

## A NEW COMMENTARY ON THE *ODYSSEY*

(PLATE 1)

*P. Yale* inv. 551 is a small rectangular piece of high quality papyrus measuring  $3.5 \times 12$  cm<sup>1</sup>. The provenance of the papyrus is not known. It is a fragment of a roll containing a commentary (ὑπόμνημα)<sup>2</sup> on the *Odyssey*.

The writing is firm and practiced, and although it has some cursive elements, it is a regular book hand that may be classed as a medium size, upright but flattened round capital of the informal type executed fairly quickly<sup>3</sup>. It is markedly bilinear (φ normally projects). The spacing between letters varies considerably, as does their inclination in relation to each other. Some letters have serifs. I suppose it is not likely to be later than the middle of the second century A.D. A very vague *terminus ante quem* may be provided by the ends of twelve lines, of a rather uncertain text, preserved on the back; they have been executed with heavy penmanship in a style I should date to the late second or early third century A.D.

The lemma is separated from the comments by a blank space equal to about two letters (line 3). Each lemma began a new line and, if my reconstruction is correct, was ἐν εἰσθέσει. To my knowledge this is the only known occurrence of εἰσθεσις in a hypomnema, ἔκθεσις being the normal practice in such documents<sup>4</sup>. Whether the lemma was preceded by a critical mark identical to the one that stood opposite the corresponding verse in the text, or by an all-purpose mark common to all lemmata (e.g., a simple παράγραφος, i.e. a dash, or a διπλῆ ὠβελισμένη,

---

1. I should like to express here my thanks to Prof. R. Merkelbach for his assistance in the preparation of this article. He suggests μάχεται as a possible restoration where I supply ἐναντιοῦται (lines 10-11).

2. On hypomnemata preserved on papyri see E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri. An Introduction*, Oxford, 1968, pp. 112-24, and E. Lobel, introd. to *P. Oxy.* XXI 2307 and XXV 2429.

3. On the informal round capital see E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Oxford, 1971, pp. 24-5; for similar hands cf. Plates 22, 24, and 39.

4. See Turner, *Papyri*, p. 114; *Manuscripts*, pp. 9, 14, and 125.

i.e.)—, as in *P. Oxy.* XXXIX 2886), is not known. No lectional signs have been preserved, except for a high stop doing the duty of a comma (line 14). Iota adscript is written (line 8). The correction in line 4 was made, *prima facie*, by the same hand.

The preserved portion contains the comments on three lemmata from the *Odyssey*. Of the first too little remains to allow for identification of the lemma. The other two are notes on the two words printed in italics in the following passage (*Od.* IV 335-45=XVII 126-36):

ὥς δ' ὀπότ' ἐν ξυλόγῳ ἔλαφος κρατεροῖο λέοντος  
 νεβροῦς κοιμήσασα νεηγενέας γαλαθνοῦς  
 κνημοῦς ἐξερέησι καὶ ἄγκρα ποιήεντα  
 βουσκομένη, ὃ δ' ἔπειτα ἔην εἰσήλυθεν εὐνήν,  
 ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ τοῖσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφῆκεν,  
 ὥς Ὀδυσσεύς κείνοισιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφήσει.  
 αἱ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἀπολλων,  
 τοῖος ἐὼν οἷός ποτ' εὐκτιμένη ἐνὶ Λέσβῳ  
 ἐξ ἔριδος *Φιλομηλεΐδῃ* ἐπάλαισεν ἀναστάς,  
 κἀδ' δ' ἔβαλε κρατερῶς, κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί,  
 τοῖος ἐὼν μνηστῆρσιν ὁμιλήσειεν Ὀδυσσεύς.

*Text*

. . . .  
 ]αιουγαροιονα.[  
 ]ειχενοικαδε[  
 ]μησασα αρι.[  
 ]σι'οτικαιδυο[  
 5 ]κακωσουν[  
 ]εταιτον[  
 ]ομηλειδ[  
 ]τωιπατρ.[  
 ].ιλοκρατ[  
 10 ]ασγενεαλογει[  
 ]εαυτοιστομ[  
 ]μηδεποτεα[  
 ]πατρωνυμ[

]ζειν·καιτοκ.[  
 15 ]αντεσαχαιοια[  
 ]υγαρνεχαιρο[  
 ]κλουπεσοντο[  
 ]φιλομηλειδ.[  
 ].ιλεακουστε.[

This may be reconstructed as follows:

[ . . . . . ] ζι· οὐ γὰρ οἶον αν[ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ] εἶχεν οἶκαδε. [ vacat (?) ]  
 [ κοι]μήσασα· Ἄρισ[τοτέ-]  
 [λης φη]σὶ ἵν' ὅτι καὶ δύο [νεβρούς]  
 5 [τίκτει·] κακῶς οὖν [ . . . . . ]  
 [μέμφ]εται τὸν [ποιητὴν].  
 [ Φιλ]ομηλείδ[ηι· οὐχ ὥς]  
 [τινες] τῶι Πατρό[κλωι, κα-]  
 [θάπερ] Φιλοκράτ[ης ἐν . Περὶ]  
 10 [Θετταλί]ας γενεαλογεῖ. [ἐναν-]  
 [τιοῦται δ]ὲ αὐτοῖς τὸ μ[ἐν τὸν]  
 [ποιητὴν] μηδέποτε ἀ[πὸ μη-]  
 [τέρων τὰ] πατρωνυμ[ικὰ]  
 [σχηματί]ζειν, καὶ τὸ «κε[χάρον-]  
 15 [το δὲ π]άντες Ἄχαιοὶ» ἀ[τοπον]  
 [ἂν εἴη· ο]ὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔχαιρο[ν τοῦ]  
 [Πατρό]κλου πεσόντο[ς. ἀλλὰ]  
 [μᾶλλον] Φιλομηλείδ[ηι τὸν]  
 [Λέσβου βα]σιλέα ἀκουστέο[ν].

#### Translation

*κοιμήσασα*: Aristotle writes that (the deer) may give birth even to two fawns; therefore ... is wrong in criticizing the poet.

*Φιλομηλείδηι*: this does not refer to Patroclus as some maintain, following the genealogy established by Philocrates in the ... book of his work *On Thessaly*. In contradiction to their opinion stand the fact that

the poet never forms patronymics from mothers' names, and the fact that the phrase «and all the Achaeans were filled with joy» would be out of place; for they would not rejoice over the fall of Patroclus. One should rather understand the reference to be to Philomeleides the king of Lesbos.

### Notes

#### Lines 3-6

The reference is to Arist. *hist. anim.* VI 29 (=578<sup>b</sup>): τίκτει δ' (scil. ἡ ἔλαφος) ὡς μὲν ἐπὶ πολὺ ἓν, ἥδη δὲ τινες ὠμέναι εἰσὶν ὀλίγαι καὶ δύο.

*Od.* IV 335-40 (=XVII 126-31) has troubled others too, among them Aristophanes:

Schol. E, H, Q, T on *Od.* IV 339: ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ τοῖσιν Ἀριστοφάνης τὸ ἀμφοτέροισι ἐπὶ τῆς ἐλάφου καὶ τῶν νεβρῶν λαμβάνει· ὁ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλης ἓν φησι τίκτειν τὴν ἔλαφον σπανίως δὲ δύο. εἰκότως δὲ Ὅμηρος τοῦτωι συγχρῆται, ἵνα καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐμπερὲς ᾗ τὸ τῆς εἰκότος· ὡς γὰρ οἱ μνηστῆρες πλεῖστοι πρὸς ἓνα, οὕτως καὶ οἱ νεβροὶ πρὸς τὸν ἓνα ἰσχυρότερον ἀντίκεινται.

Cf. Eustathius 1498, 23: διδυμότοκον δὲ ὑποτίθησιν ἔλαφον, ἵνα μὴ παρεικάσῃ νεβρῶι ἐνὶ τοῦς τοσοῦτους μνηστῆρας.

As for the critic, whose (short) name is lost in the lacuna at the end of line 5, Prof. R. Merkelbach suggested by letter that it may have been Zoilus, the well known Ὅμηρομάστιξ. Nothing clearly points to him, but the criticism would be very much in his style<sup>1</sup>.

#### Lines 7-19

According to Athen. VI 85, p. 264<sup>a</sup> (=Jacoby, *FGrH* 601 F 2, Φιλοκράτης δ' ἐν β' Θεσσαλικῶν, εἰ γνήσια τὰ συγγράμματα), Philocrates wrote more than one book *On Thessalian Matters*, and it is virtually certain that the genealogy of Patroclus, a Locrian hero, would have been part of this work, which the papyrus commentator cites as Περὶ Θεσσαλίας<sup>2</sup>.

1. On Zoilus see Jacoby, *FGrH* 71, esp. F 3-19; K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis homericiis*, 3rd ed., Königsberg, 1882, pp. 200-4; U. Friedländer, *De Zoilo aliisque Homeri obtrectatoribus*, Diss., Königsberg, 1895; H. Usener, *Kleine Schriften*, I, Leipzig-Berlin, 1912, pp. 13-14; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, Oxford, 1968, p. 70.

2. If Θεσσαλικὰ was the original title of the work, Περὶ Θεσσαλίας may be due to the influence of the titles of similar works that appeared in great proliferation during the Hellenistic era, part of what F. Leo, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, II (1960), pp. 390 ff., called Περὶ - Literature. But cf. the following note.

An independent tradition (Apoll. *Bibl.* III 176=Jacoby, *FGrH* 601 F 1) has it that, according to the same Philocrates, the mother of Patroclus was named Polymele — but this is an understandable variant: συνείπετο δὲ (scil. τῶι Ἀχιλλεῖ) καὶ Πάτροκλος ὁ Μενoitίου καὶ Σθενέλης τῆς Ἀκάστου, ἣ Περιώπιδος τῆς Φέρητος, ἣ (καθάπερ φησὶ Φιλοκράτης) Πολυμήλης τῆς Πηλέως. This genealogy is repeated in Hyg. *fab.* 97: *Patroclus Menoetii et Philomelae filius*<sup>1</sup>.

Excepting the mention of Philocrates, this comment offers no new information. Its very close affinity (even verbal) with most of the medieval scholia on the problem raised by Philomeleides is evident. If it is not their direct ancestor, it stands very close to it.

Schol. H on *Od.* XVII 134: ἄδηλον τίς ὁ Φιλομηλείδης καὶ εἰ κύριον τὸ ὄνομα.

Schol. V on *Od.* IV 343: τῶι Πατρόκλωι· Φιλομήλας γὰρ ἦν υἱός.

Schol. M on *Od.* IV 343: τινὲς τὸν Πάτροκλον ἤκουσαν· Φιλομήλας γὰρ ἦν υἱός. οὔτε δὲ ἀπὸ μητρὸς τὸ γένος Ὀμηρος σχηματίζει, οὔτε οἱ Ἕλληνας ἤσθησαν (ἄν Dindorf) Πατρόκλου ἠττηθέντος· «πᾶσιν γὰρ ἐπίστατο μείλιχος εἶναι» (*Il.* XVII 671). ἀλλ' οὗτος βασιλεὺς ὢν Λέσβου τοὺς παριόντας εἰς πάλην ἐκάλει καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας δὲ προσορμισθέντας, ὃν Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ Διομήδης δολοφονήσαντες, τὸν τάφον αὐτοῦ καταγώγιον ξένων ἐποίησαν, ὡς Ἑλλάδικός φησιν (=Jacoby, *FGrH* 4 F 150).

Schol. Q, V on *Od.* XVII 134: ὁ Φιλομηλείδης ὡς Φιλομήλου υἱός· ὁ γὰρ Πάτροκλος οὐ δύναται δηλοῦσθαι ὡς Φιλομήλας υἱός, ὅτι τὰ ἀπὸ μητέρων οὐ σχηματίζει ὁ ποιητής, καὶ ὅτι τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον οὐκ οἰκεῖον ἦν ἐπὶ Πατρόκλου· «κάδ' δ' ἔβαλε κρατερῶς, κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί». καὶ ἐν Ἰλιάδι δὲ (XVII 670) λέγει· «νῦν τις ἐνηείης Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο μνησάσθω».

Schol. P on *Od.* IV 342: ἐν Ἀρίσβηι<sup>2</sup> ἐνὶ Λέσβωι (P)· βασιλεὺς γὰρ ἦν Λέσβου ὁ Φιλομηλείδης (P<sup>1</sup>).

1. It should be noted that a parallel tradition made Philomela the mother of Achilles. See Schol. Apoll. Rhod. I 558 (=Jacoby, *FGrH* 65 F 2): οἱ μὲν ἐκ Θέτιδος αὐτὸν (scil. Ἀχιλλέα) νομίζουσι γεγενῆσθαι τῆς Χείρωνος, Δαίμαχος δὲ ἐκ Φιλομήλας τῆς Ἄκτορος, and Schol. Apoll. Rhod. IV 816 (=Jacoby, *FGrH* 269 F 4): Στάφυλος δὲ ἐν τρίτῳ τῶν Περὶ Θεσσαλίας ... «καὶ δίδωσι (scil. οἱ θεοὶ) Πηλεῖ Φιλομήλαν». (Note the title of Staphylus's work).

On the rather confused genealogy of Patroclus see W. H. Roseher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, s.v. «Menoitios 2» (II.2, cols. 2795 ff.), «Philomela 1» (IV, col. 2343), and «Philomeleides» (IV, cols. 2348 ff.). See also «Philomeleides» in *RE* XIX.2, 1938, cols. 2519 f.

2. ἐν Ἀρίσβηι is a variant for ἐνὶ Λέσβωι; cf. *Il.* VI 13.

Eustathius 1498, 54 ff. on *Od.* IV 343: Φιλομηλείδην δὲ οἱ μὲν τὸν Πάτροκλον ἤκουσαν πατρωνυμικῶς, οἷα Φιλομήλας υἱὸν· οἷς οὐ μόνον ἡ γραφὴ ἐναντιοῦται (πῶς γὰρ διὰ διφθόγγου ἔσται ἡ παρατέλευτος;) ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ πατρωνυμικὸς τύπος· οὐ γὰρ εἴωθε σχηματίζειν πατρωνυμίαν ὁ ποιητὴς ἐκ μητέρων ἀλλ' ἐκ πατέρων. ... ἥπερ οὖν ἔφαμεν, οὔτε σχηματίζει ὁ ποιητὴς ἐκ μητέρων, καὶ εἴπερ δὲ ἴσως ἐξ ἔριδος παλαιάσας Ὀδυσσεὺς κατέβαλε τὸν Πάτροκλον, οὐκ ἂν ἐχάρησαν Ἀχαιοὶ πεσόντος τοῦ ἐνῆεος, ὅς κατὰ τὸν ποιητὴν πᾶσιν ἠπίστατο μείλιχος εἶναι (cf. *Il.* XVII 671). φασὶν οὖν οἱ ἀκρῖβες τερσοὶ Λέσβου βασιλέα τὸν Φιλομηλείδην, ὃς τοὺς παριόντας εἰς πάλην προσκαλοῦμενος ἐποίει τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ εἰς τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς ἐκεῖ προσορμισθέντας. καὶ ὡς μὲν κατεπαλαίσθη, "Ὀμηρος ἐνταῦθα ἱστορεῖ· ἕτεροι δὲ φασὶ καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ Διομήδης δόλωι ἀνελόντες αὐτὸν καταγώγιον ξένων τὸν αὐτοῦ τάφον ἐποίησαν (cf. Jacoby, *FGrH* 4 F 150).

Apoll. Soph. *Lex. Hom.*: Φιλομηλείδης· τοῦ σχήματος ὄντος πατρωνυμικοῦ, ἐν τῇ δ' Ὀδυσσεΐας, «Φιλομηλείδην ἐπάλαισεν ἀναστάς», ἐδέξαντο τινες τὸν Πάτροκλον, ὡς Φιλομήλας μητρός, τοῦ ποιητοῦ μὲν οὐδέποτε τῷ σχήματι χρησαμένου ..., ἔπειτα δέ, εἴπερ ἐσημαίνετο Πάτροκλος καταπαλαισθεὶς ὑπὸ Ὀδυσσεῶς, οὐκ ἂν εἶπεν «κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί»· τὸν γὰρ Πάτροκλον ὑπὸ πάντων φιλούμενον συνίστησι δι' ὧν φησι «πᾶσιν γὰρ ἐπίστατο μείλιχος εἶναι» (*Il.* XVII 671). ἔθεν τινὲς μὲν ἕτερόν τινα Φιλομήλου υἱὸν ἔφασαν, οἱ δὲ κύριον ὄνομα, ἔπερ καὶ μᾶλλον ἀκουστέον.

*Etym. Magnum* 166, 6 ff.: Ἀτρεΐδης· ... Φιλομηλείδης («Φιλομηλείδην ἐπάλαισεν ἀναστάς»). ταῦτα μὲν παρὰ τῶν εἰς -δης πατρωνυμικῶν καὶ τῶν τύπων πατρωνυμικῶν. τὰ δὲ μητρωνυμικὰ διὰ τοῦ ἰ γράφεται ... ἔθεν τὸ Φιλομηλείδης κύριον λέγεται εἶναι. εἰ γὰρ ἦν μητρωνυμικόν, διὰ τοῦ ἰ ἐγράφετ' ἂν· ἀλλὰ οὐδέ(ποτε supplevi) "Ὀμηρος ἀπὸ μητέρων σχηματίζει πατρωνυμικόν<sup>1</sup>.

Athens

GEORGE M. PARASSOGLU

1. On the absence of metronymics in Homer cf. also: Schol. A, D on *Il.* XI 709: ἡ διπλῆ, ὅτι ἀπὸ μητρός "Ὀμηρος οὐ σχηματίζει (Α) ... ἀπὸ μητρός γὰρ "Ὀμηρος οὐδένα σημαίνει (Α, D); Apoll. Soph. *Lex. Hom.*, s.v. Φοῖβος: "Ὀμηρος δὲ οὐδέποτε ἀπὸ μητέρων κοσμεῖ τινας, μήθ' ὅτι δὲ μᾶμης; Heracl. *Alleg. Hom.* VII 6: σύνθηες γὰρ Ὀμήρωι τοῖς πατράθεν ἐπιθέτοις χρῆσθαι, τὰ δ' ἐκ μητέρων οὐκ ἂν εὔροι τις ὅπως παρ' αὐτῷ.

During proof-correction Prof. R. Merkelbach sent me the following communication, which I believe will interest the reader: «In Zeile 8/9 würde ich jetzt vorziehen [οὐ/τω γὰρ] Φιλοκράτης κτλ. Ich meine jedenfalls, dass wir in den Zeilen 7-10 zwei Eigennamen brauchen, [N.N.] + Philokrates, damit in Zeile 11 darauf Bezug genommen werden kann mit αὐτοῖς. Erbse, mit dem ich Ihren Papyrus besprochen habe, sagt: In Ps. Apollodor, *Bibl.* III 176 (F. gr. Hist. 601 F 1) ist also nicht *Poly-mele* zu lesen, sondern *Philomele*».