

Tamás Mészáros

Two Critical Notes on the Ancient Biographical Tradition of Thucydides*

I.

One of the most determinative characteristics of the ancient Greek literature is its fragmentariness: the oeuvres of the Greek authors have been transmitted in fragments, the majority of the extant dramas, poems, rhetorical speeches are known to us from fragments, and our knowledge about the lives and careers of certain authors is even more fragmentary. In the case of certain popular authors, some biographies of dubious authenticity happen to be preserved by mere chance, but usually we cannot hope for more. The case of Thucydides is actually an exception to this rule. Although the works of Didymus, Zopyrus, Antyllus and Cratippus dealing with Thucydides' life – a fact known to us from ancient references – have been lost together with several further biographies, the extant material is still significant.

The expression “ancient biographical tradition” in the title of the present paper is a generic expression for a group of strongly heterogeneous texts. The individual works, entries in lexica, anecdotes, references belonging to this group are different regarding their language, wordage and stylistic elaboration; the dates of their compilation are also varying. Their authors are usually unknown – even if the manuscripts preserved the name of the alleged authors next to the title of the work. Sometimes the lack of the unity is conspicuous even within a single work. Thus, the only common point they share is the subject, i.e. the person of Thucydides, the prominent historiographer of the antiquity – or, more precisely, Thucydides and his historical work, because from time to time the authors were more interested in the questions about Thucydides' *work*, even if the titles of the biographical works promised biographies *expressis verbis*. The same is true in a reversed way: as the biographers did not refrain from

* The present paper has been prepared with the support of the research project OTKA PD 104876 and the Bolyai Scholarship.

making literary critical comments, the authors dealing with the historical work from the viewpoints of aesthetics and stylistics also offer some biographical data. For instance, Dionysius of Halicarnassus' works related to Thucydides and Hermogenes of Tarsus' references to Thucydides also belong to the latter group, but we could even mention the scholia to Thucydides which also present some biographical information. It is necessarily the result of subjective decision what we regard as part of the tradition from this extensive *corpus* and what not;¹ the ancient biographical tradition of Thucydides is so huge that it cannot be embraced anyway.

Several scholars dealt with the biographical tradition of Thucydides already in the golden age of modern classical philology.² The researchers at the end of the 19th century primarily aimed to clarify the textual and prosopographical questions of the biographies, or sometimes they intended to reveal the sources. As for the evaluation of the whole of the tradition, their opinion is forgiving at best, sometimes even mockingly scornful: they regarded the texts as a mixture of misunderstandings and conscious falsifications only rarely containing a few affirmable statements. However, their results are unquestionable: our knowledge about Thucydides' life is mostly based on their research work even today. Then a long break followed. Although the Thucydides philology kept on flourishing, the biographical questions were brought into focus only rarely, even then as a side-effect of the research work of the ancient historians,³ while

¹ The texts of some biographies are usually published in various textual editions of Thucydides: BEKKER, I.: *Thucydidis De bello Peloponnesiaco libri octo*. Berolini 1832; POPPO, E. F.: *Thucydidis De bello peloponnesiaco libri octo I/1*. Lipsiae 1886; HUDE, C.: *Thucydidis Historiae I*. Lipsiae 1905; STUART JONES, H. – POWELL, J. E.: *Thucydidis Historiae I*. Oxford 1942; LUSCHNAT, O.: *Thucydidis*. Lipsiae 1954; ALBERT, I. B.: *Thucydidis Historiae I*. Roma 1972. Cf.: PICCIRILLI, L.: *Storie dello storico Tucidide*. Genova 1985.

² Some more important works from the Thucydides literature of the end of the 19th century without aiming to give a complex picture: GRAUERT, W. H.: *Ad Marcellini vitam Thucydidis observationes criticae*. *RhM* 1 (1827) 169–193; KRÜGER, K. W.: *Untersuchungen über das Leben des Thukydidis*. Berlin 1832; ROSCHER, W.: *Leben, Werk und Zeitalter des Thukydidis*. Göttingen 1842; RITTER, F.: *Das Leben des Thukydidis aus Scholien zur thukydidischen Geschichte geschöpft von Marcellinus. Quellen und geschichtlicher Werth dieser Lebensbeschreibung*. *RhM* 3 (1845) 321–359; PACKARD, L. R.: *On Some Points in the Life of Thucydides*. *TAPA* 4 (1873) 47–59; PETERSEN, E.: *De vita Thucydidis disputatio*. Dorpati Livonorum 1873; WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON: *Die Thukydidislegende*. *Hermes* 12 (1877) 326–367; HIRZEL, R.: *Die Thukydidislegende*. *Hermes* 13 (1878) 46–49; SCHÖLL, R.: *Zur Thukydidis-Biographie*. *Hermes* 13 (1878) 433–451; GLIBERT, O.: *Zur Thukydidislegende*. *Philologus* 38 (1879) 243–268; UNGER, G. F.: *Die Nachrichten über Thukydidis*. *Jahrb. für class. Phil.* 133 (1886) 97–11, 145–173; HERBST, L.: *Die Arbeiten über Thukydidis*. *Philologus* 49 (1890) 134–180, 338–375.

³ More important pieces are: CAVAINAC, E.: *Miltiade et Thucydidis*. *RPh* 55 (1929) 281–285;

nowadays the literary critical and rhetorical approach prevails – if we can detect any kind of trends from the few papers published in the last decade at all.⁴

Due to the accurate work of the predecessors it would be irrational to hope that all what we have thought about Thucydides' life so far could be shaken. Thus, we cannot promise anything else than two minor corrections, minor suggestions that seem to offer new information in connection with passages in two different biographies.

II.

First let us have a look at a text written on a special writing material: the biography of Thucydides found on an Oxyrhynchus papyrus (P. Oxy. 1800).⁵ The pieces of the papyrus roll presumably from the end of the 2nd century AD contain various short biographies selected according to undetermined criteria out of which – beside the Thucydides biography – nine further biographies have been identified so far.⁶ Unfortunately, the short fragment of the Thucydides biography does not offer any new information; moreover, in a reading of the first fragment – in my opinion – a minor error occurs. The first fragment of the Thucydides biography was published by Grenfell and Hunt in the following transcription lacking diacritic marks and punctuation:⁷

περι Θουκυδι[δου
 Θουκυδιδης το μεν γε[νος 65
 ην Αθηναιος παι[ς δ Ο]λο

CADOUX, T. J.: The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides. *JHS* 68 (1948) 70–123; WADE-GERY, H. T.: Miltiades. *JHS* 71 (1951) 212–221; BRADEEN, D. W.: The Fifth-Century Archon List. *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 187–208; FROST, F. J.: Pericles, Thucydides, Son of Melesias, and Athenian Politics before the War. *Historia* 13 (1964) 385–399; MEYER, H. D.: Thukydidēs Melesiou und die oligarchische Opposition gegen Perikles. *Historia* 16 (1967) 141–154; PHILLIPS, D. J.: Men named Thukydidēs and the General of 440/439 BC. *Historia* 40 (1991) 385–395.

⁴ MAITLAND, J.: Marcellinus' Life of Thucydides. Criticism and Criteria in the Biographical Tradition. *CQ* 46 (1996) 538–558; BURNS, T.: Marcellinus' Life of Thucydides. *Interpretation* 38 (2010) 3–25.

⁵ GRENFELL, B. P. – HUNT, A. S.: The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XV. London 1922, 137–150, particularly 140–141 and 147–148.

⁶ The reconstructed order of the biographies is as follows: Sappho, Simonides, Aesop, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Aeschines, Thrasybulus, Hyperides, Leucocomas, Abderus.

⁷ See GRENFELL – HUNT (n. 5) 140, frg. 2, col. II, 66. The digital image of the fragment is available on the following website: <http://163.1.169.40/gsd/collect/POxy/index/assoc/HASH9e99/183be4ab.dir/POxy.v0015.n1800.a.02.hires.jpg>
 See Plate I in Appendix.

ρου διαβαλλουσι δε τον πα
 τερα αυτου Θραικα οντα
 εις Αθηνας μετοικισθη
 ναι δυνατος δε εν λογοις α 70

νηρ γ[εν]^οαμενος⁸ ανεγρα
 ψεν το[ν] γενομενον Αθη
 ναιοις [και] Πελοποννη>
 [σιοις πολεμον

Concerning Thucydides. Thucydides was by birth an Athenian, and the son of Olorus; his father is maligned as being a Thracian who migrated to Athens. Having literary skill he wrote the history of the war between the Athenians and Peloponnesians.⁹

From the viewpoint of content, the text does not offer any new information. Although Thucydides' father was surely an Athenian citizen, the Thracian origin of his ascendants is a commonplace in his biographical tradition.

In the transcription presented in the edition of the papyrus, the reading παι[ς δ Ο]λορου (= παῖ[ς δ' Ο]λόρου) at the end of line 3 seems to be objectionable for several reasons, although it is eventually correct in its *content* ("Thucydides was the son of Olorus"). My objections are as follows:

- 1) Although in the transcription the letter *iota* after the syllable πα- is indicated as clearly visible, I cannot see traces of this *iota* on the digital image.
- 2) Since the script is *scriptio continua* lacking diacritic marks, the *lacuna* after the syllable πα- requiring complementation seems to be longer than three letters. On the basis of the number of letters in the remaining lines, I assume that approximately five letters have been lost there.
- 3) Finally, I think that the presupposition of elision in the transcription is unnecessary. From this aspect, the hand is not consequent; he did not always avoid hiatuses elsewhere. The hiatus emerging between δέ and ἐν did not disturb him some lines later (70), whereas the editor elided the – interpolated – word δέ above.

In my opinion the following happened. In the course of the transcription, the editor started out from the name of the father that was fairly easy to decipher,

⁸ The original – wrong – form γεναμενος is corrected by the same hand writing an *omicron* above the *alpha*.

⁹ Translated by GRENFELL – HUNT (n. 5) 147.

then he filled the *lacuna* in accordance with the *genitivus originis* Ὀ]λόρου. Obviously he thought that the complementation of the syllable πα- to παί[ς was evident (although this does not explain the problem of the *iota*), then due to the extension of the *lacuna* – for want of something better – he also added the particle δέ, which was with all probability intended as the pair of the μέν found in the previous line (65). I emphasize that the solution is understandable and correct in its content. Thus, our task is to offer a reading that is also correct in its content and eliminates the difficulties mentioned above at the same time.

My suggestion, i.e. the transcription of the passage complemented with diacritic marks and punctuation is the following:

περὶ Θουκυδί[δου
 Θουκυδίδης τὸ μὲν γέ[νος 65
 ἦν Ἀθηναῖος, πα[τρὸς Ὀ]λό-
 ρου, διαβάλλουσι δὲ τὸν πα-
 τέρα αὐτοῦ Θραῖκα ὄντα
 εἰς Ἀθήνας μετοικισθῆ-
 ναι. δυνατὸς δὲ ἐν λόγοις ἄ- 70
 νήρ γ[εν]όμενος ἀνέγρα-
 ψεν τὸ[ν] γενόμενον Ἀθη-
 ναίοις [καὶ] Πελοποννη-
 [σίοις πόλεμον

Concerning Thucydides. Thucydides was by birth an Athenian, born from the father Olorus; his father is maligned as being a Thracian who migrated to Athens. Having literary skill he wrote the history of the war between the Athenians and Peloponnesians.

On the one hand, the meaning of the reading πα[τρὸς Ὀ]λόρου is in agreement with the reality (“Thucydides was born from the father Olorus”), on the other, the complementation seems adequate regarding the number of letters (five letters in contrast to the three letters of the previous solution). Moreover, the same expression – the *genitivus originis* and the common noun in agreement with it in the role of apposition – also appears in the text of the biography by Marcellinus (ch. 2): Θουκυδίδης Ὀλόρου προῆλθε πατρός (“Thucydides came into being from the father Olorus”). The second part of the structure μέν – δέ is not the

particle δέ added and elided by the editor, but rather the particle δέ in line 67: thus, the Athenian origin and the Thracian ancestry are perfectly contrasted.

III.

But was Thucydides' father really called Olorus? My second example shows that even this is questionable according to some. Let us start out from the fact that in his historical work Thucydides calls himself undoubtedly son of Olorus:¹⁰ in dealing with his own activity as strategos, he tells us that the people of Amphipolis under siege: πέμπουσι ... ἐπὶ τὸν ἕτερον στρατηγὸν τῶν ἐπὶ Θράκης, Θουκυδίδην τὸν Ὀλόρου, ὃς τάδε ξυνέγραψεν, ὄντα περὶ Θάσον (IV, 104, 4).¹¹

Let us see what the so called Marcellinus biography writes about this question – this biography is the most significant in the biographical tradition of Thucydides due to its extension and importance; its text full of wrong readings and lacunas was preserved in approximately a dozen Thucydides manuscripts.¹² The work was presumably composed for the students of schools of rhetoric in the Hellenistic period, intended as an introduction to the study of Thucydides. Marcellinus,¹³ the alleged author of the biography is possibly identical with the educated orator who learnt also philosophy and wrote commentaries to the rhetorical works of Hermogenes of Tarsus.¹⁴ However, the biography comprising 58 chapters is not an organic work. Apart from the interruptions in the narration, the frequent repetitions and corrections, and obvious contradictions,

¹⁰ PRENTICE, W.: Thucydides and the Cimonian Monuments. *Jbh. des Österr. Arch. Inst.* 31 (1939) 36–41 mistakenly doubts the authenticity of this passage. I accept the arguments of LUSCHNAT, O.: Der Vatersname des Historikers Thukydidēs. *Philologus* 100 (1956) 134–139.

¹¹ “[They] sent to the other commander in Thrace, Thucydides son of Olorus, the author of this history, who was at the isle of Thasos.” Translated by CRAWLEY, R.

¹² The manuscripts kept in Heidelberg (*Codex Palatinus Graecus* 252) and in Wolfenbüttel (*Guelferbytanus Gudianus Graecus* 35) count as authoritative. About the single manuscripts and the tradition see ALBERTI (n. 1) clxxiv–clxxix for details.

¹³ About Marcellinus see BUX, E.: Μαρκελλίνος 49. *PWRE* XIV (1930) 1450–1487 and SCHISSEL, O.: Μαρκελλίνος 50. *PWRE* XIV (1930) 1487–1488. Earlier it was wrongly assumed that the author might be identical with the Roman historiographer Ammianus Marcellinus. Cf. FORNARA, CH. W.: Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus II. Ammianus' Knowledge and Use of Greek and Latin Literature. *Historia* 41 (1992) 420–438.

¹⁴ Beside Syrianus (appr. the end of the 4th c. AD – the beginning of the 5th c. AD) and Sopater (appr. the end of the 5th c. AD) Marcellinus (appr. the middle of the 5th c. AD) is the third Hermogenes scholiast known by name. Cf. WALZ, E. CHR.: *Rhetores Graeci*. Stuttgart et alibi 1832–1836, Vol. IV.

linguistic and stylistic arguments also confirm that the biography in its present form was compiled from at least two,¹⁵ but possibly even from four different authors' works sometime in the middle of the 5th century AD.¹⁶ The author of the biography often refers to his sources: apart from Thucydides approximately twenty different historiographers, poets, orators and other prose writers are named – sometimes together with the title of the works cited.¹⁷ The content is similarly varied: we can find factual statements based on thorough research on the one hand and fabulous stories and apparent absurdities on the other; the narration is recurrently interrupted by rhetorical reflections, stylistic observations and literary critical notes.

Since the major part of the biographical tradition also mention Thucydides' father as Olorus,¹⁸ we can read the discussion about the right form of the name in the Marcellinus biography with some astonishment. To be more precise, we could read this discussion, if the text of chapter 16 in question had not been heavily damaged even in the *Codex Palatinus Graecus* 252 regarded as authoritative. The manuscript, which is usually indicated with the signature E in the critical editions of Thucydides, was with all probability copied in one of the scriptoria of the imperial library in Constantinople, possibly in the second half of the 9th century, or perhaps in the first half of the 10th century.

Before the analysis of the passage in question, let us clarify a less interesting problem. In some of the manuscripts of the *Suda* lexicon, in the text of the Thucydides biography we can find the form ὠλωρος, with an *omega* in the middle syllable. Moreover, the use of this variant name is inconsequent, because the variant with the *omega* does not appear in all four *loci*, but only

¹⁵ According to OOMEN, G.: *De Zosimo Ascalonita atque Marcellino*. Monasterii Westfolorum 1926, chapters 2–44 and 56–58 were written by Marcellinus, while chapters 1 and 45–55 were written by Zosimus of Ascalon. For the latter see GÄRTNER, H.: Zosimos von Askalon. *PWRE* X A (1972) 790–795.

¹⁶ According to BUX (n. 14), Marcellinus compiled the work from Proclus' *Chrestomathia* and from the works of Caecilius of Caleacte and Zosimus.

¹⁷ The catalogue is rich: beside Aeschylus, Herodotus and Xenophon, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Didymus, Pherecydes, Hellanicus, Polemon, Hermippus, Antyllus, Timaeus, Philistus, Androtion, Praxiphanes, Philochorus, Demetrius of Phaleron, Cratippus, Prodicus, Theopompus and Asclepius are mentioned by name. Homer, Pindar and Gorgias are also cited several times.

¹⁸ Apart from the above mentioned P. Oxy. 1800, the form Olorus is used consequently for instance in the biography of Thucydides from an unknown author the text of which is published in all Thucydides editions (cf. ALBERTI [n. 1] clxxx–clxxxv), in the majority of the manuscripts of the *Suda* lexicon and by Eudocia Macrembolitissa (cf. FLACH, H.: *Eudociae Violarium*. Lipsiae 1880, 377, ch. 474).

once or twice depending on the manuscripts.¹⁹ The phenomenon can be easily explained with the phonetic changes of the later Greek language (the differences between short and long vowels faded away), which was also reflected by the instability of the orthography.

Returning to the Heidelberg manuscript mentioned, we do not think either that the form Holorus (Ὅλορος) appearing in the main manuscript of the Marcellinus biography would have any importance: the occasional mistake in the aspiration in the case of a lesser known name is a forgivable mistake. Furthermore, the orthography of the manuscript is notoriously inaccurate and its punctuation is insecure.²⁰

It is a more complicated question whether the form Orolus (Ὅρολος) is right or wrong – already the ancient researchers of Thucydides were divided on this question, and this obscurity resulted in the emergence of the textual problem mentioned. The difficulty is obviously caused by the fact that the name sounded unfamiliar to the Greek speakers, and they could easily swap the two similar consonants – both the *rho* and the *lambda* are liquids – in pronunciation.

After this introduction let us see chapter 16 of the Marcellinus biography in the Heidelberg manuscript (Cod. Pal. Gr. 252, 2^o, 25–30).²¹ The transcription strictly following the text of the manuscript is presented below:

μη̄ ἀγνοῶμεν δὲ τοῦτο ὅτι Ὅλορος ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῶ ἐστὶ· τῆς μὲν
 πρώτης συλλαβῆς τὸ ρ ἐχούσης, τῆς δὲ δευτέρας τὸ λ· αὕτη γὰρ
 ἢ γραφή, ὡς καὶ Διδύμῳ δοκεῖ, ἡμάρτηται. ὅτι γὰρ Ὅρολος ἐστίν,
 ἢ στήλι δηλοῖ ἢ ἐπὶ τοῦ τάφου αὐτοῦ κειμένη, ἔνθα κεχάρακται
 Θεουκιδίδης Ὅρολου Ἀλιμούσιος.

¹⁹ The *apparatus criticus* of PICCIRILLI (n. 1) 54 adds the following remarks to the *loci* in question: Ὅλόρου omnes fere codd. (cfr. Suida s. vv. Ὅλορος et ὄργαν): Ὅλώρου A V E, then later Ὅλορον et Ὅλορε omnes fere codd.: Ὅλωρος [*sic! recte: Ὅλωρον*] et Ὅλωρε V E.

²⁰ This is why the name appears in the form Holorus elsewhere in the manuscript – except for the damaged text of chapter 16. See M. J. LUZZATTO's essential monograph, which gives a complex analysis of the metrical scholia in the Cod. Pal. Gr. 252 (*Tzetzes lettore di Tucidide. Note autografe sul Codice Heidelberg Palatino Greco 252*. Bari 1999).

²¹ See the website of the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, where digital images of the codex have been published recently:
<http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/cpgraec252/0015?sid=ba89ebc319c24159a24051fc78badf57>
 See Plate II in Appendix.

Let us not be senseless, the name of his father was Holorus, the first syllable has a rho, the second one has a lambda; since this way of writing, as it also seems to Didymus, is corrupt. For that it is Horolus is clearly attested by his gravestone where the following words are inscribed: Thucydides, son of Orolus, from the deme of Halimus.

The confusion is clear: although according to the first sentence the name Olorus is correct (the variant forms Holorus~Olorus have just been discussed), later the author argues for the reading Orolus (Horolus). Between the two we can find a statement intended as correction about the consonantal parts of the single syllables, which instead of helping us increases the chaos. Finally, as conclusive evidence, the alleged funeral inscription is presented that justifies the variant Orolus.

Perhaps the *apparatus criticus* of the latest critical edition of the biography can help us. We can find the following critical remarks to the first sentence:²²

᾽Ολορος E : ᾽Ολορος Vg Vm : ᾽Ορολος Ab Gu Pc Pl Pe³ Vm¹ :
᾽Ολορος <οὐκ ᾽Ορολος> Oomen 84 : <᾽Ολορος, οὐκ> ᾽Ορολος
Grauert : ᾽Ορολος ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἔψευσται vel ἔσχεδιασται prop.
Schmidt 323 : minus recte Preller 39 vulgatam (᾽Ορολος) defendens
lacunam esse statuit post λ sic explendam οὐκ ᾽Ολορος.

The following remarks are added in the *apparatus criticus* to the second sentence that contains the name Orolus and the funeral inscription cited as evidence:²³

᾽Ολορός Vg : ᾽Ορολός Ab Gu Pc Pl Vm Pe³ : ᾽Ολορός E || ᾽Ολόρου
Vg Vm Pe³ : ᾽Ορόλου E Ab Gu Pc Pl.

With the letter E the reading of the Codex Palatinus Graecus 252 is indicated, then it is followed by the readings of the different Vatican, Milan, Wolfenbüttel and Paris manuscripts: almost everywhere we can find different forms without any traces of consequence. Our first impression seems to be confirmed: complete uncertainty characterizes this question.

Let us see the conjectures of the different editors. In the first place, I discuss the German Gerhard Oomen's suggestion²⁴ which was also adopted by Piccirilli

²² PICCIRILLI (n. 1) 16.

²³ PICCIRILLI (n. 1) 18.

²⁴ OOMEN (n. 15) 84.

in the main text. Oomen accepts the form Olorus and he corrects the text accordingly, and then he uses an interpolation so that the statement referring to the syllables could gain sense. Thus, the result is by and large the following: “the name of his father was Olorus, not Orolus, the first syllable has a rho, the second one has a lambda” etc.

The next attempt to restore the original text, the conjecture of Wilhelm Grauert is merely interesting from the viewpoint of the history of the scholarship, since it is based on a mistake.²⁵ Presumably Grauert could not check the Heidelberg manuscript personally – and he does not mention other codices in his paper – he only used the reading Orolus he found in an earlier edition,²⁶ and since he assumed that the variant Olorus was right – similarly as Oomen did – he interpolated a negation into the text accordingly. Thus, the final result is the same as in the previous case by accident.

Moritz Schmidt, the editor of *Didymus* does not make an independent suggestion, he only states that the form Orolus is the result of a mistake made by accident or out of negligence.²⁷

Ludwig Preller²⁸ has a contrasting standpoint, who – in defence of the variant Orolus – even suggests an interpolation resulting in a contrasting sense – Piccirilli reprehends him for it. Thus, according to Preller, the correct text is as follows: “the name of his father was Orolus, the first syllable has a rho, the second one has a lambda, not Olorus”.

In my opinion, although out of the suggestions above Oomen’s solution is almost correct, he also misunderstood the statement referring to the syllables, so his solution needs some correction. I repeat: both Thucydides’ own statement and the major part of the tradition support the variant Olorus: I also accept this version, and accordingly I suggest the consequent correction of the forms Orolus similarly as Oomen does. However, the text also mentions the wrong version, thus, somewhere the form Orolus also had to appear. The question is where.

²⁵ GRAUERT (n. 2) 176–178.

²⁶ This resulted in further misunderstandings. First HUDE (n. 1) misunderstood Grauert’s suggestion and indicated it wrongly in his apparatus (E Ὀρολος), then Luschnat also adopted Hude’s misleading remark and he corrected it only later, on the basis of H. Hommel’s personal suggestion (E ὄλορος). See LUSCHNAT (n. 10) 137.

²⁷ SCHMIDT, M.: *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*. Lipsiae 1854, 323.

²⁸ PRELLER, L.: *Polemonis periegetae fragmenta*. Lipsiae 1838, 39.

Now if we take either the name Olorus or the name Orolus, it is sure that both of them consist of *three* syllables. In accordance with the rules of orthography, the syllabification of the name is either Ὀ-λο-ρος or Ὀ-ρο-λος; the syllabifications Ὀλ-ορ-ος or Ὀρ-ολ-ος would be grammatically incorrect. This can be confirmed with the fact that the scribe writes Ὀ-λόρου²⁹ when the genitive form of the name appears at the end of the line in the Heidelberg codex.³⁰ Thus, in the first syllable, neither variants of the name contains a consonant: neither *rho* nor *lambda* appears there. Oomen and the others were possibly misled by misunderstanding two different concepts: the first and second consonants versus the consonants in the first and second *syllables*. If this is the case, and the first syllables of either variant name contain no consonants, how can we interpret the statement referring to the syllables?

Presumably we need to count with the same phenomenon as the one we all know regarding the accentuation of the Greek words, i.e. one should start counting the syllables from the back of the words. As for instance the expression *paroxytone* refers to the second syllable from the back (penultimate syllable), and the expression *proparoxytone* to the third syllable from the back (ante-penultimate syllable), we also need to count the syllables from the back of the word. The statement “the first syllable has a rho, the second one has a lambda” thus means that “the first syllable from the back has a rho, the second one from the back has a lambda”. Now this statement is only valid to the variant Olorus regarded as correct also earlier, and not to Orolus. Consequently, the interpolation suggested by Oomen needs to be replaced right after the statement referring to the syllables, so the demonstrative pronoun αὕτη also gains sense. Thus, my suggestion to restore the text of chapter 16 is the following:

μη̄ ἀγνοῶμεν δὲ τοῦτο ὅτι Ὀλορος ὁ πατήρ αὐτῶ ἐστί· τῆς μὲν πρώτης συλλαβῆς τὸ ρ ἐχούσης, τῆς δὲ δευτέρας τὸ λ, <οὐκ Ὀρολος> αὕτη γὰρ ἡ γραφή, ὡς καὶ Διδύμω δοκεῖ, ἡμάρτηται. ὅτι γὰρ Ὀλορός ἐστιν, ἢ στήλη δηλοῖ ἢ ἐπὶ τοῦ τάφου αὐτοῦ κειμένη, ἔνθα κεχάρακται Θουκυδίδης Ὀλόρου Ἀλιμούσιος.

Let us not be senseless, the name of his father was Olorus, the first syllable from the back has a rho, the second one from the back has

²⁹ Similarly a separated form appears in the text of P. Oxy. 1800 presented above, in the correct form Ὀλό-ρου.

³⁰ Cod. Pal. Gr. 252, 2^o, 5.

a lambda; since this latter way of writing, as it also seems to Didymus, is corrupt. For that it is Olorus is clearly attested by his gravestone, where the following words are inscribed: Thucydides, son of Olorus, from the deme of Halimus.

Appendix

Plate I.



P. Oxy. 1800, frg. 2, col. II.³¹

³¹ Courtesy of The Egypt Exploration Society and Imaging Papyri Project, Oxford. I would like to thank the education and public engagement manager, Carl Graves for his kind support.

