

Eurykleia was also present at the end of the episode, viz. Odysseus' return to Ithaca (462–6), although here only the parents are mentioned.

These same lines 462–6 explain her detailed knowledge of what happened between the beginning and end of the episode, Odysseus' adventures abroad. The young hero is asked about everything (ἐξέρεινον ἅπαντα) and he gives a detailed report (εὖ κατέλεξεν).⁵ Comparable explanations of how a character can narrate something he has not witnessed himself are *Odyssey* 10.249–60 (these lines explain how Odysseus can narrate to Alkinoos the things reported in 10.210–43; compare 10.249 ἐξέρποντες and 250 κατέλεξεν with the similar expressions in 19.463 and 464) and 12.389–90 (these lines explain how Odysseus can narrate to Alkinoos (374–88) the conversation between Helios and Zeus).

On the other hand, if the digression on the scar is supposed to be told from the perspective of the (omniscient) narrator, as Auerbach and Köhnken suggest, such details as given in 401 and 463–4 are superfluous (the observation that 465–6 form a ring-composition with 393–4 does not in itself explain the preceding verses 463–4). Again, the mention of the joy at Odysseus' return home (463) also indicates a personal point of view. With *Odyssey* 19.393–466 we are dealing with one of the rare long passages where the point of view of a character is represented in the narrative instead of being expressed directly by the character in the form of a speech.⁶ The reason for this exceptional case can be found easily in the context: Penelope is not supposed to notice what goes on between Odysseus and Eurykleia and the story of the scar must therefore be presented as a *mental* flash-back, not as a speech. Compare 24.331–5, where the origin of the scar is told again, this time in direct speech by a character: Odysseus himself.

I submit that this interpretation of 19.393–466, together with the arguments given by Köhnken (see my note 3), forms a convincing refutation of Auerbach's thesis concerning Homeric narration.

University of Amsterdam

IRENE J. F. DE JONG

⁵ The importance of these verses is overlooked by C. Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Harvard, 1958), 119: 'Homer simply dramatizes her (*sc.* Eurykleia's) mental image, complete with speeches and even the boar-hunt, *which incidentally she could not have witnessed*' (my italics) and Köhnken, *op. cit.*, p. 113, n. 48: 'Odysseus und Eurykleia haben jeder nur einen Teil des in Exkurs Berichteten direkt miterlebt, der Erzähler braucht für seine Zwecke die Erinnerung beider *zusammengenommen*'.

⁶ I am preparing a monograph where cases like these are analysed in terms of modern semiotical narratology. I have already made an extended study of a group of cases in *Fokalisation und die Homerischen Gleichnisse*, to appear in *Mnemosyne* 1985.

AN UNNOTICED MS OF ORPHIC HYMNS 76–7

Because of an incomplete description of its contents,¹ it has escaped notice that the fifteenth-century vellum MS Parisinus graecus 2833 contains Orphic Hymns 76 and

¹ In H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1886–98). The contents are Theocritus, *Id. cum schol.*; the *Homeric Hymns*; Moschus, *Love the Runaway*; Musaeus, *Hero and Leander*; <Orpheus>, *Hymns 76–7*; 'Proclus', *Prolegomena to Hesiod* (fol. 92 recto); Hesiod, *Works and Days*, *Shield*, *Theogony*; Dionysius Periegetes; Theognis; (pseudo-)Phocylides. F. Càssola, *Inni omerici* (Milan, 1975), 606 n. 2 remarks that MS 2833 is in the same hand as Ambrosianus 734 (S 31 sup.) and Laurentianus 32.4, a hand formerly identified as that of John Rhodus, but not in fact his (R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* [Oxford, 1953], ii. 1xiv). It is in fact that of Demetrios Damilas (later 15th to early 16th century), since

77 on folio 91 verso. The Hymns are copied, without indication of title or authorship, after Musaeus' *Hero and Leander* (lines 1–245),² and before the collected (Proclan and other) *Prolegomena* to *Hesiod* A a, b, c, BEF a, b Pertusi,³ which are followed by Hesiod's *Works and Days*, *Shield* and *Theogony*. These are all in the same hand.

The readings are close to those of the archetype Ψ as established by Quandt in his excellent edition of the *Hymns*;⁴ they are free of scholarly emendations and improvements, and are as follows:

Errors shared with Ψ :

76.1 *θυγατέρες* (read *θύγατρεις*) 3 *κε* (read *καὶ*) 7 *μυστιπλεύτους* (read *μυστιπ<ο>λεύτους*) 77.7 *ἐκάστοις* (read *ἐκαστος*) *κάτθεται* (read *κατάθεται*).

Unique error:

77.8 *ἐπείρουσα* (by haplography for *ἐπεγείρουσα*).

To judge from Quandt's thorough survey of the tradition, this text cannot descend from hyparchetype ϕ , which corrected 76.7 and both errors in 77.7,⁵ nor from B, which was copied after the archetype had been damaged at the ends of lines 76.2, 77.6, 77.8 and 77.10.⁶ But the text is too brief to establish whether it derives from A (with its apograph c), from the hyparchetype θ (excluding its descendants p and q), from the text of George Gemistus Plethon h (not extant for these hymns), or directly from the archetype Ψ , which may or may not have been one of the codices brought to the West in 1423 and 1427.⁷

The question of how these hymns came to be copied here is of greater interest. Another fifteenth-century codex, Par. gr. 2763, displays notable affinities with 2833 in the *Homeric Hymns*⁸ and Musaeus⁹ that precede, and the *Prolegomena*¹⁰ and Hesiodic poems¹¹ that follow. The sequence *Homeric Hymns* – Moschus' *Love the Runaway* – Musaeus' *Hero and Leander* forms the standard conclusion in the fifteenth-century MSS of the Hymnic corpus;¹² in these two MSS alone is Hesiod appended.

not only the Phocylides on fol. 209vff. is his (see the list in E. Gamillscheg and D. Harlfinger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600*, I: *Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Grossbritanniens* [Vienna, 1981], no. 93), but the rest of the MS as well (so Professor Harlfinger, in personal correspondence). D. C. C. Young, *Scriptorium* 7 (1953), 18, erroneously ascribes the Theognis on fol. 182r–208v to Janus Lascaris.

² MS J in the edition of K. Kost, *Commentary on Musaeus* (Bonn, 1971).

³ MS C in A. Pertusi, *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies* (Milan, 1955).

⁴ W. Quandt, *Orpheu Hymni*, 2nd edition (Berlin, 1955), gives details of all MSS then known, pp. 3*–10* and 81; he also omits Marc. gr. 509, which has a partial text (F. Vian, *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 9 [1979], 8).

⁵ Cf. *ibid.* pp. 24*f.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 19*, 28*f.

⁷ Cf. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, ii. lxxxiv; M. L. West, *CQ* 18 (1968), 289.

⁸ MS 2763 = A in T. W. Allen, *Homeri Opera* v (Oxford, 1912) and in P. Breuning, *De hymnorum homericorum memoria* (Diss. Utrecht, 1929), pp. 26–9; according to whom (p. 29), among the large family *p*, only Par. 2763 and 2833 (C in Allen) transmit the final poem *Εἰς ξένους*, found also in xAtD (but contrast Càssola, *op. cit.* 610 n. 1, who even so observes that 2833 contaminates a *p*-text with xAtD). On 2763 cf. also Vian, *art. cit.* 19. The hand is at present unidentified, but known in other MSS (thus Professor Harlfinger, in correspondence).

⁹ Both end with line 245, and textually are classed as Parisini; cf. Kost, *op. cit.* 57f.; T. Gelzer, *Mus. Helv.* 24 (1967), 129ff.; A. Ludwig, *Über die Handschriften des Epikers Musaios* (Königsberg, 1896).

¹⁰ Par. 2763 = D Pertusi; only this and 2833 (C Pertusi) have the same set of *Prolegomena*, and they are also virtually unanimous in their readings.

¹¹ Both are 'purely Triclinian' (M. L. West, *CQ* 24 [1974], 184).

¹² E.g. in Laur. 70.35; Laur. Aedil. 220; Leidensis B.P.G. 74; Riccardianus 53; and Vat. Pal. 179. In Ambr. 734 (S 31 sup.) Callimachus (e Pfeiffer) and Pindar are appended; in Harv. Coll. Ms. Typ. 18, Aratus.

In both the text of Musaeus is defective, ending with line 245; this confirms that *Hero and Leander* stood at the end originally, and that Hesiod is additional. In Par. 2763 folios 135–42 are left blank, to allow for the completion of the missing text; in 2833 it would seem that the need to fill a similar gap was seen as an invitation to preface the Hesiodic *Prolegomena* with the (highly appropriate) Orphic Hymns 76–7, to Mnemosyne and the Muses. But, despite all the other affinities of the two MSS, it is clear that the hymns were not copied from 2763, whose text of them (e Quandt) derives from the π -subgroup of the emended hyparchetype ϕ , and omits part of 77.4–5. The context, and the divergent MS tradition, raise the possibility that the position of these Hymns before the Proclan *Prolegomena* is owed to Proclus himself, whose familiarity with these poems is well known;¹³ yet such is the extent of the earlier tradition for Hesiod, wherein they are never found, that this seems most improbable.¹⁴

Columbia University

R. JANKO

¹³ Cf. M. L. West, *Hesiod, Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978), p. 68.

¹⁴ Cf. Pertusi, *op. cit.*, with references to earlier studies. I am most grateful to Professor D. Harlfinger for his generous response to my enquiries.

ON WHAT IS NOT IN ANY WAY IN THE *SOPHIST*

To ensnare the sophist of the *Sophist* in a definition disclosing him as a purveyor of images and falsehoods Plato must block the sophistical defence that image and falsehood are self-contradictory in concept, for they both embody the proposition proscribed by Parmenides – ‘What is not, is’. It has been assumed that Plato regards this defence as depending on a reading of ‘what is not’ (*to mē on*) in its very strongest sense, where it is equivalent to ‘what is not in any way’ (*to mēdamōs on*) or ‘nothing’. Likewise, the initial paradoxes of not-being (237b–239c) are seen as requiring that *to mē on* be understood in this way, that later designated by Plato (257b, 258e–259a) as the *opposite of to on* or ‘being’. On this interpretation, Plato’s counter-strategy is to recognise a use of *to mē on* which is not opposed in this strict sense to being, but is indeed a part of it and is ‘being *other than*’.

In a stimulating article,¹ R. W. Jordan challenges this account.² I shall briefly attempt to show that his objections are not decisive and that his own interpretation is open to question.

Jordan makes the interesting suggestion (p. 120) that a distinction between two senses of *not-being*, where one is equivalent to *nothing* and one is not, dates from the middle dialogues – particularly from *Republic* V, where objects of *agnoia* are *mēdamē onta* and objects of *doxa* are both *onta* and *mē onta*. He concludes (p. 121), ‘Malcolm’s view, then, seems to amount to this: that Plato is now extending the moral he draws about objects of belief (i.e. particulars) in the *Republic* to cover forms. Forms too now are seen to be both being and notbeing.’

Jordan is right in so far as *to mēdamōs on* in the *Sophist* is being read in the same way as the *mēdamē onta* of *Rep.* 477a. But there is, I submit, no real connection between the manner in which particulars are and are not in the *Republic* and that in which Forms are and are not in the *Sophist*. Whereas in both dialogues to say ‘X is F’ is to predicate F-ness of X, in the *Sophist* (for 255e–257a at the very least) to say

¹ R. W. Jordan, ‘Plato’s Task in the *Sophist*’, *CQ* 34 (1984), 113–29.

² Referred to by Jordan as ‘Malcolm’s view’. Though flattered by the appellation, I can claim to be but an adherent and not the initiator (see Jordan, p. 120, notes 14 and 15).