



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES.

ON CALLIM. LAUACR. PALLAD. 93-97.

These verses are thus given in the MSS :

'Α μὲν ἀμφοτέραισι φίλον περὶ παῖδα λαβοῦσα (al. λαβοῖσα)
 μάτηρ μὲν γοερῶν οἶτον ἀηδονίδων
 ἀγε (al. ἄγε) βαρὺ κλαίουσα (al. κλαίοισα). θεὰ δ' ἐλέησεν ἑταίραν,
 καὶ μιν 'Αθαναία πρὸς τόδ' ἔλεξεν ἔπος,
 Δια γίναι . . .

This passage presents much to perplex, notably (1) the double *μὲν* (93. 94); (2) the metrical difficulty *ἀ μὲν ἀμφοτέραισι*. It has been altered in many ways: *ἀ μὲν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέραισι* Stephanus, *ἀ μὲν ἔτ' ἀμφ.* Reiske, *εἶπε καὶ ἀμφ.* Blomfield, *ἦ καὶ ἐπαμφοτέραισι* Passow, *φᾶ μὲν ἄμ' ἀμφοτέραισι* δὲ Meineke, *ἀ μὲν ἄμ' ἀμφοτέραισι* Schneider.

The *ἀ μὲν* looks right, and is answered by *θεὰ δ'* in 95. But the second *μὲν* in 94, *μάτηρ μὲν*, is intolerable, and has been variously emended. The best correction seems to me to be *μιν*, as, before me, Schneider suggested in *Philol.* VI, p. 519. The order of the words is *μάτηρ μιν ἄγε, γοερῶν οἶτον* (probably a mistake for *οἶκτον* as Schneider prints) *ἀηδονίδων βαρὺ κλαίοισα*: for there is surely no necessity to suppose that Callimachus never used *μιν*, though Schneider, in his edition of 1870, following Meineke, banishes it, against *all* MSS, from five passages, two in the *Lauacr. Pallad.* 65, 96, three in the *Hymn to Demeter* 73, 75, 104, writing in *all μιν*, and retaining *μὲν* in 94 against his own earlier judgment. Against Schneider's view, I should suppose Callimachus to have written *μιν* in 94 of a male, in 96, *νιν*, of a female; for, though the MSS give *μιν* also in 96, it is hardly likely that so careful an observer of poetical proprieties would in 94 apply the same form to a youth, in 96 to a woman.

Returning to 93, *ἀ μὲν ἀμφοτέραισι φίλον περὶ παῖδα λαβοῖσα*, it is difficult to choose between *ἐν ἀμφ.* and *ἄμ' ἀμφ.* It might be said that the mother would naturally embrace her blinded child with both hands *at once*, to show the depth of her sympathy with his affliction. On the other hand *ἐν ἀμφ.* is more in keeping with the prevailing calmness and absence of exaggeration which mark the poem. Schneider's quotations, however (*Philol.* VI 517), of *ἄμ'*

ἄμφω from the Iliad (VII 255, XXIII 686, H. Cer. 15, ἄμ' ἀμφοτέρησιν H. Merc. 39) may perhaps be thought to determine the question in favor of ἄμα.

I suppose, therefore, that Schneider was *right* in his earlier view (1851), *wrong* in his later (1870). Not only is it extremely likely that Callimachus would distinguish *μιν* from *νιν*, and (at least in the same poem) confine *μιν* to a masculine object, using *νιν* when he speaks of a female; but the sentence, as Schneider prints it in 1851, p. 519:

ἃ μὲν ἄμ' ἀμφοτέραισι φίλον περὶ παῖδα λαβοῖσα
 μάτηρ μιν γοερῶν οἶκτον ἠρδονίδων
 ἄγε βαρὺ κλαῖοισα. θεὰ δ' ἔλεησεν ἑταίραν κ. τ. λ.

may be added to the other instances of that involution of clauses which, as is well known, the Alexandrian poets affected. Theocr. XXIX 3, Epigr. XIX 1, Callim. fr. 445 οὐδ' ὄθεν οἶδεν ὀδεύει Θνητὸς ἀνήρ, Epigr. XLIV 2. This is, I believe, the true explanation of the much disputed passage of Val. Flaccus V 685-7:

Donec et Aeeten inopis post longa senectae
 Exilia, heu magnis quantum licet, inopia, fatis!
 Nata iuuet, graiusque nepos in regna reponat,

where *inopia*, a fem. agreeing with *nata* and referring to Aeetes' daughter Medea, is *interjected* into the exclamatory clause *heu magnis quantum licet fatis!*

ROBINSON ELLIS.

ON PARMENIDES 162 A. B.

This passage Grote pronounces to him "hardly intelligible." The reader who consults Hermann's text or Jowett's translation will receive little enlightenment. In spite of its subtlety, however, the passage is not really difficult when we have once grasped the main thought, and it admits, I think, of easy emendation. It occurs in the middle of the sixth argument of Parmenides, that is, to adopt the technical divisions of the dialogue, in the first half of the third antinomy: on the negative hypothesis that the one is not, εἰ μὴ ἔστι τὸ ἓν, Plato is demonstrating the coexistence of contraries in the relative or cognizable one. In 160 E he has shown, by hypothesis, that we cannot affirm being ("is") of the one, although we may affirm "participation" in attributes.