

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Notes on the Text of the Parian Marble.—I

J. Arthur R. Munro

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 03 / April 2009, pp 149 - 154
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0002984X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0002984X

How to cite this article:

J. Arthur R. Munro (2009). Notes on the Text of the Parian Marble.—I. The Classical Review, 15, pp 149-154 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0002984X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

And this really seems to be the solution: there is another alternative.

What is here said of the procedure in the *Odyssey* is an illustration of a principle laid down at the beginning of the chapter, which Homer, Aristotle says, understood (τοῦτ' εἰσικεν καλῶς ἰδεῖν):—1451^a 16, μῦθος δ' ἐστὶν εἰς οὐχ ὥσπερ τινὲς οἴονται εἶναι περὶ ἓνα ἢ πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἄπειρα τῶ ἐνὶ συμβαίνειν, ἐξ ὧν [ἐνίων] οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐν· οὕτως δὲ καὶ πράξεις ἐνός πολλαί εἰσιν, ἐξ ὧν μία οὐδεμία γίνεται πράξις. 'A story is not a unity, as some people fancy, because it is about one person, for innumerable things happen to one person out of which no unity can be made' etc.

So here, in our passage, Aristotle says 'Homer, when composing a poem about one man, Odysseus, nevertheless did not put in it everything which happened to his hero, [for, as said above, things happened to him which could not be combined into a unity,—συνέβη ἐξ ὧν οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐν] for instance it happened to him (συνέβη) on the one hand that he was wounded on Parnassus, and on the other hand that he pretended to be mad, neither of which events had any necessary or probable connection with the other' [and so could not be combined in the same unity.]

Thus in the clause οἷον πληγῆναι κ.τ.λ., with which συνέβη must be understood, Aristotle does not assert either that Homer put in the first event and omitted the

second, or that he omitted both; but only gives them as examples of incidents which could not be combined into a unity, examples therefore which shew that Homer could not put in everything alike which happened to Odysseus (οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἅπαντα ὅσα αὐτῷ συνέβη) because they are such that he could not put in both. And that is all. It is not said how, exactly, the poet treated the incidents, e.g. which of them he left out, and it would make no difference to Aristotle's point if neither had happened to occur in the poem.

The sense then is shortly 'Homer who appreciated (καλῶς εἶδε) the principle above laid down, did not put in his poem everything which happened to his hero: for example here are two incidents, which have no conceivable connection with one another etc. [which could not therefore be combined into a unity; so that, according to our principle, one or other must be left out.]'

The logical and grammatical difficulties would thus seem to disappear.

It may be added that the words ἀναγκαῖον ἢ εἰκός are emphatic. The expression 'no necessary or probable connection' comes very near our phrase 'no conceivable connection.' The emphasis is very appropriate on the interpretation here suggested, but on the other interpretations seems rather lacking in point.

J. COOK WILSON.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE PARIAN MARBLE.—I.

IN revising the text of the Parian Marble with a view to a new edition I have hit upon certain supplements and corrections, which I publish at once, partly at the instance of Dr. Hiller von Gaertringen, who is preparing the inscriptions of Paros for the *Corpus Insularum*, partly in the hope of drawing suggestions from other scholars.

The text naturally falls into three parts corresponding to the three fragments of the stone. The first fragment, lines 1 to 45, disappeared¹ in the seventeenth century, and its text is known to us only from Selden's edition in his *Marmora Arundelli-*

ana, 1628 and 1629. The second is now in the University Galleries at Oxford, but has suffered so much from exposure and neglect that the text is in many places better preserved in the earlier editions than on the stone. The third fragment was discovered about four years ago in Paros, and remains in the local museum at Paroikia, where I have collated it.

This last portion has been excellently edited by Crispi and Wilhelm in *Mittheilungen des Instituts, Athenische Abtheilung*, xxii. 1897, pp. 183–217. For the rest Boeckh's great edition in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, vol. ii. no. 2374, is the standard. It is the foundation on which all later editors have built, and enjoys such unquestioned acceptance that even in scholarly works Boeckh's restorations are commonly quoted as if they had the

¹ Prideaux says in his preface that this fragment was used to repair a fireplace in Arundel House, presumably a marble chimney-piece. If so, it may yet be recovered, for such a piece of furniture would be likely to be removed entire, and the slab may have been made into a panel or shelf and still retain the inscription on its inner face.

authority of the Marble itself. Boeckh has indeed done more for the restoration and interpretation of the text than anyone since Selden, and more than anyone will ever be able to do again. But his edition has not the finality which has sometimes been attributed to it. Perhaps no edition can ever be final, for the reconstruction of the text is a very difficult matter. In some places the inscription has been so extensively mutilated that no supplement can be more than a happy divination. The size and closeness of the writing vary so much that one line may contain 30 letters more than another. Selden's text (as Palmerius long ago demonstrated) does not always preserve the spaces of the original, his gaps are only very roughly measured, and his dots seldom represent, and do not seem to be meant to represent, the number of letters missing. It is not surprising that even Boeckh's wide learning and wonderful sagacity are sometimes at fault. But his edition is still beyond all comparison the best hitherto published, and the bulk of his work need never be done again. I take my start from Boeckh's achievements, and discuss only points in which I think that his text can still be mended.

I.

Ep. 4. Lines 6-8. 'Αφ' οὐ κατακλυσμός ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος ἐγένετο, καὶ Δευκαλίων τοὺς || ὄμβρους ἔφυγεν ἐν Λυκωρείας εἰς Ἄθηνas πρὸ[s Κρανα]όν, καὶ ΤΟΥΔΙΟ . . . ΥΟ . . . Δ . . . Μ ΤΟΥΤΟΙΡ . . . ΟΝΙΑ Ο . . . τὰ σωτήρια ἔθυσεν, || [ε]τη ΧΗΗ[□]ΔΓ, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηνῶν Κρ[α]ν[α]οῦ.

Boeckh restores τοῦ Διὸ[s το]ῦ Ὀ[μβρίου] Ἀπη[μ]ί[ου] τὸ ἱερόν ἰδ[ρύσατ]ο [καί], comparing Pausanias i. 32, 2, ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῇ Πάρνηθι καὶ ἄλλος βωμός, θύουσι δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τοτὲ μὲν Ὀμβριον τοτὲ δὲ Ἀπήμιον καλοῦντες Δία. But the altar on Parnes is not here to the point, and Boeckh's attempt to treat seriously Selden's spaces and dots breaks down. Probably Selden copied first what was obvious and afterwards what was difficult, but his gaps proved too wide and his supplements were badly adjusted. It is better to revert to Chandler's restoration, based on Prideaux, τοῦ Διὸ[s το]ῦ Ὀ[λυ]μ[πι]ου τὸ ἱ[ε]ρόν ἰδ[ρύσατ]ο [καί]. Cf. Paus. i. 18, 8, τοῦ δὲ Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς Δευκαλίωνα οἰκοδομήσαι λέγουσι τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱερόν. On ἱερόν not ἱρόν see Wilhelm's observations in Ath. Mitth. xxii. p. 199.

Ep. 5. Lines 8-10. 'Αφ' οὐ Ἀμφικτύων Δευκαλίωνος ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις, καὶ συνήγε || [τ]οὺς περὶ ΤΟΝΟΠΟΝ οἰκοῦντας καὶ ὤ[νό]μασεν Ἀμφικτύονας κ.τ.λ.

Wilhelm (l.c.) convincingly argues that for τὸν ὄρον we ought to read ΤΟΙΕΠΟΝ, τὸ ἱερόν.

Ep. 7. Lines 12-13. 'Αφ' οὐ Κάδμος ὁ Ἀγῆνορος εἰς Θήβας ἀφίκετο [καί] ἔκτισεν τὴν Καδμεί- || -αν, ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

Palmerius supplied κατὰ χρῆσιν with reference to the oracle about the cow. Boeckh suggested ἐκ Φοινίκης comparing lines 14-5, ἐξ Αἰγύπτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔπλευσε. (Cf. also Herod. ii. 49, παρὰ Κάδμου τε τοῦ Τυρίου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ Φοινίκης ἀπικομένων ἐς τὴν νῦν Βοιωτίαν καλεομένην χώραν cf. v. 57). Flach justly observes that the number of words in lines 14-5 is different and tells against Boeckh's suggestion. (Cf. also line 7, above, and line 51 Σαπφῶ ἐν Μυτιλήνης εἰς Σικελίαν ἔπλευσε.) Flach conjectures τῆς Βοιωτίας, which is flat, and supported neither by Herodotus nor by the practice of the Marble. Perhaps, as the line seems a little too short, κατ' Εὐρώπης ζήτησιν might stand. This phrase, or its equivalent, is so frequent in connection with Cadmus, that it suggests that either one chapter of the Cadmean legend was known as 'the quest of Europa,' or some poem, which was a favourite authority for the legend, bore that title. Cf. Herod. iv. 147, Diod. Sic. v. 48 and 58, Ap. Rhod. iii. 1178, Apollod. iii. 1, Schol. Eurip. Phoen. 638, Syncell. p. 306 (Bonn), etc., and the Δήμητρος ζήτησις attributed to Orpheus in line 26 below.

Ep. 8. Lines 13-14. 'Αφ' οὐ []υκῆς ἐβασίλευσαν, ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

Boeckh justly suspects that the lacuna is too small in Selden's text. He is clearly right in preferring Lydiat's Λακωνικῆς to Selden's Φοινικῆς, but I cannot follow him in accepting the supplement Εὐρώπας καὶ Λακεδαίμων. It is neither recorded nor probable that Eurotas reigned simultaneously with his son-in-law¹ Lacedaemon, and neither of them has a strong claim to be mentioned.

I conjecture 'Αφ' οὐ [Σπαρτοί, μετὰ Κάδμου ἐκπεσόντες, Λακωνικῆς ἐβασίλευσαν, or something to that effect. The suggestion is based on the proximity of Cadmus in space and

¹ Lydiat does not prove his statement that Eurotas and Lacedaemon were sometimes regarded as brothers. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ταύγετον only shows that Taygete might be made the mother of either.

time (Ep. 7, three years earlier, cf. Eusebius (Schoene) Ann. Abr. 696 and 700) and the words *Λακωνικῆς ἐβασίλευσαν*. The Sparti furnish not only a link between these two terms, but also an explanation of the name Sparta, which would be quite in the manner of this part of the chronicle, cf. *Κεκροπία*, *Ἀκτική*, *Ἄρειος πάγος*, *Ἀμφικτύονες*, *Ἕλληνες*, *Καδμεία*, *πεντηκόντορος*, κ.τ.λ. On the Sparti in Laconia, cf. Steph. Byz. *Σπάρτη*, *Λακωνικὸν χωρίον, ἀπὸ τῶν μετὰ Κάδμου Σπαρτῶν, περὶ ὧν Τιμαγόρας φησὶν ἐκπεσόντας δὲ αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Λακωνικὴν Σπάρτην ἀφ' ἐαντῶν ὀνομάσαι*.

The Aegidae, *φυλὴ μεγάλη ἐν Σπάρτῃ* (Herod. iv. 149), were sometimes derived from these immigrant Sparti (e.g. Schol. Pind. Pyth. v. 101, Tzetzes, Lyc. 495). Theras, whom Herodotus regards as the grandfather of Aegeus, was a Cadmean, and *ἐπιτροπαίην εἶχε τὴν ἐν Σπάρτῃ βασιληίην* (Herod. iv. 147). One Admetus, priest of the Carnean Apollo in Thera, and so presumably an Aegid, boasts his descent *Λακεδαίμονος ἐκ βασιλῆων* in a pair of inscriptions of Roman date, C.I.G.I., iii. 868-9. These royal pretensions may be put beside the *ἐβασίλευσαν* of the chronicle.

Possibly Plato's fondness for the myth of Cadmus and his earth-born warriors may be connected with his interest in Sparta.

Ep. 9. Lines 14-17. In line 16 certain of the daughters of Danaus ἀποκληροθεΐσαι ὑπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν [ἱερὸν ἰδρύσ]αντ[ο Ἀθηνᾶς] || καὶ ἔθισαν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκτῆς ἐμ ΠΑΡΑ . . ΑΔΙ ἐν Λίνδῳ τῆς Ῥοδίας.

On ΠΑΡΑ . . ΑΔΙ Selden adds in his note (p. 74) 'Ex elementorum, quae supersunt in Marmore, vestigiis elicuerit forsitan quis ΠΑΡΑΡΑΔΙ aut ΠΑΡΑΓΑΔΙ.' Since therefore Selden evidently paid some attention to this word Boeckh's remark 'pro infaustis aliorum conatibus certam dedi emendationem ἐμ παράπλω' must be pronounced reckless. I had long decided that παρα[στ]άδι must be the right reading, when I was astonished to find it lurking unheeded in Palmerius' commentary. The editors seem to have wholly ignored this convincing suggestion, and perpetuated only Palmerius' impossible alternative παρα[λι]άδι. For ἐμ παραστάδι compare the formula so common in the inscriptions of Iasus, C.I.G. ii. 2672 sqq., ἀναγράφαι εἰς παραστάδα, or ἐν τῇ παραστάδι τῇ πρὸ τοῦ ἀρχείου.

Line 16 is obviously too short, but it is difficult to decide how to fill it out. The whole subject of the Danaids at Lindus needs clearing up.

At the beginning of line 16, among the names of the Danaids, Selden gives . . ΛΑΡΕΥΩ. To one who knows the stone the obvious emendation is ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΩ, and just as Archedice does not occur elsewhere among the Danaids, so Καλλιστώ may perhaps be admitted. Καλλιδική is found in Apollodorus, whose list differs widely from Hyginus'.

Ep. 10. Lines 17-21. Among other events Hyagnis the Phrygian invented flutes [καὶ ἁρμονίαν τὴν κ|α||λουμένην Φρυγιστὶ πρῶτος ἠύλησε καὶ ἄλλους νόμους Μητρός, Διονύσου, Πανός, καὶ τὸν ἐπ|

It should be noticed that the νόμοι are all associated with a particular deity. Boeckh's restoration τὸν ἐπ[ὶ Πυθῶνι ἐπικήδειον Λυδιστὶ], cf. Plut. de Mus. 15, is the only one which entirely harmonizes with the series, and although he does not print it in his cursive version, its appropriateness seems to me to outweigh the fact that this νόμος was attributed by Aristoxenus to Olympus. Perhaps τῷ Πυθῶνι (as in Plutarch) would, as Flach observes, be an improvement; and I should omit Λυδιστὶ, which is at least unnecessary after ἄλλους νόμους, and to my mind a little out of tune with the rest of the passage.

Ep. 11. Lines 21-23. καὶ Ἄκμονος, the name of the third Dactyl, inserted by Boeckh, makes the line rather long. Palmerius and Prideaux more prudently restricted themselves to two, especially as the discovery of iron is elsewhere actually ascribed to Kelmis and Damnameus without Acmon, v. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. 75.

Ep. 12. Lines 23-24. Ἀφ' οὗ Δημήτηρ ἀφικομένη εἰς Ἀθῆνας καρπὸν ἐφύ[τε]υεν, καὶ ΠΡ . . . ΠΡΑ . . . ΩΤΗ δ[εῖξαντος || Τ]ριπτολέμου τοῦ Κελεοῦ καὶ Νεαίρας, ἔτη ΧΗΔΔΔΔΠ[Ι], βασιλεύοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἐριχθέως.

Boeckh restored πρ[ό]πειρα ἐ[π]ρά[χθη] πρ[ό]πη, but evidently felt some misgivings as to the conjunction of the first two of these words. With great confidence I suggest πρ[ο]σηροσία ἐ[π]ρά[χθη] πρ[ό]πη. Cf. Hesych. προηροσία: τὰ πρὸ τοῦ ἀρότου (ἀρότρου cod.) θύματα: Suidas προηροσία: αἱ πρὸ τοῦ ἀρότου (ἀρότρου cod.) γινόμεναι θυσίαι. On the whole festival and its relation to Demeter and Eleusis, see A. Mommsen, *Heortologie*.

Boeckh writes δεξάντων, but it is more likely that Neaera is meant to be the mother of Triptolemus than his helper. Many different mothers are assigned to him.

I have added | to the numeral to distinguish this *epoch* from the next, for nowhere in the chronicle are two *epochs* dated at the same year. Boeckh adopts Lydiat's expedient, and reads || for Π in Ep. 13. But it is obviously better to set the ploughing and sowing in close connection in consecutive years. This point has some bearing on the question of the season from which the chronicler reckons his years.

Ep. 14. Lines 25–27. [Ἄφ' οὐ Ὀρφεὺς Οἰάγρον]|| υἱὸς τῆ|ν αὐτοῦ πο[ί]ησιν ἐξ[έ]θηκε, Κόρης τε ἀρπαγῆν καὶ Δήμητρος ζήτησιν καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ []θος τῶν ὑποδεξαμένων τὸν καρπὸν κ.τ.λ. One would expect τῆν αὐτοῦ εἰς αἶδου κατάβασιν (see Boeckh's note), but Selden's copy has τόν. Boeckh therefore restored καταβαθμόν, but quotes no parallel for this rather odd use of the word. Perhaps, in view of the prominence of water in the Orphic pictures of the nether world, κατάπλους might be used. Cf. e.g. Hermesianax in Athenaeus xiii. 597, ἔπειλευσεν δὲ κακὸν καὶ ἀπεχθέα χῶρον κ.τ.λ.

For the latter half of the *lacuna* Boeckh's first idea was τὸ θεῖον πάθος, and it seems to me happier than his second thought τὸ γῆθος. I would add to it ἐκεῖ, for which there is room enough, to make the meaning clear and precise.

The whole passage will then run—καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ [εἰς αἶδου κατάπλουον καὶ τὸ θεῖον|| ἐκεῖ πά]θος τῶν ὑποδεξαμένων τὸν καρπὸν. On the general sense consult Boeckh's admirable note.

In line 26 Selden has πόησιν both in his uncial and in his cursive text, and Boeckh retains it. But, without reckoning ἰαμβοποιος and the like words, ποιητῆς or ποιήσις occur 16 times in the extant portions of the chronicle, and ἐποίησεν once. The omission of the *iota* here seems more likely to be due to Selden than to the author.

Ep. 16. Lines 29–30. Ἄφ' οὐ καθαρμὸς πρῶτον ἐγένετο ΟΥΓΡΩΤΩΙΑΟΝ . . . EANT || [ἔτη Χ^α]ΔΙ|, βασιλεύοντος Πανδίωνος τοῦ Κέκροπος.

None of the conjectures hitherto proposed are satisfactory. Boeckh, partly following the lead of his predecessors, writes [φόν]ου, πρώτω|ν [Ἄ]θηναίων καθηρ|άντ[ων] Ἡρακλέα|. I would suggest [Μελάμποςδος πρώτ]ου Πρ[οι]τ[ί]δ[ω]ν [παύ]σαντ[ος τὴν μανίαν], which is nearer to the copy than it looks at first sight, and still leaves the line rather a short one. Cf. Eusebius Ann. Abr. 642

and 649 (Arm.), 647 and 650 (Hieron.), where Melampus follows in the next note after Eumolpus (cf. Ep. 15); and especially Apollodorus ii. 2, 2, 4, Μελάμπος δὲ μάντις ὃν καὶ τὴν διὰ φαρμάκων καὶ καθαρμῶν θεραπείαν πρῶτος εὐρηκὸς ὑπισχνεῖται θεραπεύσειν τὰς παρθένους κ.τ.λ. The letters EANT point to -σ|αντ[ος] rather than καθήρ|αντ[ος], and πανσ|αντ[ος] fits the space better than θεραπευσ|αντ[ος]. Cf. Alexis in Athenaeus viii. 340, ὁ Μελάμπος, ὃς μόνος τὰς Προϊτίδας ἔπασσε μαινομένης : Schol. Eur. Phoen. 181, ἐπλανῶντο ἀνὰ τὴν χώραν ἐς ὃ Μελάμπος ὁ Ἄμυθάνος ἔπασσε σφᾶς τῆς νόσου : Steph. Byz. Δουσσόι : ὅπου Μελάμπος ἔλουσε τὰς Προίτου θυγατέρας, καὶ ἔπασσε τῆς μανίας.

There is great diversity in the dates assigned to Melampus and Proetus, v. Clinton, Fast. Hell. i. p. 74. The restoration of the numeral here is due to Lydiat, who acutely observed that no other number ending in Δ|| could fall within the reign of Pandion II.

Ep. 17. Lines 30–32. Ἄφ' οὐ [ἐ]ν Ἐλευσίνι ὁ γυμνικὸς ΑΦΟΥ || . . . Α| . . τὰ Λύκαια ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ ἐγένετο, καὶ Λ . . ΚΚΕ Λυκίονος ἐδόθησαν . . τοῖς Ἑλλ[η]σιν [ἐ]ν ἔτ]η κ.τ.λ.

There can be no doubt that ἀγὼν ἐπέθη must follow γυμνικὸς, but ΑΦΟΥ is difficult, for considerations of space absolutely preclude us from starting a fresh *epoch* here, as was done by some of the earlier commentators. Boeckh ingeniously conjectured Κ|Α|Ι|ΟΥ|Σ|ΙΑ βρέφους ἀνθρώπου κ|αι|, (cf. Paus. viii. 2), but the double subject θυσία καὶ τὰ Λύκαια scarcely suits ἐγένετο, and the position of ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ is very awkward. Ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ ought to answer to ἐν Ἐλευσίνι, and everything before καὶ τὰ Λύκαια ought to be connected with Eleusis, not with Arcadia. A passage in the Hymn to Demeter, lines 263–7, has suggested to me the restoration ἐπὶ Τ|ΑΦ|Ω|Ι Δημοφώντος τοῦ Κελεοῦ, κ|αι|, which at least illustrates the sort of supplement required.

For the second *lacuna* Boeckh considered [αἰ ἐ]κκ[ηρύξεις τοῦ] Λυκίονος a certain restoration, which he interpreted 'de praconibus novos ludos per Graeciam nuntiantibus.' Müller justly objected to the unknown word ἐκκηρύξεις and substituted ἐκεχειρία, which is accepted by Flach. But neither word quite fits ἐδόθησαν, and both ideas are mere weak developments of the preceding clause. This is the right place for a reference to the human sacrifices which

formed part of the Lycaean festival and were ascribed to the institution of Lycaon. Part of a human victim was chopped up with the flesh of the other animals sacrificed, and served out to the communicants. Whoever at this ghastly sacrament chanced to eat of the human flesh was supposed to become a wolf. [Αἰ] κ[ρ]ε[ανομίαι] Λυκάονος seems to me to give the right expression, and to suit the vestiges well enough, for κ is written narrow with short tails, so that ΚΡ might easily be misread as ΚΚ.

It is difficult to say whether the space for two letters [έν] before τοῖς Ἑλλῆσιν is deliberate or casual. There is a similar gap between καὶ and τὰ Λύκαια, and such maladjustments are bound to occur in a copy gradually puzzled out—a bit here and a bit there and a bit between. But έν τοῖς Ἑλλῆσιν would rather gain by my restoration, for the insertion of έν emphasizes the un-Hellenic character of the practice. Cf. Plato, *Minos*, 315 C, καὶ μὴ ὅτι βάρβαροι ἄνθρωποι ἡμῶν ἄλλοις νόμοις χρώνται, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ έν τῇ Λυκαίᾳ οὗτοι καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ἀθάμαντος ἔργοι οἷας θυσίας θύουσιν Ἑλλῆνες ὄντες.

Ep. 20. *Lines* 34–36. Ἀφ' οὗ Θησ[εὺς βασιλεύων] || Ἀθηνῶν τὰς δώδεκα πόλεις εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συνώικισεν καὶ πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν ΑΠΡΕΩ || ΟΣ Ἀθηνῶν τὸν τῶν Ἰσθμίων ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε Σίνιν ἀποκτείνας, κ.τ.λ.

Boeckh gives ἀπ[εδ]ω[κε, καὶ ἀπογενόμενος] Ἀθηνῶν. Ἀπέδωκε seems certain, but ἀπογενόμενος is a little colourless. On the other hand Gutschmid's ἐκὼν ἀπαλασσόμενος (why present?), quoted by Flach, is unnecessarily emphatic, although the words τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἀπέδωκε point to a voluntary abdication, cf. Plutarch, *Thes.* 24 and 25. Perhaps μεταστὰς αὐτὸς would hit the mean without missing the antithesis.

Ep. 22. *Lines* 37–38. I much prefer Boeckh's suggestion ἐπ' Ἀρχεμόρωι τῷ Δι, which he prints. It is much more like the chronicle to give the occasion, cf. Σίνιν ἀποκτείνας above, ἐλόντες Κυρῆραν in *Ep.* 37, and there is no real lack of space, for the lines are long (that is to say closely written) in this part of the inscription.

Ep. 25. *Lines* 40–41. Ἀφ' οὗ Ὀρέστη[ς] . . . ΙΟΙΑΙΤΩΝΑΥΤΟ [Α]ἰγίσθου θυγατρὶ [Ἡρυγ]όν[η] ὑπὲρ Αἰγίσθου, καὶ αἰ[τοῖς] ἢ δι- || -κη ἐδικ[ά]σθη έν Ἀρεί[ω] πάγω, ἦν Ὀρέστης ἐνίκησεν [ἴσων γενομένων] τῶν ψήφων, ἔτη [Ὶ]ΗΗΗΗΔΔΔ[ΔΙ]||, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηνῶν Δημοφῶντος.

Boeckh restored Ὀρέστη[ς] πρ[ο]σ[α]ιτῶν αὐτ[ο]ῦ δίκην ὑπέσχευ[εν] κ.τ.λ., but did not satisfy himself. Perhaps Ὀρέστη[ς] ἐπὶ προνοίαι τῶν αὐτοχειρῶν ἐδικάσατο might stand in default of a better suggestion. It does not quite convince me, but it has the advantages of keeping all the letters of Selden's copy and giving a sense more pertinent to the case. Not all αὐτοχειρίαι were judged by the court of Areopagus, but only αὐτοχειρίαι ἐκ προνοίας, v. *Arist. Ath. Pol.* 57, cf. Plato, *Laws* ix. esp. 865 B, C, 871 A.

ἴσων γενομένων is more natural than Boeckh's ἰσοθεισῶν. In both lines I allow more letters than Boeckh, but keep well within the number preserved in several complete lines.

In the numeral Boeckh supplies ΠΙ, but since it is impossible to conform the number to Homer, *Od.* iii. 304–8, I think that the first year of Demophon's reign is the date most probably intended.

Ep. 26. *Lines* 41–42. Ἀφ' οὗ [Σαλα- || -μίνα ἐγ] Κύπρωι Τεύκρος ὠικισεν, κ.τ.λ.

The editors restore έν Κύπρωι, but compare ἐγ Κυβέλοισι and ἐγ Κελαιναῖς (line 19), ἐγ Κυζίκωι and ἐγ Κῶι (lines 14 and 23 of the new fragment), ἐγ Γέλαι (line 74, clearly ΕΓ on the stone). The exception έν Γάζει (lines 19–20 of the new fragment) is to be explained by the fact that the two words come in different lines.

Ep. 27. *Lines* 42–44. Ἀφ' οὗ Νη[λ]εὺς ὠικισ[ε] Μίλητον κ.τ.λ., ἔτη [Ὶ]ΗΗΗ[Δ]ΠΙ, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηνῶν ΜΕΝΕΣΘΩΣ ΤΡΕΙΣ-ΚΑΙΔΕΚΑΤΟΥ [ΕΤΟ]ΥΣ.

Selden's uncial text has NE . . EYΣ, but in his table of *errata* and his cursive version he corrects NE to NH. Boeckh puts the correction aside as a conjecture, but I see no valid reason for rejecting it. The Ionicisms in the text of the Marble have now almost disappeared (εἰως is merely in the heading), so that Νηλεὺς seems more probable than Νειλεὺς.

More important is the question of the date. Selden in his cursive version and notes tacitly corrects Μενεσθως to Μενεσθέως, which may be accepted as the reading of the Marble. He is evidently inclined to believe¹ that the words Μενεσθέως τρεισκαδεκάτου ἔτους have simply been repeated from line 39 by a blunder of the engraver, and would substitute for them Μέδοντος or Ἀκάστου. Μέδοντος is both epigraphically

¹ Palmerius positively and confidently adopts this theory.

and historically the more probable correction. But perhaps Selden goes too far in rejecting altogether *τρεῖσκαδεκάτου ἔτους*. The precise date assigned to the foundation of Syracuse in the reign of Aeschylus (Ep. 31) creates a presumption in favour of a precise date in the reign of Medon for the Ionic colonization. Moreover the engraver could hardly have made the mistake, or at least must surely have detected it, if something like *τρεῖσκαδεκάτου ἔτους* had not intervened between the king's name and the 'Αφ' of which opens the next *epoch*. But if Selden's correction *Μέδοντος*, and his restoration of the numeral 813, be accepted, as surely they must be, then *τρεῖσκαδεκάτου ἔτους* can hardly be retained as it stands. For if we may assume that the Marble continues to agree with Eusebius' Canon in the lengths of the reigns (although putting them all 26 years earlier), 813 will be the 19th year of Medon. The only other possible number is 823, which would be equally inconsistent with *τρεῖσκαδεκάτου*. Boeckh attempts to reconcile the 13th year of Medon with the numeral 813 by adopting Dodwell's suggestion that the chronicler agreed with the Excerptor Barbarus, and not with Eusebius' Canon, in reckoning the years of the reigns between Menestheus and Medon. But there still remains a difference of one

year, which he tries to adjust by his untenable doctrine of the double *computus*. We may, however, find a middle course between Boeckh and Selden. It will be enough to account for the stone-cutter's blunder if the beginning and end of our restoration resemble those of *Μενεσθέως τρεῖσκαδεκάτου ἔτους*. Now there is no evidence that the Marble is not consistently 26 years behind Eusebius down to the date of Pheidon in Ep. 30. We may therefore legitimately argue that the date 813 carries with it the restoration *Μέδοντος ἔννεακαδεκάτου ἔτους*. If the engraver slipped from *Με*- into *Μενεσθέως*, he may well have followed up the false cue and written *τρεῖσ-* (as in line 39) for *ἔννεα-*, and yet have been prevented by the final *-καδεκάτου ἔτους*, which is common to both phrases, from ever detecting his aberration.

It is worth noting that the two slips, Medon 13 for Medon 19, and Menestheus 2 for Menestheus 22 (Ep. 24), would, if taken seriously, throw the historical reckoning 26 years back on the numerical, and that this is precisely the interval by which the Marble differs from the Canon of Eusebius. Possibly it may not after all be the engraver who is to blame.

J. ARTHUR R. MUNRO.

(To be continued.)

TWO EPIGRAMS OF MARTIAL.

LIB. SPECT. XXI.

Quidquid in Orpheo Rhodope spectasse
theatro

dicitur, exhibuit, Caesar, harena tibi.
reperunt scopuli mirandaque silua cucurrit,
quale fuisse nemus creditur Hesperidum.
affuit inmixtum pecori genus omne ferarum
et supra uatem multa pependit auis.
ipse sed ingrato iacuit laceratus ab urso.

haec tamen res est facta ita pictoria.

The story of Orpheus and his lute was enacted in the amphitheatre; the stones and trees, the beasts and birds were there, all spell-bound by his music; but the show ended with a novelty: Orpheus was killed by a bear. The last verse appears as above in the best and oldest manuscript H; T amends the metre somewhat,

haec tamen *haec* res est facta ita pictoria;

most of the MSS have larger alterations,

haec tamen *ut* res est facta, ita *ficta alia*;
and Schneidewin proposed and Friedlaender and Gilbert accept

haec tamen, *haec* res est facta ita, *ficta prior*, 'yet this, this circumstance was so performed, the earlier was feigned': *res prior*, I suppose, is the accepted tale of Orpheus' death. The antithesis has no point, the emphasis of the repeated *haec* is mere ineptitude, and *tamen*, so far as I can see, means nothing at all; for there is no sort of contrast between verse 7 and verse 8, between being killed by a bear and being really and truly killed by a bear.

Mr Buecheler has recognised that the Latin letters ICTORIA at the end of the verse are the Greek word *ιστροπία*. But he