NOTES—KORT BERIGTE

TWO EMENDATIONS

Ionian depilation
Alexis II, 394 C.A.F. Kock (Athen. XIII, 565B): <δήν> πιττοκοπούμενόν τιν' ἢ ἐφρούμενον
δρῆς, 'Ἰονίων ἔχει τι θάτερον.
ἡ γάρ τριχορρυθὴν ἐπινοοῦν [μοι] φαίνεται
cαὶ πάντα τῷ πώγωνι δρᾶν ἑναντία,
ἡ τίλεις Ἡλικόν τούτο προσπίπτει κακόν.

In 1 I accept Meineke’s δήν. In 2 I restore metre and sense by reading Ἰονίων for τούτον. We have a confusion of ν and υ; Τ and Ι; and o and ω. In 3 I read τριχορρυθήν for the impossible στρατακείν—here the upright strokes TPI>CTP; X>A; PP>TE have been misread. This is a keyword for the sense: metre too is restored. In 5 ἱπποσικάκων τοῦτο of the cod. destroys metre and does not give the second Ionian evil—hence ΤΙΑΣΙΚΙΑΚΩΝ. We get ΤΙ>Π; ΤΙ>ΟΥ. We have pitch plasters and plucking-out of the hair.

Exit Dionysus, the Hero! (Plut. Q.Gr. C 36)

έλθ', οἶνηρ' ὁ Διόνυσ',
'Αλείων ἐς ναόν
ἀγνὸν σῦν. χαρίτεσσιν
[ἐς ναόν] τῷ βοώῳ ποδὶ θῶν,
ἀξιε ταῦτ', ᾧξε ταῦρε.

The MSS. give Διόνυσε in v. 1 and ταῦτῃ in 5. I give έλθ', οἶνηρ' ὁ Διόνυσ', for ἔλθείν ἦρω Διόνυσε of the MSS. J. B. Titchener, Vol. II, Plutarchi Moralia, 1935, accepts Cook’s ἦρ’, ὁ, entailing the elision of the dative τ of ἦρ. Wilamowitz, in his Gr. Verskunst, p. 384 sq., says that the form Διόνυσε and the language show that this hymn cannot claim a high age, but must have been taken down by a Peripatetic of the first or second generation. The form ἦρω for the vocative might have been one of the points in the language that influenced the great Hellenist to put the hymn down to a late period. For the formulaic inversion οἶνηρ' ὁ Διόνυσ', cp. Homeric Hymn XXVI, 11: καὶ σῶ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε, πολυστάφυλ' ὁ Διόνυσε. Homeric Hymn III, 14: χαῖρε, μάκαρ' ὁ Λητοῖ. I accept Bergk’s 'Αλείων for ὁλεον of the MSS. I delete ἐς ναόν in vs. 4. We have four prosodies, closing with a paroemiastic. The last ᾧξε ταῦτη, ᾧξε ταῦτη is taken as two adonii by Wilamowitz. (The Teubner-editor has kindly informed me that δύον for θύον is in his edition due to the printer’s devil.) I hope that this will lay the ghost of Hero Dionysus. He is οἶνηρος, because at the Θυῖα, as Pausanias tells us (VI 26), Dionysus, in a miraculous way,
fills overnight with wine three empty ἀέρητας that had been carefully closed and sealed. Here the only palaeographic difference is O>E, with the wrong division of words. Whether this is the work of Wilamowitz' Peripatetic of the first or second generation, may remain a moot point, but I don't think that the language of the hymn as restored warrants a late date.

University of Pretoria (1947)  †H. G. VILJOEN

ARISTOTLE'S COMMENTS ON THE PARMENIDEAN ONE

While criticising the aberrations of the Eleatics Aristotle writes (Phys. 186a 16–18): ἔπειτα διὰ τι ἀκίνητον, εἴ ἐν; ὡσπερ γὰρ καὶ τὸ μέρος ἐν δὲν—τοδὲ τὸ ξαφνικῶς—κινεῖται ἐν ἐαυτῷ, διὰ τι ὅλῳ καὶ πάν; Cornford correctly notes that Aristotle must here be attacking the limited One of Parmenides rather than the unlimited One of Melissus. Parmenides had denied motion to his sphere because of its internal homogeneity, but as Aristotle observes, this does not mean that the sphere as a whole is incapable of motion, even if, as Parmenides maintained, there is nothing outside it. Like an imaginary homogeneous globe of water (say in a goldfish bowl) the sphere of the all is perfectly capable of rotating within its own bounds. The clear implication of this criticism is that Aristotle regarded the Parmenidean sphere of the One as something physical and extended, for only such an entity is capable of rotation.

In the Metaphysics Aristotle also mentions the Eleatics who believed that τὸ πᾶν ἦν. Here (Metaph. 986b 18–21) he writes Παρμενίδης μὲν γὰρ ἔσικε τοῦ κατὰ τὸν λόγον ἐνὸς ἄπεσθαι, Μέλισσος δὲ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ὕλην (διὸ καὶ ὁ μὲν πεπερασμένον, ὁ δὲ ἀπειρόν φησιν εἶναι αὐτό). The obvious interpretation appears to be the following. Aristotle is here regarding Parmenides as using ἐν in the third of three senses he lays down in the Physics. The three senses are as follows: one as continuous; one as indivisible; one as having the same definition. Parmenides, then, is supposed to have argued that since objects x, y, z can each be defined as δὲν, they are therefore one in definition (κατὰ τὸν λόγον). In fact Aristotle and Eudemus do categorically credit Parmenides with such reasoning. However, as we have just seen, Aristotle in another context makes it clear that he accepted

2. Phys. 185b 7ff. Aristotle (line 19) here uses τὸ λόγος instead of κατὰ τὸν λόγον.
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