

ΠΑΡΑΤΕΙΣΘΑΙ = ΑΘΕΤΕΙΝ ?

THIS equation was set up by Mr. Allen in the *Classical Review* XV. 8-9 (1901), and remained, as far as I know, for over twenty years without effect.¹ I thought, therefore, when writing my *External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925) that the article had provided its own corrective and needed no criticism. About the same time, however, Mr. Allen in his *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), 235₂, reiterated his opinion; and later still Mr. Sheppard, *ib.* XLI. 127-9 (1927), shows that he has been impressed by it. Under these circumstances, and because a good deal depends upon the interpretation of the word, a brief discussion now seems desirable.

It must be noted at the start that the question is to be defined quite narrowly. The only stimulus to which Aristonicus and Didymus respond by the use of forms of ἀθετεῖν is the presence of an obelus in the margin of some critic's text, and our question is simply whether they also used παρατεῖσθαι in like circumstances. In modern parlance, to be sure 'athetize' and its cognates are used loosely for almost any unfavourable action by a critic, but such usages are not to the point here. For the underlying issue now is whether from ΣΑ on Γ 230 we are to understand: (1) that B 558 was not in the text of Aristarchus; or (2) stood in that text with an obelus in front of it. Mr. Allen believes in the second of these alternatives, and to uphold it proposed this equation, in which, unless we are to have an ambiguous middle term, ἀθετεῖν must be interpreted rigorously in its technical sense.

As parallels for this use of παρατεῖσθαι Mr. Allen now cites 'the *Odyssey* scholia throughout.' I know only one example from the *Hypothesis* (p. 6, 16) and those in Dindorf's index. The latter are scattered from γ to θ, a curious distribution; but as I have read the scholia on α-β, ν-ω, and glanced rapidly over those on ι-μ, without finding anything, I will assume that the list is complete. None of these examples gives Mr. Allen the slightest support. The subject is always a character of the poem, ordinarily not named, but unmistakable: *Athena* at γ 366; *Pisistratus* at δ 199; *Odysseus* at ζ 149 (*bis*), η 313, θ 102; and in the *Hypothesis*. It is obvious that a verb with one of these subjects does not mean ἀθετεῖν or anything like it. The meaning, too, seems to offer no great difficulty. It is to 'beg off,' but the element 'entreaty' has ceased, as in the English phrase,² to be dominant, so that the verb is used in

¹ Drerup, *Hom. Poet.* I. 327₁, did, to be sure, speak incidentally of Aristarchus' athetesis of B 558; but that was probably a slip. In this connexion I should like to correct an oversight of my own: p. 46 a misquotation of Drerup. For 'great Alexandrian' 'ancient critics' should

have been written; Mr. Allen gives 366 as the number of lines athetized by Aristarchus.

² A says: 'Sorry, but I can't go as I promised. This, that or the other has happened.' B reports: 'A has begged off from going with us.' Nobody misunderstands the situation.

the sense of 'getting out' or 'getting rid' of something by a variety of means, provided only that the method be more or less amiable and courteous. Its adjunct is either an infinitive or a noun of action to show what is avoided.¹

This prepares us for the consideration of the passage that Mr. Allen regards as his best parallel. It is the scholium *ὅτι παλιλλογεῖν παρήτηται. ἄλλοτριοι ἄρα οἱ ἐπιφερόμενοι στίχοι εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ* on the beginning (A 365) of Achilles' speech to his mother: 'Thou knowest; why tell all this to thee that knowest?'

Taking *παρήτηται* as equivalent to *ἡθέτηκε*, Mr. Allen must wish for its subject the name of some critic, in this case Aristarchus. This parts company at once with all the Odyssean parallels, and seems to lead only to further difficulties. Mr. Allen unfortunately does not translate, but the meaning desired must be: The line is marked 'because Aristarchus athetized the retelling of the tale. The following twenty-seven lines are therefore spurious.' I cannot acquiesce in this because, in the first place, a note of this type is impossible; a line is not marked simply because some other lines are athetized, but because it conflicts with such lines,² and can therefore be used to confirm the athetesis (cf. *SA* on B 668 or *Θ* 56 as illustrations). Then I am afraid that I have translated with too much goodwill. To give the sense supposed something like *τοὺς παλιλλογούντας στίχους* would be needed: 'Aristarchus has begged to be rid of (=athetized) the lines that retell the tale;' the infinitive would rather mean: 'Aristarchus has begged off (got out) of retelling the tale,' implying that the lines were not in his text where it is agreed they were. Finally, the logic is bad: lines are not spurious because Aristarchus athetized them; but Aristarchus athetized them because they were, in his opinion, spurious.

All these difficulties vanish if we follow the Odyssean examples and make Achilles the subject. The line is marked 'because Achilles has begged off (got out) of retelling the tale. The following twenty-seven lines are therefore spurious.' But the usefulness of the note to support Mr. Allen's interpretation of the scholium on *Γ* 230 has vanished also.

One other example remains. In B 1 and K 1 Aristarchus read *ἄλλοι*, but Zenodotus *ἄλλοι*, while various unnamed scholars had other devices for bringing in the article. At the first passage Zenodotus' reading is recorded (*SABG*) objectively, but the need of returning to the question seems to have disturbed Aristonicus. He wrote (*SA*) *παραιτητέον τοὺς γράφοντας, ὧν ἐστι καὶ Ζηνόδοτος, ἄλλοι μὲν, ἢ καὶ τοὺς ὁπωσοῦν βουλομένους δασύνειν*, which I would translate:³ 'I must beg to be delivered from the people, Zenodotus

¹ If *ζ* 149 causes us to check, it is because the scholiast feels *τὸ ἀπτεσθαι τῶν γονάτων* as a ceremony incumbent upon a suppliant, while we do not immediately appreciate that feeling.

² Or, as frequently, because it is the source of an interpolation, and so can confirm the athetesis in another way. This is here irrelevant.

³ I avoid 'deprecate' partly because in regard to it there seems to be a difference of usage

between British and American English. For me, and for some others at least in this country, it suggests an action quite mild and almost apologetic, far from the 'earnest disapproval' of the dictionaries. Besides, to translate *παρατεῖσθαι* by 'earnestly disapprove' is too much of the style of translation for which Lewis and Short furnish the classic example: *bibere* 'to arrive at the region of the river.'

is one, who write ὅλλοι μέν, and from those who want to use the rough breathing in any way whatsoever.' The only thing to note, beside the feeling, is that the adjunct is a person, for which cf. Diog. L. 6. 82: The slave Monimos wishing a change of masters feigned insanity, and made a perfect nuisance of himself ἕως αὐτὸν ὁ δεσπότης παρητήσατο 'until his master begged to be rid of him'; that is, was willing to take any price offered, and say 'Thank you!' besides.

We now come to the crucial passage **SA** on Γ 230. The line is marked 'because Idomeneus was posted next to Ajax Telamonios in accord with Δ 251 sqq.: παραιτητέον ἄρα ἐκείνον τὸν στίχον τὸν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ ὑπὸ τινων γραφόμενον.'

'στήσε δ' ἄγων, ἔν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσταντο φάλαγγες for the Athenians were not next to Ajax.' So far παραιτεῖσθαι has never appeared as an equivalent of ἀθετεῖν nor even as an approximate equivalent of it; the presumptions are all, therefore, that here it is not one either. On the contrary, it has always had a narrowly limited meaning; the presumption is that here, too, it has the same meaning. Accordingly I translate: 'I must therefore beg off from the famed line that is written by some people in the *Catalogue*.' If this were a cross reference to an athetesis, there were technical formulae in which to make it; cf., for instance, **SA** at Θ 56: ἡ δὲ ἀναφορὰ πρὸς ἐκεῖνα τὰ ἀθετούμενα 'πολλέων ἐκ πολλῶν ἐγγέσπαλοι ἄνδρες' (B 231), or **ST** at M 371: ἀθετεῖται οὖν τὸ 'καὶ σε νόθον περ ἑόντα' (Θ 284). There was no reason why τὸν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ ἀθετούμενον should not have been written had that been meant; and the fact that technical language is not used raises still another presumption that we are dealing with a different situation.

What this unusual situation is seems clear from the phrase τὸν ὑπὸ τινων γραφόμενον. In the technical language of Aristonicus¹ τινές is never used to include Aristarchus; cf. Ludwig, *A.H.T.* I. 127-9, who can cite from **SA** but one example to the contrary, and that merely apparent. Consequently the phrase used is but a passive equivalent for what in the active voice could have been δν οὐκ ἔγραφεν Ἀρίσταρχος, a form of expression that the Aristarcheans had little occasion to use, and even then avoided.² I do not see how we can escape the conclusion³ that B 558 was not in the text of Aristarchus, and unless it was in his text he could not have athetized it—that is, could not have placed an obelus in front of it.

This solution is in harmony with two other facts, and while either of these could be explained away separately, the need of explaining away both is

¹ To assume without warrant a verbatim quotation of Aristarchus would alter no more than the form of the argument. For an editor to say 'the line that is written by some people' clearly carries the implication 'but not by me.'

² They use the text of Aristarchus and assume that their readers had a text with the same lines; the papyri show that the assumption was warranted. When they deal occasionally with

other lines it is more agreeable to say 'which others add.' The note of Didymus on Φ 73 is rather exceptional 'which is not in the editions of Aristarchus'; probably he found that it was already in the copies used by some of his readers.

³ I cannot agree with Mr. Allen that the use of so common a word as τις suffices to show that we are dealing with the 'language of athetesis.'

an improbable combination. (1) When Strabo IX. 394 complains *οὐ παραδέχονται τοῦθ' οἱ κριτικοί*, the natural understanding of the phraseology is that the verse had not gained admission to the texts of the critics. I may recall Plutarch's use of *ἐξεῖλεν* with reference to I. 458-61, and to Athenaeus' use of the same verb with reference to Σ 604-5, which are also based on the absence of these lines from the text of Aristarchus. In each case it has been claimed that the phraseology is loose, and that nothing more than an athetesis is under discussion. But in each case we can see more and more clearly that our MSS. are not in the condition to be expected had the lines been written and athetized by Aristarchus. (2) When Aristonicus uses *ὑποτάσσειν* of the insertion of a plus verse, the standard of comparison is ordinarily the Aristarchian text. Consequently, as Ludwich, *A.H.T.* II. 398₃₄₃, pointed out, his explanation of the dipole at Δ 273 as *πρὸς τοὺς ὑποτάσσοντας τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὸν Τελαμώνιον* raises a presumption that B 558 was not in the text of Aristarchus. More cannot be claimed because the usage is not invariable, there being cases in which the standard of comparison is the original (*Aristarcho iudice*) text.

This method of interpreting the scholia¹ has been described as light-hearted. If it deserves the epithet, I may at least plead in extenuation a great eagerness to learn how more serious-mindedness can contribute to the elucidation of the passage.

The result can, however, be tested in another way. It had long been claimed, most notably by Ludwich, that an athetesis had never led to the loss of a line. But Mr. Allen was the first to push the question further, and seek to determine exactly what the MSS. do with athetized lines. He reaches, *Homer* 305, the correct conclusion: 'There are a few coincidences between Aristarchus' atheteses and the reading of MSS. *after* his time, but there is no reason to suppose they are other than coincidences.' I must strengthen the conclusion by attacking the examples cited. From his six coincidences must be subtracted: B 558, because its athetesis is the point being tested; H 353, because it is omitted by none² of our MSS.; I 695, because it is only an approximate coincidence; Ω 556-7, because it too seems likely to be only approximate, and the statements about it show too much confusion.³ Other examples cited, *External Evidence* 4, can replace these; but still the correctness of Mr. Allen's conclusion stands out: coincidences between omissions in

¹ Mr. Sheppard seems to believe that I am the first to think the line was not in the text of Aristarchus. That is an injustice to Ludwich, Wilamowitz, Cauer, Bethe, van Leeuwen, and no doubt to others; the most I could claim would be an effort to strengthen their conclusion.

² Quotations are a separate problem. If Dio of Prusa (lv. 15) did not have the verse, he was probably quoting at second hand; cf. *Class. Phil.* XXII. 99-100 (1927), where Oldfather catches Epictetus at that trick.

³ Mr. Allen's list is reprinted from *Class. Rev.* XV. 244₁. In one list we are told that Ω 556-7 are omitted, in the other that Ω 556 (the misprint 536 may be corrected) is omitted; in both it is said that Aristarchus athetized Ω 556. In reality Aristarchus athetized Ω 556-7, and what the MSS. do cannot be determined. The intervening Oxford text adds to our perplexity by reporting no omissions here nor at I 694 nor at Ψ 810.

the MSS. and atheteses of Aristarchus are purely coincidences; they are extremely few in number, and involve only one, or at the most two, manuscripts.

The case of B 558 is strikingly different. According to Ludwich fourteen of his MSS. omit,¹ and thirteen contain, the line. That points to the conclusion that the line is not one of those that Aristarchus athetized.

If one is not ready to accept that conclusion he can apply the converse test: collect the cases in which there is, as at B 558, a marked divergence in the testimony of the MSS., and see what is the relation of such lines to Aristarchus. This Mr. Allen did not attempt; but in the *Amer. Journ. Phil.* XXXVII. 8-12 (1916) I have listed eighty-seven passages (not lines) of this sort, to which should be added *a fortiori* the passages that are found in no manuscript. The first thing that stands out is that it is impossible to connect a single one of these passages with Aristarchus; there is not an athetesis, not a variant reading, ascribed to him. Furthermore, the list includes a very large proportion of the lines we happen to know were not in Aristarchus' text: B² 168, 206, E 901, N 255, 731, Φ 480, Ψ 804, Ω 558, not to mention N 808a, T 39a, and lines that have got into no manuscript. This raises another question: Why at Δ 196-7, Φ 73, Ψ 626, do we not find the MSS. in a similarly disturbed condition? For it is clear that this fact cannot upset the correlation noted, but itself is the thing that demands explanation. Into this I shall not here digress,³ it is enough for the present purpose that this test again points to the absence of B 558 from the edition of Aristarchus.

I class the line, therefore, as a post-Aristarchean interpolation in the vulgate. That, of course, does not mean (cf. *Ext. Ev.* 15) that it and its congeners were first composed in post-Aristarchean days. On the contrary, B 558 is one of the lines for which the opposite can be proved. The scholium on Δ 273 shows that Aristarchus knew the *τινές* who wrote the line, and it would be no surprise to find this verse in a 'wild' Ptolemaic text. As for Aristotle (*Rhet.* I. 15) and Herodotus (V. 66) being acquainted with the line, a verdict 'not proven' seems the most appropriate. The anecdote is the immediate source of the interpolation; that it in turn drew on Hesiod (cf. Mr. Allen, *Homer* 237) is possible.⁴

¹ In half of these it is entered by a second hand, but that shows merely how the line was then spreading. Mr. Allen's method of dealing with such evidence is not clear to me.

² The evidence is frequently indirect, but reasonably satisfactory. Mr. Allen, *Class. Rev.* XV. 9 and 244, will recognize but three 'omissions' in Aristarchus' text, viz. E 808, II 613, Φ 73. The first two must be set aside: II 613 because it was read in his second edition; E 808 because the evidence is conflicting, while the MSS. show it to behave like any athetized line.

³ The papyri supply the answer and confirm

the conclusion I am about to draw. Mr. Allen regards their evidence as casual, and it has usually been so treated. We should look upon them, on the contrary, as samples of a text the lines of which varied so little, that it is possible to predict what lines will, and what will not, be found in any vulgate papyrus. My predictions were first made in 1916 (*Amer. Journ. Phil.* XXXVII. 21) and seem (cf. *Ext. Ev.* 255-6) to have stood the testing of ten years satisfactorily.

⁴ Only let us not ascribe to Hesiod (cf. Mr. Allen, *ib.* 2353) the infelicity of making Ajax moor his ships 'ἐν' Ἀθηναίων ἱστάντο φάλαγγες. In

The equation $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota = \acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ is therefore to be abandoned : (1) because it conflicts with the usage of the scholia ; (2) because the corollary that B 558 was athetized is contradicted by the behaviour of the MSS., which indicate (3) that the line was not in the edition of Aristarchus.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

its original setting (if there was one earlier than the anecdote) the line need have referred neither to ships nor to Ajax. It could, for instance,

have described the action of one of the sons of Theseus in the rescue of his grandmother.