

latter would appear, given the context of *Meno*, to be a deliberate misquotation. The distinction may be a subtle one, but 'teachability' is not the same as 'learnability',<sup>3</sup> and Socrates is here concerned with demonstrating confusion regarding precisely the *teachability* of virtue.

We find this substitution of διδάξεται in only two other authors, Hermogenes<sup>4</sup> and Xenophon. E. C. Marchant claims there are no 'trustworthy indications' that Xenophon relied on any of Plato's published works when writing the first two chapters of *Mem.* 1. He states: 'At I. ii. 20, indeed, Xenophon quotes in support of his arguments two passages from the poets that are in the *Meno* and *Protagoras* of Plato, but it would be absurd to suppose that he went to Plato for two commonplace passages that would be familiar to every educated Athenian.'<sup>5</sup>

In his quotation of Theognis 35–6 at *Mem.* 1. 2. 20, Xenophon substitutes διδάξεται. He does so again at *Symp.* 2. 4. If I am correct in claiming that Plato is misquoting Theognis 35, whether deliberately (as it seems to me) or from faulty memory,<sup>6</sup> given that all our Theognis mss. read μαθήσεται, Xenophon's substitution of διδάξεται would suggest that here, at least, he did indeed go to Plato. This possibility perhaps raises the question of the extent to which Theognis was employed in Athens as a 'text' at the primary level.<sup>7</sup> (Or perhaps we ought only to question the reliability of Xenophon's memory – but then also the reliability of his memories of Socrates.) It also bears upon the discrepancies between Xenophon's and Plato's accounts of Socrates, which become all the more significant when Xenophon is regarded as having relied even here upon one of Plato's 'Socratic' works.

University of Guelph

J. MITSCHERLING

<sup>3</sup> But see section 6 of the *Δισσοὶ Λόγοι*, 'Concerning σοφίας and ἀρετᾶς, whether they are teachable', Diels–Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th ed. (Berlin, 1964), p. 414.

<sup>4</sup> Rhet. Gr. 2, 593 W. So cod. Par. 1983 (following Plato?). Clem. Strom. 5. 52. 4 retains μαθήσεται.

<sup>5</sup> E. C. Marchant, tr., *Xenophon, Memorabilia and Oeconomicus* (London, 1923), p. x.

<sup>6</sup> See T. Hudson-Williams' response to Bergk with regard to Theognis 429 and *Meno* 95, *The Elegies of Theognis* (London, 1910), p. 260.

<sup>7</sup> See Dorothea Wender's discussion of such use of Theognis, *Hesiod and Theognis* (Penguin, 1976), pp. 90–1.

## NOTES ON CALLIMACHUS, *HECALE*

(a) fr. 238 Pfeiffer, 10–14

]. . . . . μεν . . . φ . . . [  
 ]κέλευε δὲ μῆποτ' ἐλέγξα[ι  
 ]νε . η δ' ὑπὸ πάντας ἀέθλου[ς  
 ] κόον δέ κεν α[ῖ]θι δέχοιο  
 5 ]δ . . . . . εχ . . . ά . . . [  
 ] . αρῆν κεκύθεσθε κ . [  
 ] . . . [ . ]' . . . νε . [  
 ]ε δ' ἦν τόδε χειραεσα[  
 ]τας ἀκῆν ἔχε . τῇ δε . [  
 10 ]ν . ρν αἰκυμνήτις[  
 †ῆ τ' ἄκρησθ† ]να Γλαυκώπιον ἰζει  
 ]εν αἰὲ περὶ πότνια γα[  
 ]ς ὅθι πτολέμοιό μ' ἐπ' . [  
 ].[ ][[

A particularly tantalizing fragment – what survives should, one feels, be sufficient to allow some progress. Pfeiffer's notes (see on lines 3 ff., 6 and 9) are strongly coloured by his belief that we have here a conversation between Aegeus and Aethra. But Nickau's recovery of the first half of line 4 (*Philologus* 111 [1967], 126–9; cf. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* no. 281) τῶ <νυ>,<sup>1</sup> πάτερ, μεθίει με shows that, as Lobel had guessed, Theseus is addressing his father. Many perplexities remain, and Nickau hesitated to draw further conclusions; yet I think at least one point can be made. If Theseus says in line 4 'Therefore, father, let me go, and you would later get me back safe', he must immediately beforehand have given Aegeus some convincing proof that he will not succumb to the Marathonian Bull. What could justify such confidence? A very natural explanation seems to me that Theseus has been promised Athena's aid in 'every labour' (line 3 πάντας ἀέθλους).<sup>2</sup> Perhaps even we should refer to this line<sup>3</sup> Statius, *Thebaid* 12. 583 (from a passage with other echoes of the *Hecale*) *sic tibi non ullae socia sine Pallade pugnae*. So I put forward the following hypothesis, to be tested by any further evidence: lines 1–14 are throughout a direct speech by Theseus (with ἀκὴν ἔχε [9] imperative rather than indicative). Invoking Athena's promised aid, he urges Aegeus to send him out against the bull (1–8), and to entrust his safety to the power of the αἰσυνήτης<sup>4</sup> who dwells on the Acropolis (9–11). In 12 ff. he prays to the goddess ('you, Lady, who always [? care for your land of Attica]').

Of the many remaining difficulties I wish here to consider only line 11. Mr W. S. Barrett argues attractively (as did Naeke<sup>5</sup> in 1845 [*Callimachi Hecale* pp. 201–2]) that Schol. D on *Iliad* 5. 422 may preserve the major part of line 11 in an almost,

<sup>1</sup> Kassel preferred τῶ<ῥα>.

<sup>2</sup> What precedes is a real puzzle. The scribe has written ὑπο with a grave accent, which should mean that we do not have ὑπο in anastrophe. After ]νε most likely seems *iota* (Mr P. J. Parsons agrees, but says that Y or even P cannot be totally excluded). If so, we would appear to be faced with εἴη from ἔημι, or εἴη, whether from εἰμί *sum* or εἰμι *ibo* (see Macleod on *Iliad* 24. 139). W. S. Barrett, judging from the photograph, thought the next letter could as well be N as H; certainly ]νειν would open up fresh possibilities. P. J. P. agrees that H can be very similar to N in this hand, but, having re-examined the original papyrus, still believes that the letter is H.

<sup>3</sup> Rather than to fr. 253. 2 (as Pfeiffer), where Theseus probably mentions to Hecale his guidance by Athena (even though the restoration Παλλὰς hardly fits the traces of the last letter, according to Lloyd-Jones and Parsons on their *Supplementum Hellenisticum* no. 285). One is reminded of the help given by Athena in another myth treated by Callimachus, Heracles and the Nemean lion (fr. 57. 4; see now Parsons *ZPE* 25 [1977], 41). For the Nemean lion in the *Hecale* (? as a parallel to the Marathonian bull) cf. fr. 339 Κλεωναίοιο χάρωνος. Comparison of the labours of Theseus with those of Heracles was of course a commonplace, e.g., from the passage of Statius just cited, *Theb.* 12. 584 *nec sacer invadeat paribus Tirynthius actis*. It is possible that Catullus 64, when speaking of Aegeus, Theseus and the Minotaur, makes use of relevant passages in the *Hecale*. The most striking resemblance is between Cat. 64. 111 *nequiquam vanis iactantem cornua ventis* and Call. fr. 732 *incerti auctoris* (plausibly assigned to the *Hecale*) πολλὰ μάτην κεράεσσιν ἐς ἥερα θυμήναντα. Note also more generally (a) Aegeus' dread that he will lose the son whom he has so recently met for the first time (cf. Call. *Diegesis* x. 18. 21–3 and fr. 260. 7) in Catullus 64. 215–17 *gnate, mihi longa iucundior unice vita, | gnate, ego quem in dubios cogor dimittere casus | reddite in extrema nuper mihi fine senectae* and (b) the help of Athena, protectress of the city, in overcoming the monster (which I believe may be the theme of Call. fr. 238. 1–14), *ibid.* 228–30 *quod tibi si sancti concesserit incola Itoni, | quae nostrum genus ac sedes defendere Erecthei | annuit, ut tauri respersas sanguine dextram*.

<sup>4</sup> Metre appears to guarantee what placing on the papyrus would leave very much in doubt – that αἰσυνήτης is the final word of line 10. A hexameter-ending of the pattern ν[ε]οῦ αἰσυνήτης – would not be Callimachean (Maas, *Greek Metre* [tr. Lloyd-Jones] para. 93, 'Lines with masculine caesura have a secondary caesura either (a) after the seventh element, or (b) after the eighth element').

<sup>5</sup> Curiously neither Ida Kapp (*Callimachi Hecale fragmenta* [1915], p. 59) nor Pfeiffer seems even to consider that θίνα may be the true reading.

if not totally, correct form, ἡ τ' ἄκρης<sup>6</sup> θίνα Γλαυκώπιον ἵζει, 'quae cumulum ἄκρης Glaucopium' insidet' (Naeke). Hesychius' first gloss of θίς (vol. II p. 324 ed. Latte) is ὄχθος, while for θίνες (ibid) he gives *inter alia* ὑψηλοὶ τόποι. For ἵζω with accusative of the place occupied, cf. Aesch. Ag. 982, Euripides *Ion* 1314 βωμόν οὐχ ἵζειν ἐχρήν. (b) fr. 238d

]γενοίτο[  
]μοιαι[

In line 2 a word-division ]μοι ἀη[ seems inescapable, and words beginning with ἀη- are sufficiently rare to stir one's interest. It is surely worth observing that fr. 311 ἀήσυρον <-><sup>8</sup> γόνυ κάμφοι<sup>9</sup> would supply this need.<sup>10</sup> Fr. 311 is given by the Suda s.v. ἀήσυρον τὸ λεπτόν, τὸ μετέωρον καὶ κοῦφον, τὸ ἐλαφρόν, παρὰ τὸ ἀέρι σύρεσθαι. ἐπὶ ὀρνέων, an excerpt which may derive from Salustius' commentary on the *Hecale*.<sup>11</sup> So we can accept with fair confidence that the fragment describes a bird alighting for rest (cf. Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 396). We know that in the *Hecale* a crow conversed with another bird (some think an owl),<sup>12</sup> but, besides fr. 311, there are other fragments about birds, not all of which necessarily belong to the same context – see Pfeiffer, frs. 271 (with Addenda), 326, 519, 608, 803. If fr. 311 is to be identified in fr. 238d, note that it would come from the verse of *P. Oxy.* 2216 fr. 3; the large piece (fr. 1 = Pf. fr. 238) of the same papyrus has on the recto what is now shown (see (a) above) to be part of a conversation between Theseus and his father, followed by, on the verso, the outbreak of the storm which forced Theseus to take refuge in *Hecale's* cottage.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>6</sup> One could complete the line by adding <πόλιος> after ἄκρης (Dindorf [cf. Schneider fragm. anon. 332], favoured by Barrett). But it does not seem necessary to postulate omission when there are other possibilities – e.g. ἄκρη could perhaps stand alone (recognized by LSJ = 'hilltop', 'height', or, at least in prose, 'citadel').

<sup>7</sup> I would take θίνα Γλαυκώπιον together (Barrett – on this point Naeke hesitated), 'the Glaucopian mound'.

<sup>8</sup> Meineke supplied ὄν, Bergk ὡς.

<sup>9</sup> Pfeiffer was very doubtful about the future optative, and suggested κάμψαι.

<sup>10</sup> If γένοιτο is to be distinguished in line 1 (probable, though as well as compounds there are also e.g. ]γένειτ' ὄρος, ἦγα]γεν οἱ τοῦτοις, ἔψε]γεν οἱτο[ν, as Barrett points out), Callimachus' respect for Hermann's Bridge (Maas, *Greek Metre* paras. 87 and 91, though e.g. γένοιτο δὲ - - - - would be possible) and his dislike for ending with the second trochee a word beginning in the first dactyl (see Williams on *hymn* 2. 41 for the few exceptions) cut down the number of places in the hexameter where this word can stand. We would be left with the line-ending, or immediately before the feminine caesura (as *hymn* 3. 109 ὕστερον ὄφρα γένοιτο). Against the line-ending (even if not decisively so), Barrett notes that in fr. 238 (fr. 1 of this papyrus) the text on recto and verso is so positioned that the last letters (up to 8) of the lines on recto and verso are backed by blank papyrus before line-beginnings on verso and recto; but our fragment (fr. 3v) is backed by writing on the recto. The upshot is that, if we are to identify fr. 311 in line 2, a placing immediately above ]μοι ἀή[συρον of γένοιτο before the feminine caesura would fit well.

<sup>11</sup> Pfeiffer vol. II, pp. xviii–xxix. For a cautionary note about Hecker's view (endorsed by Pfeiffer vol. I, p. 228) that *all* anonymous and otherwise unknown dactylic fragments in the Suda come from the *Hecale*, see P. J. Parsons, *ZPE* 25 (1977), 50.

<sup>12</sup> Frs. 260–1 with the improved and up-dated text of Lloyd-Jones and Rea, *HSCP* 72 (1968), 125–45.

<sup>13</sup> Lobel, however, remarks (*P. Oxy.* vol. 19 (1948), 145–6) that, while fr. 2 may well come from the immediate neighbourhood of fr. 1, on the other hand fr. 3 is stained a dark colour, and has no special resemblance to frs. 1 and 2 apart from the writing.

(c) fr. 253

ἐ]ς Μαραθῶνα κατέρχομαι ὄφρα κ[.]παρ. .  
 Παλλὰς] δὲ καθηγήτεια κελεύθου.  
 τὼς ἄρ' ἐμεῦ μεμάθηκας ἄ μ' εἶρεο· καὶ σύ [γε] μαῖα  
 λέξον, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐμοί τι ποθὴ τέο τυτθὸν ἀκούσαι  
 5 ]χρηῖς ἐ[ρη]μαίῃ ἐνὶ ναίει  
 ]. ι γενέθλη.

[gap of about 32 lines]

The first two lines of fr. 253 complete Theseus' account to Hecale of himself and his mission; line 6 γενέθλη (perhaps ἐσ]τι precedes) may even have been his last word – 'so you have learnt from me what you asked me, and do you, mother, say (since I too desire to hear for a little from you) . . . an old woman you live in a solitary . . . your descent'.<sup>14</sup> I would like to suggest that, by combining two fragments, we may be able to recover the start of Hecale's reply:

τί δάκρυον εὔδον ἐγείρεις; (fr. 682, incertae sedis)  
 οὐ γάρ μοι πενίη πατρώιος, οὐδ' ἀπὸ πάππων (fr. 254)  
 εἰμὶ λιπερνῆτις· βάλε μοι, βάλε τὸ τρίτον εἴη

fr. 682 is firmly ascribed to Callimachus, but not to any specific poem. The words seem particularly appropriate as an immediate response (like *infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem*) to a question about someone's past. For the manner of opening direct speech at this point in the line, compare *hymn* 4. 212 εἶπε δ' ἄλυσθενέουσα, τί μητέρα, κοῦρε, βαρύνεις; That τί δάκρυον εὔδον ἐγείρεις; formed Hecale's first words is by no means a new idea,<sup>15</sup> but I do not think that conjunction with fr. 254 has been proposed before. In fr. 254. 1 γάρ would follow well ('a sad story, for once I was prosperous') and οὐ γάρ μοι πενίη πατρώιος covers both parts of Theseus' enquiry (fr. 253. 5–6) – her family, and why she spends her old age amid such miserable surroundings. Since fr. 255 δινομένην ὑπὸ<sup>16</sup> βουσὶν ἐμὴν ἐφύλασσον ἄλωα is almost certainly to be read at fr. 253. 7,<sup>17</sup> it emerges that, after a gap of some 32 lines, Hecale is still talking about her days of prosperity.<sup>18</sup>

(d) fr. 490 incertae sedis γρήϊον εἶδος ἔχουσα

I feel pretty sure that these words do *not* describe an old woman – rather someone (almost certainly a goddess) who has assumed the form of an old woman. N. J.

<sup>14</sup> Following the supplements given by Pfeiffer (see his notes for their origin), Lloyd-Jones and Parsons do not include these in their *Supplementum Hellenisticum* no. 285; before δε in line 2 they see traces of a letter hardly consistent with the sigma which Παλλὰς would require.

<sup>15</sup> Both Naeke (*Callimachi Hecale* [1845], p. 156) and Ida Kapp (*Callimachi Hecaleae Fragmenta* [1915], p. 84) thought of this context in the *Hecale*. Schneider (*Callimachea* vol. II [1873], p. 181), amid some implausible ideas, has one remarkable piece of divination: 'deinde quum Theseus quoque Hecale talis viri adventum miranti breviter narrasset quis esset et unde cur iret, rursus ex Hecale quaesivit quo casu factum esset, ut in hac solitudine habitaret (before the papyrus came to light!). Tum illa contristata est, ἄλυσκὸν δὲ οἱ ἔκπεσε δάκρυ (fr. 313 Pf., but this is poor judgement – if τί δάκρυον εὔδον ἐγείρεις; opened Hecale's speech, ἄλυσκὸν δὲ οἱ ἔκπεσε δάκρυ must have belonged elsewhere) dixitque τί δάκρυον εὔδον ἐγείρεις;'.  
<sup>16</sup> The papyrus and the Suda have ὑπὸ rather than περί (Choeroboscus), which Pfeiffer preferred.

<sup>17</sup> The main credit for determining this goes to Bartoletti, *SIFC* 31 (1959), 179–81.

<sup>18</sup> Barrett questions whether her prosperity was ever more than modest, since fr. 255 shows her taking an active part in the farming operations – an interesting point, but perhaps ἐφύλασσον need not imply more than a supervisory visit to the work (Sir Kenneth Dover). W. S. B. also suspects that in fr. 254. 2 τὸ τρίτον means 'for the third time' (as e.g. in fr. 75. 18), with the sense being made clear by subsequent lines.

Richardson collects instances of this disguise in a most useful note on *H.H. Dem.* 101<sup>19</sup> (he calls it an epic feature). Much more hazardingly I venture to join fr. 490 with the equally unplaced fr. 611, and to suggest a home in the *Hecale*.<sup>20</sup>

Καλλιχόρῳ ἐπὶ φρητὶ καθέζο παιδὸς ἄπυστος (fr. 611)  
γρήϊον εἶδος ἔχουσα (fr. 490)

The idea behind this is that Callimachus, though changing the name of the well,<sup>21</sup> may have an eye on *H.H. Dem.* 98 ff. ζέτο . . | Παρθενίῳ φρέατι . . | γρηῖ παλαιγενεὶ ἐναλίγκιος. Most probably καθέζο shows the poet apostrophizing the goddess in his customary manner. Demeter and Persephone certainly appeared in the *Hecale* (fr. 285 Δῶ τε Κλυμένου τε πολυξείνοιο δάμαρτα), and there are at least two contexts which might have prompted a brief allusion to Demeter's search for Persephone (briefer, I would guess, than in *hymn* 6. 7 ff., where note line 9 ἄπυστα and 15 τρὶς δ' ἐπὶ Καλλιχόρῳ χαμάδις ἐκαθίσσαο φρητὶ). Firstly, Theseus killed Cercyon (frs. 294 and 328)<sup>22</sup> at Eleusis (cf. Ovid, *Met.* 7. 439 *Cercyonis letum vidit Cerealis Eleusin*), and Callimachus could have digressed on the associations of the place, just as a reference to Scylla daughter of Nisus (fr. 288) may perhaps be connected with the killing near Megara of another bandit, Sciron (fr. 296; cf. Ovid, *Met.* 7. 443–4 *tutus ad Alcathoen, Lelegeia moenia, limes | composito Scirone patet*). Another possible context would be somewhere near fr. 278, most probably describing the reward which the people of Hermione in the Argolid received for giving Demeter information about her daughter:<sup>23</sup>

τοῦνεκα καὶ νέκυες πορθμήϊον οὔτι φέρονται  
μούνῃ ἐνὶ πτολίῳ, ὃ τε τέθμιον οἰσέμεν ἄλλους  
δανοῖς ἐν στομάτεσσι.<sup>24</sup>

*Keble College, Oxford*

A. S. HOLLIS

<sup>19</sup> For Demeter in this same context one can add Ovid, *Fasti* 4. 517 *simularat anum*.

<sup>20</sup> If my idea were correct, the *Hecale* would of course become more than likely, since the only other fragmentary poem at present known to have been in hexameters is the *Galatea* (frs. 378–9). It is possible, however, that (even if the association is right) fr. 611 and fr. 490 might have been adjacent rather than consecutive, in which case a pentameter could have intervened.

<sup>21</sup> For the names of the well and the topography, see Richardson on *Dem.* 99, and his Appendix 1.

<sup>22</sup> = Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* no. 287(b), 19–20.

<sup>23</sup> In which case note fr. 705 *incertae sedis* εἰς Ἀσίην Ἀλυκὸν τε καὶ ἄμ πόλιν Ἑρμιονήων. But the ancient sources are by no means agreed as to who enjoyed the remission of ferry-dues and why (see Pfeiffer on fr. 278). The Suda, perhaps from the commentary of Salustius, says puzzlingly ἐν Αἰγιαλῷ. Barrett observes that Αἰγιαλῷ and Αἰγαλέῳ are not so different to the eye, and that Αἰγάλεω (incidentally mentioned in Call. fr. 238. 23) is the name of a ridge between Athens and Eleusis (from which Xerxes watched the battle of Salamis, Hdt. 8. 90. 4). For traditions that the descent of Persephone took place at Eleusis, see Richardson, *H.H. Dem.* p. 150, but there is no evidence that (presumably) the Eleusinians were granted remission of their ferry-dues.

<sup>24</sup> I am extremely grateful to Mr P. J. Parsons for papyrological advice, and to Mr W. S. Barrett for detailed comments on these notes.