



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI.—AN EPIC FRAGMENT FROM OXYRHYNCHUS.

A negative indication of the value of the recent discoveries at Oxyrhynchus may be seen in the fact that the interesting epic fragment No. CCXIV seems to have escaped notice in the mass of comments that the publication of the Oxyrhynchus papyri has called forth. The papyrus which is referred by the editors "with little hesitation to the third century," contains parts of forty-three hexameters, and is, unfortunately, much mutilated. The editors translate only vv. 1-5, though the restoration of 10-13 is also complete.

The editor's restoration of vv. 1-5 is sufficiently certain to permit the printing of the text in the usual manner, with indications of only the chief supplements at the end of each line :

- 1 ἔξαπίνης ἐπέδησεν ἀνώϊστο[ισι κλάδοισι
οὐ̄ κεν ἔτι ζῶοντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον [Ἄχαιοί·
ἔνθα δέ κεν Μενέλαος ἐκέκλιτο, ἔν[θ' Ἄγαμέμνων
ᾤλετο, καὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐν Ἄργείοις [Ἀχιλλῆα
5 Τήλεφος ἐξενάριξε πρὶν Ἐκτο[ρος ἀντίον ἐλθεῖν

The remaining verses to v. 16 as published in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. II, p. 28, are as follows :

- ἀλλ ὅποσον μοι καὶ τ[ο] ἀμννεμεν εἰ[
χραιοσησαι δε μοι α[. . . .] . α[
ἠ καὶ ἀπ ἀργεῖοι <ο> λαχεν γεν[ος] ἠρακλῆος
[τ]ηλεφον ἐν θαλαμοῖς πολεμῶν ἀπανε[υθε
10 [κλ]υτε μοι ἀθανάτοι [ξ]εὺς δ[ε π]λεον ὄν γενετηρα
δαρδανου ἠμετεροιο καὶ ἠ[ρα]κλῆος ἀκουω
καὶ τούτων φρασσασθε μαχῶν λυσιν ἴσα δε μῦθοις
[σ]υνθεσιη τρωεσσι καὶ ἀ[ργ]εῖοισι γε[ν]εσθω
[ο]υδε ἀργεῖους θανε[ε]ιν [. .] ἠσομαι αὐτη
15 ξανθοῦ φοιμαξάντες εἰ[. . . .] με . . χεῦμα καίκου
τηλεφου εἰφι το[. ου]κετι θωρηχθεντες

For the first two of these lines I have no suggestion to make, except that perhaps we should read in v. 7 *χραιοσησαι* δέ μοι

'Α[ργείους] a[. The supplement, if miswritten *αργίους*—cf. *ειφι* in v. 16 and the frequent interchange of *ει*—*ι* in the Homer papyrus No. CCXXIII “of the same period”—will contain exactly the number of letters required. The remainder I would restore as follows:

- εἰ καὶ ἀπ' Ἀργείοιο λάχεν γένος Ἡρακλήος*
 [Τηλέφον ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμων ἀπάνευθεν ἔοντα]
- 10 *κλυτὲ μοι ἀθάνατοι Ζεὺς δὲ πλεόν ὄν γενετῆρα*
Δαρδάνου ἡμετέροιο καὶ Ἡρακλήος ἀκούω
καὶ τούτων φράσσασθε μαχῶν λύσιν· ἴσα δὲ μύθοις
συνθεσίῃ Τρώεσσι καὶ Ἀργείοισι γενέσθω.
οὐδὲ <γὰρ> Ἀργείους θανέειν ἀρήσομαι αὐτῇ
- 15 *ξανθοῦ φοινίξαντας ἐν αἵματι χεῦμα Καΐκου*
Τηλέφου ἴφι δαμέντας· ὄτ' οὐκέτι θωρηχθέντες

To this I would add the following commentary:—That the word at the beginning of line 8 means ‘if’ admits of but little doubt. Merkel in his preface to the minor edition of Apollonius Rhodius, p. v, speaks of the use of *ἤ* for *εἰ*, but it seems to me more probable that we have here merely a mistake of the scribe; cf. the similar Homer papyrus No. CCXXIII, E 128, *εἰμεν* for *ἤμεν*, and v. 64, *ἴδει* for *ἤδη*, though the latter may not be wholly due to phonetic causes. As long as vv. 6–7 are unrestored, it must remain uncertain whether v. 8 is to be connected with them or with vv. 10 ff.; but at present I prefer the latter alternative. For if Telephus is actually (*καί*) the descendant of Herakles, then the speaker, Astyoche, has a double claim upon Zeus: *ὄν γενετῆρα | Δαρδάνου ἡμετέροιο καὶ Ἡρακλήος ἀκούω*. For the thought cf. Quintus Smyrnaeus, 10. 40, 319, and 8. 431 ff.: *Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἰ ἔτεόν γε τῆς ἕξι εἰμι γενέθλης . . . τῷ μεν νῦν ἐσάκουσον*, which affords also a parallel for the arrangement of the clauses—contrast, e. g., the prayer of the Cyclops, ι 528 ff. In this connection it may be noted that the author shows a similar unconventionality in his treatment of the unreal conditional sentence. In Homer, in unreal conditions of the past, the apodosis frequently, though not invariably (e. g. Ψ 526) precedes; cf. the examples cited GMT., §§435, 440. However, this is not the case in the present unreal condition; cf. GMT., §438, for the examples. This order seems to have impressed the later imitators of Homeric poetry as characteristic, and they have imitated it with great consistency, just as they show a marked tendency to employ *ποτί* as far as possible for *πρός*; cf. La Roche, Wiener Studien,

XXII 49. So in Apollonius Rhodius the apodosis precedes in I 1298; II 284, 626, 866, 987-995; III 584, 1139; IV 20, 901. The only exception is III 377 ff., which is practically an unreal condition of the present, and so conforms to the Homeric usage. So in the first seven books of Quintus we have this order: in I 447, 689, 775; II 507; III 26, 366, 514, 752; IV 301, 329, 563; V 359; VI 503, 542, 570, 644; VII 28, 142, as opposed to but two exceptions: III 444; V 583. Another departure from epic conventions is to be found in the use of the plural *κλῦτε* in a prayer for which I know of no parallel, the citing of Il. 8. 5 by Liddell and Scott being a blunder. Besides, the singular when used in prayer, and the plural in addresses to men, is almost (cf. Quintus, 9. 9) invariably the first word of the speech. For the phrase *λαχεῖν γένος* cf. Musaios 30 *διοτρεφές αἶμα λαχοῦσα* and Quintus 2. 434 *Ζηῆος ὑπερθύμοιο λαχὼν ἀριδείκτον αἶμα*.

But whether v. 8 be connected with what precedes or what follows, in neither case can v. 9 stand in its present position unless indeed *τηλεφον* be emended to *Τήλεφος*, in which case I do not see how a satisfactory close for the line can be obtained. The restitution suggested follows P 426 *μάχης ἀπάνευθεν ἔόντες*; a possible but less probable ending would have been *ἀπάνευθε μένοντα*. The occurrence of interpolated lines in the Homeric papyri is not uncommon, and the present instance is no more absurd than, e. g., the insertion after E 83 (O. P., vol. II, p. 101). I would offer the following explanation of its origin. The legend tells how the Greeks were at first successful, while Telephus was absent from the battle, but how he afterwards appeared and swept all before him, until finally he was wounded by Achilles. This crisis may very well have been introduced by some such lines as

*οὐδ' ἰαχὴ κρατεροῖο¹ λάθην γένος Ἡρακλήος
Τήλεφον ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμων ἀπάνευθεν ἔοντα*

For the general situation compare the opening of the fourteenth book of the Iliad; for the concrete use of *γένος*, Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1412, and Quintus 6. 120 *Εὐρύπυλον κρατεροῦ γένος Ἡρακλήος*. If this line is an interpolation coming from a source of this sort, it follows that the speech before us is embedded in a narrative of the landing of the Greeks in Mysia. And if this is the case, there can

¹Of course I do not mean to insist on the verbal exactness of the first half of this line. Another possibility would be, cf. Δ 456: *οὐδ' ἰαχὴ τε πόνος τε*.

hardly be any doubt that the poem was a working over of the material of the *Κύπρια*, bearing a relation to that poem similar to that which the *Τὰ μεθ' Ὀμηρον* of Quintus bear to the rest of the epic cycle. A further consequence is that the time of the delivery of this speech must be anterior to the situation in the *Iliad*. Now, this is in direct opposition to the conclusion which the editors draw from their translation of vv. 1-5. "The situation is therefore posterior to that in the *Iliad*," and as my restitution of vv. 14-16 turns in part on the same point, it is necessary to inquire into the cogency of this conclusion.

The editors evidently can not have based their conclusion upon the unreal condition in v. 2 *οὐ κεν ἔτι ζῶντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον Ἀχαιοί*, for the most that it could have been cited to prove would have been that the Greeks had landed in the Troas—a time ten years before the situation in the *Iliad*. As a fact, however, it does not prove even that much, for it is merely a case—of a type familiar to us all in English—where the speaker, under the stress of emotion, regards as already accomplished that which now seems certain to happen when, had it not been for something, it might have been placed once for all beyond the bounds of possibility. The editors must therefore have drawn their inference from their translation of vv. 4-5: "and Telephus would have slain Achilles, the best warrior among the Argives before he met Hector." "Before he met Hector" in English warrants the conclusion, but *πρὶν Ἐκτορος ἀντίον ἐλθεῖν* in Greek does not. This doctrine should at the present time need no proof, as it has long since been distinctly stated; cf. e. g. Foerster apud Sturm, *Die Entwicklung der Constructionen mit ΠΙΠΙΝ*, p. 7: "dass der Infinitiv nach *πρὶν* den Begriff einer reinen Handlung bezeichne ohne weitere Angabe, ob eine solche wirklich eingetreten sei oder nicht"; and especially Gildersleeve, *A. J. P.* 2. 468, n.: "*Πρὶν* is an *οὐπω*. The 'not yet' may come later, may never come. As I have said of *antequam* with the subjunctive, the antecedence is necessary, not so the consequence, *Ἀπέδρασαν πρὶν κριθῆναι*, Xen. Hell. 1, 7, 35. They never came to trial." And p. 474: "In Attic it [*πρὶν* with inf.] . . . is necessary . . . when the action does not take place or is not to take place (= *ὥστε μή*)." After this it seems unnecessary to cite examples, but Apollonius Rhodius, III 374, 660 (*πάρος*), 800, 1395 are all instructive, and Eur. *Rhesos* 59 ff. (cf. *Alc.* 362) may be quoted in full: *εἰ γὰρ φαενοὶ μὴ ξυνέσχον ἡλίου | λαμπτήρες, οὐκ ἂν ἔσχον εὐτυχοῦν δάρυ, | πρὶν*

ναῦς πυρῶσαι καὶ διὰ σκηρῶν μολεῖν | κτείνων Ἀχαιοὺς τῆδε πολυφόνῳ χερσί.
So that the only inference that can be drawn is that the situation is anterior to the first meeting of Hector and Achilles and anterior to the landing of the Greeks in Troy, i. e. that the author followed a version of the legend different from that of the source of Tzetzes; cf. his Τὰ πρὸ Ὅμηρου, 260 ff.

Since this is the case, no objection can be brought to bear on the restitution of ἀρ]ήσομαι in line 14. At the beginning of this line the editors suggest οὐδέ <κεν>, I prefer, however, οὐδὲ <γάρ>, not only because it makes a better connection with what precedes, but also because the omission of γάρ before Ἀργείους is more easily explained.

In line 15, φοινίξαντες must, as the syntax shows, be either a misreading or miswriting for φοινίξαντας. Against ἐ[ν αἴ]μα[τι] may be brought objections of both a palaeographical and syntactical nature. In the first place the editors indicate that the lacuna is large enough to hold four letters; but N and A are letters that take a great deal of space, and, in the absence of a facsimile of this fragment, a comparison of the space occupied by ΝΑΙ in τὸν δ' ἴδεν Διεύιας—No. CCXXIII, plate I, l. 13—which is equal to that sometimes occupied by four letters, will show that these letters may probably be considered as sufficient to fill the gap. The editors give the next two letters as με, which forces the assumption of a mistake on the part of the scribe, a difficulty that is lessened by his other mistakes—η, ἀργεῖοι, omission of <γάρ> and εἰφι—and to my mind is outweighed by the fact that the proposed reading fits both metre and sense, if it be admitted that the author would use ἐν with the dative as the equivalent of the instrumental.

This construction originates in the fact that frequently the same object may be considered either as the instrument or as the place in which an action happens. Hence we find, e. g., both πυρὶ κάειν and ἐν πυρὶ κάειν, the consequence of which is to efface the distinction that originally existed, and to extend the same duality of construction to other verbs where it is no longer logically justified. The beginnings of this encroachment of ἐν with the dative upon the instrumental dative go back to classical times; cf. Kühner-Gerth³, II 1, p. 464 f.; Lutz, Die Praepositionen bei den attischen Rednern, p. 36; Sobolewski, De praepositionum usu Aristoph., p. 26 f.; that it spread in post-classical times is recognized; cf. Jannaris, Hist. Gr. Gram., §1562, and for Polybius, Krebs, Schanz,

Beiträge, I, p. 71 f.; but the extent of its use in late epic poetry, in the absence of a monograph, is difficult to determine. From Apollonius I have noted: 2. 44 *φαιδρὸς ἐν ὄμμασιν*, rendered by Lehrs *alacer oculis*; contrast Arist. Knights 550 *φαιδρὸς λάμποντι μετώπῳ*; 4. 904 *ἐν χερσὶν εἰς φόρμιγγα τανύσσας* = *manibus suis citharam intendens*. Compare also Musaios 159 *θυμὸν ἐρωτοτόκοισι παραπλάγξας ἐνὶ μύθοις* = *animum amorem-parientibus seducens* (in) *verbis*; Quintus I. 343 *ὄβριμον ἐν στέρνοισιν ἀναπνεύοντες Ἄρρη* = *pectore spirantes*; I. 400 *τὰ δ' ἐν ποσὶν ἡμάλδυνεν* = *alias pedibus conculcat*; 4. 18 *τὸν δ' ἐν πυρὶ δηωθέντα* = *igni consumptum*; contrast Soph. O. C. 1319 *ἄστυ δηώσειν πυρὶ*; 4. 225 *συνέμαρψεν ἐνὶ στιβαρῆσι χέρεσσι* (?) = *corripuit robustis manibus*; and especially 4. 341 *μίξαι ἐν αἵματι χείρας ἀπειρέας* = *ut-tingerent sanguine manus invictas*. Furthermore, it may be noted that the MSS read in Eur. El. 1172 *ἀλλ' οἶδε μητρὸς νεοφόνους ἐν αἵμασι | πεφυρμένοι . . . πόδα*, and that the Laurentianus reads in Soph. O. T. 821 *λέχη δὲ τοῦ θανόντος ἐν χερσὶν ἐμαῖν | χραίνω*. Both passages have been corrected, but the errors, if errors they be, are not without significance for the later Greek usage. The above facts may, I think, warrant us in accepting for this poem the construction of *φονίσσειν ἐν αἵματι* instead of the usual *φονίσσειν αἵματι*, for which compare the examples cited in Liddell and Scott, and Quintus 9. 179.

The use of *φι* in l. 16 in a periphrasis is without parallel, in Homer or Apollonius, nor do I know of an example from Quintus. The restitution of the next word is suggested by the frequent combination of *ἴφι δαμῆναι*; cf. also Quintus 6. 251 *βίη ῥοπάλοιο δαμέντα—βίη: ἴς = βίη: ἴφι*. The supplement proposed has exactly the number of letters indicated by the editors and accounts, besides, for the change to the nominative in *θωρηχθέντες*. For it to have been miswritten *ταμεντας* would have been nothing unusual, as the interchange of *τ* and *δ* in Egypt is very frequent; cf. No. CCXXIII, *passim*; Blass, *Aussprache*, p. 106.

In general style the poem seems to stand much nearer to the level of Quintus than of Apollonius, and I should not for that reason be inclined to place the time of its composition much before that of the writing of the papyrus.

A correspondence in mythology with Quintus remains to be noticed. The speaker is Astyoche, the wife of Telephus and daughter or granddaughter of Dardanus; the time is between the wounding of Telephus and the departure of the Greeks; everything would indicate also a time of truce, and hence there

can be little doubt that this poet's version of the healing of Telephus was the same as that followed by Quintus 4. 172 ff.:

(ἵππους) τοὺς πρόσθεν εὐμελίη Ἀχιλῆι
 Τηλέφος ὅπασε δῶρον ἐπὶ προχοῇσι Καΐκου
 εὐτέ ἐ μοχθίζοντα κακῶ περι ἔλκεϊ θυμὸν
 ἠκέσατ' ἐγχείη τῆ μιν βάλει δριμόωντα
 αὐτὸς ἔσω μηροῖο.

which Welcker, *Kleine Schriften*, III, p. 30, n., regarded as an invention of the Smyrnaean poet.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, *Feb.* 4, 1901.