

Gnomon

Author(s): Paul Shorey

Source: *Classical Philology*, Oct., 1925, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Oct., 1925), pp. 341-343

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/263453>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*

JSTOR

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

GNOMON

Classical Philology is pleased to welcome *Gnomon*, a new monthly devoted to the entire classical field, including archaeology. The managing editor is Dr. Richard Harder, of Berlin, and there is an imposing list of editors, Ludwig Curtius, Ludwig Deubner, Eduard Fraenkel, Matthias Gelzer, Ernst Hoffmann, Werner Jaeger, Walther Kranz, Karl Meister, Peter von der Mühl, Karl Reinhardt, Gerhart Rodenwaldt, Wilhelm Schubart, Wilhelm Schulze, Eduard Schwartz, Johannes Strouzel, Wilhelm Weber. It promises to furnish longer and prompter reviews of all significant publications, and the first three numbers seem to keep the promise. L. Curtius discusses critically Hans Schrader's *Phidias*, challenging for example some of his attributions to Alcámenes and Paeonius. Alfred Körte praises Wilamowitz' *Epitrepontes*, modestly declaring that he cannot regret the *Vereitelung* of his own ten years' plans because he never could have accomplished what Wilamowitz has done. W. Schubart reviews at length Idris Bell's *Jews and Christians in Egypt*. W. Jaeger commends Ross's Aristotle's *Metaphysics* which he says will be of aid to him in his own forthcoming edition. Jaeger goes on to sketch the history of the text criticism of the *Metaphysics*. Hans v. Arnim reviews Gunnar Rudberg's *Kring Platons Phaidros* and rejects, as my review in the January number of *Classical Philology* did, some of the parallels between the *Phaedrus* and the seventh *Epistle*. There are several other reviews and interesting shorter notes.

Professor Fraenkel gives neither a review nor an article to Professor Merrill's Teubner text of Catullus, but substitutes a reprint of a page of the "slating" of the book by Professor Housman in last year's *Classical Review*. I do not know and will not try to guess his motives, nor do I know how far the apparent oversights on which Professor Housman gloats were due to the special conditions of publication. I have no competence and after thirty years at the University of Chicago no appetite to discuss manuscripts and emendations of Catullus. But when Professor Fraenkel coldly remarks that he has nothing to add to Professor Housman's observations I find something quite definite and pertinent to add. Professor Housman was evidently in ill humor. Not content with disabling Professor Merrill's text criticism he throws in a quite "gratuitous" sneer because of the insertion of a harmless necessary page of metrical schemes for tiros in the book. "German tiros," he writes, "can learn metre from experts; it is in Mr. Merrill's country and mine that tiros

are instructed by their fellow tiros." Just so. In the winter of 1913 to illustrate the idiomatic use of τὸ τυχόν I quoted

nec fortuitum spernere caespitem

to a seminar class in the University of Berlin nearly ready for the doctorate. A member of the seminar volunteered the information that it was a line of Horace's *Satires*. After some discussion it was agreed that the *Satires* were in hexameters and this was not an hexameter. What was it? Another student contributed the suggestion that metric had now become an occult science which nobody could be expected to know. I infer nothing from this incident except that tiros and teaching are much the same throughout the world. But I was naturally tempted to find in it confirmation of what I had said in *Choriambic Dimeter*, that students could not learn to scan by the new schemes. Mr. Housman is loftily contemptuous of Mr. Merrill because he scans Phalaecian hendecasyllables "on Hermann's system which is already discarded by Hermann's compatriots . . . and this scansion is sure of a refuge under the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes." In other words he sneers at Mr. Merrill for printing for the convenience of students the simple scheme

⋮ — — — — —

Does Mr. Housman think that it would have strained Mr. Merrill's intelligence or scholarship to rearrange his longs and shorts on the quadrisyllabic model

— — — — —

Can Mr. Housman read

corneli tibi; namque tu solebas

by that scheme? Or does he in fact read the "cyclic" dactyl there? Does he in his own practice split *tibi*?¹ Or do the schemes exist only on paper for him and are they inoperative for voice and ear as they are in Wilamowitz' reading.² Can Professor Housman read by these schemes? And if he does and can, can he teach students to do it? Has he read the objections to the new

¹ I am aware that he may ask whether I split *libellum* or *solebas*. But a break immediately followed by a stressed long is an entirely different thing from a break between two unstressed shorts. Or is his voice an organ which one school of the new metricians argue does not stress at all and so proves that the Greeks didn't and that we shouldn't?

² At any rate certainly were in 1913. It may be that since then Professor Schroeder has taught him the gasping *salto mortale* of

ἀκτις αε—λιου το καλ

but I doubt if he or his students can keep it up through an entire ode. I have taught myself to do it with painful preparation—but not to enjoy it. And every illustration of the method I offer my class frightens them out of a week's growth of sane normal scansion. Even so one only gives the group divisions of the new scansion. It is a physiological and psychological impossibility to preserve both the groups and the quantities as marked at the same time. You have to hold or pause upon the ε and then race madly over λι to plump upon ου.

metric? Can he answer them? Has he ever seen or read a serious attempt to answer them? How many recent editors in England and throughout the world who have adopted the new schemes can read Greek verse by them acceptably, or have any better reason for accepting them than, to borrow Mr. Housman's imagery, the fear of following old fashions that have a second life in Bayswater, or under the Stars and Stripes?

I yield to none in admiration for Professor Housman's scholarship, as well as his poetry, and I am therefore more grieved than aggrieved that he does not seem to think that the courtesy of fair debate is due to the inferior scholarship that finds refuge under the Stars and Stripes.

PAUL SHOREY

NOTE ON HERODOTUS ii. 135

τῆς ὧν δεκάτης τῶν χρημάτων ποιησαμένη ὀβελοὺς βουπόρους πολλοὺς σιδηροῦς, ὅσον ἐνεχώρηε ἡ δεκάτη οἱ, ἀπέπεμπε ἐς Δελφοῦς.

In my little book on *Sappho and Her Influence* (p. 17) I spoke of "the collection of *obeliskoi* or iron spits, the small change of ancient days before coined money was used to any great extent." A further explanation of Rhodopis' tithe to Delphi seems necessary, since in *Classical Philology*, XX, 169, the question is asked: "Is this not a confusion of terms, since Herodotus says that Rhodopis sent many *obeloi*, or 'iron spits,' for roasting oxen to Delphi?" I firmly believe that these *obeloi* could be called *obeliskoi* and that they were not for roasting oxen at Delphi but were the equivalent of an actual money contribution. Plutarch says:¹ ἔδειξεν ὁ περιηγητὴς χωρίον, ἐν ᾧ Ῥοδώπιδος ἔκειντό ποτε τῆς ἑταίρας ὀβελίσκοι σιδηροῖ. That the Ῥοδώπιδος ἀνάθημα was proverbial is seen from Suidas and Hesychius and from Athenaeus, who in viii. 362b quotes some verses of Epicharmus which are corrupt but surely refer to these ὀβελοί. In xiii. 596c, Athenaeus in criticizing Herodotus says: ἡ καὶ τοὺς περιβοήτους ὀβελίσκους ἀναθεῖσα ἐν Δελφοῖς, ὧν μέμνηται Κρατίνος. The ancients then, it seems, used the word ὀβελίσκοι as well as ὀβελοί for the dedication at Delphi, the base of which Karo wrongly thought he had discovered.²

Why should a *Hetaera* rather than a herdsman or artisan dedicate many "iron spits"? Because these were "the small change of ancient days." Pollux vii. 105 speaks of ὀβελοὶ σιδηροῖ, νόμισμα σιδηροῖν τὸ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Βυζαντίων.³ Plutarch⁴ uses the phrase, ὀβελίσκοις χρωμένων νομίμασι σιδηροῖς, and many other sources mention ὀβελοὺς σιδηροῦς. So Plutarch⁵ says significantly

¹ *De Pythiae Orac.* xiv. 39 f. [Paton].

² *Journal International d'Archéologie Numismatique*, X, 290, 367.

³ Cf., also, ix. 77.

⁴ *Lyxander* 17.

⁵ *Fabius Maximus* 27.