\(^2\) Hom. ii. 21. 549; CIG. 6280 λ, 31 = Kibeli Ep. Gr. 1046, 90; Plut. quast. con. ix. 6, p. 741 B; Paus. i. 27. 2 and 4; Himer. Ecl. v. 30; Clem. Alex. Protr. iii. p. 13 Sylb. (cf. Apollod. iii. 14. 7); schol. Arist. Eq. 1169; Eust. ii. xxii. 451 (cf. Hesych. s.v. Ἀλκιάδης βουρυγις); Eust. Od. i. 357; schol. Arist. Lyk. 759. The last two relate to the sacred snake, which was in the old temple. Hesychius (s.v. ὀλευρός δορυς) alone names an exact spot, and places the snake where we should expect to find it, ἐν τῇ λειοᾷ τοῦ Ἑρεχθίου. This must interpret for us the στήλη of Plutarch (Them. 10). In Dion. Hal. Ant. xiv. 2 similarly we find ἐν τοῦ γγάμνοις Ἑρεχθίου τῷ σταυρῷ, where he is speaking of the olive. See, for the snake, the passages in Jahn-Michaelis, Paus. desc. arc. Athen. 1880, p. 27 (c. 27. 7st).

\(^3\) Plut. Cim. 5; Anth. Pal. vi. 2 (Simonides); Xen. Hell. i. 3. 20. — If Paus. i. 24. 3 is to be taken into account, it belongs in this general category.

\(^4\) To this category belongs also Hdt. viii. 55, if one believes that there Ἑρεχθίου νεώς refers to the whole building, as in the prevailing modern use of the word "Erechtheum." If one does not believe this, but that the οἰκεία Ἑρεχθίων καλομένη of Pausanias (i. 26. 5) is the double western half of the old temple, then the expression in Herodotus is not to be taken into account, since the present inquiry is limited to the investigation of the meaning of νεώς and λειον in their application to temples of Athena.

\(^5\) Philochorus frg. 146 (Dion. Hal. de Dim. 3); Paus. i. 27. 1 and 3.

\(^6\) See Michaelis’s discussion of the passages, Mitth. d. Inst. Athen. 1877, ii. p. 31 ff., with notes 25 and 27. His negative argument by which in Paus. i. 27. 3 δὲ νεώς τῆς Πολιάδος is made to refer to the cella of the Polias has not met with acceptance.
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the instances of the occurrence of the phrase it is generally agreed that the reference is to the temple of Athena. The argument from the context, in fact, led to this interpretation of these three passages.

There are two cases in which νεώς means cella. In the first of these the inscription names the whole building, the Hecatompedon, and then its parts, ὁ νεώς, τὸ προνήμιον, and τὰ οἰκήματα τὰ ἐν τῷ ἱκανομικῶδι. Here the signification of νεώς is made clear by its collocation with προνήμιον. The second case is the well-known use of the word in the treasury-documents, where it always has an epithet, ὁ νεώς ὁ θεατόμικος.

The facts for the use of ἱερόν are altogether similar. In some instances it signifies either sacred precinct or temple; generally the latter; in two it refers to the Parthenon. In none of these has it a more limited meaning than temple.

In a single case it means cella. But here, as in the two cases of νεώς mentioned above, its meaning is made clear by the context, since it is interpreted by the preceding ἀπ' ὄντων.

Here, then, we have abundant instances, both literary and epigraphical, of the uses of νεώς and ἱερόν, extending from the earliest to the latest times, and among them all only three cases in which they certainly signify cella. In each of these three cases, moreover, the context or an added epithet makes clear that this is the signification. In the passages from the scholiasts and lexicographers, on the contrary, that are quoted above, no limitation whatever of the meaning of νεώς and ἱερόν is indicated. And yet the especial purpose of these interpreters was to give a definition; nor were they

---

2 CIA. IV. p. 147 ff.
3 CIA. I. 146, 157, 158, 159; II. 652 A, 15.
6 See Hesych. s.v. ἀλοίπων βοώμ, and p. 9, note 2, above.
7 Hdt. v. 72.
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ignorant of the fact, had νεώς and ιερόν seemed to them to be liable to misinterpretation, that the unmistakable ᾠντον, an Homeric word, and σηκός were ready to their hand. 1

If, nevertheless, we seek to attach to νεώς and ιερόν in these passages the restricted sense of cella, we encounter an unexpected difficulty. Schol. V Arist. Plut. 1193 says that the Opisthodomus lay behind the νεώς of Athena Polias. Those, therefore, who hold the current view in regard to the situation of the Opisthodomus must either establish the worship of Athena Polias in the Parthenon or Hecatompedon, or reject the evidence. If the evidence is trustworthy and if the term Polias designates, as is commonly believed, Athena of the Erechtheum or of the temple that preceded it on the same site, then we are forced, on the supposition that νεώς here has the restricted sense, to the conclusion that the Opisthodomus lay in the Erechtheum. But this is impossible. Boeckh saw these difficulties, and felt himself forced to declare that the scholiast had blundered, 8 although he himself accepted and in part sought to explain the remaining testimony of the scholiasts and lexicographers.

That in the phrase οἶκος οτ οἰκήμα διπωθην τοῦ τῆς Αθηνᾶς νεώ the words οἶκος and οἰκήμα may signify house will at once be granted. This is the first and common meaning of οἶκος and is perfectly established for οἰκήμα, and if demanded by other considerations, namely, the use of διπωθην and νεώ just discussed, it must be allowed. This use of οἶκος to denote a separate structure that was a treasury receives striking confirmation from the names officially recorded of four of the treasuries and magazines at Delos, 'Ανδρῶν οἶκος, Ναζίων οἶκος, Δηλίων οἶκος, and Πώρινος οἶκος. 3 In charge of the anathema and materials stored in these were the ιεροποι, whose functions corresponded closely to those of the ταμία τῆς θεω at Athens.

The same word is used by Hesychius in defining θρησκοντα, namely: εἰς δοκημάτων καὶ χρημάτων [?] ιερῶν ἀποθησών οὐκος.

If the preceding discussion of the terms διπωθην, νεώς, and οἶκος is sound, we must either agree that the Opisthodomus was neither in

2 Staatshaushaltung, 1886. i. p. 517 f.
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the Parthenon nor in the Hecatopiedon, but was a separate building, or else reject the testimony of the scholiasts and lexicographers as to its situation. Michaelis does reject their testimony, declaring their explanation of the name for the most part worthless.¹ He makes an exception in favour of Harpocration, but the reasons for this are not apparent. In Harpocration’s definition, ὁ οἶκος ὁ διαστημα τοῦ νεῶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς οὔτω καλεῖται, one might be tempted to construe ὁ διαστημα οἶκος τοῦ νεῶ, and render the back chamber of the temple; but this construction is excluded by the phraseology of the Epitome, ἀκαθίστως δὲ οὕτως ὁ διαστημα τοῦ νεῶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὁικος, where the genitive τοῦ νεῶ cannot be partitive. Michaelis’s rejection of the evidence seems to justify the conclusion that he did not believe it possible to interpret διαστημα and νεῶ in the manner demanded by the current view.

The testimony of these later writers receives unexpected confirmation from an early and important inscription:

\[
\text{τ}]
[\text{ο }]\text{ ἡ ἕρως} \text{δρυνις} [\text{ο }]\text{ τὸ μὲν ἐκ} \\
\text{τ}]
[\text{ε }]\text{[ ἔτι} \text{ν τοι} \text{διαστημα} \\
\text{θ}]
[\text{ε }]\text{υ τὸ τέξ Ἀθηναία} [\text{s} \text{ἀρχιό ν} \\
\text{ε}]\text{ο Ὀ τὸλι.} \quad \text{CIA. IV. 1 C, 25–29 (p. 3 ff.).}
\]

This inscription, to which we shall return, says at least so much, if we accept the restorations,² that in the first half of the fifth century B.C. treasure of the Eleusinian goddesses was kept in an enclosure behind the old temple of Athenaa on the Acropolis. This statement is strikingly similar to that of the scholiasts and lexicographers quoted above, who say that the treasury was behind the temple of Athena, one of them that it was behind the temple of Athena Polias.

In 454 B.C. the chest of the Delian Confederation was transferred to Athens, and from this date the funded treasure of the state, which consisted of the surplus of its yearly income and was kept on the

¹ Der Parthenon, 1871, p. 293.
Acropolis, was large.\(^1\) This was public money, δημόσια, in contrast with sacred treasure, ἱερά. The two funds were kept separate, but they were nevertheless both housed in the same place, in the keeping of the ταμία τῆς θεοῦ.

Now the theory that the public and sacred treasure of Athens was stored in the opisthodomus of the Parthenon fails to provide a place for it before the completion of that temple in 438 B.C. This fact is so formidable that once the advocates of the theory even resorted to the supposition that the opisthodomus of the Parthenon must have been completed and put to use as early as 454 B.C. when the Delian fund was brought to Athens, but this view is now abandoned.

A place, therefore, must be provided for the storing of these funds in the time before the Parthenon was built. This is conceded even by those who believe that the Opisthodomus was in the Parthenon.\(^2\)

We have, further, excellent testimony to the existence of a treasury at Athens, which is mentioned in connexion with the Stoa Poecile and temple of Castor and Pollux in such a manner as to make it highly probable that it was a separate structure. The connexion in which it is mentioned makes it certain that it was at Athens.

\[\text{Αικαύργος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς ιερείας περὶ Πολυγνωστοῦ τοῦ ζωγράφου, Θαύσιον μὲν τὸ γένος, ὑδὸς δὲ καὶ μαθητὴς Ἀγλασωφέντος, ὑσικύντος δὲ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας ἦτοι ἐπὶ τὴν Ποικίλην στοάν ἔγραψε προῖκα, ἤ, ὡς ἔτερον, τὰς ἐν τῷ Ὀρθαυρῷ καὶ τῷ Ἀνακείσι γραφάς, ἱστορήκασιν ἄλλα τε καὶ Ἀρτέμιον ἐν τῷ περὶ ζωγράφων καὶ Ἱάβαν ἐν τοῖς περὶ γραφικῆς. Ἡπροκρατία ἕπον Πολυγνωστος.}\]

In Photius and Suidas (σ.ν. Πολυγνωστος) and in Eudocia (340, ed. Flach, 1880), this reads as follows:

\[\text{oὔτος ζωγράφος μὲν ἦν τὴν τέχνην, Θάσιος δὲ τῷ γένος, ὑδὸς δὲ καὶ μαθητής Ἀγλασωφέντος, τυχῶν δὲ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας, ἢ ἐπεὶ τὴν Ποικίλην στοάν ἄγραψε προῖκα, ἤ, ὡς ἐν κατὰ τὰς ἐν τῷ Ὀρθαυρῷ καὶ τὰς ἐν Ἀνακείσι γραφάς.}\]

---

1 There was a fund before this time, but it was relatively small. See Thumser, Hermann’s Griech. Staatsalt., 1892, t. 2, pp. 629 and 662.

2 For example, by Frazer, who says (Journ. Hellen. Stud. 1892-93, xiii. p. 163) that in this time the Athenians must certainly have had some strong place in which to store the public and sacred treasure.
The only authenticated reading is θησαυροὺς. Editors without
the χαλάκτης have changed this by interpolation to θησαυρὸς or θησα
υροῖς. In this they have disregarded the testimony of Pausanias,
who mentions the paintings in the θησαυρός as in his time. The sup
position is, supported above, that the θησαυρός of Athens which was
alluded to by Pausanias was a separate building, is strengthened by
the well-known fact that the treasuries-houses at
Athens and Sparta were called θησαυροὶ and were separate struc
tures. Here then we have additional reference to a place for the
keeping of money of Athens which was probably an independent
structure. The treasuries mentioned by Herodotus cannot have
been in amphibolism of an important building.
In the theory that the ἔπαιστοικες in the Acropolis which was
used as a treasury was a separate building is contradicted by any
independent literary evidence. It must be abandoned. Is it thus
contradicted? This ἔπαιστοικες is mentioned four times in Greek
literature. Three of the passages are quoted above. The fourth
is the following

[Text in Greek]

There is no indication in any one of these four passages that the
ἔπαιστοικες mentioned was the western chamber or chambers of
the cella of the Parthenon or of the Erectheum. In the
theory, so far as they contain any implication at all, it is easier to
suppose that the wording recorded by Demosthenes and the specula
tion imagined by Lucian relate to a building that stood apart and
was at least of a semi-sectarian character than to a part of a great
temple. It is fairly incredible that the Parthenon should have been
set on fire in the early years of the fourth century B.C., and no
distinct mention of so notable an event have come down to us and one

1 Paus. viii. 39. 1; and 39. 3; the reduction of χαλάκτης by Hesych.
quoted p. 32 above.
2 Dem. xxiv. 1. 40 p. X. Anti. dem. i. 8. 19 in Deç. XV. 389. p. 49.
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may well wonder how Lucian imagined Timon to have set to work to dig through its massive walls. That would have been impossible, and yet in his answer Timon, although he denies the charge, recognizes the possibility of doing the thing of which he is accused.

There are two other references to an opisthodomus on the Acropolis:

tόν γαρ ὄπισθόδομον τοῦ Παρθενῶνος ἀπεδείξαν αὐτῷ (the Athenians to Demetrius) κατάλαλον, κάκει διάτην εἶχε. Plut. Demet. 23.

ἐξοντι δέ αὐτῷ μοι γίγνεται δόμη ἀνειράτων τοιάδε; ἦδοκον εἶναι μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι ἄρτι κατηρκώς, οἰκεῖον δὲ ἐξαίτησε τῆς ἀκρόπολεως ἐν οἰκίᾳ Θεοδότου τοῦ ἱερατοῦ, εἶναι δὲ αὐτῇ πρώτῃ πρὸς ἣλιον ἀνοιχτά; τοῦ δὲ νεὼ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὁρᾶσθαι τῶν ὀπισθοδόμων ἀπὶ αὐτῆς, καὶ εἶναι πολὺ κατατέρω τῆς ἀκρόπολεως τὴν οἰκίαν. Aristides, i. p. 548, 14, Dindorf.

The disgraceful housing of Demetrius and his mistresses in the Parthenon is a well-known event. Plutarch’s record of it contains an implication of importance to the present discussion. When, namely, the Opisthodomus is referred to by Demosthenes, Aristophanes, and Lucian, no specification of its situation is necessary. It is sufficient to say ὁ ὀπισθόδομος. But Plutarch in designating the place in which Demetrius was lodged felt it necessary to name it τῶν ὀπισθόδομων τοῦ Παρθενῶνος. Aristides, likewise, who as the context shows undoubtedly refers to the Parthenon,1 says τοῦ νεὼ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῶν ὀπισθόδομων, not simply τῶν ὀπισθόδομων. The inference is that these two opisthodomi were not the same, and therefore that the Opisthodomus was not the western chamber of the cella of the Parthenon.2

1 ἐξαίτησε τῆς ἀκρόπολεως means south of the Acropolis. Cf. Hdt. viii. 53, ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκρόπολεως.—I am indebted for the reference to Aristides to Professor Edward Capps of the University of Chicago. Search might reveal other references to an opisthodomus on the Acropolis in other late writers. There is no such reference, other than those cited in this paper, in Homer, the Dramatists, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, the Orators, Aristotle, Diodorus Siculus, Lucian, or Pausanias.

2 Any objection to this conclusion based on the fact that Plutarch and Aristides were not, like Demosthenes and Aristophanes, Athenians, and that they wrote in a later age and needed, therefore, to be explicit in designating the opisthodomus that they mention, would hold equally against Lucian. Lucian had greater need
The theory that the Opisthodomus on the Acropolis which was used as a treasury was a separate building is not contradicted by any references to it in the literature. The references to it in inscriptions are the following:


καταβάθηται εἰς τοῖς... θ]έων τοῦ ὅπισθοδόμου ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰππωθ[ῶνα]ντιδός προτεραιότητος. CIA. I. 109.1


to be explicit than Plutarch. If Lucian, in the passage just quoted from his Timon, where he is undoubtedly referring to the Athenian treasury, had said τῶν ὅπισθοδόμων τοῦ Παρθενώνος, as does Plutarch, the determination of the question now at issue would probably not be regarded doubtful. The fact that he does not do this, but uses simply the expression τῶν ὅπισθοδόμων, is in itself a strong argument that he is referring to some other opisthodomus than that named by Plutarch.
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The striking fact here, as before, is that the great treasure-house of Athens is referred to simply as ὁ ὀπισθόδομος. Whatever other information about it we may be able to gather from these important records, there certainly is no implication in any one of them that the Opisthodomus mentioned was the western chamber or chambers of the cella either of the Parthenon or of the Hecatompedon.

The case, therefore, now stands as follows: The assumption that the Opisthodomus was not a separate building involves the rejection of the testimony quoted above of the scholiasts and lexicographers, who were drawing on good sources and whose special purpose was a definition. The authors and inscriptions, on the contrary, say nothing about the situation of the Opisthodomus because they unconsciously assume that this is known. On the other hand, the assumption that the Opisthodomus was a separate building, a fact clearly declared by the scholiasts and lexicographers, finds no contradiction in passages in the authors or in inscriptions that refer to the Opisthodomus, provides a place for the public and sacred treasure before the building of the Parthenon, and is further supported by independent considerations of weight. In other words this theory reconciles the evidence.

The direct discussion of the main thesis of this paper, that the Opisthodomus was a separate building, is now finished. The question of its situation still remains. If it was not the rear chamber or chambers of an existing temple, either the Parthenon or the Heca-
tomedon, but a separate building, where on the Acropolis was it situated? This is in itself an interesting question, but there is a stronger reason for its consideration. The proposition that the Opisthodomus was a separate building will be corroborated, if it can be shown with reasonable probability where it stood, and if that conclusion is seen to conflict in no way with the ancient testimony that has come down to us in regard to it.

In the consideration of this question, as before, and for the same reason, we expect no help from the authors and inscriptions: the scholiasts and lexicographers, however, do give us information. They say that the Opisthodomus lay behind the temple of Athena, and specifically behind the temple of Athena Polias. If, further, the generally accepted restoration of ἀρχαῖον in CIA. iv. 1. 28 be allowed, we have evidence that money was kept, although the Opisthodomus is not here named, behind the old temple of Athena, διότι τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὸ ἀρχαῖον νεῖν ἐν πόλει, at least as early as 460 B.C.²

What was the temple of Athena Polias? Until very recently there was but one answer to this question. The term Πόλας, when used of the protecting goddess of Athens, was the epithet of Athena in her oldest temple on the Acropolis, and this oldest temple, ὁ ἀρχαῖος ναός, was the Erechtheum or the temple that preceded it on the same site. The eastern chamber of the cela of this temple had been from early times the shrine of the ancient wooden image of the goddess. Here, and nowhere else on the Citadel, she was worshipped under the title of Ἀθηνᾶ Πόλας.

On the discovery of the Hecatompedon, Dörpfeld took issue with the prevailing view. The oldest temple on the Acropolis, he said, was the Hecatompedon, not the Erechtheum, which was only a shrine of Erechtheus; the Hecatompedon was the original temple of Athena Polias, but not the only one; the temple of Athena Polias par excellence was the Parthenon.³

¹ It is accepted among others by Kirchhoff, Dittenberger, Dörpfeld, Curtius, Frazer, and Furtwängler.
² (Quoted in part on p. 12. See also below, p. 45. Whether we read διότι or διότι there does not, as we shall see, affect the result.
Dörpfeld's attempt to wrest the names, old temple, temple of Athena Polias, from the Erechtheum has not met with acceptance. It has been considered and successively rejected by Petersen,¹ Curtius,² Frazer,³ and Michaelis,⁴ all of whom maintain the traditional view that the oldest temple of Athena on the Acropolis was the temple of Athena Polias, and that this was the Erechtheum.⁵ The discovery of the Hecatompedon modifies the traditional view only to the extent of making the designation of the Erechtheum as "the old temple" necessary at an earlier period than the building of the Parthenon, i.e. it was "the old temple" as compared with the Hecatompedon, not with the Parthenon.

The question at issue is large, and its discussion has been able and searching. Strong arguments have been advanced in support of the traditional view.⁶ Since they were made, a new element has been introduced into the discussion by Furtwängler, who in the remarkable book already mentioned⁷ has published a new and startling hypothesis in regard to the Hecatompedon. Neither his view nor Dörpfeld's seems to me tenable, and I now purpose to state as briefly as possible the reasons why I am not able to accept either of them. It will be possible to consider the question here only in its most important aspects.

It is an essential part of Dörpfeld's theory that, in the time prior to the building of the present Erechtheum, the worship of Erechtheus was maintained in a separate temple. He believes that the Hecatompedon was "the old temple" and belonged exclusively to Athena, and that beside it, but separate from it, was the shrine of Erechtheus.⁸

---

² Stadtgeschichte von Athen, 1891, pp. 124, 151.
⁵ Lolling also denies that the Parthenon could have been called the temple of Athena Polias (Ἀθηνᾶ, 1890, ii. p. 661, note 4), but shares Dörpfeld's opinion that after the Parthenon began to be built the Hecatompedon could be called ἀρχαι or παλαιον νοῦ (p. 643).
⁸ Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. p. 199.
This view cannot be reconciled with the evidence of Homer in the following passage:

ἀδημοσία "Ειν Αθηνας ἁγια, ἐκκεντροφ οὐσίασθαι.
ὁμοίως "Ειν Αθηνας ἁγια, ἐκκεντροφ οὐσίασθαι.
ὁμοίως "Ειν Αθηνας ἁγια, ἐκκεντροφ οὐσίασθαι.
ὁμοίως "Ειν Αθηνας ἁγια, ἐκκεντροφ οὐσίασθαι.

The passage establishes the following facts. According to the poet’s conception, at a time antecedent to the Trojan War, Athena possessed a rich temple at Athens, and in this temple, her own temple, she established Erechtheus. Here, in the poet’s time, the Athenian youth offered Erechtheus sacrifices. In the passage it is important to note that τοῦτο refers to a time prior to the time of the main verb ἁγια; that ἁγια denotes permanent establishment: that ἁγια indisputably means temple; that this temple was Athena’s; and that ἁγια refers to Erechtheus. All scholars are agreed that the temple referred to was the oldest temple of Athena on the Acropolis. The oldest temple on the Acropolis was, therefore, a temple of the joint worship of Athena and Erechtheus. The tradition of this joint worship was maintained to the latest times.\(^1\)

A celebrated passage in Strabo (ix, 10, p. 330) is, as I think, decisive against the view that the Hecatompedon was "the old temple."\(^2\) J. Dorpfeld now maintains\(^3\) that Strabo’s statement in this passage is

---

\(^1\) Dorpfeld 1879, p. 27, note: "Unter mir kann man auch den Erechtheus verstehen, doch bemerkt man es gewiss nicht wegen der unentgeltlichen οὐσία νὴν τῶν ἁγια τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς.\(^4\) What editor of Homer refers ἁγια to Athena? The tradition that it refers to Erechtheus is an ancient tradition. And for the same reasons. Ends were not offered to Athena, but heifers. Cf. H. vii. 12. 114, p. 301. vii. 12. 2. 353. iii. 158. i. 104. For a recent expression of opinion on this question, see Robins, Proc. 1894, i. p. 127, note 1.

\(^2\) An interesting inscription in connection with this question, see Robins, Proc. 1894, i. p. 127, note 1.\(^5\) Εὐσχημον στῇ χώρᾳ, ἀγία ἑνὶ θεονίᾳ, ἔγορα εὐσχημον ἔγορα εὐσχημον.

\(^3\) Quoted on p. 20.

\(^4\) For his earlier views, see Mitth. d. Inst. Athen. 1883, xii. pp. 48, 149.
entirely correct, but gives it a startling interpretation. By δ ἀρχαῖας
πῶς Strabo means the Hecatompedon; in this, not in the Erech-
theum, was the lamp made by Callimachus1 as well as the old
ἀγαλμα of the goddess. It was the original intention of the builders
of the present Erechtheum that the old statue should be housed in
its eastern chamber, but it never was placed there but remained in
the Hecatompedon.2 Pausanias in his tour of the Acropolis, Dörf-
feld now believes,3 entered the Hecatompedon from the Erechtheum
at the point indicated in his book by the words, ιερὰ μὲν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς
κτλ.;4 he makes no mention at all of the eastern chamber of the
Erechtheum, and indeed he had no occasion, for it contained nothing
worthy of description. Only by this unparalleled break with tradition
in regard to the place of the lamp and ancient statue can Dörpfeld
maintain his view that the Hecatompedon was "the old
temple." Scholars who are inclined to accept it must go further,
and suppose that Strabo, who is evidently giving a categorical
account of the temples of Athena on the Acropolis, fails altogether
to mention the Erechtheum, which was certainly in existence in his
day, for it still remains.

The difficulties that Dörpfeld encounters in these two passages,
not to discuss at this time the remaining literary evidence, are very
great. They disappear, if we assume that an Erechtheum, built on
the site of the present Erechtheum, was "the old temple." It will,
perhaps, make the following argument more easily apprehensible, if
I here state what I conceive the facts to have been. Homer's plain
language demands a temple of joint worship of Athena and Erech-
theus. Such was the Erechtheum. This was the oldest temple on
the Acropolis. In time, when the worship of the goddess had grown

---

1 On Callimachus, see Furtwängler, Mast. Greek Sculp., 1895, p. 437.
2 In C.I.A. i. 322, 1, ἔνακτάι τοῦ ποὺ τοῦ ἐν πάλιν, ἐν οἷς ἄρχαῖον ἀγαλμα,
Dörpfeld understands ἔστει. This is against the usage of Attic speech,
and would be hard to parallel. The present ἔστει is to be supplied, according to a
well-known idiom, and the words prove clearly enough that at the date of the
inscription (archonship of Diocles, 409-8 B.C.) the old image was already in the
new Erechtheum, which was completed in the summer of 408 B.C.
3 For his earlier view, see Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. p. 52 ff., 210 f.
4 Paus. i. 26. 6.
and her treasure had increased, the Athenians built her a great, new temple.\(^1\) We are informed in a document whose trustworthiness is not disputed that its official title was τὸ Ἐκατὸμπεδόν.\(^2\) In contrast with this newer temple, the Erechtheum was now "the old temple," and it kept this designation to the latest times.\(^3\) The Hecatompedon, after its destruction by the Persians, was not rebuilt as a temple.\(^4\) Its intended successor was the earlier Parthenon; its actual successor the Parthenon of Pericles. The Athenians, imme-

\(^1\) This then became the temple of Athena, although it was not the sole seat of her worship on the Acropolis, and from this time to the Persian wars any mention simply of the temple of Athena refers to it, unless the context makes clear that the Erechtheum is meant. This doubtless is the temple meant by Herodotus in v. 72, 90, in describing events which occurred at the end of the sixth century. When, on the other hand, at this time the Erechtheum is meant, it is called ὁ ἄρχαῖος ναός. Cf. Schol. Arist. Lys. 273. Such also are the references to the temple in the time just before and during the destruction of Athens by Xerxes. (Cf. Plut. Cim. 5; Herod. viii. 51, 53, 54. In passages, on the other hand, such as those that refer to the sacred snake, which by express testimony dwelt ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἐρέχθεως, simply "the temple" is a sufficient designation for the Erechtheum, as in Herod. viii. 41. See p. 9, note 2.

\(^2\) See p. 2, note 8 end.

\(^3\) For the passages in which the phrase ὁ ἄρχαῖος (παλαιὸς) ναός occurs, see p. 8, note 4. This exact designation is, of course, not necessary where the context makes clear that the Erechtheum is meant. See note 1 above, and cf. the building inscriptions cited on p. 8, note 5.

\(^4\) It may here be noted that Dörpfeld repeatedly asserts that Herod. v. 77 proves that the Hecatompedon was so rebuilt after the Persian wars (Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. pp. 31, 36, 200). One is at a loss to understand what he means when he says (ibid. p. 27) "an den Parthenon zu denken, wie es bisher geschah, ist nicht möglich." Who has believed that Herodotus refers to the Parthenon? Since Dörpfeld holds that the western chambers of the Hecatompedon were a treasury, and not the seat of a cult, in asserting that Herodotus refers to them in v. 77 in the words τοῦ μεγάρου τοῦ πρὸς ἑπίθνην τετραμένου, he ignores the author's use of the word μέγαρον. By μέγαρον Herodotus refers to the cela of a temple where is established the worship of a god. So of the temple at Delphi, i. 47, 65. vii. 140; of the temple of Hephaestus in Egypt, ii. 141; of Zeus Ammon, ii. 143; of Demeter in Paros, vi. 134; and finally of Athena on the Acropolis, viii. 53. It is extremely improbable, therefore, that in v. 77 he applies the word to rooms used for semi-secular purposes. The Erechtheum, on the contrary, which at this time had been again rebuilt (see the next note), exactly meets the demands, for here, in the western half, was established the worship of Erechtheus.
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Immediately after their return on the final withdrawal of the Persians, rebuilt the ancient temple of the joint worship of Athena and Erechtheus,¹ and this subserved alone the purpose of the worship of the goddess until the completion of the present Parthenon, for the earlier Parthenon was never completed. Toward the end of the fifth century the Erechtheum, which had been hastily reconstructed after the Persian wars, was replaced by the present structure,² but it kept the name by which it had been known of "the old temple." The traditions connected with its site were among the holiest possessions of the Attic race.

The most recent contribution to the discussion of the temples of Athena on the Acropolis has been made, as has been said, by Furtwängler. He believes with Dörpfeld that the Hecatompedon was the first great temple on the Acropolis, but maintains that this was an Erechtheum, the original Erechtheum, where first was established the joint worship of Athena and Erechtheus. When the present Erechtheum was built, the Hecatompedon was entirely removed. Its traditions and epithets were transferred bodily to the new temple on the new site, which now, therefore, became "the old temple" of Athena. Previously the Hecatompedon had been "the old temple." This view avoids many of the difficulties which beset Dörpfeld's theory.

¹ Cf. Herod. VIII. 55, quoted on p. 25. Writing sometime before 420 B.C., i.e. before the present Erechtheum was begun, the historian says, "There is on the Acropolis a temple of Erechtheus," and proceeds to speak of the olive and salt-spring as actually existing in the temple. The present passage proves that an Erechtheum was in existence at the time of writing. Frazer, who fails to take this passage into account, says (Jour. Hellen. Stud., 1892-93, XIII. p. 169) that "after its destruction in 480 B.C., the Erechtheum was not, so far as we know, rebuilt till towards the close of the fifth century B.C.," but he meets a real difficulty in explaining two inscriptions (CIA. IV. p. 31 I. 93) which make mention of "the old temple" in such a way as to lead one to believe that the temple was at the time in existence. Further, there are two other passages in Herodotus (V. 77, VIII. 41) which are equally strong proof that the Erechtheum was rebuilt after the Persian wars, if one believes, as Frazer believes, that the Hecatompedon was not then in existence. In both these passages the historian speaks of the temple as existent, in the first at the time when he visited Athens, in the second at the time of writing.

² It was begun in 420 B.C. and finished in 408 B.C. See Michaelis, Die Zeit des Neubaus des Poliatempels in Athen, Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1889, XIV. p. 349 ff.
John Williams White.

Furtwängler follows Dörpfeld in appealing to existing remains in order to prove the great age of the Hecatompedon. Its peristyle, he says, is not earlier than the time of Hippias, but the naos itself is considerably more ancient; moreover, there lie below it the remains of a yet earlier building. The philologist recognizes that such matters as this, the determination of the age of an ancient temple from its ruins, lie within the province of the expert archaeologist; but when expert archaeologists fail to agree among themselves, he turns for decision to other evidence. Now, three archaeologists of distinction, not at this time to name others, have declared that the Hecatompedon dates from the time of Pisistratus. Furtwängler's further claim, which had previously been made by Dörpfeld, that no trace (with unimportant exceptions) exists of an older building on the site of the present Erechtheum, is a purely negative argument. This fact does not prove, of course, that such an older Erechtheum never existed. Such traces may in part have entirely disappeared, as he indeed acknowledges; they may in part be concealed by the existing building. The lack of them signifies merely that the existence of an older building cannot be proved by its remains. The question whether there was such a building remains open.

We must appeal to the literature for a decision of the question raised by Furtwängler, whether the Hecatompedon was the original Erechtheum on the Acropolis, and thus "the old temple." Here again we may be disappointed. The total number of references in Greek authors to temples of Athena on the Acropolis to the end of

1 Mast. Greek Sculp., 1805, p. 416. Furtwängler here adduces no proof that this building, attested by slight remains, was a temple. — It has already been pointed out (p. 20) that the much-cited passage from the Iliad certifies to a temple of great antiquity, and this must be granted even if we suppose that the passage itself is not older than the sixth century B.C. It is difficult to follow Furtwängler when he says (l.c.) that the passage "has in view the stately Hecatompedon with its double cela." The tense of ἰδεῖσαν shows indeed that the poet speaks of sacrifices made to Erechtheus in his own day, but they are offered in the ancient temple, and this he clearly conceives to have been in existence long before the Trojan War, a venerable structure about which centered the earliest religious traditions of the race.
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the fifth century B.C. is small. Further, in the nature of the case, the majority of these chance references will give us no information on the question at issue. In view of these facts, if any single reference is found to contain positive evidence, especially if this evidence is confirmed by other probable considerations, it must be allowed especial weight. Furtwängler's view, for example, will be discredited, if at the time when he claims, as an essential fact, that the Hecatompedon was the sole temple of Erechtheus on the Acropolis, it can be shown that a trustworthy Greek author testifies that there was another temple there devoted to his worship.

We have such evidence, I think, in Herod. viii. 51-55. The historian here describes the capture of the Acropolis, the sack of the Hecatompedon, and the destruction of everything on the Citadel by fire. The Hecatompedon, which was at this time the temple of Athena on the Acropolis, he calls τὸ ἱερὸν (chap. 51 bis, 53, 54), and specifically mentions its cella, τὸ μέγαρον, as a place of refuge (chap. 53). He then continues (chap. 55), ἵστη ἐν τῷ ἄκροπολι ταύτη Ἑρεχθείος τοῦ γνησίου λαγουμένῳ εἰπεν νησί, ἐν τῷ ἐλαίῳ τε καὶ θάλασσα ἐν. With these words he plainly introduces a new temple to the attention of his hearers. The Ἑρεχθείος νησί, here first named, is not the same temple that he has just mentioned repeatedly. Herodotus, therefore, writing sometime before 420 B.C., i.e. before the present Erechtheum was begun, testifies to two temples on the Acropolis, a temple of Athena and an Erechtheum.

1 For the use of μέγαρον in Herodotus, see page 22, note 4.

2 It may be urged that τὸ ἱερὸν in chap. 51-54 does not mean temple, but sanctuary, i.e. τέμενος. The ambiguity of the word is well known. But even if we grant that ἱερὸν has that meaning in these chapters, the force of the phrasing at the beginning of chap. 55 remains the same, for the Hecatompedon has been brought clearly before the mind of the hearer by the direct mention of its μέγαρον in chap. 53. Nor can νησί in chap. 55 be given the meaning cella or chamber, and the word be made to refer to a part of the Hecatompedon, for in that case Herodotus would not have written ἐν τῷ ἄκροπολι ταύτη, but would have said ἵστη ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ταύτῃ (i.e. τῷ Ἑκατοντάρχῃ) Ἑρεχθείος... νησί, or something of the sort. One could not speak of "a chamber on the Acropolis" without immediate mention of the structure of which it was a part.

3 Kirchhoff, Entstehungszeit des herodotischen Geschichtswerkes, 1878, concludes that Herodotus died in 428 B.C. The absence of later allusions in his history shows that his death occurred at least before 420.
This interpretation of the reference in Ἐρεχθείος νησί is made certain by a statement in the passage itself. This statement proves that the temple called Ἐρεχθείος νησί cannot be the Hecatompedon. Herodotus says that the sacred tokens, the olive and the salt-spring, were “in the temple.” His words are ἐν τῷ (i.e. ἐν τῷ ἑρεχθεῖ) ἐλαιῷ κτλ.¹ The tokens we know were on the low ground to the north of the higher plateau on which stood the Hecatompedon. They were certainly not in that temple.² The difficulty caused by the language of the historian is so great that Furtwängler proposes to emend the passage and read σηκός for νησί, but he offers no critical reason for the change, and none exists.³ It is made to meet an exigency in argument and cannot be allowed. If allowed, it would bring a new element of confusion into the discussion in establishing a σηκός of Erechtheus distinct and apart from his νησί.

The conclusion, adverse to Furtwängler’s theory, to which we have been brought is confirmed by other considerations which discredit the assumption that the Hecatompedon was the original Erechtheum. On this assumption the traditions connected with the early worship of Athena and with the worship of Erechtheus, and the epithets of the temple of their joint worship, must be transferred bodily at the end of the fifth century B.C. to a new temple. Not only is it inherently more probable that they had always belonged to the site to which a later age undoubtedly attached them, but positive considerations also make it extremely unlikely that they had previously belonged to the Hecatompedon. For example, ὁ ἄρχαίος νησί was an official title of the Erechtheum in the fourth century.⁴ This same term is applied to a temple on the Acropolis in reference to an event

---

¹ On the place of the olive, see p. 39, note 6.
² In speaking of the present Erechtheum (Mast. Greek Sculpt., 1895, p. 433), Furtwängler makes an important admission: “The choice of site was determined by the consideration of keeping near the sacred ‘tokens’; in fact, the temple was to be even more closely attached to these than its predecessor had been; the cleft in the rock was included within the building.” This is precisely what the passage quoted from Herodotus proves for the Erechtheum that preceded the present Erechtheum.
⁴ C.I.A. II. 74 a, 14; 163, 9; 404, 6; 672, 43; 733 A, col. II. 6. The temple was not, then, called so simply “in common parlance” (Furtwängler, ibid. p. 433).
that occurred before 500 B.C. The title in the latter instance is meaningless on the assumption that the Hecatompedon was the only temple here at this time. Again, two inscriptions which date from the first half of the fifth century B.C. mention “the old temple” officially. This was the Hecatompedon, it is asserted, and it was called “old” in contrast to the earlier Parthenon. But this Parthenon never got beyond its foundations, and further, we have unimpeachable evidence that the official name of the Hecatompedon was τὸ Ἐκατόπτερον. These three references to an ἀρχαῖος νεώς are, on the other hand, perfectly applicable to an older Erechtheum on the site of the present Erechtheum, designated as “the old temple” in contrast with the Hecatompedon.

The assumption further that the Hecatompedon was the original Erechtheum involves a complete change of site for that building at the end of the fifth century. The sole reason alleged for this is that the Athenians desired to bring the temple into closer connexion with the ‘tokens.’ But this alleged fact would lead us rather to conclude that the tokens mark the original site of the temple. Moreover, it is a commonplace that Greek religious feeling demanded that a temple when rebuilt should occupy its old site. The exceptions, especially when at the same time the old temple was removed (the fact claimed in this instance), are few indeed, and there are always adequate reasons. Such reasons do not exist in this case. The alleged change of site, on the contrary, necessitated a vital change in the principle of construction, for the present Erechtheum stands on different levels; gave the temple a cramped situation hard upon the north wall of the Acropolis; and reduced its size. And yet this is the temple, it is claimed, that was built by the opponents of the policy of Pericles to replace the stately Hecatompedon. Furtwängler further argues that the Erechtheum in its interior arrangement repeats the Hecatompedon; but if this statement is to be used as an argument

2 CIA. IV. i. c. 27 (p. 3 ft.); i. 93. 6.
3 “It was in fact simply in order to attain this object that the position of the temple had been changed at all.” Furtwängler, Mast. Greek Sculp., 1895, p. 436. See also p. 433.
to prove that the former was the successor of the latter, comparison
must be instituted between the two temples entire. The Hecatomp-
pedon was a Doric temple,¹ built on one level; it was a peristyle,
with porticos and entrances at the east and west. The Erechtheum
is an Ionic temple, built on different levels; it is not a peristyle; it
has a portico on the east, but none on the west, and quite irregularly,
has porticos with entrances also on the north and south. The sole
point of resemblance is the division of the cella into three compart-
ments by cross-walls, and even this resemblance is disturbed by the
difference of level in the Erechtheum between the two western
chambers and the eastern chamber.² The two temples are not simi-
lar, but strikingly dissimilar. The closer the comparison we make
of them, the more we are impressed with the structural peculiarities
of the Erechtheum. It is here important to note that to Dörpfeld
the groundplan of the Hecatompedon seems to be strikingly similar
to that of the Parthenon.³ This accords excellently with the view
that the Hecatompedon, an exclusive temple of Athena, was the fore-
runner, not of the Erechtheum, but of the Parthenon.

In view of these considerations the assumption that the Hecatomp-
edon was the original Erechtheum seems to me improbable, if not
impossible. It is more natural to suppose that from the earliest
times there had stood on the site of the present Erechtheum a
temple that had been built over the sacred tokens and had accom-
modated itself to the original level; and that finally the present
Erechtheum was built in imitation, not of the Hecatompedon, but of
its own predecessors. This view is not contradicted by existing
remains, is supported by positive evidence, does not force us to shift
traditions and epithets, involves no change of site for the Erechtheum,
and adequately explains its structural peculiarities.

¹ This is the opinion of its discoverer. See Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1886, xi.
pp. 347 ff.
² Furtwängler assumes also that the central chamber of the Erechtheum was
divided by an east and west wall into two compartments. This would be another
point of similarity, but he himself acknowledges that no traces of such a cross-
³ "Jedem wird sofort die grosse Aehnlichkeit zwischen diesem Grundriis und
Another preliminary inquiry, important for the determination of the situation of the Opisthodomus, remains to be briefly considered. When ancient Greek writers, referring to a building on the Acropolis, speak of “the temple of Athena Polias,” which of the temples of Athena do they mean? As has been pointed out, Dörpfeld maintains that the chief temple of Athena Polias was the Parthenon. This title, he says, was given also to the Hecatompedon, both before and after the building of the Parthenon, but the temple of Athena Polias was the Parthenon. He claims further that the official name of the Parthenon in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. was either ὁ νεώς ή ὁ νεώς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος. If these claims are valid, we shall reasonably expect to find them confirmed by the references to the temple of Athena Polias in Greek authors and inscriptions. The following are all the passages, so far as I know, in which the expression “temple of Athena Polias” occurs, with the exception of the passage whose proper interpretation we are now trying to reach.  


2. τὸ δ' ἄνα τοῦ πέτρα ἔστιν ἐν πεδίῳ περιοικομένη κόκλαι· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς πέτρας τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ιερόν, δ' τὰς ἀρχαῖας νεὼς τῆς Πολιάδος, ἐν ᾧ δ' ἀνεβοῦσιν λύχνος, καὶ δ' Ὁριον ἀνείποις ἵκτυνος, ἐν ᾧ τὸν Φειδίου θρόνον ἑλεφάντιον ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ. Strabo IX. 16, p. 396.

3. ἦν δ' ἄνα τῷ πάρασπερ γάρ ἕνα χρήν· ἐνταῦθα ποῦ ἐν τῷ προναῷ τῆς Πολιάδος διάκόσμητο. ἦ ἔρεια διάκειτ' ἀνάθρα, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν τοσούτῳ προσκυνήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ. Luc. Pisc. 21.


1 See p. 18.


5. ταρθόνιο διὸ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Πολιάδος οἰκούσιν οὐ πόρρω, καλοῦσι δὲ 'Αθηνᾶισι φοίας ἀρρηψόντες. Paus. i. 27. 3.


7. οἶκος δ' ὁ τῆς Πολιάδος νεώς καὶ τὸ κτήσιον τοῦ Πολείδου τόμενος· συνήψαμεν γὰρ διὰ τῶν ἀνακτώρων τούτων θεοῦ ἐλλῆλοις μετὰ τὴν ἀμιλλα. Himerius, Ed. v. 30.


"The temple of Athena Polias" named in the first of the passages here quoted cannot be the Parthenon, because of the immediate proximity of the Pandroseum. In the second the language of the writer excludes that supposition. The same fact is true also in the eighth, however much the form of statement may have suffered in its transmission to us. In the fourth and fifth passages Pausanias
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has already described the Parthenon and is now on the north side of the Acropolis. The temple named in the sixth passage also cannot be the Parthenon; Erichthonius was identical with Erechtheus, and the seat of the worship of Erechtheus was the Erechtheum. Similarly in the seventh, Himerius is speaking of the place of the joint worship of Athena and Poseidon-Erechtheus. The priestly family of the Eteobutads mentioned in the ninth cannot be disassociated from the Erechtheum. So in the third the pronaos of the Erechtheum is meant, since Aeschines tells us that the priestess of Athena Polias was chosen from the family of the Eteobutads. It will be claimed by nobody that the sacred snake spoken of in the eleventh passage had its dwelling-place in the Parthenon; and until we get proof to the contrary we have the right to conclude that Eustathius does not mean in the tenth passage by “the temple of Polias” any other temple than the one so named in the eleventh passage.

If these conclusions are sound, no Greek author has called the Parthenon “the temple of Athena Polias.”

It is here instructive to note what the great temple is called during the period of the writers quoted above. It had a perfectly established name. This was δ Παρθένου. It is thus called by Demostenes, Heraclides (Dicaearchus), Strabo, Plutarch, Pausanias, Aelian, Philostratus, Zosimus, Marinus, a Scholiast on Demostenes, Harpocratio, Hesychius, the Etymologicum Magnum, and Suidas. It is incredible that the Parthenon should, as it is claimed, have been the temple of Athena Polias, and should be mentioned so often in Greek authors, and yet that its so-called distinctive title should nowhere occur.

Dörpfeld claims that δ νεώς was an official title of the Parthenon in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. He fails to quote a single

---

1 See Rohde, Psyche, 1894, i. p. 128.
2 On Poseidon-Erechtheus, see the passages in Jahn-Michaelis, Paus. descript. arc. Athen. 1880, p. 23 (c. 26, 27).
3 Cf. Paus. i. 26. 5; [Plut.] Vit. X. Or. 843 b.
4 Aesch. II. 147.
5 Dörpfeld also (Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. p. 206, note) thinks that the Parthenon is not meant in the tenth passage.
6 See the passages in Jahn-Michaelis, Paus. descript. arc. Athen. 1880, p. 13 ff.
inscription in which the Parthenon is called ὁ νεῶς. Even in Greek authors it is thus designated only twice,¹ and both these authors, so ambiguous is the expression as they have used it, have here been charged with looseness of style. Again, the only inscriptions in which the phrase ὁ νεῶς Ἁθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος occurs are the two from which the twelfth and fourteenth passages given above are quoted. In the second of these two inscriptions, it will be observed, Πολιάδος is due to restoration. And yet on the basis solely of these two inscriptions, by combination with the inscription from which the thirteenth passage is quoted, where also Πολιάδος is due to restoration, Dörpfeld establishes ὁ νεῶς Ἁθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος as the other official name of the Parthenon. He adds, without proof, that this was probably its name also in current speech during the first century of its existence.² He seeks to establish this official title as follows. The designation ὁ ἀρχαῖος νεῶς in official documents proves the existence of a new temple. This was the Parthenon, ὁ νεῶς. In another official document (thirteen above) mention is made of an ἀρχαῖος νεῶς τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος. This name proves in like manner the existence of a new temple of Athena Polias, and in fact, he says, mention of a νεῶς τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος (the phrase is not, it will be observed, ὁ καινῶς νεῶς τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος) occurs twice in official documents (twelve and fourteen above). Since now the ἀρχαῖος νεῶς τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος is identical with the ἀρχαῖος νεῶς, it follows that the νεῶς τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος is identical with the temple concisely called ὁ νεῶς. The latter is the Parthenon. The official title, therefore, ὁ νεῶς τῆς Ἁθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος, belongs to the Parthenon.

This conclusion is unsound because it rests on unestablished premises. In the first place, the assumption is made that ὁ ἀρχαῖος νεῶς means the Hecatompedon. But other scholars believe (and prove to their own satisfaction!) that “the old temple” is the Erechtheum. In that case “the new temple” is the Hecatompedon. Again, it does not follow that the antithesis to “the old temple of Athena Polias” is “the new temple of Athena Polias.” This assumption begs

² Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. p. 197 f.
The question. The expression \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \; \delta \; \alpha'\rho\chi\alpha\omega\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Lambda\theta\eta\nu\varsigma\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Pi\omicron\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\delta\sigma\varsigma \) may have arisen in some other way than the one assumed. The latter puts a relative emphasis on the word \( \alpha'\rho\chi\alpha\omega\varsigma \) for which the warrant is not forthcoming. Let us assume that the Erechtheum was called sometimes \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \; \delta \; \alpha'\rho\chi\alpha\omega\varsigma \), sometimes \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Lambda\theta\eta\nu\varsigma\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Pi\omicron\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\delta\sigma\varsigma \). The combination of the two titles would give, as Petersen long ago pointed out,\(^1\) \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \; \delta \; \alpha'\rho\chi\alpha\omega\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Lambda\theta\eta\nu\varsigma\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Pi\omicron\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\delta\sigma\varsigma \), “the old temple belonging to Athena Polias.” This interpretation is, at least, as good a working assumption as the other.\(^2\) Finally, it does not follow that the temple named \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Lambda\theta\eta\nu\varsigma\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Pi\omicron\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\delta\sigma\varsigma \) is identical with the temple called simply \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \) (if there was, indeed, such a temple). This claim rests on an assumption which also begs the question, namely that the phrases \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Lambda\theta\nu\nu\varsigma\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Pi\omicron\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\delta\sigma\varsigma \) and \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \) are equivalent to \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \; \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\varsigma\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Lambda\theta\nu\nu\varsigma\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Pi\omicron\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\delta\sigma\varsigma \) and \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \; \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\varsigma\varsigma \), which occur nowhere. If they did occur, everybody would agree that there were at least two temples of Athena Polias on the Acropolis, and the reader would be spared the present discussion. But even if the conclusion did follow, we could not infer on that account that \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \) \( \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Lambda\theta\nu\nu\varsigma\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Pi\omicron\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\delta\sigma\varsigma \) was a name of the Parthenon until it was established that \( \delta \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \) was an official designation of the Parthenon. No proof of that, as I have said above, has been offered.

The only safe conclusions that can be drawn about the expression “the temple of Athena Polias” in the three inscriptions quoted above are that in the first the application of the phrase is indeterminable; that in the second it cannot mean the Parthenon, since the temple is there called \( \alpha'\rho\chi\alpha\omega\varsigma \); and that in the third whatever indications we have point to the Erechtheum, since the girls there honoured were those who prepared the wool for Athena’s robe, and the peplus, as we know, belonged to the old statue in the old temple.\(^3\) But the inference is, of course, not certain that the stele in their honour was on that account set up beside that temple, although the fact is probable.

---

2. It is with reasonable certainty the true interpretation. *Cf.* Strabo *IX.* 16 (quoted on p. 29), where the contrasted titles of the temples are \( \delta \; \alpha'\rho\chi\alpha\omega\varsigma \; \nu\varepsilon\varsigma \; \tau\zeta\varsigma \; \Pi\omicron\lambda\iota\delta\alpha\delta\sigma\varsigma \) and \( \delta \; \Pi\alpha\rho\theta\nu\varsigma\nu\omega\varsigma \).
It seems reasonable to conclude that the phrase “the temple of the Polias” does not mean, in any of the fourteen passages quoted above, the Parthenon. The question is now narrowed to the two remaining temples. It is here proper to call attention to the fact that we are certain of the existence of only one of these, the Erechtheum, at the time covered by the passages: we have to assume the existence of the Hecatompedon during the fourth century B.C. and the following centuries in order to bring it within consideration at all. Dörpfeld believes that the Hecatompedon was in existence at this time, and that it was, as it always had been, an exclusive temple of Athena; the worship of Erechtheus was confined to the Erechtheum, the present structure, which had replaced the earlier shrine.

The three inscriptions may be dismissed at once. They are indecisive, except so far as the considerations already presented in the case of the third make for the Erechtheum.¹

The passages from the authors demand brief consideration. It should be noted that they all speak of “the temple of the Polias” as if there were only one such temple. They all indicate, I think, that this temple was the Erechtheum.

In the first the bitch enters the temple and goes down in order to get into the Pandroseum. The description exactly fits the plan of the Erechtheum. Its eastern chamber is on a higher level than its western chambers, and from the latter there was direct communication on the same level with the Pandroseum. If the Hecatompedon is meant, we must conceive, since only one temple is mentioned, that the creature took a flying leap of over ten feet from the supporting wall of the stereobate of the Hecatompedon at the north-west down into the Pandroseum. This is, at the least, an improbable meaning for ἄγαν ὑπὸ τῆς Παρθένου. The second passage has already been discussed.² In the third the Hecatompedon cannot be meant, because (besides the consideration urged above) the action of the dialogue would be impossible if the pronaoi of that temple were its

¹ If one believes, from independent considerations, that ἄγαν ὑπὸ τῆς Παρθένου always means the Erechtheum, then the second inscription becomes evidence; but it will be well, perhaps, to avoid the possible charge of the 'vicious circle.'

² See p. 20 f.
The Erechtheum would stand directly in the way.¹ To identify the temple named in the fourth passage with the Hecatompedon is, if we follow Dörpfeld's present lead,² to assume that the Ἑκατομπηδων and the lamp of Callimachus were not in the Erechtheum at all; and if on the other hand we suppose that Pausanias entered the Hecatompedon not after i. 26. 5 but at i. 27. 1 ³ and thus place the Ἑκατομπηδων and lamp in the Erechtheum, we must assume that Pausanias makes double application of the word Polias, once to the goddess of the old image in the Erechtheum, for it is clear that he refers to her as Polias in i. 26. 6,⁴ a second time to the Hecatompedon. If we are convinced by these serious difficulties that by "the temple of the Polias" in the fourth passage Pausanias means the Erechtheum, we establish its application also for the fifth, unless we are ready to believe that he speaks of two distinct temples, both as "the temple of the Polias," within the short space of a dozen lines. The mention of Erichthonius (Erechtheus) and Posidon (Erechteus)⁵ in the sixth and seventh passages shows that here the Erechtheum is meant, not the Hecatompedon, a temple of the exclusive worship of Athena. In the eighth the very confusion of statement shows that the Scholiast closely associates in his mind the temple of the Polias and her ancient image,⁶ and therefore, if we suppose that by "the temple of the Polias" he means the Hecatompedon, we must remove the image from the Erechtheum. The ἰπόδων mentioned in the ninth must be

¹ Dörpfeld claims that this passage refers to the Parthenon. For his three reasons, see Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, XII. p. 198 f. To these it may be briefly answered that Lucian in the second century A.D. is not likely to have had intimate knowledge of the official phraseology of Attic inscriptions of the fifth century B.C., and further that the inscriptions do not add τῆς Πολιαδος to the official form τῆς Ἱπlicting to accommodate an imaginary assembly (see Frazer, Jour. Hellen. Stud., 1892-93, XIII. p. 182 f.); and that to argue from the reference in the dialogue to the Pelagicon that Lucian must mean the Parthenon is to assume that the situation and extent of the vexed ancient fortification called the Pelagicon are satisfactorily known.

² See p. 21.
³ So Miss Harrison, Myth. and Mon. of Anc. Athens, 1890, pp. 908 f.
⁵ See p. 31, notes 1 and 2.
the Erechtheum, for reasons already given. The tenth and eleventh passages hang together, as has already been pointed out, and in interpreting the eleventh we have the express testimony of Hesychius that the snake was housed in the Erechtheum, not in the Hecatompedon. I conclude, therefore, that when in Greek writers we read of "the temple of Athena Polias" we must understand by it the Erechtheum, and that this conclusion is contradicted by no evidence offered by inscriptions.

This inquiry has been carried further by Frazer, in the article already often cited. He has investigated the word Polias in all its applications, and in my opinion has given a final answer to the doubts raised by Dörpfeld. He has conclusively demonstrated that the word had a local connotation to the mind of a Greek when used with reference to the Acropolis at Athens, and has shown what this connotation is. In order to settle the question of the proper application of the term "Athena Polias" or "the Polias" he collected the passages of classical writers bearing on the Athena Polias of Athens and all places in the Corpus of Attic Inscriptions in which the title occurs, and gave them careful examination. In some of these passages, as was to be expected, the application of the term Polias is indeterminable: these passages furnish no indication whether the Athena referred to was the goddess of the Erechtheum, of the Hecatompedon, or of the Parthenon. In the remainder the term is used with reference to the temple, to Athena in close association with Erechtheus, to her ancient image, to the peplus, to the priestess of Athena Polias, to the Errephori, to the sacred serpent, and the like. All the passages whose application is determinable support the view that Athena Polias was the goddess of the Erechtheum, with the

3 I had already begun, with the same purpose, an independent collection of the passages before Frazer's article appeared, and am able to contribute from Greek writers the following slight additions to his extensive list: Aelian, Var. Hist. ii. 9; Lucian, Symp. 53; Id. Dial. Merit. vii. 1; Schol. ad inc. Clem. Alex. Probr. iv. 52, p. 179. Sylb.; Apoll. Vitr. Attic. (quoting Aesch. ii. 147); Schol. V. Arist. Ep. 1169; Schol. Hom. Od. xiv. 533; E. M. i. 7, "Erechtheum." In completing my collections I have had the helpful assistance of Arthur S. Cooley of this University.
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exception of two.¹ One of these countenances the view that she was the goddess of the Parthenon,² the other may be so interpreted;³ but the author of the first is a Christian writer living in Egypt in the second century A.D., the author of the second a twelfth century commentator on Homer, and each lays himself open to the charge of contradicting himself.⁴

The result of Frazer's investigation is instructive. The fact that the word Polias, when applied to Athena at Athens, had in the times for which we have literary evidence a distinct local sense confined to one place, shows what our conclusions must be for the earlier times to which our evidence does not extend. "Polias" was probably the oldest title of Athena on the Acropolis, and dates from a remote age. The goddess had then a single temple on the Citadel, the temple of the Polias. The image within the temple was the image of the Polias. Thus the word became closely associated with a place. We have no reason for believing that when the Hecatompedon was built the worship of the Polias was transferred to that temple. We do know that in the earliest times and in the later times it was attached to "the old temple." This conception, that the worship of the Polias remained in "the old temple," in no way conflicts with the supposition that the Hecatompedon also was a temple of the worship of Athena, containing its own image. It was the temple of Athena, but not the temple of the Polias. The Parthenon in the next century is an exact parallel in all particulars. The growth of the worship of Athena in the Hecatompedon would tend still more to localize the worship of Athena Polias in the old temple. After the destruction of the Hecatompedon in the Persian wars, the old temple gained in importance. It was doubtless the purpose of Pericles to transfer the worship of Athena Polias to the Parthenon. (That may have been the purpose also of the builders of the Hecatompedon in an earlier age.) But conservative religious feeling and

¹ Frazer (Jour. Hellen. Stud., 1892–93, xiii. p. 184), who believes that the Opisthodomus was the western portico of the Parthenon (see p. 2), adds Schol. V Arist. Plat. 1193 (quoted on p. 4).
² Clem. Alex. Protrep. iv. 47, p. 13 Sylb.
³ Eustath. Od. xi. 634, p. 1704, 30.
⁴ See the discussion, on p. 31, of the sixth and eleventh passages quoted above.
party strife combined to thwart him. The Parthenon was built, but his intention was frustrated. If it had been carried out, the new temple would have become “the temple of the Polias” and the Erechtheum would have been devoted to the exclusive worship of Erechtheus. We know in fact, on unequivocal authority, that the old image was not removed from the old temple.¹ This temple remained, therefore, an important seat of worship of Athena on the Citadel; and we are not surprised to learn by the consentient testimony of writers in the following centuries that it kept the name which first attached to it and continued to be called the temple of the Polias.

After this long, but necessary, consideration of the application of the expressions “old temple” and “temple of Athena Polias,” I revert to the question which occasioned it.²

What does Schol. V on Arist. Plut. 1193 mean when he says that the Opisthodomus lay behind the temple of Athena Polias?

If the front of the old temple of Athena, i.e. of the Erechtheum, was at the east of the temple, as was generally true of Greek temples, the Opisthodomus must have lain to the west of it, behind the Pандroseum, and must be sought for there. On this supposition there must have once existed at this place a substantial and independent structure, of the foundations of which, however, no trace has been brought to light by the recent thorough excavation of the Acropolis.

This brings us face to face with a question of great apparent difficulty. Namely, how is it possible that the treasury of Athens, a separate building as has been proved, was called an opisthodomus?

Pollux (1.6) after defining the uses of the word στροφή continues: τὸ δὲ πρὸ ἀποῦ πρόδομος, καὶ τὸ κάτων ὑποστόμον. Varr. (de lingua Lat. v. § 160, ed. Spengel) gives the same definition: domus graecum et ideo in aedibus sacrīs ante cellam, ubi sedes dei sunt, Graeci dicunt πρόδομον, quod post, ὑποστόμον. This use of ὑποστόμον, to designate the back portico of a temple, is confirmed by its actual employment in the literature. It is thus applied to the western porticos of the temples of Zeus and of Hera at Olympia.³

---

¹ See p. 21, n. 2.
² See p. 18.
³ Paus. v. 10.9; 13.1; 15.3; 16.1; Lucian Hdt. 1; Fug. 7; de morte Perse; 32.
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This established application of the word seems to contradict hopelessly the view that the Opisthodomus on the Acropolis was a separate building; but in fact it itself indicates the solution of the difficulty.

Whether in early times the northern or eastern portico of the Erechtheum was regarded the front of the temple cannot be surely determined; but it seems probable that, at least in the time of the sources from which the scholiasts and Harpocraton and the other lexicographers drew their information, the front of the temple was thought to be at the north. Here lay the broad portico through which Pausanias entered the temple.¹ If the front of the temple was at the north, the Opisthodomus, which was situated διπλωμα του νεοϋ, must have lain to the south of the Erechtheum.

Here in fact we find it, the Opisthodomus of the old Hecatompedon, rebuilt, after the destruction of that temple in the Persian wars, to serve as it had served before the coming of Xerxes² as treasury of the gods and of the state. The peristyle of the temple disappeared;³ its eastern chamber was not restored; the Opisthodomus, consisting of the three western rooms and western portico, was alone rebuilt.⁴ This was the Opisthodomus to which reference is made, in the times following the Persian wars, simply as ὁ ὑποθόνος; the Ὄρσαυρός, probably, that was adorned with paintings by Polygnotus;⁵ the ῥαμείων of the scholiasts and lexicographers that lay “behind the temple of Athena.”⁶ Not only its official but also

¹ Paus. i. 26. 6 ff.
³ So also Dörpfeld, Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. p. 200.
⁴ See the plan, Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1886, xi. p. 337.
⁵ For the date of Polygnotus, see Brunn, Geschichte d. griesch. Künstler, ii. 14 ff.
⁶ The language of Herod. viii. 55 shows that a Greek felt the Pandroseum to be a part of the Erechtheum, for within it was the sacred olive. It had no roof, but was doubtless enclosed by a wall on the north and west, just as it was shut
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its current name was ὁ ὁπισθόδομος. 1 Aristophanes, Demosthenes, and Lucian could so speak of it, without danger of confusion. There was another opisthodomus on the Acropolis, but when this was meant the speaker said ὁ ὁπισθόδομος τοῦ Παρθενώνος or used an equivalent expression. 2

This solution, which we owe to the insight of Ernst Curtius, 3

in by walls on the east and south. There was direct communication between the north portico of the Erechtheum and the Pandroseum by a separate doorway, and the north portico was centered to the larger structure whose groundplan included the Pandroseum. The Opisthodomus was, quite exactly, ‘behind’ the temple, conceived in the sense seen in Herodotus.

1 Frazer (Jour. Hellen. Stud. 1892–93, XIII. p. 162 f.) thinks it remarkable, if the Opisthodomus was in use as a treasury after 480 B.C., that the first mention of it occurs in two decrees of 435 B.C., and draws the inference ex silentio that there was no Opisthodomus before the completion of the Parthenon. This apparently remarkable fact is accounted for by our lack of documents for the time between 480 and 435 B.C. The name Opisthodomus for the Athenian treasury does not indeed occur in any public document during that time, nor does any other. In fact we have only a single reference in all of these years to any place on the Acropolis where money was kept (CIA. IV. 1, quoted on p. 12 and discussed on p. 45), and yet we know that the sacred and public money-treasure housed on the Acropolis was greater between 454 and 435 B.C. than ever afterwards. Frazer himself says (p. 162) that in this time the Athenians must certainly have had some strong place in which to store the public and sacred treasures, but comes simply to the conclusion that we do not know where this was. In like manner, the fact that the first literary mention of the Opisthodomus occurs in Aristophanes is not proof that it was not in existence during the whole of the fifth century. No author before Aristophanes whose works have come down to us had occasion to mention the exact place where the sacred and public money was kept. It would be as logical to conclude from the silence of these authors that there was no treasury at all as that it was not called ὁ ὁπισθόδομος. Knowing that there was a treasury we are entirely justified, in the absence of all counter-proof, in concluding that the name by which it was designated in the last third of the fifth century and in the fourth century attached to it also in the previous time. I cannot agree with Frazer, further, in thinking that in the two decrees of 435 B.C. (CIA. I. 32, A, B, quoted in part on p. 16) the Opisthodomus is mentioned as if it were now for the first time to be used as a treasury. The references to it there (it is called simply ὁ ὁπισθόδομος) seem to me, on the contrary, to imply that it was a well-known place whose use was already established. See p. 46 ff.


3 Curtius, in the November session of the Archaeological Society of Berlin, 1890 (see Archaeologischer Anzeiger, 1890, p. 163): “Der alte Tempel nach der
explains at once the *name* Opisthodomus in its application to the Athenian treasury and some apparently but not really contradictory testimony of the scholiasts. The tradition that this treasury was once in fact the rear chambers in the cella of an actual temple seems certainly to have been preserved during the centuries that followed the invasion of Xerxes. The *name* ὀπισθόδωμος would serve to keep the tradition alive. Aristophanes and Demosthenes undoubtedly knew what the Opisthodomus was and were acquainted with its history; and the interpreters who first explained their references to it must, with the great resources at their command, have had knowledge of the truth on so important a matter. Schol. V Arist. Plut. 1193¹ tells us that the Opisthodomus lay behind the temple of Athena Polias. The sources of the existing scholia on Aristophanes are acknowledged to be excellent. We cannot reasonably refuse to believe, however much we may regret the mutilated form in which the rest of the scholium has been transmitted to us, that the original author of the statement just quoted (Aristophanes of Byzantium or one of his pupils?) knew what he was writing about. He knew that in the time of the poet Aristophanes the Opisthodomus was a separate building, situated, as is here recorded, behind the temple of Athena, and he knew also why it was called ὀπισθόδωμος, not because it lay behind her temple, but because it had once been the component part of a temple. But had the scholiasts and lexicographers whose comments and definitions have come down to us any knowledge of the true tradition? It is impossible to say. Two facts are here most important to note. First, it is certain that they knew what the normal opisthodomus was, namely the rear part of a building. Temples with opisthodomi were extant for a long time. We have mention of the opisthodomus of a temple in so late an author

---

¹ Zerstörung durch die Perser wurde nur in seinem Hinterhause wieder aufgebaut, um als Schatzkammer zu dienen. Es sind zahlreiche Zeugnisse vorhanden nach denen der Opisthodom ein selbständiges Gebäude der Akropolis gewesen sein muss." See also Stadtgeschichte, 1891, pp. 132, 152. I came independently to the conclusion that the Opisthodomus must have been a separate building, convinced by the testimony of the scholiasts and lexicographers, but erred at first in supposing that it lay on the lower ground due west of the Erechtheum. Curtius's suggestion has been received with favour.

¹ Quoted on p. 4.
as Achilles Tatius.\textsuperscript{1} What we should expect to find, therefore, in
the scholiasts and lexicographers is the definition of the normal
opisthodemos. Secondly, what we do find in them in the main is
something very different. I call attention again to the passages
quoted on pp. 3, 4 of this article. Milchhöfer points out that it is
remarkable that these scholiasts and lexicographers do not give us
the definition that we should expect.\textsuperscript{2} They define the ὀπισθοδόμος
as a building that lay ὄπισθεν τοῦ ναῷ. They do not define it as τὸ
ὄπισθεν μῖρος τοῦ ναῷ. It is common to discredit these late writers,
and to say that they ‘etymologized,’ but etymologizing here would
have given the second definition, and that definition would have
exactly described the sort of opisthodemos they knew about. Their
persistent statement, therefore, that the Opisthodemos lay behind
the temple of Athena, must be the record of a fact. This fact they
had inherited from a trustworthy source. It is no paradox to say
that it becomes even more credible as a fact, so contrary is it to what
we should expect them to say, on the assumption that they did not
fully understand it.

This statement that the Opisthodemos lay “behind the temple of
Athena” appears persistently in slightly varying form in nearly all
the ancient explanations of the ὀπισθοδόμος that have come down to
us. Sometimes there is added a brief definition of the normal opis-
thodemos.\textsuperscript{3} This should occasion no surprise. And sometimes
there is evident confusion, which either results from the ignorance
or carelessness of the writer or is due to too brief statement or to
defective transmission of the text.\textsuperscript{4} This also should occasion no

\textsuperscript{1} Achil. Tat. III. 6.
\textsuperscript{2} Philol. 1894, LIII. p. 359.
\textsuperscript{3} To the scholium on Arist. Plut. 1193 just cited is added after the main
explanation the statement: τὸν ὀπισθοδόμον: τὸ ὄπισθεν τοῦ ἁλκου, ἤτοι τοῦ ναῶν.
Cf. the other brief scholia on Arist. Plut. 1193: τὰ ὄπισθεν τοῦ ἱδίου. Δύ. τὸν
ὄπισθεν τοῦ ἱδίου. Par. 2827. And on Arist. Plut. 1191: τὸν ὄπισθεν ἁλκου τῆς
θεοῦ. LB. So Phorius s.v. ὀπισθοδόμος says first τὸ ὄπισθεν παρὰ ὀἰχήματος, and
then adds the alternative statement that the Opisthodemos was a state treasury
on the Acropolis that lay ὄπισθεν τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ναῷ. The brief definition τὸ
ὄπισθεν παρὰ ὀἰχήματος is found also in E. M. s.v. ὀπισθοδόμος and Bekk. Anc. 1.
p. 286, 26.

\textsuperscript{4} Cf. p. 4, note 2; p. 5, note 1. We find, as I think, an instance of confusion
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surprise, although we must regret it, for it opens a field for doubt and discussion. Still, making due allowance for all difficulties of this sort, it seems certain that these late writers do contain a record of the true tradition about the Opisthodomus.

There remains, finally, a scholium which merits special consideration, because of the use that has been made of it and because, as it seems to me, it stands quite apart from the rest in its meaning. Schol. V Luc. Tim. 53 reads: ὡς ἑρότολον διαβάλλων ταύτα θαυμάζων· ὁ γάρ ὅπωρόνομος ἱερὸν· ἀκολουθεῖν δὲ τοῦ ἀδότου οὕτως ἐλέγετο. The point of view of the scholiast should here be noted. His mind is dwelling solely on the act of sacrilege. He adds the statement τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν δὲ τοῦ ἀδότου οὕτως ἐλέγετο in explanation of the previous predication ἱερὸν. He is thinking of the regular opisthodomus of a temple. Such an opisthodomus was a sacred place, because it stood behind the sanctuary of the god.

Boeckh bases his belief that the Opisthodomus was the western chamber of the cella of the Parthenon on the scholiion on Luc. Tim. 53. In two other passages to which he refers he thinks that ναὸς is equivocal and must be interpreted by the single scholium on Lucian. This ignores, as we have seen, the established use of the word ναὸς in its application to temples of Athena on the Acropolis. The existence of the Hecatompedon, brought to our knowledge by Dörpfeld’s brilliant discovery, was not known to Boeckh. If it had been, he would not have maintained with such vigour against Osann and

of facts in E. M. i.v. ὅπωρόνομος and Bekk. Ancr. i. p. 286, 26. Here two definitions are confused, that of the Opisthodomus (the Athenian treasury) and that of the normal opisthodomus (of any temple). The form of statement here should be compared with that in Photius. Schol. R Y Dem. xxiv. 136, which, under the lemma τρυπαί, reads, ἄν δὲ ὅπωρόνομος τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν τῆς θεοῦ, leaves us in doubt what the scholiast means. τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν τῆς θεοῦ may signify the place behind the goddess in the sense of behind her temple quite as naturally as that of behind her statue.

1 Quoted on p. 14.
2 The variant on this reads: ὅτι ὅπωρόνομος ιερὸν· τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν τοῦ ἀδότου οὕτως ἐλέγετο, ἐν ὧ καὶ τα δημοσία ἀκολουθεῖν φοβοῦσα. (This should probably be: ὅτι ὅ πωρόνος ιερὸν· τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν [ὁ] φοβοῦσα.)
3 C/G. i. p. 177 f.
4 See p. 7 ff.
"Britanni nonnulli"\(^1\) the thesis that there was no other opisthodomus on the Acropolis than that in the Parthenon.\(^2\)

If the conclusion that the Opisthodomus was a separate building and that it consisted of the three western chambers and western portico that before the Persian wars constituted the western half of the cella of the Hecatompedon is correct, it should be confirmed by a consideration of the uses to which the Opisthodomus was put. If it fails, as thus constituted, to account adequately for any established facts, the conclusion is in so far invalidated.

The scholiasts and lexicographers, in the first place, call it a ταμιόν or θοσανφοφλαίον. In it, by their testimony, were housed τὰ χρήματα, both the sacred treasure, τὰ ἱερὰ χρήματα, τὰ χρήματα τῶν θεῶν, and the public treasure, τὰ δημόσια χρήματα, τὰ δημόσιον ἀργύριον καὶ ὁ φόρος.

Our earliest documentary proof of the existence of the Hecatompedon is the celebrated inscription already referred to.\(^3\) This inscription names the ταμίαμ frequently,\(^4\) and, although much mutilated, evidently contained important prescriptions of their duties. Among these is specified τὰ οἰκήματα [τὰ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ] ομοίῳ ἀνοίγειν [τοὺς] ταμίας (II. 17, 18). It is generally agreed that the chambers here referred to are those in the western half of the cella and that they were treasure-chambers.\(^5\) These are the rooms which, according to the conclusions to which we have come, constituted the treasury referred to as ὁ ὀπισθοδόμος in later times.

\(^1\) Dodwell, Classical Tour in Greece, 1819, 1. p. 345; Wilkins, Atheniensia, or Remarks on the Topog. and Buildings of Athens, 1816, p. 98, note. See also Stuart and Revett, Antiquities of Athens, 1825, II. p. 26, note d.; p. 29, note h. Michaelis has a remark about the Englishmen: "Die früher vielfach beliebte Unterscheidung des Opisthodoms im Parthenon und eines zweiten Opisthodoms als selbständigen Staatsschatzhauises hat jetzt nur noch historisches Interesse"! (Der Parthenon, p. 27, note 85.) I must confess, with shame, that I knew nothing about the views of the Englishmen until my own views on the question were already formed and expressed in writing.


\(^3\) See p. 2, note 8, end.

\(^4\) 1. b (?), r (?), II. 3, 8, 13, 16, 18, 25.

\(^5\) See p. 39, note 2.
The inscription quoted in part on p. 12, which in date falls between 480 and 460 B.C.,\(^1\) records the fact that treasure was kept in a precinct behind the old temple of Athena. The περιβάλλος here mentioned, if the lacuna has been properly supplied, was that of the Hecatompedon, in which at the time of the decree stood the restored treasury, and in this treasury the money in question must have been kept. That it was safely housed is certain, however general the phrase [ἐν περιβάλλος] may be; the treasure was not kept in the open.\(^2\)

After the Persian wars to the time of the completion of the Parthenon the treasures in kind of Athena must have been stored partly in “the old temple,”\(^3\) partly in the treasury. In the latter was also the sacred money of Athena, and, as we have seen,\(^4\) likewise that

---

1 See Dittenberger, SIG. 384.
2 It is by no means certain that [περιβάλλος] is right. The phrase [ἐν περιβάλλο] gives a suspiciously vague designation of the place where the money was kept. Curtius (Stadtrecht, p. 132, note) conjectures [ἐν τινὶ δῶρα], but this falls short by a letter. [ὑπὸ περιβάλλο] is Dörpfeld’s conjecture (Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. p. 39), but he there fails to take account of the preceding πολύ. Kirchhoff (CIA. iv. 1) and Dittenberger (SIG. 384) read [ὑπὸ περιβάλλο], but this does not affect the conclusion which we have reached. See p. 39. The original of the remnant πολύ perhaps yet remains to be found. If the supposition expressed above, that the money referred to was housed in the restored treasury, is true, and if it is also true that the inscription read περιβάλλος, the reason why the place where the money was kept is mentioned in this general way, and not specifically by name, must be a matter of conjecture. It then becomes important to note that the inscription belongs to a time of confusion at Athens, just after the Persian wars, when it is quite possible that the name Opisthodomus, by which presumably the treasury was known before the destruction of the temple and which later became its fixed designation, had not yet been officially attached to this remnant of the temple. It must have seemed odd to the Athenians at first to designate as an opisthodomus a building which was now in fact a single structure, although originally it had been, as part of an actual temple, a real opisthodomus. This seems a simpler and more natural conjecture than that in περιβάλλος we have reference, as Frazer conjectures (Journ. Hellen. Stud., 1892–93, xiii. p. 162), to a building temporarily erected to house the treasures till the permanent treasury was ready.

3 Some of the Persian spoils were still there in the time of Pausanias (t. 27. 1). For the proof that the old temple (Erechtheum) was rebuilt after the Persian wars, see p. 23, note 1.
4 CIA. iv. 1 (p. 12) is a decree relating to the Eleusinian goddesses.
of some of the other gods. On the completion of the Parthenon the treasures in kind were transferred, as is well known, to the Pronaos, Neo Hecatompedos, and "Parthenon" of the new temple. In 435–4 were passed the two celebrated decrees (C.I.A. I. 32 A, B) which brought all of the finances of the state into order. In them we clearly perceive the influence of Pericles, under whose careful financial policy Athens was preparing herself for the great struggle with Sparta that was to follow. The provisions of these two decrees are met with singular fitness on the supposition that the public and sacred money was housed in the restored Opisthodomus of the Hecatompedon.

The money now stored in the treasury had become a great sum (A 2 ff.). This fact is confirmed by the testimony of Thucydides. The amount of coined silver on the Acropolis at the time when the decree was passed was 9700 talents. This included both the state-

1 But not the money. Frazer's argument (Jour. Hellen. Stud., 1892–93, xiii. p. 163 f.) for making the western portico of the Parthenon the Opisthodomus (in brief, that the treasury documents name four compartments where treasure was stored, and that if three of these were in the Parthenon the natural inference is that the fourth, namely the Opisthodomus, was also there) overlooks the important fact that the objects stored in these three compartments were essentially different from the contents of the fourth. We have no evidence that anything except money was stored in the Opisthodomus from the completion of the Parthenon to the end of the Peloponnesian War. It was a treasury, and a treasury in which was kept a great sum of money. Against this view, moreover, is the testimony of Plutarch (quoted on p. 143), who tells us distinctly what the opisthodomus of the Parthenon was. Nobody supposes that Demetrius was lodged in the western portico.

2 Thuc. II. 13.

1 Kirchhoff, Geschichte des Athenischen Staatsverbandes, 18–6, p. 22 : Dittenberger, SIG. 1, 4, note 1. — The fact of the existence of this great treasure seems to me to be fatal to the view that the Opisthodomus was the western portico of the Parthenon. (See Dorpfeld, who formerly held this view, and Frazer, as cited on p. 4.) This portico was altogether inadequate for the purpose. It is pertinent, further, here to add that it was open to view on three sides, where bronze gratings between the columns were all that barred a thieving public. Can we believe, moreover, that this great treasure was cramped into this small space, and yet that the large room beyond it, the "Parthenon" in the limited sense, was left practically empty, containing, as the treasure documents show (C.I.A. I. 101–105), only a relatively small number of articles employed at festival-time ("eine Dutzend Klinen und Stühle," Petersen, Mitth. 1887, xii. p. 69)?
reserve and the treasure of the goddess. The existence of so great a treasure in 435 B.C., which must have been the accumulation of years, necessarily implies the existence of a place for storing the money before the completion of the Parthenon.

It is noteworthy that the decrees assume certain facts. The fact of the existence of a treasury is taken for granted, just as that of the boards of the hellenotamiae, logistae, and ταμιαὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας. The treasury is named three times (A 15, 17, B 23), simply as ὁ ὅπισθοδομός, in such a way as to imply that it was a well-known place in established use. The specification, further, of the duty of the hellenotamiae in B 18 ff., ἐκ τῶν φόρων κατατίθεναι κατὰ τὸν ἐνναυτὸν τὰ ἐκάστοτε γενόμενα παρὰ τοῖς ταμιασὶ τῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας, simply recognizes and emphasizes, as Kirchhoff has shown, a previous practice. The one important new provision is the establishment of the board of the ταμιαὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν (A 13 ff.). This necessitated certain rearrangements in the use of the Oipisthodomus. From this time the tamiae of Athena are to store her money-treasure ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ δεξὶ τῶν ὅπισθοδόμου, the tamiae of the other gods ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ ἄμφετερα. This must mean, as Dörpfeld has already pointed out, the room to the right and the room to the left in the back part of the Oipisthodomus. But since we know that there was a third treasure, and that it was large, which although in the care of the treasurers of Athena was still kept separate, we cannot but conclude that it was stored in the larger chamber that lay in front of the two smaller chambers. It had probably been here from the first establishment of a state-fund. This use of the larger chamber explains the provision in A 15 ff. (quoted on p. 16). This provision, in which the words ὁσα δυνατον καὶ δοσιν imply a limitation, means, as I think, that the ταμιαὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν are not to have access to the chamber in which the treasure of which they are in charge is stored except in company with the ταμιαὶ τῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας, not that they are always to be present when the other rooms are opened. To reach their own chamber they were obliged to pass through that set aside for the reserve fund of the state, which was in charge, under the authority of the state, of the more ancient and much more

---

1 Athen. Staatsch. p. 33.
2 Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. p. 38.
important board. It must not be forgotten that the state exercised absolute control over all of these treasures, although it employed the form of a fictitious loan when it drew upon the resources of Athena and of the other gods. The outward symbol of this authority was the key of the treasury held by the ἐπιστάτης τῶν προιόντων, of whom Aristotle says, 1 τηρεῖ δ' οὖσα τάς κλαίς τάς τῶν ἱερῶν 2 ἐν ὀσὶ τὰ χρήματα ὑστερ καὶ (τὰ) γράμματα τῆς πόλεως. The custody of the key did not imply responsibility for the actual management of the funds.

The view here advanced, that the Opisthodomus of the authors and of inscriptions was the Opisthodomus of the old Hecatompedon, rebuilt without peristyle and eastern chamber after the destruction of that temple in the Persian wars, is not accepted by Milchhöfer. In his able and searching discussion of the Opisthodomus, 3 he first combats the identification of “Parthenon” and Opisthodomus, a view that at the time of the publication of his article had just been reasserted by Furtwängler; he then advances positive arguments to sustain the proposition that the Opisthodomus was a separate building; and finally he states what he believes its probable situation to have been. He would place it at the eastern end of the Acropolis, where are remains which were once supposed to be those of the chalcothece. 4 His view as to the situation of the Opisthodomus has been accepted by Furtwängler. 5 To me it seems to be untenable, for the following reasons.

---

1 Aristot. Resp. Athen. 44.
2 The first of the two ἱερὰ here meant is the Opisthodomus. (The other was the Metroum, down in the town.) Cf. Poll. VIII. 96: ἔχει δὲ οὖσα τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς κλαίς ἐν ὀσὶ τὰ χρήματα καὶ τὰ γράμματα. Eust. Od. XVII. 455: τὰς τε κλαίς (τῶν ἱερῶν, Rose) ἐν ὀσὶ τὰ χρήματά εἰσὶ φυλάττει καὶ τὰ γράμματα τῆς πόλεως. Cf. also Suidas and E. M. s.v. ἐπιστάτης. Less exactly the argument to Dem. XXII. p. 590. See Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, 1890, II. 1, p. 338.
3 See p. 1, note 1.
5 Mast. Greek Sculp., 1895, p. 425 f.
It is contradicted, in the first place, by such indications of the situation of the Opisthodomus as we find in our authorities. They tell us that it lay behind a temple of Athena. No building at the eastern end of the Acropolis would be behind either the Parthenon, or the Hecatompedon, or the Erechtheum. In placing the Opisthodomus at the eastern end of the Acropolis, Milchhöfer thus rejects the testimony of the scholiasts and lexicographers. He thinks that these late writers are of doubtful authority in this question, but nevertheless, in arguing for the Opisthodomus as a separate building, calls attention to the remarkable fact that no one of them gives what we should think to be the most natural interpretation of the word ὀπισθόδωμος. They define it not as the rear part of a temple, but as ἐπίωσεν (ὀπισθωθεν) τοῦ νεῶ, τοῦ ἱεροῦ, also ὀπισθωθεν τῆς θεοῦ; we find no such expression as τὸ ὀπισθωθεν μέρος τοῦ ναὸν οὗ ὀπισθήθη ἐν τῷ ναῷ.1 It should here be noted that in the very phrase to which Milchhöfer calls especial attention they say unequivocally that the Opisthodomus was behind the temple. It was doubtless his feeling for the force of their testimony that led him at first to seek to place the Opisthodomus actually behind a temple of Athena, namely to the west of the Parthenon.2 He shows the same feeling for the force of ὀπισθωθεν in dealing with the early fifth century inscription already quoted.3 He indicates his preference for the reading [ὀπισθωθεν], and adds that the peribolus with its treasury constituted “dann schon eine Art ‘Opisthodomos’ des alten Tempels.”4 This is full recognition of the fact that this earlier ‘sort of opisthodomus’ at least lay behind the temple. But the other opisthodomus that followed, the Opisthodomus, he puts behind no temple.5

1 Philol. 1894, LIII. p. 359.
2 Ibid. p. 360.
3 See p. 12. For its interpretation, see p. 45.
5 Milchhöfer arbitrarily makes the inscription cited a terminus ante quem. Yet money had to be housed on the Acropolis both before and immediately after the Persian wars, and he himself believes that “the treasurers of Athena had been installed in the Opisthodomus long before the Parthenon was built.” (Ibid. p. 357.) How long before? To me it seems likely that the inscription refers to the real Opisthodomus, not to ‘a sort of Opisthodomus.’ See p. 45, with note 2.
Milchhöfer, as I have said, sought first to place the Opisthodomus behind the Parthenon, but here he encountered a substantial obstacle, the real chalcoteche, and relinquished his first suggestion. He adopts his final view with more confidence, although he says that certainty in the matter is not to be expected. Two considerations weigh with him. First, if we should put the Opisthodomus at the eastern end of the Acropolis, it would be an opisthodomus (rear-building) in the sense in which the Propylaea are the fore-court (Vorhof) of the Acropolis. But this is the gratuitous intrusion of a new point of view. In no ancient reference to the situation of the Opisthodomus is there anywhere mention of the Propylaea; our authorities orient the Opisthodomus not from the Propylaea but from a temple of Athena. It is pure conjecture, therefore, to assume that the Opisthodomus got its name because it was at the ‘rear’ of the Acropolis as the Propylaea were at the front. In this case, further, the name ὀπισθόδομος would stand without parallel. Nowhere in the literature, so far as I know, is the eastern end of the Acropolis called its ‘back part,’ nor is there intimation anywhere that a Greek ever thought of it as that. Secondly, it seems to Milchhöfer in itself probable that such a structure as the Opistho-

---


2 It should be noted that the word Πρόοδαμα does not mean “front-gateway,” in the sense of gates in front of a space behind, but rather “that which is in front of the gates,” in this case the wings and portico in front of the five doorways as one comes up from the west. The use of the adjective πρόοδαμος establishes this fact. Neither the word Πρόοδαμα nor the structure itself, which lies low and led to the rear of the temples, could have suggested to a Greek any such strong antithesis between the Propylaea and the high ground at the east fronting the temples, where stood the great altar, as lies at the basis of Milchhöfer’s assumption. The natural means of orienting objects on the Acropolis is, as we have seen, not the Propylaea, but the temples. The probability, further, of such an antithesis as Milchhöfer assumes is weakened by the actual situation which he assigns to his ‘back-building.’ It does not lie on high ground on the eastern continuation of the axis of the Propylaea, but in the extreme south-eastern part of the Acropolis on ground that was lower than that to the north and to the west of it (see Jahn-Michaelis, *Paus. descript. arc. Athen.* 1880, *Tabula ii*), and with the peribolus of the Parthenon directly between it and the Propylaea. It is doubtful whether it could have been seen, even before the building of the present Parthenon, from the Propylaea.
domus was erected at the eastern end of the Acropolis on the site of a pre-Persian building used as a magazine and for purposes of administration.\textsuperscript{1} He would therefore identify the present remains as those of the Opisthodomus. This again is simply conjecture.\textsuperscript{2}

There is a second strong objection to Milchhöfer’s view. It contravenes the established application of the word διοπθοδόμος, which as defined by Pollux and Varro, and in fourteen instances of its use in authors, in each of which its meaning is certain, designates an integral rear part of a building.\textsuperscript{3} It has no other application. Nothing, therefore, but convincing evidence should induce us to believe that the word could have been applied to a building on the Acropolis at Athens which always had been a separate structure.

\textsuperscript{1} “Es ist auch an sich wahrscheinlich, dass hier ein solcher Bau an Stelle vorpersischer Magazin- und Verwaltungsräume aufgerichtet worden ist.” \textit{Ibid.} p. 361. This statement leaves it doubtful where Milchhöfer thinks the treasure was stored before the Persian wars.

\textsuperscript{2} This theory is not supported by schol. Dem. xxiv. 136 and Pollux ix. 40, noticed on p. 5, note 1 above. Even if we accept Milchhöfer’s suggestion that these may possibly rest on better ultimate authority than the rest of the notices (\textit{ibid.} p. 359), they do not tend to establish his view. The phrase of the schol., \textit{ἀλείμα ὀπίσω τῆς ἀκροτήθου}, “a house behind the Acropolis,” removes the Opisthodomus from the Acropolis altogether. Pollux doubtless means to say the same thing, “the (part) behind the Acropolis.” He here uses \textit{κάτωθι} adverbially, as in the same phrase in his definition of \textit{σηκός}, quoted on p. 38.

\textsuperscript{3} For the definitions of Pollux and Varro, see p. 38. The word \textit{διοπθοδόμος} occurs in the following places in reference to the rear part of a temple: Diod. Sic. xiv. 41; Plut. \textit{Demet.} 23 (see p. 15); Aristides, i. p. 548, 14 Dind. (see p. 15); Paus. v. 10, 9, 13, 1, 15, 3, 16, 1; Lucian \textit{Hdt.} 1, \textit{Fug.} 7; \textit{de morte Perig.} 32; Anth. Pal. xii. 223, 4 (Strato); Achil. Tat. iii. 6; in reference to the back part of a house: Appian, \textit{de bell. civ.} i. 20; in reference to the rear part of a baulerium: Themistius, xv. p. 234 Dind. All the occurrences of the word known to me have been cited in this paper. — In the course of his argument Milchhöfer unconsciously makes an important admission. He says (\textit{ibid.} p. 356), “Von vorn herein wird Jedermann zugeben, dass lediglich der offiziell überlieferte Name ‘Opisthodomos’ darauf geführt hat, das Schatzhaus für einen Theil des Tempels zu halten; auf Grund unserer sonstigen Ueberlieferung hätte man in dem \textit{ταμεῖον} nur einen selbständigen Bau vermuten können.” The fact remains that the treasury was called Opisthodomus. Of this apparently anomalous fact we find adequate explanation in the view advanced in this paper that the treasury was once an integral part of the Hecatompedon.

1 Ibid. p. 356.
3 Hom. Od. iv. 302; Paus. ix. 4. 2; Strabo xvii. 26, p. 805.
4 Photius, E. M., i.e. ὈΣΙΟΘΟΔΟΜΟΣ; Beka. Ane. i. p. 286, 26. See p. 42, note 3.
of an acropolis or of any ‘whole’ not indicated by the word itself. It would be as forced to suppose that the word ὀπισθόδωμος was so applied, meaning a rear-building of the Acropolis, as that πρόδωμος might mean a front building of the Acropolis or πρώτως a front temple of the Acropolis. There is no shadow of authority for saying that the last two words were ever so used.

The case, then, may be summed up as follows against Milchhöfer’s theory. First, it contravenes the ancient evidence, and assumes a Greek point of view for the orientation of buildings on the Acropolis which cannot be established. Secondly, on trustworthy testimony, the Opisthodomus (ὁ ὀπισθόδωμος) in which the Athenians stored their treasure was a separate building, as Milchhöfer himself believes; but Greek usage of speech allowed the word ὀπισθόδωμος to be applied only to a structure that was, or at some time had been, the integral rear part of a building. ‘The Opisthodomus,’ therefore, must at some time have been an integral rear part of some building. The theory advanced in the second part of this paper is that this building was the Hecatompedon.
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PLATE II.

BY JOHN HENRY WRIGHT.

I.

Of the history of the votive tablet, figured on the accompanying plate and discussed below, nothing seems to be known, except that the slab came "from the Levant," and has been in Boston for forty or fifty years.² It is now in the Museum of Fine Arts of that city, in the Room of Classical Antiquities; its number on the register of acquisitions is S. 1695.³

The dimensions are: greatest height, m. .72; width, m. .42; thickness, m. .06. It is of coarse white marble, "probably Asiatic."⁴

On the upper part of the front surface there is a panel upon which are represented in low relief a man, child, woman, and second child (the last fragmentary), standing in a row from right to left, en face, each with the right arm raised from the elbow, palm turned out, and thumb separated from the fingers. The attitude is the familiar one of adoration.⁵ The man and the boys wear the short

¹ The substance of this article was read before the American Philological Association, July 12, 1894, at the Williamstown meeting.
² My best thanks are due to Gen. Charles G. Loring, Director of the Museum, and to Mr. Edward Robinson, Curator of Classical Antiquities, for calling my attention to the tablet as soon as it was received, and for furnishing me with facilities for publishing it. A preliminary notice of the tablet appears in Mr. Robinson’s Report to the Trustees for 1893, pp. 19, 20.
³ It was for many years exhibited among the curiosities of the old “Boston Museum,” a hall attached to a theatre. In 1893, when the collections of the "Museum" were broken up, it came into the possession of Mr. Charles A. Cummings, who, on December 20, 1893, gave it to the Museum of Fine Arts.
⁴ Mr. Robinson.
⁵ Compare Sittl, Die Gebäude der Griechen und Römer, pp. 147 ff. The attitude is as in Waddington-LeBas, Monuments Figurets, pl. 137, and on many
sleeveless chiton and the long himation, the latter thrown under the right arm and over the left shoulder. The woman wears a short himation similarly thrown, and the long chiton. What appears to be an object held in the left hand of the boy in the middle is perhaps only a piece of the untrimmed marble,\(^1\) and the tassel-like appendage near the left hand of the woman is nothing more than the rudely-cut end of the himation. In artistic character this sculptured relief is crude, stiff, and lifelessly conventional. The design, as often on tablets of this sort, does not exactly fit the inscription, which speaks of only one child. Hence we may infer that the slab with its relief was not made to order, but was selected by the devotees from a stock of ready-made stones as the one coming nearest to their needs.

Above the panel was probably once an ornamental coping, which has been sadly mutilated.\(^2\) The left edge of the slab is likewise incomplete, being broken off from top to bottom.

Below the relief stands the inscription, in letters of the style current in Asia Minor, and especially in eastern Lydia, about 200 A.D. The inscription is perfectly preserved, except that each line lacks at the end from two to four letters.

\begin{verbatim}
'Αρτέμιδι Ἀναείτι καὶ Μη- νὶ Τιάμοι Μουσαῖς Ὁ [καὶ]
Καλλιγένεια ἣ σύμβιοισ' αἰτ-
τοῦ ὑπὲρ Μουσαίοιν τοῦ ὑοῦ
μαρτυροῦντες τὰς δ[υνά-]
μεσ τῶν θεῶν ἀπέδω[καν]
τὴν εὐχήν· ἔτους ὅπα· [μην(νὸς)]
Δείον ἦ.
\end{verbatim}

other monumeta, especially from Asia Minor.—Cf. Plutarch, Vit. Mar. 26, ηθαμοὶ δὲ και Κάρθουσ ὄρουμ ἀναξ ὑπὲρ τὰς χεῖρας καθερώσων τὴν τέχνην τῆς ἡμερας ἐκείνης, where καθερώσω is used in a specific sense, like ἀκούσας, similar to that pregnant in ἀκούσι τὴν εὐχή.

\(^1\) On some reliefs of a similar character the adorants carry cakes in their hands.

\(^2\) On this coping may have been carved something to represent a part of a human body, the member cured by the divinities. Compare the four eyes carved on the coping above a similar row of figures, in Waddington-LeBas, Monuments Figurés, pl. 137 (no. 688, from Goerdis or Julia Gordus), and see below p. 72, nos. 6 and 7.
"To Artemis Anaïtis¹ and Mên Tiamu : Musæs, son of Musæs,² and Calligeneia his consort, on behalf of Musæs their son, in testimony to the powers of the gods, have paid their vow. In the year 281, the 10th of the month Dies [A.D. 196?]."

¹ The Anaïtis Inscriptions known up to 1886, ten in number, have been collected and printed by S. Reinach, Chroniques d'Orient, II. 1885, pp. 105, 107 f.; 1886, pp. 155, 156 (from the Revue Archéologique, with additions). According to Leemans’s facsimiles, on the stones from Kula in Reinach, Chroniques, 1886, p. 156, No. 2 (νθ), the date should be σπαθ, not σπαθ, and an 'Anaïtis should be inserted between Μπρατ and 'Αναντιαγ; and in no. 5, the date is σπαθ, not σπαθ. Of these ten 'Anaïtis inscriptions, one is from Hypeapa, near Odemish, undated; two, undated, are from Philadelphia; the remaining seven are from Kula or vicinity, three undated, four dated respectively A.D. 160, 200 (?), 235 (236), and 236 (237). To this number should now be added no. 11, our inscription, dated A.D. 196; nos. 12, 13, the two inscriptions from Kula (Maua) published by Contoleon, Athenische Mitteilungen, XII. 1887, pp. 254, 255 (cf. E. L. Hicks, Classical Review, III. 1889, p. 69), dated respectively A.D. 215 (216) and 244 (245); for no. 12 see p. 72, no. 5; no. 14, undated inscription from Philadelphia (not from Tralles), Contoleon, Athenische Mitteilungen, XIV. 1889, p. 106. — Possibly also belong here (as no. 15) Michaelis, Journ. Hellen. S., V. p. 154, the proper name Παθ-Αμαθ, 'gift of Anaïtis' (?); and (as no. 16) Waddington-LeBas, nos. 699, from Kula, undated: I would emend Μπανάνθ μεγ ΑΛΙΑΝΗ in it to μεγ ΑΝΑΙΤΙ(H). The inscription has not been tested by a squeeze. To be sure there is a town Alia in Phrygia, but on coins we have ΛΙΑΗΝΟΝ.

Seven of these Anaïtis inscriptions are now in Leyden, and have been published in facsimiles by C. Leemans, Verh. d. k. Amsterdam Akad. XVII. 1886 (1888), no. 7: Leemans also gives, from Reinach, the transliteration of all the remaining ones, except nos. 1 (from Odemish), 11, 14, and 16.

It will be noted that of these inscriptions, all of which the provenance is known, except one from Odemish, come either from Philadelphia (three), or from Kula or neighborhood (ten). — For Mên Tiamu inscriptions, see note on pp. 71-3.

² On the spelling of this name in this inscription see the remarks on line 2. For Maua (from Maua), Latinized Musæs, cf. Barnæs = Barnacus: Benseler, Curtius Studien, III. pp. 167, 168.

³ Throughout this article it is assumed, in the reduction of dates, that the era of Sulla — which seems to have begun about July 1, B.C. 85, and not Sept. 24, B.C. 85, or 84 — was followed in Upper Lydia, as well as in Phrygia. Cf. Marquardt, Röm. Staatsverw., I. p. 337, and, for the date, Ramsay, Historical Geography, p. 452. (Where two dates are given in the reductions, the second must be adopted if the era is assumed to have begun Sept. 23, B.C. 85.) In the sequence of months Dies came first; Peritius, fourth; Dystrus, fifth; Xandicus, sixth; Artemisius, seventh; and Daesius, eighth. — [But see below, p. 73.]
II.

Judging from many other inscriptions similarly dedicated,¹ we may infer that one Musaeus,—who seems to have pronounced his name Musæs,—and his wife Calligeneia, on the serious illness of their son, or in some other grave stress, had made a vow to Artemis Anaitis and Mên Tiamu that if the boy were by these gods restored they would dedicate to them some anathema. To the object thus dedicated they attached this tablet which commemorates the might of the gods named in it.

The restoration and interpretation of the inscription offer no difficulties.

Line i.—ANAELTI, in which EI has the value of I, and vice versa, must have been felt as a dative for 'Ἀναιής (perhaps 'Ἀναήν, cf. τάξις τῶν), though the regular form of the word would be 'Ἀναήθα. So far as I have observed, 'Ἀναήθα does not occur except in a dative construction, and thus may be regarded as a dative form. Hence I would accent 'Ἀναήθα, not 'Ἀναήθα, nor 'Ἀναήθα. The following case-forms are found on the stones (a usually replacing the first s): nom., 'Ἀναήθα: gen., 'Ἀναήθας. 'Ἀναήθας (sic: for 'Ἀναήθας?); dat., 'Ἀναήθα. 'Ἀναήθα.'Ἀναήθας acc., 'Ἀναήθα. —The lost MH of [Μη]n was probably written as a monogram,² MH, or perhaps [ε]n was abbreviated; there is not room for both words written out in full.

¹ Anaitis (Artemis, θεία, μητέριον, μητήρ, prefixed) is, in many of the dedicatory inscriptions, gratefully remembered for services of healing, as is also Mên Tiamu. Cf. Reinaeh, Chroniques, iibid. Mên had a character in some respects like that of Asclepius. Thus Mên Caru had a medical school attached to his temple at Attuda (Ramsay, American Journal of Archaeology. IV. p. 777), and near his shrine at Mênos Come, between Carura and Attuda, were hot springs: Athen. II. 43 λ. The coins of Paralas in Lycaonia have as types not only the god Mên, holding the pine-cone and with cock at his feet, but also Asclepius and Hygieia: Head, Historia Numorum, p. 596.

The Charite dedication.—Reinan, Chroniques, 1886, p. 156: 'Αρτέμις Ἀναήθας Χαρίη | Ἀπόλλωνις, παράστασις | σχοινά καὶ ἔκαθέναι ὑπὸ τὰς λεπίδας, εἰρήν. 'To Artemis Anaitis, Charite, daughter of Apollonius, having had an accident, and having been by the priestess restored through exorcisms and incantations, has paid her vow,'—when compared with Strabo, XV. 3. 15. p. 732, where mention is made of the priests of Anaitis (ἐλεγχόμενον ὑπό), suggests something of the methods employed by the servants of the goddess in fulfilling her petitioners' desires. Cf. Paus. V. 27. 5: ἄγρο μάγος... ἄνθρωπος μέρισμα... ἐκπορευόμενον τε μάθημα.

² Cf. MINI in Waddington-LeBas, no. 663; also below, p. 72, no. 5.
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Line 2.—We must not write Μηνικυδου as one word, with Boeckh, G. E. Benseler, Leemans, etc. The parallel forms, nom. Μην Κάρου, gen. Μηνός Κάρου, and Μηνός Τιάμου, make this impossible. Cf. Waddington-LeBas, Inscriptions de l’Asie Mineure, no. 668.—Τιάμου is an indeclinable word of uncertain origin and meaning; see pp. 68 ff.

—ΜΟΥΣΑΙΟΣ is, of course, not a graver’s blunder¹ for ΜΟΥΣΑΙΟΣ. Examples of -as for and from -ος are frequent in Greek (and Latin) proper names on stones of the Roman era, and of -is for -ius in Roman inscriptions from the earliest date.² In by far the larger number of examples, which have been collected by F. G. Benseler, the iota is not part of a diphthong as here, but instances are by no means wanting where -ος (-aeus) and -ος ( eius) become respectively -as (-ae) and -ς (-es). If these cases were lacking, we should either look upon Μουσάς as a graver’s blunder for Μουσάος or be tempted to read Μουσάς (Musaeis), with uncertain accent, as a trisyllabic word; but with the examples in mind, and for other reasons suggested in the notes, it seems better to regard the final syllable as diphthongal, and to treat the word as a disyllabic.³ The accent is

¹ Some incisions on the slab between Κ and Σ, which might be taken for an attempt to insert an Ο, are nothing more than clumsily-cut parts of Σ.

² The name Μουσάος is very common on the stones. Note from Kula, date 244 (245) A.D., a dedication from one Αδρακλης Μουσάος to Μηνίτιν Αμάλιτι: Athenische Mitteilungen, XII. p. 255 (Classical Review, III. 1889, p. 69). The encroachment of the Roman praenomen is significant of the later date.

³ Cf. F. G. Benseler, Curzit Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik, II. pp. 139–143; also Lobbeck, Pahlol, ssw. græc. Prolegomena, pp. 490 ff.; Blass-Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der griech. Sprache, I. p. 400. This correction is frequent in proper names in Greek, after about 50 A.D., but in Latin is much more ancient. Of the hundreds of examples collected by Benseler, the following occur where -ός has become -as (sometimes written -aeus): Αδρακλης (but this was probably Γαίς: cf. F. D. Allen, Harvard Studies, II. p. 76), Άθραος, Άθραος, Ερημίτης, Ατταίς, Κάρτας, Καβάς, Κόρτας. The cases of -ός becoming -as (-aeus) are Στροβίνος (accus.), Ηλείς, and perhaps Κράτες, Εόρας. Professor Ramsay has seen ΕΡΜΑΙΣ, gen. -10. Add also Ηραδρος, Waddington-LeBas, no. 678 (below, p. 71, no. 1).—I am not aware that Μουσάος has ever before appeared in the shortened form.

⁴ In favor of the disyllabic pronunciation, or for -as as against -aí, might be adduced the fact (e.g.) that Άθραος becomes not only Άθραος, but also Άθραος (cf. Ερμας from Ερμας, etc.). The form Άθραος could not have arisen from a Άθραος.
less certain. There is a twofold question here: the accentuation of the longer and that of the shorter form. The vulgate and traditional accentuation of the longer form, traceable apparently to Aristarchus, is Μοῦσας. But there are scholars who would give such proper names, to distinguish them from adjectival forms of identical spelling, the recessive accent, and would write accordingly Μοῦσας. Evidently Μοῦσας would become Μοῦσας, and Μοῦσας would become Μοῦσας. The analogy of Ἀθήναιος (Ἀθήναις?) seems to favor Μοῦσας (Μοῦσας); but the modern Greek Βαρβολομαῖς (from Βαρβολομαῖς), and the accent of Ἀθήναις, Ἑρμᾶς, etc., — which could have arisen only from a Ἀθήναιος, Ἑρμαιος (not from Ἀθήναιος, Ἑρμαιος), in both of which classes of cases the accent remains on the syllable that originally carried it, — speak emphatically, and in my judgment decisively, for Μοῦσας. — B after Musæs indicates that Musæs is second of the name, i.e., in the second generation; thus in Waddington-LeBas, no. 656, we read δις

1 A scholium on Iliad E 69, edited by Cramer (Anecd. Paris. III. p. 283) appears to contain Aristarchus's doctrine on the accentuation of Μοῦσας and similar words. The matter is fully discussed by Lehrs, De Aristarchi studii homericis, pp. 292 ff. Cf. also Herodian, passim (Lenz's index, s. Μοῦσας); Ellendt, Lex. Sophocleum, p. 460. — On the accent of the shorter forms of words in -us (from -ον), see Benseler, ibid. pp. 182 ff.

2 In Ἀθήναις, Ἑρμᾶς, and similar words, we have a reversion to the accentuation of the adjectival form, the necessity of accentual differentiation — as in Ἀθήναιος, Ἀθηναῖος, 'Athenaeus,' and Ἀθηναίος, 'an Athenian' — not being felt where the spelling was different. — Indeed, though Ἀθήναιος must stand, is it certain that Ἀθήναις is right? Ought we not to make it Ἀθηναις, on the analogy of Ἀθηναίς? And similarly should we not change into periphrasms several of the proper names cited in the preceding notes?

3 It would hardly be sound to argue that as corruption must take place in unaccented syllables, neither of the two syllables in -ον would have been under the accent, and that we must accordingly write Μοῦσας and Μοῦσας. In the first place, at the period of our inscription the pitch accent in Greek had not become a stress accent, and it is mainly the stress accent that works havoc with unaccented syllables; in the second place, there are many examples of corrected syllables the former element of which was once under the accent.

4 There are numerous instances in inscriptions of Roman date: e.g. Διονυσίου β, Waddington-LeBas, no. 617; id., no. 647 (?Ηλε[ν][╌][δ][φ][ο][ὶ][.navigationBar(4)], where three persons named Heliadorus are mentioned; id., 734, 795. Hicks, Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum, III. 1, 2, p. 213 (no. DLXXXVIII), etc.
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Pausanias, but the sign for the ordinal or adverb is more frequent. Mousaios Β probably means 'Muses, son of Muses.' His own son, here referred to in τοῦ ὤν, might have been designated as Mousaios Γ.1

Line 3.—The H after Καλλιγένες has been corrected from N.—σύμβια, which is the regular form on the stones, is preferable to συμβία: there is a distance trace of O on the marble. Compare also Waddington-LeBas, no. 734 (C.I.G. 3872b).

Line 4.—For Μουσαίου τοῦ ὤν, see Waddington-LeBas, no. 682, from Goerdis (= Julia Gordus). There is hardly enough room for νόης. Mousaiou Γ is out of the question; and for Μουσαίου τοῦ Γ I can find no analogy. In Waddington-LeBas, no. 703 (from Kula), father and mother unite on behalf of their τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν τέκνων.

Line 6.—δυνάμεις for δυνάμεις, as in 'Ἀναίτις above. In a different sense the word occurs in Waddington-Lebas, no. 668 (from Kula, cited below, p. 72, no. 3).—τῶν θεῶν are the pair Artemis Anaitis and Mên Tiamu.

Line 7.—ἐτῶν οἰκία, or 291, is probably of the era of Sulla2 (85 B.C.), which seems to be the one followed in the part of Asia Minor where Artemis Anaitis and Mên Tiamu were together worshipped; possibly, however, that of Actium is used (32 B.C., not 31 B.C.).—The word μηνός, 'month,' was probably indicated4 either by its

1 An interesting inscription illustrating this usage is Waddington-LeBas, no. 743 (C.I.G. 3952), Νεκρὸν παΐδα τῶν ἐν γεγονόσιν νῶν Παυσανίου Β τοῦ Διονυσίου... ἐκμελήσας Παυσανίου τοῦ Παυσανίου Γ. This gives the stemma:

Dionysius

Pausanias

Pausanias Β

Nicias

Pausanias Γ

Professor Ramsay has noted inscriptions with Α, and even Ε, with a name.

2 Franz established this era as beginning about B.C. 84 (C.I.G. III. pp. 1103 ff.), the year when Sulla reorganized the province of Asia (Appian, Mithrid. 61). Cassiodorus (Chron. p. 682) confirms the testimony of Appian: Ηις άνθρωπος—Cinna IV et Carbone II (= B.C. 84)—Asiam in XLIV regiones Sulla distribuit. Cf. Waddington-LeBas, on no. 980 (Vol. III. p. 254). On the exact date of the beginning of the era see above, p. 57, note 3.

4 Μηνός, as M in Waddington-LeBas, no. 683; as Μ, id. no. 679; as Μ, id. no. 702 (from Kula).
initial letter or by a monogram. — The month Δῶς, of the Macedonian calendar, early adopted by the successors of Alexander for these regions, is the first month of a year which originally began soon after the autumnal equinox. Under the Romans the year appears to have begun ca. August 1. Hence our inscription may be dated in August, A.D. 196 (or 249?). The relief, however, must be somewhat, if only very slightly, older; as we remarked above, it was already in stock when the inscription was cut.

III.

The provenance of the tablet may be placed with probability in the Κατακακαύμωνη district in eastern Lydia, or, in modern terms, the vicinity of Kula, a large Turkish village in Asia Minor, about eighty miles east of Smyrna. 1 This inference is based upon the fact that all of the other inscriptions known bearing the names of both Anaïtis and Mên Tiamu have been traced directly to Kula or vicinity, not to speak of the large number of stones inscribed with one or the other of these names, which with few exceptions are from this region. 2 If it were possible to identify the marble of this slab with that quarried between Ghielude and Sandal 3 (ancient Satala?), near Kula, this provenance would be established beyond a peradventure.

One is tempted to connect Kula with Κολόνη, of which mention is made in classical writers. But apart from the consideration that the name Κολόνη is given to several places in antiquity, Professor W. M. Ramsay has shown 4 not only that Kula does not occupy the site of

1 Interesting views of Kula are given by Texier, Description de l'Asie Mineure, I. pl. 50, p. 133, and by Hamilton, Asia Minor, Vol. II. p. 136. The volcanic cones, long extinct, that gave its character to the Catacecaumene, are prominent features of the landscape. Cf. Strabo, XIII. 4, 11, p. 628.

2 See p. 57, note 1, and pp. 72, 73.

3 About forty years ago Wagener saw and copied at Kula an inscription bearing the words Ἡ Κολοννῶν κατουλα, and dated A.D. 101. He published it in the Mémoires de l'Académie de Belgique, Mémoires couronnées XXX., it has also been published in part by Keil, Philologus, Suppl.-Bd. II. p. 607 ff., and, more correctly, by Tsakryoglu in the Μουσείον (1876, p. 41; read Δωρον Χ', not α'). The identification of Kula and Κολόνη is based mainly upon this inscription, and is accepted by Wagener, De Witte, Waddington, Foucart, Von Diest, and others. Tsakryoglu
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an ancient city, but also that the name 'Kula' is a Turkish word meaning 'fortress,' with merely an accidental resemblance to Κολή, and that it was only in comparatively late times applied to this town. There are, however, as the remains show, several ancient sites a few miles to the north, northwest, and northeast of Kula (notably Sandal), and from one of these sites our slab may well have found its way — probably through Kula — to Smyrna, and thence to the United States forty or fifty years ago, when American trade with the Levant was much brisker than it is now. For many years past marbles of various kinds have been brought in to Kula from the adjoining regions, and are thus registered by epigraphists as from Kula.

IV.

Our tablet raises a number of interesting problems, into the detailed discussion of which I will not enter, problems chiefly connected with the personality and cult of Artemis Anatiss and of Mên Tiamu. These very names, on a slab dedicated by Greeks and dated by a Roman date, bear witness to the composite character of the religion of eastern Lydia and western Phrygia in the second century of our era.

thinks that the Κολή here intended must have been on the site of Sandal, a town near Kula, and that the older name of Kula was Πόργος, or Πυργία, of which ‘Kula’ is presumably the Turkish translation. Professor Ramsay, however, has shown that the stone in question was brought to Kula (at least forty years ago), and not from Sandal, but from Injikler, a village in the mountainous Kara Taah district, eight hours north of Kula; accordingly he would place Κολή in these hills (Historical Geography of Asia Minor, pp. 123, 211, 432, 456; private letter to the writer); so also Kiepert in 1894 (Formae, etc., no. 10). — Perhaps this mountain town may have been a colony from the region of the λίμνη Κολή, near Sardis (Strabo, XIII. 4, 5, p. 625), taking thence its name. Though in inscriptions καρουλα often means 'town,' with no connotation of 'colony,' the latter sense is not always wanting; cf. also Strabo, V. 4, p. 249. — Mr. Hicks (Classical Review, III. 1889, p. 69) seems to identify Καρούλα and Kula, but strangely enough puts Kula north of Lake Coloe, more than thirty miles from its true position.

1 Arundell (Asia Minor, I. p. 42), visiting Kula more than sixty years ago, before the interest in inscribed stones had caused them to be carried much from place to place, remarks that there is nothing in Kula to suggest an ancient site.

2 On the Anaitis inscriptions, see above, p. 57, note 1. For a collection of the Mên Tiamu inscriptions, see pp. 71-3.
There appear to have been early worshipped in these regions a pair of mighty divinities of productive nature, originally perhaps of an agrarian character, a female and a male god, the female regularly taking precedence. The former appears in literature and on inscriptions under many names, of which Mæ was probably the native and most ancient name, which is regularly replaced by Μήτηρ (with or without θεός). The latter was probably once a solar divinity, though subsequently he was transformed into a lunar god: he appears to have been known most anciently by the native populations as Ma-n, or Maen, though he, like the Great Mother, had also several less precise appellations. It is possible that these two names in the

1 Professor W. M. Ramsay, than whom no one is better qualified, promises a chapter on Mén in his forthcoming Local History of Asia Minor, of which Vol. I. is now in press. To what he has already published on the subject of Anatolian religion and antiquities, in various archaeological journals and in his Historical Geography of Asia Minor, I owe the germ of some of the suggestions here offered, especially concerning the preeminence of Mén in Asia Minor. But for the argument on which this preeminence is based he must not be held responsible.

2 Some of the ancient names of the Great Mother are given by Strabo: Οὗ ἔρεως, Φρυγᾶς τῷ φόλας καὶ ἅλως αἱ Ἱεράς καὶ τὸν Τρόην ἀπελευθερώσαντες εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καταλύουσι τὴν ἁρμόνιον. Ἐπειδὴ μὲν καὶ αὐτὸν τιμῶσι, καὶ ὑπόδειχουσι ταύτην, μηδέρα καλοῦσι θεόν καὶ "Ἀγαθών καὶ Φρυγᾶς θεὸν μεγάλην, ἀνά δὲ τῶν τίτων Ἰδαία καὶ Διηθητήρα καὶ Σατυρήνας καὶ Παισερονηθῆς καὶ Κυβέλην." Strabo, X. 3. p. 469.

3 Stephanus Byz., i.e. Μάταπερα, asserts that among the Lydians Rhea was known as Mæ. Cf. also an inscription from Byzantium: "Αξενὼς Εὐαλλοῦς Μήτηρ θεόν Μαὶ Μουζῆς κατὰ εὐχὴν εὐχαριστήρια," cited by Foucart, Associations religieuses chez les Grecs, p. 88.

4 "La religion de la Mère des Dieux avait son centre dans la Phrygie à Pessinunte. Elle paraît à l'origine avoir consisté dans les rapports des deux personnages divins, l'un feminin appelé Mæ, d'où peut dériver le nom de Μήτηρ; l'autre, masculin, appelé très-anciennement Papas." Foucart, ibid. p. 88. — The evidence adduced for Papas as the ancient or native name of the male god is too slender to be convincing; Foucart cites an inscription of the Roman era (C.I.G. 3817), from northern Phrygia, which reads Παπᾶς Διὸς σωτῆρα εὐχὴν καὶ Ἡρακλῆς ἀνακυκλώσας. Cf. also Ramsay, Journ. Hellen. S., III. p. 124, V. pp. 257 ff. There is, besides, Arrian, Frag. 30 (ap. Eustath. II. B 408, p. 565): δικέφες έις τὰ λαρά τῶν δρόμων Βοιωνίων ἐλέειν Πάραν τὸν Δία καὶ Ἀττίν τὸν αὐτὸν, and Diodorus (III. 58. 4) cited below.

The antiquity of the name Ma-n, Maen, Mén, for this god is, however, well attested, as also its local use in Phrygia and Lydia. This attestation consists mainly in (1) the ancient local and legendary names Mánēs (Herodotus, I. 94), Mánis (Plutarch, Mor. 360), perhaps also Μήτηρ (from Mæ-w?), etc., which point
beginning were but variations (feminine and masculine) on the same stem. In due time, however, the native or popular conceptions of the deities fell under the influence of the religious traditions and beliefs of adjacent nations, especially of such peoples as came to

to a divinity, as Homeric Δαμφῖος points to Ζεύς; (2) the vast and early prevalence of proper names in Asia Minor based on the same stem; (3) the early use of Μαθηρίας, on which see p. 67, n. 1; (4) a large number of inscriptions, beginning with the fourth century B.C. and extending far into Christian times, where Μήν is honored, in many of which the Great Mother and Mēn are coupled as are no other two deities; (5) numerous coin types of a similar character; (6) and, finally, references in literature, to be sure for the most part of late date, to Μήν as the distinctive god of the Phrygians.

In Lucian, Iup. Trag. 42, we should probably read Φρέγεσ δέ Μήν [for Mss. Μήν]; sc. θεότης. Cf. ibid. 8.

In classical literature the divinity most commonly named, in the ancient Phrygian religion, in association with the Great Mother, was Attis, but Sabazius was also known as her son. The line, however, cannot be sharply drawn between the personalities of Mēn, Attis, and Sabazius. I am disposed to look upon each of them as originally only different and special aspects of the same divinity, though in later times they appear now and then to have assumed in the popular imagination independent existences; thus in Wagener's relief Mēn conducts a chariot in which Sabazius drives. (To Professor Ramsay's kindness I owe a drawing of this relief, not yet published so far as I know.) Proclus (ad Tim. IV. 251) distinctly tells us that Mēn was addressed as Sabazius in the most solemn ceremonials of the latter god; and on inscriptions (very late Roman) we find dedications to Attis Menotyrranus, where the identification is complete (Orelli-Henzen, Inscriptionum ... Collectio, nos. 1900, 1901, 2264, 2353). On certain coins Attis is represented with all the attributes of Mēn (and vice versa); e.g., coins of Pessinus, of Roman date; Head, Historia Numorum, p. 630; Guignault-Creuzer, Religions de l'Antiquité, II. 3. p. 951. On the imperial coins of the Carian Antioch we have in succession the head of Mēn; Attis standing; the god ΣΩΤΟΝ, a male figure holding a branch (the equivalent of Sabazius). Of course this does not prove identification, but it points to it. At the same time, one must be careful not to urge what may be examples of very late conscious syncretism as evidence for an original identity.

In the solar characteristics of Sabazius I see a survival of the more ancient conception of the god, which through contact with Greeks and by the singular etymological perversion suggested above, was radically changed.—The epithet μυκτόφωνες, as applied to Mēn (Sterrett, Papers of the American School at Athens, II. no. 64, p. 94), should not be pressed in support of this view.

Full of suggestion is Diodorus III. 58. 4: οἱ γὰρ τῆς θυρών μιθυλογεῖται τῷ παλαίτι γενόται Βασίλεια Φρύγιας καὶ Λυδίας Μήνας. τῇ μαρτα πέρι Διοδήμην γεννήσαι μὲν
reside among the primitive inhabitants: thus the female divinity now received, among other names, from the Persian colonists in Central and Upper Lydia, as from Persian rulers of a later date, that of the great Persian divinity Anahita. The Greeks, however, of the region thought of her sometimes as Artemis. Hence in later times, when devout persons of Greek descent residing in the Catacecaumene would worship the Great Goddess, they would often address her as Artemis Anaitis.

The name and character of the male god also underwent serious modification. The name Maen, early becoming Hellenized into the form Μή, was by popular etymology connected with μήν, μήνη, 'month,' 'moon,' and then fancy transformed a god who may have had solar attributes into a lunar divinity, and gave him, as appears in late art, appropriate symbols (the crescent behind the shoulders over against the radiating solar disk that characterized his double, Sabazius). In this new relation he gained wide popularity, and his cult spread into regions that previously had not known the Phrygian god. His vast significance is attested in many ways,

1 The towns slightly northward of Kula, which lay on the direct line of the ancient royal road to Persia, were a great seat of the Artemis-Anaitis-Mētēr worship. Cf. Ramsay, Historical Geography, pp. 30, 131; Journ. Hellen. S., IV, p. 385, III. p. 55. — Into the questions either of a possible ultimate Babylonian origin for Anaitis, or of Semitic admixtures in her cult at various places, I do not enter. For the literature, cf. Cumont, Wisowa-Faulby, I. p. 2020.

2 From the many passages I select only Pausanias III. 17, where we are told that the Lydians have the oldest statue of Artemis, worshipped by them, however, as Anaitis. At Philadelphia, and in Macedonia, she was known as Μήτηρ 'Andērēs, Bulletin de Corr. Hellénique, VIII. p. 376; below, p. 72, no. 6; above, p. 57, no. 13.

3 This etymological conception led the Romans of the Empire sometimes to translate Mēn by Lunus (Spartianus, Vit. Carac. 6, 7; cp. Chwolson, Stabier, I. pp. 399 ff.). But on some Latin inscriptions, cited above, p. 65, the stem Mēn is still used.

4 See Waddington-LeBas, Monuments Figurés, pl. 132, no. 2, and below, p. 72.

6 A glance into the index of Head's Historia Numorum (i. Mēn), gives one a good idea of the geographical range of the cult of the god, from Istrus and
A Votive Tablet.

some of which have been hinted at in a former note (p. 64, n. 4), but there are one or two aspects of his worship that are of special interest to the classical scholar. If our examination of the evidence is trustworthy, we must believe that, as far back as the earlier years of the fourth century B.C., the priest of Mên was a familiar figure in the streets of Athens, and had vividly impressed himself upon the popular imagination.¹

Panticapaeum on the western and northern shores of the Euxine to Laodiceia ad Libanum in Syria. — The prevalence of this cult in Thrace and in Thracian colonies is noteworthy as one of the many signs of the close connection between Thrace and Phrygia. Cf. Strabo, X. 3, 16, p. 471. On many Thracian coins and reliefs the god is represented on horseback, but he is similarly figured elsewhere.

¹ The oldest inscription known to me relating to Mên is that published by Foucart, Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, IV. p. 129 (Διονύσιος καὶ Βασίλεια τῶν Μην ἡ ίερὰ ἀγίον). It is from the Peiraëus, and is dated, epigraphically, the second half of the fourth century B.C. — Apart from the names of persons, the earliest form in which the word occurs in literature is in Μηναγόρης. This word is a title of a comedy by Menander, ll. 320 B.C. (Athen. XI. 472 b), and perhaps also of one by Antiphanes (so Bekk. Anecd. 88, 18; but Athen. XII. 553 c reads Μηναγόρης; cf. Kock, C.A.F. II. p. 74). From the presence of the related word Μηναγόρης (applied, for example, by Iphicrates to Callias: Aristot. Rhet. III. 2, 10) likewise occurring as the title of plays, the emendation of Μηναγόρης to Μηναγόρης, wherever in the manuscripts the former word is found, has often been proposed. But the word is guaranteed against such treatment by Hesychius's ὁ ἀνῶ τοῦ μηνᾶ συνάγων [which I would emend to ὁ ὑπ' ἑν τοῦ Μηνᾶ συνάγων, though ὁ ἐν τῷ Μην ἐστι is also possible; cf. Eustathius, Odys. p. 1824, μηναγόρης: τὸ . . . μετὰ τυμπάνων καὶ τιμων τοιούτων περιδειν καὶ ἐν τῇ Μηνῷ κύλειν τροφᾶς . . . ἐν τῷ τῷ Ρέι]. But for Eustathius one would be tempted to supply θεάων with συνάγων, comparing Dem. F. L. 281. The explanation of Suidas whereby ἀνῶ τοῦ μηνᾶ means 'to make,' is clearly a darkening of counsel, and Meineke's suggestion that the first element in μηναγόρης is Μῆν, 'the moon-goddess,' can hardly gain acceptance. Cf. also Clement of Alexandria, Protrept. II. p. 20, Potter; Dionysius Halic. Ant. II. 19, and Eusebius, Praep. Ev. II. 8.— The deportment of these ἁγόραι in public is described not only by Antiphanes in the fragment already cited, but also by many other writers, e.g., Plato, Resp. II. 364 b; Apuleius, Metam. 8. Cf. Foucart, Associations religieuses chez les Grecs, pp. 160 ff. The word ἁγόρης, Latin Ariolus, in turn gave its name to a comedy by Philemon in Greek, and to one in Latin by Naevius.— The existence of these two words side by side, Μηναγόρης and Μηναγόρης, in the popular speech of the Athenians in the fourth and third century B.C., is quite intelligible, if we regard them as calling up the two characteristic divinities of Phrygia in their itinerant and beggar priests,— the Great Mother and Mên. The strange Phrygian religion
The exact signification of the epithet Τάμων it is perhaps impossible to establish. Waddington, in his well-known note on Μέν (Waddington-LeBas, no. 668), approves the suggestion that would connect the word with some Lydian root, comparing other words of similar termination (e.g., Πράμος, Τευτάμος, Περγαμός). But is it hazardous to see in this word a local form of the great Babylonian (Semitic) divinity Tiāmat (Tiam-tu, Tham-te; cf. Hebrew שָׁם),

early impressed the imagination of the European Greeks: the erection of the Metroum in Athens in the fifth century, in expiation of the murder of a metragyretes (Suëd., s.v.), was a national recognition of its power; but yet deeper was the hold it took on the lower orders of society and on restless spirits, on the one hand giving rise to the formation of orgiastic thiasi, with their fanatical excesses, and, on the other, suggesting taking topics to the comic poets and to orators who often delighted in expressing themselves in broad comedy. Cf. Strabo, X. 19, p. 471, πολλά γὰρ τῶν ἑπεκέν ἱερῶν παρεδήλωσεν [the Athenians], ἵνα καὶ θεωμηθήσωσι· καὶ δή καὶ τὰ θρίαμβα καὶ τὰ φρύγια. The drastic passage in Demosthenes (Cor. 250) describes in caricature a thiasus in honor both of the Μήτηρ θῶν and her companion male divinity; the Scholiast distinctly informs us that the κόλ σώμα refers to Μέν Sabazius; though the δή δὴς immediately following properly refers to Attis, it here probably more specially connotes the Mother, and thus Strabo is right in saying that this scene contains Σαβάτα καὶ Μητύρα (X. 3. 18, p. 471). As the mother of Aeschines, a priestess and τυμαναστρα (Dem. Cor. 284), is here figured as a female Μήτηρ γόρτης, we may safely infer that Demosthenes would represent Aeschines himself as a Μήτηρ γόρτης, though of course in this tumultuous picture no attempt is made to keep the colors distinct.

1 On the Babylonian Creation Tablets the name of this being appears as Tiāmat. In Hebrew the form becomes שָׁם, usually rendered 'waters, deep, depths.' In Berossus, as corrected by Robertson Smith, the form שָׁם occurs, with בָּלכַסא as the Greek translation; Damascus, however, gives Tàiḥ— the transliteration of the same form in its variant Tiavat. Tiāmat, fem., is the "construct" of Tiavat (Tiamatu). Professor M. Jastrow, Jr., to whose kindness I owe some of the references to the literature of Tiāmat, given below, writes me: "As for the mythological conceptions associated with the Hebrew שָׁם, it is noticeable that it is never found in combination with the article, which is itself an indication that the consciousness of its being, or having been, a nomen proprium never died out. Again, such passages as Ezekiel xxxi. 15. Psalms xxxiii. 7, civ. 6, Proverbs iii. 20, and others, prove that the Hebrews connected with the word views of a different order from the ordinary sense of 'waters.' In the passages quoted שָׁם is the subterranean ocean that nourishes fountains and springs. It seems to me therefore that your identification receives added force from the mythological conceptions once connected with the Hebrew form, which warrant one in assuming a larger circle for the Tiamat conception than Babylonia. We may therefore expect some day to
A Votive Tablet.

69
demon of the subterranean waters (καταχθόνος)? Now it is well known that epithets of Semitic origin are actually applied here and there in Western Asia Minor to divinities locally worshipped under Greek names; and that as a rule each of these is the equivalent of some more familiar Greek word. Accordingly I would suggest that, in this inscription, Mên Tiamu is only another form of Μήν κατα-
χθόνος. Chthonic divinities are for the most part associated with fountains, i.e., with subterranean waters, and in especial with healing springs: the conception underlying the word Tiámat and its cognates is that of the vast world and underworld of waters, or of unorganized nature conceived as a watery abyss. As in Artemis Anáitis, Greek and Persian names—the latter colored by Semitic myth—had been used to give a proper shading or depth to the native conception of the Great Mother, what is more probable than that a name distinctly Semitic might have been used in designation of the male divinity, especially when viewed in an aspect permanently characteristic of the Semitic god? If we are right in our explanation of the occasion of the dedication of the relief,—the commemoration of the might of Artemis and Mên in bringing back a sick child from the confines of the lower world, or in suffering it

find Tîhâm (= Greek Tìmu) in a North Syrian inscription as the connecting link between the Babylonian and the Greek form."

The fact that in the literary documents Tiámat is made a female divinity is not a fatal objection to our identification. As the personification and presiding genius of as yet unorganized nature, ruling over beings with bisexual characters, this divinity might originally have been conceived as without sex. In fact, on the monuments Tiámat is often represented with the attributes of a male being.


1 Examples are [Μήν] Καμαμεθρη, on imperial coins from Nysa in Lydia, where the epithet is connected with Semitic (Arabic) Qamar, 'the moon' (Head, Historia Numorum, p. 552), and [Σενα] ΑΚΚΙΣ, on coins of Laodiceia ad Lycum in Phrygia, where Waddington and Longpérier, as Professor Ramsay reminds me, see in the epithet (= Φασανος) a Semitic stem, viz. that in the Arabic 'azīz, 'powerful': Head, ib. p. 566.
to return,—it must have been Mên of the lower world that was here addressed.¹ And, as already intimated, in the polyglot terminology² of the period of the Mên Tiamu inscriptions, and in the Catacecau-

¹ Most of the large number of epithets applied to Mên,—some of which are still unintelligible,—are geographical in character (Waddington-LeBas, no. 668). Among such as are not geographical may be cited γύραννος, πάτριος θεός, μακάμως, φωσφόρος, διος (?) κατακίττες.

² Professor G. F. Moore has called my attention to a curious bilingual inscription from Palmyra, which contains a name suggestive of Tiamu. He writes: "In Vogüé, Inscriptions sémitiques, no. 3 (cf. Mordtmann, Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenl. G. XXXI. 100), Mordtmann restored Ἡλίς [2], Gad Thaimi. The Greek runs καὶ θεὸς ἀναδιμαν [Μαλα]χῆθη καὶ Τῶχη θαμαῖος καὶ [Ἄτερ]γάτε. Gad Thaimi also occurs on a seal from Palmyra (Mordtmann, f.c.). An Old Testament scholar is reminded of Isaiah lxv. 11, where we read of lectisternia to Gad and Meni. (The latter name is guaranteed against Lagarde's conjecture Ἡλίς = Nanaea, by the play on the name in ὕππος at the beginning of the next verse.) Evidently Meni, though not elsewhere found, was a Semitic (Aramaean) god of fortune, and by the side of Gad Thaimi, a Μην Tāmūr might not seem inconceivable. We should, to be sure, not be much better off, for Thaimi is almost as obscure as Tāmūr. Nöldeke interpreted, 'the Tōχa of Thaimi'; Mordtmann at first, 'the Tōχa of the Thaimites'; afterwards he felt constrained by a series of proper names to take Thaimi as the name of a divinity (ib. XXXIX. 45 n.). But the Greek Θαμαῖος is quite regular, and seems to preclude a combination with Tāmūr. Mordtmann (ib. 44) combines, curiously at least, the Meni of Isaiah lxv. 11 with... Menique magister on an altar from Vaison in Provence (Orelli-Henzen, no. 5862 [unless Menis be a mistake for menis, possibly Menis magister = Menotyramus = Μης Τιμαρμος? read gaudebunt? J. H. W.]):

Belus Fortunae rector Menisique magister
ara gaudebit quam dedit et voluit.

The corresponding Greek inscription is:

Εὐθυνέῃ τόξεα Βῆλην Σελέως θέτο βασιλέ.
τῶν ἐν Ἀραμιτὶ μνημένου λογίων.

Though no one would venture to make Semitic Meni and Phrygian Mên identical in origin and nature, the resemblance between these two names would at least make easy, in regions where the two gods were known, the ascription to the latter of Semitic characters and epithets.

Perhaps an evidence of the fusion of Aramaean Meni and Phrygian Mên, at least in Ameria in Northern Asia Minor, may be seen in the language of Strabo XII. 3. 31, p. 557, where the implication is that, in the oath of the kings of Pontus, Μης Φαρδιὼν and τόξη βασιλέως are identical in meaning. Φαρδιὼν, though possibly originally referring to a divinity, must here be used as a generic name for
mene, Μήν κατεχόνος might well have been sometimes known and worshipped as Μήν Τάμων.¹

¹ ‘king’ (cf. Kaiser from Caesar): hence Μήν and Τάχυς were felt to be the same. But this could be only because Men, the Aramaean god, who was the god of fortune, or Τάχυς, had become identified in the popular mind with Men, whose encroachments subsequently almost completely obliterate Men as an independent divinity. — Other instances of the association of Τάχυς and Men appear on the coins of Antioch Pisidiae (Mionnet, Suppl. VII. p. 102, no. 81; Stephani, Comptes Rendus, 1861, p. 3), and of Laodicea ad Libanum (Eckhel, III. pp. 366 ff.; Head, Historia Numorum, p. 663).

¹ The identification of Tiamu with Thamut (Tham-te) appears to be asserted by a writer of the first century B.C., who was very familiar with Phrygian religious beliefs and customs. — Alexander Polyhistor. In a passage preserved to us in Syncellus, p. 52 (cf. Schöne, Euseb. Chron. I. 16), Polyhistor, quoting from Berosus, and interpolating explanatory remarks, informs his readers that according to Babylonian legends the demon of watery abyss, who was slain by Bel-[Marduk; ἄμφως = ὁ Μορδηκα], was called in Chaldean Θαμως, which [he tells us] in Greek translation is θάλασσα, and is equivalent to the moon [perhaps, ‘according to the Phrygians is the moon’]. This last sentence becomes at once intelligible, if we assume that he was thinking of Μήν = Τάμων as he wrote: — Σελήνη: Μήν (Μήν) = Τάμων: Θάμως. Cf. Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 1894–5, Philadelphia meeting, no. 22; also Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, X. 1 (1895), my note on “Homoroka a Corruption of Marduk.”

NOTE. — Mên Tiamu Inscriptions.

Below are collected all the inscriptions known to me that contain the name of Mên Tiamu. There seem to be no coin types with the legend ΜΗΝ ΤΙΑΜΟΤ.

— The Μουσείον καὶ Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς Σχολῆς at Smyrna, in which nos. 6 and 7 were first published, is designated by Μουσείον. Facsimiles of nos. 1, 2, 3, and 8 are given by Waddington-Le Bas; of nos. 5 and 6, by Leemans; of no. 4, in our PLATE II, opp. p. 55. — For the literature of the Anaïtis inscriptions, see above, p. 57, note 1.

1. Ἐρων;] ἄμφως! ... καὶ Μήνις Τάμων καὶ Μήνις Πετραίντον τοῦ [ἄνα]μα τοῦ Δώδουν; Ἰουλιανός, Δέμιας, Εὐεὐχήμων, Ἀρφιον Ἀρφιων, Πάνθος, Σκοντος, Πρωτήστος, Ἐρωμακράνη, Μητρόδωρος, Δέμιας, Ἀφριάς, Ἐρωμητής, Δέμιας, Μητρώφοις, Ἀγαλλίσσων, Ἡραίη, Ἐρωμητής, Ἀπολλόνων, Ἡμη, Ἐρωμητής, Αμων, Ἀμων, Δέμιας, Μητρώπος, Νεομηχαος, Πελα, Μάρκος, Τάχυς, Ἀνξορος, Μήνις, Σελτίσατος, Νευκλας, Ιουλια. — From Goerdias (Julia Gordus). Dated A.D. 163 (164)? Waddington-LeBas, no. 678.

Supply, after ἄμφως, κατὰ τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐκπαγήν, or words to the same effect (?).
2. 'Ιερά συμβολις καὶ στοάρα καὶ ἐπιτάγή τοῦ κυρίου τύραννου Δίως Μασπαλατηνοῦ, καὶ Μηνὶ Τίμαμος εὐχὴν ἵνα Σιλανδρίου Μενεκράτου, Μενεκράτη τίμωσιν, Μικράτατοι Διωώροι, Διωώρου Παινίου, Ἐρμογένθη Ἐρμίντου, Δούκιος Ὀρτούμ, Διωώρης Γλώσσαν, Διωῷτος Μείζων, Τρόφημαι Ἐρτίους, Ἀπελλώνιος (Ἀπελλώνιος), Ἀθανάσιος (Ἀθανάσιος), Μαρκάντος (Μαρκαντός), Μέναρδος Ἐρμινῆν, Ἐρμογένθης Πατιανᾶ, Μητρόδωρου Βικτώριαν, 'Ἀγκλεισίδης Μακρακόν, Ἀναλητής Διωώρου, Ἐρμογένθης Τροφίμον. [Ζ]άβης Ἐρμογένθης. Ἐπουμηλησμαῖρος Ἰουλιανοῦ καὶ Ἐρμογένθης, ἦτοι τοῖς μηνὶς Διωῴρου. — From Mennes, near Kula. Dated A.D. 171 (172). Stele representing Zeus aetoporous and Mēn standing erect, with tunic, chlamys, and Phrygian cap, crescent behind his shoulders, a pine-cone (?) in his left hand, spear in his right hand, his left foot on the head of a bull that lies on the ground. Waddington-Lebas, no. 667: Monuments Figurei, pl. 136, no. 2. C.I.G. 3438 (Boeckh).

3. Κατά τῆς τῶν θεῶν ἐπιτάγης ιεροῦ δομοῦ εὐχήν Διὸς Μασπαλατηνοῦ καὶ Μηνὶ Τίμαμος τυράννου τηρεῖται ἀπὸ ημῶν θ. αἱ τὰ τοιοῦτα ἀπειθεῖν ἀναγνωρίζεται τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ Δίως. Ἐπουμηλησμαῖρος Διωώρου Διωώρου καὶ Ἐρμογένθης Βαλερίου. ἦτοι τοῖς μηνὶς Διωώρου. — From Kula. Dated A.D. 172 (173). Stele with relief representing two busts, one with radiated head, the other with a crescent behind the shoulders. Waddington-Lebas, no. 665: Monuments Figurei, pl. 136, no. 1. C.I.G. 3439 (Boeckh).

4. Our inscription; see Plate II, and pp. 56 ff. Dated A.D. 196.

5. Θεός Ἀρείτες καὶ Μηνὶ Τίμαμος Μελήτης καὶ Γλώσσαν ἀνθίζον τὸ λεοντόλημα σχαραστώτες. ἦτοι τοῖς μηνὶς Σαλίκου. — From Kula. Dated A.D. 215 (216). Marble stele: woman draped, with right hand raised in adoration. Leemans, Verh. d. k. Amsterdam Akad. XVII. 1886 (1888), no. III; Contoleon, Athenische Mittheilungen, XII. 1887, p. 255; E. L. Hicks, Classical Review, III. 1889, p. 69. This inscription has ΕΤΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΣΑΝΔΙΚΟΤ. Perhaps we should read ΤΗΣ ΜΗΝΙΟΝ (Mηνιον) Σαλίκου = A.D. 255 (256), on the supposition that the sign for μηνιος has been omitted. — Leemans’s Μεστάμων is a misreading of ΜΗΝΙΑΜΟΤ. Cf. above, p. 58; also p. 59.

6. Θεός Ἀρείτες καὶ Μηνὶ Τίμαμος Τόρχη καὶ Σωκράτη καὶ 'Αμμιάος καὶ Τρόφημος καὶ 'Αμμιάος καὶ Φιλητή καὶ Σωκράτη καὶ 'Αμμιάος θυάτερα τὸ λεοντόλημα σχαραστώτες. ἦτοι τοῖς τοῖς μηνὶς Σαλίκου. — From near Kula. Dated A.D. 236 (237). Relief representing two breasts, two legs, and two eyes. Tsakryoglous in Mauévi, V. 1884–5, p. 54 (Reinach, Chroniques d‘Orient, 1886, p. 155); Leemans, ib. no. IV.


Perhaps we should add, at least for comparison:

8. Βικτώριας Μέσκος καὶ ἐπιτάγη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπερὶ τῆς σωτηρίας Δικοῖ Τιμίων ἀνθίζοντες, ἦτοι τοῖς τοῖς μηνὶς Ἀρείτες [Mηνὶς] θυάτερα τὴν εἰλοκυρίαν [ἐνέδραν]. — From Mennes (near Kula). Dated 177 A.D. Waddington-Lebas, no. 669. If we regard the Δικοῖ Τιμίων as an attempt to render Μηνὶς Τίμαμος into Greek words more intelligible to a Roman, the inscription
might be grouped with those relating to Μήν Τάμων. Of course, Τμαλψ is not a translation of Τάμων, though it may here be a popular etymology for it. The phrase καὶ έτερα γερά is very common in the Mên inscriptions. Cf. Zéls Σάβατος in Wagener's inscription, cited above, p. 62, note 4: Foucart, Associations religieuses chez les Grecs, p. 71.

In Waddington-LeBas, no. 675 (from Kula, without date), I suggest Μ[ην] δείψ for Waddington's δείψ. (Cf. ib. no. 1670, [θ]είψ δείψ καὶ δείψ.) The names of the dedicators of this slab, Manes and Banes, are noteworthy.

POSTSCRIPT.

The preceding pages were put into type in August, 1894, and went to the printer to be electrotyped in May, 1895. Hence it has been impossible, in the revision of the sheets, for me to make use of Professor Ramsay's Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia (Vol. I, Lycos Valley), the work referred to as in press on page 64 above, and issued only a few months ago. When Professor Ramsay was in the United States, in the autumn of 1894, he was good enough to glance over the first proof-sheets, and made many useful suggestions; hence his remarks, on p. 340, on my identification of Tiamu, and his criticism of the same. I trust that in its present more matured form my argument may commend itself to him.

In the Lycos Valley many topics, here only briefly adverted to, are fully and luminously discussed, with much fresh evidence: e.g., the ancient religion and divinities of Asia Minor, pp. 7 ff., 87, 105, 132 ff., 145, 169 ff., 262 ff., 271, 273, 292 ff.; Sabazius, Sozon, etc., pp. 140, 262 ff., 293 ff.; the Sullan era, pp. 201 ff. (which Professor Ramsay would now begin August 1, 85 B.C., and not July 1), etc., etc. Professor Ramsay emphasizes the difference between the earliest religious stratum in Asia Minor, based upon a matriarchal social system, and that introduced by the conquering Phrygians, probably immigrant from Europe, where the male element is dominant. It should be borne in mind that in this article the word 'Phrygian' has not been used in an ethnographical but only in a geographical sense, to designate not alone the oldest inhabitants but also the same as they
appear in history amalgamated with the Phrygians proper, and dominating in no small measure the religion and mythology of their conquerors.

While a few minor statements would have been modified and many important references to authorities, literary and epigraphic, would have been added had the _Lycos Valley_ reached me in season, on the whole the main contentions of this article remain unaffected by it. Professor Ramsay, on p. 132, says: "These facts prove that the name Attes belongs to an older status of religious history than Men, . . . and history confirms the inference that Kybele and Attes were the ancient Phrygian names for the Mother and the Son." Certainly Attes is a more ancient word than _Mηυ_ in the Grecised form, though not necessarily more ancient than Maen (see above, p. 64; also _Lycos Valley_, p. 169). In spite of the testimony of Arnobius V, 6, to the effect that Attis is connected with Attagus, the Phrygian word meaning 'goat,' cited by Professor Ramsay p. 350, there seems much in favor of the view of Eduard Meyer that the name and myth of Attis is a Semitic importation, detachable from the circle of myths relating to the Mother, and hence later than the original native religion; see _Geschichte des Alterthums_, I, p. 308.

December, 1895.
THE DATE OF LYCOPHRON.

By William N. Bates.

The date of the poet Lycophron has never been satisfactorily settled. Writers on the history of Greek literature have been much at variance as to the period in which he lived. Some have thought that he flourished in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 B.C.), others in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes (247–221 B.C.), others again have been satisfied with saying that he flourished about the middle of the third century. The reason for this divergence of opinion is apparent as soon as one looks at the evidence upon which our knowledge of Lycophron rests. The writers who make him flourish in the time of Philadelphus, base their statement upon the scraps of information which the scholiasts and lexicographers have handed down about him; while those who make him flourish in the time of Euergetes throw aside the testimony of the scholiasts and rely upon a passage in the Alexandra to show that he flourished at this later date. The passage in question (lines 1226–1280) is a prediction of the coming greatness of Rome, and these writers argue in a seemingly plausible manner that Lycophron could not well have written such a passage before the first Punic war. The other writers, who say that he flourished about the middle of the third century, are simply trying to reconcile these conflicting statements.

This was the state of the case when in 1883 Wilamowitz undertook to settle the date of the composition of the Alexandra. He showed that the latest event mentioned in the poem is the murder of Heracles, the seventeen-year-old son of Alexander the Great, in

---

1 Lines 1446–1450 were also appealed to as evidence, in spite of their enigmatical character. For a possible explanation of the references in these lines, see Wilamowitz, De Lycoph. Alex., p. 8 f.
the year 309. The part which Cassander had in this murder and in the previous murders of Olympias, Alexander's mother, and of Roxana and her child is nowhere alluded to. Wilamowitz argued from this that the Alexandra was written while Cassander or his sons were in power, that is between 309 and 287. He showed furthermore that Lycophron had part of Timaeus' history before him when he wrote the Alexandra, and Timaeus did not begin his work until 310. Hence he argued that it is more likely that the Alexandra was written between 300 and 290 than between 309 and 300. Wilamowitz also showed that the Alexandra was imitated by Dosiades in his Boumós and hence was written before that poem, which he supposed to have been composed between 285 and 270. Sussemlh in his Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit shows that the Altar of Dosiades was probably written about 292–290 and hence the Alexandra, which preceded it, was probably written about the year 295. Sussemlh argues furthermore that the Alexandra is the work of a young man, and assuming that Lycophron was thirty or thirty-five years old when he wrote it, he concludes that he must have been born between 330 and 325.

Such is the present state of our knowledge as to the date of Lycophron. The most important point which has been gained is the fact that the Alexandra was written about 295. With this point settled, the passage in the Alexandra relating to Rome can have no bearing on the date of the poet and may consequently be disregarded.

Additional evidence, however, can be presented which will establish with much more accuracy the date of the poet.

The general period in which Lycophron lived is stated clearly by Tzetzes in his life of Lycophron,8 where he mentions him as the contemporary of Ptolemy Philadelphus. This statement is repeated in an ancient scholium on line 1226 of the Alexandra,4 and is inferred also from the statement of an anonymous writer on comedy published

---

1 Line 801.
4 Lycophr., ed. Kinkel, p. 179.
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by Cramer,¹ and from a fragment of Tzetzes published by Ritschl.² But we have more precise information than this. Tzetzes in the fragment just mentioned informs us that Alexander the Aetolian, Lycophron of Chalcis, and Zenodotus of Ephesus were hired by Ptolemy Philadelphus at the royal expense, the first to arrange the tragedies, Lycophron the comedies, and Zenodotus the Homeric poems and the works of other poets which had been collected at Alexandria.³ This statement is repeated in substantially the same form in the anonymous writer on comedy and in the scholium Plautinum.⁴ These passages make it clear that the books which Lycophron, Alexander and Zenodotus were employed to put in order were those which Philadelphus and his father had collected and which formed the beginning of the Alexandrian library. This collecting of books had been going on for some years, and authorities agree that the books were brought together as a library at the very beginning of the reign of Philadelphus, that is between the years 285 and 283, when Philadelphus was king and Ptolemy Soter and Demetrius of Phalerum were still alive. The work of arranging the books must have been done before the library could be of use to any one. That is to say, this work must have been begun by 283 at latest. Moreover, as Tzetzes informs us that Philadelphus hired the men at royal expense, he must have done so after 285, when he became king. Consequently Zenodotus, Lycophron and Alexander must have begun their work of arranging the books during the years 285–283, or perhaps during the year 285–284.

This conclusion accepted, we have a definite point to start from in determining the date of Lycophron, for the dates of his two associates in the work can be estimated with some degree of exactness, and we should not expect Lycophron’s age to differ greatly from the ages of the other two. Zenodotus held the most important position

¹ Anecdot. Paris., Vol. I. p. 6. Perhaps this is to be ascribed to Tzetzes.
² Opusc., Vol. I. p. 206. See also p. 199.
³ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Λιτωνὸς καὶ Λυκόφρων ὁ Χαλκίδης, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ζηνόδωτος ὁ Ἐφέσιος τῷ Φίλαδελφῳ Πτολεμαίῳ συνεργότατες βασιλεώς, ὁ μὲν τὰς τῆς τραγῳδίας, Λυκόφρων δὲ τὰς τῆς κυμαθίας θηρίων διώρθωσεν, Ζηνόδωτος δὲ τὰς Ὀμηρίου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τοιησῶν κτλ.
⁴ Ritschl, Opusc., Vol. I. p. 5.
of the three; he had charge of all except the dramatic poetry, and was afterwards librarian. We should naturally expect him therefore to be older than Lycophron and Alexander. Now Zenodotus according to Couat⁠¹ was born between 324 and 320, and Alexander⁠² about 320; Susemihl⁠³ gives the dates as about 325 and 315 respectively. Consequently if Lycophron was younger than Zenodotus, he must have been born after 325, but on the other hand, as he wrote the Alexandria about 295, he can hardly have been born as late as 315. His birth-year was probably not far from 320.

This date is in a measure confirmed by an additional fact which has been handed down about Lycophron, namely that he was a member of the Alexandrian Pleiad. This Pleiad, as we are informed in a scholium to Hephaestion,⁴ consisted of seven tragic poets who all flourished at the same time in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Their names are given by several authorities, but with some variation. Lycophron is named as a member by all the authorities, and there is sufficient evidence for determining the other six members with considerable certainty.⁵ About the dates of two of the mem-

---

¹ Histoire de la Poésie Alexandrine sous les trois premiers Ptolémées, p. 57.
² Ibid., p. 105.
⁵ The lists are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. p. 57, 10</td>
<td>I. p. 109</td>
<td>I. p. 109, codex S.</td>
<td>Homerus</td>
<td>Homerus, Theocritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homerus</td>
<td>Homerus</td>
<td>Homerus</td>
<td>Homerus</td>
<td>Theocritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sositheus</td>
<td>Sositheus</td>
<td>Sositheus</td>
<td>Sositheus</td>
<td>Aratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycophron</td>
<td>Lycophron</td>
<td>Lycophron</td>
<td>Lycophron</td>
<td>Nicander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Aeantides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philiscus</td>
<td>Aeantides</td>
<td>Dionysiades</td>
<td>Philiscus</td>
<td>Philiscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysiades</td>
<td>Sosiphanes</td>
<td>Euphronius</td>
<td>Sosiphanes</td>
<td>Homerus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeantides</td>
<td>Philiscus</td>
<td>Philiscus</td>
<td>Dionysiades</td>
<td>Lycophron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noticed that all five authorities agree on Homer, Lycophron, and Philiscus; four agree about the names of Alexander and Sositheus, and Alexander is still further confirmed by Eudocia, Viol., p. 62. Dionysiades is named in three of the lists, and likewise has the testimony of Strabo, p. 675 (Meineke, p. 941, § 15). This makes six of the members of the Pleiad about whom there can be no doubt. About the seventh member, however, authorities disagree. Aeantides has three authorities in his favor; Sosiphanes, two; while Euphronius, Theocritus, Aratus,
bers, namely of Aeantides and Dionysiades, nothing definite is known; but the other four (i.e. omitting Lycophron) can all be shown to have flourished in the 124th olympiad, that is 285–281 B.C.¹ I have already shown that Lycophron was engaged in work in the Alexandrian library in the year 285–284. How long he was occu-

and Nicander have each one. The last three authors, however, were not tragic poets, and their names may consequently be disregarded. Likewise Euphorion; for the only ground for believing that he wrote tragedy is the finding of his name in the scholiast mentioned above. In favor of Sosiphanes we have the statements of Suidas and one of the scholia to Hespenaion. But Suidas tells us (i.e. Σωτήρος) that this poet lived in the time of Philip of Macedon or of Alexander the Great, and furthermore that he died either in the 111th or 114th olympiad. In other words, Sosiphanes died about forty years before the other members of the Pleiad are said to have flourished. Consequently Sosiphanes cannot have been a member of the Pleiad, and the seventh member must therefore have been Aeantides, who has the evidence of three passages in his favor. We must conclude, therefore, that the tragic Pleiad consisted of the following seven writers: Homer, Lycophron, Philiscus, Alexander, Sositheus, Dionysiades, and Aeantides, which is the list of members given by the scholium to Hespenaion, Vol. I. p. 57, 10.

¹ For Homer, see Suidas, i.e. 'Ομήρος: Όμηρος γραμματικός καὶ τραγῳδοὺς ταινιοῦ, διὸ συνηγμαθη τοῦ ἐκτά οἱ τὰ δευτερὰ τῶν τραγῳδῶν έχουσι καὶ ἐκλέχθεσαν τη την Πλειάδος. ἤκμαζεν θυματικὰ ἐπὶ. Of Sositheus, Suidas says, i.e. Σωτήρος: Σωτήρος . . . τῶν την Πλειάδος ἐστὶ, ἀνταγωνιζόμενος Ὁμηροῦ τοῦ τραγῳδοῦ . . . ἀκμαίας κατὰ την ρήμα θυματικά. Alexander Aetolus, as has been said, seems to have been born about 320–315, and in the year 285–284 to have been engaged in arranging the tragedies for the Alexandrian library. In 276 he was with Aratus and Antagoras of Rhodes at the court of Antigonon Gonatas, where he stood in high favor (see Vita I. of Aratus in Westermann, Ἱβερά, p. 54, and cf. Droysen, Hellen., Vol. III. p. 197). Thus we can safely say that Alexander flourished as one of the Pleiad at the end of the 124th olympiad. Philiscus, the fourth member whose date we can fix, is described by Suidas (i.e. Φιλίσκος) as τραγῳδὸς καὶ λεπεῖς τοῦ Διακόνου ἐστί τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου Πεπεραμένου γεγονός . . . καὶ τῆς θυματίας τάξεως τῶν τραγῳδῶν οὔτε ἔσσει τῆς καὶ ἐκλέχθεσαν Πλειάδος, κτλ.; and Callixenes, quoted by Athenaeus (V. p. 198 c), says, in describing as an eye-witness the great procession which took place when Philadelphus was crowned king in 285: . . . μεθ’ ὧν ἐπορεύομαι ὁ ταινιης, λεπεῖς ἐν Διακόνου καὶ πάντες οἱ τοῖς Διάκόνου τεχνίται. That is, Philiscus enjoyed a reputation as a poet in the year 285, or, in other words, may be said to have flourished in the 124th olympiad. Thus Homer, Sositheus, Alexander, and Philiscus are all shown to have flourished at the same time, as in fact we infer from the scholium to Hespenaion (I. p. 57, 10), and that time was the 124th olympiad, or 285–281 B.C.
pied in this work cannot of course be known, but it must have taken considerable time. Moreover we are informed that he wrote a work on comedy in at least nine books,¹ which it seems likely was the result of his labors in the library. If, then, Lycophron flourished as a tragic poet with the other members of the Pleiad he must have done so towards the end of the 124th olympiad or about the year 281. Therefore if Lycophron was born at the date I have already shown, he must have been about forty years old when he began to flourish as a tragic poet; and this is certainly an age at which a literary man might very naturally be said to flourish.

As to the extent of Lycophron’s literary career we have no certain evidence. We are told by Tzetzes that he wrote sixty-four or forty-six tragedies, and Suidas gives us the names of twenty of them. These titles when added to his other works seem to imply a literary career of some length. How long he lived is not known. His death is mentioned in but one place, namely in Ovid’s Ibis, where the poet says,²

Utque cothurnatum perisse Lycophrona narrat
Haereat in fibris fixa sagitta tuuis.

This leads us to infer that Lycophron was killed by an arrow while engaged in some scenic representation. There are three scholia on the passage, but none of them appears to be ancient, and all simply confirm the words of the text without adding anything essential.

At first sight this seems to be all that can be gathered about the death of Lycophron; but after examining the Ibis carefully I think we have good grounds for believing that Ovid took this allusion to Lycophron’s death from the Ibis of Callimachus. For in the first place Ovid himself says that he is imitating that poem.³ How

¹ Ἀθ. XI. p. 485 d.
² Lines 531, 532.
³ Lines 55-60:

Nunc quo Battiales inimicum devovet Ibin,
Hoc ego devoveo teque tuoque modo.
Utque ille, historiis involvam carmina caece:
Non soleam quamvis hoc genus ipse sequi.
Illius ambages imitatius in Ibide dicar
Oblitus moris iudiciumque mei.
closely he did this cannot of course be known, for no vestige of this latter work is extant; but the scholiast on lines 315–316 gives what purports to be a metrical translation of two lines from the Ibis of Callimachus which are very similar to the two lines of Ovid.\textsuperscript{1} If this scholium could be relied upon, we should have good grounds for believing that the imitation was a close one.\textsuperscript{2} A second point is that in mentioning the death of Lycophron Ovid uses the words ‘utque narrant’ implying that he is quoting. Again, Lycophron was hardly known to the Romans—in fact he is mentioned but once again in all Latin literature—and it is hard to see why Ovid should have introduced his name here if it had not been suggested to him by finding it in the work he was imitating. For surely Lycophron’s death was much less terrible than many of the other misfortunes which he invokes upon the head of his enemy. Again, the enemy against whom Callimachus wrote his Ibis was Apollonius Rhodius, a poet like Lycophron; and hence Callimachus might very fitly hold up the death of Lycophron as an example of what his fate might be. On the other hand Ellis has shown\textsuperscript{3} that the enemy whom Ovid attacks was not a poet or literary man, but rather an informer. Thus Ovid can have had no particular reason for mentioning Lycophron’s fate unless he was repeating something which he found in Callimachus. In view of these facts, although of course in a case like this certainty is impossible, I think we are justified in assuming

\textsuperscript{1} Ovid’s lines are (315, 316):

\begin{quote}
Utque necatorum Darei fraude secundi  
Sic tua subsidens devoret ora clinia.
\end{quote}

While the so-called lines of Callimachus run:

\begin{quote}
Sic tu deperea sicut periere secundus  
Quos Dareus multo proruerat cinere.
\end{quote}

(\textit{secundus} \ldots proruerat, G.; \textit{secundus} \ldots obruerat, C. et \textit{Ask.})

Ellis, in his commentary to this passage in his edition of the Ibis (p. 58), says:

“\textit{Notabilis haec mentio Ibatis Callimacheae, nec video cur non genuina habenda sit}.”

\textsuperscript{2} For a discussion of the Ibis of Callimachus, see Riese in \textit{Jahr. für Phil.}, Vol. CIX. (1874), pp. 377–381, where Schneider’s theory that the Ibis was an epigram is completely refuted. Riese’s opinion is approved by Susemihl, \textit{Gesch. Gr. Lit.}, Vol. I. p. 351, n. 19, and by other scholars.

\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Proleg. to the Ibis}, p. xxii. fol.
that Ovid took the allusion to Lycophron's death from the Ibis of Callimachus.

If this is granted, an approximate date can be established for the death of Lycophron: for Lycophron must have died before the Ibis of Callimachus was written. Now it is agreed that this poem was written about two years before the hymn to Apollo, which Richter and Conant think was composed in 248. Susemihl says it was written either in this year or in 263, and argues in defence of the latter date. If, then, the hymn to Apollo was written in 248, the Ibis must have been written about 250, before which time Lycophron must have died: or if we accept the date preferred by Susemihl, which certainly seems reasonable, Lycophron must have been dead by 265. But he cannot have died very long before this date: for if he wrote the greater part of his tragedies after he left the Alexandrian library, as is probable, the time necessary for their composition obliges us to suppose that he lived until very nearly the year in question.

To resume briefly, the life of Lycophron was about as follows. He was born between 325 and 320, wrote his Alexandra about 295, was appointed to arrange the comedies in the Alexandrian library in 285-284: about 280 he was flourishing as a tragic poet, and continued as such down to the time of his death, which must have occurred before the year 250, and probably shortly before the year 265.

---

2 Kallimachos. Hymn., p. 6 and fol.
3 La Poëte Alexand., pp. 229-235.
QUO MODO *iaciendi* VERBI COMPOSITA IN PRAESENTIBUS TEMPORIBUS ENUNTIAVERINT ANTIQUI ET SCRIPSERINT

**QUÆRIT**

MAURICIUS W. MATHER.

I. Praefatio.

CUM has *iaciendi* verbi praesentis formas quae praepositionibus subiunguntur pertractaverint viri doctissimi haud ita pauci, quorum in primis Wagnerum, Lachmannum, Corsenenum, Guil. Schmitzium, L. Müllerum honoris causa volo nominatos, adhuc tamen non fuit, qui omnibus inscriptionibus perscrutandis atque quem ad modum poetae Latini ab illius Livi Andronicici temporibus usque ad extremum alterum saeculum p. Chr. n. haec verba composita ad versus accommodaverint quaerendo huius rei scrupulos dubitationesque multas tollere conatus sit. Mihi igitur in mente est, quae ex his fontibus duobus magna cum cura laboreque exempla derivavi, ea ita ordinata in extremo opusculo\(^1\) enumerare, ut omnibus appareat quae testimonia sint antiqua ad hanc rem pertinentia, atque ut sit facultas iudicandis verumne ipse ego in meo commentariolo investigaverim.

Soluta praeterea oratione scripti codices non nulli adhibiti, qui temporibus octavo saeculo p. Chr. n. superioribus exarati sunt, aliquid ad existimandum, quo modo haec verba scripsissent antiqui, obtulerunt. Post decimum autem saeculum qui scripti sunt libri minus, ut fit, proficiunt hac in quaestionis; in his quoque saepenuero, præcipue renascentium litterarum temporibus, perversam per duas \(i\) litteras rationem videmus scribendi, quae non solum in quibusdam poetarum locis numeros laedit,\(^2\) verum etiam perpaucis in antiquio-

---

2. Cf. ind. Plaut. b, pro *coniicitis*, *coniiciam* habet *F coniciitis*, *coniiciam*; Moret. a, pro *dicit* habent H e *adiciit*; Mart., pro *dicit* habent b φ *adiicit*. 
ribus libris, in eisque admodum raro, occurrit, numquam autem in
titulis. Atqui huius ipsius rationis auctores sunt grammatici Latini.
Unde patet eos, cum non nihil prosint nobis quaerentibus, tamen
praecpta scribendi non tam ex consuetudine haussisse quam ex
similitudine; atque ideo iis quae docent necesse est ne nimis
credamus cavere.

In editionibus auctorum Latinorum usque a tempore, quo formis
describi coepti sunt libri Latini, ad medium huius saeculi iaciendi
verbi praesentis formas quae cum praepositionibus coniunguntur
duplicata i paene constanter scriptas legimus, velut abicit, deicit et
similia. Solae excipiuntur figurae in quibus e numerorum ratione
primam appareat syllabam aut corripi aut per diphthongum, quem
dicunt, cum ineunte i coalescere, ut in Iuv. 15, 17:

Hunc abicit, saeva dignum veraque Charybdì,
et in Verg. E. 3. 96:—

Tityre, pascentes a flumine réce capellas.

Wagner primus, quod sciam, in editione Vergili carminum ad
pristinam orthographiam revocatorum a. 1841 in lucem edita illum
geminationem reiecit. Qua de re conferas illius operis p. 445.
Cum autem unam i litteram ab antiquis scriptam putaret, duas
tamen esse auditas adnotavit ad A. 12. 308, ubi dixit disicet verbum
esse scriptum sed disicet auditum. Etiam scriptas esse duas i
litteras arbitratus Ritschel, vir doctissimus, verbum obiciunt et aetate
et integritate par esse illis plurimus, universi, sequuntur vocabulis
iudicavit in Proleg. Trin., 1848, p. 92. Brambach quoque in libro
de Latine scribendi ratione, quem Die Neugestaltung der Lateini-
ischen Orthographie inscriptum a. 1868 edidit, quamquam unam i
imperi aetate plerumque scriptam fatetur (p. 201, vs. 5), tamen cum
vocali syllaba praefixa exiret, propter illum pleniorem sonum i litterae
vocalibus interpositae duplicem i tantum non semper scriptam existi-
mavit (vs. 19). Atque post consonante exuentes praepositiones
esse auditam i consonantem demonstrare adfirmat exempla a Gellio
(4. 17) prolata, quorum prima syllaba positione produceatur (vs. 11),
atque hanc i consonantem scribi quoque iubere ipsum Gellium et
Priscianum (vs. 24). Itaque qui lingua Latina hodie utuntur, eos
Iaciendi Verbi Composita.

iubet post vocalis duplicem i, post consonantes vel duplicem ponere vel simplicem (p. 202, vs. 7: "Es lässt sich demnach für unsere Orthographie die Regel aufstellen, dass nach vocalisch auslautenden Präpositionen das doppelte I zu schreiben sei; nach consonantisch auslautenden Präpositionen ist sowohl doppeltes als einfaches I gestattet, jenes nach der Theorie, dieses nach der vorherrschenden Praxis"). In libro autem qui inscribitur Hülfsbüchlein für Lateinische Rechtschreibung a. 1872 in lucem emisso, § 20, II, unam i scribendam dicit et post vocalem et post consonantem.


Lexicis porro Latinis non semper possimus credere: quorum quod praecipuum in nostra patria tenet locum, illud dico quod a Lewis et Short recognitum Harper's Latin Dictionary inscribitur, et illud minus a Lewis solo a. 1890 editum, quod inscribuitus Elementary Latin Dictionary, inducent formas vel simplici vel duplici i littera scriptas, sed quam inconstantri consilio rationeque perspicui potest animadversis his exemplis: —

L. et S. s.v. abicio, \\textit{abicio} or \\textit{abyicio} (in the best MSS. abicio).
Lewis s.v. abicio, \textit{abicio} (a usu. long by position) or \textit{abicio}.
L. et S. s.v. eicio, \textit{eicio} (or \textit{ejicio}).
Lewis s.v. eicio, \textit{eicio} (pronounced, but not written, \textit{e-iicio}).
L. et S. s.v. subicio, \textit{sabicio} (less correctly \textit{subjicio}: post-Aug. sometimes \textit{sab-}).
Lewis s.v. subicio, \textit{subicio} (the first syl. usu. long by position; often pronounced and sometimes written subicio).
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His variis opinionibus doctorum nostrae aetatis virorum quadam in praefatione praepositis, iam demum veterum testimonia de hac re eo pergamus consilio inspicere, ut primum ea verba tractemus quorum praefixae syllabae consonante cadant, deinde postea quorum vocali.

II. IACIENDI VERBI COMPOSITA QUORUM PRIOR PARS CONSONANTE CADIT.

Modum volgarem haec iaciendi composita in praesentibus temporibus dicendi quorum praepositiones consonante finiuntur temporum cursu se immutasse testimonia sunt poetae. Omnia enim formarum apud poetas repartarum qui ante Augusti obitum scripserunt, praeter solas quattuor apud Plautum et Naevium, produci primam syllabam vel licet vel necesse est. Nam cum maior pars eorum quae sunt exempla apud scaenicos poetas praepositionis mensuram non prae se fert; non desunt tamen quae productionem sine ullo dubio ostendunt; atque quae in herois quidem reperiuntur, illa omnia producenda sunt.

Sed post Augustum mortuum, vel adeo fortasse paulo ante, alia consuetudo orta est, qua illa mensura, quam Plautum et Naevium quater certe adhibuisse diximus, volgaris est facta. Cf. Moret. 96:—

Spargit humi atque subicit . . .

German. 196:—

Qualis ferratos subicit . . .

Conferas porro infra, p. 145 sqq., si libet, ut usum perspiciis reliquorum. Hanc tamen correetionem, quamvis plerumque acceptam, omnino vitaverunt Valerius Flaccus et Serenus Sammonicus, semel adsumpsit Statius; neque productionem plane excluderunt alii. In sermone autem constanter correetas esse has praefixas syllabas con-

---

1 Cf. ind. Plaut. b; etiam p. 99.
2 Cf. ind. Rell. b.
3 Cf. ind. Plaut. c; Ter. b; Rell. c.
4 Cf. ind. Plaut. a; Ter. a; Rell. a.
5 Cf. ind. Enn. a.
6 Cf. ind. Val. a.
7 Cf. ind. p. 151; cf. etiam Ausonium, ib.
Mauricius W. Mather.

sonante exeuntes secundo saltem saeculo\(^1\) dilucide docet Auli Gelli narratio in 4. 17, cum dicit plerisque, ut apud veteres poetas ratio-

em numeri servarent, vocalem praepositionis produxisse. Quarto quoque saeculo correctionem testatur Marius Victorinus, quem in

optinorum numero grammaticorum esse ducendum existimavit Ritschl

in Museo Rhenano XIV (a. 1859), p. 302. Conferas illum locum

(K. VI. 67. 17) quo dicit versum Vergilianum (A. 11. 354) qui incipit

a verbis *Adiciae nec te δισφαλον esse*, veluti capite imminuto.

Quo modo igitur haec commutata ratio intelligi possit, qua, cum

primo produxissent praefixam consonante finitam syllabam, deinde

corripiebant, nunc tandem consideremus. Si unam \(i\) litteram scribe-

bant, nullum obicit scrupulum haec contractio, sed quem tum fuisse

modum et scribendi et dicendi arbitremur cum poetae productis

uterentur praefixis syllabis?

Principio igitur grammaticorum, ut par est, videamus testimonia.

Apud Quintilianum sunt haec verba (1. 4. 11): “littera \(i\) sibi insidiat; *conicis* enim est ab illo *iacit.*” Gellius haec dicit (4. 17.

6 sqq.): “Sed neque *ob* neque *sub* praeposito producendi habet

naturam, neque item *con*, nisi cum eam litterae secuntur, quae in

verbis *constituit* et *confecit* secundum eam primae sunt, vel cum

eliditur ex ea *n* littera, sicut Sallustius: *faceribus*, inquit, *copertus.*

In his autem, quae supra posui, et metrum esse integrum potest et

praepositiones istae possunt non barbare protendi; secunda enim

littera in his verbis per duo \(i\), non per unum scribenda est. Nam

verbum ipsum, cui supra dictae particulae praepositae sunt, non est

icio sed *iacio*, et praeteritum non *ici* facit, sed *iacit.* Id ubi com-

positum est, \(a\) littera in \(i\) mutatur, sicuti fit in verbis *insilio et incipio,*

atque ita vim consonantis capit, et idcirco ea syllaba productus

latiusque paulo pronuntiata priorem syllabam brevem esse non

patitur, sed reddit eam positu longam, proptereaque et numerus in

versu et ratio in pronuntiato manet. Haec, quae diximus, eo etiam

conducunt, ut, quod apud Vergilion in sexto positum invenimus

(vs. 366) :—

Eripe me his, invicte, malis: aut tu mihi terram

Inice,

---

\(^1\) Cf. etiam ind. Inscr. a, *addicit* in vss. hexametris a. 136 p. Chr. n. scriptis.
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sic esse iniic, ut supra dixi, et scribendum et legendum sciamus, nisi quis tam indocilis est, ut in hoc quoque verbo in praepositionem metri quis gratia protendat." Prisciani autem testimonium hoc est (K. II. 126. 18): "solet plerumque in compositione a in i converti, ut 'cado incido,' 'facio inficio,' 'iacio inicico.' . . . . . At contra haec Servius in commentario Vergilianio (4. 549): "obici, reicio, adicio 'i' habent vocalem sequentem quae per declinationem potest in consonantis formam transire, ut obici, reici." Ex his locis apparat grammaticos plerumque duas i litteras censuisse scribendas, alteram consonantem, alteram vocalem. Quod si fit, positione longa reditum prima syllaba, atque sonus qui auditur est ille cuius omnes, qui de hac re recentioribus scripsere temporibus, fuerunt auctores.1

Nusquam tamen haec ratio grammaticorum firmatur ex inscriptionibus. Unum exemplum mihi repertum (iniic, cf. ind. Inscr. c) in Falsis continetur, in quibus haud scio an alia inveniri possint; non enim qua cura veras, ea falsas examinavi.

Neque in libris quidem manu scriptis est frequens gemenata i littera usque ad duodecimum vel potius proximum saeculum. Namque in poetarum libris haec fere sunt exempla, quantum quidem conligi potest ex variis scripturis quas optimae editiones suppediant: —

Plautinorum2 codicum in Lipsiensi uno est duplex i saepe repertum, neque in hoc ubique. Hunc codicem, qui F volgo, L in Truculenti editione Schoelliana notatus est, saeculo XV scriptum ab Italo librario, verba poetae partim vere correcta, partim etiam magis corrigita atque licenter interpolata exhibere dixit Ritschl in Trinummis praeferatione.3 Decuratus (C) saeculi XI, et ante rasuram Ursinianus (D) saec. XII habent scriptum obiciere in Mil. 619, sed in D alterum i est erasum. Iterum habet C obiciere in vs. 623.

Tibullianus4 codex Guelferbytianus (G) saec. XV praebet duplicatam i litteram in utroque exemplo iaciendi verbi praepositioni subiecti, constict 1. 8. 54, subictit 1. 5. 64.

1 Cf. sup., pp. 84-86.
2 Cf. ind. Plaut. a, b, c.
3 Schoell. edit., 1884, p. xiv.
4 Cf. ind. Tibul. a.
Vergilius 1 Palatinus-Vaticanus (P) saec. IV-V ii bis exhibet, disiciet in A. 12. 308, ubi manu secunda deletum est alterum i, et superiicit ib. 11. 625. Tum schedae rescriptae Veronenses (V) saec. IV-V (?) habent in A. 7. 339 disiice ut videtur, supra scripta fortasse s littera. Cf. Ribbeck. ad h.l.


Moretus 3 carminis Vaticanus 3252 (B) saec. IX et Helmstadiensis 332 (H) saec. XV et Basileensis (e) saec. XV tradunt adiicetur in vs. 99. H ε adiicet in vs. 96.

Senecae 4 recensio interpolata (A), quae ad tempora medio XIV saeculo haud superiora pertinet, adiice praebet in Med. 527.

Valeri Flacci 5 Monacensis (M) saec. XV, qui est optimorum huius poetae codicum, disiciet in 3. 162 manu secunda habet ex disiciet.

Silius 6 Florentinus (F) saec. XV, qui secundus est ad Laurentianum omnium optimum, habet in 9. 538 disiice manu secunda scriptum ex disice vel disire.

Iliadis Latinitae 7 codices Erfurtanus (E) et Leidensis (L), qui ambo saeculo XII scripti huius carminis sunt excellentissimi, tradunt alter disiceret, alter disiceret in vs. 325.

Martialis 8 denique codices duo interpolati (b φ) saec. XV profe-runt in 10. 82. 1 illud quod numeris obstat, adiicet.

Qui autem verba soluta scripturunt, in eorum codicibus ne unum quidem exemplum i duplicis credo inveniri posse, nisi in iis qui post octavum certe saeculum exarati sunt. Plures enim qui ante septimum saeculum sunt descripti, post autem partim rescripti sunt, quo modo

---

1 Cf. ind. Verg. a. 6 Cf. ind. Val. a.
2 Cf. ind. Ov. a. 7 Cf. ind. II. Lat. a.
3 Cf. ind. p. 145, Moret. 8 Cf. ind. Mart.
4 Cf. ind. Sen. b.
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eius verbi quod est iacere formas praesentis, quae praepositionibus adfiguntur, nobis tradant. ex apographis quibusdam sive ex annotationibus criticis editorum cognovi, neque etiam semel illam geminationem inveni. In illa enim inicitur scriptura.quam habet in.

Plini N. H. 13. 129 codex rescriptus Veronensis sive San-Paulinus saeculi IV-VI, illud i supra positum recentior manus addidit. Nam in ceteris horum compositorum exemplis, quae sunt hoc in libro, i simplex constanter scriptum legitur. Item in Gai Institutionibus 3. 119 codicem Veronensem saec. V-VI non habere illius iii vestigium recte iudicavit Lachmann, ubi dixit in sua editione, “Duplex i in codice esse non credo.” Quod enim a Studemundo traditum est in huius codicis apographo p. 159 in versus 11 fine, ADIX (CI ab initio proximi versus est perspicuum). id non est a codice descriptum, sed AD litterae solis schedis Goescheni debentur, et IX ex schedis Bluhmiani recipiuntur. In illo spatio x notatum cum Bluhme olim i exstitisse opinaretur, parum perspexisse oculos mihi certum videtur. Nam cum in extremo versus aliter potuit maculam pagina facile accipere, tum constanter in codice i, non ii, scrittur.4

Horum praeterea codicum scripturas perspexi:

Ciceronis libri de Re Publica Vaticani palimpsesti in lucem a. 1822 editi ab A. Maio (Auct. Cl. I), qui secundo vel tertio saeculo eum exstitisse suspicatus est (cf. o. c. pp. lxv–lxvi); Teuffel autem, § 184. 5, quarto saeculo attribuit.


T. Livi codicis rescripti Veronensis quem partes librorum III–VI continentem Theodorus Mommsen a. 1868 descripsit et edidit. Saeculo IV eum esse scriptum censuit ille p. 158.

T. Livi codicis Puteani sive Parisini 5730, qui saec. V vel VI descriptus maximus est ad libros emendandos a vicesimo primo ad

1 Sillig. edit. 1855. VI. p. 170. 15.
4 Cf. Studemund. p. 320; deici, inicito, obicere, subicere formas satia frequenter occurrunt in codice.
tricesimum (cf. apparatum criticum et prolegomenum Luchsianae editionis liberorum XXI–XXX duobus voluminibus annis 1888–89 perfectae).


Frontonis codicis palimpsesti Bobensis, qui ad saeculi VI initium pertinet (cf. Naber. edit. 1867, pp. xi–xii; etiam p. 280 ubi dicitur hic codex i pro ii constanter habere in compositis iaciendi verbi).


His igitur inspectis ne unum quidem exemplum ii scripti inveni. Haec ergo geminatio quam raro sit scripta post consonante exeunte praepositionem apparebat. Nam quater tantum ante XII saeculum se mihi obtulit quaerenti, in Vergili videlicet P et V libris qui ambo ab IV vel V saeculum pertinent, in Moreti B qui IX saeculi est, in Plutarch C XI saeculi, neque est frequens nisi XIV saeculo et XV. Cf. porro pp. 116–18 infra, ubi de hac re agitur cum vocalis est extrema littera praefixae syllabae.

Itaque grammaticos fuisse solos huius scripturae auctores videmus, nec quod in sermonibus duplicem i audirent, eo praecepta sua dabant, nam unum i dictum esse usque ab Augusto mortuo plane demonstrant cum correpta apud poetas prima horum syllaba verborum, tum ea quae narrat¹ Gellius (4. 17) et Marius Victorinus (K. VI. 67. 17); sed quia non solum similitudo poscere videbatur, ut iacio verbum, cum praefixa esset praepositio, a litteram in i converteret;² verum etiam versus antiquorum poetarum productas ostendebant primas syllabas, id quod vix intelligi posse putabant nisi consonans i adset, ut positione fieret productio.³ Nec quisquam dubitare potest, quin,

¹ Cf. pp. 88–89.
² Cf. Quint., Gell., Prisc. locos supra, pp. 88–89. citatos.
³ Cf. Gell. ib.
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quae duplicis $i$ in codicibus exempla extant, omnia grammaticorum praeceptis debeantur; etenim cum, litteris iam renascentibus, frequentissima fierent, tum maxime, lingua Latina iam non viva vigente, nitebantur docti in grammaticis antiquis.

Duplicem $i$ ergo in verbi iaciendi compositis, quorum consonante finiretur prior pars, non scripisses antiquos praeclare patet, neque quisquam, nisi Brambach $^{1}$ in priore libro nostris temporibus id scribendum docuit. Auditos tamen et consonantis et vocalis $i$ sonos quoad productis uterentur primis syllabis, id docuerunt multi.

Huic autem doctrinae id obstat, quod temporibus de quibus agitur, id est antequam Augustus e vita excessit, geminacionem eam litterarum, qua altera consonans fieret, altera vocalis, tolerare noluerunt Romani. Itaque quae vocabula recto casu $uais$ vel $eius$ litteris terminantur, ea omnia genetivo singularis et nominativo pluralis $ai$, $et$ litteris cadebant, dativo et ablativo pluralis $ais$, $eis$; numquam autem $aui$, $eii$, $aies$, $eis$.$^{9}$ Neque posteriori quidem tempore nisi apud grammaticos hoc alterum $i$ accessit. Formae quae sunt $patri$, $auxiliis$, similia, huc non pertinent, quoniam in eis utraque $i$ littera vocalis habet instar; atqui etiam ea antiquiores $iei$, $eis$ litteris terminaverunt.

Primum igitur ad id testimoni quod est in inscriptionibus animum quaesum intendas. In Corporis Inscriptionum primo volumine, quod titulos continet qui ante Caesaris obitum incisi sunt, cum verborum $aius$, $eius$ litteris finitorum genetivi singularis, nominativi dati ablative pluralis nullum sit exemplum, satis tamen faciunt haec exempli gratia citata: CI. II. 1129 PLEBEI$^{4}$; 1587 POMPEI; 4970. 51–61 ATEI; 3695, a. 6 p. Chr. n., MAIS; IV. 1180, quae probabiliter

$^{1}$ Cf. pp. 84–85.

$^{9}$ Item $volgus$, $equus$ vocabula et quae sunt similia primo demum saeculo p. Chr. n. duplicatum $u$ litteram patiebantur, ut $vulgus$, $equus$, alia. Cf. Quint. I. 4. 11.

$^{9}$ Item $volgus$, $equus$ vocabula et quae sunt similia primo demum saeculo p. Chr. n. duplicatum $u$ litteram patiebantur, ut $vulgus$, $equus$, alia. Cf. Quint. I. 4. 11.

$^{9}$ Item $volgus$, $equus$ vocabula et quae sunt similia primo demum saeculo p. Chr. n. duplicatum $u$ litteram patiebantur, ut $vulgus$, $equus$, alia. Cf. Quint. I. 4. 11.
Mauricius W. Mather.

Tiberi aetate incisa est, MAI, POMPEIS, [all]EI (cf. ALLEI in 1179); 1181, 1186, 1189 POMPEIS.

Libri quoque antiquissimi cum identidem duplicatam i litteram habent, tum saepissime simplicem, velut in Livi codice Veronensi (cf. p. 91) sunt plebis in 5. 2. 13; Veis in 5. 4. 10; 5. 46. 4; 5. 52. 10 (Beis); 6. 4. 5; alia, Veis autem in 5. 5. 10. cf. etiam Neue. Formenl. I. 2. 99.


Aliquid porro testimoni addunt illa Graiugena, Troiugena vocabula, quae, nisi Graiugena, Troiugena putidum et insolitum nonum dedissent, nullam sane causam sibi habuissent.4

1 Cf. tamen Prob. (K. IV. 221. 8 et 257. 17) infra, p. 108, prolatum.
3 De Syll. vs. 453, K. VI., p. 339.
4 Illae Troiugenas, Graiugenarum (Grāing. A) figurae, quas Lucretium i. 465 et 477 scripsisse, codice Leidensi A saec. IX teste, censuerunt Lachmann et
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Itaque solus, qui aii, eii sonis favere videatur, est Caesellius. Priscianus enim (p. 94, adn.) id tantum agit ut rationem eius scripturae reddat quam male\(^1\) arbitratur antiquorum esse. Namque Probus qui docuit Graios per i geminum oportere scribi, tamen huius Gai, hi Gai, his Gais iussit; atque Cicero cum aii, Maiiam, Asiadem scribere vellet,\(^8\) nusquam dicitur Gaiii, Pompeii, neque etiam Gaii, Pompeii similiaque scriptisse. Caesar autem si re vera per triplicem i Pompeii et alia maluit scribere, eadem, qua Caesellius, cura commotus duas i litteras quas in nominativo scribecat, ut illum pleniorem i consonantis sonum inter vocalis posite expresset (cf. p. 107 sq. infra), declinacione perire noluit. At si ita scriptis, nihil eo demonstratur consonantem i enuntiavisse. Enuntiaverit autem; mos modo grammaticus fuerit, qui se in usu volgari consuetudineque numquam firmavit.

Brambach igitur, cum in libro Die Neugestaltung der Lateinischen Orthographie, pp. 197–8 praecipit, ut ab iis, qui hodie Latine scribant, ii et iis litteris exprimantur plurales nominativus, dativus, ablativus omnium vocabulorum quorum casus rectus aius vel eius litteris exeat, atque haec commendare studet non solum ex illo Priscianil loco et illo VERTVLEIEIS (CI. I. 1175)—quamquam hoc certo non demonstrat consonantem i litteram, excipiente i vocali, ut Verteusis, auditam esse,—verum etiam ex silentio, ut praedicat, grammaticorum de i et is litteris scribendis. Sed in hac re mihi non videtur obtemperandum doctissimo viro.\(^8\) Namque quod testimoniorum habemus ex inscriptionibus, libris, grammaticisque, id universum adversatur ei haec praecipienti. Concedit ipse quidem in titulis per unum i scripta interdum inveniri huius modi verba, atque laudat MAIS Or. 5614 a. 219 p. Chr. n., 6112 quod est I. R. N. 3571, a. 387 p. Chr. n., POMPEIS Or. 5814, 6167 (5814 = CI. IV. 1180; 6167 = IV. 1189, cf. pp. 93–94, sup.).

---


\(^8\) Cf. Quint. I. 4. 11; Vel. Long. K. VII. 54. 16 infra pp. 107–08, prolatos.

\(^8\) Cf. autem eius Höflischuline für Lateinische Rechtschreibung § 14, ubi quasi in palinodia simplicem i dicit melius scribi.
Mauricius W. Mather.

Ergo mihi quidem certum esse videtur Romanos *abiicit*, *adiicit* reliqua non magis dixisse quam scripsisse: Quintilianum autem et Priscianum (pp. 38–89 sup.), cum *coniicit* et *iniicio* esse ab iaciendo dicerent, nolisisse *i* consonantem, praepositione ante se posita, omnino amitti in figuris praeSENTibus, atque Gellium¹ non solum hoc eodem scrupulo commotum esse, sed ratione quoque, qua poetae antiqui haec verba ad versus accommodarent, quae ratio scilicet aliam mensuram praefixae syllabae poposcit atque ipsius tempore volgo audiebatur.

Haec igitur ratio pronuntiandi si spernenda est, nec vocalem praepositionis, cum consonante exit, produci licet nisi si *s* vel /j/ littera *in* vel *con* praepositionem insequitur,² quo tandem modo arbitremur haec verba, libera re publica, dixisse Romanos?

Non desunt in libris, nec etiam in inscriptionibus, indicia quae persuadeant, id verbum quod est *iaciv* cum praepositionibus con-
sonantibus subiungi inciperet, *a* litteram cum *ε* litteram commutasse.

In Plautinis⁴ libris, et si haec per *ε* facta scriptura non apparat, vestigia tamen eius quater deprehendimus. Poen. 117.4 (octon. ana-
paest.): —

Fuit hodie operae pretium quois qui amabilitati animum *adiceret*

ubi *adiceret* habet F (quo de codice v. p. 89 sup.), *adiceret* A. Mil. 112: —

*Conicit* in navem miles clam matrem suam

ubi *contegit* quod est in CD codicibus videtur ex *coniexit* corruptum. Truc. 298: —

Út pereat, ut eum *iniiciatis* in malam fraudem et probrum

*inleciatis* (corr. *illeciatis*) habet A quod Schoell retinet, *iniiciatis* BCD.

² Cf. Gell. 2. 17; 4. 17. 6.
³ Cf. Ind. Inscr. a.
⁴ Cf. Ind. Plaut. a, c.
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Mil. 623:

Eám pudet me tibi in senecta obiciere sollicitúdinem
obiciere in D fortasse ex obiciere est corruptum; obiceret ante rasuram habet B codex, obiciere C.

Terenti codices unum exemplum praebent, Ad. 710:

Itaque ádeo magnum mi iniecit sua cómoditate cúram
ubi iniecit, quia A cum reliquis (e in ras. F) et Donatus in lemmate habent, videtur pro praeterito habitum esse; quam prave autem, indicat cum contextus sermonis, tum proximus versus, “Ne imprudens faciam” . .

In ea sententia,—

Fórtior qui cúpiditates est quam qui hostes subicit, quae a Vincentio Bellovacensi citata nunc commode inspici potest in Ribbecki Comicorum Fragmentis, p. 368. 49, subicit traditum est a et γ codicibus. Huic scripturae quamvis causae potuisset esse obscura . distinctio i brevis et e brevis sonorum, quoniam tamen prima producta est syllaba, fortasse olim subicit scriptum est, unde i consonans incuria excidit.

Ciceronis operis de Divinatione A et V codices, decimo saeculo descripti, habent abiecit in 1. 48. 106 (vs. hexam.) :

Abiecit efflantem et laceratum adfibigit in unda.

In Vergili Aeneide 6. 421:

Obicit. ille fame rabida tria guttura pandens
Priscianus (K. II. 349. 15) obicet legit, testibus libris Lugdunensi et Sangallensi (obicet G), qui uterque ad nonum saeculum pertinet.

T. Livium hanc scribendi rationem interdum certe adhibuisse bene testantur ex optimis codicibus non nulli. In 10. 8. 3: —

et nunc tribunus . . . quinque augurum loca, quattuor pontificum adicit, in quae plebei nominentur eqs.

1 Cf. ind. Ter. a.
2 Cf. ind. Rell. a.
3 Cf. Luc. 7. 574 ubi pro subicit habent non nulli libri subigit vel subigit.
4 Cf. ind. p. 138, Clc. a.
5 Cf. ind. Verg. a.
et in 10. 37. 14:—

Fabius ambo consules . . . res gessisse scribit . . . sed ab utro consule, non adicit eqs.


Husdrubal ad eum navium numerum . . . decem adicit, quadraginta navium classem Himilconi tradit eqs.


Plineum autem hunc modum scribendi usurpsse non credo, etsi in N. H. 7. sect. 1. 2 adicit habet V codex (K a Silligio notatus) saec. XI, abicit reliqui. Eius enim tempore non iam sic, sed sic erat in 1adiendi verbi compositis.

Nec illorum vetustissimorum codicum, quos pp. 91–92 supra laudavi, ullus praebet huius rei exempla.


Schuchardt denique in libro, quem, Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins inscriptum, a. 1867 prodidit, vol. II. p. 4 haec profert ex codice Gothano Evangeliorum, qui saeculo septimo (cf. III. p. 4) scriptus est: adieciuntur 44. b. 12; 319. b. 15; inieciunt 362. a. 2. Haec exempla tametsi mihi non fuit facultas ut comprobarem, facile tamen

---

1 Illud coniicint, quod Lachmann ex Lege Servilia profert, non ailiu est atque meum exemplum quod datur in Indice I, a. 2.
illii viro docto credere possumus, namque alias accuratissimum et fide dignissimum eius esse librum inveni. 1

Quoniam igitur cum haec satis multa existunt exempla, quae abiccit, adiccit aliaque ostendunt, tum i consonans necesse est adfuisset, quo producetur syllaba prima, mihi quidem videntur haec formae satis probari. Communis enim volgarisque usus, quo in compositis a brevis in i correpta est, iaciendi formas non nisi i consonante eicta adficiebat; nam aliter esset perfestus auditus ille i consonantis ante i vocalem positi sonus, quem linguae Latinae non fuisse satis plane nobis videmur supra pp. 93-95 indicavisse. Conferas etiam illud societatem vocabulum, quod, etsi in eo non agitur de i consonante, tamen per o litteram in e, non in i correptam solum difficilem durumque vitavit.

Abicio ergo, abiccit, adicio, adiccit et cetera primo audit esse censeo cum iaciendi verbo praepositiones inciperent praefigi, neque desita audiri certe inter poetas atque eos qui litteris humanitateque politiores erant usque ad extremam Augusti aetatem. Mutatio tamen illa, qua i littera fieret ab e, iam satis antiquo tempore incipiibat haec verba adficere. Quod cum fieret, i consonante omissa, iam praefixa syllaba non producebatur positione, et abicio, abiccit similiaque audiebantur. Has formas autem dixisse hoc tempore imperitos solos rudesque, e quibus volgo oriuntur ea quae ex ingenio sunt linguae, est veri simillimum, quia ante Augusti obitum non nisi apud Naevium et Plautum existant, quaterque tantum apud eos. Cf. Naev. 2 vs. 94, p. 22 R—

Immò quos scicidi in ius conscindam atque ab'iciam.

Plaut. 3 Asin. 814: —

Praerpias scortum amânti atque argentum s'bibias.

Merc. 932: —

Sânus non es. quin pedes vos in curruculum c'nicitis.

Rud. 769: —

Iam hércele ego te continuo barba arrâpiam, in ignem c'niciam.

2 Cf. ind. Rell, b.
3 Cf. ind. Plaut. b.
Pro hoc coniciam habent CD codices coiciam, itaque illud conicitis in Merc. 932, ut etiam omnes formae coniciendi verbi quas infra in indice Plauti sub littera c enumerabimus, coiciendi potuerunt esse; sed haee breviores formae minus placent 1 apud Plautum, quod nullo altero loco sunt codicibus sustentatae. 2 Illarum quoque omnium formarum quae sunt in Plauti indice c, Terenti b, Reliquorum c enumeratae, priores partes liceat, si quis velit, corripere. Sic abicio, abiciam et reliqua, non abicio, abiciam audiamus. Haud tamen probabile hoc esse mihi videtur, nam illa supra dicta quattuor exempla sola sunt, quae primae correptionem postulat; longae autem certo sunt haee syllabae apud Plautum decies, apud Terentium reliquisque scaenicos poetas octies 3.

Cum igitur Naevius et Plautus et quivis alius correpta prima syllaba dixerunt haec verba, haua multum licet dubitare, puto, quin etiam scripserint abicio, abiciit et alia similia per ic litteras. 4 At non abicio, sed abiciio plerunque hoc tempore et dici et scribi solet, neque est illius ulium formae vestigium, exceptis illis quattuor exemplis, dum usque ad extremum saeculum alterum a. Chr. n. perveniat. Ex anno 105 a. Chr. n. est nobis servata lex parietis faciendo, quae proiciito 5 figuram continet. Sed septendecim annos prius in lege de pecuniis repetundis lata insculptum est coniciant. 6 Inter annos igitur 122 et 105 a. Chr. n. haec verba scribendi icta se consuetudo mutaverat, ut etiam in leges, quae veteres maxime amant formas, illa recentior per ic litteras facta scriptura admitteretur. Licet ergo conicere, ut mea fert opinio, illum sonum, qui his litteris significaret, satis frequenters paulo ante a. 105 auditum esse, eumque sane in eorum sermone, qui politioris humanitatis non expertes fuissent. Anno demum 44 a. Chr. n. sunt incisa in lege Ursonensi illa inicere et reiciantur, 7 neque exstat eo interim spatio ulium in inscriptionibus.

1 Cf. Lachmann. in Lucr. p. 188.
3 Cf. ind. Plaut. a, Ter. a, Rell. a.
4 Sic etiam scribendae cum per diphthongum dicta sunt verbi iniciendi composita. Cf. p. 114 inf.
5 Cf. ind. Inscr. a, 3. Huius formae cum vocali exeat praepositio, nihil tamen hoc interest ad hanc rem.
6 Cf. ind. Inscr. a, 2.
7 Cf. ind. Inscr. a, 4 et 5.
exemplum. Itaque, quantum suspicamur, haec forma usque ab anno 105, vel paulo ante, volgari usu scribebatur, atque in inscriptionibus inde ab hoc tempore sola est quam reperimus, in codicibus nostris longe frequentissima.

Verum tamen quamquam icio, icit et reliqua volgo in compositis et scribebantur et dicebantur, tamen icio, icit ceteraque apud poetas certe eruditosque maxime valuerunt usque ad Augustum mortuum; quas formas prouintiassse eos satis indicant numeri, scripsisse autem, illae scripturae, quas supra pp. 96—98 laudavi. Plerumque tamen qui eorum opera descripserunt, volgari mori obsequentes, illas icio formas in icio converserunt; mox vetus scribendi modus fere in oblivionem adductus est.

Primum illius brevioris formae in herois exemplum dat Moretum carmen in versu 96: —

Spargit humi atque abicit

Sed is, qui hoc carmen composuerit, cum productam syllabam numeri gratia in versu 99 cuperet, non dubitavit illam veterem mensuram usurpare: —

Caseus adicitur...

id quod fortasse indicat veterem sonum nondum perisse, nisi forte mavis putare per imitationem scilicet veterum hoc fieri.

Eorum, qui aetate inferiores fuerunt, poetarum semper correptam primam syllabam adhibuerunt 4 Germanicus, Manilius, Seneca (sed excipiendae 4 fortasse dissicere verbi formae; cf. ind. a), Lucanus, Martialis, Juvenalis. Duas habet Phaedrus in senariis formas, quae sublatione incipientes mensuram non significant. Et correptas et productas Silius induxit in versus praefixas syllabas; sin autem excipimus dissicam formam et superici — quo in verbo in temporibus praesentibus simplicis iasiendi formae subiunctae praepositionibus

---

1 Cf. ind. Ov. b.
2 Cf. ind. p. 145, Moret. a.
3 Vid. exempla in indice, p. 145 sqq.
4 Duo exempla habet ille (cf. ind. c) quorum prima syllaba producta an correpta sit incertum est. Haec duco in correptis, quoniam productionem nisi in dissicere verbo non videtur Seneca usurpasse. Sed etiam hoc in verbo codicibus non credendum est. Cf. p. 126 inf.
mutari non videntur — plures correptas habet. Valerius Flaccus autem et Statius Vergilium imitari ita studebant, ut illa productione paene constanter uterentur, non magis tamen Silio intellegentes quo modo veteres eam effecissent, nisi forte exemplaria habuerunt, quae veterem scribendi rationem conservarint; itaque aut vocalem praepositionis tractim pronuntiabant, aut una i littera scripta, sonum consonantis i et vocalis i sequentis in una syllaba efferebant. Semel per neglegentiam, ut opinor, illam sua aetate volgarem correctionem adhibuit Statius in Thebaide 7. 4: —

Sidera proclamatque ādict . . .

Eodem modo veterum consuetudinem imitati sunt Serenus, Ausonius, Claudianus, alii; atque hic pariter cum Statio non caret vulgaribus formis.

Haec poetarum testimonia si cum enarrationibus Gelli (4. 17) et Mari Victorini (K. VI. 67. 17), quas supra p. 88 protuli, comparamus, plane apparat, ut mihi videtur, inde ab extrema Augusti aetate cum correpta prima syllaba constanter audita esse haec composita.

Ille autem vetus sonus, quo productio praefixeae syllabae efficiebatur, sequentibus illis iectio, iectit aliisque, quamvis plane perisset inter eruditos litteratosque, ut praeclare demonstrat Gelli locus, ubi numeros apud veteres poetas observasse dicuntur alii vocali praepositionis producenda, alii duabus i litteris, quorum prior consonans esset, efferendis, est tamen putandum, mea quidem sententia, haud ubique omnino periisse, sed interim se propagasse aut inter eodem imperitos rudesque homines a quibus iccio et similia principium duxere aut in provincialium linguis. Illae enim formae, quae p. 98 supra referuntur ex Digestis Florentinis et codice Gothano Evangeliorum, indicio sunt illum iectio sonum in aliquibus locis multo post valuisse, quam Romae inter eruditos certe periisse. Licet

1 Cf. Verg. A. 11. 625 (ind. a) superi cacit; Val. Max. 3. 2. ext. 7 superiaceretur habent omnes codd.; Plin. N. H. 7. 2. 2 § 21 superiaci codd. plerique, superari unus.
2 Cf. L. Müller. de Re Metr. p. 291* = 250*.
3 Cf. p. 99 sup.
4 Cf. praeterea p. 113.
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enim Digestorum librarius describere vel imitari potuisset, quae in antiquis legibus viderat, non tamen facile arbitrari possimus, quae in codice Gothano sint exempla, vetere more scribendi adfecta esse, quoniam non ante medium alteri saeculi p. Chr. n. Evangelia Latine reddita sunt.

Unius rei restat ut mentionem faciam, quae ad has consonante exunctis praefixas syllabas pertinet. Servius enim in opere de Finalibus (K. IV. 450. 12) haec dicit: "Item ex ipsis praepositionibus ad et ob et in et sub diversae in verbis ponuntur. Nam corripiuntur cum crescendo disyllabum reddunt, ut adit, obit, init, subit; indifferenter sunt cum trisyllabum faciunt, ut adicit, obicit, iniciit, subicit; producuntur tantum cum tetrasyllabum ex se reddunt, ut adicio, obicio, initio, subicio." Haec igitur cum narrat, patet in promptuque est ex usu eorum poetarum, qui dactylicos versus scribebant postquam icio sonus volgaris factus esset, argumenta eum deduxisse. Nam, enumeratione mea examinata, cum nullum ei adversatur exemplum, id facile intelligi potest, quia in dactylicos numeris nulla ratio est, nisi praepositione producta, qua adicio forma et aliae similes in versus induci potuerint. Sin autem illa Naevi et Plauti exempla, abiciam, obicias, ciclicitis, ciciciam (cf. p. 99 sup.) reminiscemur, Servi verba in loquendi consuetudine non niti praeclare apparebit.

Hactenus igitur, ut iam breviter recognoscam argumentum, haec conatus sum demonstrare: Cum consonante terminaret praeposito, icio scripturam et sonum apud antiquos in grammaticorum tantum praeciptis exstitisse, nec saepes esse adhibita, quoad litterae renaerescentur saeculo XIV; icio autem ferme scriptum legi et in inscriptionibus et in veterrimis libris manu scriptis, quamquam semel in illis, in his non numquam apud scriptores, qui ante Tiberium imperatorem vixerint, icio forma aut exact, aut vestigium sui reliquerit; quoniam igitur per illud icio non significetur 1 sonus, quo intellegere possimus numerorum rationem apud poetas, qui praefixam syllabam producserint, sin autem icio formam sumamus, facile illa ratio explicetur, veri simillimum esse icio non solum scriptum, verum dictum

1 Non adsentior Lachmanno aliisque qui duplicem sonum per unum i scriptum repraesentari docent. Cf. pp. 84–86 sup.
quoque esse a poetis politioribusque usque ad extremam Augusti aetatem; sed *icio* tamen sonum se prodere iam in versibus Plauti et Naevi, atque ad extremum alterum saeculum a Chr. n. ita frequenter audiri, ut scribendi ratio respondere sono inciperet, ab eoque inde tempore *icio* magis volgo scriptum quam *ecio*: Tiberio autem imperatore *icio* formam iam neque auditam inter eos qui litteris imbuti essent neque scriptam, attamen sive in multitudine imperita rudique, sive inter agrestis et rusticos semper remansisse; verum *icio* cum inter doctos moris esset continenter, poetas aliquot Vergilium aliosque veteres ita studiose imitatos, ut quam productionem praefixae syllabae apud illos perspexissent, eam in suos versus, quamvis ignari antiquae dicendi rationis, inducèrent.

III. *Iaciendi* verbi Composita quorum prior pars vocali terminatur.

Iam de *iaciendi* verbo agamus vocali finitis praepositionibus subjuncto. Praefixae syllabae, quae ad hanc rem pertinent, sunt septem numero, *de, e, pra, pro, co, re, tra* 2. Sed *pra* praeposition nihil ad hanc quaestionem prodest, quoniam nusquam apud poetas neque in inscriptionibus reperitur. *Praecipientes* est apud Festum p. 249. 34 M. = 324. 34 Thewr., sed Columella 8. 17. 10 *praeciuntur* videtur scripsisse, atque *praecit* est Scauri codice Bernensi (B) saec. X traditum (cf. K. VII. 17. 6). Unde forsitan conclusadas hoc verbum, item ut id quod est *superacio*,1 simplicis verbi formam retinuisse.

Reliquas autem praefixas syllabas, quae omnes apud poetas repe-riuntur, numquam necesse est corripere. In scaenicorum versibus cum possint corripi hae syllabae haud raro, velut in Plaut. Stich. 360:

> Péñam et glandiúm *deicit*. hic hércele homo nimíúm sapit.

Cas. 23:

> *Élicite* ex animo cúram atque alíenum aés; papae.

Mil. 205:

> Détèxerum itá veménter *écit*; quód agat, aegre súppetit.

---

1 Cf. p. 102 et adn. 1.
Pers. 320:—

Ego réciām; habe animúm bonum. credútur; commodábo.

Ter. And. 382:—

Áliquam causam quam òb rem étciát óppido. eiciát? cito.

Ph. 18:—

Illi ád famem hunc a stúdio studuit récere
et in aliis, omnes tamen aut per se longae esse, aut cum sequenti
syllaba per diphthongum coniungi possunt. Itaque quoniam hi
poetae ipsi exempla praebent, quorum certo producendae sunt
syllabae primae, velut Plaut. Asin. 127:—

Súcine hoc fít? foras aéribus me étci?

Laber. vs. 83, II. p. 292 R.:—

Hoc vóluit clicheum cóntra pelvem próici
et alia, atque ceteri poetae constanter produxerunt aut per diphthong-
gum enuntiarunt, credamus licet omnia illa dubia produci oportere.
Qua ratione sum ipse usus in enumeratione mea.

Sed harum praepositionum vocales, cum diversas per se mensuras
habeant, sunt tamen omnes adfectae consonantis i excipientis natura.
Nam ut consonante, ita vocali cum praepositiones caderent, iaciendi
verbum non est dubium quin primae sonum litterae diu servaverit.

Hae igitur sunt productionis rationes: de, e, pro praepositiones
vocalis litteras habent natura longas, co et tra autem compensant
productis vocalibus extremas litteras anissas, sed re producitur

---

1 Cf. ind. Plaut. d, e, f ; Ter. c, d ; Rell. d, e, f ; etiam Lucil. b ; Sen. d.
2 Cf. ind. Plaut. d ; Rell. d ; etiam Phaedr. b.
3 Cf. p. 96 sqq.
4 Cf. p. 110 sqq.
5 Cf. Gell. 2. 17. 8 sqq.: “coligatus et conexus producte dicitur. Sed tamen
videri potest in his, quae posui, ob eam causam particula haec produci, quoniam
eliditur ex ea w littera (cf. 4. 17. 6) ; nam detrimentum litterae productione syllabae
compensatur.” Etiam cf. Verg. G. 4. 257, cónexae ; A. 9. 410, cónixus ; ib. 1. 73,
cónubio ; quibus in omnibus verbis co, non con, adhibitum esse apparut ex inscrip-

Alia est sententia non deductum esse illud co ex com (con), sed com (con) ex co,
nescio quo addito. Confirmationem petit haec opinio ex linguis Germana et
Mauricius W. Mather.

non tantum d' Errera compensanda, quantum i consonantis proprietate quadam, quae cum ea est inter vocalis posita, i vocalis litterae quasi umbra et imago ante eam audita, ut aiv. Maria, sic adfecit antecedentem vocalis naturam, ut etiam si illa brevis fuit, produceretur.\footnote{Recordert quaeo quo modo m littera ante f vel s, aut g ante m vel n posita productam reddiderit antecedentem vocalem.}

Nam cum red praepositione quibusdam verbis praefixa saepè adsimulata sit eorum primae litterae, velut repnati\footnote{Cf. Corssen. Auspr. II.\textsuperscript{4} pp. 466-8, qui aliorum alias rationes exposuit.} rettuli, retlatum (L cruc. 2. 1091). reddidisset (Cap. Rep. 2. 8. 14). reddivco (L cruc. 1. 228), etiam cf. Ne. Formenl. 2\textsuperscript{3} p. 923, aliorum (cf. Cl. I. p. 593). tamen numquam d' litteram amissam compensat vocali producenda;\footnote{Alia est Brixii sententia ad Capt. q18 elata, sed ibi recusatis potuit scribi vel certe dici. Aliud remedium petitii Fleckesein.} atqui ante i consonantem ne semper producitur, ut in reiect Verg. A. 5. 421; reiecti ib. 11. 630; reiectura Ov. M. 9. 513; reiecto Sen. Thyest. 808; reiectat Sil. 7. 722; reiecta ib. 15. 726: et alia multa.

Gothica: nam alterius ei syllaba praefixa, alterius ei cognatae sunt, ut videtur, cum eo. (Cf. F. Klage. Eyr. Wcrb. der deutschen Sprache, 1889, s. v. ge: "Verwandtschaft des Prafixes mit lat. em: nam ist wahrscheinlich."

I consonanti hanc fuisse proprietatem cum non prorsus certum sit,\(^1\) veri tamen simillimum videtur. Cf. Seelmann. Ausspr. d. Lat. p. 231: "Gewisse momente lassen es nicht zweifelhaft erscheinen, dass bis zum IV oder V jahrh. n. Chr. die bessere volkssprache mitlautendes \(I\) und \(V\) als halbvocale, also = \(i\) und \(y\) fortführte," item p. 230: "Die laute ... wo also trotz des j-artigen beigeräusches ein \(i\) ... deutlich durchtönt, nennen wir mit fug und recht 'halb- vocale.'" At sane non semper. Nam neque cum ab initio verbi posita est, eo magis ultimam vocalem antecedentis verbi produxit (cf. Catul. 62. 3: Surgerē iam tempus ...), neque tum cum in medio vocabuli \(i\) vocalem excepit, sub sequente quoque vocali in eadem syllaba, illam \(i\) antecedentem longam reddidit. \(Biiugus\ enim,\ triiugus, quadriiugus\ et reliqua similia constanter brevibus primis syllabis utuntur. Sed si quam aliam vocalem atque \(i\) subsecuta est, tum tenuem vocalis \(i\) sonum ante se dedit, sed arte secum coniunctam, nec cum antecedente vocali in alia syllaba elatam;\(^8\) nihilque referre utrum in simplicibus verbis an in compositis stet,\(^6\) \textit{re} syllaba constanter longa satis demonstrat.\(^4\) Atque sic factus est ille plenior,\(^5\) pressior,\(^6\) latior,\(^6\) pinguis\(^8\) sonus \(i\) litterae, quo antecedens vocalis, si brevis fuit, evaderet longa, si vero producta, productor.

Hunc sonum \textit{ex} vocali et consonante mixtum ut scribendo significaret, duabus \(i\) litteris opus esse putaverunt non nulli. Inde sunt illa \textit{aiio, Maiia, Aiax}, quae Ciceroni placuisse commenorant et Quintilianus, ubi dicit (I. 4. 11), "Sciatis Ciceroni placuisse \textit{aiio Maiiamque geminata \(i\) scribere; quod si est, etiam iungetur ut consonans}"; et Velius Longus his verbis (K. VII. 54. 16): "Et in plerisque Cicero videtur auditu emensus scriptionem, qui et \textit{Aiacem et Maiam} per duo \(i\) scribenda existimavit; quidam unum esse animadvertunt, si quidem potest et per unum \(i\) enuntiari, ut scriptum

---

\(^1\) Cf. L. Müller. de Re Metr. p. 292\(^8\) (251 \(1\)).
\(^5\) Cf. grammaticorum locos infra prolatos.
\(^6\) Cf. Pompeium K. V. 103. 33 sqq.
est. Unde illud quod pressius et plenius sonet per duo i scribi oportere existimat." Eiusdem modi sunt etiam illa Lucretiana Troiugen... supra p. 94 adn. 4 laudata, atque Troianis in 1. 476, quae potius Ciceronis esse quam Lucreti equidem arbitrer. Illam enim geminationem usurpatam esse Lucreti aetate non probabile videtur, quoniam in CI. I. nullum est exemplum.1 In CI. II tamen haec inter alia existant aetatis incertae exempla: 1076 POMPÉIVS; 1923 EIIVS; 4587 CVIIVS; etiam haec, quae accuratius sonum prae se ferunt; EIÍVS 1964. I. 41 et saepe: CVIIVS ib II. 10; et alia. Qua ex ratione scribendi prave factum est illud POMPÉIVS CI. IX. 3748 et alia quae sunt similia.2 Plauti quoque Ambrosianus rara exempla habet, quorum videas exempli gratia MAIIORES Trin. 642.

Grammatici autem saepius poscunt ut haec i littera consonans inter vocalis posita per geminationem scribatur. Cf. Caesellium apud Cassiodorum (K. VII. 206. 6): "Pompeius, Turpeius, et eiius per duo i scribenda sunt et propter sonum (plenius enim sonant) et propter metra; numquam enim longa fiet syllaba, nisi per i geminum scribatur." Cf. etiam Diomedem (K. I. 428. 10): (positione longa fit syllaba) "cum correpta vocalis desinat et interposita i excipiatur a vocali . . . quoniam inter duas vocales duarum syllabarum posita i geminatur. Sic enim scribi per geminatam litteram metri ratione desiderat, si quidem potestatem tuetur duplicis consonantis." Conferas porro, si velis, Marium Victorinum in K. VI. 24. 21; 27. 9; 35. 22: Maximum Victorinum K. VI. 197. 16.

Sed aliis, duplicis soni haud ignari, unam scribi litteram voluerunt; veluti Probus (K. IV. 221. 8): "I littera duplicem sonum designat, una quamvis figura sit, si undique fuerit cincta vocalibus"; itemque (257. 17): "I littera cum fuerit in medio vocalium, ita ut consonans sit, duplicem sonum reddit"3; et Velius Longus (K. VII. 55. 2): "At qui Troiam et Maiam per unum i scribunt, negat onerandam pluribus litteris scripitionem, cum sonus ipse sufficiat; hanc enim naturam esse quarundam litterarum, ut morentur et enuntiatione

1 EIÍVS tamen est satis antiquum; cf. p. 93 adn. 3.
3 At cf. Serv. Aen. 1. 1 supra p. 94 laudatum.
sonum detinient. . . . atque ipsa natura i litterae est ut interiecta vocalibus latius enuntietur”; etiam Donatus in K. IV. 368. 27 et Beda in K. VII. 229. 30.

Quamvis male\(^1\) opinati sint hanc i esse duplicem consonantem, atque ideo positione produci multas vocalis, quae re vera natura aut compensatione producuntur,\(^8\) tamen praecclare testificantur i litterae vocalibus interpositae fuisses sonum duplicem.

Summam quandam omnium harum doctrinarum dat Priscianus, ubi duplicem et simplicem i litteram distinguit (K. II. 13. 27): “Et i quidem modo pro simplici modo pro duplici accipitur consonante; pro simplici, quando ab eo incipit syllaba in principio dictionis posita, subsequente vocali in eadem syllaba, ut Iuno, Iuppiter; pro duplici autem, quando in medio dictionis ab eo incipit syllaba post vocalem ante se positam, subsequente quoque vocali in eadem syllaba, ut Maius, peius, eius, in quo loco antiqui solem facta geminare eandem i litteram et maius, peius, eius scribere, quod non aliter pronunciari posset, quam si cum superiore syllaba prior i, cum sequente altera proferretur, ut pe-i-us, ei-ius, mai-i-us”; addatur quod est in K. II. 14. 14: “Pro simplici quoque in media dictione inventur, sed in compositis, ut iniuria, adiungo, eictus, reiice.”\(^8\) Vergilius in bucolico (3. 96) proceleusmaticum posuit pro dactyro: Tityre, pascentes a flumine reiice\(^4\) capellas.”

At male non modo hoc tale discrimen fecit, verum etiam separat\(^4\) illa duo i duas syllabas. Etenim in compositis non semper simplex est i littera, sed tum modo cum consonantem aut i vocalem excipit, ut in adiungo, biugus et similibus verbis; neque separandus in duas syllabas est ille mixtus sive duplex sonus, namque aliter unum i omnino non suffecisset; atque Priscianus cum illa dicit, conatur tantum scripturam interpretari, quae non iam in usu fuit, cujusque sonum ipse non intellexit. Cf. K. III. 467. 15: (in Troia

\(^1\) Cf. Schmitz. Beitr. pp. 73-4.


\(^8\) Sic optimi libri, reie Hs ex reicere, Hertz.


\(^6\) Ad eum tamen accedunt viri docti Schmitz (Beitr. p. 75) et Seelmann (Ausspr. d. Lat. pp. 235-6).
Mauricius W. Mather.

vocabulo) “solent . . . Latini . . . pro consonante duplici accipere i et eam a priore subtrahere syllaba et adiungere sequenti; quamvis antiqui solemant duas ii scribere et alteram priori subiungere, alteram praeponere sequenti, ut Troia, Maiia, Aiiax.” Ibi quoque vehementer errat¹ ubi dicit (K. II. 303. 5): “Idque in vetustissimis invenies scripturis quotiens inter duas vocales ponitur, ut eius, Pompeius, Vulteius, Gaius; quod etiam omnes, qui de litera curiosius scriperunt, affirmant.” Nusquam enim exstat id duplex i in Cl. I, hoc est in titulis aetate superioribus a. 44 a. Chr. n., neque est in libris frequens traditum. Qui igitur maxime id sustentarunt, erant grammatici, sed ne eorum quidem omnes, ut patet ex testimoniis quae supra protuli.

Hac digressione iam finita, qua apparit i consonantem vocalibus interpositam effecisse suapte natura, ut, quae vocalis esset ante se posita, i vocali sola excepta, produceretur, nunc revertendum ad propositum nostrum.

Non modo i consonantem iaciendi verbi diu retentam esse post vocali finitas praepositiones satis significat constans harum omnium productio, verum etiam iecio primo dictum et scriptum, cum verbum et praeposito in unum convenissent² plura indicia sunt quam in illis compositis quorum prior pars consonante cadit.

Cl. IX. 78 a: proiectad in lege antiqua.³

In Plautinis libris etsi nullum est certum exemplum, videtur tamen eieciam olim esse scriptum in Truc. 659 ⁴: —

Hoc facto exponam atque omnis eiciam foras

ubi pro eiciā D codicis habent B et C ieciam (ieciā B).

Lucilius eicere⁵ scripsit, si Noni (300. 25 M.) codicibus credendum est, in versu dactylico (XXVIII. 106. M.): —

Eicere istum abs te quam primum et perdere amorem

² Quo modo prius scripserint, quam facta sit verbi et praepositionis inter se coniunctio, exemplo est illud endo iacito, quod erat in XII tabulis, teste Festo p. 313 M. = 452. 7 Thew. ⁴ Cf. R. Schoell. Legis duodecim tabularum reliquiae, 1866, p. 115.
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hoc enim scriptum legitur in Lugdunensi (L) et ex correctione in Harleiano (H), qui uterque est IX saeculi, atque huc spectat fortasse eicere scriptura quam ante correctionem habuit Bambergensis (B) saec. IX-X, unde profectum est id eicere codicis Guelferbytani (G) saec. X-XI. Eicere habent H₁, Gen. (saec. X), B₄, G₃.

Varronem¹ quoque hanc scribendi rationem usurpasse eiusdem Noni codices testificantur. In versu enim, qui in 452. 9 M. citatus est,

Frígore torvēnatum eicēt ieunio vellicum
cum eicēt habēant LH₂G, eicēt est in BH₁.

Lucreti² codices Leidenses (A saec. IX, B saec. X) habent eicēt, ceteri eicēt, in 2. 951: —

Dispersamque foras per caulas eicēt omnis

sed in 3. 513: —

Addere enim partis aut ordine traiecre aecumst

nulla varia esse scriptura videtur.

Catullus³ autem unum incertum exemplum praebet ubi proiect

verbum in 64. 370: —

Proiect truncum submisso poplite corpus

legitur; nam proiect in Ambrosiano (A) saec. XIV scriptum erat ante correctionem, et in Berolinensi (L) saec. XV.

Ex Vergili⁴ codicibus habent sex hanc vetustiorem scripturam:

Romanus (R) saec. IV-V, deicēt in G. 1. 333: —

Deicēt, ingegniant austri et densissimus imber

A. 8. 428: —

Deicēt in terras, pars imperfecta manebat

ib. 10. 753: —

Deicēt: at Thronium Salius, Saliumque Nealces.

Mediceus (M) saec. IV-V deicēt in G. 1. 333.

¹ Cf. ind. p. 136 Varro.
² Cf. ind. Lucr. b.
³ Cf. ind. Catul. b.
⁴ Cf. ind. Verg. b.
Bernensis 184 (c) saec. IX deicit in A. 10. 753, 11. 642: —

Deicit Herminium nudo cui vertice fulva

proiect ib. 5. 776: —

Proiect in fluctus ac vina liquentia fundit

traiect ib. 9. 634: —

Traiect. I, verbis virtutem inlude superbis.

Codex Gudianus (γ) saec. IX secunda manu, et Minoraugiensis (m) saec. XII, et ex correctione Bernensis 165 (b) saec. IX traict ib. 9. 634. Videtur etiam Priscianus, vel potius fortasse posterior eius operis libarius, deicit descripsisse in versu A. 10. 753 citando; cf. K. III. 293. 16.

Ovidi codex Laurentianus 36. 12 (λ) saec. XI-XII habet in margine deicit in M. 11. 386, quamquam in versu est scriptum dissidit, atque in plerisque libris est dissidit aut disicit vel plane scriptum vel sat indicatum: —

Dissecit1 (disicit) hos ipsos, colloque infusa mariti.

Statius unus Bambergensis (B) saec. XI exhibet hoc genus formam, eicit quidem in Th. 6. 770, ubi non nulli habent eicit aut eicit, sed Puteanus (P) saec. X, Gudianus 52 (G) saec. XIV, Helmstadiensis (H) saec. XV tradunt id quod sententia postulat, reicit2: —

Et patria vigil arte Lacon hos reicit ictus.

Itaque illud eicit codicis B ex reicit decurtatum esse videtur.

Liviani codices haec suppedant: eicit in i. 41. 1: —

Tanaquil inter tumultum claudi regiam iubet, arbitros eicit et deicit in i. 48. 3: —

Tarquinius . . . medium arripit Servium elatumque . . . per gradus deicit

qua quidem aperte praeentis sunt temporis,4 et deicit in i. 40. 7: —

alter elatum securim in caput deicit, reictoque in vulnere telo ambo se foras eiciunt

quod, cum praesentis esse putaverit Hertz,1 potest esse praeteriti. Etiam in 22. 37. 9:

ut praetor . . . classem in Africanam traiceret

Puteanus (P) saec. V-VI habet traiceret.

Haec praeterea dat Lachmann in commentario Lucretiano p. 128:
e Caelio Antipatro Nonius 89. 6 deicit ("congenuclat percussus
deicit dominum"). In Caesaris de bello Gallico comm. 4. 28
exemplaria duo (Parisinum 5763 (B) saec. X et Vossianum primum
sive Lugdunensem 53 (C) saec. VI laudat Nipperdey, Holder autem
B solum) deisserentur. In apocalypsi Iohannis 11. 2 unus codex
("unum e meis") est (cf. eius editionem Novi Testamenti. Eius
autem habet codex Fuldensis.2 v. edit. Ranke. p. 446.12).

Ex Schuchardti libro3 II, 4 haec adsumpsi: Digesta Florentina4
IX. 2. 31 deiceret; IX. 3. 1. § 4 et XLIII. 16. 3. § 12 deiceretur;
IX. 2. 53 deisserentur; VII. 1. 13. § 4 et XLIII. 16. 3. § 9 deiscerere
(infin.); VII. 1. 13. § 5 deicerit (pro infin.). Codex Sessorianus
Augustini Speculi saec. VIII-IX (cf. Schuch. III. 3) proiecetur.5
Codex Bobiensis-Vaticanus Augustini Sermonum saec. VI-VII (cf.
Schuch. I.c.) proicere.6 Gothanus7 Evangeliorum 38. b, 15 proicet.

Post vocali igitur, item ut post consonante, cadentes praepo-
sitiones sicio formam esse antiquiorem licet nobis arbitrari. Sed
sicio in his quoque compositis se mox ostendit in sermone, ut ex
scenaicis poetis8 appareat, non plerumque tamen ita etiam ut eiiio
verbum, quod exempli gratia profero, in quattuor syllabas ē-i-i-o
distinguereetur,9 sed in tres eiiio quaram prima esset diphthongus.10

---

1 Cf. eius edit. ad h. l. et ad 41. 1.
2 Cf. p. 92 sup.
3 Cf. p. 98 sup.
4 Cf. p. 98 sup.
5 Cf. A. Mai Novae Patrum Bibliothecae tom. I, 1852, partem sec. p. 28, vs. 27.
6 Cf. ib. partem primam, p. 25. vs. 11.
7 Cf. p. 98 sup.
8 Cf. etiam p. 99 sqq.
9 Contra sicio formam cf. sup. pp. 104-05; atque sicio quamquam initio quidem
veri est simillimum per quattuor syllabas auditum esse, non diu tamen haec ratio
dicendi perstitisse mihi videtur. Operae est pretium fortasse illud deinde adver-
bium recordari, in quo praefixa syllaba cum i littera sequente diphthongum effecit.
Similiter saepius dehinc, deincaps, prindo, alia.
10 Cf. ind. Plaut. e; Ter. d; Reil. e.
Cf. Mil. 205:—

Déxterum ita veménter ēcit; quód agat aegre súppetít

Asin. 254:—

Quin tu abs te socórdiam omnem rēćís, segnitiem ámoveš

Phorm. 717:—

Nam si áltera illaèc màgǐs instabít, fósītàn nos rēćiát

ib. 18:—

Ille ád famem hunc a stúdio studuit rēćiēre.

Sunt quoque alia¹ exempla quae per diphthongum sive synizesim, quam vocant, potuerunt dici. Haud tamen placet talis ratio; quae enim exempla certo sunt sic enuntianda apud hos scaenicos poetas non plus quinque inveniuntur, quae divisim necesse est enuntiari, quindeceim.

Haec autem per diphthongum ratio dicendi, quoniam brevior commodiorque erat illa altera per ēcı́o, magis magisque valuit, dum a. 105 a. Chr. n. pervagati fuit usus. Namque cum sono apud Romanos obscura est scriptura, tum eo anno lex est incisa, quae habet proiciō² scriptum. Apud poetas tamen et alios litteris instructos illud ēcı́o tam diu est identidem et dictum et scriptum, quoad remansit post consonante terminatas praepositiones, hoc est usque ad extremam Augusti aetatem.³ Inde ab hoc tempore omnino non usurpatur est neque apud poetas neque apud alios. Sic enim non solum inter se constat ratio omnium iaciendi verbi compositorum, et quorum consonantibus et quorum vocalibus cadunt praepositiones, verum huc quoque se vertunt vestigia earum quae ēcı́o habent formarum.⁴ Nam exstant haec aut in operibus quae sunt ante Augusti obitum composita, aut quae longe posteriora sunt; neque est ullam, quod sciam, exemplum apud scriptores priorum duorum p. Chr. n. saeculorum, uno tantum excepto apud Statium (cf. p. 112 sup.). Id ergo Statium ipsum scripsisse mihi quidem haud probabile

---

¹ Cf. ind. Plaut. f.; Ter. e; Rell. f.
² Cf. ind. Inscr. a. 3. Nempe potuit hoc verbum per diaeresim enuntiari, sed cf. p. 113 et adn. 9.
Iaciendi Verbi Composita.

videtur; atqui concedendum est profecto potuisse eum, quod in aliquo veterum scriptorum exemplari conspexisset, id imitari. Quae autem exempla in Novi Testamenti codicibus et apud Augustinum reperiuntur, ea, ut reor, indicant illius iecio formas inter rudes rusticocque diu conservatas esse.¹

Tametsi igitur, cum iecio iam a Tiberio imperatore obsoluisset, in sermone nihil nisi breviorem formam per diphthongum expressam in usuuisse maxime probable videtur, in carmina tamen hanc quidem formam, at per diaeresim elatam, admiserunt poetae. Cf. German.² 512: —

Rectus per medios decurrens trācit axis

Phaedr.³ Append. 8. 20: —

Et vōce mollī; ilcet? enim vero ēici
et alia.⁴

Sed quamquam diaeresim numerorum gratia, fortasse etiam vete-
rum consuetudine adducti,plerumque adsumpsersunt, volgarem tamen
dicendi modum neque hi neque illi spernebant. Quae apud Plautum
et Terentium sunt exempla supra laudavi. Quibus accedant haec:
Lucil. 652 Lachm.: —

. . . ego animam

Prōciām ut me amōre expediam . . .

ubi incertissima est scriptura.⁵ Quod dedi est ex Lachmanni
conjectura. Minime tamen, etiam si ea accipietur, necesse est per
diphthongum, prōciām, enuntiare, alteram enim mensuram, prōiciām,
facile accipit versus. Quod quidem maluit Lachmann ipse.⁶

Lucretius⁷ duo exempla habet, 3. 877: —

Nec radicitus e vita se tollit et ēcit

4. 1272: —

Ēcit enim sulcum recta regione viaque

¹ Cf. p. 102 sup.
² Cf. ind. p. 145 German. b.
³ Cf. ind. Phaedr. b.
⁴ Cf. ind. Manil. b; Val. b; II. Lat. b; Stat. c; Claud. c.
⁵ Cf. ind. Lucil. b.
⁶ Cf. Comm. in Lucr. p. 188.
⁷ Cf. ind. Lucr. c.
Mauricius W. Muther.
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Laber. 1 sqq. L. p. 306 R. —

Numquid me accès ? quoque mihi ac Graecum olibero?

Verg. 2 E. 5: 30 —

Titre, faucemque a humine vicis capellis.

Hor. 3 S. 2. 9. 39 —

Sétere de saxo dives sur miter Cadmo.

Ov. 4 F. 4. 7: 59 —

Facum intulit nummum, nummum, non accis captam.

Ciris. 5 113 —

Accis et inhumata virtute remisit Martem.

Sen. 6 Phoen. 146: —

Et unum acies premte captum duas

quamquam hic quoque praevixit per se longa syllaba potuit esse.

Val. Fl. 7. 514 —

Num accis virtus aeger patientem et mora dictis.

Stat. 7 Th. 4. 574: —

Tela manu valetque canes in ruinis huius.

Sed ante Romanos non admisisse similia sunt argumenta eorum, quae supra pp. 89-92 protuli, namque deest id ut in titulis, ita in libris antiquissimis et solutae ratione et vincula. exceptis modo P. Rec. Vergilianis: neque saepe in poetarum certe codicibus ante XV saeculum indicabatur. Talem praefera sonum, quo i consonans i vocalis exceptum esset in eadem syllaba, abhorret a Romanorum consuetudine, satis, arbitror, apparat ex testimoniiis supra p. 93 sqq. adlatis.

---

1 Cf. ind. Rell. e. 6 Cf. ind. Ciris.
2 Cf. ind. Verg. c. 7 Cf. ind. Sen. d.
3 Cf. ind. Hor. e. 8 Cf. ind. Val. c.
In poeta rum libris manu scriptis quae huius formae tradita sunt exempla, quod comperire ex editionibus criticis potuerim, haec fere sunt:

Plautinus F saec. XV (cf. p. 89 sup.) praebet reiicio in Merc. 908, deii ciam in Stich. 355, reii ciam in Pers. 320, reii cre ib. 319.


Catullianus Guelferbytanus (G) saec. XV gem inum i constanter habet.

Vergilianorum codicum habent tres huius formae exempla: Palat inus (P) saec. IV-V coficiunt in A. 10. 801, et de i · cit ib. 8. 428 in quo forsitan illius deiicit lateat vestigium. Romanus (R) saec. IV-V proici ib. 6. 835. Bernensis 184 (c) saec. IX trai · cit ib. 10. 400 ubi altera est erasa.

Ovidiana Defloratio Vincenti Bellovacensis saec. XIII dat ejici tur in T. 5. 6. 13. Codex m imperite interpolatus (cf. Merkel. edit., 1841, p. cclxxxi) traiictias in rasura habet in F. 4. 782. Codex Q (cf. p. 90 sup.) saec. XV habet ejicitur in T. 5. 6. 13, traierer ib. 5. 2. 33 ubi traiicere habent et Excerpta Politiani (A) et codex Oxoniensis (E), uterque saec. XV, et Berolinensis (o) saec. XIV.

Phaedri Neapolitanus (N) saec. XV (?) et Vaticanus 368 (V) saec. XV-XVI dant eici in Append. 8. 20.

1 Si qui alii codices hanc formam habent, scilicet novissimorum sunt.
2 Cf. ind. Plaut. d, f.
3 Cf. ind. Lucr. b.
4 Cf. ind. Hor. a.
5 Cf. ind. Verg. a.
6 Cf. sup. p. 94, adn. 4.
7 Cum his placeat comparare Ter. Hec. 842, ubi pro coniciat, quod est in codicibus, Palmer et alii coniciat voluerunt scribi. Cf. ind. Ter. b.
8 Cf. ind. Catul. b.
9 Cf. ind. Verg. a, b.
11 Cf. ind. Ov. c.
12 Cf. ind. Phaedr. b.
Stati codex Dommerichianus (D), qui in libris pessimis interpolatis habendus est, praebet deiciat\textsuperscript{1} in Achil. i. 311. Codices Behottiani, incerta aetate, eiicit\textsuperscript{2} in Th. 6. 770.

Varronis librorum de lingua Latina codex Hauniensis saec. XV in versu Atti (430. I. p. 191 R.) 7. 65 prolato reici\textsuperscript{3} tradit, reici\textsuperscript{4} Gothanus saec. XV, reici\textsuperscript{5} reliqui (excepto Florentino saec. XI, qui reici\textsuperscript{6} habet) saeculo XIV inferiores.

Gelli codicum interpolatorum pars in versu Pacuviano (94. I. p. 88 R.) 4. 17. 15 sumpto habent proici\textsuperscript{7}.

Horum codicum nullus praeter Vergilianos P R C superioribus saeculo XIII temporibus descriptus est. Post consonante autem praespositiones finitas nullum ex codicibus quorum comperi scripturas, praeter Vergili PV, qui uterque ad IV vel V saeculum pertinere, Moreti B saeculi IX, Plautique C saeculi XI, iicio scriptum habuisse dum ad XII saeculum perventum esset, supra p. 92 indicatum est. Quoniam ergo in Vergilianis solis vetustissimorum codicum hoc iicio invenitur, satis patet, opinor, id non a volgari usu sive loquenti sive scribendi esse ortum, sed ab alicuius more grammatici vel librari, atque a quo magis ortum putemus quam a Probo\textsuperscript{8} illo Aristarcho Vergiliano?

Namque grammatici post vocalis, ita ut post consonantes (cf. pp. 88–89 sup.), quod iacio verbi i consonantem nullo modo amitterem esse crediderunt, per duo i haec composita scribi iubebant; atque Velius Longus quidem eo more adductus, quo consonans i vocalibus interposita per duo i scripta est\textsuperscript{9} tria i memorat (K. VII. 54. 20): “Inde (h.e. a scribendo Aaiasum, Maiasum, Troiunam) crescit ista gaminatio et incipit per tria i scribi coiiicit.” Etiam (ib. 72. 4): “Troia per i unum an per duo scribere debeam; et coiiicit utrum per unum i an per duo an per tria . . . et sic fiat eiicit et coiiicit.”\textsuperscript{10}


\textsuperscript{1} Cf. ind. Stat. a. s. v. disticiat. \textsuperscript{2} Cf. ind. Stat. c. s. v. reiciat.
\textsuperscript{3} Cf. ind. Rell. f. \textsuperscript{4} Cf. ind. Rell. d.
\textsuperscript{5} Cf. p. 94 sup. \textsuperscript{5} Cf. pp. 107–08 sup.
Gellius in 4. 17. 15 testibus optimis codicibus proicit scriptis, quamquam post consonantes iicio scribendum modo dixerat, nihilque erat causae cur post vocalis quoque idem non iuberet. Servius autem unum i plane demonstrat se, ut enuntiavisse, ita etiam scripsisse; cf. ad Aen. 4. 549: "Obicio, reicio, adicio 'i' habent vocalem sequentem, quae per declinationem potest in consonantis formam transire, ut obici, reici." Accedat quod dixit ad Aen. 10. 473: "Re naturaliter brevis est, et eam pro longa posuit. Sic alibi (G. 3. 389): —

Reice ne maculis infuscet vellera pullis.

Quod licet possit excusari, quia cum facit reici, inter duas vocales i posita producit superiorem, ut dicamus longam eam esse spe qua per declinationem longa futura est; tamen quia in hac re argumentum magis est quam ratio, dicamus ecastin factam, quae poetis plerumque conceditur."

Iacio verbum igitur, cum praepositionibus quae vocalibus cadunt inciperet subiungi, in iicio se convertisse videtur. Plauti autem aetate in sermonibus certe haec e littera propria mutatione porro conversetabatur in i vocalem, id quod simul fecit ut i consonans reiceretur, nam i consonantis sonum i vocali subsequite non patiebantur Romani. Itaque praeposizione cum illa i vocali in una syllaba plerumque elata, diphthongus est effecta, quae magis atque magis valens ad extremum alterum saeculum ante Christum natum ita volgo audiebatur, ut, scriptura apud Romanos sono obsequente, etiam in legibus, quae veteres formas maxime amant, repraesentaretur scribendo. Inde in volgari commune usu cum haec forma versa- reretur, apud poetas tamen et alios politos litterarumque peritos illud iicio usque ad extremam Augusti aetatem restabant. Tiberio autem imperatore, non iam est hoc usurpatum, nisi, ut videtur, ab imperitis provincialibusve; verum iicio cum in sermone omnibus iam inde fuit in usu per diphthongum enuntiatum, tum numeri gratia per diaeresim a poetis non numquam adhibitum est.

---

1 Cf. 4. 17. 6 sqq. sup. pp. 88-89 prolatum.
IV. De \( H \) littera ad hiatum corrigendum adhibita.

Ille tamquam hiatus, qui concursu ultimae vocalis praepositionum cum illo \( iio \) formatus est, raro in codicibus per \( h \) litteram insertam vitatur. Hoc \( h \) quamvis Lachmann \(^1\) et L. Müller \(^2\) putasse videantur aequale fuisse eius \( iio \), perpaucorum mori librariorum, ut opinor, debetur. Nam neque in titulis neque in illis solutae orationis codicibus, quos supra pp. 91–92 laudavi, omnino occurrit: neque scilicet multo saepius in libris poeta rum. Quae notavi exempla in quibusdam editionum apparatibus criticis memorata haec sunt:

In Vergili Mediceo (M) saec. IV-V trahuit\(^3\) in A. 10. 400.


Cohiberat nesció quid de ratiuncula
(sic L. Müller. et cohibere ad codices plerique) cohibere dedit L.

In Plauti codice Vetere (B) saec. XI de hic \( iam \)\(^5\) in Stich. 349, unde dehinc \( iam \) in CDF.

Catulli Oxoniensis (O) saec. XIV-XV reddid prœhicies\(^6\) in 55. 19, prœhiceræ\(^7\) in 64. 82.

Ovidiani libri aliquot, saeculo XIII vel XIV descripi, habent trahiceræ\(^7\) in T. 5. 2. 33. quorum satis sit memorare Berolinensem (B) saec. XII-XIV et hos XII saeculii. Guelferbytanum (sec. manu, G₂), Holkhamicum (H), Parisinum 8254 (R).

\(^1\) Cf. Comm. in Lucr. p. 128.
\(^2\) Cf. de Re Metr. p. 291 = 250: "Alii pro eo quod est \( iocia \) scripsere \( iocia \) vel \( hicin.\)"
\(^3\) Cf. ind. Verg. b.
\(^4\) Cf. ind. p. 155; Rell. f.
\(^5\) Cf. ind. Catull. b.
\(^6\) Cf. ind. Plaut. f.
\(^7\) Cf. ind. Ov. c.
V. DE ILLIS VERBIS QUAE SUNT CONICIO ET DISICIO.

a) Conicio.

Restat denique ut de verbis quae sunt conicio et disicio breviter agam. Nam ut de conicio prius verba faciam, non satis adhuc cognitum est, qua ratione con et co ab antiquis adhibita sint. Examinatis autem iis formis quae in inscriptionibus et apud poetas sunt, atque etiam orationis solutae non modo iis quas ego in vetustissimis libris manu scriptis inveni, verum etiam quas conlegeorunt in libro suo Neue et Wagener, haec mihi videntur elucere: con praepositionem plerumque, si quidem non constanter, adhibuisse poetas; co autem formam, quae, ut veri simile est, pariter cum con praeponebat ei quod est itio verbo, tum, cum itio in itio converteretur, mox solam in sermone usurpari, atque, diphthongo cum i vocali plerumque effecta magis magisque valuisse, ab eisque qui solutis

---

2 Et con (com) et co formas ante i et u litteras semivocalis praebent inscriptiones antiquissimae; cf. illud senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus (CI. I. 196 (p. 43), a. 186 a. Chr. n.), in quo exstant haec: conpovisse vs. 13, coventionem vs. 23, coniura[re] vs. 13; etiam CI. I. 1011 coniunxer, 1053 coniugi, 1064 et 1413 coii qui quae inscriptiones, etsi incerta aetate, sunt tamen inter vetustissimae. Vide alia exempla ap. Neue. II, pp. 865, 867. Principio autem hau scio an illo co solo ante semivocallis usi sint Romani; contio enim et cunctus (concios in Carm. Arvalli, CI. I. 28. 4) vocabula non ab conventio et coiunctus possunt duci, verum ab conventio et coiunctus. Hoc si verum est, coiicio est primum adhibitum, deinde cum illo pariter conicio (cf. ind. Inscr. a. 2, coniicant, a. 123–2 a. Chr. n.); atque con praefixam syllabam plerumque scripserunt poetas, si quidem in codicibus possimus niti, cui non est mihi dubium quin ieciendi formas usque ad Tiberium imperatorem subiunxerint. Ille autem itio simul atque in usum venit, cum eo non saepe con, sed co, coiunctum est, quoniam sic poposcit consuetudo Romana. Namque ante vocalis co fere adhibitum est. Cf. cog (ab co-ago), coactus, coeo, coetus (ab coitus), coepio, alia. Exciipienda sunt sola haec vocabula: comedo, comes, comitium, cum ipsis quae ab his originem ducunt. Corripitur autem co syllaba (cf. p. 105 et adn. 5) cum eam excipiunt vocales; cf. Hor. S. 1. 2. 9: —

Verg. A. 3. 424: —

Omnia conductis chémur obsonia nummilia.

At Scyllam caecis cólumnes spelunca lateríria.

Sed apud poetas illud eo valde raro traditum est. In Plauti Rudente 769 coiciam ⁴ habent CD codices, sed reliquis in locis huius poetae con solum legitur.⁵ Apud Terentium autem con est constans, atque in Hecyra 132 non est dubium quin id conici, quod habent plurimi libri, praeferendum sit illi coici quod est in Bembino (A). Illud eo quod est in Laberi et Afrani versibus⁷ forsitan poetis ipsis non debeatur, sed Gellio⁸ et Nonio,⁹ qui hos versus sumunt. Namque con potest in omnibus restituti neque numeri laeduntur.

(Similiter de syllaba. Cf. Ter. Haut. 825: —

Ne ego homo sum fortunatus: ab uno tibi Syre.

Verg. A. 1. 106: —

Hi summo in factu pendens, his unde abhinc.

Lucr. 2. 202: —

Quin vacui per inane beurum cuncta ferrantur.)

Cum tamen eius ico verbi formae huic eo subiungantur, non corripitur sed per diphthongum cum i sequente coniungitur. Cf. pp. 113 (cum adn. 9)–116.

¹ Cf. ind. Inscr. a. 6. 10; b. 3; Neue, II, pp. 864–65. Accedat etiam ex Plini codice rescripto Veronensi (cf. p. 91 sup.) 15. § 29 (= edit. Sillig. vol. VI. p. 240. 2)

coicit forma. Serv. ad Aen. 9. 409 (411): "conicit antiquum est."

² Cf. p. 101 sup. ³ Cf. p. 91 sup. ⁴ Cf. pp. 91–92 sup.


⁹ Cf. Non. p. 267. 34 et 36 M.
Iaciendi Verbi Composita.

Item apud Lucilium haud scio an sit con\(^1\) ponendum in 2. 25 et 29. 48 M. (=62 et 715 Lachm.), qui versus a Nonio 268. 5 et 506. 27 M. citati sunt. Con\(^2\) dat Gellius 4. 17. 2 in Lucili versus qui est 11. 10 M. vel 342 Lachm.

Vergili libri con\(^3\) formam exhibit constanter, nisi quod in A. 10. 646 et 5. 662 Romanus (R), in 10. 801 Palatinus (P) eo habent. Ovidiani quoque libri con\(^4\) semper reddunt, tametsi in M. 7. 245 ante correctionem eo habuit codex Marcianus Florentinus 225 (M) saec. XI. Apud Ennium,\(^6\) Lucretium,\(^6\) Ciceronem,\(^7\) Tibullum\(^6\) nihil nisi con est traditum, neque licet nobis dubitare quin ipsi poetae coniciendi formas scripserint. Sed post Augusti obitum cum illud ictio breviori ictio formae cessisset, in con utendo, eoque longo, nihil minus perstiterunt poetae.\(^8\) Cuius rei sola duo sunt exempla, alterum apud Valerium Flaccum,\(^9\) alterum apud Silium.\(^11\)

b) Disicio.

In verbo autem disiciendi de quo alias alii sententias dixerunt, eandem, qua sum in ceteris usus, rationem volo adhibere. Atque disicio ne quisquam, oro, arbitretur aliud esse verbum ex illo secere\(^10\) compositum. Nam cum O. Ribbeck, vir doctissimus, hanc opinionem a. 1873 diserte protulerit in corollario comoricum fragmentorum p. xiii sqq., ac Prisciano sumendo 1002 P (K. III. 56. 18): "Sciendum, quod tunc dis praeponitur, quando sequitur e vel i vel p vel s vel t vel i loco consonantis, ut discumbo . . . diffro . . . displaceo . . . disicio, dissero, distraho . . . disiectus, disiungo," ubi id disicio enumerat ille cum dissero verbo, non cum disiectus, studuerit sententiam comprobare; minime, ut ipse quidem fatetur, sustentant codices hanc distinctionem, tum disiceret tum disicere inconsulte ac temeritie exhibentes, neque id quod seco est in hoc solo composito sicio factum esse mihi facile persuadetur, eoque minus quod disseco exstitit a dissecano. Itaque disiciendi verbum, quod habent saepis-

---

\(^1\) Cf. ind. Lucil. b. \(^2\) Cf. ind. Lucil. a.
\(^3\) Cf. ind. Verg. a. \(^4\) Cf. ind. Ov. a. \(^5\) Cf. ind. Enn. a.
\(^6\) Cf. ind. Lucr. a. \(^7\) Cf. ind. Cic. b. \(^8\) Cf. ind. Tibul. a.
\(^12\) Seccere quidem non minus se commendat quam lavere, sonere, tonere.

Iaciendi Verbi Composita.

2) Att. 348. I. p. 181 R. dissicit. dissicit H1, dissicit Hs.
3) Naev. 57. II. p. 16 R. dissicis.
4) Caecil. 239. II. p. 74 R. dissice. sic Putean., disce volgo.
5) Lucr. 3. 639 dissicetur.
6) Verg. A. 12. 308 dissicit. bcMs, dissicit γM1, dissicit P1, dissicit P2, dissidit R.
7) Verg. A. 1. 70 dissicce. Rybem, schol. Serv. 5. 683; dissiccep M, disce Donati exempl.
8) Verg. A. 7. 339 dissicce. RybψMs, dissipae c, disce M1, disiice, supra scripta for. tasse s, V.
9) Ov. M. 11. 386 dissicit. sic vel dissicit codd. plerique; dissidit λ cuius in marg. deiccit.
10) Sen. Tro. 395 dissicit. dissiccat E, dissipat A.
12) Sen. Phoen. 343 dissicce. E, deicte interpolator E.
13) Val. Fl. 3. 162 dissicce. C, dissicet P, dissicet M1, dissici cit Ms.
15) Sil. It. 13. 444 dissicce. Ch, discite O.
16) II. Lat. 325 dissiceret. dissiceret E, discideret FV, divideret MN, dissipere L, dissutere B.
19) Stat. Th. 10. 69 dissicce.
Mauricius W. Mather.

Ex his igitur sunt novem (4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17) quae variis scripturis et dis et diss vel perspicue exhibent vel satis indicant; decem (1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19) quae, cum diss manifestum vel haud obscure indicatum habent, tum dis scripturae nullum dant vestigium; unum denique (16) quod dis solum habet, sed etiam in hoc forsanis diss in iis scripturis lateat, quae sunt in FVLB codicibus.

Quamquam hi ipsi poetae, ut arbitror, illam geminationem s litterae non adhibuerunt.\(^1\) Nam ante Augustum mortuum disiicendi formas veri simile est esse scriptas, atque postea disiicendi, in quo sane dis syllaba corriperetur; cuius rei exempla duo praebere Seneca\(^2\) videtur in Agam. 896:

Disiicere et hostem quaerit implicitus suum

et in Phoen. 343:

Disiicite passim moenia in planum date

quorum in utroque dis syllaba potest corripi. Sed in Tro. 395:

nubes...

Arctoi Boreae dissicit impetus

ubi versus Asclepiadei ratio postulat ut dis syllaba producatur, non disiicet scrispis poeta, verum dissecat vel disiicat,\(^3\) si quidem codici Etrusco omnium praestantissimo credere possimus. Apud Valerium Flaccum autem et Silium et Statium, si eorum in iaciendi compositis rationis meminerimus,\(^4\) haud mira videbitur productio dis syllabae. Hanc vero productionem non duabus s litteris scribendis significaver, nam simplicis s exempla ipsa, quae sunt omnium optime codicibus sustentata, praebent Silius 9. 538 et Ilias Latina 325.


\(^2\) Cf. ind. Sen. a.

\(^3\) Cf. sup. p. 124. adn. 6.

\(^4\) Cf. sup. pp. 101–02.
INDEX.

Enumeratio omnium praesentium praepositionibus subjunctarum iaciendi verbi formarum, quae in Inscriptionibus et apud Poetas, quotquot inter annos 240 a. Chr. n. et 200 p. Chr. n. scripsérunt, sunt repertae. Adduntur quae formae apud Ausonium et Claudia, num occurrunt.

I.


a) Quorum tempora definirii possunt, secuntur: —
   (cf. p. 110) proieciad (= proiciito?) in lege Lucerina de luco tempore non certo sed antiquo promulgata. CI. IX. 782; Eph. Epigr. II. p. 205.
   (cf. pp. 96, 100) conieciant in lege repet. a. 123 sive 122 a. Chr. n. CI. I. 198. 50.
   (cf. pp. 100, 114) proiciito in lege paretis faciendi a. 105 a. Chr. n. CI. I. 577, I. 12, 16 (p. 163) et X. I. 1781 (p. 218).
   inicere in lege Ursonensi a. 44 a. Chr. n. CI. II. Supplem. 5439. lxi. 1; Eph. Epigr. III. p. 91. 1.
   reiciantur CI. ib. xcv. 27; Eph. Epigr. II. pp. 110, 224.
   (cf. p. 121 sq.) coicerentur in titulo artificis de ossibus Hilarae sepeliendis a. 13 a. Chr. n. CI. VI. 2290.
   deiciientes in Menologio Rustico Colotiano et Men. Rust. Vallensi, quae haud multo recentiora facta sunt quam Fasti nobis servati, qui omnes ex annis u.c. 723—804 (= 31 a. Chr. n.
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-51 p. Chr. n.) orti sunt.\(^1\) CL. I. p. 359. xxii. a et b sub mense Decembr. vs. 15; VI. I. 2305 et 2306 (pp. 637, 639).
adicere in titulo a Vespasiano ad milites in provinciam Baeticam a. 78 p. Chr. n. miss. CL. II. 1423. 11.

subici in decreto Domitiani ad Falerienses ex Piceno attinentes a. 82 p. Chr. n. CL. IX. 5420. 8.


(cf. p. 88, adn.) adicit in vss. heroicis a. 136 p. Chr. n. compositis. CL. XIV. 2852. 15.

subicientur in epistula a. 314 p. Chr. n., ut veri simile est, a Constantino ad Romae praefectum scripta. CL. V. 2781. 27; Eph. Epigr. VII. p. 416, tab. B, vs. 45.
adici in titulo sacro, qui in Ianiculo repertus, certe post Diocletiani tempora, probabiliter quinto saeculo iam ver. gente, incisus est. CL. VI. I. 1711. vs. 3.
adicit ib. vs. 17.

[reiciendos e Claudi orationis a. 48 p. Chr. n. habitae fragmento, quod in tabula aenea servatur. cf. ed. Monfalcon., 1851, t. IV. 8 (non vidi); Tacit. Nipp. edit. quart., 1880, II. p. 304, col. II. 8.]

\(^1\) Cf. Ph. E. Huschke, Das Alte Röm. Jahr und seine Tage, p. 142.
Iaciendi Verbi Composita.

§) Quorum tempora non definiuntur, haec sunt:

adicias in praeceptis T. Flavi cuiusdam de ossibus et cineribus datis. CI. VI. II. 8431.

adiciatur CI. X. i. 649.

(cf. pp. 121–22) coicito in fragmento Arimini effosso, quod Garrucci eius tabulae esse conicit, quae altera parte exhibet legem repetundarum. cf. conieciunt sup. CI. XI. i. 364 a.

deiciat CI. X. i. 1971.

incere CI. XIV. 586.

traiciendas in titulo sepulcrali. CI. VI. ii. 10237, vs. 13. (In summa 21.)

e) Haec exempla cum ad quaestionem nostram non pertineant tamen digna sunt quae laudentur:

(cf. p. 89) iniise in tabella marmorea, quae in compluribus libris titulos continentibus edita a Mommseno Falsis adsignata est. CI. X. i. 204* (p. 10*).


adiecit in fragmento pusillo VTVM·ADIECIT. Est sine dubio temporis praeteriti. CI. XII. 5309.

II.

Exempla e Poetarum scriptis sumpta iam cum variis scripturis disponamus, primumque quidem
PLAUTINA,

quorum expedit in primis ea proferre

a) in quibus syllaba praefixa consonante exit eiusque productio metro confirmaur. cf. p. 100.

ā’diceret Poen. 1174.1 A, adiecerit F cf. p. 96.

(cf. p. 122) cōnīcit2 Mil. 112. contigit B, contegit CD cf. p. 96, compagit F.


(cf. p. 125 sq.) diśscit Curc. 424. dessicit BE, diligit FE.

i’nicio Cas. 225. BI, initio E, initio FV.

i’nicit Aul. 197.

i’nice Truc. 479. iniice F (L cf. p. 89).

i’nice Pers. 88. BCD, iniice F cf. p. 89.

ō’bicītur Merc. 339. obiciitur F “ “

ō’bicītur Pseud. 592. A, obiciitur F “ “

(In summa 10.)

b) Pauca sunt exempla quae correptam habent syllabam primam consonante cadentem.


(cof. p. 99) ō’bicio Asin. 814. obitias E. (3.)

(c) Plerumque anceps est primae syllabae consonante exeuntis mensura.

ō’bicio Merc. 851. abiicio F cf. p. 89.

ō’biciam Men. 555. abiciam F “ “

ō’diciat Asin. 769. aditiat BD.

ō’dicito Merc. 491. A, abdicito F.

(cf. p. 122) cō’nīcium Curc. 253. conitio BEI.


“ “ cō’nīcium Cas. 342. conitiam B, nitiā E.

1 Ritscheliana editionis numeros sequor.
Iaciendi Verbi Composita.

   “ “ cōnīcīte Cas. 386. coniicto F cf. p. 89.
   “ “ cōnīcītō Cas. 94. coniicerc F “ “
   “ “ cōniciere Trin. 238. initiuit BE.
   cōniciam Amph. 875. iniiciam F (L cf. p. 89), initiim rell.
   cōniciam Truc. 762. iniiciam F (L cf. p. 89), initiim rell.
   cōniciam Cas. 589. A, iniiciam F cf. p. 89, initiium EV.
   cōniciat Pers. 71. initiat BCD, titiat Da, iniiciat F cf. p. 89.
   cōniciatis Truc. 298. BCD, inleciatis (corr. illeciatis)
   iniiciatis A cf. p. 96, iniiciatis F (L cf.
   iniicite Capt. 659. iniicite, icite in ras., B, iniicite F
cf. p. 89.
   iniicere Epid. 690. iniicere, iniicere
   iniicere Capt. 267.
   iniicere Pseud. 407. A, incipere BCDF, iniicere ‘pri-
   iniicere Pseud. 643. ACD, iniicere F cf. p. 89.
   ıbiciio Curc. 567. obitio E (corr. Ei).
   ıbiciunt Curc. 531. obiitunt E.
   ıbiciunt Trin. 1124. obiiciunt F “ cf. p. 89.
   ıbiciunt Pers. 470. obiiciunt F “ “
   ıbiciam Rud. 770. A, obiciam F “ “
   ıbiciet Epid. 664. obiciet F “ “
   ıbiciemus Mil. 148. obitiemus BCD, obiiciemus F
cf. p. 89, obiciemus B.
   ıbiciatur Poen. 606. obiciatur F “ “
   ıbicito Poen. 1235. obicito A
   ıbicere Mil. 623. obiceret ante ras. B, obiciere C
   ıbicere Mil. 619. B et ex ras. D, obiciere C et ante
   ıbicere obi BCD, obici F cf. p. 89,
obicere Müller Pros. p. 538.
(34-)
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d) Vocali autem exeuntes praepositiones in his producuntur.

dē'ici Asin. 425.
dē'icite\(^1\) Stich. 360. ABCDF.
ed'icite\(^1\) Cas. 23. B, dicite V, diicite ras. ex discite
       E, ducite IF.

(cf. p. 105) ē'ici Asin. 127.
pro'ici Cist. 618.
re'icio\(^1\) Merc. 908. reicio F cf. p. 117. (6.)

e) Bis certe praepositio cum i littera sequente per synizesim,
quam dicit, coalescit. cf. pp. 104 sq., 114.
ē'cit Mil. 205. ABCDF.
re'icis Asin. 254. reice libri, reicis Lambin. (2.)

f) In reliquis dubium est producta an per diphthongum cum i
sequente praepositionis vocalis sit enuntianda. cf. pp. 104
sq., 114.

dē'iciam vel Stich. 349. A, de hic iam B, dehinc iam
   dē'ciam CDF cf. p. 120.
dē'iciam vel Stich. 355. ABCD, deiciam F cf. p. 117.
ed'icis vel Asin. 161. ras. unius litt. ante eicis D.
ed'icis Truc. 659. eiciā D, ieciā B, ieciam C cf.
ed'iciam Mil. 845. p. 110.
ed'iciar vel F, eicia BC, eici acellaria D.
ed'iciam 117.
re'icere p. 117. (7.)

\(^1\) His in exemplis atque in omnibus sequentibus Plautinis produci praeposi-
tionem non demonstrant numeri. Verum tamen in talibus vocelem numquam
corripi licet sine dubio adfirmare. Cf. p. 104 sq.
Iaciendi Verbi Composita. 133

TERENTIUS.

a) Terentius, quorum consonante finita prior pars producitur, haec suppeditat. cf. p. 100.

(cf. p. 97) śniecit Ad. 710. A cum reli. (e in ras. P), Donat. in lemm.
śbici Ad. 610 b.
sūbice Ph. 387.

b) Correptas primas syllabas quae consonante cadunt cum non habeat poeta noster, ancipites tamen multas praebet. cf. p. 100.

Śbiciunda Ad. 744. abicienda A et, e in ras., D.
(cf. p. 122) cōnicio Haut. 63. ic in ras. C, conitio P.
cōnicas Haut. 292.
cōnicerem Ph. 190.
cōnicito Ph. 166.
cōnicere Eun. 547.
Înícere And. 140.
Śbicerem Haut. 186.

(9.)

c) Vocali autem exunctes praeoccupationes in his per se longam faciunt syllabam. cf. p. 132, adn.

ēcitur Ph. 673.
ēciam Ph. 437.
ēciat And. 382. (ante caesuram versus.)
ēciunda Eun. 222. eiciunda A, fāciunda D.

(4.)

d) Per diphthongum haec necesses est dicere. cf. p. 132, adn., 114.

reīciat Ph. 717.
reīcere Ph. 18.

(2.)

e) Unum exemplum licet dubitare sitne per diphthongum legendum an membratim. cf. p. 132, adn., 114.

ēciat vel And. 382. (verbam a postremo proximum.)
ēi ciat

(1.)
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RELIQUI SCAENICI POETAE.

Reliquorum, qui fabulas docuerunt, poetarum nunc indicabitur usus.

a. Syllabas praefixas quae consonante finiuntur in his exemplis producendās declarant numeri. cf. p. 100.

(cf. p. 125 sq.) dissicis Naev. 57. II. p. 16 R.¹
" " dissicit Att. 348. I. p. 181 R.² Hs, discit H.
" " dissice Caecil. 239. II. p. 74. Putæan., discæ volgo.
i’nicī Caecil. 262. II. p. 77.
sūbicīt Append. Sent. 49. sic volgo, subigit β,

(b) Naevius solus correctam syllabam primam consonante cadentem exhibet.

(cf. p. 99) abiciam Naev. 94. II. p. 23.

(c) In his incerta est consonante exeuntium praepositionum mensura. cf. p. 100.

abīcere Publil. Syr. 9. II. p. 310. sic Ribb., aspicere libri.
adrīcis ex inc. fab. 86, II. p. 127.
īncere Ennius 126. I. p. 31.
īnicendum Laber. 134. II. p. 298. (sine numeris citem.)
ōbīcitur ex inc. fab. 40. II. p. 119.
ōbīcitur ex inc. fab. 57. II. p. 121.

(d) Vocali quae exerceant syllabae primae videntur in his produci.

(cf. p. 122) cósicior Laber. 147. II. p. 300.
" " cósicere Afraen. 311. II. p. 204.
èlcer è Pacuv. 385. I. p. 128.
prō‘icit Pacuv. 94. I. p. 88. proicit Vat. Rott. Par.,
proicit cett. cf. p. 118.

(cf. p. 105) prō‘ici Laber. 83. II. p. 292.

¹ O. Ribbeck, Comicorum Fragm., edit. sec., 1873.
² O. Ribbeck, Tragicorum Fragm., edit. sec., 1871.
Iaciendi Verbi Composita.

e) Synisesis, quae dicitur, semel appareit. cf. p. 132, adn., 114.

(cf. p. 116) dē'cis Laber. 119. II. p. 296. (1.)

f) Per diphthongum haec dicenda sint necne non liquet. cf. p. 132, adn., 114.

(cf. p. 122) cō'icere vel Afran. 216. II. cohicere L cf. p. 120.
cō'icere p. 191.
ē'ciebantur vel Enn. 9. I.
ē'ciebantur p. 16.
prō'iceret vel Afran. 347. II.
re'icis vel Att. 430. I. Flor., reiicies Haun.,
re'icis p. 191. reiices Goth., reiicis

(4.)

ENNIUS (ANNALES).

Iam vero, ut reliquis poetas, qui omnes fere hexametros versus
scripserunt, deinceps temporum ordine disponamus, Enni in Anna-
libus usus indicetur.

a) Consonante terminatae praepositiones, ut constanter in herois
usque ad extremam Augusti aetatem, producendae sunt.
cf. p. 87.

(cf. p. 123) cō'nicit Ann. 61 M. = 75 Vahl.
ī'nicit Ann. 172 M. = 171 Vahl. (2.)

b) Solum exemplum, quod vocāli finitam priorem partem habet,
ea producta dicitur. cf. p. 105.

prō'iciunt Ann. 250 M. = 238 Vahl. (1.)

LUCILIUS.

Ex Lucili autem reliquiis excerpta sunt haec exempla, quorum in sex
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a) Consonante cadunt praepositiones.

(cf. p. 123) cónicere XI. 10 M. sic Salmas., sucit codd.
ôbiciebat XI. 14 M.
sûbicere IV. 29 M. (ad fn. septenari troch.).
sûbicet XV. 37 M. subsit Fest. (summisit Paulus)
sûbicet XXVI. 62 M. cf. 308 et 310 M., subrigit
? lib. incert. Lachm. in edit. vs. 1111.
107 M.

b) In his autem vocāli exit prior pars:

(cf. p. 123) có'icis II. 25 M. sic Lachm. in comm. Lucret.
côlculo? XXVIII. 48 M. p. 136, coici aut conici codd.
(dem. iamb.).
dèciam XXVIII. 35 M. sic aut deiciunt codd. (sen.
(iamb.).
(cf. p. 110) cie'cere XXVIII. LH₂, eicere Bn, eicere G₁,
106 M. eicere Gen. H₁ B₁ G₂.
réiceret XXII. 6 M. sine metro citatum.
(cf. 818 Lachm.).
(cf. p. 115) prô'iciam 652 Lachm. perficiam XXVII. 22 M. ex
vel Madvig. Advers. 1. 18, perei-
prô'iciam? ciam Non. codd. p. 296 M.

LUTATIUS CATULUS.

e'iceret vs. 4. Baehr. PLM. VI. 276.

M. TERENTIUS VARRO.

XXII). sic BH₁, eicit LH₂ G.

(1.)
Iaciendi Verbi Composita.

LUcretius.

a) Consonante finitae praepositiones.

(cf. p. 123)  cō′nicuēnt  6.731.
   "   "  cō′nicere  1.751.
   "   "  cō′nicere  2.121.
   "   "  cō′nicere  2.1073.
   "   "  cō′niciens  1.284.
   "   "  cō′niciens  6.345.
   "   "  ō′biciens  5.755.

   (8.)

b) Vocali finitae praepositiones.

de′icīt  5.1125.
(cf. p. 111)  e′īcīt  2.951.  AB, eicit Nicc., Flor. 31, Camb.
   "  e′icit  6.689.
   "  e′iciuntur  3.58.  sic Lambin., Lachm., Munro, eli-
   "  e′iciuntur  3.497.  ciuntur codd.  cf. p. 117.
   "  e′iciatur  4.945.  idem ac 3.58.  "   "
   "  e′icere  4.1046.
   "  prō′iciunt  5.896.  eliciatur codd.  "   "
   "  rē′icit  1.34.  sic Turneb., Lambin., proficiunt codd.
   "  rē′icere  6.81.
   "  trā′iciuntur  2.714.
(cf. p. 111)  trā′īcēre  3.757.

   (14.)

c) Bis apparat diphthongus. cf. p. 115.

   e′icit  3.877.
   e′icit  4.1272.

   (2.)

CATUllus.

a)  ō′bice  24.9.  (vs. Phalaec.).
i′niciens  35.10.  (vs. Phalaec.).

   (2.)
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b) ε'iciunt 105.2. eiiciunt G cf. p. 117.
pro'icies 55.19. prohicies O cf. p. 120, proiicies G cf. p. 117.
pro'icere 64.82. DC al., proiciere G cf. p. 117, prohicere O cf. p. 120.

(4.)

CICERO.¹

Duorum exemplorum apud Ciceronem exhibet alterum certo *longum* priorem partem, alterum *ancipitem*.

a) (cf. p. 97) abiecit de Div. 1.48.106. AV.
b) " 123 coniciet de Div. 2.5.12. (in arsi senari).

(2.)

TIBULLUS.

(cf. p. 123) conicet 1.8.54. coniciet G cf. p. 89.
subiicet 1.5.64. subiicet G " "

(2.)

PROPERTIUS.

a) adiciam 4.2.41.
adice 4.11.77.
iniciat 4.6.86.
inicere 4.7.34.
obicitur 3.19.1.
obiciat 2.30.25.
subiicet 1.7.20.

(7.)

b) pro'icis 3.8.4.

(1.)

¹ Haec verba ex Tusc. 2.36 Thielmann in Wölfl. *Archiv* IV. 600 in senarium voluit restituere, "Impelluntur, feriuntur, abiciuntur, cadunt." Verum, ne asper-rimum dicam hunc esse versum, pro aetate Ciceronis omnino haud placet emenda-tio, quae primam syllabam compositi correetam reddit.
VERGILIUS.

a) Consonante terminatur prior pars.

ā'diciunt A. 8.304.
ā'diciunt 10.182.
ā'diciam 12.837.
ā'dicias 11.354.

(cf. p. 123) có'nicit 5.619.
" " có'nicit 7.347. có'cicit c.
" " có'nicit 9.411.
" " có'nicit 10.646. coicit R cf. p. 123.
" " có'nicit 10.657.
" " có'nicit 10.891.
" " có'nicunt 5.662. coiciunt R cf. p. 123.
" " có'nicunt 6.222.
" " có'nicunt 10.330.
" " có'nicunt 10.801. coiciunt P cf. pp. 117, 123.
" " có'nicunt 11.194.
" " có'nice A. 9.494.

(cf. p. 126) dissicit 12.308. bc, disicicit M cf. 7.339 inf., disiciit P2γ, disiciit P cf. p. 90, discidit R.
" " dissicte 1.70. Rybc, schol. Servi 5.683, disiscit M, disisce Donati exempl.

ī'nicit 9.553.
ī'nicit 11.728. Rc, incicit MPyb, incicitit Heins.
ī'nicunt E. 6.19. inciunt V.
ī'nice A. 6.366.
ō'bicis 4.549.
ō'bicet 7.480.
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ō'biciunt 2.444.
ō'biciunt 9.45.
ō'biciunt 9.379.
ō'bicur 2.200.
ō'bicur 5.522.
ō'bicienda E. 3.7.
sū' bicio A. 3.314.
sū' bicit E. 10.74.
sū' bicit G. 2.19.
sū' biicunt 4.304.
sū'biicunt A. 2.236.
sū'biicunt 5.103.
sū'biicunt 7.110.
sū'biicunt 12.288.

(43.)

b) Vocali finitae priores partes.

dē'icis A. 11.665.
(cf. p. 111) dē'icit G. 1.333. RM, deicit γbc.
" " dē'icit 10.753. Rci, Prisciani ω, deicit MPVyb.
(cf. p. 112) dē'icit 11.642. c1, deicit MPRyb.
dē'ice G. 3.422.
prō'icis A. 11.361.
" " prō'icet 5.776. c, proicit R.
prō'ice 6.835. proice R cf. p. 117.
rē'icet 10.473.
rē'iciunt 11.619.
rē'ice G. 3.389.
" " trä'icet A. 9.634. γ2cm, traiicit b, traiicit M, transiit ut vid. γ1, transigit P, transadigit R.
trä'icet 10.400. trahicit M cf. p. 120, traiicit(eras. i) c cf. p. 117.
trä'icet 11.685. (15.)
c) Per diphongum enuntiatum.

(cf. p. 116) rei'ce E. 3.96. (1.)

HORATIUS.

a) a'bicito Ep. 1.13.7.
a'diciant C. 4.7.17.
i'niciat 1.17.26. (vs. Alcaicus.)
i'niciat S. 1.6.32. inliciat C, illiciat g cf. p. 117, iniitiat ER, ut vid., z.
o'biciebat 1.4.123.
o'biciet 1.6.69.
o'biciet 1.6.107.
o'bicere Ep. 1.16.62.
o'bicere C. 3.10.3. (vs. Asclep.) (9.)

b) pro'icit A.P. 97.
pro'icere S. 2.3.100. (2.)

c) (cf. p. 116) dei'cere S. 1.6.39. (1.)

OVIDIUS.

a) a'dicis A.A. 3.8.
a'dicis M. 11.285. addicit λ.
a'dicit A.A. 3.152.
a'dicit M. 2.384.
a'dicit 7.266.
a'dicit 11.637.
a'dicit 11.671.
a'dicit 12.58.
a'diciunt 1.245.
a'diciunt 7.121.
a'diciunt 10.656.
a'diciam Am. 2.13.25.
a'diciam M. 9.628.
a'diciam Pont. 1.8.56. addiciam FP.
"adicem" T. 5.5.25.  addicerem HKV αβηλν,  
adijcerem Q cf. p. 90,  
adducerem C (corr.),  
adderem D (corr. D2).

"adice" Med. Fac. 63.  
"adice" 82.  
"adice" Rem. Am. 558.  
"adice" 790.  
"adice" M. 6.182.  
"adice" 14.319.  

"adice" F. 1.189.  codd. plerique, addice ΢ adiice Νσ cf. p. 90.

"adice" 4.75.  
(cf. p. 123)  " o'nicit M. 7.245.  coṣicit M.  
"o'nicit" 5.42.  
"o'nicit" 11.28.  
"o'nicit" T. 3.1.46.  coniiciendus H cf. p. 90,  
conviciendus Ο, conniiciendus Κ, coniiciendus Q cf. p. 90, iniciendus F3V3,  
(recte FV).


"nicit" Am. 3.9.20.  
"nicit" M. 9.78.  
"nicint" A.A. 1.116.  
"nicint" F. 6.515.  
"niçam" Am. 1.4.40.  
"niçam" 2.5.30.  
"niciet" 1.4.6.  
"niciet" T. 3.7.35.  innicit V, inniciet V2.  
"nicias" Ep. 19.190.  
"nicias" Pont. 3.4.101.
Iaciendi Verbi Composita.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{I\'nicerem} & \quad \text{Ep. 12.158.} \\
\text{I\'niceret} & \quad \text{M. 3.389.} \\
\text{I\'nice} & \quad \text{Ep. 8.16.} \\
\text{I\'nicere} & \quad \text{M. 1.184.} \\
\text{o\'bicit} & \quad 3.516. \\
\text{o\'bicit} & \quad 13.308. \\
\text{o\'biciunt} & \quad \text{T. 5.10.40.} \quad \text{obiiciunt QV cf. p. 90.} \\
\text{o\'bicur} & \quad \text{Am. 2.7.18.} \\
\text{o\' bicies} & \quad 2.2.37. \\
\text{s\'ubicur} & \quad \text{T. 4.1.74.} \quad \text{subijcio Q} \quad " \quad " \\
\end{align*}\]

b) \textit{Correpta} prima syllaba quae \textit{consonante} cadit non occurrit apud Ovidium. Namque illud \textit{abici}, quod Merkel et Gütthling in Pont. 2.3.37 acceperunt atque L. Müller in libro de Re Metrica p. 291\textsuperscript{a} (p. 250\textsuperscript{o}) defendit, nimium \textit{abigi} verbo locum dat atque cedit; scribitur enim in uno codice \textit{B}, Monacensi lat. 384 saec. XII, qui liber quamquam ad constituendam Ponticorum scripturam ponitur inter praeceptuos, hic tamen non sequendus est contra ceteros, qui \textit{abigi} tradunt. Neque Ovidius, qui aliter his consonante exeuntibus primis syllabis semper longis utitur, semel brevem passus esse potest putari. cf. p. 101.

c) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{d\'ecit} & \quad \text{M. 1.719.} \\
\text{d\'icitur} & \quad \text{T. 5.6.13.} \quad \text{eiicitur deflor. Vincent. Bellov., eijicitur Q cf. p. 117.} \\
\text{pr\'ociet} & \quad \text{Ep. 21.165.} \\
\text{pr\'ociet} & \quad \text{M. 9.575.} \\
\text{pr\'ociet} & \quad \text{Pont. 3.4.97.} \\
\text{pr\'ociere} & \quad \text{I. 164.} \quad \text{protiere T.} \\
\text{pr\'ociare} & \quad 294. \\
\text{r\'ecio} & \quad \text{Ep. 21.200.} \\
\text{r\'eicit} & \quad \text{F. 1.436.} \\
\text{r\'eiciat} & \quad \text{T. 1.1.66.} \quad \text{reiciet \textit{Bp} (corr. \textit{ps}), proiciat \text{ER}δηλ, eiciat (in ras. d dispicitur) \psi.}
\end{align*}\]
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ré’icerer M. 9.606.
ré’ice Am. 1.4.34.
ré’ice A.A. 1.695.
ré’ice M. 14.677.
ré’icere 2582.
ré’icere 9.51.
tra’icit 9.128.
tra’icias F. 4.782.
tra’icerer T. 5.2.33.
traicier BGzHR al. cf. p. 120, traicier Δξο, traicier Q cf. p. 117, transigerer V, traicierem GO.

(19.)


(1.)

CONSOLATIO AD LIVIAM

passorum usque Nasso utum exemplum praeberet, quod consueveratur illius servat.

a dice 185.

(1.)

A SABINUS

quaeque usum ut exemplum.

a dice Bp. 3.2.

(1.)
Iaciendi Verbi Composita.


MORETUM.


a) fubicít 96. sic aut adicit plerique codd., adicit H cf. pp. 83, adn., 90, abdicat V. (1.)

b) ñadicitur 99. adicitur BH cf. p. 90. (1.)

CIRIS.

Ciris exemplum diphthongi habet.

(cf. p. 116) reîcere ? 118. sic Heins., dicere aut ducere codd. (1.)

AETNA.

Aetnam, cum post aliquanto componeretur, hic liceat ponere. lnice 405. C, isse H. (1.)

GERMANICUS.

a) (cf. p. 101) sumbicít 196. obicit var. script. (1.)

b) (cf. p. 115) tràlicit 512. traxit et pertraxit var. scriptt. (1.)

MANILUS.

a) (cf. p. 101) ãdic(e) 4.44. (1.)

b) (cf. p. 115) pròicit 4.259. (1.)

PHAEDRUS.
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| Æbicet | 4,5,42. |
| Ædiciam | 4,2,9. |

b) Vocem cadit praefixa syllaba.

(cf. p. 115) Æsic Append. 8,30. eüci NV cf. p. 117. (1.)

**SENECA.**

a) Consonante quae terminantur praepositiones producuntur. si quidem codicibus credere possimus, in formis tribus dissipatiendi verbis. cf. autem pp. 101, adn. 4, 126.


" " dissicere Agam. 896 L. (sen. iamb.)

" " dissicite Phoen. 343 L. sic E. deicite interpolator E co-

dicis. (sen. iamb.)

343 P.

b) Consonante cadentes praefixa syllabae his in exemplis corri-


| Ædic | Med. 277 L. = 277 P. (sen. iamb.) |
| Ædic (bis) | Med. 527 L. = 530 P. (sen. iamb.) |

adjic A cf. p. 90.

| Ædic | Med. 783 L. = 786 P. (sen. iamb.) |
| Ædic | Oed. 811 L. = 832 P. (sen. iamb.) |
| Ædic | Herc. Oet. 364 L. = 367 P. (sen. iamb.) |
| Ædic | Thyest. 727 L. = 727 P. (sen. iamb.) |
| Ædic(e) | Med. 471 L. = 474 P. (sen. iamb.) |
| Æbic | Med. 496 L. = 499 P. (sen. iamb.) |
| Æbic | Med. 237 L. = 237 P. (sen. iamb.) |
| Æbic | Herc. F. 434 L. = 438 P. (sen. iamb.) |
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c) Consonante finitae priores partes breves an longae sint numeris decerni non potest. cf. p. 101, adn. 4.

ādicere Phoen. 201 L. = Oed. fr. 201 P. (sen. iamb.)
ōbicere Med. 497 L. = 500 P. (sen. iamb.)

(2.)

d) Uno in exemplo vocali terminata praepositione sit legenda an per diphthongum est dubium. Haec tamen ratio se magis commendat. ¹

(cf. p. 116) prō'iciet vel prō'iciet Phoen. 426 L. = 64 P. (sen. iamb.)

(1.)

OCTAVIA

fabula praetexta Senecae falsa olim attributa, haud tamen ita multo recentiore tempore scripta, habet duo exempla quae cum eius consuetudine consentiunt.

ādic(e) 125 L. = 130 P. (sen. iamb.)
sūbicīt 827 L. = 843 P. (sen. iamb.)

(2.)

LUCANUS.


ōbicfs 8.796.
ōbicīt 9.188.
sūbicīt 7.574. subigit aut subegit var. scriptt.
sūbicī 8.740. subiit Gii.

(4.)

VALERIUS FLACCUS.


ā'dicias 7.508.
ā'dice 8.41.


¹ Cf. L. Müller. de Re Metr., pp. 163-6⁴ (150-3⁴).
b) Voca
di

Vocali cadentes præfixae syllabae in his producuntur. cf.
p. 115.

dé'cit 1.191.
dé'cit 2.330.
dé'cit 6.194.
dé'cit 6.218.
dé'cit 6.553.
pro'cit 2.527.

(6.)

(1.)

(1) Silius Italicus.


disice LV. disire vel disice corr. in dissijce F. cf. p. 90.
dissite O. discute volgo.

Ch. discite O.

sic Bauer ed. 1892: supericuit vel potius supericit scriptum esse iudicavit Wagner ad
Verg. 11.623. suberigit codd.

LOV. cf. Verg. 11.625 (p. 140
sup.). subegerit F. super-

stetit conicet Bentley.

(4.)
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\[\begin{align*}
\text{Inicīt} & \quad 10.570. \\
\text{ōbicīt} & \quad 4.149. \\
\text{sūbicīt} & \quad 1.113. \\
\text{sūbicīt} & \quad 13.298. \\
\end{align*}\] (4)

ILIAS LATINA.

Ilias Latina, quae fortasse a Silio scripta est, habet haec exempla duo:


b) (cf. p. 115) trā'icīt 835 (PLM. III. p. 48). (1.)

STATIUS.

a) Consonante quae cadunt priores partes in omnibus, praeter unum, exemplis producuntur. cf. p. 102.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ā'bicīt} & \quad \text{Achil. 1.172.} \\
\text{ā'bicīt} & \quad \text{Th. 2.479.} \\
\end{align*}\]


“ “ dīscīce Th. 10.69.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ī'nicio} & \quad 5.315. \\
\text{ī'nicīt} & \quad 3.434. \\
\text{ī'nicīt} & \quad 6.194. \\
\end{align*}\]

1 Inicīt initio vs. Th. 9.807 omnes codd. habent, praeter Puteanum (P), codicum Statianorum excellantissimum, in quo iecīt et, quod postulat contextus verborum. scriptum legitur.
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I'niciam 1.242.
I'nice 7.518.
I'nice 11.595.
su'bic 2.189.
su'bic 5.672.
su'biciunt 3.716.
su'biceres 1.74. (15.)

b) (cf. p. 102) 7.4. (1.)

c) Vocali exequites praepositiones tantum non omnes faciunt per se syllabam longam. cf. p. 115.
d'e'cit Th. 6.650.
d'e'cit 12.368.
d'e'cit 12.743.
pr'o'cis 2.460.
pr'o'cit 1.388.
pr'o'ce 2.658.
pr'o'cite 3.643.

d') Per diphthongum autem dicendum est unum exemplum.
(cf. p. 116) 4.574. (1.)

MARTIALIS.

"dicit 4.54.9.
su'bic 9.75.10. (scazon.) (3.)

IVVENALIS.

a) (cf. p. 101) 15.17. (1.)
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SERENUS SAMMONICUS.

\( a \) Huius ad a. 200 p. Chr. n. florentis poetae utrumque exemplum habet *productam* syllabam praefixam. cf. pp. 87, 102.

\( \text{ābicē} \) 113 (PLM. III. p. 112).
\( \text{ādīcies} \) 463 (PLM. III. p. 128). (2)

Posteriorum solos poetarum Ausonium Burdigalensem et Claudium Claudianum dignos puto qui hac in quaeestione, quod versus Latinos numeris perfectis scripserunt, laudentur. Horum

AUSONIUS

\( a \) ea tantum exempla praebet quorum priores partes exeunt *consonante* atque *producentur*. cf. p. 102.

\( \text{ādīciam} \) p. 195. III. 2 [150.2] ed. Peiper. 1886;
\( \quad \) p. 49. 22; p. 101. 12; p. 105. 23.
\( \text{ādīcies} \) p. 195. III. 2.
\( \text{ōbicīt} \) p. 88. 17.
\( \text{ōbicītur} \) p. 89. 39.
\( \text{sūbicē} \) p. 338. LXX. 2.
\( \text{sūbicīt} \) p. 91. 9. (9)

CLAUDIANUS.

Claudianus autem plerumque *longas*, bis tamen *correptas* habet praepositiones. cf. p. 102.

\( a \)\)
\( \text{ādīcias} \) 1141.
\( \text{ōbicīs} \) 21.301.
\( \text{ōbicīt} \) 26.613.
\( \text{ōbicīt} \) 33.74.
\( \text{sūbicīt} \) 18.358. (5)

\( b \)
\( \text{ōbicīs} \) 8.365.
\( \text{sūbicīt} \) 36.134. (2)

\( c \) (cf. p. 115) \( \text{dēicit} \) 28.230. (1)
HOMERIC QUOTATIONS IN PLATO AND ARISTOTLE.

BY GEORGE EDWIN HOWES.

INTRODUCTORY.

As it has not seemed wise to enter in this paper into the question of the authenticity of the various works ascribed to Plato and Aristotle, I have here included all the quotations from Homer that are contained in any of the works edited under the name of Plato or Aristotle. For the text and variants of Plato I have relied, wherever possible, upon the collations given by Schanz (Platonis Opera quae Feruntur Omnia, 1875-). Unfortunately for classical scholars the edition of Schanz is still incomplete; the readings, therefore, of the following works only are taken from his text: — Alcibiades I., Alcibiades II., Amatores, Apologia Socratis, Charmides, Convivium, Cratylus, Crito, Gorgias, Hippias Minor, Ion, Laches, Leges I.–VI., Lysis, Meno, Phaedo, Phaedrus, Protagoras, Sophistes, Theaetetus. From the edition of Stallbaum (Platonis Opera Omnia) have been taken the text and variants of the following: — Leges VII.–XII. (1859), Minos (1841), Philebus (1842), Republica (1858). From Hermann’s edition (Platonis Dialogi, 1853) are quoted the passages in Axiouchus and the Epistulae. In giving passages from Aristotle, greater uniformity has been possible by adopting for the complete works the text and collations of Bekker (Aristotelis Opera, 1831), and for the fragments the text of Rose (Aristotelis qui Ferebantur Librorum Fragmenta, 1870), both edited by the Berlin Academy. The principal other authors of whom critical use has been made have been quoted from the following editions: — Homer, from La Roche (Homeri Ilias, 1873–1876, and Homeri Odyssea, 1867–1868); Hesiod, from Rzach (Hesiodi quaे
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Feruntur Omnia, 1884); Aeschylus, from Wecklein (Aeschylis Fabulæ, 1885); Sophocles, from Jebb (Antigone, 1891; Electra, 1894; and Oedipus Tyrannus, 1893) and from Campbell (Sophocles, The Plays and Fragments, 1881; from this the Ajax is cited); and Euripides, from Kirchhoff (Euripidis Fabulæ, 1867–1868). The editions of the Homeric Scholia used are those of Dindorf (Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam, 1855; and Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem, 1875–1877, containing the Scholia of Venetus A and of Venetus B) and of Maas (Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem Townleyana, 1887–1888). Any departure from the text of the editions mentioned above has been indicated by a note.

I have thought that a study of the quotations from Homer found in our manuscripts of Plato and Aristotle might have a twofold value,—it might show whether these authors quoted accurately or not, and it might possibly shed some light upon the Homeric text of their day. It is evident at once that many difficulties beset our path. The mistakes of the scribes of the manuscripts of both Homer and of the authors quoting him have, of course, been numerous; and yet, if we assume that all the differences of reading between the passages quoted and the quotations are due to the mistakes of these scribes, we beg the question at the outset, and admit that these authors quoted from the same Homeric text that we have to-day, and quoted accurately. Moreover, if we claim that all the variations, apart from those caused by the carelessness of scribes, are due to the practice of the ancients of quoting from memory, we again beg the question by assuming that none of the variants in the quotations has a real variant Homeric reading to depend upon. Besides, even if it should be granted that these authors may have quoted from memory,—an induction that does not necessarily follow because of a great difference between a passage quoted and the quotation,—this explanation would need to be used judiciously and not applied to every apparent case, for many passages that would seem at first sight to offer this as the most plausible explanation will on careful study be explained in a much more satisfactory manner. But let me not anticipate too much. I wish, merely in a general way, to indicate some of the difficulties that confront us. It would be beyond the limit of this paper and of my ability to
Homeric Quotations in Plato and Aristotle.

attempt to offer all the possible solutions of all the difficult questions that present themselves. It is my intention, while least of all wishing to dogmatize, to give what seems to me to be the most probable explanation of the various passages under discussion.

I. Quotations from the Dramatic Poets and Hesiod.

I have deemed it advisable to consider, somewhat briefly, the quotations of Plato and Aristotle from the dramatic poets and Hesiod, so that an impression, more or less distinct, may be formed of their general trustworthiness when quoting from other authors. In discussing the quotations from the dramatists I shall consider those passages only that are found in the extant plays; for the fragments, except in special instances, necessarily fail to offer a satisfactory basis of comparison.

Quotations from the Dramatists.

A. So far as I know, Plato gives but two quotations from the dramatists, apart from several references in which there is no attempt to quote the exact language.


Plat. ὁ δοκῶν ἂν ἄλλες ἡν ἢ ἦλεν,

βασίλευν ἄλοκα διὰ ψευδός καρπούμενον,

τέ γὰ τὰ κενά βλαστάνει βουλεύσασα.

Aesch. βασίλειον ἄλοκα διὰ ψευδός καρπούμενον,

τέ γὰ τὰ κενά βλαστάνει βουλεύσασα.

Plato has changed the nominative καρπούμενος to the accusative, that it may fit the structure of his sentence.

2. Alcibiad. II. 151 B = Eur. Phoen. 858–859:

Plat. 1 οἶνων θίμην, φίσι, καλλίνικα στήθης·

ἐν γὰρ κλίθων κείμεθ', ὀστερ σῶθα σὺ·

Eur. οἶνων θίμην καλλίνικα σὰ στήθης·

ἐν γὰρ κλίθων κείμεθ', ὀστερ σῶθα σὺ,

1 Schanz, following Buttman, restores σὰ. Cod. B, κείμεθα; T, διακείμεθα.
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As σά of the verse of Euripides is necessary for the trimeter, its loss from the manuscripts of Plato is probably due to a copyist, as we cannot suppose that Plato would have allowed such an unmetrical verse to stand in his text.

B. Aristotle has given us twenty-four quotations from the dramatists. In seven\(^1\) of these the manuscripts of Aristotle coincide with those of the poets, with the exception of a few unimportant variants evidently due to the carelessness of scribes.

The other seventeen will require some discussion.

1. *Rhet.* 3, 14 (p. 1415 b 20) = *Soph.* *Antig.* 223:

   Aristot. ἀνάκ. ἐρῶ μὲν σείς ἐπαν τὸν φύσι. ὑπο.
   Soph. ἀνάκ. ἐπὶ ὀψὶ φύσι τάχευς ὑπὸ.

   The reading σπονδῆς receives additional support from the scholiast who writes: οὗ τοῦτο λέγω, ὅτι μετὰ σπονδῆς αὐθαίρετον ὑπὸ σε ἡπόρευμαι. The coincidence of the use of σπονδῆς by both Aristotle and the scholiast may, of course, be accidental; but it is at least striking and entitles the reading to a fair consideration. Even if Aristotle is quoting from memory here, as many suppose, the reading is not thereby invalidated. A man may quote from memory and still quote correctly. We might add that some of the editors — e.g. Dindorf and Schneidewin — have adopted σπονδῆς in their text.

2 (and 3). *Eth.* Ἀκ. 9, 9 (p. 1169 b 7) and *Mag.* *Mor.* 2, 15 (p. 1212 b 27) = *Eur.* *Or.* 667:

   Aristot. *Eth.* Ἀκ. ὅταν ὁ δικαίων εὖ διδαχῇ τι δει καλῶν;
   Aristot. *Mag.* *Mor.* ὅταν δὲ δικαίων εὖ διδαχῇ τι δει καλῶν;
   *Eur.* \(^{3}\) ὅταν δὲ δικαίων εὖ διδαχῇ τι χρῆ καλῶν:

   The second quotation of Aristotle assures us — what we should otherwise readily have assumed — that the omission of δε in the first quotation is merely a copyist’s blunder. Besides, it confirms the


\(^{3}\) Cod. B has δε, which Kirchhoff edits.
reading δεί at least for Aristotle. Without going deeply into the question we may say that it is very doubtful whether the Attic poets ever used χρή with a genitive. Besides, in Eur. Her. Eur. 1338 we have a similar verse — whether spurious or not:

θεοὶ δὲ ὅταν τιμῶσιν, οἶδὼν δὲί φίλων.

If genuine, this verse shows a similar phase; if spurious, it was probably modelled after Eur. Or. 667. Again, the reading τι δεί φίλων is confirmed by Plutarch. Further, as already noted, the word δεί itself still appears in one manuscript of Euripides. So we should agree with Kirchhoff, Nauck, Paley and others in admitting δεί into the text of Euripides.

4. Rhet. 3, 6 (p. 1407 b 34) = Eur. Iph. Taur. 727:
Aristot. Ἀλτοῦ μὴν αἰδέ πολύθυροι διαπτυχαὶ.
Eur. ἄλτον μὴν αἰδέ πολύθρηνοι διαπτυχαὶ.

The word πολύθρηνοι, 'much wailing,' was long ago seen to be wrong. We are indebted to Aristotle for the true reading. The folds of the tablet were 'many-gated,' i.e. there were many leaves that might be considered to form the entrance to the tablet. Although Euripides has used an uncommon expression, it receives some justification in the δἰθυρὸν of P. 18: Ἡρώδωτος μὴν λέγει δελτίον δίστυχον, οἱ δὲ Ἀττικοὶ γραμματεῖδοι δίστυρον, καὶ θύρας τὰς πτῦχας ἄχρι δύο, ἀνὰ πτῦχας καὶ τρίτυχον καὶ πολύτυχον; and later in Χ. 57: δέλτων δελτία, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν γραμματείδων δίστυρον ἢ τρίτυχον ἢ καὶ πλευρῶν πτυχῶν. The reading of Aristotle is, therefore, welcome, and is accepted by Kirchhoff, Nauck, Klotz, Paley and modern scholars generally.

5. Pol. 1, 2 (p. 1252 b 8) = Eur. Iph. Aug. 1400:
Aristot. βαρβάρων δι' Ἑλληνος ἀρχείν εἰκός,
Eur. βαρβάρων δι' Ἑλληνος εἰκός ἀρχείν, ἄλλ' ὁβ βαρβάρων,

1 Moral. 68 E.
2 Cod. Yb, ἄλτον μὴ δῆ.
3 Edited by Kirchhoff, πολύθυροι.
4 Edited by Kirchhoff, ἀρχείν εἰκός.
The manuscripts of Euripides offer a metrical difficulty, namely a spondee in the odd foot of a trochaic metre. Ways suggested for avoiding the difficulty have been the cutting of the verse into two parts or the substitution of the Doric form ἀρόξεν. The discovery of the quotation in Aristotle, however, practically settled the matter in favor of the reading ἀρόξεν εἰκός.

So far we have considered twelve passages, which show that Aristotle’s quotations are entitled to great respect; seven of them are practically identical with the passages quoted, while the other five give readings superior to those found in our manuscripts of the poets themselves. The remaining twelve passages offer greater difficulties.

1. Rhet. 1, 13 (p. 1373 b 12) = Soph. Antig. 456–457:

Aristot.1 ὦ γὰρ τι νῦν γε λάχθει, ἄλλ’ ἀεὶ ποτε
ζῆ τοῦτο, κοιδῆς οἶδεν ἐκ ὅτου φαίη.

Soph. ὦ γὰρ τι νῦν γε λάχθει, ἄλλ’ ἀεὶ ποτε
ζῆ ταῦτα, κοιδῆς οἶδεν ἐκ ὅτου ἐναγ.

Verse 456 is quoted by Aristotle again in Rhet.8 1, 15 (p. 1375 b 1):

οὐ γὰρ τι νῦν γε λάχθει, ἄλλ’ ἀεὶ ποτε.

In the two quotations of verse 456 the variants in the manuscripts of Aristotle contradict one another and thus corroborate the readings of the manuscripts of Sophocles. Possibly the word τοῦτο was purposely written by Aristotle, that it might harmonize with his preceding words: οὖν καὶ Ἡ Σοφοκλείου Ἀντιγόνη φαίνεται λέγουσα, οὐ δὲ ἰδέαν ἀπειρημένων βάψαι τὸν Πολυνάκη, ὥς φύσιν ἐν τοῦτο δίκαιον. Otherwise its use must be due to the carelessness either of Aristotle or of the scribes.

2. Rhet. 1, 15 (p. 1375 b 1) = Soph. Antig. 456 and 458:

Aristot.8 ὦ γὰρ τι νῦν γε λάχθει, ἄλλ’ ἀεὶ ποτε.

ταῦτ’ οὖν ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐμελλὼν ἀνθρώποις οὐδενός.

Soph.4 ὦ γὰρ τι νῦν γε λάχθει, ἄλλ’ ἀεὶ ποτε

τοῦτον οὐκ ἐμελλὼν, ἀνθρώποι οὐδενός

---

1 Cod. QVβ, τε (for γε); Zβ, σε (for γε); Q, καὶ χιθ.
2 Cod. Αε, τού (for τοῦ).
3 Cod. Αε, τοῦ (for τοῦ); Αε, ἐμελλὼν.
4 Cod. L, ἐγ’ οὖν.
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Evidently this passage was so well known to his hearers or readers that Aristotle thought it unnecessary to quote it in full. It is quite possible that he may have used the word τοῦτον, which is undoubtedly right in the verse of Sophocles. A copyist might readily have changed this to ταῦτ᾽ οὖν either carelessly, or because he thought that ἡμέλλον would most naturally be followed by an infinitive, of which ταῦτα would be the object.

3. Rhet. 3, 14 (p. 1415a 20) = Soph. O. T. 774:
Aristot. ἵμιοι πατήρ ἦν Πάλαβος.
Soph. ἵμιοι πατὴρ μὲν Πολύβος ἦν Κορίνθος,
Little stress can be laid upon this passage, for Aristotle is rather referring to the verse than quoting it.

Aristot. τοῦλεύθερον δ᾽ Ἑλληνες ἤξιοντες ποσίν
Eur. τοῦντιεθεν οὖν Ἑλληνες ἤξιοντες δορί,
This passage of Aristotle is clearly corrupt in the manuscripts. Possibly the word ποσίν is involved in the corruption; it is surely more prosaic than δορί, and is probably wrong.

5. Eth. Eud. 7, 1 (p. 1235a 22) = Eur. Phoen. 539-540:
Aristot. τῷ πλέον δ᾽ αἰεὶ πολέμον καθίσταται
tολμᾶσσον, ἐχθρᾶς ἃ' ἡμίρα κατάρχεται.
Eur. τῷ πλέον δ᾽ αἰεὶ πολέμον καθίσταται
tολμᾶσσον ἐχθρᾶς ἃ' ἡμίρας κατάρχεται.
Except for the accent of ἐχθρᾶς one manuscript of Aristotle gives the same reading as the manuscripts of Euripides, and may preserve the correct tradition. The meaning of the last verse of Euripides, “and begins the hostile day,” is somewhat obscure, however. The reading of the manuscripts of Aristotle, “and the day begins hostility,” is about as intelligible and may possibly be right.

1 Cod. Aς, τοῦλεύθερον Ἑλληνες; Yb2b, τοῦλεύθερον δ᾽ Ἑλληνες; Q, τὸ ἔλεος δ᾽ Ἑλληνες. Bekker has edited τοῦντεθεν οὖν Ἑλληνες.
2 Cod. Pb, ἡμῖρας.
3 Some cod., αἰεὶ; C, πλέον.
6. Rhet. 3, 17 (p. 1418b 21) = Eur. Troad. 969:

Aristot.\(^1\) τοῖς θεοῖς πρῶτα σύμμαχος γενόμοι.

Eur.\(^2\) ταῖς θεαισί πρῶτα σύμμαχος γενόμοι

The article τοῖς is a purely grammatical blunder and cannot be attributed to Aristotle. That he had a feminine gender in mind is evident from his next words (also a quotation), ἐγὼ γὰρ Ἰραν. He may have used ταῖς θεαισί, which a scribe might think was a mistake for τοῖς θεοῖς. If he wrote ταῖς θεαισί, which the manuscripts of Euripides show, it might have been changed by a scribe, first to the common Attic τοῖς θεαισι, and later to τοῖς θεοῖς.

7. Rhet. 3, 16 (p. 1417a 32) = Soph. Antig. 911-912:

Aristot.\(^3\) μητρὸς δὲν ἂδου καὶ πατρὸς βεβηκότων

οὐκ ἐστὶ ἀδελφός δοτὶς ἂν βλάστοι ποτὲ.

Soph. μητρὸς δὲν ἂδου καὶ πατρὸς κεκευθότοιν

οὐκ ἐστὶ ἀδελφός δοτὶς ἂν βλάστοι ποτὲ.

The reading βεβηκότων may be due to the carelessness of Aristotle or it may have crept in as a gloss of some learned man, who beside the κεκευθότοιν of his text wrote the corresponding expression βεβηκότων.

8 (and 9). Rhet. 2, 21 (p. 1394b 16) and Eth. Eud. 7, 2 (p. 1235b 21) = Eur. Troad. 1051:

Aristot. (Rhet.)\(^4\) οὐδείς ἐραστὴς δοτὶς οὐκ ἀεὶ φίλει,

Aristot. (Eth. Eud.) οὐδείς γὰρ ἐραστὴς δοτὶς οὐκ ἀεὶ φίλει,

Eur. οὐκ ἐστὶ ἐραστὴς δοτὶς οὐκ ἀεὶ φίλει.

In the passage of the Eudemian Ethics the word γὰρ has been introduced to join the statement more closely with the preceding words.

10. Pol. 1, 13 (p. 1260a 30) = Soph. Ajax 293:

Aristot. γυναικὶ κόσμον ἢ σιγὴ φίλει,

Soph. γύναι, γυναικὶ κόσμον ἢ σιγὴ φίλει.

---

\(^1\) The verse is given thus in all the manuscripts. Bekker, however, edits ταῖς θεαισί.

\(^2\) Cod. BCG, θεαισί; E, ταῖς θεαισί.

\(^3\) Cod. Q, ἂν βλαστῇ; ZbAc, ἂν βλαστάτω.

\(^4\) Cod. Ac, ἐρασθείς δοτις οὐχὶ καὶ φ.
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11. Metaphys. 4, 5 (p. 1015 a 31) = Soph. Elec. 256:
   Aristot. ἀλλ’ ἢ βία μὲ ταύτ’ ἀναγκάζει ποιεῖν.
   Soph. ἀλλ’ ἢ βία γὰρ ταύτ’ ἀναγκάζει μὲ δρὰν,

   Aristot. ὁνὸς ἵστι τὸν ἀνδρὸν δοτὸς ὅστ’ ἁλεύθερος
   ἡ χρηστάσις γὰρ δοῦλος ἵστιν ἡ τύχη.
   Eur. ὁνὸς ἵστι βουτῷ ὅστ’ ἁλεύθερος:
   ή χρηστάσις γὰρ δοῦλος ἵστιν ἡ τύχη.

Most of these last quotations of Aristotle, though differing from the manuscripts of the dramatists, contain—if we except palpable blunders evidently due to copyists—readings that are intelligible and quite possible. Some of them probably represent correct old readings; for it would be singular if, where variants are found between the manuscripts of Aristotle and of these authors, he is right only when grammatical or metrical difficulties prove the traditional readings of these authors corrupt.

Quotations from Hesiod.

After this rather brief reference to the passages of the dramatic poets quoted by Plato and Aristotle, we may perhaps with profit glance at the passages quoted from Hesiod.

A. At first sight Plato’s quotations from Hesiod seem to show great carelessness, as almost all of them give readings different from those contained in the manuscripts of Hesiod. Each of these passages, however, will need to be considered separately.

1. Conviv. 178 B = Theog. 116–120:
   Plat. ἀφ’ ἐφρώπερνος, πάντων ἓδος ἀσφάλες αἰεί,
   ἦδη Ἔρος.
   Hes. "Ἡτοι μὲν πρώτητα Χάος γάνετ’, ἀφ’ ἐφρώπερνος
   Γαῖ’ ἐφρώπερνος, πάντων ἓδος ἀσφάλες αἰεί
   [ἀθανάτων, οὐ ἦσαν κάρη νιφόετος Ὁλύμπου,]
   Τάρταρά τ’ ἡφούεται μυχὶ χθονὸς εὐρυναότης,
   ἦδη Ἔρος,
In the words actually quoted the manuscripts of Plato agree with those of Hesiod. The omission of verses 118 and 119 will be discussed later.


Plat.¹ ἵκατον δὲ τε δούραθ' ἀμάξης.

Hes.² ἵκατον δὲ τε δούραθ' ἀμάξης,

The difference here is mainly one of breathing, and therefore of little account, as manuscript traditions on such matters have small weight. We might say, however, that the best manuscript of Plato has δούραθ', which, if correct, would imply ἀμάξης — with smooth breathing — and thus cause a correspondence between the best manuscripts of the two authors.


Plat. γνώσεται τὸν Ἡσίοδον ὅτι τῷ ὄντι ἦν σοφὸς λέγων πλέον εἶναι τως ἦμισυ παντός.

Hes.³ Νῆσιοι, ὦθὲ ἰσασίν, δῶρ πλέον ἦμισυ παντὸς

Here it is evidently the purpose of Plato not to quote, but merely to refer to the passage of Hesiod. The two words ἦμισυ παντός are common to both passages, and there is nothing in the rest of the reference in Plato inconsistent with the manuscript readings of Hesiod. In similar language Plato again refers to the same passage in *Leg.* 3, 690 E.


Plat. καὶ κεραμεῖς κεραμεῖ κοτόει καὶ δοῖδός δοῖδψ καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῆς,

Hes. Καὶ κεραμεῖς κεραμεῖ κοτόει καὶ τίκτων τίκτων, καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῆς φθονεί καὶ δοῖδός δοῖδψ.

These verses were variously quoted in antiquity. In one place — *Pol.* 5, 10 (p. 1312 b 5) — Aristotle gives the order κεραμεῖ κεραμεῖς, though there it is rather a reference than a quotation. In three other instances,⁴ however, he shows the traditional manuscript order,

---

¹ Cod. B, δοῦραθ'. ² Cod. Mm₁, ἀμάξης or ἄμ; Mm₂, ἀμάξης; most cod., δοῦραθ' ἀμάξης. ³ Cod. MZBAV, ὦθ' το. ⁴ *Rhet.* 2, 4 (p. 1381 b 16); *Rhet.* 2, 10 (p. 1388 a 16); *Eth. Eud.* 7, 1 (p. 1235 a 18).
which is confirmed by many other writers also. In Priscian we find verse 26 quoted thus:

καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχὸ φθονεῖ καὶ τέκτονι τέκτων.

This, in an indirect way, tends to corroborate the reading of Plato. For the last part of the verse as quoted by Priscian refers to the class of men (τέκτονες) which Plato would naturally have mentioned if he had finished his verse, since it is the only class referred to by Hesiod but omitted by Plato. Apparently, even in the remote past there were differences of reading, which may easily have arisen before the time of Plato, and even have crept into manuscript copies of Hesiod.


Plat. (Crat.) αὐτὰρ ἐπιδὴ τούτο γάνος κατὰ μοὶ ἵκαλυψεν,
οἱ μὲν δαίμονες ἄγνοι ὑποχόνιοι καλόνται,
Ἴσθλοι, ἀλεξίκακοι, φώλακες θυητῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Plat. (Rep.) οἱ μὲν δαίμονες ἄγνοι ἐπιχεθόνιοι τελέθοσιν,
Ἴσθλοι, ἀλεξίκακοι, φώλακες μερόπων ἀνθρώπων

Hes.⁵ αὐτὰρ ἐπιδὴ τούτο γάνος κατὰ γαῖα κάλυψε,
τοι μὲν δαίμονες εἰσὶ Διὸς μεγάλοι διὰ βουλαὶ
Ἴσθλοι, ἐπιχεθόνιοι, φώλακες θυητῶν ἀνθρώπων,

This is a difficult passage to settle satisfactorily. Plato differs not only from Hesiod but also from himself. Let us consider first those readings in which he consistently differs from Hesiod.

(a) ὁ μὲν. That this reading was found in the manuscripts of Plato in early times is seen from Eusebius,⁶ Hermogenes,⁷ and others, who quote it thus from Plato. Lactantius,⁸ though with a variant τοί, quotes it thus from Hesiod. It may very well have stood in the manuscript of Hesiod to which Plato had access.

---

¹ XVIII. 145. p. 169 K.
² Cod. A has ἔτει χε., with δὴ written above; cod. MC, ἔτει μέσ., with χε written above; almost all the other cod. have ἔτει σευ.
³ Praep. Ev. 13, 11, p. 663 A.
⁵ Inst. Div. 2, 14, 7.
(b) ἄγνοι. This word, too, is confirmed for Plato by Eusebius, Hermogenes, and Theodoretus. It is suggested for Hesiod also by Plutarch, who in wrongly quoting the verse as

\[ \text{ἄγνοι ἡπιχθόνιοι φώλαις θυητῶν ἄνθρωπον}, \]

shows that the word ἄγνοι was somewhere in the sentence.

(c) ἀλεξίακοι. The testimony of Eusebius, Hermogenes, Theodoretus, and Aristides shows that this is correct for Plato. Though Theodoretus is referring to the Cratylus of Plato, he thinks he is giving the words of Hesiod, for he prefaces his quotation with these words: ἐ δὲ γε Ἡσίοδος περὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ γίνους ταῦτα ἐφη.

Now let us look at those words that show Plato as differing from Hesiod and inconsistent with himself.

(d) ἤπιχθόνιοι (Rep.); ὑποχθόνιοι (Crat.). As Aristides alone, who seems to be quoting from the Cratylus, reads ὑποχθόνιοι, while the other authors, including Theodoretus, who quotes from the Cratylus, give ἤπιχθόνιοι, probably Plato wrote in both passages ἤπιχθόνιοι, which was early corrupted in the Cratylus to ὑποχθόνιοι.

(e) τελίθοντες (Rep.); καλίονται (Crat.). The authors quoting Plato are about evenly divided on these words. Probably these readings represent very old variants which may have extended back to old manuscripts of Hesiod.

In the case of one word, Plato agrees with Hesiod in one passage but disagrees in the other:

(f) μερότων (Rep.); θυητῶν (Crat., and also Hesiod). For the former word Eusebius offers his testimony, while the latter is confirmed by many ancient authors. As the phrase μερότων ἄνθρωπων was a common ending for verses of both Homer and Hesiod, it would have been easy for either Plato or a scribe to write μερότων ἄνθρωπων instead of θυητῶν ἄνθρωπων.

In the Cratylus, Plato quotes one more verse than in the Republic. In this verse he differs from Hesiod in one phrase:

---

1 8, De Mar. p. 915 D.  
2 Moral. 431 E.  
3 Vol. II. p. 171 (230 Dind.).  
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(g) μοιρ' ἐκάλυψεν (Crat.); γαία κάλυψε (Hes.). Theodoretus confirms μοιρ' for Plato, and evidently thought it correct for Hesiod. The phrase γαία κάλυψε recurs in verses 140 and 156 of the Works and Days. So it seems to me probable that Plato, if in verse 121 his text of Hesiod had read γαία κάλυψε, would have quoted it so, even if he were giving the words from memory, as the repetition of the phrase would have impressed it upon his mind. Why is it not fully as natural, therefore, to suppose that the original reading of verse 121 of Hesiod was really μοιρ' ἐκάλυψε, which was early changed by a scribe to γαία κάλυψε because of the repetition of that phrase in verses 140 and 156? Taking all these points into consideration, I am inclined to believe that the text of Hesiod from which Plato quoted may have been:

αὐτὰρ ἐπαθή τούτο γάνος κατὰ μοιρ' ἐκάλυψε
καλέονται
tοι μὲν δαίμονες ἄγνοι ἐπεχθόνιοι τελέοντιν
ἐσθλοί, ἀλεξίκειοι, φύλακες θυητῶν ἀνθρώπων.


 Plat. ὥς τὴν μὲν κακότητα καὶ Λαδὸν ἔστιν ἑλέσθαι
 ῥημίως: λείη μὲν ὄδος, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναιεί.
 τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἱδρύτα θεοὶ προπάροιμον ἑκθηκαν

Hes. τὴν μὲν τοι κακότητα καὶ Λαδὸν ἔστιν ἑλέσθαι
 ῥημίως: δλίγγη μὲν ὄδος, μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναιεί.
 τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἱδρύτα θεοὶ προπάροιμον ἑκθηκαν

The word ὡς given by the manuscripts of Plato is nowhere confirmed for this passage of Hesiod and undoubtedly merely connects the quotation with the preceding words of Plato: τούτως δὲ πάσι τοῖς λόγοις μάρτυρας τοιχάς ἔπαγονται, οἱ μὲν κακὰς πέρι εὐπετεῖας διδότες, ὡς, etc. Some scribe, however, supposing it the first word of the quotation, and finding that there were too many syllables in the verse, may naturally enough have retained ὡς and omitted τοι. In the variants λείη and δλίγγη we certainly have testimony strong enough to prove absolutely that there were old readings of Hesiod that are not found at all in our manuscripts of that author. For, although all the manuscripts of Hesiod here read δλίγγη, the
reading λείη is confirmed (1) by Plato, who, in referring to this passage of Hesiod, again uses the word λείη; (2) by Xenophon, who in turn is confirmed by Stobaeus; and (3) by Plutarch.


Plat. iōròta θεοί προστάροβέν ήθηκαν ἄθαντοι. μακρός δὲ καὶ ὄρθος οἷμος ἐς αὐτήν, καὶ τρητὶς τὸ πρῶτον ἔτην δ' ἐς ἄκρον Ικηταί, ἰμαδὴ δὴ ἧπετα πέλει. χαλέπῃ περ ἑώρα.

Hes. τῆς δ' ἄρτης ἰδρωτα θεοί προστάροβεν ήθηκαν ἄθαντοι. μακρός δὲ καὶ ὄρθος οἷμος ἐς αὐτήν καὶ τρητὶς τὸ πρῶτον ἔτην δ' ἐς ἄκρον Ικηταί, ἰμαδὴ δὴ ἧπετα πέλει. χαλέπῃ περ ἑώρα.

(a) The reading Ικηταί is confirmed by one manuscript of Xenophon, from whom Stobaeus also quotes the same reading, and by one manuscript of Hesiod, while Ικηται is substantiated by Stobaeus in another passage. The fact that Plato in the Protagoras uses Ικηται is of no importance, for there he is merely referring to this passage of Hesiod and not quoting it; and, besides, he there adds τις to show that the statement is a general one, thus giving the same force to the sentence as if he had said Ικηταί. I am inclined to think, therefore, especially as the form Ικηται offers difficulty in the way of interpretation, that Ικηταί is the correct reading for Hesiod.

(b) The variation of δὴ Ηπετα and δὴ Ἡπετα needs no discussion, as it is a point to be determined by the judgment of the editor rather than by a particular manuscript tradition.

(c) The word φέρειν of the manuscripts of Plato is a mere blunder of somebody. For in referring to the passage again, Plato says: ὅταν δὲ τις αὐτῆς ἐς ἄκρον Ικηταί, ἰμαδὴ δὴ Ἑπετα πέλει.

---

1 *Leg. 4. 718 E.*  
2 *Mem. 2. 1. 20.*  
3 *Floral. 1. 101.*  
4 *Memoral.* p. 77 D.  
5 The cod. have φέρειν (for Ἑπετα).  
6 Some cod. τις αὐτῆς; *Nat. 121.* Ἡπετα; *Mem.* δὴ Ἑπετα; *Atr.* δὴ Ἑπετα.  
7 *Mem. 2. 1. 20.* Cod. A, Ἡπετα; the rest, Ικηταί.  
8 *Floral. 1. 101.*  
9 *Floral. 1. 17.*  
10 *Memoral.* p. 340 D.  
11 *Protag. 340 D.*

Plat. 1 εἰ καὶ τις σμικρόν ἐπὶ σμικρῷ καταθείη,

Hes. Ἐν γὰρ κεν καὶ σμικρόν ἐπὶ σμικρῷ καταθεῖον.

The difference of these two readings is not easy to explain, unless we assume that Plato preferred to use another form for a general statement. Still, both readings are metrical and possible, though a syllable is lacking in the verse in Plato.


Plat. δὲ μὲν τὰς δρῶς τοῖς δικαίοις τούς θεοὺς ποιεῖν

ἀκρασίας μὲν τε φέρειν βαλάνου, μέσας δὲ μελίσσας·

εἰροπόκοι δ' ἔσει, φησὶ, μαλλοὶ καταβεβριθάσιν,

Hes. ἀκρης μὲν τε φέρει βαλάνου, μέσος δὲ μελίσσας·

εἰροπόκοι δ' ἔσει μαλλοὶ καταβεβριθάσιν.

Plato here adapts the verses of Hesiod to the structure of his sentence. There is nothing, however, inconsistent with the words of Hesiod.


Plat. 2 ἐμαθον γὰρ παρ’ Ἡσιόδου, ὁς Ἰφή,

ἐργον οἶδεν ἐλοι ὑπειδός.

Hes. Ἐργον δ' οἶδεν ὑπειδός, ἐργὴν δὲ τ' ὑπειδός.

Here, too, the words are woven into the structure of Plato's sentence.

There is another passage of Plato that, although it does not quote from Hesiod, makes such a reference to him as to entitle it to our consideration:

12. *Crat. 402 B*:

ἀρα δ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτομᾶτου αὐτοῦ διμοφόρους βεμάτων δύνατα θέωσαι,

ἂπερ αὐτ’ Ὁμήρος 3 Ὁκεανὸν τε θεῶν γίνεσθαι φησὶν καὶ μητέρα Τηθοῦν·

οἶμαι δὲ καὶ Ἡσιόδος. λέγετε δὲ που καὶ Ὀρφεὺς ὁτι κτλ.

The point of the passage for us lies in "the words οἶμαι δὲ καὶ Ἡσιόδος. Jowett," who evidently thinks that Plato means that

---

1 Cod. B, σμικρῷ (for σμικρῷ).
2 Codices, δ' οĎδε.
3 Η. 14, 201.
4 In a note to his translation of this passage of Plato.
Hesiod had a very similar verse telling of ‘Ocean, the origin of gods, and mother Tethys,’ says: “The verse is not found in the extant works of Hesiod.” It seems to me, however, that Plato may have meant that Hesiod, too, describes Oceanus and Tethys as parents of (some) gods. I should agree with Hermann, therefore, in considering that Plato had in mind Theog. 337:

Τηθος δ’ Οκεανῷ Πουμοῦς τέκνε δινήντας,

The words οἴμαι δι καὶ Ἡσίοδος surely offer considerable evidence in favor of the view that Plato quoted from memory. The natural interpretation would be: “I think Hesiod has such a verse, but I can’t recall it.” Still, the words might imply merely: “I think Hesiod has such a verse somewhere, but I don’t know just where to look for it.” And we must bear in mind that looking for passages whose place was not tolerably well known, was a much more arduous process with the old rolls than with modern books.

Conviv. 178 B = Theog. 116–120. This passage was quoted a few pages above. Plato is referring here to the antiquity of the god Ἑπόμ. It would not be surprising, therefore, if he omitted everything in the passage quoted that was extraneous to his purpose. But, since we find that Aristotle in quoting the same passage twice omits these same verses (118 and 119), we are led to believe that these verses may not have existed in their texts of Hesiod, especially as they are, for other reasons, suspected by many scholars.

A consideration of all of these passages leads me to think that Plato had a text of Hesiod different in many respects from ours; and that his variants must not thoughtlessly be dismissed as due to ‘lapse of memory.’

B. After this somewhat cursory treatment of Plato’s quotations of Hesiod, let us turn to Aristotle’s quotations of the same author. Three of these, apart from very slight differences evidently due to scribes, give the traditional readings of Hesiod. The others I shall treat separately.

1 Cf. page 161.
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4 (and 5). Eth. Nic. 9, 1 (p. 1164 a 27) and Eth. Eud. 7, 10 (p. 1242 b 34) = Op. et D. 370:

Aristot. (Eth. Nic.) ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις δ’ ἐνίοις ἀράσκει τὸ μισθὸς δ’ ἀνδρὶ.

Aristot. (Eth. Eud.) μισθὸς ἀνδρὶ φιλῳ.

Hes.1 Μισθὸς δ’ ἀνδρὶ φιλῳ εἰρημένος ἄρκιος ἐστώ.

In the Eudemian Ethics the loss of δ’ makes the fragment unmetrical. The particle must have been omitted by a scribe. A knowledge of the real reading is shown in the passage of the Nicomachean Ethics.


Aristot.2 οὖτος μὲν πανάριστος δὲ αὐτὸς πάντα νοῆσῃ, ἑσθλὸς δ’ αὐτῷ κάκευνος δὲ εὖ εἰστώτι πίθηται. δὲ δὲ κε μὴ’ αὐτός νοεῖ μὴ’ ἄλλον ἀκοῦν ἑν θυμῷ βάλλεται, δ’ αὐτ’ ἄρχηνος ἀνήρ.

Hes.8 Οὖτος μὲν πανάριστος, δὲ αὐτῷ πάντα νοῆσῃ, φρασάμενος, τὰ κ’ ἐξείτα καὶ ἐς τέλος ἦσιν ἄμεινοι'; ἑσθλὸς δ’ αὖτ’ κάκευνος, δὲ εὖ εἰστώτι πίθηται'. δὲ δὲ κε μὴ’ αὐτῷ νοεῖ μὴ’ ἄλλον ἀκοῦν ἑν θυμῷ βάλλεται, δ’ αὐτ’ ἄρχηνος ἀνήρ.

The main difference in these passages is that the manuscripts of Aristotle give generally αὐτὸς (verses 293 and 296) while those of Hesiod have αὐτῷ. It seems clear that Tzetzes had in his manuscript of Hesiod αὐτὸς in both places, for he says (on verse 293): πανάριστος ἄριτ', δὲ τοῖς αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτοδιδάκτως τὸ πρότερον νοεῖ, and on verse 295: ἄγαθος δὲ καὶ κατὰ διότερον λόγον, καὶ μὴ δὲ ἄριτ’ ἀντοῦ μὲν γνώς, πιστεύει δὲ τοῖς καλῶς συμβουλεύοντιν. Moschopoulus seems to have read the same, for he says: ἥγουν οὖτος μὲν ἓστιν ἄριστος, δὲ

---

1 Cod. B, γ'; in many cod. this verse is omitted.
2 Cod. Lb Mb αὐτῷ (verse 293); Lb, νοεῖ; Mb, νοῆσῃ (Mb adds φρασάμενος τὰ εὖ ἐξείτα καὶ ἐς τέλος ἦσιν ἄμεινοι'); Hs Kb Mb Nb Ob (i.e. all the cod. except one), νοῆσῃ; Lb Mb, βάλλεται; Mb, αὐ.
3 Cod. Mm, Z (with the gloss αὐτῷ ἐαυτοῦ), L, αὐτῷ (verse 293); O, αὐτῆς; all cod., νοῆσῃ; B, εἰσίν; ZA, εἰσίν; M, ἀμείνοι; M (verse 295) omits δ'; B, μὴ’ αὐτῷ (verse 296); some, μὴ’ αὐτῷ; Mm, μὴ’ αὐτῆς (from αὐτῆς); many cod., νοεῖν.
George Edwin Howes.

δι' έκτοτε τάτα νοῦσα ... δι' δ' εν μήτε δι' 'έκτοτε νοῦ μήτε ἄλλον ἄκουσιν κτλ.

Since there are many writers some of whom quote αἰτῶς and some αἰτῷ. we may fairly infer. I think, that both readings go back to a very old period. Verse 294 of Hesiod is omitted by Aristotle and also by Aristides and by Clement of Alexandria. It is quoted, however, by Stobaeus and by Andronicus Rhodius. Whether Aristotle had it in his text of Hesiod or not is uncertain, for he might readily have omitted it as unessential to his quotation, even if he had had it. Still the verse is open to suspicion and has been rejected by some scholars. e.g. Brunck and Steitz.

7. Ῥήτ. 3. 9 (p. 1409 b 28) = Ὀπ. et D. 265–266:

Aristot. οἱ τ' αἰτῶ κακὰ τείχαν ἄνήρ ἄλλῃ κακὰ τείχων.

Hes. οἱ γ' αἰτῶ κακὰ τείχαν ἄνήρ ἄλλῃ κακὰ τείχων.

These two verses do not properly belong in a collection of Aristotle's quotations, for they are a parody by Democritus, as Aristotle himself says: ἦστε γίγνεται τῇ δικαιή δημοκριτός τῷ Ἑιοι εἰς Μελανικώδην ἐπιθυμείν μεταφάσαν αὐτὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀβαλάς. οἱ τ' αἰτῶ κτλ.

8. Ὀσ. 1. 4 (p. 1344 a 17) = Ὀπ. et D. 699:

Aristot. παρθένην δὲ γαμεῖν ἵνα ἤθελε καθαρό διδάξεις.

Hes. παρθένην δὲ γαμεῖν. δὲ κ' ἤθελε καθαρό διδάξεις.

Aristides, in referring to this passage of Hesiod, uses ἵνα. ἵνα has far the greater probability as the original reading, because it restores hiatus: ἵνα ἤθελε.

---

1 Vol. II. p. 26 (p. 31 Did.).
2 Petæd. 5. 8 (p. 279).
3 Floriæ. 4. p. 252 (ed. Meineke).
5 Cod. QVB Zb. ἀνάβαλας; Q. κακίστη γὰρ.
6 The word γ' edited by K Zach has no manuscript authority. Almost all the cod. have τ' or δ'.
7 Cod. Mb. διδάξει.
8 Vol. II. p. 33 (p. 41 Did.).
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Aristot.1 ἐμελῶς ἐφησθαί δοκᾶ

μὴτε πολύξεινος μήτ' ἄξεινος,

Hes. Μηδὲ πολύξεινον μηδ' ἄξεινον καλέσθαι,

With the variants μὴτε and μηδὲ we need not concern ourselves as they are often confused in manuscripts. If the manuscripts of Aristotle represent him correctly in this passage, it must be considered either as a mere reference or as a misquotation, for the words πολύξεινον and ἄξεινον must be right in Hesiod, since they are in the same construction as νακεστῆρα (verse 716), which the metre demands.


Aristot.2 φήμη δ' οὕτι γε πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται, ἥτινα λαοὶ πολλοὶ.

Hes. Φήμη δ' οὕτι τις πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται, ἥτινα πολλοὶ λαοὶ φημίζουσι.

Of the variants τι γε and τις we need say only that some manuscripts of Hesiod3 show τι, to which γε could easily have been added by a copyist, and one manuscript of Aristotle has τις without γε.

Demosthenes,4 Aeschines5 and Dio Chrysostomus6 give the order of words λαοὶ πολλοὶ, while other writers confirm the traditional reading of Hesiod πολλοὶ λαοὶ. Of the five manuscripts of Aristotle collated by Bekker for this passage four read πολλοὶ alone, the other has οὗ πολλοὶ. This οὗ, of course, may be the remnant of a previous λαοὶ, but the weight of evidence would seem to suggest that Aristotle wrote merely πολλοὶ, thus completing the verse in accordance with our reading of Hesiod.

___

1 Cod. Lb, ἄξεινος; LbO add καλεσθὰι.
2 Cod. Kb, οὗτε πάμπαν; Kb has οὗ (for λαοῖ); the other cod. show no trace of the word.
3 Cf. critical apparatus in text of Koechly-Kinkel for this passage.
5 Con. Timarch. p. 141.
6 Or. 37, p. 128 R.
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Aristot. (Pol.) ὁς κεραμεῖ κεραμεύς
Aristot. (Rhet. 2, 4) κεραμεύς κεραμεύς.
Aristot. (Rhet. 2, 10) κεραμεύς κεραμεύς.
Aristot. (Eth. Eud.) γὰρ κεραμεύς κεραμεύς κοτέει,
Hes. Καὶ κεραμεύς κεραμεύς κοτέει καὶ τέκτων τέκτων,

From these last four passages of Aristotle it is evident that, when he was quoting only a part of a verse, or perhaps referring to it, he did not feel it necessary to give the exact language. A comparison of these four passages shows that Aristotle had here the same reading in his Hesiod as we find in ours.

15 (16 and 17). Phys. Auscul. 4, 1 (p. 208 b 30), Metaphys. 1, 4 (p. 984 b 27), and De Xenoph. 1 (p. 975 a 11) = Theog. 116–120:
Aristot.¹ (Phys. Auscul.)

πάντων μὲν πρῶτηστα χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
gai' eirṓsteremos,
Aristot.² (Metaphys.)

πάντων μὲν πρῶτηστα χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
gai' eirṓsteremos, ἡδ' ἔρος, δὲ πάντεσσι μεταπρέπει ἀθανάτοις,
Aristot.³ (De Xenoph.)

πρῶτον μὲν πάντων φησὶ χάος ἐγένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
gai' eirṓsteremos, πάντων ἡδον ἀσφαλέις αἰεί,
ἡδ' ἔρος, δὲ πάντεσσι μεταπρέπει ἀθανάτοις.
Hes. Ἡτοι μὲν πρῶτηστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
gai' eirṓsteremos, πάντων ἡδον ἀσφαλέις αἰεί
[ἀθανάτων, οἱ ἔχοντι κάρη νυφόντος Ὀλύμπου,]
Τάρταρα τ' ἡρόστην μυχῇ χονδρὸς εὐρυδάκτης,
ἡδ' ἔρος, δὲ κάλλιστος ἐν ἀθανάτοις θεοῖς

¹ Cod. F, γένετ'.
² Cod. Η, αὐτὰρ (for αὐτὰρ); E, γάρ γαϊά; Η* Λ, ἔρος.
³ Cod. B R V, αἰείδερος.
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(a) In the first two passages, in which Aristotle is apparently intending to quote exactly, we read πάντως, and in the third, where the inversion of words and the metrical difficulties in the first line indicate that—if our text is correct—the quotation really begins with αὐτάρκης, we still find πάντως. It seems to me the natural inference is that Aristotle had πάντως in his text of Hesiod.

(b) The omission in the Metaphysics of verses 118 and 119 is of no great importance, for there Aristotle quotes only what is necessary to prove his point, namely that Hesiod made Ἔρως a ‘first cause.’ But still, as the general subject of this passage is the ‘first causes,’ the omission of Τάρταρα from this list would seem to indicate that, even if Aristotle had verse 119 in his text of Hesiod, he did not interpret Τάρταρα as one of the ‘first causes.’ In De Xenophane, where he quotes at greater length, the addition of verses 118 and 119 would materially change the force of ἔδως and γαῖς. The omission of these verses by Aristotle, therefore, indicates to my mind that they were not contained in his Hesiod.

(c) In two passages Aristotle gives πάντως μεταφέρει ἄθανάτους, where the manuscripts of Hesiod read κάλλιστος ἐν ἄθανάτοις θεοῖς. For the reading of Aristotle we find no support among ancient authors. It has been thought that Aristotle confused the verse of Hesiod with this verse of the Homeric Hymns:\footnote{2, 149.}

πάντως ἄθανάτους, ἐν καλλίστοις μεταφέρει ἄθανάτους.

That view is perhaps possible; and yet it is not impossible that Aristotle gives us a variant reading that has elsewhere disappeared.

Taking all of Aristotle’s quotations together, I feel that they are tolerably accurate. Some differences between the quotations and the passages quoted are probably due to his carelessness; many are undoubtedly due to the blunders of scribes; but there is left a considerable number of differences that are best explained, I think, as coming from an earlier text tradition than is preserved in the extant manuscripts of the authors quoted, especially as I have proved, in a few cases at least, that a difference of text really existed. Feeling, therefore, that readings offered by Plato and
Aristotle must not be rejected merely because they find no support in the manuscripts of the authors quoted, but must be carefully considered as possibly giving independent testimony on many matters of text, let me approach my real subject.—the quotations from Homer.

II. QUOTATIONS FROM HOMER.

Introductory.

A very casual reading of a few of the scholia of Homer convinces us that there were, even in very early times, many manuscripts of that author. Some of the variants, though they have disappeared entirely from the body of the text of the extant manuscripts, are still preserved in the scholia. For example, in a scholion of Ven. A on Iliad 22. 11. we read: ὥς Ἰονίων τοσὰν ἐφίζαρον... τὸν δὲ γιονίων ἐφίζαρον. In our extant manuscripts we read ἐφίζαρον and ἐφίζαρον, but nowhere ἐφίζαρον. In the scholia in manuscripts HMQ. Dindorf on Odyssey 1. 93. we read: τῶν τίμων δ' ἐκ Καπρού µε, while the manuscripts of the Odyssey all show Αἰακίου µε.

Another proof of the antiquity of some of the variants is found in papyrus fragments, some of which go back to a very old date. I shall speak of only two of these fragments.

1. A papyrus fragment containing Iliad 24. verses 127–804. Of the many peculiarities of reading of this fragment let me select two as examples.

(a) In verse 213 the fragment reads ῥοῦς. Ven. A and some other manuscripts read δι:]. the rest have ῥοῦς. An interlinear gloss of Ven. A tells us: ὥς ῥοῦς ῥοῦς ὑγίου. The scholiast, then, knew both of these readings.

(b) In verse 330 the fragment has δι'. Ven. A and many other manuscripts have ὅτα δι', while the rest have δι'. In a marginal scholion of Ven. A we find: µὴ δι' ἀνοικο. Both readings, then, were known to the scholiast. Now this fragment is assigned by La Roche to the first century either B.C. or A.D. Hence we see that
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some of the Homeric variants are of high antiquity, and were known to the scholiasts.

2. The other fragment is of considerably greater importance for us. It is the one discovered recently in Egypt by Flinders Petrie. It contains portions of Iliad 11, verses 502-537. Though there remain only the first letters of some verses and the last letters of others, the fragment shows remarkable differences when compared with the traditional readings of the Iliad. Let us note these differences.

(a) Verse 515. Papyri, πασσων: Π., πασσειν. Some of the ancients suspected this verse of Homer, as we see by the scholion in Ven. Α: ἀθετεῖτοι, . . . καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης προηθέτει. Ζηρόδοτος δὲ ὀδέ ἐγραφεν.

(b) Verse 520. Papyri, ὅς: Π., νῆας.

(c) Verse 528. Papyri, κεῖθ εἰπ: Π., κεῖα' εἰπ.

(d) Verses 529 and 530. Papyri, κοῦροι τ.: Π. ἵππης and ἀλλάλοντο.

Besides, the fragment shows the endings of four verses not found in our manuscripts of Homer,—between 504 and 505 νοησεν, between 509 and 510 κεῖ ελοιντο, between 513 and 514 νοοτ, and between 514 and 515 ἀλλοντε. Both Mahaffy and van Leeuwen assign this fragment to the third century B.C. It is undoubtedly older than any other scrap of Homer that has come down to us, and offers invaluable suggestions with reference to early traditions of Homer. It preserves not only variants nowhere given in our Homeric manuscripts or scholia, but also traces of verses that have been lost to us. In view of these facts it will be unwise in our present investi-

1 Published by Mahaffy (with other fragments) in Flinders Petrie Papyri, Dublin, 1891.

2 Cod. Lips., κεῖθ'.

3 So Mahaffy; but van Leeuwen says (Memorium 20, 1892, pp. 127-130), the fragment reads AT Π or AT Π.

4 Van Leeuwen thinks it is χαλκόν.

5 This word, as van Leeuwen says, has been accidentally omitted by Mahaffy in his transcription.

6 Athenaeum, Dec. 6. 1890, no. 3293, p. 777.

7 Memorium, 20, 1892, p. 127.
gation to reject without consideration any variants offered by ancient authors, even if they are unsubstantiated by any of our Homeric manuscripts or scholia.

At last we are ready, I think, to examine thoughtfully the passages quoted from Homer by Plato and Aristotle. Some of these are only phrases or parts of verses, but I have included them in the list of quotations.

**Plato's Quotations from Homer.**

**A. No Variants.**

Plato gives many Homeric quotations that in the manuscripts used by the best editors show no readings different from those in the best manuscripts of Homer. The minor differences of breathing, accent, adscript *iota* and movable *nu* I have not considered as variants, for any manuscript tradition on these points is comparatively modern and entitled to little consideration. There are fourteen of these quotations that show no variants.

1. *Conviv.* 219 A = *II.* 6, 236:
   \[\chiρύσεα\ \chiαλκείον\]
   The entire verse is quoted by Aristotle.\(^1\)

2. *Phaedo* 112 A = *II.* 8, 14:
   \[\tauήλε\ \muάλ*\ \'\χι\ βάθιστον \ινό \χθονός \ιστι \ βέρεθρον.\]

3. *Crat.* 392 A = *II.* 14, 291:
   \[χαλκίδα\ \κακλήσκουν\ \θεοί, \ανδρες \δε\ \κύμνην,\]
   This verse is quoted thus by Aristotle\(^2\) also.

4. *Rep.* 3, 388 C = *II.* 18, 54:
   \[\ομοι \εγώ \δειλή, \ομοι \δυσαριστοτόκια.\]

5. *Apol.* 28 D = *II.* 18, 98:
   \[\αιδεία, \φησί, \τεθνείν\]

6. *Gorg.* 449 A = *II.* 20, 241 and often:
   \[\ε\ύχομαι\ \ε\υμι,\]

---

\(^1\) *Eth. Nic.* 5, 11 (p. 1136 b 10).

\(^2\) *Hist. An.* 9, 12 (p. 615 b 10).
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7. Protag. 340 A = II. 21, 308–309:
φίλε κασίγνητε, σθένωσ σώφρος ἀμφότεροι περ
σχόμεν.

8. Rep. 3, 387 A = II. 23, 100–101:
ψυχή δὲ κατὰ χρονός, ἤστε καπνός,
ἀχέο τετρευμα.

9. Rep. 3, 391 B = II. 23, 151:
Πατρόκλῳ ἥρωι, ἕφη, κόμην ὑπάσαιμι φέρεσθαι,

10. Alcibiad. II.1 142 E = Od. 1, 34:
ὑπὲρ μόρον ἀλγε ἔχουσι.

11. Protag. 315 B = Od. 11, 601:
Τὸν δὲ μετ’ εἰσενόθη,

12. Rep. 3, 390 B = Od. 12, 342:
λιμφ δ’ οἰκτιστον βανέεν καὶ πρόμον ἐπιστείδ

13. Epist. 7, 345 E = Od. 12, 428:
δφρ’ ἐτι τὴν ἀνθρωπόταμῳ χαρμῇβιν,

14. Theaetet. 170 E = Od. 16, 121:
μᾶλα μνημο

B. SLIGHT VARIANTS.

To the list just given may properly be added twenty-one other passages, in which the variants, whether in the manuscripts of Plato or Homer, are slight and such as constantly arise from the carelessness of scribes.

1. Rep. 3, 389 A = II.2 1, 599–600:
ἀθεστοῖς δ’ ἀρ’ ἄνωρτο γῆλως μακάρεσσι θεοῖν,

2. Rep. 3, 389 E = II.3 4, 412:

τέτα, σιωπῆ ἕσο, ἀμφ’ δ’ ἐπιστείδεο μὸθε,  

1 So Schan, though the codices of Plato have ἐπέφερον. The codices of Homer vary between ἐπέφερ μόρον and ὑπέφερον. That this difference was felt as a real variant is seen by schol. MQ (Od.): οὐ σκώτον τὸ ἐπέφερ μόρον. Cod. B (Plato) has ἀλγε ἔχουσι.

2 Cod. G, δ’ ἄνωρτο.

3 Cod. A, τέτα; N, σιωπή.
3. Crat. 415 A = II. 6, 265:
   Plat.1 μὴ μὲ ἀπογυνώσῃς μένος.
   Hom.2 μὴ μ’ ἀπογυνώσῃς μένος,
4 (and 5). Theactet. 152 E and Crat.3 402 B = II.4 14, 201 and 302:
   ὡκεάνων τε θεῶν γίνεσθι καὶ μνημέα Τηθῶν
   ψυχή δ’ έκ μεθίων πτωμάν Ἀιδώσει βεβήκει,
   ἐν πότιμον γούσαν, λατοῦ σ’ ἀνθροπήτα καὶ ζήσων.
7. Phil.6 47 E = II. 18, 108–109:
   πολύφρονα περ' ἀληθήναι,
   δ' τε πολύ γλυκίων μέλιτος καταλεβομένου —
8. Rep. 3, 386 D = II.7 20, 64–65:
   οἰκία δ’ θυγατέου καὶ άδηματος γιανέη
   σμερδάλε’, εύφωτα, τά τε στυγέουσι θεοί περ.’
9. Crat. 391 E = II.8 20, 74:
   δ’ Χάρθων, φησί, καλοῦν καὶ θεοί, ἄνθρωπος δ’ Σκάμαιδρον
10. Rep. 3, 391 A = II.9 22, 20:
   ή γ’ δ’ τισαίμνη, ει μοι διάνοις γε παρείη.
11. Leg. 7, 804 A = Od.10 3, 26–28:
   Τηθῶν, ἄλλα μὲν αὐτός ἐν φρεσί στόιν νοήσεις,
   ἄλλα δὲ καὶ δαίμων ὑποθήνεται: ο’ γάρ ὅδω
   ο’ σε θεῶν δέλπης γενόθαι τε τραφέομεν τε.
12. Leg. 3, 680 B = Od.11 9, 112–115:
   τούτων δ’ ο’τ’ ἄγοραί βουληθήροι ο’τε θέμαστοι,
   ἄλλ’ ο’ Γ’ ὑψηλῶν ὄρεων ναύον κάρφων
   εν σπέρσι γλαφυροί, θεμιστεύει δὲ ἐκατός
   παλιῶν ἢ’ ἀλόχων, ο’δ’ ἄλληλων ἀλέγοντοι.

---

1 Cod. T, ἀπογυνώσῃς, emended to ἀπογυνάωςῃ.
2 Cod. L0, μένος δ’; G, μένος τ’.
3 Text, γένεσιν φησί. Cod. T omits φησί.4 Cod. H (verse 201), γε.
5 Cod G (verse 857), ἀδροτήτα; Cant. Mor., ἀδροτήτα.
6 Many cods., ο’ το πάνω.
7 Many cods., φασθή, with and without iota.
8 Cod. L Harleian, κάμαρδον.
9 Cod. D, εἱ μή.
10 Cod. K, ο’δε θεῶν δ’.
11 Cod. I, ο’δ’; DIFK, στέσει; AQ, στέσει; K, γλαφυρός; K, παλιῶν τ’.
The words ἑμιστεύει ... ἄλοχων are so quoted by Aristotle. Moreover, he also refers to them, but with the reading παιδῶν ἥδ' ἄλοχων.


οὐ δημιουργοὶ ἦσος,
μάντιν ὲ λητήρα κακῶν ὲ τέκτων δούρων,

14. *Rep.* 2, 381 D = *Od.* 17, 485–486:

θεοὶ ζείδοις δικότες ἄλοδαποῦι,
παντοῦ τελέσουσι ρευστοφωσί πόλις.

15. *Soph.* 216 C = *Od.* 17, 486:

ρευστοφωσί πόλις,

16. *Minos,* 319 B = *Od.* 19, 174:

ἐνενήκοντα πόλεις,

17. *Minos,* 319 B = *Od.* 19, 178–179:

τοῖς δὲ ὕψοις, ἐν Κυκλοσχός μεγάλη πόλει, ἧνα τε Μίνως
ἐνενώρος βασίλευς Δίὸς μεγάλον ὀριστῆς.

18. *Minos,* 319 D = *Od.* 19, 179:

ἐνενώρος βασίλευς Δίὸς μεγάλον ὀριστῆς,

19. *Rep.* 4, 441 B = *Od.* 20, 17:

στήθος δὲ πλήξας κραδίνη ἥτισπε ἑυδὸς.

20 (and 21). *Rep.* 3, 390 D, and *Phaedo,* 94 D = *Od.* 20, 17–18:

στήθος δὲ πλήξας κραδίνη ἥτισπε μετα,
τέταλθ ἡ κραδίνη, καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποι' ἐτήλης.

---

1 *Pol.* 1, 2 (p. 1252 b 22).
2 *Eth. Nic.* 10, 10 (p. 1180 a 28).
3 Some cod. have δημιουργοὶ.
4 Cod. Q, ἤσσοι; D, μάντιν ὢ (omitting ὑ); HIL, μάντιν ὢ; M, μῆλων and γρ. δωρεα.
5 Cod. Q, τελέοντες; V, τελέσουσι; C, τόλμας.
6 Cod. C, τόλμας.
7 Some cod. have ἱνείκεστα.
8 Most cod. have ἱνείκεστα. La Roche edits ἱνείκεστα, which is demanded by the metre.
9 Many cod., Κνώσοι.
10 Many cod., τοῖς; very many, κρωσθέντος; La Roche edits Κρωσθέντος; A (recent hand) CL, ἱνείκοσι; many, ἱνείκοσι; N, ἱνείκοσι; S, ὡ ἱνείκοσι.
11 Cf. note 10.
13 A few of the best cod. have ἱνείκας.
14 Cod. G, στήθεα; H, ἱνείκας, γρ. ἱνείκας; many cod. omit δή; N, ἄλλα. 
C. Plato Agrees with the Best Manuscripts of Homer, though There were Other Homeric Readings.

There are nineteen passages in which the readings of Plato agree with those of the best manuscripts of Homer, although other Homeric manuscripts or the scholiasts or Eustathius show that there were other\(^1\) readings known to the ancients.

1. *Rep.* 3, 393 A = *Il.*\(^2\) 1, 15–16:

\[
\text{καὶ ἠλισθεὶς πάντος Ἀχαιῶν,}\\
\text{'Ατρείδα δὲ μᾶλλον δόω κοσμήτορε λαῶν}
\]


Though these verses are repeated in Homer,\(^3\) the context of Plato makes it clear that he is referring to the earlier passage, for he says, — Ὑλωθ’ οὖν, ὅτι μέχρι μὲν τούτων τῶν ἐτῶν (then comes the quotation) λέγει τε αὐτός ὁ ποιητής, a statement that would not be true if it referred to *Il.* 1, 374–375.

2. *Rep.* 3, 389 E = *Il.* 1, 225:

\[
\text{οἰνοβαρές, κινὸς δραματ’ ἔχων, κράδέος δ’ ὄλφοι}
\]


3. *Crat.* 428 D = *Il.* 1, 343 and 3,\(^4\) 109:

\[
\text{ἀμα πρόσωπω καὶ δείσω.}
\]


4. *Hipp.* *Min.* 370 A = *Il.*\(^5\) 9, 312–313:

\[
\text{ἐκθρός γὰρ μοι κεῖνος ὅμως Ἀδραίο πώλησιν,}\\
\text{ὅς χ’ ἔπερον μὲν κεῖθεν ἐνι φρεσίν, ἄλο δὲ εἶπῃ,}
\]

Eustathius seems to have had the reading βάζῃ, for twice in explaining verse 313 he uses the verb βάζω.

---

\(^1\) Under the head of other readings I have included verses which, though they are preserved in our manuscripts, were rejected by any of the old critics.

\(^2\) *Il.* 1, 374–375.

\(^3\) *Il.* 1, 374–375.

\(^4\) Cod. E, πρόσω καὶ δείσω.

\(^5\) Cod. G, ἔκεινος; many cod., κεύθεν; H, κεφάλη.
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5. *Leg.* 10, 906 E = *Il.* 9, 500:

**Plat.** ἡμιβή τε ὑδάν κυίαν

**Hom.** ἡμιβή τε κυίαν

**Schol. Ven. A.** — ἐν ἄλλῳ λοιβής τε κυίας τε.

Though Plato has amplified the expression ἡμιβή τε into ἡμιβή τε ὑδάν, it is clear that he had our manuscript reading of Homer, for in the *Republic* he quotes the verse in full just as we have it in our Homerian manuscripts.


Ἀλαὶ Διογένες Τελαμώνε, κορανε λαών,

πάντα τί μοι κατὰ δυνάν τείσι μονήσωσθαι.

**Schol. Ven. A.** — ἐν τοι τῶν ὑπομνημάτων διηρημένω τείσακο.

7 (and 8). *Conviv.* 174 D and *Protag.* 348 D = *Il.* 10, 224:

**Plat. (Conviv.)** Σὺν τε δυ’, ἔφη, ἐρχομένω πρὸ δ τοῦ

**Plat. (Protag.)** and Homer:

σὺν τε δυ’ ἐρχομένω, καὶ τε πρὸ δ τοῦ ἔνοπλον.

**Schol. Ven. A.** — συνερχόμενοι δύο ἀντί τοῦ συνερχομένων.

 Blasio de μὴ νοσάντες τὸ ὑ προστιθάσαι, κακῶς.

The first four words of this verse are twice quoted by Aristotle. The verse is parodied once by Plato.

9. *Conviv.* 214 B = *Il.* 11, 514:

ἱγρός γὰρ ἄνηρ πολλῶν ἀυτάξιος ἄλλων.

**Schol. Townl.** — Ζηρόδοτος δὲ οὗ γράφει: Ἄριστοφάνης δὲ ἄδετεω.

10. *Rep.* 3, 390 C = *Il.* 14, 296:

φίλοισιν λίθοντες τοκῆς

**Schol. Ven. A (Il. 1, 609).** — λίθοντες.

---

1 Many cod. have λοιβή τε and κυίαν.
2 Many cod. have κυίαν.
3 2, 364 E.
4 Cod. G Mor, κορανε’ ἁχαίων; H, δή (for τί); EL, ἀδίσα.
5 Best codices, δή (for δ τοῦ).
6 Cod. G, ἐρχομένῳ; L, καὶ τῳ.
7 Pol. 3, 16 (p. 1287 b 14) and Eth. Nic. 8, 1 (p. 1155 a 15).
8 Alcibiad. *Il.* 140 A.
9 Cod. B, ἀγρήν.
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11. Rep. 3, 391 A = II. 22, 15:

ξβλαφάς μ’ ἐκάργε, θεών δολοτατέ πάτεν τον.  


12. Rep. 3, 386 D = II.1 23, 103–104:

α τόπος, η μα τις έστι και εϊν ‘Αλεξο δόμασιν
ψυχή και εἴδωλον, αὐτάρ φρένες οϋκ ένι πάμην.


13. Axioc. 367 D = II.3 24, 525–526:

ός γάρ ἐπεκλώστοι θεοι διελώσι βροτοισιν,
ζώειν ἀχνυμένοις,

The reading, ἀχνυμένοις, of Plato and most of the manuscripts of Homer is confirmed by Stobaeus and Plutarch. The reading, ἀχνυμένους, given by two manuscripts of Homer, seems to have been a real variant, for it is quoted for Homer in one passage of Stobaeus.

14. Rep. 3, 386 C = Od.7 11, 489–491:

βουλομὴν κ’ ἐπάρουρος ἐων θετομένην ἀλλα
ἄνδρι παρ’ ἀκόλυφο, [ὁ μῆ βίωσε πολίν εἰη,]
η πάσιν νεκροίς καταφθημένους ἀνάσισαν.

Schol. H., — τινής δε πάρουρος, δ’ ἀκόλουθος, οὐκ εβ. Eustathius (1695, 36), — το δε βουλήμην κ’ ἐπάρουρος διτίπιν ἐχει γραφην. η γαρ ἐπάρουροσ . . . η τρωσιλάβοις πάρουρος.

The reading, ἐπάρουρος, is verified by Plato again in the Republic, where he refers to these verses of Homer.

---

1 A few cod., τι; C, αἰτάρ.  
2 Floril. 98, 50 and 98, 75.  
3 Floril. 124, 14.  
6 In the best codices δ... εη is lacking. These words were probably added by somebody who knew the passage in Homer.  
7 Cod. I omits verses 489–535.  
8 Cod. ES, ἀχνυμένους.  
9 Moral. 105 C.
15. *Gorg.* 526 D = *Od.* 11. 569:
χρόνων σχήματον ἵχοντα, θεμοτεύκτα τίκωσιν.
Schol. H (on verse 568). — τοθείται μίχρα τοῦ ὦς εἶτω ... ὦς (verse 627).
A part of this verse is quoted again by Plato in the *Minos.*

16. *Char.* 161 A = *Od.* 17. 347:
αἰδώς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ σχημασθῇ ἄνδρι παρείναι.

17. *Leg.* 10. 904 E = *Od.* 19. 43:
αὐτῇ τινι δίκη ἐστι θεῶν. καὶ ὁ Ολύμπος ἱκνουσιν.
Eustath. (1854, 45). — τινές οὖς γράφοντες, αὐτή τινι δίκη ἐστι θεῶν.

ἡ βασιλείας ἀμίμωνοι, ὡστε θεοίδης
εὐδικόν ἀνέχοντο, φέροι δὲ γαῖα μέλαινα
πυρὸς καὶ πῦρ ὅπας, βρέθηκε δὲ ὀλυσίαν καρπῷ,
τίστῃ δ' ἐμπέδα μῆλα, ἡλάσασα δὲ ταράχη ἱχθος.
Schol. H. — πάντα, οὖ μῆλα. The omission of verse 110 I shall consider later.

19. *Rep.* 1, 334 B = *Od.* 19. 396:
κλεπτοστήν 6' ὀρκῷ τε.
Schol. L (La Roche), — γρ. [τε] νοῷ τε (for 6' ὀρκῷ τε).

D. QUOTATIONS WOVEN INTO THE TEXT.

There are twenty-two passages in which Plato, while weaving a phrase or a verse of Homer into the structure of his sentence, shows that he had Homeric readings identical with ours; or at least the quotation has nothing inconsistent with our readings.

---

1 Many cod. have ἱκνωσιν; S, ἱκνωσιν.
2 319 D.
3 Cod. A, προοίμιον (γρ. παρείναι by a recent hand); G, αἰδώς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ φθο' ἱμμαι ἄνδρι προοίμιον; M, γρ. φθο' ἱμμαι ἄνδρι προοίμιον.
4 Very many cod. have τίστῃ; M, τίστῃ; Al, πάντα (for μῆλα); H (in margin), πάντα, οὖ μῆλα; A (recent hand), γρ. μῆλα; many, παρέχει.
1. *Com. 183 E* refers to *Il. 2. 71:

Plat. ἢ μι γὰρ τῷ τοῦ σώματος ἀθαν αὔγοντι, οὐκ ἔρω, οἶχεται ἀποτάμησος.
Hom. ὑχεῖ' ἀποτάμησος. ἐμὲ δὲ γλείπης ὑπὸς ἀνήκειν.

2. *Achil. 141 D* refers to *Il. 2. 303:

Plat. οὕς δὲ σὲ σε ὑψίσον ἐστιν ἐνά γε χθοίς τε καὶ προϊς γεγονημένα.
Hom. χθοίς τε καὶ προϊς', ὡς ἐκ Ἀδηλίς νῆς Ἀχαιῶν

3. *Phaedr. 260 A* refers to *Il. 1. 3, 361:

Plat. οὕτωι ἀπόβλητον ἵτος ἐστι δὲ,
Hom. οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητον ἵτος ἔστω, ὡς κεκα ἑτῳ.

4. *Achil. 132 A* refers to *Il. 2, 547:

Plat. ἐπτρόπους γὰρ ὁ τοῦ μεγαλήτορος δήμος Ἐρεχθεῶς.
Hom. δήμον Ἐρεχθεῶς μεγαλήτορος, ὡς τοῦ Ἀθηνη.

In the passage in Plato the epic form has been changed to the Attic Ἐρεχθεῶς. Such a change—common in the manuscripts of Plato—is generally due, I think, to scribes. Here, however, as Plato rather hints at the passage than quotes it, he may well have used the form Ἐρεχθεῶς himself.

5. *Theaet. 194 E* refers either to *Il. 2, 851 or to *Il. 16, 554:

Plat. ὡς ὅταν τοῖς λάσιοι τούτο κηρύχτη. οὐκ ἔτηκαμεν ὁ πάσοφος ποιημένος.
Hom. (Il. 2, 851) Παφλαγών δ’ ἔγειτον Πελαιάκος λάσιοι κηρ. Hom. (Il. 16, 554) ὁπεὶ Μενοείδειος Πατροκλῆς λάσιοι κηρ.

6. *Theaet. 183 E* refers to *Il. 3, 172:

Plat. Παραμείνεις δὲ μοι φαίνεται, τὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου, αἰσθάνοις τε μοι ἀμα δεινός τε.
Hom. αἰσθάνοις τε μοι ἐστι φιλε ἐκυρία δεινός τε.

1 Cod. G, προϊς; C, προῆς.
2 Cod. DGH, ὡς.
3 Cod. ἑταρ.
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7. Alcibiad. II. 150 D refers to II. 5, 127–128:

Plat.\(^1\) ἀλλὰ δοκεῖ μοι, ὡσπερ τῷ Διομήδει φησίν τὴν Ἀθη
"Ὀμηρος ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀφελῶν τὴν ἀχλύν, δὲ
ἐὰν γιγνώσκοι ἡμὲν θεὸν ἢδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα,

Hom.\(^2\) ἀχλύν δ’ αὖ τοι ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔλον, ἢ πρὶν ἔπην,

διὸ τ’ ἐὰν γιγνώσκης ἡμὲν θεὸν ἢδὲ καὶ ἄνδρα.


8. Crat. 407 D refers to II. 5, 221–222:

Plat. περὶ δὲ ἄλλων δὲν τινων βούλει πρόβαλλε μοι, ὅφρα ἢδι
οἱ οἱ Εὐθύφρονοι ἤπιοι.

Hom. ἀλλ’ ἂν ἐμῶν ὑπὸν ἐπιβήσοι, ὅφρα ἢδι,

οἱ Τρώοι ἤπιοι, ἐπιστάμενοι πεδίοιο.

9. Rep. 5, 468 D refers to II. 7, 321:

Plat. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ὀμηρος τὸν εἰδοκιμήσαντα ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ νότ

σιν Αἰαντα ἤφη διηνεκέσσι γεραίεσθαι,

Hom. νότοισιν δ’ Αἰαντα διηνεκέσσι γέραιεν

10. Epist. 7, 344 D refers to II. 7, 360 or II. 12, 234:

Plat. ἓ ἄρα δῆ ὅι ἐπιτά, θεοὶ μὲν οὐ, βροτοὶ δὲ φρένας ἥλει

ἀυτοὶ.

Hom. ἓ ἄρα δῆ τοι ἐπιτᾶ θεοὶ φρένας ἥλεσαν αὐτοὶ.

The author of this Epistle has changed the second person τοι
the third person οἱ, to adapt the quotation to his purpose.

I might note the interjection of the expression μὲν οὐ, βροτ
δὲ, which interrupts the metre.

11. Crito 44 A refers to II. 9, 363:

Plat. ἢ ἐδώκει τίς μοι γυνὴ . . . καλέσαι με καὶ εἴπειν: ἡ Σώκρατ

ἡματί κεν τριτάτῳ Θηΐνη ἑρίβωλον ἱκοῖο.

Hom. ἡματί κε τριτάτῳ Θηΐνη ἑρίβωλον ἱκοῖην.

---

\(^1\) Cod. B, γιγνώσκει.

\(^2\) Cod. L, γιγνώσκεις; A and some others, γιγνώσκει; Η, γιγνώσκει; several γιγνώσκει.

\(^3\) Cod. D, θείης; B, θεος.

\(^4\) Cod. D, φθίνῃ δ’. 

12. Gorg. 485 D refers to Il. 9, 441:

Plat. τὰς ἄργον ἐν αἱ ἡφὶ ὁ ποιητὴς τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀριστερεῖς γίγνεσθαι,

Hom. οἱ δ' ἄργοι, ἵνα τ' ἄνδρας ἀριστερεῖς τελέσοισιν.

13. Cont. 179 A refers either to Il. 10, 482 or to Il. 15, 262:

Plat. ὅστε ὁμοῦν εἶναι τῷ ἄριστῳ φόρῳ. καὶ ἀτεχνῶς, δ' ἡφὶ ὁμήρος, μένος ἐμπνεῦσαι ἐνοικῶν τῶν ἡμῶν τῶν θεῶν.

Hom. (Il. 10, 482) δὲ φάτο, τῷ δ' ἐμπνευσε μένος γλαυκώπις Ἀθηνα.

Hom. (Il. 15, 262) δ' δὲ εἰπὼν ἐμπνευσε μένος μέγα ποιμέν λαῶν.

14. Rep. 8, 566 C refers either to Il. 16, 776 or to Od. 24, 40:

Plat. ὃ δὲ δὴ προστάτης ἐκεῖνος αὐτός δὴλος δὴ δὲ δὴ μέγας μεγαλωστὶ οὔ κεῖται,

Hom. (Il.) κεῖσο μέγας μεγαλωστὶ, λειπασμόν ἱπποσινῶν.

Hom. (Od.) κεῖσο μέγας μεγαλωστὶ λειπασμόν ἱπποσινῶν.

15. Cont. 174 B refers to Il. 17, 587–588:

Plat. ποιήσας γὰρ τὸν Ἀγαμέμνον διαφερόντως ἁγάθων ἄνδρα ταῖς πολεμικά. τὸν δὲ Μενέλαυς μαιλθακὸν αἰχμητήν.

Hom. οὐς δὲ Μενέλαυς ὑπέτρεπα ὃ δὲ πάρος περ μαλθακὸς αἰχμητής νῦν δ' ὀξεῖες ὦς αἴρεως.

16. Rep. 3, 388 A refers to Il. 18, 23–24:

Plat. Πάλιν δὴ ὁμήρος τε δεσπόμεθα... μὴ ποιεῖν Ἀχιλλέα, θεᾶς παιδα... μηδὲ ἀμφιτέρησι χερσίν ἐλώνα κόνιν αἰθαλός σαν χειμάν φύσιν κακός κεφαλῆς.

Hom. ἀμφιτέρης δὲ χερσίν ἐλών κόνιν αἰθαλός σαν χειμάν τά κακός κεφαλῆς, χαρίν δ' ἔσχων πρόσωπον.

17. Rep. 3, 388 B refers to Il. 22, 414–415:

Plat. μηδὲ Πρίαμον ἑγγὺς θεῶν γεγονότα λειτανισάτα τε καὶ κυνινδόμενον κατὰ κόπρων. ἐξονομακλήθην ἄνω μαξόντ' ἄνδρα ἐκαστον.

1 Cod. GL, ἄργοις; D, τελέσοισιν.
2 Cod. I omits this verse; Vrat b A, ἔσχωσε.
3 Cod. DL, μεγαλωστὶ.
4 Cod. H, ὑπέτρεπας; A, πάρος γε.
5 Some cod. have κυνινδόμενον; some cod., κόπρων.
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Hom.¹ πάντας δὲ λυτάνει κυλινθόμενοι κατὰ κόπρον,
ἐξονομακλήθην δομοᾶξον ἄνθρα οἰκάστον.

18. Protag. 309 A refers either to Il.² 24, 348 or to Od.³ 10, 279:
Plat. οὖ σὺ μάτοι Ὀμήρου ἐπαινέσθε εἰ, δὲ ἐφη χαριεστάτην
ηῆθην ἐκείνου τοῦ ὑπηνήτου,
Hom. πρῶτον ὑπηνήτη δοὺς χαριεστάτη ἦβη.

19. Phaedr. 266 B refers to Od. 5, 193:
Plat. τούτων διώκω κατόπισθε μετ' ἰχνιον ὡστε θεοίο.
Hom. καρπαλίμωσι δὲ δ' ἐπειτα μετ' ἰχνια βαίνε θεοίο.

At first sight Plato's words seem inconsistent with those of Homer. The differences, however, are easily explicable. The expression τούτων διώκω, while not attempting to reproduce βαίνε, takes the place of it. The use of ἰχνιον in the singular avoids a hiatus before ὡστε and preserves the rhythm. The word ὡστε is used to suggest the comparison. The epic genitive θεοίο is sufficient to show that Plato had this verse in mind.

20. Rep. 7, 516 D refers to Od. 11, 489–491:
Plat. ἦ το τού Ὀμήρου ἄν πενθείναι καὶ σφόδρα βουλεθαι
ἐπάροουν ἔντα θητεύμεν ἄλλω ἄνδρι παρ’
ἀκλήρω.
Hom.⁴ βουλοίμην κ’ ἐπάροους ἔων θητεύμεν ἄλλωσ,
ἄνδρι παρ’ ἀκλήρω, δὴ μὴ βιοινον πολύς ἄη.

21. Protag. 315 D refers to Od. 11, 582:
Plat.⁵ Καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ Τάνταλον γε εἰσείδον.
Hom.⁶ καὶ μὴν Τάνταλον εἰσείδον χαλέν’ ἄλγε’ ἰχοντα,

¹ Cod. Vrat A, ηλιάνειν.
² Cod. S, πρώτως.
³ Cod. N, πρῶτως; QV, χαριστατο; A (recent hand), γρ. δὴ (for τοῦ περ).
⁴ For variant readings and scholia cf. above p. 182, where this passage has already been given.
⁵ Cod. BT, εἰσείδος, but B with a note in the margin to indicate that there is a mistake.
⁶ Cod. H (first hand) K, καὶ μὲν; C, τάνταλον τ’ εἰσιδον; many cod., κρατήρ’ (for χαλέν’).
22. *Laches 201 B* refers to *Od. 17, 347*:

Plat. τὸν Ὄμηρον δοκεῖ μοι χρήναι προβάλλεσθαι, δε ζηῇ
οὐκ ἀγαθὴν εἶναι αἰδῶ κεχρημένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρεῖναι.

Hom.¹ αἰδῶς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχρημένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρεῖναι.

This verse is quoted exactly in the *Charmides.²*

E. ATTIC FOR EPIC WORDS.

In a few passages the readings of the manuscripts of Plato agree with those of the manuscripts of Homer, except that a few Attic have been substituted for epic forms. As Plato in quoting these or similar passages elsewhere has sometimes given the real epic form, we must attribute these Atticisms not to him, but to the scribes.

1. *Laches 191 A = II.³ 5, 223 and II. 8, 107*:

Plat. καὶ Ὄμηρος που ἐπαινῶ τοὺς του Ἀινείου ἵππους κρατεῖνα
μᾶλ' ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα ἐφη αὐτοῖς ἐπιστασθαι διώκειν ἕδε
φήσονται.

Hom. κρατεῖνα μᾶλ' ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα διώκειν ἕδε φήσονται.

The confusion of such forms as διώκειν and διώκειν in the manuscripts of Homer is too common to call for comment here. The form διώκειν in Plato may well be attributed to a scribe.

2. *Soph. 268 D = II.⁴ 6, 211 and II. 20, 241*:

Plat. ταύτης τῆς γενεᾶς τε καὶ ἀιματος
Hom. ταύτης τοι γενεᾶς τε καὶ ἀιματος εὐχρομαι εἶναι.

The form κραδεῖν is similar in its declension to γενεᾶς. The former is quoted by Plato in the *Republic,⁶* from the *Iliad,⁶* and also in another passage of the *Republic* from the *Odyssey.⁷* So Plato surely was familiar with this epic or Ionic declension. Besides, in a passage of the *Republic* where the same phrase is found, many

---

¹ Cf. above p. 183, where the variants of this verse are given in full.
² 161 A.
³ Cod. G, φήσονται.
⁴ Cod. G, ἰδ (for τοί); D, γενεᾶ (here, too, probably through a fault of the copyist); H Cant, καλ (for τέ καλ); L, τοι καλ; Lips, Mosc. 3, καλ εὐχρομαί αἴματος εἶναι.
⁵ 3, 389 E.
⁶ 1, 225.
⁷ 4, 441 B.
⁸ 20, 17.
⁹ 8, 547 A.
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manuscripts show ταύτης τοι γενεᾶς. The natural supposition, therefore, is that a scribe of Plato’s manuscript has changed the epic γενεᾶς to the Attic γενεᾶς. The same scribe or another may then have changed τοι to τῆς, that the full Attic usage might be shown. That Plato himself was not responsible for this change from τοι to τῆς, is evident from the passage in the Republic1 just cited, where we find the Homeric expression ταύτης τοι γενεᾶς (or γενεᾶς).

3. Rep. 2, 364 D = II. 9, 497–501:

Plat.3 στρεπτοὶ δὲ τε και θεοὶ αὐτοὶ,
και τοὺς μὲν θυσίαις καὶ εὐχωλαῖς ἀγάναις
λοιβῇ τε κίνητι τε παρατηρῶν’ ἄθροισι
λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβή καὶ ἀμάρτῃ.

Hom.5 νηλεῖς ἤτορ ἤξεν· στρεπτοὶ δὲ τε και θεοὶ αὐτοὶ,
τὼν περ και μείζων ἄρετη τιμῇ τε βίη τε.
και μὲν τοὺς θυέοντι καὶ εὐχωλῆς ἀγάνης
λοιβῇ τε κίνητι τε παρατηρῶν’ ἄθροισι
λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβή καὶ ἀμάρτῃ.

To verse 500 Plato refers in the Laws.4 Of the omission of verse 498 I shall speak later. Perhaps a possible explanation of θυσίαις is that a copyist has carelessly written the more common Attic word in place of the epic and poetic θύσιος. Then the metre may have helped to produce the poetic or old Attic ending αἰσι. The μὲν τοὺς of Homer has suffered inversion in Plato through somebody’s carelessness. The form εὐχωλαῖς may be explained as an Atticism.

4. Rep. 3, 388 C = II. 16, 433–434:

Plat. αἱ αἱ ἁγάνις, ὅτε μοι Σαρπηδόνα φιλτατον ἄνδρῶν
Μοῖρ’ ὑπὸ Πατρόκλου Μενοιτίδαο δομήηνα.

Hom.6 ὁ μοί ἁγάνις, ὅ τε μοι Σαρπηδόνα, φιλτατον ἄνδρῶν,
μοῖρ’ ὑπὸ Πατρόκλου Μενοιτίδαο δομήηνα.

---

1 8, 547 A.
2 Many cod. (verse 497), γα (for τε); many cod., λιστοι δι (before στρεπτοί); some cod., ἁγάνις; Flor. x, εὐχωλησι.
4 10, 906 E.
5 Cod. H, μν.
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We see from this same section of Plato—Republic 3, 388 C—where we read ὧμοι ἐγὼ δειλη. ὧμοι δυσαριστοτόκα, that the exclamation ὧμοι was known to Plato as Homeric: so I suspect that the un-Homeric αἴ αἴ is to be attributed to some scribe, who has substituted this common Attic form.

5. Minos 319 D = Od. 11. 569:
Plat. χρυσοῦν σκήτρων ἔχοντα
Hom.1 χρυσοῦν σκήτρων ἔχοντα. θεματεῖόντα νίκοςον,

Here we may consider either that Plato meant merely to refer to the words of Homer, without quoting them exactly, or—as seems to me more probable—that the Attic form χρυσοῦν is due to a scribe.2 For in the Gorgias3 Plato quotes the entire verse of Homer just as our Homeric manuscripts give it.

6. Rep. 3. 387 A = Od. 24. 6–9:
Plat. ὡς δ' ὅτε νικηρίδες μυχὴ ἄντρον θεοπείων
      τρίζονσαι τοσόντα, ἵτε κ' τις ἀποσύσαν
      ὀρμανθ' ἐκ τέτρης. ἀν' ἄλληλησαι ἔχονται,
      ὡς αἴ τετρηγναί ἂν ἱςαν.

Hom.4 ὡς δ' ὅτε νικηρίδες μυχὴ ἄντρον θεοπείων
      τρίζονσαι τοσόντα, ἵτε κ' τις ἀποσύσαν
      ὀρμανθ' ἐκ τέτρης. ἀν' ἄλληλησαι ἔχονται,
      ὡς αἴ τετρηγναί ἂν ἱςαν· ἱρχε δ' ἀρα σφαν

Here, too, I think we may say with great probability that a scribe has changed the epic ἱςαν—quoted by Plato from Homer—to the doubtful Attic ἱςαν.

F. Plato's Variants Substantiated.

In a few passages, where Plato has given us readings different from those of the traditional Homeric text, we find the most important variants of Plato substantiated either by some of the manu-

---

1 Many cod. have διαθέσαν; S, ἀκοῦσαν.
2 We might compare ὑσσοῦ for ὑσσοῦ (Lev. 3. 681 E = II. 20, 218).
3 5.6 D.
4 Cod. A, τρίζονσαι; KS, ἄτα; M, ἄνα; ADL, ἀλλήλησι; M, ἔχονται with ἔχονται above); A, τετρηγναί.
scripts of Homer or by scholia of these manuscripts or by ancient authors.

1. *Hipp. Min.* 365 A = II. 9, 308–314:

Plat.1 Διογένης Δαμητιάδη, τολμηχαν’ Ὀδυσσεύ,
χρή μᾶν δὴ τῶν μῦθων ἀπηλεγέως ἄποικεν,
ὥσπερ δὴ κρανέω τε καὶ ὡς τελεσθαί δίω,
ἐξιθρός γάρ μοι κεῖσαι διός Ἀιδαο πύλησιν,
ὅτε χ’ ἔπερον μᾶν κεῖσθ’ ἐνι φρεσίν, ἀλλ’ ἄλλ’ ἐσπ’.

Homer.2 Διογένης Δαμητιάδη, τολμηχαν’ Ὀδυσσεύ,
χρή μᾶν δὴ τῶν μῦθων ἀπηλεγέως ἄποικεν,
ἂν πέρ δὴ φρονέω τε καὶ ὡς τετελεσμένον ἦσσα,
ὡς μὴ μοι προῖνσε πορίμενοι ἀλλοθεν ἄλλος.
ἐξιθρός γάρ μοι κεῖσαι διός Ἀιδαο πύλησιν,
ὅτε χ’ ἔπερον μᾶν κεῖσθ’ ἐνι φρεσίν, ἀλλ’ ἄλλ’ ἐσπ’.

There are several points in this passage that demand discussion.

(a) ὡσπερ. We note that all the manuscripts of Plato, with one exception, read ὡσπερ, while all of the manuscripts of Homer, together with one of Plato, read ἂν πέρ. It may be that in this one manuscript of Plato has been preserved his original reading ἂν πέρ, identical with that of Homer, but there are certain facts that discredit this view. For, as we shall see presently, this passage of Plato undoubtedly shows some old variants. Besides, the one manuscript of Plato that reads ἂν πέρ is the only one that agrees with the Homeric manuscripts in reading τετελεσμένον ἦσσα; so I suspect that it has been revised to agree with Homer, especially as it shows many other remarkable agreements with Homeric manuscripts. So it is quite possible that ὡσπερ is an old variant.

---

1 Cod. S, ἂν πέρ (for ὡσπερ); S, ἂν πέρ (for ὡς, verse 310); W, τετελεσθαί (for τελεσθαί); S, τετελεσμένον ἦσσα (for τελεσθαί). A variant reading, as often, is κεῖθ’ (for κεῖθ’).

2 Cod. D omits δὴ (verse 309); A and many others, κρανέω (for φρονέω); C (second hand), γρ. φρονέω; D, ἄστι (verse 310); E, τρόιστε; D, τροίστε; A Townl., παρήμενο; A, γρ. παρήμενος; many cod., κεῖθ’; H, κεῖθ’; many cod., ἔστω ὃς καὶ τετελεσμένον ἦσσα (verse 314).
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(δ) κρανίω. All the manuscripts of Plato give κρανίω, while those of Homer give κρανίω or φρονίω. Both readings are recognized by Eustathius (751. 5).—κρανίω ἢ φρονίω. διὰς γὰρ γράφεται. Aristarchus favored φρονίω, for in Schol. Ven. A we read,—'Αρισταρχος ὑπὲρ δὴ φρονίω, and in Townl.,—αι 'Αριστάρχου φρονίω.

(ε) τελέσθαι δίω. The best manuscripts of Plato read τελέσθαι δίω, while the Homeric manuscripts have τετελεσμένον ἵστατ. This Homeric reading is supported, as I have said, by one manuscript of Plato. If that correctly represents Plato’s original reading, then the two authors agree and no discussion is necessary. But the weight of evidence points to a real Homeric variant, τελέσθαι δίω. For in verse 314 Plato’s manuscripts read τετελεσμένον ἵστατ, which is supported as a variant by many manuscripts of Homer, and by a scholion in Ven. A,—ἐν ἄλλω ὡς καὶ τετελεσμένον ἵστατ. It seems unlikely that two verses so near together should have the same ending, and so I think that τελέσθαι δίω is the right reading for Plato in verse 310 and represents an old variant of Homer, which Plato has here preserved.

(d) Of the omission of verse 311 I shall speak later.

(ε) καὶ τετελεσμένον ἵστατ (verse 314). While most of the manuscripts of Homer show μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ἄριστα, the reading of the manuscripts of Plato is καὶ τετελεσμένον ἵστατ, which is supported by many manuscripts of Homer, and by the scholion of Ven. A,—ἐν ἄλλῳ ὡς καὶ τετελεσμένον ἵστατ.

Taking the passage as a whole, I think that the variants of Plato gain sufficient confirmation from the manuscripts and scholia of Homer, to entitle the whole quotation to our thoughtful consideration, as probably representing an early version of Homer.

2. Hipp. Min. 371 B = Il. 9, 650–655:

Plat.1 οὐ γὰρ πρὶν πολέμων μεθύσομαι αἰματόντος,
πρὶν γ’ θυόν Πριάμων διάφρονος, Ἐκτορα διόν,
Μυρμηδῶν ἐπὶ τε κλίσιάς καὶ νῆας ἱκέσθαι
κτείνοντ’ Ἀργείων, κατὰ τε φλέξαι πυρὶ νῆας.
ἀμφὶ δὲ μιν τῇ ’ ῥʔ κλίσιν καὶ τῇ μελαίνῃ
Ἐκτορα καὶ μεμαώτα μάχης σχέσιςθαι δίω.

1 Cod. S, οπόθεται; Vindob. suppl. 7, φυλάθαι.
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Hom.\(^1\) οὐ γὰρ πρὶν πολέμου μεθῆσομαι αλμαστόντος, πρὶν γ’ νῦν Πριμόμου δαίφρονος. Ἕκτορα διόν, Μυρμιδόων ἐπὶ τε κλισίας καὶ νῆες ἱκέσθαι κτείνοντ’ Ἀργείοις, κατά τε σμύξαι πυρὶ νῆες. ἄμφι δὲ τοι τῇ ἦμιynth κλυνῇ καὶ νη ἰμαλαίν’ Ἕκτορα καὶ μεμαύτα μάχης σχήσεσθαι δίω.

That the reading φλέξαι, given by the manuscripts of Plato, is a real Homeric variant, is shown from the scholion in Ven. A., — ὁτιος σμύσαι Ἀργαστερχε. οθὲ δὲ καὶ τὴν φλέξαι γραφήν. ὅτι γρ. καὶ κατά τε φλέξαι. The word μιν is due perhaps to carelessness on the part of the scribe. The difference between ἦμιynth and ἦμιynth is too slight and too common to call for comment.

3. Axioph. 367 D = II. 17, 446—447:
 Plat. οὐ μὲν γὰρ τί ποτ’ ἵστιν οἰκυρώτερον ἀνδρός πάντων δοσά τε γαών ἐπικενεί τε καὶ ἔρπει.
 Hom.\(^2\) οὐ μὲν γὰρ τί ποτ’ ἵστιν οἰκυρώτερον ἀνδρός πάντων, δοσά τε γαών ἐπικενεὶ τε καὶ ἔρπε.

That the reading ποτ’ of Plato is probably correct for that author is shown by Stobaeus,\(^3\) who quotes these very words from Plato. In another passage,\(^4\) where he gives the same words, Stobaeus seems to be quoting directly from Homer. If that is so, he helps to show that ποτ’ may be an old variant for Homer.

4. Leg. 3. 681 E = II. 20, 217—218:
 Plat. ἐν πεδίῳ πετάλιστο, πόλει μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ’ ἐθ’ ὑπορείας ψκεον πολυπτίδαν ἕδησ.
 Hom.\(^5\) ἐν πεδίῳ πετάλιστο, πόλει μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ’ ἐθ’ ὑπορείας ψκεον πολυπτίδακος ἕδες.

The change from ψκεον to ψκεον is undoubtedly the work of a scribe.\(^6\) That Plato’s manuscripts had ψκεον in early times is clear from the fact that Strabo\(^7\) thus quotes from Plato:

\(^1\) Cod. G, σμίδαι: Κ, ἄργειοι τε καταστέκα; some cod., μβί οτ μβ.
\(^2\) Cod. H Vrat d, οἰκυρώτερον; D, δοσά.
\(^3\) Floril. 98, 75.  
\(^4\) Cod. G, ἀλλ’ ἐθ’; E, ψκον; many cod., πολυπτίδακον.
\(^5\) We have had a similar example of contraction in χρυσοῦν in Minos, 319 D = Od. 11, 569: cf. above p. 190.  
\(^6\) 13, 1, 25 (C 593).
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ἐν τούτῳ πετάλωσα. τόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,
καί ἐκ τούτων ἦς ἐκὼν πολυτείδακος ἤδης.

This quotation of Strabo shows also that Plato wrote πολυτείδακος. That this was a variant of Homer we know both from the manuscripts and from Schol. Ven. A. — γρ. πολυτείδακος.

5. Lysis. 214 A = Od. 17, 218:

Plat. αἰεὶ τοι τῶν ἄρων ἦσει θεὸς ὡς τῶν ἄρων
Hom. ὡς αἰεὶ τῶν ἄρων ἦσει θεὸς ὡς τῶν ἄρων.

This same verse is quoted three times by Aristotle. In two instances his manuscripts agree with those of Homer, but in the third case he gives the same reading as Plato. It looks, therefore, as if there might have been, even in early times, a variation between αἰεὶ τοι and ὡς αἰεὶ.

6. Leg. 6, 777 A = Od. 17, 322–323:

Plat. ἦμον γὰρ τα νόοι φαινόν. ἀπαρέίπται εἰρύπτα Ζεὺς ἄνδρων. οὐς ἠν δὴ κατὰ δούλων ἦμαρ ἀρχής.
Hom. ἦμον γὰρ τ’ ἄρωτᾳ ἐποιήσανται εἰρύπτα Ζεὺς ἄνερος. εἶτ’ ἠν μὲν κατὰ δούλων ἦμαρ ἀρχής.

At first sight it would seem as if the only explanation of the great difference between the quotation and the apparent original, would be to suppose a serious lapse of memory on the part of Plato. Fortunately for our investigation, and fortunately for a better idea of a possible explanation of such differences generally, we have the testimony of both Athenaeus and Eustathius, to show that Plato is here giving an old variant, of which there is no trace in the manuscripts or scholia of Homer. Athenaeus, to be sure, is quoting from Plato, and really substantiates the correctness of the text of Plato alone: but he seems to have accepted Plato’s text as a correct Homeric quotation. Besides, we read in Eustathius (1766. 55). — ἦμον γὰρ τ’ ἄρωτᾳ ἐποιήσανται εἰρύπτα Ζεὺς ἄνδρων. οὕς ἠν δὴ καὶ ἄρως, ὡς ἐπερ

1 Cod. CDKL. 4 (for the second αἰ): M. 47.
2 Eth. Eud. 7. 1 (p. 1235 a 7) and Ret. 1, 11 (p. 1371 b 16).
3 Mag. Mora. 2, 11 (p. 1208 b 10).
4 Cod. A (first hand), ἀναμείναται.
5 6, 264.
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With this testimony before him even La Roche, who in his text of Homer feels obliged to follow the H黑马默 manuscripts, is forced to admit, — "id vero negari non potest, Platonem et Athenaeum in Homero suo scriptum reperisse γάρ τε νόου ἀπαμείρεται... ἀνδρῶν οὐς ἄν δῆ." 1

G. New Readings in Plato.

Now we come to those quotations from Homer which, although in individual variants they receive some confirmation from other sources, in general may be said to offer readings not elsewhere substantiated. These passages, however, should be viewed in the light of the points already discussed. Note, for example, the passage just dismissed. From a chance quotation of Athenaeus and from a remark of Eustathius, we are able to maintain a position that might otherwise have seemed untenable. A very easy explanation of the following passages is to assume that Plato by quoting from memory has wrongly given readings that never existed as real Homeric variants. Now, although that supposition may be true in some instances, it must not be assumed beforehand. In fact, I think that, in view of the many passages already discussed in which Plato has evidently quoted with accuracy, it is fairer to assume — unless we find strong evidence to the contrary — that Plato, whether he quoted from memory or not, has given what was in his text of Homer. In some of the following passages there is not much to be said, except to note the points of difference between the quotation and the accepted text of Homer.

1. Hipp. Min. 370 C = Il. 1, 169–171:

Plat. νῦν δ’ εἰμι Θήραθ’, ἐκείνη τολὴ λατιόν ἵστιν
οὐκαθ’ ἵπποι σιν νησικορωνίσαι, ὀδὶ ὁ δ’ ὅω
ἐνθάδ’ ἀτμος ἔως ἀφενος καὶ πλαύτων ἀφίζειν.

Hom.2 νῦν δ’ εἰμι Θήραθ’ δ’, ἐτεὶ ἡ τολὴ φέρτερόν ἵστιν
οὐκαθ’ ἵπποι σιν νησικορωνίσαι, ὀδὶ ὁ δ’ ὅω
ἐνθάδ’ ἀτμος ἔως ἀφενος καὶ πλαύτων ἀφίζειν.

1 In his Adnotatio Critica on this passage.
2 A few cod. have ἀφενος.
2. *Rep. 3. 389 E* = *Il. 3. 8 and 4. 431*:

Plat. ἵσων μένα πνεύμονες Ἀχιλῆ, σφεῖ δεδιότες σημάντορας,

Hom. (Il. 3. 8) οἷς ὃς ἰσων σφεῖ μένα πνεύμονες Ἀχιλῆ

Hom.¹ (Il. 4. 431) σφεῖ δεδιότες σημάντορας. ἄμφε δὲ τᾶς

It seems to me it would be unfair to Plato’s education and scholarship, to assume that he has ignorantly brought together two verses that belong to different books of the Iliad. More natural is it to think that these two parts of verses were given to illustrate the point under discussion, namely the proper relation of men to their leaders. The absence of σφεῖ may be due either to Plato, who may have preferred not to use the same word in two successive lines of his dialogue, or, as seems to me more likely, to a scribe, who on seeing two examples of σφεῖ may have thought one of them a mistake of his predecessor.

3. *Rep. 2. 379 E* = *Il. 4. 84*:

Plat. οἰδ' ὃς ταῦτα ἡμι σεῖς

δάβῳν τε κακῶν τε τέτακτα.

Hom.² Ζεύς, δὲ τ' ἄθροισ' ταῦτας πολύμοι τέτακτα.

This seems to represent an entirely different version from the traditional Homeric text.

4. *Rep. 3. 408 A* = *Il. 4. 218*:

Plat. ἣ οί μάκαρα, ἢτι καὶ τῷ Μενέλαιῳ ἐκ τοῦ τραύματος οὐ δ' Πάνδαρος ἔβαλεν αἱμ' ἑκμυγνύοντ' ἐπὶ τ' ἡπτια φάρμακ' ἐπιστος,

Hom. αἱμ' ἑκμυγώνας ἐπ' ἐρ' ἡπτια φάρμακα εἰδ' ἐκπλεισσος.

Apart from the verbal differences of these two passages, Plato gives us an entirely different account. According to the traditional version Machaon, after sucking the blood from the wound of Menelaus, applies an ointment. Plato, evidently through carelessness, makes Machaon and his brother attend to the wound.

¹ Cod. H, δεδιότες.
² Cod. M, ἄθροισ'; G, ταῦτα.
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5. Rep. 5, 468 D = II. 8, 162 and II. 12, 311:

Plat. καὶ γὰρ ἢμεῖς ἐν τε θυνίας καὶ τοῖς τουτοίσι πάσι τούς ἀγάθοις, καθ' ἄδηλον ἄγαθοί φαίνονται, καὶ ὄμοιοι καὶ οὐς νῦν ἢ διέγομεν τιμήσομεν, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐδραίας τε καὶ κράσιν ἐδὲ πλείον δεπάσσον.

Hom. ἔδρα τε κράσιν τε ἐδὲ πλείον δεπάσσον.

Since these words of Plato are not metrical, we must consider that he is giving the substance of the passage and not quoting, for we find here in Plato changes, additions and subtractions, as compared with the original Homer.

6. Hipp. Min. 370 B = II. 9, 357–363:

Plat. αἱρέσιν ἵνα Διὸ ῥέξας, φησί, καί πάσι θεοίσιν, νησίσας εἰ νήσας, ἐπὶν ἀλαδε προερύσσω, ὅψει, αὖ κ' ἐθάλησθα καὶ αὖ κέν τοι τὰ μεμήλῃ, ἣν μᾶλ' Ἐλλησποντον ἐπ' ἱχθυόντα πλεούσας νῆσας ἑμᾶς, ἐν δ' ἄνδρας ἐρεσοῦμενε μεμαώτας: εἰ δὲ κεν εὐπλοίην δῶῃ κλινός ἐννοεῖαν, ἣματι κεν τριτάτῳ Φθίνην ἐρίβωλον ἦκοιμην.

Hom. αἱρέσιν ἵνα Διὸ ῥέξας καὶ πάσι θεοίσι, νησίσας εἰ νήσας, ἐπὶν ἀλα δε προερύσσω, ὅψει, ἣν ἐθάλησθα καὶ αὖ κέν τοι τὰ μεμήλῃ, ἣν μᾶλ' Ἐλλησποντον ἐπ' ἱχθυόντα πλεούσας νῆσας ἑμᾶς, ἐν δ' ἄνδρας ἐρεσοῦμενε μεμαώτας: εἰ δὲ κεν εὐπλοίην δῶῃ κλινός ἐννοεῖαν, ἣματι κεν τριτάτῳ Φθίνην ἐρίβωλον ἦκοιμην.

It would seem as if either Plato had in his Homer αὖ κ', or some scribe changed ἦν to αὖ κ' to make it correspond to the αὖ κέν of the last part of the verse.

7. Alcibiad. II. 140 A = II. 10, 224:

Plat. σῶν τε δύο σκεπτομένων

Hom. σῶν τε δύο ἐρχομένων, καὶ τε πρὸ δ' τοῦ ἐννόησιν,

---

1 Cod. G, τ' ἦθ. 2 Cod. G, τ' ἦθ. 3 Cod. S, ἦν (for αὖ κ', verse 359).
4 Cod. G, ἱπάς; L, αὖ κ' ἦθελεθα; L Cant, μεμήλε.; Vrat b, μεμήλε.; S, μεμήλε.; G, ἐλθετονον; E, αὖ περ (for εἰ δὲ κεν); D, Φθίνη δ'.
6 Cod. G, ἐρχομένων; L, καὶ το.
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This verse of Homer is quoted entire in the Protagoras, and the first part of it again in the Convivium. In those two passages Plato gives the reading of our Homeric manuscripts. Here, however, it is clear that he is parodying what was evidently a well-known verse.

8. Ion 538 C = II. 11, 639–640 and 11, 630:
   Plat. οἶνος πραματείᾳ, φησὶν, ἐπὶ δ’ ἀγείον κνη τυρόν κρήστι χαλκείᾳ. παρὰ δὲ κρόμυον ποτὲ δύσων.
   Hom. (II. 11, 639 and 640)
   οἶνος Πραματεία, ἐπὶ δ’ ἀγείον κνη τυρόν κρήστι χαλκείᾳ, ἐπὶ δ’ ἀλφία ἀλευκα πάλυνε.
   Hom. (II. 11, 630)
   χάλκειον κάνον, ἐπὶ δὲ κρόμυον, ποτὲ δύσων.

Here it would seem as if Plato had confused the endings of two verses—630 and 640. But our impression is modified when we read in the Republic these words: τεκμαίρομαι δὲ, ὅτι αὐτὸν οἱ νεῖς ἐν Τροίᾳ Εὐρυντώφυ τετραμάθος ἔτ’ οἰνον Πραματείαν ἀλφία πολλὰ ἡπι-πασθέντα καὶ τυρόν ἑπεξεπάτη. Plato is here evidently referring to this same passage of Homer, and the words ἀλφία πολλὰ ἡπι-πασθέντα show that he knew that ἐπὶ δ’ ἀλφία ἀλευκα πάλυνε or some similar expression belongs to the Homeric passage. So I think the confusion was made through design and not through ignorance.

9. Ion 539 B = II. 12, 200–207:
   Plat. ὅψις γὰρ σφιν ἐπήλθε περιστέμεναι μεμαθών, αἰτοῦ ὕποκτης, ἐπ’ ἀριστερὰ λαὸν ἔργων, φοινής ἐκάστοιτα φέρων ὑπόχειν πάλαρον, ζηφιόν, ἐπ’ ἀσπαρτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἱδίετο χάρμης. κόψει γὰρ αὐτὸν ὅχοντα κατὰ στήθος παρὰ δειρῆς ἐνώθεις ὑποί, δ’ ἀπὸ ἔθεν ἤκε χαμάξε ἀλγής τε ἔδινες, καὶ δ’ ἐγκάββαλ’ ἀμέμπ’ αἰτοῦ δὲ κλάγεσα ἐπεῖτο πνοεῖς ἀνίμων.

---

1 348 D. 2 174 D. 3 Cod. Vindob. suppl. 7, κησταί from κηστη.
4 Cod. G, κηστῆ; Ἰ, κηστῆ; Ṣ, κηστῆς.
5 Cod. D, χάλκεον; G, καλέον.
6 3, 405 D.
7 The best cod. have ὁλίσω; Vindob. suppl. 7, ἑκάββαλ’; others, ἐγκάββαλ’ ἀμέμπ’. ἤπα Vindob. suppl. 7, τέσσαρα.
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Hom. 1 ὥς γὰρ σφῶν ἐκῆλθε περισσοῦνες μεμαῦσεις,
αἰετῶν ὑπεκέπτες ἐκ ἀριστερὰ λαῶν ἕργαν,
φοινικέτα δρᾶκοτον φέρων ὄνειροι πέλαρον
ζωῆν, ἦτ' ἀσταῖροντα· καὶ οὗ τοι λήθετο χάρμης.
κόκκο γὰρ αὕτων ἱχώνα κατὰ στῇβος παρὰ διωὴν
ἰδοθέαι οἰκίων· δ' δ' ἀπὸ ἱδέων ἦς χαμαῖες
ἀληθέοις ὀδύνησι, μέσῳ δ' ἐνί καββαλλ' ὁμλυφ, ἀντώς δὲ κλάγγεσ πέττοτο πτοιήσ ἀνίμοιο.

With regard to the form in Plato ἐγκάββαλ' we note that it is found in two manuscripts of Homer also. It is doubtful whether ἐπετο is a true ancient variant or a scribe's blunder.

10. Leg. 4, 706 E = II. 14, 96–102:

Plat. 2 ὃς κέλει πολέμιοι συνεκτικότος καὶ ἀυτῆς
νῆσα ἐνσέλμοις ἄλαδ' ἐλκείν, δῇρ' ἐνι μᾶλλον
Τρωι ἐν ἑκτὰ γήνης ἐκδομένοις σερί ἡμῆς,
ἥμιν δ' ἀλής ἔλεφθος ὑπερέπτες· οὖ γὰρ Ἀχαιοι
σχῆμον πολέμιοι νηὸν ἄλα'd ἐλκομνᾶν,
ἀλλ' ἀποταπαίοιναι, ἐρωθαισοί δὲ χάρμης:
ἐνθά κη σῇ βούλῃ δηλήσεται, οἳ ἀγορευεῖς.

Hom. 3 ὃς κέλει πολέμιοι συνεκτικότος καὶ ἀυτῆς
νῆσα ἐνσέλμοις ἄλα δ' ἐλκέμεν, δῇρ' ἐνι μᾶλλον
Τρωι ἐν ἑκτὰ γήνης ἐπικρατοῦσαι σερί ἡμῆς,
ἥμιν δ' ἀλής ἔλεφθος ὑπερέπτες. οὖ γὰρ Ἀχαιοι
σχῆμον πολέμιοι νηὸν ἄλα δ' ἐλκομνᾶν,
ἀλλ' ἀποταπαίοιναι, ἐρωθαισοί δὲ χάρμης:
ἐνθά κη σῇ βούλῃ δηλήσεται ὅρχαμε λαῶν.

There are several words in this passage of Plato that need to be noted.

(a) ἐλκείν. This form is one of those Atticisms that are probably due to scribes.

---

1 Cod. G, ἐκῆλθε; G omits ἔσται and adds τὸ after κατὰ; S, ἐτ'; H Townsh., ἐγκάββαλ'; many cod., καββαλ'; G, πέττοτο προὶ προῖς.
2 Cod. A, εὐθείως.
3 Cod. C, γένεω; S, ἐνεκράτεως; C Baroc., ἐπιρρέες; Lips., ἐπιρρέες; E, δ' ἐλκομνᾶν; H, ἀποταπαίοιναι; many cod., ἀποταπαίοιναι; S, ὅρχαμε ἀνδρῶν.
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(δ) ἔλθομενοις. This reading is not so pleasant to me as the Homeric ἔπικρατοῦσι, for it merely repeats the idea expressed in εὐκτά. Still, it is intelligible, and Plato may have had it in his text of Homer.

(ε) πολέμου. This form is undoubtedly a mistake of the copyist, as the sentence demands an accusative as the direct object of σχησοῦν, and not a genitive of separation, for that is supplied by νηών.

(δ') οἵ δημοτεῖς. This is one of the common verse-endings of Homer. In the Homeric text we have another common ending δραμει λαϊ. We shall have to ascribe the difference in Plato's text either to Plato or his scribes, unless we may imagine that different rhapsodists may sometimes have used different verse-endings, in case the general sense of the passage was not affected thereby. Then Plato's phrase might represent a real tradition.

11. Rep. 8, 545 D = Il. 16, 112–113:

Plat.1 ἦ βοώλει, διόπερ Ὄμηρος, εὐχώμεθα ταῖς Μοῦσαις εἰκὼν ἡμῖν,

δυνας δὴ πρῶτον στάσις ἔμπεσε,

Horn.2 ὅσπερ νῦν μοι μοισι Ὄλυμπα δύνατο ἡκοῦσα,

δύνας δὴ πρῶτον πῦρ ἔμπεσε νησιν Ἀχαιῶν.

Here in Plato, as often in the manuscripts of Homer, we read δυνας, where the metre demands a long penult.

The introduction of the word στάσις serves to parody this well-known verse of Homer.

12. Apol. 28 C = Il. 18, 96:

Plat. αὐτίκα γὰρ τοι, φησί, μεθ' Ἐκτορα πότομος ἔτούμος.

Horn. αὐτίκα γὰρ τοι ἢπείτα μεθ' Ἐκτορα πότομος ἔτούμος.

In this passage φηςι, which is generally extra metrum, has apparently crowded out the regular word ἢπείτα, and has taken its place in the hexameter.

13. Apol. 28 D = Il. 18, 104:

Plat.3 παρὰ νησι κορωνίσιν ἐχθος ἀρούρης.

Horn. ἄλλι ἡμί παρὰ νησιν ἢτούσιον ἐχθος ἁρόρης,

1 Bas 2, ἐπέτειρ. 2 Cod. Lips, δοτ. 3 Cod. B, κορωνίσιν (the ' added above ἐ by a second hand); D, κορωνησίων.
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Whether here Plato has used, carelessly, an epithet κορωνίσιν, in place of the traditional ἰτώσιον, or whether he gives us an old Homeric variant, is uncertain.

14. Conv. 195 D = ll. 19, 92–93:

Plat.1 τῆς μὲν θ' ἀπαλοὶ πόδες· οὗ γὰρ ἐν' οὖδεος πύλαται, ἀλλ' ἄρα ἤ γε κατ' ἀνδρῶν κράτας βαίνει.

Hom.2 οὐλομάνη· τῆ μὲν θ' ἀπαλοὶ πόδες· οὗ γὰρ ἐν' οὖδει πύλαται, ἀλλ' ἄρα ἤ γε κατ' ἀνδρῶν κράτας βαίνει.

That Plato really wrote τῆς seems clear from Stobaeus,3 who, in quoting him, gives the verse as we find it in Plato. That Plato is here preserving an old tradition is seen from a scholion in Ven. A,—οὖνως (i.e. τῆς) Ἀρισταρχος, ἀλλοι δὲ τῆς μὲν θ' ἀπαλοί. This reading—τῆς—has otherwise entirely vanished from the manuscripts of Homer with the exception of one manuscript, in which it is preserved, more perhaps through carelessness than actual tradition. Stobaeus shows us, too, that Plato wrote οὖδεος. As both genitive and dative seem admissible here, Plato may well be preserving an old variant in the form οὖδεος.

15. Rep. 3, 388 C = ll. 22, 168–169:

Plat. ὅστε ὁ πότοι φάναι, ή φίλοι ἄνδρα διωκόμενον περί ἄστυ ὀφθαλμῶν ορώματι. ἐμόν δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἤτορ.

Hom. ὁ πότοι, ἥ φίλοι ἄνδρα διωκόμενον περί τείχος ὀφθαλμῶν ορώματι. ἐμόν δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἤτορ

ἄστυ may be an old variant.

16. Crat. 392 E = ll. 22, 507:

Plat. οὸς γὰρ σφιν ἵματον πόλιν καὶ τείχα μακρά.

Hom.4 οὸς γὰρ σφιν ἵματον πόλιας καὶ τείχα μακρά.

To adapt the verse to his sentence Plato changed the verb from second person to third, without any violence to the metre. To whom the change of πόλιας to πόλιν is due is uncertain. The words are so similar that one might have been substituted for the other at almost any time.

1 Cod. T, πυλαται (from πυλαται); B, πυλαται.
2 Cod. S, τῆς; G, βαίνει.
3 Floril. 63, 36.
4 Cod. D, γὰρ μὲν.
17. Ion 537 A = II. 23, 335-340:

Plat. 1 Κλινθήναι δὲ, φησί, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνζίστω ἐνὶ δέφρῳ ἥκεν ἐπὶ ἀριστερὰ τοῦν· ἀτάρ τὸν δεξιὸν ἵππον κόψαι ὁμοκλήσας, εἶξαί τε οἱ ηνία χερσὶν.

ἐν νύστῃ δὲ τοι ἕπος ἀριστερὸς ἐγχρομφήτῳ, ὅς ἂν τοι πλήμνῃ γε δοάσεται ἄκρου ἴκασθαι κόκλον ποιητοῦ· λιθοὺ δὲ ἀλάσθαι ἑπαρεῖ.

Hom. 2 αὐτὸς δὲ κλινθήναι ἐνπλέκτῳ ἐνὶ δέφρῳ ἥκεν ἐπὶ ἀριστερὰ τοῦν· ἀτάρ τὸν δεξιὸν ἵππον κόψαι ὁμοκλήσας, εἶξαί τε οἱ ηνία χερσὶν.

ἐν νύστῃ δὲ τοι ἕπος ἀριστερὸς ἐγχρομφήτῳ, ὅς ἂν τοι πλήμνῃ γε δοάσεται ἄκρου ἴκασθαι κόκλον ποιητοῦ· λιθοὺ δὲ ἀλάσθαι ἑπαρεῖ.

It is uncertain whether the difference in the order of the first few words in Plato is due to him or not. For ἐνζίστω, however, we have a twofold testimony. In the first place it is given by one of the manuscripts of Homer. Besides, Xenophon 3—though giving a different case of the word and adapting the sentence to the construction of his own—gives this quotation:

αὐτὸν δὲ κλινθήναι ἐνζίστον ἐπὶ δέφρου ἥκεν ἐπὶ ἀριστερὰ τοῦν, ἀτάρ τὸν δεξιὸν ἵππον κόψαι ὁμοκλήσας εἶξαί τε οἱ ηνίᾳ χεριᾷ.

But while he gives some support to ἐνζίστω, he does not offer any for the order of words as given by Plato.

18. Rep. 3, 388 A = II. 24, 10-12:

Plat. Πάλιν δὴ Ὄμηρον τε δεσφόμεθα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν μὴ ποιεῖν Ἀχιλλέα, θεᾶς παιδα, ἄλλος ἐπὶ πλευράς κατακείμενον, ἄλλοτε δὲ αὐτῷ ἵππον, ἄλλοτε δὲ πρηνῆ, τοὐτ δὲ ὁρθὸν ἀναστάτα πλωίζοντ' ἀλώστ' ἐπὶ θυ' ἄλος ἀτρυγέτοιο,
Homer.\(^1\) ἄλλοτ' ἐπὶ πλειρὰς κατακείμενος, ἄλλοτε δ' ἀπε ὑπτιος, ἄλλοτε δὲ πρηνής· τοτε δ' ὀρθὸς ἀναστάς δινεύσεσκ' ἀλών παρὰ θυ' ἄλος. οὐδέ μιν ἢ ἔσ

Since Plato is adapting these verses to the structure of his own sentences, he uses the accusatives κατακείμενον, ὑπτιον, πρηνῆ, ὀρθὸν, ἀναστάντα and ἄλωντ' in place of the corresponding nominatives. With the exception of ἀναστάντα, however, they do not violate the metre.

If πλωίζοντ' in the manuscripts of Plato is what he really wrote, either he had πλωΐζοσκ' in his Homeric text, or else he introduced it for a parody. If the reading is corrupt, the suggestion of Heyne\(^2\) is a good one. He thinks that Plato does not offer a new reading, but is merely interpreting the verse of Homer, and that he wrote πρωίζοντ', which included the idea suggested in the last words of the verse, οὐδὲ μιν ἢ ἔσ. A scribe to whom the verb πρωίζω was unknown might easily have changed it to πλωίζω, a verb that does occur a few times.

The word ἀργύριοι may have been added by Plato, to complete the verse metrically.

19. Ion 538 D = Il. 24, 80–82:

Plat.\(^3\) ἦς ὡς μολυβδαίης ἱκλής ἐς βουσθόν ἰκανεν,

ἡ τε κατ' ἄγραλου βοδὸς κέρας ἀμμαμανία

ἐρχεται ὕμηρτησι μετ' ἐχθόνει βῆμα φίρονσα.

Homo.\(^4\) ἦς ὡς μολυβδαίης ἱκλής ἐς βουσθόν ὀρουσεν,

ἡ τε κατ' ἄγραλου βοδὸς κέρας ἰμμεμανια

ἐρχεται ὕμηρτησιν ἐν' ἐχθόνει κῆρα φίρονσα.

(a) ἰκανεν. Though this is a weaker word than ὀρουσεν, it may, for all that, have stood in Plato's Homer.

(b) ἰμμεμανία. This is a form that might easily have been changed by a scribe from ἰμμεμανία; but we find that it was really

---

1 Cod. D (verse 11) omits δε; Syr (verse 11), δε; Vrat d, δε aβ; S, δενεσκ'.
3 Cod. Vindob. suppl. 7, τυθυδ' (for βουσθόν); τ, πυθυδ (in margin); S, κηρα (for βῆμα).
4 Many cod., βουδη; S, βηνη; D, ἰμμεμανία; G, ἰμμεμανίασ.
recognized as a distinct reading. For it is so given in one manuscript of Homer and is referred to in a scholion of Ven. A, - ἐν ἄλλῳ ἤμεμανία.

(ε) πῆμα. This word, too, though it is considerably different in form from κῆρα and is not found in the manuscripts of Homer, is a real ancient variant. Proof of this fact is accidentally preserved for us by a scholion in Ven. A, — ἐναὶ τῶν κατὰ τόλεμες ἐν ἱχθύσι πῆμα φέρουσα· ἄτονον γὰρ ἐν ἱχθύων κῆρα λέγειν. If it were not for this one scholion, we should be obliged to say of this reading, as of others, that it may represent a real variant, or it may be due to Plato’s carelessness.


Plat. 1 Οὐκ ἄρα, ἢν γ' ἐγώ, ἀποδεκτέον οὔτε Ἄρμην οὔτ' ἄλλον ποιητοῦ ταύτην τὴν ἀμαρτίαν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀνοήτως ἀμαρτάνοντος καὶ λέγοντος, ὥς δοιοὶ πίθου κατακειάται ἐν Διὸς οὐδεί.

κηρὼν ἐμπλειός, δὲ μὲν ἐσθλὼν, αὐτὰρ δὲ διειλών· καὶ ψ' μὲν ἄν μίξας ὧ δεῖν δεῖ ἄμφοτέρων,

ἀλλοτε μὲν τε κακῷ ὑ γε κύρεται, ἀλλοτε δ' ἐσθλῷ·

ψ' δ' ἄν μὴ, ἀλλ' ἄκρατα τὰ ἄτερα,

τὸν δὲ κακὴ βούβαρσες ἔτι χρόνα διὰν ἐλαύνει·

Hom. 2 δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθου κατακειάται ἐν Διὸς οὐδεί.

527 δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθου κατακειάται ἐν Διὸς οὐδεί

528 δώρων οἷα δίδωσι, κακών, ἔτερον δὲ ἐάνω.

529 ψ' μὲν ἄμμισας δοῖν δεῖν τερπικάριον,

530 ἀλλοτε μὲν τε κακῷ ὑ γε κύρεται, ἀλλοτε δ' ἐσθλῷ·

531 ψ' δὲ κε τῶν λυγρῶν δοῖν, λυμπητῶν ὑθηκε·

532 καὶ δὲ κακὴ βούβαρσες ἔτι χρόνα διὰν ἐλαύνει,

We feel pretty sure that Plato’s text has been transmitted to us correctly, for Eusebius, 3 in quoting the passage ὃς δοιοὶ . . . διὰν ἐλαύνει from Plato, gives the same manuscript readings, except ἄμφοτέρων δῷ (for δῷ ἄμφοτέρων) and γε (for τε, verse 530). This might

---

1 Many cod., ἄμμισας; a few cod., ἄμμισας or ἄμμισας.
2 A papyrus fragment, κατακειάθε; cod. L, δ' (verse 528); cod. Townl. omits verse 528; L, κ' ἄμμισας; papyrus, ἄμμισας; D (verse 531), δοῖν; G Flor, βούβαρσες.
3 Præp. Ev. 13, 3 (p. 643).
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appear to be one of the cases where Plato is quoting from memory. For as part of the passage is metrical and part is in Plato's own words, it looks as if he knew the exact words of only a part of the Homeric passage. If we admit this view, we must maintain that in verse 528, which appears so different in Plato, he thought he was quoting exactly. Then either this verse represents real old variants, or else Plato was greatly mistaken in what he thought he knew.

21. *Ref. 4, 424 B = Od. 1, 352:*

Plat. ἄλλ' ὡς οἴον τε μάλιστα φυλάττειν, φοβουμένους, ἃταν τις λέγη, ὡς τὴν δοξήν μᾶλλον ἐπιφανείοναν ἀνθρώποι,

Hom.1 ἡ τε ἀκούοντεσσι νεοτάτη ἀμφισβήνα.

In substituting ἀκούοντεσσι for ἀκούοντεσσι, Plato is evidently parodying the verse somewhat.

22. *Conviv. 220 C = Od. 4, 242:*

Plat.2 οἴον δὲ αὖ τὸ ᾧ ἐφέξε καὶ ἐνθη καρπερὸς ἀνήρ

Hom. ἄλλ' οἴον τὸ ᾧ ἐφέξε καὶ ἐνθη καρπερὸς ἀνήρ

23. *Ref. 3, 390 A = Od. 9, 8–10:*

Plat. παραπλεῖαι ἵσι τράντα καὶ κρείνων, μένω δὲ ἐκ κρητήρος ἁφύσωτιν

Hom.3 ἡ ἐκείνη παρὰ δὲ πλήθουσι τράντα καὶ κρείνων, μένω δὲ ἐκ κρητήρος ἁφύσωτιν

The word παραπλεῖαι, if not a real ἀπαξ as I suspect it is, is surely very uncommon and would not come from a copyist, except by a most egregious blunder; nor would it result from 'lapse of memory,' it seems to me. It is more likely that the word was in Plato’s Homer.

---

1 Cod. E, η κει.
2 All cod. have αὖθι; B, ἐφέξε (with the ρ where an erasure has been made).
3 Cod. PS, πλήθουσι; AMV, δὲ (for δ’ ἐκ).
24. *Met. 1100 A = Od. 12. 435:

Plat. τὸν ἐὰν ὁμοιὸν ἐστὶν τοῖς τεθνάζοντες τὸν Ἀττιλίαν ἰδον, ἀληθῶς τοῖς εἴτει. ὅτι οἷς τετινναί τῶν ἐν Ἀιδών, τοῖς δὲ σαίν ἄττικοι.

Homo. ὅποι τετινναί τοῖς δὲ σαίν ἀττικοι.

In codex L. of Homer, just as in the manuscripts of Plato, a scribe, thinking that τοῖς should agree with σαίν, has changed it to the feminine form. In the manuscripts of Plato the scribe has gone one step farther and given the Attic form αἰ.

25. *Rep. 3. 386 D = Od. 12. 493:

Plat. αἱ τετινναί, τοῖς δὲ σαίν ἀττικοί.

Homo. αἱ τετινναί, τοῖς δὲ σαίν ἀττικοί.

Here, again, in Plato we have a change similar to that in the preceding passage, but the scribe has changed merely the gender, and has not given the Attic form.

26. *Axioch. 368 A = Od. 15. 245-246:

Plat. τὸν δ' ἄρα ἀττικον τοῖς φήμιν:

τὸν τε ἐὴν σαίν τε Ζεἰν τ' αἰγίνχος καὶ Ἀττιλίαν ταντοῖν φιλότητι· οὖδ' ἕκαστο γῆρας οὐδὲν.

Homo. ὅτι τε ἐὴν σαίν τε Ζεἰν τ' αἰγίνχος καὶ Ἀττιλίαν ταντοῖν φιλότητι· οὖδ' ἕκαστο γῆρας οὐδὲν.

In Homer the relative ὅτι has its antecedent in the preceding verse. Plato may well have preferred to make his sentence more complete by writing τοῖς.

Plato may have had ταντοῖν in his Homeric text, but a simple explanation of the form would be that a scribe, supposing that φιλότητι was in the dative case, changed ταντοῖν to ταντοῖν.

---

1 Schanz, in spite of αἰ in the best codices, has followed Cobet in editing τοῖς.
2 Cod. L, τοῖς: D, αἰ.
3 A few cod. τοῖς.
4 Cod. L, τοῖς: D, αἰ.
6 The best codices of Stobaeus, who (Flora, 98. 75) quotes this passage from Plato, give the verses just as we have them in Homer.
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27. *Ion* 539 A = *Od*. 20, 351–357:

Plat. 1 δαίμονιοι, τι κακόν τόδε πάσχετε; νυκτὶ μὲν ὑμῶν εἰλίαται κεφαλαί τε πρόσωπα τε νύρθε τε γυνα, οἰμώγη δὲ δέδηκε, δεδάκρυται δὲ παρειαί· εἰδώλων τε πλέον πρόθυρον, πλείρη δὲ καὶ αὔλῃ ἱερέων ἑρεβόσθε ὑπὸ ζῴον· ἥλιος δὲ οὖρανού Ἑπατόλωλε, κακῇ δ' ἐπιδιέδρομεν ἀχλύς.

Hom. 2 ἥ δεῖλοι, τι κακόν τόδε πάσχετε; νυκτὶ μὲν ὑμῶν εἰλίαται κεφαλαί τε πρόσωπα τε νύρθε τε γυνα, οἰμώγη δὲ δέδηκε, δεδάκρυται δὲ παρειαί, αἴματι δ' ἱθράδαται τοῖχοι καλαὶ τε μεσόδραμα· εἰδώλων δὲ πλέον πρόθυρον, πλείρη δὲ καὶ αὔλῃ, ἱερέων Ἐρεβόσθε δὲ ὑπὸ ζῷον· ἥλιος δὲ οὖρανού Ἑπατόλωλε, κακῇ δ' ἐπιδιέδρομεν ἀχλύς.

The expression ἰ δεῖλοι is so common in Homer that it must have been well known to Plato. δαίμονιοι, too, though generally found in the singular, occurs in *Odyssey* 4, 774 in the plural. It is possible that it was a variant here in *Odyssey* 20, 351, though it may be a mistake of Plato's.

γυνα is a good Homeric word and may be a variant for this verse.

On the omission by Plato of verse 354 I shall speak in the next section.

The variants τε and δὲ need no comment, for these words are often confused in manuscripts.

H. OMISSIONS IN PLATO.

There are four passages in which Plato in quoting from Homer has omitted a verse. These are: *Hippias Minor* 365 A⁶ = *Iliad* 9, 308–314; *Republic* 2, 364 D⁴ = *Iliad* 9, 497–501; *Republic* 2, 363 B⁸ = *Odyssey* 19, 109–113; *Ion* 539 A⁴ = *Odyssey* 20, 351–357.

These verses are, in a way, similar. For no one of them is necessary to the general sense of the passage in which it stands. The

---

1 Cod. W, ὑμῶν; best codices, δέδηκε.
2 Cod. D, δεῖλοι; KS, ἱθράδαται; CDEQS, πλέον; A, ἐπιδιέδρομεν.
3 Verse 311 is omitted.
4 Verse 110 is omitted.
5 Verse 498 is omitted.
6 Verse 354 is omitted.
explanation of the omission is not at all certain. Plato may not have had these verses in his text. For we remember that in the
ThucydidἙρμ海岛 fragment one verse, and possibly two, known in our
manuscripts of Homeric are omitted. Or Plato may have omitted
the verses either purposely or accidentally. Or the omission of them
may be due to scribes. For we notice that in the manuscripts of
Homer, too, single verses are occasionally omitted by scribes.

I. ONE SPECIAL PASSAGE.

There is one passage in Plato that from its uniqueness demands
attention. It is in Alcibiades II. It purports to be from Homer,
and certainly in indirect fashion the substance of five verses, only
one of which is found in our Homeric manuscripts. The passage in
Plato, most of which is metrical, is as follows: ἀστρον γὰρ τοῖς Τριών
ἐπετείλη τεμπείον;

ἐργάτες ἐκεῖνοι τοῖς τεμπείοις ἑκάστῳ 

τῆς ἐν τῇ τῆς τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπιμελήτῃ, 

πάντῃ τῇ πάντῃ πάντῃ πάντῃ πάντῃ πάντῃ χάρι 

καὶ Πρῶτος καὶ λαός ἐπιμελής Πειρήματος.

The passage has been thus restored in the Iliad:

Hom. I. 8. 545–552

[Ὁρὸν δ᾿ ἐλεύθερον τοιούτως διατικόν.] 

ἐξαίτια δ᾿ εἰς τὴν ἐκείνην οἵᾳν ἐπιμελήτῃ 

[pānoi τῇ πάντῃ πάντῃ πάντῃ πάντῃ χάρι 

καὶ Πρῶτος καὶ λαός ἐπιμελής Πειρήματος].

As the Alcibiades II. belongs to the list of works that are probably
spurious, we should not attribute much weight to this passage as one
of Plato's. But, as the work is probably of high antiquity, even if
Plato did not write it, the passage will serve to illustrate once more
the fact that there are old variants of Homer, and even whole verses,
preserved for us by ancient authors alone.

1 149 D.
2 Cod. CD (second hand) EGHL. κατορθων.
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Conclusion with regard to Plato's Quotations.

As this completes the list of passages in which Plato quotes from Homer, it may be well to emphasize the lesson of these quotations. Some scholars have thought that the differences between the readings of our Homeric manuscripts and those of Plato are best and most easily explained by assuming that Plato quoted from memory, and that his memory was very faulty. Whether, in general, Plato quoted from memory or not, is still a doubtful point. I am willing to admit that that supposition offers the best explanation of some few passages. If sometimes he quoted from memory and sometimes looked up the passage, we have no means of ascertaining which quotations are the result of one method and which are the result of the other. For if I have not shown that apparent mistakes cannot be taken as the test of that question, my paper has been in vain. Besides, as I have already stated, there is nothing at all inconsistent in quotation from memory and correctness. Let me say, as a kind of summary, that in general these are the reasons that influence me to believe that, whether he quotes from memory or not, Plato's quotations are to be weighed very carefully, and not rejected merely because at variance with traditional readings. (1) Very many verses as quoted by him agree with our traditional text. (2) Many verses evidently owe their variants to careless copyists, who, in many instances, have changed the epic to the Attic form. That Plato is not responsible for these Atticisms is often shown by other passages, in which the same verses are given just as our Homeric manuscripts have them. (3) Some variants are supported either by Homeric manuscripts, or by scholia, or by ancient authors. Of scholia and authors we know that only a small percentage have come down to us. If more were extant, we should undoubtedly receive confirmation for still more of these variants of Plato. (4) Papyrus fragments in general, and the Flinders Petrie fragment in particular, show that ancient manuscripts had many readings far different from those that have come down to us from other sources. We should not be surprised, therefore, to find that Plato, or any other ancient author, presents us with many variant readings. In fact, we should be properly surprised if they did not show these variants. We might then
reasonably suspect that the readings they gave had been tampered with, to adapt them to our later tradition. Therefore I feel convinced, that to the existence of Plato’s manuscripts we are indebted for a great many ancient Homeric readings that otherwise would have been lost to us.

**Aristotle’s Quotations from Homer.**

Let me pass on at once to the Homeric passages quoted by Aristotle.

**A. No Variants.**

First I shall list those passages in which the manuscripts of Aristotle — so far as collated by Bekker — show an entire agreement with those of Homer, with no variants for either author. There are twenty-eight of these passages.

1 (and 2). *Rhet.* 3. 14 (p. 1415 a 15) and *Poet.* 19 (p. 1456 b 16) = *Il.* 1. 1:

μην ἄλλα θεά.

3. *Poet.* 25 (p. 1461 a 10) = *Il.* 1. 50:

οὐρίας μὲν πρῶτων.

4. *De Mundo* 6 (p. 397 b 26) = *Il.* 1. 499 and *Il.* 5. 754:

ἀρνοτάτης καρπάς.

5. *Pol.* 1. 12 (p. 1259 b 13) = *Il.* 1. 544 and often:

ταίρη ἀνθρώπων τε θεῶν τε,


ἄλλα μὲν μαθεῖ τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων

εὔδου παντείναι.

Here, as often, Aristotle omits part of a verse.


Ἀγαμάλλωσα πουμένα λαῖν


ἡ δὴ μορία Ὠδουσεῖς ἐσθηλὰ ἄργην;

9. *Rhet.* 1. 6 (p. 1363 a 6) = *Il.* 2. 298:

ἀληθῶν τοι δηρών τε μένων.

τοιοῦτοι δέκα μοι συμφράδμονοι.


Ζεῦ κύδωσε μέγιστο καὶ ἄθανατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι,

ὅπωρειροι πρῶτοι ὑπ’ ἄρκη πημύκναιν,

ὅδε σοὶ ἐγκέφαλοι χαμάδες βίοι ώς ὅτε οἶνος.

12. *Probl. 9, 9* (p. 890 b 9) = *Il. 5, 75*:

ψυχρὰν δ’ ἔλε χαλκῶν ἀδοῦσιν,

13. *Poet. 21* (p. 1458 a 7) = *Il. 5, 393*:

δεξιτερῶν κατὰ μαζών


χρύσα χαλκίων, ἐκατομβοὶ ἐνεαοβοῖν,

The first two words are given thus by Plato¹ also.


μνημένοι ἔθελε ἑξ ἄριδος σεῦ ἀμείνων φωτὶ μάχεσθαι

Ἔκτορι

16. *Hist. An. 6, 21* (p. 575 b 5) = *Il. 7, 315* and *Od.*² 19, 420:

ἀρσένα πενταέτηρον

17. *Frag. 108* (p. 1495 b 10) = *Il. 9, 175* and often:

κοῦροι δὲ κρήτηρας ἐπεστέφαντο κοτόιω

18. *Pol. 2, 7* (p. 1267 a 1) = *Il. 9, 319*:

ἐν δὲ ἐγὼ τιμῇ ἡμῶν κακῶς ἦδὲ καὶ ἐσθήλοις.


ἐν γαῖᾳ ἱσταντο λαλουμένα χροὸς ἄσω,


καθὸν ἱμάντα


ἦνὸς Ἐννάλιος,

¹ Conviv. 219 A.
² In the passage in the Odyssey we find a variant: cod. A, πίενα γρ. ἄρσενα.
22. *Poet.* 25 (p. 1461 a 28) = *Il.* 21, 592:
κενής ποτείικτον κασιτέρων,

23. *Poet.* 25 (p. 1461 a 23) = *Il.* 23, 328:
tο μὲν οὖ κατακαθηται ὁμβρφ.

tο μὲν οὖ κατακαθηται ὁμβρφ.

A point of discussion among the ancients was whether in this passage of the Iliad ον was οὐ, ‘where,’ or οὐ, ‘not.’ Into this discussion I cannot go.

25. *Rhet.* 3, 14 (p. 1415 a 16) = *Od.* 1, 1:
ἀδόρα μοι ἄννεκε μοῦνα,

26. *Frag.* 165 (p. 1505 b 25) = *Od.* 6, 6:
oi σφας στυνίκοντο.

27. *Rhet.* 3, 14 (p. 1415 b 26) = *Od.* 6, 327:
dος μ’ ἐς Φαιήκας φίλον ἔλθεν ἦδ’ ἑλευνόν,

28. *De Anima* 3, 3 (p. 427 a 26) = *Od.* 18, 136:
tοῖος γὰρ νόος ἀτάτιν.

**B. Slight Variants.**

There are thirty-nine passages in which the variants of the manuscripts of both Aristotle and Homer are few and slight, and undoubtedly due to the carelessness of scribes.

1. *Rhet.* 2, 2 (p. 1379 a 5) = *Il.* 1, 82:

   Ar.  
   ἄλλα γε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἐχει κότον.

   Hom.  
   ἄλλα τε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἐχει κότον, ὄφρα τελάσυς,

2. *Rhet.* 1, 6 (p. 1362 b 35) = *Il.* 1, 255:

   ἦ κεν γρημηθεὶ Πρώμος.
3. Rhet.² 2, 2 (p. 1378 b 32) = Il. 1, 356:
 ήτύμησεν: ἐλών γὰρ ἱκε τέρας αὐτοῦ ἄτομας

4. Metaphys.³ 11, 10 (p. 1076 a 4) = Il. 2, 204:
 οὐκ ἐγκαθόν πολυτιμανίς: εἰς κοίμασις ἑταὶ.

5. Frag.⁴ 143 (p. 1502 b 16) = Il.⁵ 4, 65–67:
 ἦθεν ἐν Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαίων φιλοτιμίναι ἴον,
 περιάμ δ' ὡς κεν Τρώας ὑπερκύδιας Ἀχαιῶν
 ἀρχισε πρῶτοι ῥήμα δρίκη δηλήσασθαι.

6. Rhet.⁶ 3, 11 (p. 1411 b 35) = Il. 4, 126:
 ἐπιτάσσεται μενεαίνων,

7. Frag. 13 (p. 1476 a 17) = Il.⁷ 4, 297–298:
 ἐπιτήσας μεν πρώτα σὺν ἵπποισι καὶ ὄχεσθιν,
 πεζοῦ δ' ἐξεσπεῖν,

 Ar.¹ 'Ἐκτυρ γὰρ ποτε φήσει ἐνὶ Τρώους' ἄγορεύων,
 Τυθείδης ἐπ' ἕμω.

Hom.² 'Ἐκτυρ γὰρ ποτε φήσει ἐνὶ Τρώους' ἄγορεύων'.
 Τυθείδης ἐπ' ἕμω φοβείμενος ἴκετο νῆς.

9. Pol.⁸ 1, 2 (p. 1253 a 5) = Il. 9, 63:
 ἀδρήτωρ, ἀδήμος, ἀνίστος.

10. Rhet.¹⁰ 3, 9 (p. 1410 a 29) = Il.¹¹ 9, 526:
 διδασκετὶ τ' ἐπιλογίῳ παράρρητοι τ' ἐπιτάσσειν.

---

¹ Cod. A omits ἄτομας.
² Cod. E (also T in the margin) adds ἔστι.
³ Cod. E, τρωίας; B, τρωίαν.
⁴ Cod. O, εἰς; L omits δ'.
⁵ Cod. QYb Zb, ἐπιτάσσει.
⁶ Cod. Vrat. b, c, Mosc. 1, 3, τρώγοντα; M, τρώτον; CGH, ἐξεσπεῖτε; E, ἐξεσπεῖτε;
⁷ Cod. N, ἐξεσπεῖτε.
⁸ Cod. Mb adds φοβοδῶμευοντο.
⁹ Cod. E, δή (for γὰρ); D, τρώγοσιν; D, τυθείδης δ'; E, ἕμω.
¹⁰ Cod. Q, ἀδρήτωρ; Sb Tb, ἀδρήτωρ.
¹¹ Cod. A, ἐπιλογίας; A, δ' (for the second τ').
¹² Cod. DH, παράρρητοι.
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11. _Rhet._ 25 (p. 1461 a 12) = _Il._ 10, 316:

όθ δέ τοι εἴδος μὲν ἐνὶ κακός,

12. _Hist. An._ 9, 44 (p. 629 b 22) = _Il._ 11, 554 and _Il._ 17, 663:

καλός τίς τε δεῖ τάς τε τρεῖς ἐσφυγμένος περι,

13. _Rhet._ 2, 21 (p. 1395 a 13) = _Il._ 5, 12, 243:

εἰς οἶνος ἀριστος ἀμύνοιει περι πάτριος,

14. _Rhet._ 3, 11 (p. 1411 b 34) = _Il._ 13, 587:

Ἀτ. ἐκεῖνον ἀμύνοις,

_Hom._ θάνατος γέμιον, ἑκάς δέ ἔστω τιμός ἀμυνόμενος.

In the passage of the Rhetoric from which these words are taken Aristotle is giving examples of vividness in narration. Naturally, he quotes that part of the phrase that is especially pertinent.

15. _Rhet._ 3, 11 (p. 1412 a 7) = _Il._ 13, 799:

καρπὴν, ἀπολύομενα πρὸ τοῦ τὲ ἄλλα· αὐτὰρ ἐν τὸ ἄλλα·

16. _Hist. An._ 9, 12 (p. 615 b 10) = _Il._ 14, 291:

χαλεπὰ κινήσασαν θεοῦ ἄδειος δέ κυρίωσιν.

17. _Rhet._ 3, 11 (p. 1412 a 1) = _Il._ 15, 542:

αἰχμὴ δὲ στήριξαν διάφοροι παραμένοι.

18. _Rhet._ 1, 11 (p. 1370 b 11) = _Il._ 18, 109:

ὅτε πολὺ γλυκῶν μελίτων καταλαβόμενον·

19. _Rhet._ 2, 2 (p. 1378 b 5) = _Il._ 18, 109–110:

ὅτε πολὺ γλυκῶν μελίτων καταλαβόμενον ἀνδρῶν ἐν στήθουσιν αἴξεται.

20. _Rhet._ 25 (p. 1461 a 30) = _Il._ 20, 234:

Δι' εἰνακεῖναν.

---

1 Cod. Aς, ὥς ὅρθρα; Bς, ὥς ὅ ὁ τοῦ; Νς, ὥς (with ὅ τοῦ omitted); Aς, ὅ τοῦ.
2 Cod. Dς, εἰπότως (with a gap left for the rest of the verse); Aς, ἄιςτες; Cς, ἄιςτες; Pς, ἄιςτε; Aς, ἄιςτες ἄιςτε.
8 Cod. ES, ἀμύνοιει.
6 Cod. Q, ἀμύνοιε.
8 Cod. L, δεῖ (for ἀρεί).
6 Cod. QV,Z, πρόκε.
7 Cod. L, ὄρασιν.
9 Cod. PΑ,Dα,Dς, σέβησθαι.
9 Cod. Aς, σέβησθαι.
10 Cod. Yς, ὅστε.
11 Cod. Zβ, ὅστε; Ας, στήθουσι.
12 Cod Aς, εἰνακείαν.
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21. Rhet. 1, 11 (p. 1370 b 28) = II. 23, 108 and Od. 4, 183:
   ὃς φάτο, τοῦτο δὲ πάσιν ὣφε ἵμερον ἄρον γόηο.

22. Rhet. 2, 3 (p. 1380 b 29) = II. 4, 24, 54:
   καταφύη γὰρ δὴ γὰριν ἀκιδεῖει μετεῖδωμαι.

23. Eth. Nic. 7, 1 (p. 1145 a 21) = II. 6, 24, 258–259:
   οὖν ἐφ’
   ἀνδρὸς γε θυγτοῦ πάσι ἀκιδεῖει ἄλλα θεοῖο.

24. De Mundo 6 (p. 401 a 4) = Od. 5, 64:
   κλήθρη τὸ αἴγειρόν τε καὶ εὐώδης κυνάρισσος,

25. Frag. 162 (p. 1505 a 26) = Od. 5, 93:
   κέραστε δὲ νεκταρ ἔμνθρον

26. Frag. 165 (p. 1505 b 20) = Od. 6, 4 and 8:
   οἷς πρὶν μὲν ποτ’ ἱσακεν
   ἀλφηστάς.

27. De Mundo 11 (p. 401 a 7) = Od. 7, 115 and 11, 589:
   δύναι καὶ βοεία καὶ γλακάρια,

28. De Mundo 6 (p. 401 a 1) = Od. 7, 116:
   Αἰ. ἃν περὶ τοῦ γλυκεραί καὶ ἱλαίαι,
   Ημ. ἃν περὶ τοῦ γλυκεραί καὶ ἱλαίαι τηλεθώσαι.

---

1 Cod. Q2h, ἄφ’.
2 Cod. E, ἄφ’.
3 Cod. Q, ἀκιδεῖες; the reading in Ac is uncertain; cod. Q, μετεῖδωμαι.
4 Cod. CD omit ὄν; H, βαῖνε; H, μεταίκωμαι.
5 Cod. M8, ὃ γὰρ; Ls8, ὃ ἄρον.
6 Papyr. (first hand), ὧν, ἄκιδαμε; cod. D, θυγτοῦ.
7 Cod. P (recent hand), ἀκιδεῖες; O omits τε.
8 Cod. LQ, ἀκιδεῖες.
9 Cod. ACER, κέραστε.
10 Cod. DLMP, ἀλφηστάς; B, ἀλφηστάς.
11 Cod. O, δύχεις (but it has been corrected).
12 Cod. S omits this verse.
13 Though most cod. give δύχεις in these two passages of the Odyssey, La Roche edits, in both places, δύχεις.
14 Cod. Q, συκαί.
15 Cod. S omits the verse; many cod. have συκαί or συκαί; I, τηλεθώσαι; Schol. B. H. Q. (Od. 9, 425), τηλεθώσαι.
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29. *Pol*. 8, 3 (p. 1338 a 29) = *Od*. 9, 7–8:
   δαυτυμόνες δ' ἀνὰ δάματ' ἀκονάζωνται δοιδοῦ
   ἱμένοι ξέιης.
30. *Pol*. 1, 2 (p. 1252 b 22) = *Od*. 9, 114–115:
    θεμποτείχι δὲ ἱκανος
    παύον ἢδ' ἄλοχον.

Plato⁴ in quoting more fully from the same passage of the *Odyssey⁴* gives the same text. The passage is referred to in the *Nicomachean Ethics⁸*

31. *Rhet*. 2, 3 (p. 1380 b 23) = *Od*. 9, 504:
   φάσθαι ὁδυσσέα πτολικάρθοιν,

32. *Hist. An.* 6, 21 (p. 575 b 6) = *Od*. 10, 10, 19:
   βοῦς ἐννεώτου.

33. *De Mir. Aus.* 105 (p. 839 b 33) = *Od*. 12, 67–68:
   ἀλλὰ θ' ὁμοῦ πῦκκας τε νεών καὶ σώματα φωτῶν
   κύμαθ' ἀλός φορέοιν πυρὸς τ' ὀλοίων θύελλαι.

34. *Eth. Nic.* 2, 9 (p. 1109 a 32) = *Od*. 12, 219–220:
    τούτου μὲν καπνοῦ καὶ κύματος ἐκτὸς ἐργεῖ
    νήα.

By mistake Aristotle assigns these verses to Calypso, though they contain the advice of Circe and were uttered to his companion by Odysseus.

35. *Rhet.* 1, 11 (p. 1371 b 16) = *Od*. 17, 218:
    ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὅμοιον,

36. *Eth. Eud.* 7, 1 (p. 1235 a 7) = *Od*. 18, 17, 218:
    ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὅμοιον ἄγιν θείας ὡς τὸν ὅμοιον.

---

1 Many cod., ἀκονάζωνται.
2 Cod K, παιδων τ'.
3 Lf. 3, 680 B.
4 9, 112–115.
5 10, 10 (p. 1180 a 28).
6 Cod. QYb Zh, πτολικάρθοιν.
7 Cod. P, ἐννεώτου.
8 Cod. L, ἐννεώτου.
9 Cod. B, αλλὰς, θύελλαι.
10 Cod. QY, θύελλαι.
11 Cod. Mb Nb, τὸ τοῦ; Lb Ob, ὡς τοῦ; Kp omits μὲν.
12 Cod. Yb Zh, τὸ; Q, τὸ ὅμοιον φίλον τὸ. ως
13 Cod. CDKL, ὡς (for the second ως); M, ν.
14 Cod. CDKL, θύελλαι.
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Here the manuscripts of Aristotle agree with those of Homer, and disagree with those of Plato who, in the Lysis,\(^1\) quotes the same Homeric verse. In one passage,\(^8\) however, the manuscripts of Aristotle show the same readings as those given in the manuscripts of Plato. In the Nicomachean Ethics\(^4\) we find the verse of Homer referred to, but the first part of the verse is not quoted.

37. \textit{Eth. Nuc.}\(^4\) 4, 4 (p. 1122 a 27) = Od. 17, 420 and 19, 76\(^8\):
\[\text{πολλάκι δόσκον ἄληγη}.
\]

38. \textit{Probl.} 10, 36 (p. 894b 34) = Od.\(^6\) 20, 71:
\[\text{μήκος δ' ἵπτων Ἀρτεμις ἄγνη},
\]

39. \textit{Rhet.}\(^7\) 1, 7 (p. 1365 a 30) = Od. 22, 347:
\[\text{αὐτόδιδακτος δ' εἰμί.}
\]

C. Agreement with the Best Manuscripts of Homer.

Now let me give those passages in which the manuscripts of Aristotle agree with the best manuscripts of Homer, although the existence of variants is indicated, either in the manuscripts or scholia of Homer, or by Eustathius. I have listed twenty of these passages.\(^6\)

1. \textit{Rhet.} 1, 6 (p. 1363 a 5) = \textit{Il.} 2, 160:
\[\text{καθι εἰς οὐκ ἔχουσιν Πρώμυς}
\]

2. \textit{Frag.} 172 (p. 1506 b 31) = \textit{Il.}\(^2\) 2, 226–228:
\[\text{πλεῖσται τοι χαλκοῦ κληρία, πολλαὶ δὲ γυναῖκες}
\]
\[\text{εἰσίν ἐν κληρίς ἡξαύρετο, ἅ τοι Ἀχαιοῖ}
\]
\[\text{πρωτίστῳ δίδομεν.}
\]

---

\(^1\) 214 A. \(^2\) \textit{Mag. Mor.} 2, 11 (p. 1208 b 10). \(^3\) 8, 2 (p. 1155 a 34).
\(^4\) Cod. MB, δόσημ. \(^6\) Cod. S, δὴ πρή.
\(^5\) Cod. IK, πολλάκις. \(^7\) Cod. QYβZβ omit δ'.
\(^8\) Where Aristotle has quoted a verse that we learn from the scholia was rejected by some one of the ancient critics, I have considered that he is in agreement with the original Homeric tradition, and that the rejection by the ancients constitutes a variant.

\(^9\) Cod. Barocc. Mor., κληρίας; Cant., κληρίς; L, κληρίως.

3. *Frag.* 13 (p. 1476 a 21) = II.1 2, 554:
κοσμήσῳ ἑπτὼν τε καὶ ἀνίφως ἀσπιδιώτας.


4. *Rhet.* 3, 12 (p. 1414 a 2) = II.8 2, 671–673:
Nikeis αὖ Σύμπηθεν, Nikeis Ἀγλαῖς, Nikeis δὲ κάλλιστος.


To emphasize the asyndeton in these verses of Homer, Aristotle quotes the first words only of each verse.

5. *Frag.* 144 (p. 1502 b 31) = II. 3, 277:
ἥλιος θ' δὲ πάντ' ἐφορζεὶ καὶ πάντ' ἔπακόως
Schol. BQ (Od. 12, 374),—ἥλιος δ' δὲ.

6. *Frag.* 146 (p. 1503 a 9) = II. 3, 454:
Ἰσον γὰρ σφιν πάσιν ἀπήχθετο κήρι μελαίη.

Schol. Ven. A (II. 9, 378),—σφισι.

7. *Poet.* 25 (p. 1461 a 14) = II.8 9, 203:
ζωρότερον δὲ κέραις

Schol. Ven. A,—οὕτως κέραις χωρίς τοῦ β. Schol. Townl.,—δίξω τοῦ Ἁριστοφάνης κέραις. Eustathius (746, 48),—ιστόν δὲ δὴ τῶν τινῶν ἀνιγράφων τὸ κέραις κέραιρε φασίν, and (1397, 64),—ζωρότερον δὲ κέραις ᾧ κέραιρε.

8 (and 9). *Rhet.* 2, 2 (p. 1378 b 33) and *Poet.* 3, 5 (p. 1278 a 37) = II. 9, 648 and II. 16, 59:
ὅσεi τιν' ἀπίμητον μετανάστην,


1 Cod. L, κοσμῆσαι θ'.
2 Cod. QY Zb, αἰσθήσεν.
3 Cod. S, δ' αἰσθήσεν; L, αὖ ἐστίμησεν.
4 Cod. Bz, κερας; Nv, κερις.
5 Cod. CD (by correction) HS, κέραιρε.
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δέρθε γειγκ δε σφυν


11 (and 12). *Pol.* 3, 16 (p. 1287 b 14) and *Eth. Nic.* 8, 1 (p. 1155 a 15) = *Il.* 3, 10, 224:

σύν τε δεί ἓρχομένω


υπερχυμοίσοι δεί αντι του συνερχομένων. ἵνα δε μη νοθεύετε το τῇ προστίθεισι, καθώς.

Plato, as we have observed, both quotes and parodies this verse.


ἀπο δε φλέβα πᾶσιν ἔχοσιν,

ἡ γ' ἀνά νύπα θέουςα διαμετέρασιν ἀχυρίν' ἵκνει.


14. *De Mundo* 6 (p. 400 a 19) = *Il.* 6, 15, 192:

ζεύς δ' ἐλαχ' ὁμορνέον εὐρύν ἐν α inet και νεφέλησιν.


νεφέλεσιν.

15. *Poet.* 25 (p. 1461 a 20) = *Il.* 18, 489 and *Od.* 5, 275:

οὐ μή δ' ἄμμορος


Πολυδάμας μοι πρώτος ἀλγχήσιν ἀναθήσειν,

1 Cod. Th, τι.

8 Cod. G, συνερχομένω.

9 *Protas.* 348 D and *Conclus.* 174 D.

4 *Alcibiad.* *Il.* 140 A.

8 Cod. PDi, ἡ διὰ (for ἡ τ' ἀνθ); P, διαμετέρα; PDm, ίαιας.

6 Cod. L, δ' ἐλαχερῆ; G omits ἐν.

7 Cod. Na, ἐν μόνοι.

8 Cod. Pb, πολυδάμας.

9 Cod. Lb, πολυδάμας; Mb, πρῶτος; Kb, ἀναθήσει; Mm, ἐνωθήσει.

10 Cod. E, πολυδάμας; C omits μοι; E, πρῶτος ἡ πρῶτος.
2. *Eth. N. *3. 13 (p. 111 S. 22) refers to *II. *3. 24:
   
   *Ar.* **εἴρην** **ἐλαφόν** **ἀγριον** **ἀγέα,**
   **ἀλλ’ ὅτι** **βαρῖν** **ἐκα.
   
   *Hom.* **εἰρήν** **ἐλαφόν** **κυρίων** **ἀγριον** **αἰγα,**

3. *Rhet. 3. 4* (p. 1406 b 20) refers to *II. *10. 485-486:
   
   *Ar.* "Εστι **δὲ καὶ** **ἐκεῖνο** **μεταφορά:** **διαφέρει** **γὰρ** **μικρὸν:** **ὅταν**
   **μὲν** **γὰρ** **ἄτη** **τῶν** **Ἀχαλλάδος,
   **ός** **δὲ** **λέων** **ἐπόρουσεν,**
   **ἐκεῖνον** **ιστιν,**

---

1 Cod. D, ράο. 2 Cod. Q, κατεχε. 3 Cod. DL, καλὰ (for χερι). 4 *Metaphys. 11, 10* (p. 1076 a 4); cf. above, p. 213.
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Hom.1 οἷς δὲ λέον μῆλουσιν ἀσμαμάτωσιν ἐπελθών, αἴγουν ἡ δίεσος, κακὰ φρονέων ἐνορούσῃ.

If this Homerian passage is the one referred to by Aristotle, there are several difficulties in his statement. In the first place, Homer is speaking of Diomedes, and not of Achilles as Aristotle says. This misstatement of Aristotle may be merely a slip on his part. Besides, the verb in the passage of Homer is ἐνορούω, whereas Aristotle has ἐπορούω. The difference between the form of the two verbs, however, is slight, and a scribe might easily have changed one to the other.2 Still, there may have been such a verse about Achilles somewhere in Aristotle's Homer, and he may be quoting it correctly.

5. Pol. 1, 4 (p. 1253 b 35) refers to Π. 18, 376:

Ar. ἄσπερ τὰ Δαμάλου φασίν ἢ τοὺς τῷ Ἑφαιότου τρίποδας, οὔς φησιν ὁ ποιητὴς
ἀυτομάτους θείον δύσεσθαι ἄγωνα,
Hom. ὅφει οἱ αὐτόμαται θείον δυσαίατ' ἄγωνα,

Eustath. (1148, 8),—δυσαίατ' ἄγωνα, ἢ δύσονται ἄγωνα. Schol. Ven. A.—ἐν ἄλλῳ δύσονται ἄγωνα. ἐν δὲ ταῖς εἰκαστικαῖς κατὰ δῶμα νευότατο. Schol. Townl.,—ἐν δὲ ταῖς εἰκαστικαῖς θείον κατὰ δῶμα νέοιντο. Though we cannot feel certain as to which reading, δυσαίατ', δύσονται or δύσωνται, Aristotle had in his Homer, still we know he did not have the variant κατὰ δῶμα νέοιντο, which is cited by the scholiasts.

6. Eth. Nic. 10, 10 (p. 1180 a 27) refers to Od. 9, 114:

Ar.4 καὶ ζῇ ἐκαστος ὡς βούλειται, κυκλωπικώς θεμιστεύων παϊδῶν ἡδ' ἀλόχων.
Hom.6 θεμιστεύει δὲ ἐκαστος παϊδῶν ἡδ' ἀλόχων,

Either Aristotle purposely wrote ἀλόχων for ἀλόχων, or else some copyist made the change. For in another passage6 Aristotle in quoting a part of these verses has left us ἄλοχων in his text.

2 I might note an example of the confusion of these two verbs in Π. 11, 747.
3 Cod. S, αὐτόμαται; Townl., δυσαίατ'; many cod. have δύσονται; L Lips., δύσωνται.
4 Cod. Mb omits ἐκαστος. 5 Cod. K, παῖδων τ'. 6 Pol. 1, 2 (p. 1253 b 23).
7. *Eth. Nic. 3, 2* (p. 1155 a 32) refers to *Od. 17, 218:

Ar. *οι μὲν γὰρ ὁμοιότατα τίνα τιθάσειν αὐτήν καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίους φίλους, ὅταν
τὸν δροιόν φασιν ὡς τὸν δροιίον,
Hom.1 ὡς αἱ τὸν δροιίον ἀγαθεῖς ὡς τὸν δροιίον.

This verse, either in whole or in part, is elsewhere quoted three times by Aristotle.3


Ar. ἵττιθικῶτατον γὰρ ὁ θυμὸς πρὸς τοὺς κυνόνως, ὅταν καὶ ὁ "Ομηρος
δριμ ὡς ἀνά βίνας μένος
Hom.5 τοῦ δ’ ἔριπτο θυμός, ἀνά βίνας δε οἱ ἠθή
δριμοῦ μένος προούτεψε φιλον πατέρ εἰσορώστε.

These words belonging to different verses Aristotle has brought together—in a reference rather, than a quotation—to illustrate bravery or spirit. By the introduction of δ’ the fragment has been made metrical, so far as it goes.

E. ARISTOTLE’S VARIANTS SUBSTANTIATED.

Of those passages in which Aristotle gives a reading different from the accepted one of Homer, there are many cases where Aristotle’s reading is substantiated either by manuscripts of Homer, by scholia, by Eustathius or by ancient authors.

1. *Rhet. 2, 2* (p. 1379 a 4) = *II.*4, 196:

θυμὸς δὲ μέγας ὡς τε διοπτρεφέων βασιλῆων

Schol. Ven. A,—οἱ Ζηνόδοτος γράφει διοπτρεφέων βασιλῆων
οὔτως ἐνικῶς αἱ Ἀριστάρχων. εἶχον δὲ καὶ αἱ χαριστάται αὐτῶς, ἀνευ

1 Cod. CDKL, ἕτερον (for the second ὥς); M, ὥς.
2 *Rhet. 1, 11* (p. 1371 b 16); *Eth. End. 7, 1* (p. 1235a 7); *Mag. Mor. 2, 11*
(p. 1208 b 10).
3 Cod. E, ἀνά βίνα; K, ἀνάρριψα; S, ἀνάρριψα; P, ἀνάρριψα.
4 Cod. GL, θυμὸς γάρ; Cant., θυμὸς δή; ACES, διοπτρεφος βασιλῆς; DGHL, διοπτρεφῶν (or διοπτρεφον) βασιλῆων. La Roche adopts the reading of Zenodotus instead of that of the best codices.
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2. Probl. 23, 23 (p. 934 a 15) = II. 7, 64:

Ar.1 μελάνει δὲ τε πότος ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ.

Hom.8 ὁρμυάνου νίον, μελάνει δὲ τε πότος ὑπ’ αὐτῆς,

Although only one manuscript of Homer gives αὐτοῦ, the reading shown by Aristotle, we find from this scholion of Ven. A that it was a well-attested variant: 'Ἀρισταρχὸς πότον διὰ τοῦ ἐκ, καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτῆς, τῇ φρειᾷ. ἀλλοι δὲ πότος ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ.

3. Hist. An. 6, 28 (p. 578 b 1) = II. 9, 539–540:

Ar.5 θρέψειν ἐπὶ χλούνην σὺν ἄγριον· οὐδὲ ἐφίκει τηρεί γε σιτοφάγη ἄλλα μίψ ὑλήνετι.

Hom.4 ὅρσεν ἐπὶ χλούνην σὺν ἄγριον ἀργιάδοντα, δὲ κακὰ πόλλα ἐρθεσκέν ἰθων Οἰλῆς ἀλφῆς·

Some scholars think that Aristotle has here confused this passage with Odyssey 9, 190–191 where we read:

καί γὰρ θαῦμα τέτυκτομεν υπὸ τρόπον, οὐδὲ ἐφίκει·

ἄνθρωπος γε σιτοφάγης, ἄλλα μίψ ὑλήνετι.

I cannot suppose that Aristotle has accidentally confused these two Homeric passages. For, as Homer in the passage of the Odyssey is speaking about the famous and peculiar Polyphemus, it seems to me absurd to claim that Aristotle, who we know wrote much about Homer and his works, was ignorant of this fact, or even forgot that these verses applied to the Cyclops. To me, Aristotle’s words have the ring of truth when he says: τῶν δ’ ὄφρων καὶ ἄγριων οἱ τομία μείζον σύνονται καὶ χαλακώτεροι, ἄσπερ καὶ Ὄμηρος ἔποιησεν θρέψαντα. Besides, the reading of Aristotle is confirmed somewhat by Eustathius, who says (772, 46): τὸ δὲ ὅρσε καὶ ἐδέχετο εὐρήσε αὐτὰ τῷ γεωγράφῳ, θρέψειν ἐπὶ χλούνην σὺν· παρ’ ἐφίκει καὶ στίχοι εὐρήσεν οὕτως ἐπηγάδοι· οὐδὲ ἐφίκει· τηρεί γε σιτοφάγης ἄλλα μίψ ὑλήνετι.

---

1 Cod. C X Y, meleme.
2 Cod. S, melas; G Mor, melain; many cod., poton; Lips., Harl., Townl., Ven. B, auti; G, autou.
3 Cod. P, thihv; Da, alle agros (but corrected).
4 Cod. C, chloin.
5 All cod. (except Ven. A), thaum etetukto.
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καὶ σημείωσαι καὶ τοῦτο εἰς τὸ περὶ στίχων λειτούργων ἐκ τοῦ Ὀμήρου. Eustathius, a few lines below (772, 54), adds: καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ κατὰ τὸν γεωγράφον χλούνην σὺν τὸν τομαίν νοῦ, δεχόμενος τὸ θρέψει ἐπὶ χλούνην σὺν ἄγριον καὶ τὸν ἵζης γραφόντα στίχων πρὸς πίστωσι τοῦ ὅτι τῶν ἄβραν καὶ ἄγριων οἱ τομαί μείζονα γίνονται καὶ χλειψώτεροι.

Eustathius, when he refers to γεωγράφος, as he often does, means Strabo.¹ So, if we may believe Eustathius, Strabo too, though the reference cannot be found anywhere in his extant works, I think, quoted these verses from Aristotle and believed them to be Homeric. Therefore I think that Aristotle had these verses in his text of Homer.

4. Ὅητ. 25 (p. 1461 a 26) = II. 10, 252:

Ar.⁵ παρφέχηκεν δὲ πλέων νοέ.| Hom.⁵ ἀστρα δὲ δὴ προβήθηκε, παρφέχωκεν δὲ πλέων νοέ


5. De Part. An.⁴ 3, 10 (p. 673 a 16) = II.⁵ 10, 457 and Od.⁶ 22, 329:

Ar. φθεγγομένῳ δὲ ἀρα τούτῃ κάρη κοινήν ἐμίξθη. | Hom. φθεγγομένων δὲ ἀρα τοῦ γε κάρη κοινήν ἐμίξθη.

It is evident that there were two readings φθεγγομένῳ and φθεγγομένων, for there is a trace of both in the manuscripts both of Aristotle and of Homer; and, besides, Eustathius tells us (818, 4): γράφεται μὲν, φθεγγομένη.

¹ Perhaps one example will suffice to show this. Compare Eustathii Commentarii 419, 21 (Geographi Graeci Minores, Vol. II, ed. Mueller) with Strabo 8, 8, 9 (c. 372). In Eustathius we read: ὁ δὲ Γεωγράφος φησιν διὶ τοῦ νεώτερος καὶ μάλιστα Μακεδόνες καὶ θεταλίου ἄργως τὸ τεῖδον φασὶ. Strabo's words are as follows: ἄργως δὲ καὶ τὸ τεῖδον λέγεται παρὰ τοῖς νεώτεροι, παρ Ὀμήρῳ δ' ὀοῦ ἀπαξ: μάλιστα δ' ὁμοίας Μακεδονικῶς καὶ θεταλικῶς εἶναι.

² Cod. Ac, πλέω; Bc, πλέον.
³ Many cod. have either παρφέχχει οτι παρφέχχεται; many cod., πλέω.
⁴ Cod. E, φθεγγομένων; FZ, φθεγγόμενων; EPSUY, τοῦδε.
⁵ Cod. H, φθεγγομένω.
⁶ Cod. D omits this verse; L, φθεγγομένων, κάρη κοινήν ἐμίξθη; GR, τοῦ δὲ; MQ, τοῦδε.
Ar.\(^1\) πάρφασις, ἦ τ᾽ ἐκλεφέ νόον πύκα περὶ φρονέοντος.
Hom.\(^2\) πάρφασις, ἦ τ᾽ ἐκλεφέ νόον πύκα περὶ φρονεώντων.

7. *Poet.* 25 (p. 1461 a 33) = *Il.* 20, 272:
Ar.\(^8\) τῇ β' ἐσχέτο χάλκεον ἔγχος,
Hom.\(^4\) τῇ β' ἐσχέτο μείλινον ἔγχος.

8. *Rhet.* 3, 17 (p. 1418 a 8) = *Od.* 4, 204:
Ar. δή φιλεῖ, ἐτέι τῶν εἴπεις δοῦ ἅν πεπεμβάμενος ἄνήρ,
Hom. δή φιλεῖ, ἐτέι τῶν εἴπεις, δοῦ ἅν πεπεμβάμενος ἄνήρ

9. *Mag. Mor.* 2, 11 (p. 1208 b 10) = *Od.* 17, 218:
Ar.\(^6\) αἰεὶ τοι τὸν δρομὸν ἤγει θεός ὡς τὸν δρομὸν.
Hom.\(^7\) ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν δρομὸν ἤγει θεός ὡς τὸν δρομὸν.

In two other passages\(^8\) the manuscripts of Aristotle agree with the accepted Homeric reading ὡς αἰεὶ. Here, however, Aristotle disagrees with that reading, but agrees with the text of Plato.\(^9\) So it looks as if there were two old readings, one of which is given by Plato, and by Aristotle in this passage, while the other reading is preserved in the existing Homeric manuscripts and in the other two passages of Aristotle.

10. *Poet.* 22 (p. 1458 b 29) = *Od.* 20, 259:
Ar.\(^10\) δίφρων δικίλιων καταθέεις δλίγην τε τράπεζαν.
Hom.\(^11\) δίφρων δικίλιων παραθεῖς δλίγην τε τράπεζαν.

---

\(^1\) Cod. Mb, φρονέοντων.
\(^2\) Cod. L, φρονέοντως.
\(^3\) Cod. Br, δ' (for δ').
\(^4\) Some cod., χάλκεον.
\(^5\) Most cod., εἴπει; BL (after erasure), τῶν εἴπεις; D, τῶν εἴπεις.
\(^6\) Cod. Mb omits τοὺ.
\(^7\) Cod. CDKL, ἐς (for the second ω); M, ἐς.
\(^8\) Rhet. 1, 11 (p. 1371 b 16) and *Eth. Eud.* 7, 1 (p. 1235 a 7).
\(^9\) Lyons 214 A.
\(^10\) All cod., δίφρων τε, the τε evidently a mistake of scribes.
\(^11\) A few cod., καταθέεις.
F. Homeric Verses Omitted in Aristotle.

Naturally, perhaps, I should consider next the passages in which Aristotle's readings receive no support elsewhere; but I prefer to pass over these for a time, and to take up those passages in which verses that are contained in our Homer are omitted in Aristotle.

1. *Pol. 3, 14* (p. 1285 a 13) = *Il. 2*, 391–393:

Aristotle: οὐ δὲ κ' ἔγνω ἀπάνευθε μάχης, οὐ οἴ
ἀρκιον ἐσσεῖται φυγέων κύνις ἢ ὁ οἰνοῦς.

Homeric: οὐ δὲ κ' ἔγνω ἀπάνευθε μάχης ἐβέλοις νοῦσιν
μυμέψειν παρὰ νησί κορωνίσιν, οὐ οἴκεια
ἀρκιον ἐσσεῖται φυγέων κύνις ἢ οἰνοῦς.

In this passage Aristotle omits the last part of one verse and almost the whole of the succeeding verse. His object in quoting the passage is to show the authority of a leader to inflict death upon his men, if need be, in time of battle. Consequently he gives those words only that emphasize that part, omitting even the main verb of the sentence. In the Nicomachean Ethics we find verse 391 given in full, though, to be sure, it differs somewhat from our Homeric text. Of the expression πάρ γὰρ ἤμω θάνατος I shall speak later.


Aristotle: εἰσὶ δὲ ὑπερβολαὶ μειρακιώδεις: σφοδρότητα γὰρ δηλοῦσιν.

Homeric: οἶδ᾽ εἰ μοι τόσα δοῖσα ψάμαθος τε κόσις τε.
κούρην δ᾽ οὐ γαμέω Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρείδαο,
οἶδ᾽ εἰ χρυσεῖῃ Ἀφροδίτη κάλλος ἑρίζοι,

Homeric: οἶδ᾽ εἰ μοι τόσα δοῖσα ψάμαθος τε κόσις τε,
οἶδ᾽ κεν δὲ ζητεῖ θυμόν ἤμων πείσει Ἀγαμέμνων,
πρὶν γὰρ ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ἤμων δόμεναι θυμαλγαί λάβην.
κούρην δ᾽ οὐ γαμέω Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρείδαο,
οἶδ᾽ εἰ χρυσεῖῃ Ἀφροδίτη κάλλος ἑρίζοι,

---

1 Cod. Th, δεῦτα. 2 A few cod., δ᾽ ἂν (for δὲ κ'). 3, 11 (p. 1116 a 34).
4 Cod. QZbAs, δοῖς; Zb, δοῖα; Q, δοῖα; Q, ἄρης; QYbZbAs, χρυσῆ; Q, ἄρης.
5 Cod. S, Cant., πεῖρα; E, χρυσῆ; Vrat. b omits verse 390.
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It might possibly be claimed that in this passage verses quoted by Aristotle had been carelessly omitted by a scribe, but I think that such a suggestion is not necessary or even probable. Aristotle is here quoting examples of exaggeration of statement. As the force of the first example lies wholly in verse 385, especially in the words δοιη δεα ψάμαθος τε κόνις τε, Aristotle very properly omits the conclusion, which, no matter what its character might be, could not lessen the exaggeration of the condition. In the second example the three verses are so intimately connected that it is not easy to separate them. Even here, however, we notice that the last part of verse 390, γλαυκώπιδι ἵσσαρίζοι, has been omitted as unnecessary.

3. Poet. 25 (p. 1461 a 16) = Il. 10, 11–13:

    Ar. το δε κατα μεταφοραν ἔρῃται, ολον ... ἀμα δε φησιν
    ἥτοι δε το πεδιον το Τρωικὸν ἄθριστειν,
    αιλλων συρίγγων θ' ὀμαδόν.

    Hom.1 γ τοι δε το πεδιον το Τρωικὸν ἄθριστειν,
    θαφμαζον πυρὰ πολλα, τα καετο ἴλαθι πρα,
    αιλλων συρίγγων τ' ἐνοπην ὀμαδὸν τ' ἀνθρώπων.

Here again those verses only are given by Aristotle which are necessary to illustrate his point. Of the variant θ' ὀμαδόν I shall speak later.

G. Verses not found in our Homer.

There are many places in Aristotle where he shows a familiarity with verses of Homer that cannot now be found in Homeric manuscripts. Such are the following:

1. Pol. 3, 14 (p. 1285 a 13) = Il. 2, 391–393:

    Ar.2 δε κε ογον ἀπαντεβε μάχης, ου οι
    ἄρκιον ἵσσεται φυγειν κώνας ήδ' ὀλωνοις
    παρ γαρ ἐμοι θανατος.

    Hom.3 δε κε ογον ἀπαντεβε μάχης ἰθλοντα νοηνο
    μμαλζειν παρα γηνοι κορωναι, ου οι ἕπειτα
    ἄρκιον ἵσσεται φυγειν κώνας ήδ' ὀλωνοι.

In the Iliad, this last verse ends a speech of Agamemnon.

---

1 Cod. Cant., τα καινον. 2 Cod. Ib, ἵσσεται. 3 A few cod., θ' ὀμαδόν (for δε φησιν).
I have already considered this passage of Aristotle. Now I wish to call attention to the words πὰρ γὰρ ήμοι θάνατος, which Aristotle seems to have had in his Homer, but which are not found in our Homeric manuscripts.

2. Hist. An. 6, 28 (p. 578 b 1) = II. 9, 539-540:
   Ar.1 θρίψεν ἐπὶ χλοῖν σὺν ἄριστον. οὐδὲ ἔφκει
   θηρί γε στεφάγψι, ἀλλὰ βίῳ ὑλῆεντι.
   Hom.2 ὄρον ἐπὶ χλοῖν σὺν ἄριστον ἀργίδοντα,
   ὁς κακὰ πάλλ᾽ ἐρδείκεν ἐδώ τινος Οὐήκης ἂρων.

Though I have already discussed this passage at some length,3 this second verse in Aristotle ought to be listed here, as it is not found in our Homer.

3. Rhet. 2, 9 (p. 1387 a 32) = II. 11, 542-543:
   Ar.4 καὶ τὸν ἐντὸ τῷ θρίπτον αἱμοποθεῖ, μάλιστα μὲν οὖν τοιν
   ἐν τῷ άντφο. ὡθεν καὶ τοῦτο ἔρημον,
   Ἀλκαίος 8᾽ ἀλέωνα μάχην Τελαμωνιάδου.
   Ζεῦς γὰρ οἱ νεμέσαχα, δρ᾽ ἀμείνων φωτὶ μάχοιτο.
   Hom. Ἀλκαίος 8᾽ ἀλέωνα μάχην Τελαμωνιάδου.
   [Ζεῦς γὰρ οἱ νεμέσαχα, δρ᾽ ἀμείνων φωτὶ μάχοιτο.]

Verse 543 is omitted in all the Homeric manuscripts, but it is substantiated by Plutarch,5 who quotes it thus:

Ζεῦς γὰρ τοι νεμέσα, δρ᾽ ἀμείνων φωτὶ μάχοιο.

The verse is given also in the Pseudo-Plutarch.6

4. Eth. Eud. 3, 1 (p. 1230 a 19) = II. 22, 98-100:
   Ar.7 "Εκτοράδι ξαδὼς είλε.
   Πονοδάμας μοι πρῶτος ἑλεγχεῖν ἀνάθησαι.
   Hom.8 98 ἄχθησας 8᾽ ἁρα ἅπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλύτερον θυμὸν.
   99 ὁμοι ἐγών, εἰ μὲν κε πῦλας καὶ τείχα δύω,
   100 Πονοδάμας μοι πρῶτος ἑλεγχεῖν ἀνάθησαι,

1 Cod. P, ὅμως; Da, ἀλλ᾽ ἄριστο (but corrected).
2 Cod. C, χλοῖς.
3 Cod. Ph, πόλισσα.
4 Cod. Aε, πολιέσας; QVb Zb, πολιάς.
5 Moral. 36 A.
7 Cod. Ph, πολιδάμας.
8 Cod. H, τόχα; E, πολιδάμας; C omits μοι; E, πρῶτος ή πρῶτον.
The words "Εκτορα δ' αἰδὼς εἶλε, if they existed in Aristotle's Homer, must have come before verse 99, as they could not have formed a part of Hector's soliloquy.


ίτισικάτατον γὰρ ὁ θυμὸς πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους, ἔθεν καὶ Ὀμηρος σθένος ἐμβαλε θυμῇ καὶ μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἔγειρε

Of the words σθένος ἐμβαλε θυμῇ it might be said, that Aristotle had quoted them carelessly, since we find somewhat similar expressions in our Homer, as: μένος δὲ οἱ ἐμβαλε θυμῇ, and σθένος ἐμβαλε ἰκάστῃ. But, when we consider the expression μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἔγειρε, we find nothing in our Homer resembling it nearer than these words: μένος μέγα, θίλη ἀ ᾖ τὰ θυμῶν. So I suspect that both of these quotations of Aristotle were made from verses in his Homer that are not found in ours.

Now, as is evident, I am treading on extremely doubtful ground. For there are some passages quoted by Aristotle as from Homer, that are entirely different from anything in our Homeric manuscripts. It might be suspected that Aristotle was quoting from other works, not now extant, that were sometimes attributed to Homer. But, so far as I know, with the exception of the Margites, Aristotle mentions as Homeric only the Iliad and the Odyssey. Therefore, since we have abundant proof, as I have shown, that there were many verses of the Iliad and Odyssey that have not been preserved in our Homeric manuscripts, why may we not justly suppose that these quotations of Aristotle refer to verses of Homer that were found in some of the older manuscripts, but were either not known to the Alexandrine critics or else rejected by them, and hence were lost to our comparatively modern manuscripts?

7. *Pol. 8, 3* (p. 1338 a 24):

διόπερ Ὀμηρος οὕτως ἐποίησεν

ἀλλ' οἶνον μὲν ἡτε καλεῖν ἐπὶ δαῖτα θαλεῖν.

The insertion of a single short syllable in the second foot — for example, τε — would make the hexameter complete.

---

1 II. 16, 539.  2 II. 11, 11, and II. 14, 151.  3 II. 15, 594.  4 Aristotle refers to this, as a work of Homer, in *Poet. 4* (p. 1448 b 30).
8. *De Anima* 1. 2 (p. 404 a 29):

διὸ μαλώς τοι ASN τὸ Ὀμηρος
οὐ ἔκαπτον ἔλλοφορον.

Aristotle thus refers to this verse in the Metaphysics: *φοινὶς καὶ καὶ
tὸ Ὀμηρος ταῦτα ἥματα διάνεσθαι τὴν δέκα, ὥστε ἐνεργεῖ τὸ Ἐκτορα,
οὐ δὲ ὁ ἐν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ ἀκούει λόγον, ἐκίνησε ἔλλοφορον τον.*

So we can have no doubt. I think, that Aristotle’s quotation represents part of an actual Homeric verse. The same expression, too, is found in Theocritus, who says:


ἐγκλείοντος γάρ ὁ θυρίς πρὸς τῶν κυδίων, ἓνα καὶ Ὁμηρος ... 
καὶ ἕξεσεν ἀίρα.

The verb ἐξεῖν is used by Homer, so far as our text shows, only in the expressions ἐξεῖσε ἀίρα and a ἔξεσε ἀίρα. Theocritus, however, has the same expression that is quoted here in the Nicomachean Ethics, namely ἐξεῖσε κωκά: ὡς ὅ ὁ ὅλος ἕξεσεν ἀίρα. As Theocritus knew his Homer well and copied him freely, perhaps, this expression in his Idr was borrowed directly from Homer. Why may he not have had an Iliad or Odyssey in which this expression was used? This old edition of Homer in the possession of Theocritus might have contained also the expression ἐξεῖν ἔλλοφορον, which Theocritus uses and which is quoted in the *De Anima.* It would seem as if in these two passages Theocritus supported Aristotle and his quotations.

10. *Frag.* 159 (p. 153a b 44) in Schol. Tawnl. on II. 24. 420:

δίκαιον πέρας τραπέταις μετα. ὡς ἄρπαν Ἀριστοτέλης αἰρετῶν

"Ὀμηρος

πέται δὲ περιβροτοῖς ὑπειλή.

That this reading of Homer was lost in early times is shown by the words of the scholiast that follow: τῶν δὲ τὸ ἤλιον ὑποδέθηκαν ὑπὲρ φύσεως.

---

3 Cod. SW. ὡς ὁ δὲ τῆν. 4 Ἰδ. 21. 15. 5 5 (p. 1056 b 28l). 6 Ἰδ. 22. 129. 7 Cf. the previous passage discussed.
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"Εστι δὲ καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν μεταφορά: διαφέρει γὰρ μικρόν· διὰ τὸν μὲν γὰρ εἰκόν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλῆα ός δὲ λέων ἔπορουσεν, εἰκὼν ἕστιν, διὰ τὸν δὲ λέων ἔπορουσε, μεταφορά.

The expression ός δὲ λέων ἔπορουσεν has already been discussed.1 Whether that refers to a passage no longer found in our Homer or not, the words λέων ἔπορουσε, if they represent a quotation at all correct, must have come from a text of Homer different from ours; for in our Homer we cannot find any passage to which they would properly refer.

H. New Readings in Aristotle.

There remain for consideration the comparatively few passages in which Aristotle, while quoting verses contained in our Homer, gives readings unsupported by other testimony. It will not be necessary to treat each one of these passages fully, though a few suggestions may very properly be made.

1 (and 2). Soph. Elench. 4 (p. 166 b 6) and Poet. 25 (p. 1461 a 22) = Il. 2, 15 and 2, 32:

Ar. (Soph. Elench.) καὶ τὸ περὶ τὸ ἐνύπνιον τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὃς ὅκνι αὐτῶς ὁ Ζεὺς ἔστων
dίδομεν δὲ οἱ εἰκόσι ἄρισθαι,
ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐνυπνῷ ἐντόλετο διδόναι.

Ar. (Poet.)
dίδομεν δὲ οἱ

Hom. "Ἡρη λυσσομένη, Τρόϊς ὀι κῆδε' ἐφήπται.

Though the words δίδομεν δὲ τοι εἰκόσι ἄρισθαι are found in Iliad 21, 297, it is evident from the general sense of the passage in Aristotle, that he is referring to one of the earlier passages, and not to the later one.

3. Eth. Nic. 3, 11 (p. 1116 a 34) = Il. 2, 391–393:

Ar.2 δὲ κε' εἰκὼν ἀπάνευθε μάχης πτώσουσα νοήσω, oἱ οἱ ἄρκιον ἐστάται φυγεῖν κύνας.

1 Cf. p. 220. 2 Cod. Kb, ἄρκιον; KbMb, ἄκπιον.
Hom.\(^1\) δὲ δὲ \(κ' \varepsilonτὼν \) ἀπάνθεινε μάχης ἑθελοντα νοήσω
μεμνάξειν παρὰ νησι κορωνίσαν, οὐ ἄλλον
ἀρκον ἑσσάτωμεν φυγάνει κάποις ἡδ' οὐνοίτο.

In this passage it is stated carelessly that the verses were uttered by Hector, whereas they were really spoken by Agamemnon. That Aristotle was aware of that fact, is clear from a passage in the Politics,\(^3\) where he correctly refers the words to Agamemnon.

The reading πτώσοντα is metrically and grammatically correct.

4. Probl. 30, 1 (p. 953 a 23) = Il. 6, 200–202:
Ar.\(^5\) αὐτὰρ ἔπει καὶ κάσος ἐκήθετο πᾶσι θεοῖν,
ἡτοι ὁ κατεδαφίσας τὸ Ἀλήμων οὗτος ἄλητο,
ὅν θυμὸν κατέδωκεν, πάτον ἀθρόων ἀλείπτων.

Hom.\(^4\) ἅλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κάσος ἐκήθετο πᾶσι θεοῖν,
ἡ τοι ὁ κατεδαφίσας τὸ Ἀλήμων οὗτος ἄλητο,
ὅν θυμὸν κατέδωκεν, πάτον ἀθρόων ἀλείπτων.

5. De Mot. An. 4 (p. 699 b 37) = Il. 8, 20–22:
Ar.\(^5\) ἅλλας ὅπικ ὅν ἱρύστατ' ἐς ὀφρανύσθη πεδώνθη
Ζηρ', ὑπατον πάντων, οὐδ' εἰ μᾶλλα πολλὰ κάμοιτε,
πάντες δ' ἐξαιτεῖθ' θεοὶ πάσοι τε βασιν·

Hom.\(^8\) πάντες δ' ἐξαιτεῖθ' θεοὶ πάσοι τε βασιν·
ἀλλας ὅπικ ὅν ἱρύστατ' ἐς ὀφρανύσθη πεδών δὲ
Ζηρ', ὑπατον μῆστωρ', οὐδ' εἰ μᾶλλα πολλὰ κάμοιτε.

La Roche\(^7\) tells us that there has been no change in the order of verses of the Iliad or Odyssey from the time of Pistratus down, and that the manuscripts of Homer show this fact. Here, however, in Aristotle we find the order of verses changed. This change may be due either to Aristotle or to a scribe.

---

\(^{1}\) A few cod., \(δ' \) ἄρ (for \( δ' κ' \)).
\(^{2}\) 3. 14 (p. 1285 a 11).
\(^{3}\) Cod. t, \\( \sigmaτεσ \) (for \( \καύσεις \)); t, \( \sigmaτα \); t, \( \κατεδαφίσας \).
\(^{4}\) Cod. C (after an erasure) and many others have \( \epsilonδάκτην \).
\(^{5}\) Cod. E, \( \epsilonδάκτην \); P, \( \υπατον \) \( \muηστορ \) \( πάντων \); EP, \( \epsilonξαιτεῖθα \).
\(^{6}\) Cod. C, \( \piάντες \) \( \tau' \); S Mosc. 1, \( \epsilon \) \( \mu' \); G, \( \epsilonρωτήττ \); HL Vrat. b, \( \epsilonδάκτην \); Schol.
Ven. A, \( γρ. καὶ \) \( πάνθρωπο \).
\(^{7}\) Homerische Textkritik, p. 7.

Ar. \(^1\) ἵνα τε πρῶται τρίχες ἵππων

κρανίῳ ἔμπεθυμα, μάλιστα δὲ καύριον ἤτοιν.

Hom. \(^2\) ἄκρην κακὶ κορυφῆς, δὲ τε πρῶται τρίχες ἵππων

κρανίῳ ἔμπεθυμα, μάλιστα δὲ καύριον ἤτοιν.

7. *Rhet.* 1, 7 (p. 1365 a 13) = *II.* 9, 592–594:

Ar. \(^3\) δοσά κακὶ ἄνθρωποι τέλει τῶν ἄστυ ἄλωθ᾽

λαοὶ μὲν φθείροντο, πάλιν δὲ τε πῦρ ἄμαθον,

τέκνα δὲ τ᾽ ἄλλοι ἄγονοι.

Hom. \(^4\) κήδε, δο ἄνθρωποι τέλει τῶν ἄστυ ἄλωθ᾽

ἀνδρας μὲν κτεῖνοντες, πάλιν δὲ τε πῦρ ἄμαθον,

τέκνα δὲ τ᾽ ἄλλοι ἄγονοι βαθυζώνου τε γυναικας.


The expression λαοὶ μὲν φθείροντο is Homeric, and is found in *Iliad* 6, 327. It is not impossible that it may once have been used in *Iliad* 9, 593, just as Aristotle quotes it.

In the reading τ᾽ ἄλλοι Aristotelte agrees with the Homeric manuscripts, though the scholiasts, as we see, note a variant δήσοι.

8. *Poet.* 25 (p. 1461 a 18) = *II.* 10, 11–13:

Ar. ἤτσι δὲ ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τρῳκόν ἀφρήσειν,

αἰλὼν συρίγγων θ᾽ ἀμαδόν.

Hom. \(^6\) ἢ τοι δὲ ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τρῳκόν ἀφρήσειες,

βαῦμας τυρὰ πολλὰ, τὰ καύστο Ἱλισθι πῦρ,

αἰλὼν συρίγγων τ᾽ ἐνοῦ ἄμαδον τ᾽ ἀνθρώπων.

Of the omission of verse 12 I have already spoken. I have now to treat of the word ἄμαδον. It seems to me probable that Aristotle had the expression in his Homeric text just as his manuscripts give it. In this passage Aristotle is speaking of metaphors. Now ἄμαδον with αἰλὼν and συρίγγων would give a much better example of a

\(^1\) Cod. SY omit πρῶται; Z, ἐμπεθυμα.

\(^2\) Cod. H, κακοκρυφῆς; C (first hand) omits τε.

\(^3\) Cod. QYb Zb, ἄσα; QYb Zb omit πέλει.

\(^4\) Cod. G, κήδεα δει.

\(^6\) Cod. Cant., τὰ καὐστά.
metaphor than would ἢνοςτήν; for ὃμαδος generally refers to the
din or uproar of men, whereas here by a transfer of meaning it
would refer to the din or blare of trumpets.

9. Fr. 143 (p. 1502 b 4) = ll. 10, 332:

φησι δ' Ἀριστοτέλης ὅτι οὐδ' ὁ ποιητής λέγει ὡς ἐπιώρησαν,
καθάπερ ἐν ἄλλων
ὡς φαίνω καὶ ρ' ἐπίορκον ὡμοσεν,

Hom.1 ὡς φαίνω καὶ ρ' ἐπίορκον ἔσιμοσε, τὸν δ' ὀρθοτεν.


We must assume that Aristotle intended to end the real quotation
with ἐπιώρκον, or else that ἐπ (or ἐπ') has been lost through some
mischance, for the use of the simple verb ὡμοσεν renders the line
unmetrical.

10. Poet.2 22 (p. 1458 b 31) = ll. 17, 265:

ἡώνες βοσῶσιν

This expression of Aristotle is thus edited by Bekker. All the
manuscripts, however, read ἱὼνες βο().' The error of the manu-
scripts is probably due to a scribe, who would naturally suppose the
subject of this verb to be persons rather than things.

11. Eth. Eud. 7. 1 (p. 1235 a 26) = ll. 18, 107:

Ar. ὥς ἔρις ἐκ τε θεών καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλλοτο.

Hom. ὥς ἔρις ἐκ τε θεών ἐκ ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλλοτο,

12. Probl. 26, 31 (p. 943 b 22) = Od. 4, 567:

Ar.3 ἀλλ' αἱ ζεφύροι διαπνεύοντες ἄγ' τοὐ

Hom.4 ἀλλ' αἱ ζεφύροι λέγειν πνείοντος ἄγτος

For the reading of the Homeric manuscripts we have the testimony
of many writers. The verse as quoted by Aristotle, however, would
readily unite with the preceding verse of Homer, ὦ νεφές, οὕτω ἁρ
χειμῶν πολύς οὔτε ποτ' ὀμβρος, if the succeeding verse were omitted,
'Οκεανὸς ἀνίησεν ἀναφύξειν ἀνθρώπους.

---

1 Cod. H, ἐκεὶ βρακον; a few cod., ἀπόμοσε; D, ἀπόμοσεν; H, ἀπόμοσε; C (recent hand), ἐκ τε.
2 All cod., λοιπος βος.
3 Cod. Y, αἵ; n, διαπνεύσειν; C, αὕτω.
4 Most cod. have πνεύματα; M, πνεύματα; H, πνεύματ'α; Schol. HP, τὸ πνεύματα
διὰ τοῦ ἐκ προς τὸ ζεφύρωσι.
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13. De Mundo, 6 (p. 400 a 11) = Od. 6, 42-45:

Ar.1 Οἶλυστόν', δει φασί θεῶν ἵνα δοφαλὲς αἰεὶ
ἐμμαίναι. οὖτ' ἀνίμουσι τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ' ὁμβρψ
dεύτα, οὔτε χῶν ἐπιπάναται, ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἴθρη
πάνταται ἀνέφελος, λεική δ' ἀναδέρμομεν αἴγη.

Hom.2 Οἶλυσκὸν δ', δει φασί θεῶν ἵνα δοφαλὲς αἰεὶ
ἐμμαίναι. οὖτ' ἀνίμουσι τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ' ὁμβρψ
dεύτα, οὔτε χῶν ἐπιπάναται, ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἴθρη
πάνταται ἀνέφελος, λεική δ' ἐπιδέρμομεν αἴγη.

Of Aristotle's form ἀνέφελος nothing need be said, for that is
found in many Homeric manuscripts also. ἀναδέρμομεν is not
supported elsewhere.

14. Poet. 22 (p. 1458 b 25) = Od. 9, 515:

Arist.3 νῦν δὲ μ' ἵνα δλίγος τε καὶ οὐσίανδι καὶ ἀκίκους,

Hom.4 νῦν δὲ μ' ἵνα δλίγος τε καὶ οὐσίανδι καὶ ἀκίκους

Eustathius (1643, 7) says: γράψαταί δ' ἐν τοια καὶ δεικής. Since
the three manuscripts of Aristotle have δειδής or ἀδής, it seems
to me probable that Aristotle had in his Homer and wrote δεικής,
which is read in a scholion of Homer and also in Eustathius. This
could easily have been corrupted, in the text of Aristotle, into δειδής
and then ἀδής.

15. Rhet. 3, 11 (p. 1411 b 33) = Od. 11, 598:

Ar.5 αὕτη ἐπὶ δαύεδόντε κυλίσθενο λάας ἀνωθῆς,

Hom.6 αὕτη ἐπεί τιδ' ἐν δὲ κυλίσθενο λάας ἀνωθῆς.

The difference in reading is really very slight, and the unmetrical
ἐπὶ in Aristotle is probably due to scribes.

---

1 Cod. P, ὁλομυκέων θ'; O, ὁλομυκόν; Q, ὅτι; P, ὅτι; Q, ἰδιαίς (for ἰδιαίς); O, ὅτι (verse 43); O, ὅτι ab ἱκόστα; P, ἀνεφάλα; Q, ἀνεφάλος; O, ἀλεχ (for λέχω).
2 Cod. AK, ὁλομυκόν'; B, ὁλόμεν ' (verse 43); LPS, ὁλόμεν (verse 44); most cod., ἀνεφάλος; Eustath. 1551, 5, ἀνεφάλος and ἀνεφάλος; D, ἀνεφάλος; Schol. H.P., Ἄπασι αἴθρα.
3 This verse is so edited by Bekker, although one cod. (No) has ἀδής, and the other two (Ae Be) have ἀδής.
4 Cod. S, ἀναλείπ; M, γρ. ἀνεφάλος.
5 Cod. B, ἐπὶ; Q, δαύεδόν τε.
6 Cod. EQ, ἀδής.
16. *Rhét. i, 11* (p. 1370 b 5) = *Od. i*, 400–401:

_Ar._

μετὰ γὰρ τε καὶ ἀλγοῦσι τῆρπεται ἄνηρ

μνήμενος, διὸ τολλὰ πάθη καὶ τολλὰ ἔοργῃ.

_Hom._

μνωμονέω· μετὰ γὰρ τε καὶ ἀλγοῦσι τῆρπεται ἄνηρ,

ὁ τε τὸν μᾶλλα τολλὰ πάθη καὶ τολλὸν ἐπαληθῇ.

The word ἔοργῃ given by Aristotle seems to me to harmonize better with πάθη and with the general sense of the passage than the traditional ἐπαληθῇ.

17. *Pol.* 8, 3 (p. 1338 a 26) = *Od.* 17, 385:

_Ar._

οἱ καλόποιν δωδὸν φήσιν, δι' ἐν τέρπησιν ἀπαντᾶς.

_Hom._

καὶ θέσπιν δωδὸν, δι' ἐν τέρπησιν άείδων;

18. *Probl.* 30, 1 (p. 953 b 12) = *Od.* 19, 122:

_Ar._

καὶ μὲν φήσι διάκριν πλοίων βεβαρημένοις οἴνης.

_Hom._

φρένι δι' ἐκαρπόλειν βεβαρητὰ μὲ φρένας οἴνης.

The first part of the verse as given by Aristotle is unmetrical. Were it not for the fact that the last part is metrical, we should think that Aristotle was merely referring to the passage and not attempting to quote it. As it is, it looks as if he might have had a different text.

**Conclusion with regard to Aristotle’s quotations.**

In general, now, what can be said of the trustworthiness of Aristotle’s quotations? Did he, by relying on memory, commit so many offenses that his variants are entitled to no consideration? About him, as about Plato, I think we may say that there are occasional passages where the presumption seems very strong that he has quoted from memory and quoted wrongly. We cannot, however, dismiss all, or even many, of his variants in that abrupt way. Whether he quoted from memory or not, for the following reasons I feel that his readings are entitled to a careful consideration, and

---

1 Cod. Ac, μνωμανέως δε; Q, πάθη; QZθ, ἐοργῇ; Y, θρην.
2 Cod. D, μμωμένω; M, γρ. μμωμένω.
3 Cod. R (and Eustath. 1824, 59), δε ἀκ.
4 Cod. X, πλόοιν βεβαρημένον.
5 A (first hand) omits this verse.
that, where they differ from the traditional text of Homer, in most instances they probably give us variants of high antiquity.

1. Let me repeat again that we feel more strongly since the discovery of the Flinders Petrie fragment, that the modern manuscripts of Homer differ greatly from the earlier traditions.

2. Though I cannot go into the question as to whether Aristotle himself prepared a Homeric text for Alexander the Great, — for there seems to be conflicting testimony on this point, — it is clear from the titles of two of the works of Aristotle,¹ and from references to him in the scholia of Homer, where his readings or explanations are occasionally mentioned, that he paid a good deal of attention to the study of Homer, and hence must have been well acquainted with his poems.

3. Many of the quotations in Aristotle agree with our traditional Homeric readings. Many that disagree receive support either from Homeric manuscripts or from scholia or from ancient authors.

4. Many of the differences are undoubtedly due either to mistakes of scribes, or to the fact that Aristotle occasionally refers to verses without intending to give the exact words.

There then remains a comparatively small number of unsubstantiated variants, to be attributed to a difference of text. Should we not expect that Aristotle, who lived so long before the Alexandrine critics, would exhibit as many real variants as his manuscripts show?

¹ Προβλήματα Ὄμηρικα (cf. Biographi Minores, ed. Westman, p. 404, 77), and Ἀπορήματα Ὄμηρικα (cf. Diogenes Laertius, 5, 1, 26).
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Abbreviation, 58.
abiciam, 99.
abiciit, 87, 101.
abiciit, 97.
Accent of 'Anaitis, 58.
of Μουραίο, Μουραί, 60.
Actium, era of, 61.
adici, 102.
adiecercit, 96.
adiecirentur, 98.
adieciit, 98.
Adoration, attitude of, 55.
Aeantides, tragic poet, 78 n.
-aes from -aeus, 59.
Aeschylus, Plato's quotations from, 155.
άγορης, 67 n.
Aias, 95, 107, 110.
aitio, 95, 107.
-ai, from -oai, 59.
-aius, -eius, words in, 93.
Alexander Aetolus, 78 n., 79 n.
Polyhistor, 71 n.
Alexandra of Lycophron, date, 76.
'Anaitis, 56.
Anahita, 66.
Anaitis, inscriptions relating to, 57 n.
epithets of 57 f., 66, 72 n.
cult, 58, 66.
'Anāvus, inflection, 58.
accent of dative, 58.
Aratus, not tragic poet, 78 n.
ἀχαίοι (καλαβρ) μοῦ, 8, 18, 21, 26 f.
Arilus, αγορης, 67 n.
Aristotle, Homeric quotations in, 153 ff.
Artemis Aanatis, 56, 57 ff.
worship, 66.
and Mén Tiamu, votive tablet, 55 ff.

Asclepius, Mén like, 58 n.
'Ανευς [Zeus], 69 n.
Athena Polias, temple of, 11, 18, 29 f.
temple of not the Parthenon, 30–33.
nor the Hecatompedon, 34–36.
'Αθηνᾶς from 'Αθηναίος or 'Αθηναίος?
59 f.
Attalus, 74.
Atteo, Attis, 65 f., 68 n., 74.
'Αττητ ὂς, 68 n.
Attis, Menotyrannus, 65.
Myth, 74.
Attitude of adoration, 55.
Asia Minor, religion, 63 ff., 73 f.
Austenius, comp. of iacio, 151.

-B-, 60 f.
Babylonian Creation Tablets, 68 n.
Barnaues for Barneaeus, 57 n.
BATES, W. N., The Date of Lycophron,
75 ff.
Boeckh, on Opisthodomus, 1, 5 n., 11,
43 f.
Brambach, on -icio etc., 84.
on -tis, 95.

Cassellius, on -tis, -tis-, 94 f., 108.
Calendar, Macedonian, 62.
sequence of months in, 57 n.
Calligeneia, 57.
Catacecaumene, 66 f.
Catullus, comp. of icio, 137 f.
Cicero, comp. of icio, 138.
Claudian, comp. of icio, 151.
co-, prepos., nature of, 105.
cocio, concio, 121 ff.
ocio, 118.
\[
\text{Euripides, the 'old temple.' 5 a., 18-}
\]\n\[\text{153 f.}\]
\[\text{the temple of Athena Polias, 11,}
\]\n\[\text{rebuilt. 153 a.}\]
\[\text{Euripides, popular. aw. 66.}\]
\[\text{Plato's quotations from, 153 f.}\]
\[\text{Euripides. Aristotle's quotations from,}
\]
Gai, Gaii, etc., Grai, Graii, etc., 93 ff., 110.
Germanicus, comp. of iacio, 145.
Graingermarum, 94, 108.
Grammarians, testimony about comp. of iacio, 88 f., 92.
Great Goddess, 58, 64, 66.
Great Mother, 69.

H to remove hiatus, 120.
Hecatompedon, names applied to, 2 n., 22, 27.
inscription referring to, 3 n., 10, 44.
not rebuilt after Persian Wars, 22 n.
age of, 24.
*Hpaioi from *Hpaioi, 59 n.
*Ermaoi, from *Ermaioi or *Ermaioi? 59 n. f.
Hesiod, Aristotle's quotations from, 168 ff.
Plato's quotations from, 161 ff.
leper, meanings of, 5, 8, 10 f., 25 n.
leperothena, 72 n.
Homer, Aristotle's quotations from, 210 ff.
Plato's quotations from, 176 ff.
tragic poet, 78 n.
Homeric quotations in Plato and Aristotle, 153 ff.
*Osimkwa, a corruption of Marduk, 71 n.
Horace, comp. of iacio, 141.

i as ei, 38.
-icio, testimony for, 99 ff., 103, 113 ff.
contracted w. preposition, 113 ff.
iniciatus, 96.
iniciant, 98.
iniciit, 97.
Injikler, 63 n.

Inscriptions: on votive tablet to Artemis Anaitis and Mén Tiamu, 56 ff.
relating to Anaitis, 57 n.; to Mén Tiamu, 71 n. ff.
dated, 56, 57 n., 71 n.
from Byzantium, 64 n.
Julia Gordus (Goerdia), 56 n., 61 n., 71 n.
Hypaepa (near Odemish), 57 n.
Kula (Menneh, Maioria), 57 n., 59 n., 61, 62 n., 72 n. f.
Palmyra, 70 n.
Philadelphia, 57 n.

-is for -os, 59.
for -isms, 59.
Isaiah lxxv. (111), 70 n.
i consonant, effect on preceding vowel, 106 ff.
doubled between vowels, 107 ff.
Iaciendi Verba Composita, 83 ff.
iacio, comp. w. prep. ending in conson., 87 ff.
ending in vowel, 104 ff.
comp. in inscriptions, 127 ff.
-icio, testimony for, 96 ff., 103, 110 ff.
in vulgar and provincial Latin, 102, 115.
-icio, testimony for, 88 ff., 103, 117 ff.
Juvenal, comp. of iacio, 150.

Kallegemia, 56.
Kamaeiyn, [Μαη] 69 n.
Katachthones, 69 f.
Katakeuasthen, 62.
katougia, 63 n.
kuilou, kuilou, 72 n.
Kolup, not at Kula, 62 f.
Ku, Ku, Kolup, 63 n.
Kula, 62 f.
inscriptions from, 57 n., 72 n. ff.
not Kolup, 62 f.
Ποργος, Πυρόπ, 63 n.
Lachmann, on -licio etc., 85.
Lucan, comp. of iacio, 147.
Lucilius, comp. of iacio, 135 f.
Lucretius, comp. of iacio, 137.
Lunus (Μήν), 66 n.
Lutatius Catulus, comp. of iacio, 136.
Lycophrion, date, 75 ff.
Lydia, religion of eastern, 63 ff.

Μῖν, 64.
Μειζον, 95, 107, 110.
Μα-ν, Maen, Mên, antiquity of this god, 64 ff., 74. See also Mên.
Manes, 64 n.
Manilius, comp. of iacio, 145.
Marduk, 71 n.
Martial, comp. of iacio, 150.
Μεσοφαλακτής, Διή, 72 n.
Mather, M. W., Iaciendi Verbi Composita, 83 ff.
matriarchal social system, 73.
Μέταρων, meaning of in Hdt., 22 n., 25.
Mên (see also Ma-ν), epithets, 70 n.
like Asclepius, 59 n.
relation to Attis and Sabazius, 65 n.;
and Great Mother, 65 n.
originally a solar divinity, 64, 66.
range of cult, 66 n. f.
priests of, in Athens, 67 n.
Mên Caru, 58 n. f.; Pharmacu, 70 n.;
Tiamu, 57 ff.
Artemis Anaitis and, votive tablet to, 55 ff.
inscriptions relating to Mên Tiamu,
71 n. ff.
Μῆν Τημων, 56, 71 n. ff.
Μῆν Τιμων, 59, 71 n. f.
Μῆνιδων, incorrect, 59.
Mên Tiamu = Μήν κακαχθένος? 69 f.
Μεταρων, 65 n., 67 n. f.
comedy by Menander, 67 n.; by
Antiphanes? 67 n.
Μήν, Μήν, 66, 67 n., 71 n.

Meni, Aramaean Τόχη, merged into
Μên, 70 n. f.
Menis magister, Mênotyrranus? 70 n.
Μήν (from Mê-ν?), 64 n.
μετάρων, 65 n.
Μήνη, Ανάινα, 57, 58, 66 n.
(Θεών), 64, 68 n.
Μήνη, 68.
Μεταρων, 67 n. f.
Metrum at Athens, 68 n.
Michaelis, on Opisthodomus, 1, 5 n., 12.
on ‘old temple’ and temple of
Athena Polias, 19.
on age of Hecatompedon, 24 n.
Milchhöfer, on Opisthodomus, 1 n., 16 n.,
48; objections to view of, 49–53.
Monogram, 58, 62.
Months in Macedonian calendar, 57 n.
Mother, Great, names of, 64 n. See also
Μήνη.
Μουσαίοι, frequent on stones, 59 n.
Μουσαί from, 56, 58.
accent of forms of, 60.
Müller, Luc., on -licio etc., 85.
 Munro, on -licio etc., 86.
Musaes, 57 ff.
from Musaeus, 58.

Μῶιν, meanings of, 5, 7–11.
Oath of kings of Pontus, 70 n. f.
ἀθικαι, 99.
οἰκείθες, 97.
οἰκειόμενος, 98.
οἰκείθι, 97.
ὁίκος (οἰκήμα), meaning of, 11.
Old temple, i.e. Erechtheum, 8 n., 18–23.
passages referring to, 8 n., 9 n., 26 f.
προαερ (πρειαρ), meanings of, 5–7.
Opisthodomus, views on, 1–3.
a separate building, 3–17.
passages relating to, 3–5, 12, 13, 14.
situation of, 17 f., 38–40, 48–53.
Opisthodomus — continued.
the restored Opisthodomus of the Hecatopodeton, 39 f., 44–48.
meaning and application of the word, 38, 41 f., 51–53.
trustworthiness of tradition about, 41–43.
other opisthodomi, 15, 40, 51 n.
Ovid, comp. of iacio, 141 ff.

Papas, old Phrygian god, 64 n., 66 n.
Parthenon, passages referring to, 9 n., 10 n.
not the temple of Athena Polias, 30–33.
earlier Parthenon, 22 f., 27.

Peterse, on Opisthodomus, 2.
on ‘old temple’ and temple of Athena Polias, 19.
on age of Hecatompedon, 24 n.

Phaedrus, comp. of iacio, 145 f.

Philius, trag., 78 n.
Phrygian, ancient religion, 64 f., 72 f.
priests in Athens, 68 n.
‘Phrygian’ used in geographical sense, 74.

Plato, Homeric quotations in, 153 ff.
Plautus, comp. of iacio, 130 ff.
Pleiad, Alexandreine, 78 f.

Póld, application of, 36–38. See also Athena Polias.

Pompeii, Pompeiis, etc., 93 f.
Pompeii, 94.

Pompeius, etc., 108, 110.

Popular etymology, 66, 73.

Praenomen, encroachment of Roman, 59 n.

Prepositions w. iacio, 87 ff., 104 ff., 120, 121 ff.
short before -icio, 99 ff.
contracted w. -icio, 113 ff.

prōcius, 116.
proicius, 111.
proicius, 112.
propiciatio, 110.

Propertius, comp. of iacio, 138.

Quantity of prepos. before iacio, 87 f., 99 ff., 104 ff.

Ramsay, W. M., 57–59, 62, 64 n., 65 n. f., 73 f.

rēce, 116.
rēecer, 114, 116.
rēcius, 114.
rēcius, 116.
rēcius, 114.

Religion of eastern Lydia and western Phrygia, 63 ff., 73 f.

Rhea, 64 n.

Ribbeck, on -icio etc., 85.
on disicio, 123 f.

Ritsch, on -icio etc., 84.

Sabazius, 65 n., 73.
relation to Attis and Mēn, 65 n.
Zeus Sabazios, 62 n., 73.

Scenic poets, Roman, comp. of iacio, 134 f.

Schmitz, W., on -icio etc., 86.

Senea, comp. of iacio, 146 f.

Serenus Sammon., comp. of iacio, 151.

Silius Italicus, comp. of iacio, 148 f.

Sophocles, Aristotle’s quotations from, 156 f.

Sosipha, not tragic poet, 78 n.

Sositheus, 78 n.

Soson, 65 n., 73.

Statius, quantity before -icio, 102.
comp. of iacio, 149 f.

Subicius, 87.

Sulla, era of, 57, 61 f., 73.
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σύνβισις, 56, 61.
συμβλέπων, leps, 72 n.
Syncretism, 65 n.

Ταῖστ (Τιαντ = Τιαματ), 68 n.
Τεbu( (= Θαμ-τε, Τιαματ), 68 n.
ταμείωσασ, ἐχθρον, 72 n.
Terentius, comp. of iacio, 133.
Thamte (Tiamat), 68, 70 f.
Theocritus, not tragic poet, 78 n.
Tiamat, 68 f.
without sex, 69 n.
Τιμησα, 56, 68 ff.
significance of (κατακληματικος), 68. See also under Μην Τιαμο.
Tibullus, comp. of iacio, 138.
Τιμαλη, Τιλ, 72 f.
τραίλερε, 111.
τραίλερετ, 113.
τραίλετ, 112.
Τραγι, 110.
Τροιγεναί, 94, 108.
τόχο βασιλέων, Μην Φαράκον, 70 n. f.

Vahlen, on -icio etc., 85.
Valerius Flaccus, comp. of iacio, 147 f.
quantity before -icio, 102.
Variants, Homeric, antiquity of, 174 ff.
Varro, comp. of iacio, 136.
Vergilius, comp. of iacio, 139 ff., 145.
Votive tablet to Artemis Anaitis and Mēn Tiamu, 55 ff.

Wagner, on -icio etc., 84.
White, J. W., The Opisthodomus on the Acropolis at Athens, 1 ff.
Wright, J. H., A Votive Tablet to Artemis Anaitis and Mēn Tiamu in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 55 ff.

Zenodotus, date, 78.
Zeus, 64 n.
Ἄστρος, 69 n.
Μαρκαλατης, 72 n. bis.
Σαδεκωρ, 73 n.
σωφρος, 64 n.
Ταμαθος, 72 n. f.
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